

The Triple Nexus in Practice: Toward a New Way of Working in Protracted and Repeated Crises

December 2019



NYU | CENTER ON
INTERNATIONAL
CIC | COOPERATION

Cover photo: Rohingya refugees in the Kutupalong Rohingya Refugee Camp in Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 2018 (UN Photo/KM Asad).

Center on International Cooperation

The Center on International Cooperation (CIC) is a non-profit research center housed at New York University. Our vision is to advance effective multilateral action to prevent crises and build peace, justice, and inclusion.

Suggested citation:

Center on International Cooperation, "The Triple Nexus in Practice: Toward a New Way of Working in Protracted and Repeated Crises" (New York: Center on International Cooperation, 2019).

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	iii
Abbreviations.....	iii
Executive summary.....	vi
1. Introduction	1
1.1. <i>About the study</i>	1
1.2. <i>Background to the new way of working</i>	1
1.3. <i>Context for the study</i>	2
2. Reinforcing, not replacing, national and local systems.....	5
2.1. <i>Promising developments and good practices</i>	5
2.2. <i>Constraints</i>	16
3. Transcending the humanitarian–development divide.....	25
3.1. <i>Promising developments and good practices</i>	26
3.2. <i>Constraints</i>	42
4. Anticipating crises before they occur.....	57
4.1. <i>Promising developments and good practices</i>	57
4.2. <i>Constraints</i>	63
5. Recommendations.....	69
5.1. <i>For governments and local civil society</i>	69
5.2. <i>For the UN system</i>	71
5.3. <i>For donors</i>	75
Endnotes.....	78
Annex: topic guide.....	89
Boxes	
Box 1: Humanitarian needs in national development planning.....	6
Box 2: Incorporating refugees into the education sector in Jordan.....	7
Box 3: Analysis supporting government action.....	10
Box 4: A diversity of approaches to supporting local governments, communities, and NGOs.....	11
Box 5: Yemen: localization in active conflict situations.....	14
Box 6: Humanitarian principles and working with state institutions.....	19
Box 7: Somalia: not ripe for implementation, but why undermine ownership?.....	20
Box 8: Promising transition strategies: Nigeria, Somalia, and DRC.....	21
Box 9: Collective outcomes: a few key questions.....	25
Box 10: Planning across humanitarian and development divides in Lebanon.....	27
Box 11: Linked plans: Mauritania, Burkina Faso, and Sudan.....	34
Box 12: Mainstreaming, acceleration, and policy support for 2030 Agenda as an entry point.....	37
Box 13: World Bank facilities.....	38
Box 14: Ethiopia’s Refugee Proclamation.....	40
Box 15: Language barriers as a crucial impediment in some countries.....	44

Box 16: Peacebuilding linkages in Nigeria.....	46
Box 17: 2019 HRPs and the new way of working.....	48
Box 18: Humanitarian–development(–peacebuilding) pooled funds.....	51
Box 19: Danish joint strategies at global and country levels.....	54
Box 20: Contingency planning in Afghanistan, South Sudan, and Iraq.....	59
Box 21: Anticipatory and early-action finance.....	62
Box 22: DAC Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus.....	66

Tables

Table 1: Summary of recommendations.....	xiv
Table 2: A sample of collective outcomes.....	32

Acknowledgments

This review was commissioned and funded by the United Nations Development Programme and the government of Norway. The Center on International Cooperation (CIC) at New York University is deeply thankful for their support and the contributions they have made to the research and analysis. CIC also gratefully acknowledges the government officials and United Nations resident coordinators who facilitated country visits for this study, as well as government and other national stakeholders, and colleagues in resident coordinator offices, United Nations Country Teams, Humanitarian Country Teams, and donor missions who shared their experiences and expertise. Input and insights were also kindly provided by members of the Joint Steering Committee to Advance Humanitarian and Development Collaboration, including the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance, the Peacebuilding Support Office, the Development Coordination Office, and others, as well as colleagues from the World Bank, Inter-Agency Standing Committee, and the International Network on Conflict and Fragility. Finally, CIC thanks the many colleagues from nongovernmental organizations and academic institutions who also contributed to this review. This report was authored by Leah Zamore, with strategic advice from Sarah Cliffe and Subinay Nandy, and research assistance from Shavon Bell. The views expressed in this report, and any errors, are solely our own.

Abbreviations

3RP	Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan
ARC	African Risk Capacity
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CADRI	Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative
CAR	Central African Republic
CARE	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere
Cat-DDO	Catastrophe Deferred Drawdown Operations
CCA	Common Country Assessment
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
CFE	Contingency Fund for Emergencies
CRRF	Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework
CRW	Crisis Response Window
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DEVCO	Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development
DHC	Deputy Humanitarian Coordinator
DIZA	Inclusive Development of Host Communities
DPA	Department of Political Affairs
DPPA	Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
DSRSG	Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General
ECHO	Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ESP	Education Strategic Plan

FAM	Famine Action Mechanism
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FbA	Forecast-based Action
FCV	Fragility, Conflict, and Violence
FMS	Federal member states
FoodSECuRE	Food Security Climate Resilience
GCCFF	Global Concessional Financing Facility
GCR	Global Compact on Refugees
GHD	Good Humanitarian Donorship
HC	Humanitarian Coordinator
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
HDP	Humanitarian, Development, and Peacebuilding
HIPC	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
HNO	Humanitarian Needs Overview
HRP	Humanitarian Response Plan
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IFI	International Financial Institution
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IDA	International Development Association of the World Bank
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INCAF	International Network on Conflict and Fragility
INGO	International Nongovernmental Organization
JHF	Jordan Humanitarian Fund
JSC	Joint Steering Committee
MAPS	Mainstreaming, Acceleration, and Policy Support
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
MPTF	Multipartner Trust Fund
MSF	Médecins Sans Frontières
NDP	National Development Plan
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
N/LNGO	National/Local Nongovernmental Organization
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Development Assistance Committee
PARCA	Refugees and Host Communities Support Project
PBF	Peacebuilding Fund
PBSO	Peacebuilding Support Office
PDA	Peace and Development Adviser
PDNA	Post-Disaster Needs Assessment
PSNP	Productive Safety Net Programme

QCPR	Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review
RC	Resident Coordinator
RCO	Resident Coordinator Office
RMR	Risk Mitigation Regime
RMU	Risk Management Unit
RPBA	Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment
RRP	Refugee Response Plan
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SDF	Social Fund for Development
SDRF	Somali Development and Reconstruction Facility
SRSG	Special Representative of the Secretary-General
UNAMID	United Nations–African Union Mission in Darfur
UNCF	United Nations Cooperation Framework
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDS	United Nations Development System
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Program Services
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WASH	Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene
WFP	World Food Programme
WHS	World Humanitarian Summit

Executive Summary

This review was commissioned by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with support from the government of Norway and in consultation with other United Nations (UN) partners in the Joint Steering Committee to Advance Humanitarian and Development Collaboration (JSC), to evaluate progress on the “new way of working.”

The new way of working has three objectives:

- *Reinforce—do not replace—national and local systems.* This objective is motivated by a recognition that humanitarian action often perpetuates parallel international structures over years and fails to build national capacity in countries affected by protracted or repeated crises. As the former secretary-general’s *One Humanity, Shared Responsibility* report, which first introduced the new way of working, put it, “From the outset, international actors should be looking for opportunities to shift tasks and leadership to local actors. This must be the mindset and a predictable part of any international response plan from the start of an operation.”¹
- *Transcend the humanitarian–development divide by working toward collective outcomes, based on comparative advantage and over multiyear timelines.* This objective came about through the realization that building stronger national and local resilience would require development and humanitarian actors to work together and would take time. The *One Humanity* report notes that “humanitarian actors need to move beyond repeatedly carrying out short-term interventions year after year towards contributing to the achievement of longer-term development results. Development actors will need to plan and act with greater urgency to tackle people’s vulnerability, inequality and risk as they pursue the Sustainable Development Goals.”²
- *Anticipate—do not wait for—crises.* This point aims to focus attention on the human costs and wasted resources spent in acting too slowly as crises build up. It calls for “a step change in our efforts to anticipate better and then act to prevent crises.”³ As noted recently by Emergency Relief Coordinator Mark Lowcock: “What we need to do is move from today’s approach, where we watch disaster and tragedy build, gradually respond and then mobilize money and organizations to help; to an anticipatory approach where we plan in advance for the next crisis.”⁴

The purpose of the review is to take stock of how the “new way of working” launched at the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in 2016 is being implemented in the field. It is too early to evaluate outcomes. The review therefore aims to identify early changes in behavior and approaches at country level, showcase opportunities and good practices, and provide recommendations to

overcome actual and potential risks and challenges for the UN system and its partners.

While our terms of reference were focused on humanitarian–development linkages, the new way of working frequently spans the “triple” nexus of humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding work. Several important findings on peacebuilding emerged from the research and field visits and are therefore highlighted here. Continued field visits specifically designed to assess development–humanitarian–peacebuilding links will continue to deepen these findings.

Reinforcing, not replacing, national and local systems

The first part of the report tracks progress on reinforcing national and local systems and enhancing national leadership. Examples run the gamut of programmatic activities, from analysis and planning to programming and financing. For instance, many governments now include humanitarian activities, whether carried out by their own agencies or by international partners, in their national, sectoral, or provincial plans. Analysis that identifies the links between humanitarian issues, development, and peacebuilding challenges has been important to inform these plans. In some cases, this “joint” analysis has been performed by governments (Ethiopia); in others, it has been undertaken by the UN and other international partners, but with considerable national involvement (Central African Republic, Nigeria, Somalia).

In many countries, efforts to ensure greater alignment with national and local systems have moved well beyond analysis and planning to operations that are affecting hundreds of thousands of refugees, internally displaced persons (IDPs), and members of host communities. Two key factors in moving to scale are expanding national and local social protection systems and harmonizing cash and other programming around national or local standards.

Links between humanitarian services and national and local social protection are the crucial channel through which repeated, short-term humanitarian activities can help build resilient national systems, scalable to respond to shocks, in the longer term. (Re)routing international support to and through these same systems is essential if we are to address the structural factors that have made “permanent emergencies” and indefinite humanitarian assistance a reality in the first place. Relevant social protection and service delivery systems include safety nets for the impoverished and vulnerable, inclusive sectoral services (health, education, water, and so forth), and specific emergency-related functions such as disaster preparedness.

A transition toward greater use of local systems is occurring in a variety of contexts. Governments with functioning social protection systems that cover most of the country are finding various promising models to use them in humanitarian emergencies, including by catering to refugees, IDPs, and host communities together, for example in Ethiopia, Jordan, and Indonesia. Even in “hot”-conflict areas, the infrastructure of precrisis national social protection systems can be drawn upon for joint activities, as has been the case in Yemen. Conversely, in countries where social protection systems have not existed for many years because of conflict, such as Somalia, Afghanistan, and Timor-Leste at independence, governments can design emergency responses to provide the nucleus of national social protection systems later on. In other words, in every setting some link exists or is conceivable between humanitarian activities, development aid, and social protection, although the nature of the link varies. Across contexts, preserving and increasing the scope, budget, and flexibility of social protection programs is a critical priority.

Cash programming is crucial in this regard because it allows aid actors to harmonize their assistance behind local standards and avoid duplicative mechanisms. There are now promising examples of cash-payment systems that can be run by local actors in future emergencies, including in Chad, Lebanon, and Somalia. However, important challenges remain, including those related to targeting and incentives for harmonization.

The UN has made progress in reinforcing local systems. Agencies with mandates that span humanitarian and development remits, in particular UNDP and the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF), lead the way in innovating on government and nongovernmental-organization (NGO) partnerships. But more traditional humanitarian agencies, such as the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the World Food Programme (WFP), have also adapted their engagement with national and local actors. Pooled trust funds have been strategically important in advancing the objective of reinforcing local systems, and UNDP and others have also played a useful role in the Mainstreaming, Acceleration, and Policy Support (MAPS) process—supporting governments that wish to address humanitarian and peacebuilding issues as part of their national adoption of the sustainable development goals (SDGs). Several donors have also developed specific measures and strategies on localization, while international NGOs are placing a greater emphasis on supporting local civil society.

Baseline capacity constraints and the lack of systematic cross-country learning inhibit further progress. Despite the steps forward, relatively small amounts of funding currently flow through national systems. From the donor perspective, concerns about lack of respect for humanitarian principles, bureaucratic delays, and lack of transparency constrain progress. In turn, governments lack crisis-preparedness and crisis-response capacities and oversight mechanisms for addressing fiduciary issues and monitoring compliance with humanitarian principles. Outside the disaster-response areas, there is also little systematic learning on good practice in establishing whole-of-government national systems for crisis response and recovery, which span financial, personnel, and procurement systems and specify the relative roles of the center of government, line ministries, emergency agencies, and subnational authorities.

National ownership of humanitarian action in different countries also shows different degrees of understanding and commitment to humanitarian principles and human rights-based approaches by the key actors. The review finds that prioritizing national ownership remains important wherever key government actors genuinely support humanitarian principles, and other fundamental norms are not at stake, even when the state lacks capacity. But these situations need continued assessment and dialogue, with offers of necessary support.

Transcending the humanitarian–development(–peacebuilding) divide

Efforts to reinforce national systems have themselves been a key driver for transcending humanitarian–development–peacebuilding divides. Where governments have taken up greater roles in humanitarian assistance, they have by necessity created links between emergency agencies and line ministries such as education and health. The use of local social protection systems and of cash programming has enabled much closer collaboration between international humanitarian and development agencies. For the World Bank, for example, a shared objective of building local capacity is cited by staff as the most important

factor in determining whether collaboration with the UN works well in situations affected by humanitarian emergencies.

One of the most encouraging findings is that humanitarian–development–peacebuilding linkages appear to be moving beyond analysis and planning and into practical, programmatic action with shared objectives. Examples this review identifies include area-based programming in Nigeria, links between humanitarian assistance and local governance in Somalia, and links between social protection programs and humanitarian assistance in Chad, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, and Yemen, among others. Practical coordinated action appears to be moving forward fast in two situations. First of all, where strong government leadership exists. This is true whether or not the government has the capacity or the desire to use state systems for humanitarian protection and aid: development and humanitarian actors have worked together in Ethiopia, Indonesia, and Jordan, where state systems are used, and in Chad and Somalia, where governments have explicitly asked for strong use of nongovernment capacities alongside state programs. Second, high insecurity has motivated actors to collaborate where traditional development modalities are difficult, such as Central African Republic (CAR), Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen.

Hence, approaches on the ground are being adapted at two ends of the spectrum: higher-capacity situations in which government wants to meet humanitarian objectives and principles through its own state systems, with international support; and highly insecure situations, in which traditional development actors are increasingly operating with and through humanitarian partners. There are however a number of “missing middle” cases with less cooperation: those in which much of the country has a high degree of stability and government leadership for development, and often high per capita development volumes, but in which governments have been reluctant to engage in a coordinated dialogue on approaches to humanitarian crises. These situations necessitate greater reflection on how to incentivize and create stronger links.

Within the UN, specific country teams have made progress in making development and humanitarian planning more coherent, through different models of combining and linking plans. A growing number of country teams have identified “collective outcomes”—that is, concrete results that humanitarian, development, and other actors commit to achieving jointly over a multiyear period with the aim of sustainably reducing needs, vulnerabilities, and risks. Many of the new UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs)/UN Cooperation Frameworks (UNCFs) and the 2019 Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs) show a clear evolution of such teams’ thinking, with greater coverage of development–humanitarian–peacebuilding links. At global level, these and other efforts to achieve coherence on the ground are being supported by new frameworks, such as the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) and the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), and by the recently established JSC.

Progress is not even, however. There are many cases of disconnected and duplicative UN planning—the UNDAFs/UNCFs, HRPs, Refugee Response Plans (RRPs), Peacebuilding Priority Plans, and other mechanisms—that places a capacity burden on national counterparts. While there are good examples of collective outcomes emerging, many remain too generic and contain little reference to strategic priorities, such as building national capacity to drive sustainable outcomes in the medium term. Although HRPs are growing in sophistication, donors and governments often perceive multiyear plans as comprising two or three single-year plans, rather than aiming to build resilient systems and

capacities over time. There are also concerns about whether changes ongoing within the UNDAF/UNCF process are sufficient to ensure that UNDAFs/UNCFs provide an inclusive, living framework capable of driving programming across the triple nexus.

We find that the reasons for maintaining separate UN plans and for relatively low strategic ambition are often more bureaucratic than principled. There is still a sense that different agencies “own” and push different planning instruments (UNDAFs and UNDP, HRPs and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance, or OCHA, and RRP, and UNHCR). Institutional funding cycles continue to drive humanitarian response planning. Actors also face challenges related to capacity. The role of resident coordinators (RC) and resident coordinator/humanitarian coordinators (RC/HC) is crucial in upping the strategic ambition of collective outcomes, but they are effective only when they have the capacity to link development, humanitarian, and peacebuilding issues. The UN Development System (UNDS) reforms and new UNDAF/UNCF guidelines provide opportunities to address capacity gaps, but they also carry some risks—for instance, that of delinking the RC’s office from UNDP’s capacity. Regarding the World Bank and humanitarian actors, the review finds plenty of evidence that a closer partnership has developed. We identify promising examples of practical coordination behind shared objectives in CAR, Chad, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, Somalia, Uganda, and Yemen, among other places. There are some areas to work on. World Bank staff feel that humanitarian agencies often do not sufficiently prioritize national institution building. Humanitarian staff feel that Bank programs are still slow and that the Bank overestimates government capacity to implement. Yet despite these teething problems, collaboration is at a qualitatively different level from what would have been the case just five years ago.

Bilateral donors are also beginning to adapt their processes and instruments to facilitate more-coherent, joined-up financing. Multiyear humanitarian funding is becoming more common. Rather than avoiding crises, some development-financing instruments are “staying and delivering” in crisis contexts. Funding mechanisms capable of supporting activities that span the double or triple nexus are emerging. Key constraints remain, however, including institutional silos within donor governments and a geographic separation between humanitarian and development financing within affected countries, both of which impede complementary action toward collective outcomes.

Regarding peacebuilding, an important finding is the demand from government coordination agencies to see the UN country team assist them in drawing security and justice actors together with development and humanitarian actors, to develop a common vision of development and peacebuilding outcomes that is shared by different parts of governments and their international counterparts. Resident coordinators generally note that they are comfortable providing such convening and strategic support at a government’s request. However, the availability of capacity, such as peace and development advisers (PDAs) and UNDP-supported country-support platforms, is crucial for them to play this role effectively. Other opportunities for forging peacebuilding linkages identified by the review include the creation of new coordination structures that span the triple nexus, the inclusion of peacebuilding concerns in HRPs, and joint prioritization of issues such as the recruitment of youth by armed groups and inter-religion cohesion. Nevertheless, a clear consensus on the appropriate role of the peace pillar (especially with respect to the “hard”-peace component) has yet to emerge, and concerns remain about the potential for humanitarian objectives to be subordinated to security goals.

Anticipating rather than waiting for crises

In countries undergoing humanitarian emergencies during the period 2017–19, the majority bore some form of additional shock on top of the underlying emergency. Such shocks include new or renewed conflict within the country (Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Afghanistan), spillovers from neighboring conflicts (Chad, Colombia, Niger), natural disasters (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Haiti, Somalia), economic shocks, such as the closure of trading routes (Lake Chad Basin), and currency movements or fiscal contractions (Chad, Jordan, Lebanon, Sudan, South Sudan). The original vision of the new way of working paid particular attention to this issue because failure to anticipate crises is a primary driver of high costs, both in human lives and financial terms.

Planning systems have not yet been updated to reflect this imperative. Very few government plans, HRPs, or UNDAFs/UNCFs include any form of concrete contingency planning. Afghanistan is a notable exception, with the 2018–21 HRP correctly foreseeing the risk of additional emergencies driven by various factors. One of these, drought, did indeed necessitate updating the plan. The 2019 HRP also correctly foresaw and acted on an additional risk—“the inability of development partners to deliver on the commitments made at the Brussels [pledging] conference, or through the new One UN—One Programme”⁵—and countenanced a “temporary widening” of the response to make up for the ongoing lack of development programs and state services in crisis-affected areas. By contrast, planning systems did not fully incorporate contingencies for the evolving peace process, although the updated HRP does specify certain opportunities and risks associated with it.

Recent years have seen a significant increase in the financial instruments related to natural disasters. Catastrophic-risk insurance facilities provide coverage in the Caribbean and the Pacific for earthquakes, cyclones, and flooding, and in Africa for drought. Where risks are too high for private sector insurers, the development banks have established contingency-financing mechanisms that play the same role, providing callable funds that are drawn down by societies only when needed. The joint UN–World Bank Famine Action Mechanism (FAM) and the UN Peacebuilding Fund (UNPF) are important examples of agencies taking the lead on upstream, preventative, and early-action financing.

Conflict-related humanitarian emergencies do not, however, benefit from this type of contingency. Conflict risks are difficult to assess, politically as well as functionally. Early-warning and forecasting mechanisms are much stronger for disasters related to natural hazards than to political violence. Supporting early action in conflict settings is even more challenging. Moral hazard is a prominent concern: in many conflicts, the government may be an actor. The moral hazard question, however, does not affect countries that have simply suffered because of conflict spillovers from their neighbors. The World Bank’s new International Development Association (IDA) windows for risk mitigation, crisis response, and refugee-hosting countries, along with the Global Concessional Financing Facility (GCFF), go some way toward addressing these concerns.

But there are various types of crises they do not cover. Tunisia, for example, has suffered greatly in economic terms from the Libya conflict, but as a middle-income country, no specific mechanism exists to compensate it. Similarly, there is room for more engagement when it comes to the macroeconomic and fiscal pressures confronting affected countries, including growing levels of indebtedness.

Conclusions and recommendations

The overall conclusions of the review are positive: behavioral change is occurring at country level. But there is room for improvement, and momentum may be stalling. The review makes detailed recommendations for governments, donors, and the UN system. These fall into three broad areas.

- *Ramping up capacity in national and local systems.* The review finds that government leadership is a critical success factor, whether or not state systems are used in the short term. We recommend that governments consider the benefits of incorporating humanitarian and peacebuilding objectives and activities in their own planning in situations in which there are important links with development; we further recommend that they prioritize building the capacity to prevent, respond to, and recover from crises in accordance with international humanitarian law and humanitarian principles. To that end, it is important for governments to specify, in advance, how decisions will be made and how responsibilities will be assigned before, during, and after a crisis, including the relative roles of the central government, line ministries, emergency agencies, civil society, and subnational authorities. We also recommend that international financial and technical support be made available to governments that commit to building national and local capacity to respond to repeated and protracted emergencies, with support spanning financial, personnel, and procurement systems and coordination and analysis capacities.
- *Consistent follow-through in bridging the silos.* There are very good examples of transcending humanitarian–development and humanitarian–development–peace (HDP) divides; but every country under consideration also has examples of avoidable gaps and duplications. To arrive at more consistency, we first recommend that the JSC consider several strategic and system-wide policy changes, with a priority around establishing a coherent, UN-led planning discussion with government as the default approach to avoid the current supply-driven duplication of plans, programs, and financing instruments at country level. Second, we suggest three kinds of support to RCs and RCs/HCs, as part of the UNDS reforms in crisis-affected contexts: guidance for nexus support at governments' request, a “people pipeline” of experts and advisers that can be deployed; and reframing UNDP's assistance as a crucial “public good.” For donors, we recommend investing in these efforts to bridge the silos at country level, in line with the new Development Assistance Committee (DAC) recommendation to “provide appropriate resourcing to empower leadership for cost-effective coordination across the humanitarian, development and peace architecture.”⁶ We also suggest that donors might improve the incentives for bridging silos and for achieving collective outcomes if they could adopt combined development–humanitarian(–peacebuilding) country strategies, provide guidelines on application of humanitarian principles to national recipients (governmental and nongovernmental), and ensure that developmental and humanitarian budget lines can be pooled. Last, we recommend that IDA deputies ask for a review of development–humanitarian–peacebuilding links and the UN–World Bank partnership during IDA 19 to identify good practices that can be made more consistent.
- *Make contingency planning the norm and link it to finance.* Planning and financing are not yet reflecting the aim to move more quickly and to anticipate crises. We suggest that governments consider including more contingency planning in their national development plans, as well as adopting emergency staff deployment, budget transfer, and procurement

procedures for those states that have not yet done so. As noted above, ensuring equitable social-service provision, including through universal approaches that leave no region or population behind and that are capable of scaling up during a shock, is critical not only for recovery, but also for prevention. For the UN, we recommend that contingency plans be incorporated in the new UNDAFs/UNCFs and multiyear HRPs in crisis-affected countries. On the World Bank side, we recommend that IDA deputies and the World Bank consider adapting the Crisis Response Window (CRW) for contingent emergencies, including a measure for conflict spillovers in the GCFE, and further contemplate measures to improve the speed of IDA and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) crisis-response programs. Lastly, we recommend a UN–World Bank–IMF process to discuss humanitarian crises, peacebuilding, and macroeconomic-policy linkages and concrete follow-up actions to strengthen collaboration.

Table 1: Summary of recommendations

For governments and national NGOs

- Reaffirm state commitments to humanitarian principles and international humanitarian and human rights law.
- Consider whether repeated/chronic humanitarian crises and conflict drivers merit attention in national development–peace planning and analysis.
- Clarify roles and responsibilities within government and between government and its partners.
- Strengthen response and recovery procedures and transparent fiduciary standards.
- Ensure access of vulnerable and affected populations to public services, including by prioritizing commitments to universal service provision and social protection floors for all.
- Advocate for greater support for insurance and contingent-financing mechanisms.

For the UN system

- Prioritize and utilize political economy analysis.
- Agree on a strong, systematically strategic role for the JSC.
- Select RCs and RCs/HCs to play a bridging role, and support them to do so.
- Prioritize UNDP’s strategic objective to strengthen national prevention, response, and recovery capacities in countries affected by chronic and repeated crises.
- Design and implement programs in ways that reinforce existing systems and services, including public systems wherever appropriate.
- Consider developing a pool of strategic external advisers.
- Move toward a comprehensive analytical and planning approach in most circumstances, with interim response plans where needed.
- Make contingency planning in UNDAFs/UNCFs, HRP, and project agreements the norm.
- Design country-based pooled funds in ways that incentivize HDP collaboration.
- Pass on multiyear funding to NGOs, with clear expectations.
- Hold a UN–MDB–IMF retreat on the “missing middle” and on fiscal and macroeconomic linkages.
- Consider commissioning a study on cost-effectiveness of multilateral cooperation in protracted or repeated humanitarian emergencies.

For donors

- Invest in national capacity for whole-of-government emergency preparedness, response, recovery, and equitable service delivery.
- Create clear guidance on the circumstances under which funding can be provided to different recipients while respecting humanitarian principles.
- Provide incentives to move toward comprehensive planning at country level through combined peace–development–humanitarian strategies and flexible funds.
- Adapt the IDA CRW, RMR, and the GCFF to address conflict spillovers and contingencies.
- Review progress on HDP links and the World Bank–UN partnership during IDA 19.
- Clearly demonstrate the additionality of development support in refugee-hosting settings.
- Use the ECOSOC–World Bank session to address cooperation in humanitarian settings.

1. Introduction

1.1. About the study

This study of the new way of working was commissioned by UNDP, with support from the government of Norway, and carried out by the Center on International Cooperation (CIC) at New York University.

The objective of the review is to provide evidence and good practices on the new way of working at an early stage in order to provide the basis for more systematic implementation at field level. The project aims to identify changes in behavior and approaches at country level; showcase opportunities, challenges, and good practices; and provide recommendations to overcome actual and potential risks for the UN system and its partners.

The report is based on interviews with over three hundred individuals in UN country teams, governments, and civil society; three country visits, to Chad (N'Djamena), Nigeria (Abuja and Maiduguri), and Somalia (Mogadishu, as well as Nairobi, Kenya), respectively; and an extensive review of relevant written materials, including unpublished or confidential documents.⁷ Insights from follow-on visits to Ethiopia and Lebanon are also incorporated where relevant.

The report is by no means exhaustive of the many promising efforts currently underway from Syria to the Sahel. Only a handful of countries could be visited, and the analysis of those countries is therefore deeper. The review is one of several recent and ongoing studies of the new way of working and its cousin, the HDP nexus, commissioned or carried out by UN agencies, donors, and international NGOs.⁸ It aims to complement this growing literature by providing an independent, external assessment of an initiative whose success or failure has major implications for international policy and assistance in the world's most imperiled communities.

While our terms of reference were largely limited to humanitarian–development linkages, the new way of working frequently spans the “triple” nexus of humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding work. Several important findings on peacebuilding emerged from the research and field visits and are therefore highlighted here; continued field visits specifically designed to assess development–humanitarian–peacebuilding links will continue to deepen these findings.

1.2. Background to the new way of working

1.2.1. Three objectives

The new way of working is most commonly defined as (i) working toward collective outcomes (ii) over multiyear timeframes (iii) based on comparative advantage.⁹ While these three components are indeed critical, it is important to note that they make up just one of the overarching objectives of the new way of working as originally envisioned. The agenda was first articulated at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit (WHS). The summit's framing document, the *One Humanity*,

Shared Responsibility report, calls upon humanitarian and development actors to:

- *Reinforce—do not replace—national and local systems.* This objective is motivated by a recognition that humanitarian action often perpetuates parallel international structures over years, failing to utilize or strengthen national and local capacity and leadership in countries affected by protracted or repeated crisis. As the *One Humanity* report puts it, “From the outset, international actors should be looking for opportunities to shift tasks and leadership to local actors. This must be the mindset and a predictable part of any international response plan from the start of an operation.”¹⁰
- *Transcend the humanitarian–development divide by working toward collective outcomes, based on comparative advantage, over multiyear timelines.* This objective came about through the realization that addressing the structural drivers of crises would require development and humanitarian actors to work together and would take time. The *One Humanity* report notes that “humanitarian actors need to move beyond repeatedly carrying out short-term interventions year after year towards contributing to the achievement of longer-term development results. Development actors will need to plan and act with greater urgency to tackle people’s vulnerability, inequality and risk as they pursue the Sustainable Development Goals.”¹¹ UNDP Administrator Achim Steiner has more recently underlined that “helping people affected by the crisis requires us to work together—humanitarian and development organizations alike—to tackle immediate humanitarian needs and the root causes of the crisis.”¹²
- *Anticipate—do not wait for—crises.* This point aims to focus attention on the human costs and wasted resources spent in acting too slowly as crises build up. It calls for “a step change in our efforts to anticipate better and then act to prevent crises.”¹³ As noted by Emergency Relief Coordinator Mark Lowcock: “What we need to do is move from today’s approach, where we watch disaster and tragedy build, gradually respond and then mobilize money and organizations to help; to an anticipatory approach where we plan in advance for the next crisis.”¹⁴

It is this broader conception of the new way of working to which the present report adheres. This is in line with feedback from governments, UN staff in the field, and donors who are sympathetic to the content of the new way of working but feel that the focus is very much on internal UN processes and that the repetition of the name “new way of working” is too driven by headquarters concerns. For this reason, the report avoids the use of an acronym (NWoW) to refer to this agenda and instead focuses on the underlying objectives.

1.3. Context for the study

1.3.1. Staggered implementation

There is no simple start date to the new way of working. On the one hand, some country teams had already moved to foster stronger partnerships between humanitarian and development actors that informed, and hence pre-dated, WHS. On the other, global dissemination of the approach took time, and hence most HRPs and UNDAFs/UNCFs had a chance to reflect on this change in a deeper sense beginning only in the 2017–18 planning cycles. The agenda also emerged alongside a constellation of other initiatives and reforms—including the 2030 Agenda, Sustaining Peace, and the CRRF—each with its own set of protagonists and constituencies. It has coincided with deep internal reforms within both the UNDS and OCHA. The post-WHS era has also seen the

establishment within the World Bank of new financing facilities for refugee-hosting states and the publication of the landmark UN–World Bank report *Pathways for Peace*, which laid out a new approach to cooperation to prevent conflict, including in humanitarian situations. Lastly, the UN has established a new humanitarian–development–peacebuilding coordinating structure, the JSC.

In essence, then, the new way of working is an evolving process unfolding alongside others. The present stocktake has taken this into account: while fieldwork started in 2018, we analyze changes that have occurred from 2016 into 2019, including the most recent generation of HRPs and early feedback and ongoing discussions on the UNDS reforms that began to take effect on January 1, 2019.

1.3.2. Member-state support

Although it was originally agreed among UN agencies and the World Bank, the new way of working enjoys substantial member state support. Under the auspices of 2030 Agenda, governments have committed to leaving no one behind; to addressing root causes, including those of conflicts and crises; and to supporting cross-disciplinary approaches to addressing the world’s challenges.¹⁵ Similarly, member states’ 2016 Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) resolution specifically calls for greater coherence between humanitarian and development actors. In particular, it urges the UN development system to “enhance coordination with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies and in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations.”¹⁶ It further calls for efforts to “move beyond short-term assistance” through such activities as joint risk analysis, multiyear planning, improved coordination, promotion of national ownership, and greater emphasis on strengthening systems.¹⁷ Other examples of governmental support for a new way of working include the GCR, the new OECD DAC recommendation on the humanitarian–development nexus, and the Grand Bargain.

1.3.3. A complex global landscape

The review also takes account of the urgency and complexity of the landscape in which governments and international partners intending to implement the new way of working are operating. The number of crises unfolding worldwide is growing in number and in intensity. Many major humanitarian situations—food insecurity across the Sahel; drought and conflict in Somalia; displacement in and from Afghanistan—have persisted not for months or even years, but for decades, with no solutions in sight. The international system at country level is byzantine. There are more than one hundred participants in HRPs in most cases. In countries such as Afghanistan and Niger, a dozen or more DAC donors provide Official Development Assistance (ODA), often with little cooperation between them; and upward of twenty UN agencies participate in the UNDAF. These figures do not include non-DAC donors and agencies operating outside of the humanitarian appeal. Nor do they include international peacekeepers and donor military forces. Further, regional multilateral organizations form yet another set of actors in this arena. That is all before considering the complex political and institutional dynamics within affected societies themselves.

In remaining true to the structure of the new way of working, the findings of this study are organized with reference to the three strategic objectives of this framework. By reflecting each goal—the reinforcement of national and local systems, the anticipation of crises, and cross-pillar approaches—our findings are engineered to be directly relevant and applicable to the complex array of relevant stakeholders within the humanitarian and development sectors. It is important, however, that the

three objectives are not seen as separate realms of activity, but rather concepts applicable to all programming and meriting significant consideration at all stages of a response.

2. Reinforcing, not replacing, national and local systems

The new way of working envisages a major shift toward building the capacity and resilience of national and local systems—state and community—to prevent, respond to, and resolve humanitarian emergencies. As stated in the *One Humanity* report, “The international community has an obligation to respect and further strengthen this capacity and local leadership in crises and not to put in place parallel structures that may undermine it.”¹⁸ This does not mean that using state systems will be possible in each and every case: where governments lack presence in conflict-affected zones or are unable to respect humanitarian principles, for example, the immediate humanitarian imperative to save lives cannot be jeopardized in favor of longer-term localization and development objectives. The review finds, however, that there are instructive practices in many different contexts in which the use and strengthening of domestic systems has been complementary to humanitarian principles and to lifesaving objectives. The review also identifies ongoing challenges, including the lack of capacity and resources in affected states and the reluctance of international actors to work with and through country systems. This section documents some of these practices and constraints.

Notably, the section focuses primarily (though not exclusively) on the role of public systems and services. It thereby differs from much of the discourse on localization, which tends to focus on the role of national and local NGOs. This is by no means intended to minimize the importance of supporting the latter within the new way of working: civil society actors have a vital role to play, and efforts to empower and equip them to play that role are urgently needed in all contexts. (In many cases, important progress has already been made in this regard, including in terms of funding, capacity building, and participation.) But it remains the case that national and local governments bear the primary responsibility for preventing and responding to humanitarian crises, and careful attention is needed to ensure that they are supported in doing so, whenever conditions and capacities allow.

2.1. Promising developments and good practices

2.1.1. *Government ownership of crisis response and recovery is rising*

One of the most promising developments identified by the review is the rising number of governments that have come to view issues such as forced displacement as development and peacebuilding challenges, not only as humanitarian ones, and that have taken steps to incorporate humanitarian needs into their development-planning processes (see box 1). Importantly, countries have employed varying approaches to suit their own context. Some have focused on re-establishing state authority and legitimacy in areas that were previously outside the state’s control, in recognition of the importance of bringing positive services, alongside security, to populations affected by conflict. Others have focused on improving the relationship between refugees or IDPs and host communities. Further examples focus on mitigating future disasters and preventing the escalation of conflict and

displacement (addressed further in section 4).

These and other developments are prompting a variety of policy and institutional reforms: the adoption of new legislation aimed at integrating refugees or IDPs into public systems, the creation of new institutions charged with responding to emergencies or extending existing services to affected areas, the streamlining of planning and coordination mechanisms, and others. Including humanitarian needs in national plans has also opened up space within which governments' development partners, for whom alignment with national plans is a guiding principle, can reorient their own programming toward affected areas, a development we return to in section 3.

Box 1: Humanitarian needs in national development planning

Somalia

In late 2016, Somalia launched its National Development Plan (NDP) for 2017–19. The country's first NDP since 1986, the plan marks a significant milestone. It builds on progress made under the New Deal Compact for Somalia, including the creation of the Somali Development and Reconstruction Facility (SDRF), a coordination and financing mechanism that brings government, the UN, NGOs, and donors together. Notably, this document places considerable emphasis on the specific needs of IDPs and returnees, and it includes a resilience pillar that focuses on preventing future crises. Capturing and analyzing lessons learned during the NDP planning-and-implementation process could provide important insights as the government and its partners endeavor to develop a new NDP over the course of 2019.

Chad

Chad's NDP does not as thoroughly engage with humanitarian issues; it focuses largely on development priorities. One government official identified this as a missed opportunity. However, the NDP does prioritize issues of national unity, good governance, a diverse economy, and access to water, health services, adequate housing, and energy. The plan also emphasizes the need for improved collaboration and transition between the development and humanitarian sectors and, like the HRP and UNDAF in Chad, recognizes that humanitarian need results from development challenges. Several interviewees emphasized the extent to which that recognition alone represented an important mindset shift.

Nigeria

In the Buhari Plan, named for President Muhammadu Buhari, the government has laid out a strategy that emphasizes the importance of investing in peace and reconstruction in the Northeast, calling for interventions that provide immediate relief, support the restoration of livelihoods, generate employment, secure communities, restart agriculture, rebuild infrastructure, facilitate peacebuilding, and resuscitate health, education, and other essential services. To meet these objectives, the government created the Presidential Committee on the North-East Initiative to coordinate the recovery and implement the Buhari Plan, and it has established state-level coordination structures, which play a crucial leadership role on the ground. A crucial next step, identified by several interlocutors, will be to update the plan in light of subsequent developments on the ground and to take forward the process of transitioning from the Presidential Committee on the North-East Initiative to the more permanent North-East Development Commission.

2.1.2. Sector-based strategies are a crucial entry point to reinforce national and local systems

While the inclusion of humanitarian needs in national development plans represents an important milestone, NDPs tend to be too broad and sweeping to drive programming and funding. Sector strategies, by contrast, provide an important opportunity to align international interventions with national and local priorities. In the health sector, Uganda's Health Sector Integrated Refugee Response Plan offers a promising example. The five-year plan, launched in January 2019, marks a notable step forward for the sector. It aims to benefit Uganda's 1.19 million refugees and over 7 million Ugandans in refugee-hosting districts.¹⁹ NGOs in Uganda have "commit[ted] to align our activities with the plan" and have called on donors to support it.²⁰ The health plan is the second, along with an education plan, in a series of sector plans designed to integrate refugees into Uganda's national services and systems. It will soon be followed by strategies on livelihoods and on water and the environment.

Progress on inclusive sectoral planning within the education sector has perhaps been even more notable. In addition to Uganda, inclusive education strategies have emerged in countries such as Ethiopia, Jordan (see box 2), Lebanon, Somalia, and Turkey. For instance, in Somalia, donors and agencies have developed a sector-wide approach to education aligned to the priorities articulated by the Somali government's strategic plans, including the need to provide quality public education specifically to populations affected by conflict and crisis.

Progress is also occurring at global and regional levels. The Global Partnership for Education has assisted efforts to incorporate affected groups into national education plans and systems. Regionally, the Djibouti Declaration on Regional Refugee Education, adopted by Intergovernmental Authority on Development member states, includes a commitment to integrate refugees into national education systems by 2020. Similarly, the Dubai Roadmap for Education 2030 in the Arab Region expresses stakeholders' commitment "to the inclusion of refugee children and youth systematically in national education planning processes in order to monitor their participation and educational attainment."²¹

These and similar sector strategies are leading to concrete changes on the ground. In Ukraine, for instance, IDPs in several cities have benefited from government efforts to expand school capacities, simplify admission processes, cover school fees, and provide textbooks.²² In Lebanon, international support for the government's education strategy has enabled the Ministry of Education and Higher Education to subsidize school fees and other costs and rehabilitate schools, to the benefit of refugees and Lebanese.

Box 2: Incorporating refugees into the education sector in Jordan

Education is the sector most frequently cited as having made progress toward a new approach in Jordan. In keeping with a commitment made at the 2016 London Conference, the government made its schools and learning facilities available to children regardless of their status or nationality. This integrated approach was spearheaded by the then-minister of education and later prime minister, giving it substantial political backing.

The challenges within the education sector remain immense nevertheless. With funding from the international community and technical expertise provided by the UN and others, the government has formulated a five-year Education Strategic Plan (ESP) 2018–22 that seeks to address educational needs in a more proactive, comprehensive manner. The plan notes the tremendous strain the influx of refugees has placed on Jordanian schools but reaffirms the government's vision of "quality education for all, including vulnerable Jordanians and refugees, to contribute to an economically strong and peaceful Jordan."²³ It also identifies concrete steps that should be taken, such as the establishment of sixty new schools per year to accommodate both Jordanians and refugees.

By orienting the strategy around the needs of the system, in addition to those of refugees, the ESP marks a departure from the succession of predominately humanitarian plans and strategies that characterized the sector when refugees began arriving in large numbers in 2011. Notable good practices are emerging, such as an initiative that provides healthy school meals produced by vulnerable Jordanian and refugee women. The potential for further progress was affirmed at the 2018 Brussels Conference, with the Brussels Partnership Paper calling on the international community to "support the [government] in advancing the achievements of the education sector, and appropriately applying best practice and lessons learnt to other priority sectors, in particular health and social protection."²⁴ Efforts are underway to document the approach taken by the education sector and to derive lessons therefrom, in the hopes that these can be replicated in other sectors.

2.1.3. Local authorities may also provide a pathway to reinforce national and local systems

Many of today's humanitarian crises are subnational in nature. They may take place within the context of a centralized system with deconcentrated local authorities or within a more decentralized or federal system in which subnational authorities have a large degree of autonomy in implementing local humanitarian and development initiatives. The review finds that it is important to recognize the nature of the national political system and the extent to which authority is devolved or deconcentrated.

In Nigeria, for example, the federal government plays a key role in national leadership on security, humanitarian response, and reconstruction in the Northeast, and the president's and vice president's offices and other federal ministries have been heavily involved in decision-making. On a day-to-day basis, however, the state authorities of the six affected states play a crucial role in planning and coordinating the civilian response. In certain cases, this allows them to provide entry points unavailable at national level for improving the response. For instance, in the absence of an IDP policy at national level, it was the state of Borno, together with the UN and other partners, which adopted a Strategy on Protection, Return, and Recovery setting out minimum standards that must be fulfilled before the return of IDPs can be promoted.

Similarly, in Somalia, growing local capacity, an ongoing federalization process, and minimal central-State presence outside of Mogadishu mean subnational authorities have space to play a vital role. Both Somaliland and Puntland have established local disaster-management agencies (as has the federal government), while other federal member states (FMS) have identified focal points to liaise with humanitarians and coordinate the response. The Benadir Regional Authority has recently created a Durable Solutions Unit, with support from UN agencies. Notably, according to several sources, this

growing engagement of FMS is key to understanding why famine was averted in 2017 while a similarly severe drought in 2011 led to more than 250,000 famine-related deaths. (The UN's Joint Programme on Local Governance was cited as an important contributor to this capacity development.) FMS involvement appears to have also played a peacebuilding role: "There was a real added value of getting the various government entities together in a room."

Ethiopia provides a third example. It was the Somali regional state that developed the country's first durable-solutions strategy specifically targeting internal displacement. The strategy, which aligns with the Kampala Convention and relevant national frameworks and which recognizes the specific challenges faced by pastoralists in the region, has stimulated the interest of other regions, such as Gambella and Oromia, in developing inclusive and wide-ranging approaches to internal displacement. Work done by the Somali regional government, which co-chairs a multi-stakeholder Durable Solutions Working Group, has also garnered the interest of policymakers at national level, and recently encouraged the central government to include the needs of IDPs in the country's national humanitarian planning process for the first time.

2.1.4. Well-timed joint analysis can help galvanize inclusive national development planning

The review finds that the expression of government ownership at national and local levels, in a manner adapted to context, is all but indispensable to realize the objectives of the new way of working. However, analysis or generation of ideas by international partners has a crucial role to play in encouraging governments to take the lead: in many of the cases reviewed, there was a very positive interaction between the evolving thinking of national leadership and analysis provided by international partners. Such analysis has, for instance, provided the basis for government recovery and development plans that span the triple nexus, prompted governments to (re)assess strategies for training and deploying civil servants in affected areas, fostered understanding among government officials of the developmental benefits of inclusive approaches to refugees, and supported governments in mobilizing greater or more appropriate resources. Several concrete country examples are provided in box 3.

2.1.5. UN agencies and NGOs are increasing their localization and capacity-building efforts

There is no shortage of promising examples of efforts by international actors to adopt a more localized approach at the programmatic level. The Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) for the Syrian refugee crisis illustrates this well, as the first of its eight strategic objectives is "strong national leadership remaining the cornerstone of the response."²⁵

Several distinct approaches to facilitating such national and local leadership are emerging, depending mostly on the functionality of existing country systems. Where public delivery capacity is sufficiently present, such as in Ethiopia and Lebanon, UN agencies and NGOs are increasingly aiming at building on and expanding country systems at both national and local levels so that they can effectively and equitably absorb affected populations (often in furtherance of government-sector strategies, as noted above). Thus, Mercy Corps has focused on strengthening public-service delivery and social cohesion in several refugee-hosting municipalities in Lebanon while, with international support, tens of thousands of refugees have recently been absorbed into Ethiopia's public schools. In Ukraine, the UN is working to build the capacity of the government's free legal-aid clinics to gradually assume responsibility for providing pro bono legal aid to IDPs. Meanwhile, where public services are absent but government commitment is evident, humanitarian and development partners are working with governments to

make parallel service provision nevertheless deliver longer-term national capacity. This is the case with Chad's recent conversion of refugee-community schools into government public schools²⁷ and Colombia's strategy for recovered areas.

There are also some good examples of support specifically for governments' emergency-management systems and capacities. In Somalia, the EU has recently handed over emergency-response equipment, including fire-fighting vehicles and ambulances, to the Benadir Regional Administration and the Municipality of Mogadishu, and it has contributed to the development of a municipal Emergency Response Plan.²⁸ Oxfam programs in Burundi, DRC, Iraq, Lebanon, Uganda, and elsewhere are aimed at strengthening national and local disaster-management systems. Further examples of localized approaches are highlighted in box 4.

Box 3: Analysis supporting government action

Nigeria

In Nigeria, international support for analysis was instrumental not in driving, but in supporting the government's wish to move beyond a security-only response to the Boko Haram threat and its associated humanitarian consequences. In 2015–16, the World Bank, UN, and European Union (EU) supported the government to undertake a Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment (RPBA). The assessment, which coincided with a substantial scaling-up of humanitarian response, called for a collective strategy focused on peacebuilding and recovery to complement humanitarian assistance and stabilization efforts, to be founded on the recognition that a sustainable resolution to the crisis demands addressing the symptoms as well as the structural and developmental drivers of conflict.

Iraq

As Iraq began to develop its most recent Poverty Reduction Strategy, UNICEF saw an opportunity to enhance the government's focus on issues related to child poverty and vulnerability. At the time, child poverty received little if any specific attention from national planning documents and diagnostic tools. After conducting initial assessments, the government and UNICEF published a comprehensive analysis of multidimensional child poverty in 2017.²⁶ The report recommended the introduction of a child grant and underscored the importance of prioritizing children in the formulation of social policies and development plans. The 2018–22 Poverty Reduction Strategy took note of these findings.

Ethiopia

In Ethiopia, the government has conducted joined-up analysis of humanitarian linkages to support a transition toward more comprehensive and integrated approaches. International partners have also provided very practical analysis on specific issues, with important results. For example, the government recently worked with the UN and other partners to create groundwater suitability mappings. The mappings precipitated an increase in the success of borehole drilling by as much as 40 percent. As a result, rather than trucking water into the countryside at a cost of 25 birr per liter, a new multivillage water scheme reduced the cost to 0.5 birr per liter.

Box 4: A diversity of approaches to supporting local governments, communities, and NGOs

Chad

There is widespread recognition that greater and more locally rooted development support is needed to address the structural drivers of chronic need in Chad (a country that has required a humanitarian appeal for every one of the last fifteen years). One promising example in this regard is the EU's Inclusive Development of Host Communities (DIZA) project, which aims to enable access to basic services and social protection for affected populations. Toward that end, the project, which both the EU and the Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) are supporting, focuses on creating economic and livelihoods opportunities for displaced persons and host communities alike, while also strengthening local governance capacities. That is, it aims not only to integrate but to localize humanitarian and development action, an approach it shares with a growing number of programs in the country.

Central African Republic

WFP's latest interim country strategy for CAR notes that between 65 and 75 percent of households' disposable income is being spent on food (even as a majority of the population depends on agriculture). Against this, WFP is procuring food from local smallholder farmers to support its school-meals programs. At the same time, WFP is working with the government and other UN agencies to provide schools with an integrated package of assistance (school meals, access to safe water, learning materials, deworming, and local school gardens).

Uganda

The Project for Capacity Development of Local Government for Strengthening Community Resilience in Acholi and West Nile Sub-Regions aims to bolster the capacity of local administrations in impoverished and crisis-affected areas to plan and implement integrated service delivery and community-based development interventions. In addition to engaging directly with local governments, the project works in partnership with the central Ministry of Local Government, the Office of the Prime Minister, and the National Planning Authority.

Nigeria

In early 2019, judges and staff of Nigeria's Community Court of Justice received training on the law of war and armed conflict at a workshop organized in collaboration between the Economic Community of West Africa (ECOWAS) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). Topics included protection of healthcare, use of military force, and the rules of detention. ECOWAS and ICRC's partnership seeks to ensure that international humanitarian law (IHL) is observed in the region—for instance, by encouraging national governments to integrate IHL into relevant frameworks, disseminating IHL information to security agencies and armed forces of member states, sensitizing civil society organizations and judicial bodies to such information, and including IHL in school curriculums. OCHA and UNDP have also worked together to provide human rights training to state and local police in northeast Nigeria.

Somalia

The UN's Community Recovery and Extension of State Authority/Accountability program strives to link community-led peacebuilding and reconciliation with the (re)introduction of state authority into conflict-affected areas. In that sense, it represents a departure from stabilization/state-building efforts that focus narrowly on supporting military operations or on strengthening central state authority. The program operates in partnership with the Ministry of Interior and Federal Affairs and the newly formed federal member states Jubbaland, South West, Galmudug, and Hirshabelle. It aims to support the development of publicly legitimate local governance structures that can deliver services equitably and effectively and thereby help to rebuild Somalia's fractured social contract.

2.1.6. Linking emergency response to scalable safety nets is key to successful localization

In line with the above, the review finds that among the most significant long-term shifts in the field is a growing convergence on the desirability of providing humanitarian responses through flexible national social–safety net systems over time (just as is the case in developed countries). Where social protection programs already exist, there are increasing moves to expand them and make them more scalable to provide a standing response to shocks that cause repeated humanitarian needs. In Ethiopia, for example, the government is taking steps to expand its Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP), including by making urban residents eligible and by increasing the support provided to the most vulnerable Ethiopians.²⁹ Transforming the PSNP into a “shock resistant” protection scheme is a major governmental priority. In the Philippines, similarly, international actors responded to Typhoon Haiyan by providing top-up payments to recipients of the government's flagship social protection program in addition to the more conventional use of parallel systems. Responses to the 2016 earthquake in Ecuador followed a similar top-up model,³⁰ while in Niger, efforts are underway to expand the infrastructure and coverage of the country's fledgling safety net, including by making it adaptable in the face of shocks such as forced displacement.³¹ Other examples of efforts to extend or strengthen safety nets within crisis contexts can be found in countries as diverse as Cameroon, Chad, Haiti, Jordan, Lebanon, Mali, Somalia, and Yemen (the approach in Yemen is detailed in box 5).³²

2.1.7. Coordinated cash programming is helping forge humanitarian links with public safety nets

The rise of cash programming is one of the most tangible signs of progress within the humanitarian system in recent years. In Somalia, for instance, the rapid scaling up of cash transfers during and after the 2017 drought (for example, from 10 to 60 percent of WFP's food-related aid, according to one source) is widely seen as a momentous achievement. But perhaps the more transformative trend is the growing commitment to *harmonizing* cash programs, including by aligning them with national systems and standards whenever possible.³³ The UNICEF–WFP collaboration through WFP's SCOPE platform in Somalia is a good example. Shared cash-delivery mechanisms have also emerged in Jordan and Lebanon; while mostly operated by humanitarians for the benefit of refugees, the systems' transfer mechanisms and technologies are increasingly being incorporated into government safety nets. In Mauritania, a cash working group comprising UN agencies and NGOs has gradually morphed into a “cash and social protection working group,” with participation from the government. Cash transfers in Chad are increasingly aligned with the government's social protection scheme. In Cameroon, UNHCR provides the same transfer values for the same duration to refugees as the

government- and World Bank–supported social protection program provides to Cameroonians.³⁴

Good examples are emerging at global level as well. As but one example, on December 5, 2018, the heads of OCHA, UNHCR, UNICEF, and WFP released a joint statement on the coordination of cash assistance.³⁵ In it, they affirmed the need to leverage existing government systems, whenever possible; to improve complementarities between cash programs in the field; and to afford affected populations a greater decision-making role regarding cash. The statement further outlined several key commitments on the part of the four agencies, including to provide cash through a common cash system; to ensure that the common system is inclusive and builds on a single transfer-mechanism approach; and to harmonize data-management approaches through interoperable data systems and data-sharing agreements, in line with protection principles.

A group of prominent international NGOs have likewise committed, within the context of the Grand Bargain, to collaborating globally for the purpose of strengthening and harmonizing cash programming.³⁶ Similarly, a group of major donors—including Australia, Canada, Denmark, EU/ECHO, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the UK, and the US—have recently agreed to a Common Donor Approach for Humanitarian Cash Programming.³⁷ The Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) initiative has also recently approved a new principle related to cash—the first new principle to be added to the GHD since the original commitments were adopted in 2003.

Although it remains to be seen what becomes of them, it is difficult to overstate how important these developments potentially are. Poor coordination among cash programs leads to service gaps, pay disparities, wasteful duplications, and intense frustration among and between affected communities, aid actors, governments, and donors.³⁸

2.1.8. Links with national systems are being created even in very active conflict settings

It is not always possible or appropriate to tap directly into national or local systems and services. Steps can nevertheless be taken to lay groundwork toward that end. Indeed, even in the most difficult circumstances, agencies are finding ways to reinforce national standards and systems in their programming. This is not a panacea: careful analysis is needed to ensure that alignment with national and local priorities does not compromise humanitarian principles. Similarly, there is a growing appreciation of the important but nuanced role social protection can play in preventing violence (or, if poorly designed, in fomenting grievances).³⁹

Despite the challenges, national leaders and their international partners are finding smart ways to forge linkages across the HDP nexus in conflict settings. At least three distinct (though by no means mutually exclusive) approaches are discernible. Firstly, in cases, such as Somalia and Afghanistan, in which government entities wish to play a leadership role but lack the presence, capacity, or legitimacy to deliver services in affected areas, national and local authorities are still being supported to set standards (for example, related to cash-transfer frequencies or minimum healthcare packages or education curriculums) and adopt regulations that are applicable to nonstate service providers operating in conflict and nonconflict areas alike. In this way, schools or health clinics or transfer programs that are still provided by nonstate actors can begin nevertheless to resemble a national system. Secondly, in contexts in which supporting such a regulatory role of government is less feasible, country teams are focused on building the response and social protection functions of local civil society. South Sudan provides a good example in this regard: for instance, the International

Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) have recently issued a combined plan and international appeal to support the South Sudanese Red Cross, including through capacity development and logistics support. A third approach provides something of a middle way between these two—that is, between directly supporting (current) government leadership and focusing primarily on capacitating civil society: namely, efforts to preserve and reinforce legitimate pre-conflict public welfare institutions through techniques such as “shadow alignment” (see box 5).⁴²

Box 5: Yemen: localization in active conflict situations

In the context of a devastating war and an unprecedented economic and humanitarian emergency, the international community has made it a priority to try to preserve the capacity of Yemen’s public welfare institutions to deliver essential services. The 2019 HRP, which adopts what is perhaps best described as a “Humanitarian Plus” approach, identifies preserving state service-delivery capacity as one of its five overarching objectives. Development actors, including UNDP and the World Bank, have likewise identified the preservation and strengthening of public institutions as an overriding priority.⁴⁰ Such an approach is possible precisely because Yemen had functioning and relatively independent welfare institutions prior to the war. The Social Welfare Fund, the Social Fund for Development (SFD), and the Public Works Project, in particular, provided a measure of economic security to millions of Yemenis. When the war erupted, resources dried up and the programs all but ceased functioning, plunging a huge portion of the population into economic crisis.

Rather than set up an entirely parallel delivery structure, the international community has opted to “shadow align” their support to this preexisting social-policy landscape. In one of the first programs of its kind, the World Bank provided IDA funds directly to UNICEF and UNDP to undertake emergency and resilience interventions. UNICEF, in turn, utilized the public sector’s beneficiary registry and standards related to transfer values and frequencies in designing its intervention. Over time, it has introduced improvements into the Social Welfare Fund’s targeting and delivery process—for instance, by updating the national beneficiary registry. Such improvements are intended one day to be incorporated into the national social protection system.⁴¹

Similarly, UNDP has designed its emergency employment and basic services programming specifically to preserve the implementation capacity of the SFD and Public Works Project. Other agencies—development and humanitarian—have likewise undertaken to facilitate the preservation or (eventual) revival of public safety nets. For instance, WFP aims to support the Ministry of Education to prepare the groundwork for reestablishing the country’s national school-meals program. More broadly, humanitarians have begun to work through the community structures that the SFD established to deliver services.

2.1.9. Multidonor trust funds constitute an important means of supporting governments

Multipartner trust funds (MPTFs) provide one of the most promising mechanisms for supporting government ownership. In some cases, MPTFs are located within governments' treasury/finance departments. This is the case with Ethiopia's Consolidated WASH (water, sanitation, and hygiene) Account, for instance—a pooled fund managed by the finance ministry. In other cases, MPTFs are located outside of government financial-management systems but within government-led coordination structures. Somalia's main MPTFs provide good examples of this approach, as they are externally managed (for example, by the UN and the World Bank) but sit within the government-led SDRF. Somalia's UN MPTF contains a "National Window," through which small but important amounts of funding are channeled directly to the federal government (with the rest passing through the "UN Window" to fund joint programs vetted by the SDRF).

Between these two approaches (that is, use of country budgetary systems and use of government coordination structures) are MPTFs that (i) remain externally managed but (ii) provide direct budget support and (iii) form part of the government's coordination architecture. The classic example of such an arrangement is the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund, which, while overseen by the World Bank, provides considerable direct support to the government and plays a key role in the government's development processes.

2.1.10. UN humanitarian pooled funds play a crucial role in supporting national and local NGOs

Country teams noted that humanitarian pooled country-level funds were particularly important to support national and local nongovernmental responders since decisions were made at country level, where the capacity of local counterparts and their needs for capacity building are best known. This is borne out by the numbers: in 2018, OCHA-managed pooled funds allocated 25 percent of their budgets to local organizations, up from 1 percent in 2006.⁴³ Some countries have moved well beyond that. The Somalia Humanitarian Fund, for instance, provided almost 50 percent of its budget to national and local actors in 2018. In DRC, the share of humanitarian pooled funding allocated to national and local NGOs (N/LNGOs) increased from 21 to 38 percent between 2016 and 2017. The 2019 allocation strategy for the Jordan Humanitarian Fund (JHF) prioritizes projects that encompass civil society partnerships, "in line with the JHF's capacity development objectives."⁴⁴

However, it is noteworthy that country-based pooled funds receive only between roughly 2 and 10 percent of humanitarian-appeal requirements.⁴⁵ Overall, just 0.4 percent of all humanitarian assistance goes directly to local and national NGOs (affected governments receive just 2.5 percent). Moreover, as noted below, funding is only one component of localization; the extent to which humanitarian pooled funds are helping to capacitate and empower national and local actors is less evident.

2.1.11. Some donors are trying to incentivize a shift toward ending parallel services

Alongside governments and aid agencies, donors have been innovating to advance the localization objectives of the new way of working (and Grand Bargain). For example, pursuant to its latest Humanitarian Strategy, France intends to ensure that each NGO project financed by the Emergency Humanitarian Fund includes funds for local-stakeholder capacity building.⁴⁶ The strategy also commits France to increasing its funding for local stakeholders and to begin measuring the degree of localization in its humanitarian action. Similarly, Norway has declared that local and national organizations must be more fully included in humanitarian activities because of their comparative advantages, such as their local knowledge, close contact with affected populations, and presence at

all stages of crisis.⁴⁷ With this in mind, Norway has committed to “strengthening local and national capacity to respond to humanitarian crises through relevant funding mechanisms such as the UN Country-based Pooled Funds.”⁴⁸

In addition, the Dutch humanitarian strategy notes that humanitarian organizations, while focused on swift relief, can often remove agency from local actors.⁴⁹ Consequently, the Netherlands has pledged to employ local systems when available, specifically highlighting those promoting the role of women. Other donors, including Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, and Switzerland, have also taken steps to prioritize partnerships that include capacity-building components.

Nevertheless, structural and legal barriers persist in many donor countries that prevent or inhibit a more localized approach to financing in practice. Further engagement with donor governments—including parliamentarians and treasury officials—is crucial.

2.1.12. The UN and other partners are establishing more sophisticated risk management to facilitate localization and national ownership

Donor concerns about risk management have been a key constraint on localization in the past. After high-profile fraud scandals emerged in the wake of the 2011 famine in Somalia, the UN created a risk management unit (RMU) to monitor fiduciary risks on behalf of the aid community. The RMU, housed within the RCO, has over time been used more strategically. Its analysis is being utilized not only by humanitarians but by donors, the UN mission, and the government (for instance, by analyzing what mechanisms are needed for the government to receive more money directly rather than through parallel processes). Although the RMU has helped to increase confidence in localization efforts, local NGOs are concerned about the opacity of its partner-risk assessments.

In Iraq, the country-based Pooled Fund Performance Index now allows N/LNGO partner-risk assessments to be adjusted according to partner performance over time. While the review did not assess this in the field, it appears to have similar objectives as the RMU. NGOs are also undertaking risk analysis to facilitate localization. A recent study entitled “NGOs and Risk: Managing Uncertainty in Local-International Partnerships,” conducted by InterAction in collaboration with a number of NGO partners, provides a welcome set of findings in this regard.⁵⁰

Although these and other efforts have gone some way to alleviate donor concerns, risk management remains a key constraint cited by donors as well as the UN and NGOs when it comes to localizing financing.

2.2. Constraints

2.2.1. Most governments lack procedures to provide a fast emergency response or to maintain or increase normal service delivery in affected areas

The review’s field visits and interviews conveyed strong support among government officials for localization and national ownership. Yet, in several countries, governments were in favor of moving cautiously: supportive of combining state-driven initiatives with services delivered by NGOs and international partners directly, simply in the interest of getting things done fast. From Chad to Nigeria to Mali to Lebanon, leaders are concerned about limits to the speed and capacity of government systems: they want localization, but at a realistic pace. They would also welcome enhanced capacity support for specific response and recovery procedures.

In particular, there are capacity gaps in many of the countries reviewed when it comes to budget execution and budget flexibility, procedures for transferring resources from central to affected subnational governments, emergency public procurement, and measures to deploy civil servants to crisis-affected areas. Equally of concern is the absence of capacity (and in some cases will) to maintain or increase the provision of basic services to affected areas or to address other underlying developmental challenges, which goes a long way to explaining why humanitarian actors often end up providing parallel services indefinitely in the first place. Finally, there is a need for greater attention to governments' abilities to anticipate crises, as discussed in section 4.

2.2.2. Governments are concerned about cost shifting

Adding to the challenge, several government counterparts were concerned about cost shifting. This preoccupation takes two forms. Firstly, governments are concerned that if and when they agree to incorporate the needs of populations affected by humanitarian crises in their national development plans and delivery systems, humanitarian aid will decrease without any corresponding increase in development aid. This has been a concern in contexts such as Jordan and Iraq, for example, where the development of transition strategies has been constrained by concerns about how to offset reductions in humanitarian aid.⁵¹ In Chad, similarly, several of those consulted worried about the ongoing lack of development aid (roughly 65 percent of ODA to Chad is humanitarian and has been for some time, despite the chronic, structural nature of the crises).

Secondly, some government counterparts also noted that they worried they would be caught in a medium-term trap, whereby international partners help with initial costs of incorporating refugees or IDPs into national systems but leave hosting states with a later "contingent liability" that they would have to continue meeting, indefinitely, without international support.

To allay these apprehensions, an increase in donor commitments to multiyear programming is key to demonstrate that governments will not be left with steep liabilities to cover. This issue is discussed further in section 3. In addition, ensuring that development support does not exacerbate the indebtedness of crisis-affected countries is crucial, an issue we return to in section 4. Finally, there is a particular need for greater and more equitable "responsibility sharing" specifically in refugee-hosting contexts. Just a handful of developing countries host the majority of the world's refugees, often incurring significant economic, social, and political costs (and benefits) in the process. Providing such countries (which provide a global public good) with additional development support is vital not only morally or financially, but also politically: host governments are less likely to agree to include refugees in their systems and services if doing so requires them to divert portions of existing development funding away from the needs and priorities of their own nationals.

2.2.3. Humanitarian funding of government capacity remains low

Globally, just about 2.5 percent of international humanitarian assistance is channeled directly to national governments. Even less goes to national NGOs (about 0.4 percent) and local NGOs (0.04 percent) directly from donors, though the combined figure jumps to roughly 10 percent when indirect funding is included.⁵² As that low figure suggests, many donors, including within the UN, continue to resist the idea of channeling humanitarian budgets through country systems, including in cases in which governments have sufficient capacity and accountability. Other donors, especially at field level, are more open to the idea but note that their headquarters, governments, and parliaments often prefer to utilize humanitarian budgets precisely because they bypass state systems.

In turn, as noted above, host governments indicate that the lack of funding through state systems and lack of clear additionality, especially in the case of refugee-hosting states,⁵³ make it more difficult for them to gain national political support for the full socio-economic integration of IDPs and refugees. This seems to be a consistent concern at municipal level as well, in light of fiscal decentralization rules that fail to account for an influx of displaced persons: municipalities and provincial governments rarely see their revenues supplemented so they can care for displaced populations. One exception in this regard is the provision by UNHCR of funding directly to several district administrations in Uganda. However, such support is outweighed by the fall in general budget support from development donors and in the fiscal transfers from the central government to local districts, the latter of which declined from 21.5 percent of government revenue during FY 2010/11 to 12.5 percent in FY 2017/18.⁵⁴

2.2.4. Funding through national and local institutions is constrained by three sets of concerns

Crucially, for humanitarian donors, the lack of funding for emergency response through state systems reflects three sets of concerns. The first is a concern that humanitarian principles prevent the channeling of humanitarian funds through governments (even though the Good Humanitarian Donorship initiative stresses the need to strengthen governmental and nongovernmental emergency preparedness and response capacity).⁵⁵ Anecdotally, this appears to have evolved in recent years toward concerns about the politicization of humanitarian aid (for instance in counterterrorism contexts) and difficulties realizing the centrality of protection. The second is a concern that public systems are too slow to respond in a timely manner to crises, a concern that some governments themselves indicate they share. The third is that such systems lack transparency and accountability measures to ensure funds are not corrupted and that they reach intended beneficiaries.

One challenge in this regard is that donors tend to consider the risks of using state systems without weighing these against the risks associated with other delivery mechanisms or the opportunity costs of bypassing state systems over prolonged periods of time.⁵⁶ There are, in any event, good examples of how sound mechanisms can be developed, such as the lessons learned in Indonesia after the tsunami. We return to this issue in our recommendations.

Box 6: Humanitarian principles and working with state institutions

That states are primarily responsible for addressing crises that occur in their territories is a well-settled principle. UN Resolution 46/182—the UN humanitarian community’s Magna Carta—expresses plainly that the affected state has “the primary role in the initiation, organization, coordination, and implementation of humanitarian assistance within its territory.”⁵⁷ The same principle is affirmed repeatedly in other international treaties.

While such state responsibility is very much in keeping with the development system’s commitment to national ownership, it is less self-evidently compatible with the humanitarian principles of neutrality and independence. Indeed, humanitarians often invoke neutrality and independence to explain their reluctance to work with governments (particularly but not exclusively in settings in which the state is party to a conflict). However, it is worth recalling that, unlike humanity and impartiality, neutrality and independence are not universally applicable. Jean Pictet, one of the main promulgators of humanitarian principles, long ago distinguished humanity and impartiality as “substantive” principles of the highest order while identifying neutrality and independence as “derived” principles that fall within “the domain of means and not ends.”⁵⁸ Based on Pictet’s thinking, UN agencies have likewise defined neutrality and independence as “derived principles” and “enablers of the higher level principles of Humanity and Impartiality” whose applicability “varies depending on context.”⁵⁹

A similar interpretation of the principles can be seen in Norway’s Humanitarian Strategy, which affirms that humanity and impartiality “form the basis for all Norway’s humanitarian efforts” while neutrality and independence “are important for gaining the necessary trust and access to be able to provide humanitarian assistance and protection in a humane and impartial way.”⁶⁰ It further notes that how best to comply with the latter principles “will depend on the humanitarian context.”⁶¹ Norway is one of few donors that have issued specific guidelines on applying humanitarian principles.⁶² Similarly, experts at ICRC have concluded that neutrality and independence are pragmatic, operational principles with “no intrinsic moral value” and that they are “relative and not absolute, in the sense that they must be interpreted and applied in light of concrete circumstances.”⁶³

One way to manage the tension between humanitarian principles and country ownership is to continually assess the government’s willingness to take responsibility for the response. This requires a nuanced approach; even in deeply politicized contexts, interviewees point out that “no government is a monolith” and that opportunities exist to engage with at least some part of the government, be it a line ministry, an oversight body, or a municipal office. Another way to manage the tension is to build protections into the terms of the development support provided in response to a crisis. For instance, in one country, concerns about the government’s willingness to guarantee that all returns of displaced persons were voluntary led one development actor to specify conditions in that regard.

2.2.5. Donors continue to bypass government-led coordination structures

There are many situations in which donors bypass not only government systems, but also any discussion with government to coordinate interventions (see box 7). Donors often have concerns that, even where national governments indicate a desire to coordinate the response in ways that respect humanitarian principles, capacity constraints mean they are not able to do so on the ground. The finding of the research, however, is that prioritizing national ownership is appropriate wherever key governmental sponsors genuinely support humanitarian principles (and other bedrock UN values are not at stake), even when the state lacks capacity and strong accountability mechanisms. In these cases (Somalia is an example), most funds and services will be provided outside state structures, at least over the near and medium terms. But the government can still be involved in setting priorities and standards for such parallel service delivery, while being supported to build its own capacity and accountability over time.

Box 7: Somalia: not ripe for implementation, but why undermine ownership?

The SDRF is the central aid-coordination architecture in Somalia. The facility comprises both a coordination platform and a financing architecture for implementing the NDP, including its resilience pillar. It aims, among other things, to bring bilateral and multilateral financing under common governance, to strengthen coherence across actors and instruments, to facilitate alignment with national priorities, and to reduce transaction costs.

Despite these important objectives, funds channeled through the SDRF fell from 22 to 20 percent between 2015 and 2017.⁶⁴ Almost all such funds were provided by the African Development Bank's Somali Infrastructure Fund, the UN Multi-Partner Trust Fund, or the World Bank Multi-Partner Fund. Many bilateral donors continue to provide just a small fraction of their funding through the SDRF. The United States, for instance, delivers less than 5 percent of its aid through the framework, the European Commission less than 15 percent. By contrast, several smaller donors provide considerably more, including Switzerland (51 percent), Norway (44 percent), and Sweden (39 percent). No less crucially, interviewees underscore that donors frequently decline simply to report their bilateral activities to the facility, although a commitment to begin doing so has recently been secured from some donors. The consequences of these dynamics include, among others, reduced coherence between bilateral- and multilateral-aid interventions and increased politicization of aid as donors and government counterparts pursue bilateral agendas outside of any collective scrutiny.

2.2.6. State-NGO service partnerships often lack a clear transition strategy

A number of countries experiencing protracted crises have experimented with government service partnerships with NGOs, both local and international. Such “contracting out” can provide fast, yet coordinated, service provision that saves lives; designed well, it can also help strengthen links between states and citizens and create the nucleus of a productive long-term state-civil society relationship.

By building on existing NGO delivery capacity, such partnerships can allow for a rapid scaling up of services even under active insecurity. The design of the programs is important, however, and the review finds that clear benchmarks for transition and a growing role of the state over time are essential to make these partnerships sustainable and to avoid a political pushback against them. Timor-Leste is a good example of a phased approach to build up public health services over five years. Afghanistan, by contrast, spent too long in an equilibrium of low effectiveness and capacity building in NGO-provided health services before trying to rectify this through the Citizen's Charter.⁶⁵

Box 8: Promising transition strategies: Nigeria, Somalia, and DRC

Most plans and programs—even multiannual ones—lack clear transition strategies or responsible disengagement strategies. They do not contain within them a clear vision for how the program(s) will achieve outcomes over time and how this will, in turn, inform the nature and sustainability of planning/programming. A recent appraisal of UNDP's work in South Sudan, for instance, found that “most of the projects did not have specific sustainability plans and exit strategies.”⁶⁶

Nigeria

The same is not true in Nigeria. In Borno, UNDP and the World Health Organization (WHO) are administering a phased program aimed at community recovery and resilience. The main components include repairing and reconstructing essential infrastructure; providing training and incentive packages to health professionals, teachers, and community workers; establishing participatory local governance processes; stabilizing livelihoods; revitalizing environmentally friendly agricultural production; and developing market-based skills. Notably, the priority in phase one of the project, covering the first six months, is to provide immediate livelihoods opportunities through labor-intensive reconstruction, revitalization of agriculture, and provision of critical health and nutrition, education, and water and sanitation services. The second phase, covering eighteen months, aims to reestablish sustainable basic service delivery, establish sustainable long-term livelihoods, and fully rehabilitate and “build back better” critical community infrastructure. Over the medium term, the program seeks to reestablish local government, connect it with communities and community leaders, and introduce participatory planning and conflict-resolution mechanisms.

Somalia

Somalia's 2019 HRP also provides an example of how to focus and incentivize greater attention to transitions. During the planning process, the HCT applied a resilience and durable-solutions lens to all projects included in the HRP. To that end, the country team evaluated projects against questions such as the following: Is a sustainability/handover component built into the project? Is the project linked to government or community systems? Meanwhile, within the health sector, there is a goal to ensure that the government is able to manage the vaccine-and-medicine supply chain by 2020. The HCT is also focused on supporting the Ministry of Education to provide education in emergencies.

Democratic Republic of the Congo

In DRC, the 2019 RRP calls for a gradual transfer of registration and documentation responsibilities from UNHCR to national authorities, and it commits to providing greater support to enable the development of a national registration-and-documentation system. It expresses UNHCR's intention to collaborate with UNICEF and others to develop a program aimed at increasing refugee access to the national education system, thereby "permitting humanitarian interventions to phase out in favour of more sustainable approaches to support for developing systems."⁶⁸ The plan also emphasizes the need to enroll refugees in national health systems and to support infrastructure rehabilitation in refugee-hosting areas that benefits locals as well as refugees. The overall goal is to "gradually transition away from direct interventions."⁶⁹ While this is undoubtedly a long-term objective, and vigilance against premature handovers or withdrawals is essential, incorporating such transition thinking into a response plan opens up space for preparing for and seizing opportunities if and when they do arise.

2.2.7. From an NGO perspective, localization is viewed far too narrowly

Localization has been at the forefront of the humanitarian agenda in recent years. This is particularly the case among NGOs, which have spearheaded a number of promising initiatives to galvanize support for the principle "As local as possible, as international as necessary." Some UN agencies are also meeting or exceeding their localization commitments. UNICEF provided roughly 30 percent of its humanitarian budget to national and local actors in 2017, while more than 20 percent of UNHCR's annual program expenditure went to national and local partners that year.

Despite some important exceptions, however, power within the humanitarian system remains centralized within a handful of international organizations. (In 2017, more than half of all humanitarian funding went to just three UN agencies: WFP, UNHCR, and UNICEF.) From the perspective of national and local actors, some consistent messages emerge from interviews in Chad, Somalia, and elsewhere about why this is. Firstly, the localization debate is being waged on narrow grounds. The focus is overwhelmingly on funding/subcontracting arrangements rather than on broader issues of power and political economy. Secondly, and as a result, local institutions continue to be treated mainly as contractors, with little if any autonomy or decision-making authority, rather than as partners.

Thirdly, the capacity-building initiatives that do take place focus mainly on building capacity to administer short-term UN- or INGO-financed projects rather than longer-term institutional capacity and independence (this echoes governments' concerns regarding technical assistance). As noted in the most recent Charter4Change progress report, "The majority of the capacity support [reported by signatories] was around compliance to their standards."⁶⁷ Fourthly, to the extent that local actors are receiving increased support, it is often because of high insecurity and low risk tolerance among international actors, with local NGOs perceiving the shift more as a risk write-off than as an act of empowerment.

It also bears emphasizing that localization is not without real risks. There are concerns about “capture and suppression.”⁷⁰ The shrinking of civic space in many countries presents a crucial barrier to enabling empowered local civil society leadership. Interviewees in several countries noted that the more established local organizations tend to have close links with dominant political parties or ethnic groups. Other challenges include the creation of “phantom” NGOs—that is, NGOs that have no real links to the community and emerge simply to attract donor funding.

2.2.8. Humanitarian actors are insufficiently engaged in long-term national budgeting processes

Many UN and humanitarian actors tend to work only with line ministries, rather than finance ministries, when they engage with governments. Meanwhile, international efforts to strengthen public financial management are often disconnected from humanitarian needs. They also tend to reflect a highly technical approach, even though budgeting processes are deeply political.⁷¹

The absence of concerted analysis, advocacy, and policy advice when it comes to the distributive impact of fiscal policies is particularly notable in this regard. In some countries, fiscal systems are regressive rather than redistributive, exacerbating the plight of the most vulnerable: a study of Mali’s fiscal policies found that they increase poverty, with many impoverished Malians ending up poorer because of the effects of the tax-and-transfer system. Indirect taxes were found to be the main driver of these impoverishing effects.⁷² Meanwhile, even as they collect a disproportionate share of revenue from the earnings of poor and vulnerable households, many of the countries considered for this review spend as little as 0.5 percent of GDP (gross domestic product) on social protection. Analysis by the UN and others suggests that even the most resource-constrained governments can afford to enhance the coverage and equity of their social spending.⁷³

Another key impediment to localized approaches in contexts such as Nigeria, Uganda, and Ukraine, for example, is the lack of adequate fiscal decentralization. Cities or districts whose populations have doubled, tripled, or quadrupled because of an influx of displaced persons continue to receive the same levels of support from their central governments as they did prior to the crisis. In the absence of updated fiscal rules capable of accounting for population movements, inclusion of refugees or IDPs in local public services will remain burdensome if not infeasible, financially and politically. Addressing these sorts of challenges requires strong literacy in matters of fiscal policy and political economy. UNICEF’s approach to budget analysis and advocacy and UNDP’s work on participatory budgeting and development finance assessments are promising examples, but they remain exceptions.⁷⁴ The partnership with the World Bank, examined further below, is also an opportunity in this regard.

2.2.9. Sustainability needs to be political as well as technical

There is a widespread understanding that political dynamics have an impact *on* aid operations. There is less attention paid to the political effects *of* aid interventions. In particular, there is a lack of systematic monitoring and analysis of the unintended consequences of programs. One example, mentioned elsewhere, is the tendency of international organizations to “poach” skilled civil servants or professionals from governments and local NGOs, with sometimes-considerable effects on the long-term capacity of the public sector and civil society. Desk research and interviews suggest that another common way aid produces negative outcomes relates both to the targeting of humanitarian aid and social protection and to the potential for resentment between recipients and nonrecipients.

Recent research demonstrates that the exclusion errors of many flagship programs and safety nets are well above 50 percent,⁷⁵ while interviewees allow (and perception surveys confirm⁷⁶) that targeting decisions are an important source of tension and frustration among affected communities and are often driven by budgetary considerations as opposed to vulnerability assessments. Nevertheless, targeted programs are often justified as the best or only way to reach the furthest behind. Crucially, this is a political issue as much as it is a technical one: low-coverage and poorly targeted programs are unlikely either to achieve genuine change or to garner the political support necessary to sustain the programs over the long term. (It is a well-known aphorism that “services reserved for the poor are invariably poor services.”)

Moreover, highly targeted programs cut against SDG and human rights commitments to progressively achieve universal healthcare and education and social protection floors for all. As the most recent World Social Situation report concludes, “Universal programmes—available to all without conditions—are most likely to ensure inclusion and non-discrimination.”⁷⁷ Nevertheless, while there is a growing recognition of the need to provide aid to host communities as well as displaced persons, the politics of targeting is rarely a main focus within nexus discussions. This is an important omission given that closer links between humanitarian programs and public systems give the former an increasingly outsized influence on government social policy formation (for example, related to coverage and eligibility criteria). The political sustainability of program design is an issue that merits more attention in the future, informing both humanitarian programs and policies to meet the SDGs.

3. Transcending the Humanitarian–Development Divide

The second overarching objective of the new way of working is to transcend the humanitarian–development(–peace) divide by working toward collective outcomes, over multiyear timeframes, on the basis of comparative advantages. Collective outcomes are commonly defined as concrete results that humanitarian, development, and other actors commit to achieving jointly over a specific, multiyear period with the aim of reducing needs, vulnerabilities, and risks. Identifying and achieving such outcomes at country level forms the core of the Commitment to Action launched at the WHS in 2016.⁷⁸ It is a central recommendation of the most recent QCPR, which urges aid actors to “work collaboratively to move beyond short-term assistance towards contributing to longer-term development gains . . . with the aim of reducing need, vulnerability and risk over time.”⁷⁹ It is reflective of commitments made within 2030 Agenda to adopt cross-pillar and multidisciplinary approaches, to leave no one behind, and to address the underlying inequities that produce crises. Collective outcomes are also referenced in the Peace Promise,⁸⁰ and, in some contexts, humanitarian, development, and peace actors are working together across the triple nexus. The need to bridge humanitarian–development divides is further encouraged by a multitude of other international frameworks, including the GCR, the Sendai Framework, the sustaining peace agenda, and the new OECD-DAC recommendation on the nexus.

This section identifies findings, good practices, and constraints related to this imperative. In line with the *One Humanity* report as well as discussions at the JSC and elsewhere, it focuses specifically on the areas of conducive environments for the new way of working, leadership and capacity, analysis and coordination, identifying and operationalizing collective outcomes, adapting and harmonizing financial instruments, and accountability. As in the other sections, what follows is not an exhaustive catalogue of all relevant issues but rather a focused discussion of important trends and constraints.

Box 9: Collective outcomes: a few key questions

Collective outcomes are viewed by many as the crux of the new way of working. However, they are by no means a self-delineating concept, and country teams face a range of questions, most without “right” answers, when setting about to identify appropriate outcomes for their contexts. Such questions include those related to the following:

- **Conducive environment:** What is the nature of the crisis (for example, conflict, chronic drought, flooding) and of the broader political economy in which it persists? Is the context likely to change? What implications does this have on the achievability of collective outcomes?

- **Leadership:** How invested are the government, country team, donors, and civil society in pioneering a joint approach? What are the dynamics like between the leaders of these constituencies? Who is best placed to secure political buy-in? How can momentum be sustained as leaders rotate in and out?
- **Analysis and coordination:** Is there a shared vision for how best to prevent or resolve a given crisis or a forum for developing one? What information is already available, and what’s missing? What capacities and appetite for coordination exist, and what explains the persistence of any gaps?
- **Articulating collective outcomes:** How inclusive should the process be? How should competing priorities be reconciled? At what level should outcomes be pitched (area-based; subnational, national)? How transformative should outcomes be? What should their relationship with existing plans and priorities be?
- **Operationalizing collective outcomes:** How can country teams ensure that outcomes drive programming rather than the other way around? What programming approaches are most suitable to achieving outcomes in a given context? What is the appropriate balance between meeting needs and addressing causes? How best can the centrality of protection be maintained?
- **Financing collective outcomes:** What would an effective financing strategy look like, and how might donors be persuaded to support one? What are the *qualitative* challenges with existing funding mechanisms, and how might these be overcome?
- **Accountability:** How can accountability to affected populations best be secured? What kinds of mechanisms are needed to incentivize collaboration around collective outcomes over the medium and long terms?

3.1. Promising developments and good practices

3.1.1. *There is a step change in collaboration between humanitarian and development actors*

As noted, a key element of the new way of working is to transcend the humanitarian–development divide by working toward collective outcomes based on comparative advantage over multiyear timelines. The review finds that a step change along these dimensions is beginning to occur on the ground, with real progress emerging related to joint analysis, planning, and operational links. We judge that a principal reason for this is the growing commitment to “reinforce rather than replace,” as covered in the previous section. Governments and development actors, in particular, feel that the renewed humanitarian commitment to localization gives them greater space to link humanitarian action with development funding (which generally has to show national ownership and some form of durable institution building).

In addition to this major shift, humanitarian and development actors have found new practical instruments that are helping to transcend divides. Momentum is also resulting from the high-level support provided to the new way of working, most prominently in the form of the JSC. The fact that the new approach is not associated with a single agency and relates to multi-stakeholder processes beyond the UN further distinguishes it from prior similar initiatives, such as Early Recovery (associated with UNDP) and Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (an EU initiative).

Conducive environments

3.1.2. Collaboration has moved fastest where government ownership is deepest

The review finds that the deepest linkage between humanitarian and development activities—and cooperation between international humanitarian and development actors—occurred when governments took the lead.⁸¹ In several countries, including Afghanistan, Niger, Nigeria, and Somalia, support at the highest political levels has proved especially effective.⁸² Governments' regulatory and convening roles are also frequently cited as critical enablers. In at least one case, it was only after the government stepped in to set minimum standards that disparate aid actors undertook to harmonize their approaches and improve the quality of their services. The importance of government leadership is further demonstrated by the emphasis country teams place on its absence: lack of political leadership is consistently ranked as the most important or second-most important barrier to the new way of working.

As noted above, by focusing on working with governments—where this can be done in a principled manner—to strengthen and use local systems where possible, humanitarians have begun to succeed in aligning development actors behind the same objectives. This shift is not to be underestimated: it is the use of local systems that is the biggest enabler of collaboration between humanitarian and development actors.

Box 10: Planning across humanitarian and development divides in Lebanon

Almost a decade after Syrian refugees first began fleeing to Lebanon, the government-led Lebanon Crisis Response Plan 2017–2020 maintains a strong focus on humanitarian aid. Two of its four strategic objectives concern protecting and assisting vulnerable populations. Yet the plan is most notable for its emphasis on the necessity of development support to a country grappling with more refugees per capita than any other. It calls on international actors to strengthen Lebanon's social, economic, and environmental stability and to support service provision through national systems. The plan itself embodies the latter objective: unlike a traditional HRP, it is signed by the government and the UN. The minister of social affairs, jointly with the RC/HC, chairs the national body that oversees the plan, while line ministries lead each of its sectors.

As in other countries, achieving the “mindset shift” that such a strategy requires remains a work in progress. The 2019 update to the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan identifies several lessons that are still being learned, including the need to reinforce government institutions' leadership and partnership capacity (another is the need to improve the coordination of multiyear programming). But there is evidence that such a mindset shift is taking root. The 2019 interagency health-sector chapter, for instance, recognizes that “while maintaining a direct delivery component to cover critical needs for vulnerable people, the priority of the Health sector is increasingly shifting towards continued investments in health systems strengthening and enhancement of institutional resilience to sustain service provision and quality of services, and to achieve a positive and sustainable impact on health indicators for the long term.”⁸³ During the plan's first year, donors provided more than \$200 million to strengthen public service delivery and capacity development.

3.1.3. *Insecurity is also a short-term driver of collaboration*

A second situation in which humanitarian and development actors are working together far more closely is where security conditions prevent development actors from reaching most areas of the country directly. More work is being done to collaborate and localize in these situations. In northeast Nigeria, there has been close cooperation from agencies that have both a humanitarian and a development mandate to support IDPs—for example, through UNDP’s area-based programming. Conditions of high insecurity have also spurred UNDP and OCHA to work together in training local security forces on human rights. Even where joint programming is not possible or appropriate, the environment may still be conducive to alignment between programs. In South Sudan, for instance, humanitarian activities in the water, health, and education sectors are being designed to complement projects undertaken by development actors in those same sectors. Similarly, in Somalia and CAR, insecurity is driving collaboration between humanitarian and development actors at sectoral and multisectoral levels.

Leadership and capacity

3.1.4. *Ensuring that RCs and RC/HCs have adequate humanitarian and peacebuilding expertise is essential*

The importance of government leadership has already been emphasized. The necessity of international leadership is equally clear. Among international actors, RCs and RC/HCs are uniquely positioned to lead the new way of working. They are among the rare senior officials who straddle the humanitarian–development divide (or the triple nexus, in the case of triple-hatted DSRSG/RC/HCs); their status as highest- or second-highest-ranking UN official in country gives them convening power and access to national political leadership. Their position as coordinators (as opposed to implementers) means they are not in direct competition with agencies over funding, especially now that the system has been “delinked.” They are also specifically mandated by the QCPR to support, “through a transparent, collaborative process, a joint, impartial, comprehensive and methodologically sound assessment of needs for each emergency to inform strategic decisions.”⁸⁴

A recent explanatory note on the reinvigorated RC system, published by the UN, listed several key skills and profiles that RC/HCs will need to have moving forward if they are to play such a role, including deep understandings of the 2030 agenda and development processes, effective interpersonal and team-building skills, and competence working across the HDP nexus.⁸⁵ Interviews and research point to the following as additional skills and responsibilities of empowered RC/HCs in humanitarian contexts:

- **Political savvy:** the ability to navigate complex institutional and crisis dynamics, including at regional level, and to “make the case” for the new way of working not only technocratically but politically
- **Normative expertise:** the ability to seize opportunities for domesticating global policy processes (for example, the SDGs or Sustaining Peace) and international norms (for example, refugee law, human rights law) as well as to analyze and address gaps, risks, and opportunities emerging from national policy processes
- **Strategic planning:** the ability to lead UNDAF/UNCF and HRP processes (or to develop context-specific approaches), help shape UN country presences, and co-lead mission transition processes in ways that lead to coherence, rigorous prioritization, and clear delineation of roles and responsibilities

- Empowered decision-making: the ability to avoid “lowest common denominator” outcomes by making decisions in the absence of a consensus, and having those decisions be honored
- Peacebuilding: the ability to understand the strategic links between development, humanitarian assistance, and peacebuilding; to champion peacebuilding priorities; and to engage strategically with political, security, and justice actors/sectors and serve as a bridge between these and the economic and social sectors. (Notably, ensuring RCs are fluent in peacebuilding was also a recommendation of the Advisory Group of Experts on the UN’s peacebuilding architecture.)⁸⁶

3.1.5. Adequate support—for example, from nexus advisers—is equally critical

A key pillar of the RC system reform is the need for RCs to be adequately staffed and sufficiently resourced. When it comes to the ability of RCs to lead the new way of working, two issues are worth noting. First, the difficulties in building linkages between RCOs and HCTs experienced by several countries reveal the extent of the challenge. In one case, staff in an RCO struggled simply to be included on the HCT’s mailing list. As one interviewee pointed out, “Sure, the RC/HC chairs the HCT, but he doesn’t take notes. . . . It was a battle just to get access to the agenda.”

Secondly, interviewees all but universally praise the role of nexus advisers. While supply is not meeting demand, the UN’s People Pipeline initiative is currently being developed to help address the shortage. Spearheaded by UNDP and several other UN entities, the initiative focuses on developing and nurturing a cadre of advisers from across the UN system and beyond who are able to engage in and facilitate complex system-wide processes across the triple nexus. In addition, efforts underway within the UNDS reforms are aimed squarely at alleviating capacity constraints within RCOs: nearly 50 percent of the total budget for reorganizing the RC system will be dedicated to that purpose, with RCs benefiting, on average, from five posts covering planning, policy, partnerships, economics, and monitoring and evaluation.

Other mechanisms for supporting country teams that are commonly cited positively by interviewees include (i) UNDP/OCHA and Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Task Team country support on the humanitarian–development nexus; (ii) ProCap, GenCap, and CashCap advisers; (iii) Global Focal Point multidisciplinary teams; and (iv) INCAF support, for instance in the form of Resilient Systems Analyses. Systematizing such support will be a crucial next step.

Analysis and coordination

3.1.6. Joint analysis of the causes and consequences of crises is a crucial starting point

Joint analyses have provided an important entry point for the new way of working in countries such as CAR, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Somalia. Among the most commonly cited examples of analytical tools capable of encompassing the HDP nexus are the RPBA and the Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA), spearheaded by the UN, World Bank, and EU, and the UN’s Common Country Assessment (CCA). All three represent major analytical exercises involving multiple stakeholders. All three present opportunities to identify emergency needs while also uncovering underlying challenges. Each places a premium on government leadership, wherever this is appropriate. In some cases, such as in CAR, such analyses also entail extensive surveying of affected communities. Within the auspices of the UNDS reforms, new guidance concerning CCAs is likely to enhance their ability to serve as a collective analytical starting point from which to identify collective priorities.

The next generation of CCAs are intended to draw from the capacities, resources, and expertise within and, crucially, beyond the UN; to identify multidimensional risks that could threaten welfare, “covering a full spectrum of development, humanitarian, peacebuilding and human rights issues”; and to analyze the underlying structures and inequities that produce or could produce crises and conflicts. This holistic focus provides a strong rationale to build linkages between CCAs and other analytical processes. In Lebanon, for instance, the upcoming CCA will be undertaken jointly with the World Bank’s country assessment. There are also opportunities to strengthen linkages with human rights analysis, the latter of which can help identify root causes of protracted crises as well as facilitate advocacy around solutions, such as access of vulnerable populations to economic, social, and cultural rights.

Meanwhile, within humanitarian country teams, there are promising examples of analyses that look beyond immediate household needs at underlying root causes of crises. In Chad’s 2017 Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO), which undergirds its 2017–19 HRP, the country team distinguished between the different crises unfolding in the country (displacement, health emergencies, food insecurity) and considered the various chronic and structural challenges undergirding them, including macroeconomic challenges, inequality, climate change, impoverishment, lack of services, and population growth. Afghanistan and Colombia provide similar examples. There are also cases of humanitarians adapting their analyses to government-owned response and resilience plans. In Jordan, for instance, UNHCR, WFP, and UNICEF have recently signed an agreement to conduct a joint vulnerability assessment that is harmonized with the Jordan Response Plan.

There are also important efforts underway to learn lessons from previous and ongoing attempts to undertake joint HDP analysis. A recent workshop convened by ECHO and OCHA, in collaboration with the World Bank, provides a good example in this regard. The workshop considered the many challenges inherent in joint HDP analysis, and identified a number of ways to overcome them: set common objectives by identifying the processes and plans into which the analysis should be fed; develop shared analytical frameworks and identify appropriate coordination platforms that can “host” the analysis; invest in analysts with expertise that spans the nexus.⁸⁷

3.1.7. Joint coordination structures are (slowly) emerging

Another clear trend is the slow-moving but prominent shift toward improved coordination, at both high and working levels. Chad, for instance, has established a high-level Humanitarian-Development Forum; OCHA has become a member of Chad’s development cooperation mechanism; and field-level cluster meetings are open to development partners. The government in Niger has established, with support from the RC/HC, a High Tripartite Committee to advance collaboration on nexus-related issues. In Somalia, several working groups under the SDRF have been created that focus on humanitarian- and nexus-related issues, such as durable solutions for IDPs. In Ukraine, the country team has established an HCT Working Group on the nexus. In Nigeria, efforts are underway to activate a humanitarian–development nexus working group and to strengthen existing interministerial and interagency coordination structures at both national and state levels. A joint steering committee co-led by the Government and RC in Mauritania has been established to oversee a new shared plan. The CRRF secretariats established or being developed in countries such as Uganda and Ethiopia provide further examples, as they bring together government, humanitarian, development, donor, and civil society actors into a single country platform.

In another promising trend, country teams in DRC and Sudan have undertaken comprehensive

reviews of their coordination architectures. In the case of DRC, the review prompted several changes, including decentralizing decision-making via regional and local interagency committees. Sudan is currently considering major shifts as well thanks to an extensive review process: a coordination review task team, co-chaired by the humanitarian-development nexus adviser and OCHA and involving four UN agencies at senior level, three international NGO country directors, and one donor representative, spent a year evaluating how best to create a suitable joint coordination structure at national and subnational levels. Finally, some new structures are emerging that span the triple nexus. In CAR, for instance, there have been meetings not only between the UNCT and HCT but also with the SRSR. In Somalia, there are efforts to decentralize coordination in ways that bring together humanitarian and development agencies with the Peacekeeping Mission.

Identifying collective outcomes

3.1.8. Collective outcomes are playing an important role in bridging silos

As noted at the outset of this section, collective outcomes are a central component of the new way of working. In several contexts, they have helped to bring humanitarian and development actors closer together. In Chad, collective outcomes were designed to link the HRP with the UNDAF, the World Bank country strategy, and the government's NDP. In Lebanon, the UN and the World Bank have established a "compact" of shared priorities around which they plan to collaborate over the next several years. Collective outcomes have played a similar bridging role in other contexts. Recently, the country team in South Sudan has developed shared multiyear targets, related to food security and gender-based violence, that draw upon common objectives in the HRP and the UNCF. Outcomes are also beginning to appear directly in strategic plans, including Mauritania's 2018–22 CDPP, Somalia's 2019 HRP, and Ukraine's 2019–20 HRP.

While the involvement of governments in articulating outcomes varies by country, a few promising examples of national ownership are emerging. In Haiti, humanitarian and development actors have coalesced around the government's commitment to reduce the rate of cholera to less than 0.1 percent. That common objective has formed the core of the cholera-response strategy on the part of both communities. The epidemic has been on a "clear downward trend" since 2017, though it is not yet eliminated, according to the most recent HNO.⁸⁸ In Burkina Faso, the collective outcome on nutrition prompted the government to create a budget item related to nutrition, while at least one donor used collective outcomes as a basis for supporting a capacity-building program related to disaster-risk preparedness.

In addition to outcomes at the strategic planning level, there are also examples emerging of two or more aid actors identifying collective outcomes at the programmatic level. In DRC, for instance, UNDP and UNHCR have committed to pursuing joint outcomes related to local governance, preparedness, peace and justice (for instance, through establishment of peace committees composed of refugees and host-community members), and integrated analysis. In Somalia, durable-solutions consortia have identified collective outcomes related to solutions programming. Area-based programming is frequently cited as a key enabler in this regard.

Meanwhile, individual agencies and NGOs are shifting toward a more outcome- and solutions-oriented approach. The International Rescue Committee (IRC), for instance, has rolled out an Outcomes and Evidence Framework across its suite of interventions: as of 2018, every IRC country program has developed a strategic action plan to inform decisions related to five outcomes—health, safety, economic wellbeing, education, and power. Similarly, UNDP's Country Programme Document

for Pakistan, covering 2018–22, offers a promising example of a framework that focuses less on outputs and more on outcomes. The Danish Refugee Council has undertaken a series of internal changes designed to strengthen its overall strategic and operational capacities, including its ability to plan for the long term and to undertake outcome-oriented programming at the outset of a response.

Operationalizing collective outcomes

3.1.9. There are promising examples of joint or aligned planning processes

In a growing number of protracted crises, country teams are finding that joint or aligned plans work well. The Partnership Framework in Mauritania is perhaps the clearest example of a “one planning system” approach (see box 11), but strategic planning processes are gradually being rationalized in several contexts. For example, the HCT/UNCT in Burkina Faso began to transition from a standalone HRP to a combined HRP/UNDAF in 2016 when they reached a common understanding that maintaining separate planning processes to address overlapping sets of issues made little sense. Similarly, in several other countries, more joined-up planning has emerged following a RPBA, which brings together humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding actors around a shared vision. The RPBA undertaken in CAR in 2016 informed the development of a comprehensive national recovery and peacebuilding plan, which encompasses objectives across the triple nexus. Both the UNDAF and the HRP are aligned with the recovery and peacebuilding plan. In Chad, the identified collective outcomes have also helped to harmonize disparate planning and programming processes. The outcome related to food security and nutrition, for instance, informed the development of a comprehensive National Response Plan on Food Insecurity and Malnutrition, while the outcome on basic services contributed to the development of new World Bank and EU/ECHO programs.

Table 2: A sample of collective outcomes

COUNTRY	OUTCOMES
<p>Burkina Faso</p>	<p>Food Security By 2020, reduce by 50 percent the number of people in phase three of food insecurity and reduce to 0 percent the number of people in phases four and five of food insecurity.</p> <p>Nutrition By 2020, reduce by 30 percent the rate of chronic malnutrition among children zero to five years.</p> <p>Climate-Induced hazards By 2020, reduce to less than 1 percent the number of households vulnerable to climate shocks and increase by 50 percent the number of institutions with capacities for disaster risk reduction.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Chad</p>	<p>Food Insecurity Reduce the number of people in severe food insecurity by 27 percent (from 1 million to 770,000 people) by 2019. Reduce the number of people in food insecurity by 32 percent (from 2.8 million to 1.9 million people) by 2019.</p> <p>Nutrition Reduce the rate of severe acute malnutrition among children five years and under from 2.6 percent to 1.8 percent by 2019. Reduce the rate of global acute malnutrition among children five years and under from 11.9 percent to 10 percent by 2019.</p> <p>Health Reduce the obstetric-case fatality rate from 5 percent to less than 1 percent by 2019.</p> <p>Basic Social Services Ensure that 90 percent of people in need have access to functioning basic social services including water, sanitation, and education by 2019.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Mauritania</p>	<p>Outcome 1.2: Improve food security and increase access to livelihood, decent jobs, and economic opportunities. Outcome 1.3: Institutions and communities contribute to sustainable management of natural resources and to anticipating and responding to crises and the effects of climate change. Outcome 2.2: Vulnerable populations have access to adequate and durable services for health, nutrition, WASH. Outcome 2.3: Institutions, civil society, and communities ensure improved protection against different forms of discrimination.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Somalia</p>	<p>Food Insecurity By 2022, the number of people experiencing acute food insecurity decreases by 84 percent, with global acute malnutrition rates reduced by 5 percent and sustained below the emergency threshold.</p> <p>Durable Solutions Risk and vulnerability are reduced, and resilience of internally displaced persons, refugee returnees, and host communities are strengthened to reach durable solutions for 100,000 displaced households by 2022.</p> <p>Basic Social Services Number of vulnerable people with equitable access to inclusive basic social services increases by 27 percent by 2022.</p> <p>Climate-Induced Hazards Proportion of population affected by climate-induced hazards (drought and flood) falls by 25 percent by 2022.</p>

Sudan	<p>Economic Development and Livelihoods By 2023, people in Sudan have access to improved productive capacities that contribute to providing inclusive and sustainable livelihoods, creating jobs, and ending extreme poverty.</p> <p>Basic Social Services By 2023, vulnerable populations have increased physical and social well-being through equitable and sustainable access to quality basic social services.</p> <p>Environment, Climate Change, Disaster-Risk Reduction By 2023, people’s resilience to consequences of climate change, environmental stresses, and natural hazards is enhanced through strengthened institutions, policies, plans, and programs.</p> <p>Governance By 2023, national, state, and local institutions provide accountable and participatory service delivery and governance, including enhanced rule of law, equitable access to justice, and protection of human rights.</p>
--------------	--

Box 11: Linked plans: Mauritania, Burkina Faso, and Sudan

Mauritania

In Mauritania, the government and the UN recently adopted the Partnership Framework for Sustainable Development 2018–2022. The framework integrates humanitarian and development planning streams, replacing both the UNDAF and the HRP. It is based on a CCA that encompasses both structural challenges and humanitarian needs. A Resilience Systems Analysis workshop, organized by the OECD and UNCT, further facilitated the joint analysis that undergirds the plan. The strategy is framed around three Strategic Priorities and ten outcomes, of which four have been identified as “common outcomes” (see table 2). Although the strategy is signed between the government and the UN, the planning process included other partners, and the plan itself was endorsed by most of the international NGOs operating in Mauritania. The country team is developing specific five-year targets for each of the strategic outcomes. Those consulted indicated that flexibility would be ensured at the level of annual work plans. However, specific situations may go beyond the margins allowed by this level of flexibility. As a case in point, in 2018 exceptionally high food-security and nutrition needs necessitated an additional humanitarian plan.

Burkina Faso

The most recent UNDAF process in Burkina Faso brought together humanitarian, development, and peace actors to undertake joint analysis, planning, and programming. Resilience and vulnerability emerged as overarching concepts around which all three communities could coalesce. To that end, the country team undertook efforts to develop a common understanding of resilience (inconsistent and amorphous definitions of resilience are a common complaint in many countries). Relying in part

on the Humanitarian Needs Overview, the CCA mapped, for each region, where the most vulnerable populations are located. The country team also identified concrete linkages with peacebuilding—for instance, those related to recruitment of youth into armed groups. The resulting strategic plan is grounded in the new way of working, with two of its overarching objectives (related to governance and food security) specifically referencing the nexus. The plan also underscores the importance of multisectoral approaches and provides a helpful visualization of the coherent and integrated approach to be pursued by the country team.

Sudan

Sudan's 2018 HRP calls for humanitarians to adopt a long-term perspective and to work in close coordination with development partners, including through the UNDAF. It cites relevant interventions within the UNDAF and calls for capacity building of partners and government counterparts to enhance national response mechanisms, ensure sustainability, and integrate refugees and IDPs within national social-service systems. Further, the document affirms that activities within the HRP are aligned with relevant government plans, including those related to WASH, nutrition, and health. Notably, each sector response within the HRP contains a section identifying its links to the HCT's multiyear strategy and to development planning. Moreover, this integrated framework calls for aid actors to work across clusters/sectors and to provide services in the same location to the same population "based on a comprehensive set of initiatives and activities—the Essential Package approach—combined into one plan."⁸⁹

3.1.10. Multiyear humanitarian planning is a (potential) vehicle through which to operationalize collective outcomes

In addition to more joined-up planning, there is a clear trend toward more multiyear humanitarian response planning. A growing number of country teams have adopted multiyear humanitarian strategies, including those in Afghanistan (2018–21), Cameroon (2017–20), CAR (2017–19), Chad (2017–19), DRC (2017–19), Haiti (2019–20), Nigeria (2019–21), occupied Palestinian Territories (2018–20), Somalia (2017–19), Sudan (2017–19), and Ukraine (2019–20). Likewise, multiyear refugee response plans are proliferating, including DRC's (2019–20), Jordan's (2018–20), Lebanon's (2017–20), Sudan's (2019–20), and Uganda's (2019–20), among others. Notably, UNHCR has placed twenty-two of its own operations on multiyear strategies and budgets (up from six in 2016).⁹⁰

In some cases, multiyear humanitarian strategies are becoming vehicles through which collective outcomes are being codified. Collective outcomes are included in Somalia's 2019 HRP, for instance, while Nigeria's describes five areas from which outcomes will be identified (basic services and local governance; durable solutions; livelihoods; food security and nutrition; and social cohesion, peace, and reconciliation). This trend is likely to continue as more country teams identify collective outcomes. However, concerns remain about the quality of multiyear plans, including the extent to which they tend to aggregate disparate programs rather than inducing a collective strategy.

3.1.11. Country teams are adapting UNDAFs/UNCFs and other development frameworks to meet the needs of affected countries

Under the UN reforms, the UNDAF/UNCF is to be considered the primary planning document of the UN system at country level. In crisis or at-risk contexts, the new UNCF guidance envisages the

UNCF as a vehicle for identifying and achieving collective priorities across the triple nexus. It calls for the frameworks to guide the entire program cycle for achieving the 2030 Agenda by putting “leave no one behind” front and center; to complement and be informed by other policy frameworks, including HRPs/RRPs and the UN Resilience Framework; to be responsive to emerging or unforeseen needs; and to reflect collective outcomes that address risk and vulnerability. The UN Resilience Framework, in turn, seeks to help country teams incorporate resilience building into their strategic plans and programs through joint assessments, planning, programming, monitoring, and resource mobilization.

Although these guides were issued in 2019, their calls for greater attention to risks, vulnerabilities, and crises are already captured in several existing strategic plans. In Nigeria, the UNDAF describes UN humanitarian activities and encompasses peacebuilding objectives in addition to development concerns. (Notably, there is also a peacebuilding component included in the HCT’s Nigeria Strategy on Protection, Return and Recovery for North-East Nigeria.) In Yemen, the UN Strategic Framework aims to address what it refers to as “Humanitarian Plus priorities.” In Haiti, the UNDAF treats the humanitarian response as a crosscutting issue that informs the framework’s outcomes. In Sudan, the UNDAF seeks to strengthen the nexus whenever possible and to ensure that priority is given to those left furthest behind (see box 11). South Sudan’s UNCF covers just three years rather than the traditional five in light of the high unpredictability of the conflict, displacement, and food-security situation there.

Similarly, “One UN” plans, such as Afghanistan’s, provide an important platform to bring humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding activities into one strategy.⁹¹ There are also good examples of agencies aligning their country programs behind the UNDAF. In Ukraine, UNDP’s Country Programme Document was scheduled to end in 2016 but was extended to 2017 to allow the country office to develop a new 2018–22 CPD that matches the UNDAF time span. In South Sudan, the 2019–21 UNCF is the principal document on which UNESCO’s 2019–21 country strategy is anchored.

At the same time, concerns persist that UNDAFs exist “only on paper” and that they lack the flexibility and comprehensiveness to address humanitarian and peacebuilding concerns alongside development challenges. The new guidance seeks to address this problem through improved accountability mechanisms; it remains to be seen whether and how these will work in practice.

Box 12: Mainstreaming, Acceleration, and Policy Support for 2030 Agenda as an entry point

The MAPS approach to helping countries achieve the SDGs has been an important entry point for dialogue on development–humanitarian cooperation. Supported by UNDP in partnership with other agencies, MAPS missions are the UN system’s first attempt to facilitate SDG integration at country level. In crisis-affected countries, MAPS missions have begun to provide a crucial entry point for transcending humanitarian–development divides. In Sudan, the mission worked with partners to identify “accelerators” for the SDGs. The government integrated these into its development planning, while both the UNCT and HCT embedded the MAPS accelerators into the UNDAF and HRP. A follow-up mission helped build momentum for identifying collective outcomes. In Burkina Faso, similarly, the government and the MAPS mission identified the new way of working as an SDG accelerator. Based on the mission, the government, the UN, and NGOs worked to develop the national Sahel Emergency Program, funded by the government and in line with the national development plan, which aims to improve essential infrastructure in crisis-affected areas. The country team is also looking to establish an SDG Acceleration/Nexus Platform linking humanitarian, development, peace, and human rights actors to inform analysis, programming, and monitoring across the nexus.

Adapting and harmonizing financing instruments

3.1.12. Multiyear financing is increasing

The shift toward joint planning and multiyear humanitarian plans has been accompanied by a shift among donors toward longer-term funding partnerships. Donor self-reporting under the Grand Bargain indicates a notable increase in multiyear humanitarian financing over the last several years. Almost 60 percent of donors reported such an increase in their 2018 self-reports.⁹² Some donors, including Belgium, Canada, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, report providing more than half of their humanitarian financing on a multiannual basis. As a result of this trend, WFP has received multiyear contributions of roughly \$1 billion for the period 2018–20, and OCHA has at least twenty-one multiyear financing agreements.

Sweden has recently signed a four-year agreement to support the CERF, covering the period 2018–21. Norway, likewise, approved a four-year agreement with the CERF in 2018 and three years of core support for OCHA (covering 2019–21)—the government’s first multiyear awards to both entities. The parliament also recently authorized indicative core support for UNHCR and WFP for 2019–22. Denmark has developed multiyear planning frameworks with humanitarian partners and several partnership agreements covering both humanitarian and development funding. Germany and Qatar provide further examples.

At the same time, while multiyear funding opens up space for humanitarian assistance to contribute to more transformational outcomes than might be possible under annual agreements, this is by no means guaranteed. As a recent evaluation of multiyear funding in Ethiopia put it, “MYHF went primarily to traditional humanitarian relief operations.”⁹³ Finding ways to ensure that such funding supports a new way of working rather than business as usual is essential.

3.1.13. *The World Bank's partnership with humanitarian actors has become much closer*

The Bank has several modalities that are either new or evolving and that facilitate much closer collaboration with humanitarian actors. These include modalities (i) to provide refugee-hosting countries with highly concessional funding, through the GCFF (for middle-income countries) and the IDA Refugee Sub-Window (for low-income countries); (ii) to provide financing through the IDA CRW, which includes responses to disaster and climate change–related shocks (for low-income countries); (iii) to finance efforts to address drivers of conflict and fragility through the Risk Mitigation Regime (RMR); and (iv) to provide significant financing more quickly directly to UN agencies and nongovernment partners at government's agreement in highly insecure contexts. Box 13 provides an overview of several of these facilities.

Box 13: World Bank facilities

At present, the World Bank offers several funding options for countries experiencing a humanitarian crisis:

- Under the IDA CRW, the Bank offers concessional financing for development in the wake of severe economic crises, natural disasters, and public health emergencies. An assessment on whether to deploy CRW financing involves both quantitative factors (for example, economic damages and losses, recovery needs) and qualitative factors (for example, whether the shock has particularly impacted poor and vulnerable communities, whether the country has space to respond using its performance-based allocation, and the extent of burden sharing with other donors). This is different from a purely insurance-based solution, and it allows the Bank to take into account a wider range of factors. CRW funding is typically part of an overall Bank response package that can include support from other sources, such as Performance Based Allocation resources, and funds from fast-disbursing Contingent Emergency Response Components. Discussions are underway to adapt the CRW to make it more preventative/anticipatory.
- In contrast with the CRW, which targets lower-income countries, the GCFF provides funding for middle-income countries with large numbers of refugees. The facility was created originally with Jordan and Lebanon in mind. However, Colombia became eligible in early 2019. This concessional financing strategy is intended to support development priorities such as social protection programs, jobs and decent work, and budget support, among other areas.
- A counterpart to the GCFF and CRW, for lower-income refugee-hosting countries that form part of IDA, is the Regional Sub-Window for Refugees and Host Communities. As a source of development funding for eligible nations working to provide services for major flows of refugees, this instrument is intended to provide development support that benefits refugees and the host communities that live alongside them. The balance of grants and credit in each funding allocation depends on the debt risk of a given nation: the higher the debt risk, the higher the percentage of funding from grants. Criteria are very similar to that of the GCFF, including national frameworks, the number of refugees, and legal structures to protect refugees.

- The RMR makes additional resources—up to roughly \$840 million—available to mitigate drivers of conflict and fragility in four pre-identified countries: Guinea, Nepal, Niger, and Tajikistan. As a form of preventative financing, the RMR supports development interventions that seek specifically to target fragility risks and reinforce resilient systems in these countries. A new facility within IDA 18, the RMR has already improved Bank programming and policy dialogue in the four countries, according to a recent midterm evaluation. The evaluation also concluded that “it is still early days and much work remains.” It highlighted the need to ensure that conflict- and fragility-related issues are integrated not only in RMR-supported projects but throughout the entire country portfolio and the need to place “strong emphasis . . . on partnership with key actors such as the UN and EU.”⁹⁴

3.1.14. Direct Bank funding of UN agencies and other nongovernmental actors is increasing

With regard to World Bank–UN financial partnerships, good examples emerging from the review include the Bank’s \$50 million emergency program to help scale up the response to drought in Somalia. With the federal government in arrears (and thus ineligible for Bank financing), and in light of domestic-capacity concerns, the Bank opted to fund the project through ICRC (the first time it had ever done so) and FAO (with which the Bank had a preexisting analytical partnership). Similarly, after the collapse of public institutions in Yemen, the World Bank began to collaborate with and fund UN agencies including UNICEF and UNDP (see box 5). CAR provides a third example. After conflict descended in 2013, the Bank initiated a project with WFP and FAO, contracted by the Ministry of Rural Development. More recently, financial partnerships between the Bank and ICRC and the Bank and UNICEF have developed in South Sudan.

3.1.15. World Bank–financed activities coordinated behind shared objectives are even more significant

There are good examples emerging of the World Bank coordinating closely with other actors. As noted above, in Lebanon, the Bank and the UN have formulated a “compact” which identifies ten priority areas for collaboration, including in relation to data and analysis and sectoral programming. In Chad, the Bank’s Refugees and Host Communities Support Project (PARCA) program and the EU/ECHO initiative known as DIZA (first described in box 4) are good examples of coherent activities behind shared objectives. Although the two programs adopt distinct methodologies, with PARCA working through government systems and DIZA through NGO consortia, the objectives and principles of the programs were designed in tandem. The two projects are using harmonized cash-transfer benefits and a shared questionnaire to target beneficiaries, and they are using the government’s standards in construction and service provision. Together the two projects aim to support more than three hundred thousand refugees and over five hundred thousand Chadians. It bears noting, however, that the process has not been seamless. Several interviewees expressed concern at how long it took (over a year). Sources of delay appear to have included weighty procedures, high government turnover, and challenges securing headquarters approval.

3.1.16. There is promising World Bank–UN collaboration on convening, analytical, and policy support

Beyond financing and programming, the Bank is collaborating with the UN in convening and policy-support roles. In 2017 the World Bank and UN signed a new Partnership Framework for Crisis-Affected Situations, which commits the two institutions to jointly address critical crisis risks. That commitment is playing out in creative ways. At global level, the partnership has, for

instance, produced the *Pathways for Peace* report—and joint follow-on work—which champions a new way of working on issues related to prevention and sustaining peace. Country-level examples of joint coordination and analytical and policy support are also increasing. In Iraq, the Bank and humanitarian actors are establishing a national social protection forum, which is expected to bring together representatives of humanitarian, early-recovery, development, and government social–safety net programs. In Yemen, a World Bank staff member was seconded to the UN special envoy’s office, while in CAR and Somalia, new analytical methodologies are being deployed. World Bank emergency financing in Burkina Faso has been guided by joint analysis of the food-insecurity and malnutrition situation. In Nigeria, in what may be the first such arrangement, OCHA is renting office space to the Bank in Maiduguri.

When it comes to analysis, promising examples include the partnership between the Bank and UNHCR to create and manage a data center focused on forced displacement and, at country level, a commitment on the part of the Bank and the UN in Lebanon to undertake their main country analyses jointly rather than separately. In several contexts, including Cameroon, Chad, Ethiopia, and Uganda, the Bank and UNHCR are collaborating on policy engagements related to the CRRF or the Refugee Sub-Window. In Ethiopia, for instance, collaboration between the Bank and UNHCR has led to support for Ethiopia’s new Refugee Proclamation. The Bank played a crucial role, having agreed with government that the Proclamation would be a prior action of its program. Recently adopted, the Proclamation has transformed Ethiopia’s refugee policy from one premised on encampment and exclusion to one of the most progressive refugee frameworks in the world—at least on paper.

Box 14: Ethiopia’s Refugee Proclamation

Until recently, official government policy required most of Ethiopia’s nearly one million refugees to reside in camps in remote, impoverished areas of the country. Hundreds of thousands of refugees have lived in such camps for years, some for decades.

Within the last two years, government policy toward refugees has undergone a remarkable shift. In late 2017, Ethiopia officially launched the CRRF, which stresses the importance of including refugees in national and local systems. The government subsequently produced a CRRF implementation roadmap and established a CRRF coordination structure—composed of government officials, humanitarian agencies, development actors, NGOs, and donors—and a CRRF National Coordination Office.

More recently, the government has enacted into law a new Refugee Proclamation that affirms the right of refugees and asylum seekers to move freely, to choose where to settle, to work, and to access services. The shift away from a humanitarian- and camp-based approach toward such an inclusive model is to be guided by a ten-year National Comprehensive Refugee Response Strategy. While considerable challenges will remain in implementation, the expression of such a clear government commitment to refugee rights and inclusion is a notable development in its own right.

Accountability

3.1.17. Member state boards can play a crucial role in incentivizing humanitarian–development collaboration

Executive boards can help enhance accountability for coordination across the HDP nexus. At global level, governing bodies have requested joint updates in certain cases; an increase in reporting on partnerships and nexus-related activities is notable in agency submissions. A step toward systematizing enhanced collaboration at the corporate level occurred when boards approved the inclusion of a common chapter in the 2018–21 strategic plans of UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, and UN-Women. Governing bodies are also playing a role when it comes to financing. Since mid-2016, the boards of at least seventeen UN entities have held dialogues on how best to finance the objectives agreed on in corporate strategic plans, including discussions of how to incentivize donors to shift away from highly earmarked funds and toward more flexible, longer-term funding commitments.⁹⁵

Boards are also playing a role within specific country contexts. One example is the joint visit to Uganda of the executive boards of UNDP, UNFPA, UNOPS, UNICEF, UN-Women, and WFP in 2018. The mission focused on several issues, including the extent to which UN agencies were working coherently to support the integration of refugees into national and local services and systems. It concluded that “while humanitarian-development links are strong, more could be done to support a smoother, better-coordinated transition.”⁹⁶ Identified challenges included those related to balancing support between refugees and locals, scaling up promising interventions, improving communications, and developing appropriate infrastructure.

3.1.18. . . . As can individual donor partnership agreements

Some donors are adapting their assistance strategies to incentivize humanitarian–development joint action. In Afghanistan, for example, a midterm review of SIDA’s development strategy led to an adjustment that saw greater inclusion of vulnerable groups such as IDPs and returning refugees.⁹⁷ Similarly, in DRC, SIDA supports from its development budget UNICEF’s multisector program addressing recovery needs of displaced populations. Donors can also embed new approaches into their headquarters-level partnership frameworks in exchange for multiyear and flexible funding.

An example in this regard is the US State Department’s framework agreement with UNHCR covering 2018–19, which includes localization commitments, among others. In exchange, the US has committed to piloting adjustments in its own practices to allow greater flexibility in the use of its funds to meet the most urgent needs in each crisis.⁹⁸ Similarly, the 2018 Netherlands partnership with the International Organization for Migration has supported development programming in conflict-afflicted regions in Iraq, thus fostering cross-nexus collaboration by ensuring that development actors are present alongside humanitarian actors in communities affected by crisis.⁹⁹ Another promising example is Germany’s Transitional Development Assistance Fund, which is designed to bridge immediate and long-term funding.

3.2. Constraints

Conducive factors

3.2.1. There is a “missing middle” in humanitarian–development cooperation

The review generally finds good progress in transcending previous humanitarian–development divides. However, as noted, progress has occurred primarily in countries where there is either strong government leadership and capacity (Indonesia, Jordan, Ethiopia, Nigeria) or very high insecurity and little decentralized government capacity (Somalia, CAR, Yemen). There are a number of “missing middle” cases that have much lower degrees of cooperation: those where much of the country has a high degree of stability and government leadership for development, and hence high per capita development volumes, but where governments have been reluctant to have a coordinated dialogue on approaches to humanitarian crises. This applies in situations such as Myanmar’s. These situations necessitate greater reflection in the next period of implementation.

Leadership and capacity

3.2.2. Governments frequently need sensitive support for leadership and coordination

Transcending the humanitarian–development divide is frequently acknowledged as difficult for international actors; it is less frequently recognized that it is also a challenge for governments.¹⁰⁰ Government officials emphasize a lack of coordination between their disaster/emergency-management agencies and their development-oriented line ministries, divisions and tensions between their line ministries and their ministries of finance and planning, and political, human, and financial barriers to greater participation of local authorities. Overlapping mandates are also a key constraint: different federal, regional, and local authorities are responsible for implementing an assortment of services and social protection programs, often with little if any coordination between them.

Coherent and consistent international support can help address these challenges. For example, in Nigeria the RC’s office and OCHA have devoted great attention to contacts with both the federal agencies in Abuja and the state governments. This has been crucial in maintaining government endorsement of new approaches. In Mauritania, as one interlocutor noted, “the government has 27 committees working on Vision 2016–2030. We are trying to support them to get out of these siloes.” Support is also being provided to Ukraine to improve its relief-coordination capacities. In some cases, however, donors and agencies have contributed to the challenge, for instance by supporting competing parts of the government, each claiming to be leading the response.

Crucially, the relationship between different entities in government is almost always sensitive, and it is important that the RC/HC’s offices and broader country teams have the right skills to communicate with different actors (including military) without undermining national coordination and decision-making processes or compromising humanitarian and human rights principles. Political savvy and a flexible approach are key. A promising example in that regard occurred in Lebanon, where UNDP sought to minimize political sensitivities surrounding engagements with local government by first training trainers from the central government before assisting them to train municipalities on the use of UNDP’s Resilience Municipalities Toolkit.

3.2.3. Despite the envisaged positive impact, there are risks associated with the UN reforms

By a wide margin, those consulted consider the UN reforms to be crucial enablers of the new way of working, especially on issues of RC empowerment and accountability for collective results. (It is also notable that recent Inter-Agency Standing Committee policy changes likewise “empower” HCs.) One contrasting concern, however, voiced by several informants, is that the RC’s leverage with the host government may suffer because of the delinking. That is the case because governments’ relationship with RC/HCs has often been based firstly on the latter’s status as UNDP representatives. Indeed, more than one RC/HC notes that formal invitations from governments are most often addressed to them in their UNDP role. The reason relates directly to the resources UNDP brings to bear and its longstanding presence and good relationships with governments. By contrast, RC/HCs have meager budgets, while their role as HCs often requires them to raise sensitive issues that require strong capacity for analysis and dialogue.

3.2.4. High staff turnover and lack of in-country expertise are major challenges

High turnover is a considerable challenge both for governments and for country teams in virtually every context considered. In several countries, crucial government interlocutors have been replaced several times over since 2016, making it difficult to sustain momentum for a new way of working and leaving those involved feeling as if they are constantly “starting from scratch.” The expertise of government actors, particularly below the ministerial level, is also a concern in several countries. On this score, the aid sector itself has an impact, contributing to a “brain drain” of qualified civil servants. A study of the wage effects of aid in DRC, for instance, found that the UN and international NGOs pay wages roughly five to seven times higher than the public sector, while technical experts working for embassies earn twenty-two times more than their counterparts in government.¹⁰¹ The study emphasized that these wage differentials have both short-term and long-term effects on state capacity, a concern that also emerged frequently in interviews with national and local NGOs and with governments. Country teams themselves are beginning to grapple with this issue in some contexts, for instance by conducting analyses and setting standards on wages.

Turnover within the UN system is also a major concern, particularly insofar as it affects the analytical capacities and institutional memory of country teams. Many interviewees cite the proliferation of short-term and consultancy contracts, with technical-level interviewees, especially, noting that the precariousness of their positions affects their ability to take risks, to stay motivated, and to contribute to longer-term initiatives. Senior officials express similar concerns: “You can’t maintain a response to a protracted crisis with a staff that turns over every 3–6 months.”¹⁰² Difficult living and working conditions appear to play a role, but the key challenges are on the supply side.¹⁰³

There is an absence of mechanisms for long-term surge support and of incentives and resources for cultivating standing expertise across the triple nexus. Funding for nexus advisors is unpredictable and insecure, and major processes often depend on expertise from beyond the UN: “When a big new process starts, everyone brings in new people who haven’t been involved in the previous process. So we’ve just had a bunch of brilliant World Bank economists come in and come up with an entirely different M&E framework. And it’s not linked to SDGs, UN indicators. But since these issues are so complicated, you do need expertise.” A particular concern in this regard relates to the lack of in-country capacity to undertake robust, ongoing political economy analysis, and the lack of language skills.

Box 15: Language barriers as a crucial impediment in some countries

In contexts such as Myanmar, there is an especially urgent need for a deepening of country knowledge, including through language skills. According to one country expert, “It’s difficult to overstate the extent to which international diplomacy related to Myanmar is limited by the absence of good translation.” By way of example, he noted that the same word in Myanmar can variously mean “racial,” “ethnic,” “national,” and “indigenous.” In a country experiencing acute ethnic strife and rising nationalism, the dangers of miscommunication and misunderstanding are manifest. While boosting the language skills of international actors is a long-term endeavor, greater support and training for local interpreters—especially simultaneous translation—could be provided. Additionally, aid actors could invest in translating works of scholarship focused on countries such as Myanmar, which tend to be written in English or French and are therefore not accessible to the vast majority of these countries’ populations. A similar initiative undertaken in Indonesia met with much success. By one estimate, over one hundred books on Myanmar could be translated for as little as \$100,000.

Coordination and analysis

3.2.5. Disjointed analysis remains the norm in many instances

While important progress has been made when it comes to analysis, the overall analytical landscape remains a disjointed one in many countries.¹⁰⁴ On the humanitarian side, those consulted identify several reasons for this. Data-privacy concerns and competition between agencies and NGOs continue to lead to “information hoarding.” Incompatible assessment methodologies continue to produce competing understandings of vulnerability. While coordinated assessments are growing in frequency, the majority remain agency- or sector-specific rather than interdisciplinary. As the 2019 Afghanistan HNO explains:

First and foremost, sector-specific assessments are—by nature—isolated, lacking information on how their specific findings relate to other sectors and needs. Second, the scope of many datasets is not actually nation-wide but focused on the provinces or regions most relevant to the particular phenomena under review/assessment—making statistical analysis and comparison more difficult. Third, the research frameworks of sector-specific datasets often do not allow for statistically-valid findings on the specific needs of the most vulnerable groups (i.e., female-headed households, the disabled, the elderly, etc).¹⁰⁵

The sheer number of assessments is another key barrier. According to one NGO source in Somalia, there were more than one hundred assessments undertaken within the same time span in Kismayo and Baidao alone during the height of the drought. This contributed to assessment fatigue among vulnerable populations and a confusion of responses, with different agencies and NGOs identifying and targeting different groups with different amounts of assistance for different periods of time.

On the development side, important challenges are present as well. There are concerns that analyses are not “people centered” enough and that they, too, proceed mainly on the basis of sectors. (A promising development with regard to the former is that the new PDNA guidelines identify conflict sensitivity as one of the core principles of the PDNA.¹⁰⁶) Analytical processes are considered too “heavy” to be effective in an emergency situation. They are frequently undertaken by short-term consultants and thus have little impact on the working culture in-country. Several interviewees described the results as “paper in a drawer,” suggesting that the analysis does not drive subsequent decision-making. UN staff in some countries perceive the RPBA and PDNAs to be largely EU- and World Bank–driven. The quality of political analysis is an often-cited concern. Perhaps most fundamentally, joint analyses tend to be one-off events, carried out in the wake of a disaster or at the start of a major program cycle, rather than ongoing processes. In Nigeria, for instance, there are concerns that crucial plans and programs continue to draw from the RPBA from 2016, despite how much the crisis has evolved since then.

3.2.6. Lack of development coordination is hindering progress

Humanitarian coordination is far from perfect, but most of those consulted emphasized that the greater challenge lies on the development side. This is especially the case in contexts where the government lacks the capacity or interest to play a leadership and convening role. Encouraging governments to play such a role—and supporting them to do so—is among the most important prerequisites for the success of the new way of working. However, as noted previously, there are examples of development donors bypassing government-led coordination structures even when these are in place and relatively functional. Meanwhile, while the UN’s development efforts are generally seen as well coordinated within the UNCT, the vast majority—almost 90 percent—of development assistance flows outside the UN system. How, when, and for what purposes to engage bilateral-development donors—including “nontraditional” donors such as China and Turkey—remain pressing concerns. Key challenges include varying degrees of presence and flexibility among bilateral donors at country level, incentives that privilege disbursements and “burn rates” over collaboration for results, differing priorities and development visions, and a lack of mechanisms to facilitate coordination. The sheer number of partners can exacerbate these challenges: according to one estimate, the average fragile state today accommodates more than 750 separate donor interventions each year and receives aid from an average of sixty-five different funding organizations.¹⁰⁷

Articulating collective outcomes

3.2.7. Collective outcomes often do not target the most strategic issues

Many collective outcomes could apply to virtually any of the countries considered for this review. It has been difficult for governments, the UN, and other international partners to find a way to target more strategic, locally relevant issues, even when these are imperative. For example, government and international interlocutors in Nigeria agreed that humanitarian and state activities in the northeast would not be able to deliver lasting recovery unless IDPs could cultivate land and goods could be transported more freely by road in order to lower prices. The objectives of more frequent safe road transport, lower consumer and higher producer prices, and renewed access for IDPs to cultivate land would have been more strategic than those under consideration during the time of the research. While this would have required a certain careful navigation given that these goals are related to the security operation, the relationship of the UN and government is productive, and it is likely that an effort for more strategic focus would have borne fruit.

Similarly, in Somalia, many interviewees highlighted the pressing need to rebuild the country's once-extensive flood-control infrastructure; without such an effort, the country is unlikely to be able to prevent the recurrent floods and droughts it experiences from perennially devolving into acute humanitarian crises.¹⁰⁸ As noted in section 4, however, efforts to strengthen water-management infrastructure remain ad hoc and small scale. Rapid, unregulated urbanization of Somalia's main cities, driven by IDPs that intend to remain where they are indefinitely if not permanently, is another critical strategic challenge, one that requires an extensive focus on issues of urban planning and land tenure as essential components of any durable solution.

Box 16: Peacebuilding linkages in Nigeria

There is increasingly a consensus that the new way of working encompasses the triple nexus of HDP action. There is less of a consensus on whether it is limited to the “softer” components of peace or extends as well to the military/security sector.

Northeast Nigeria is one context in which transformative change is all but inconceivable without the careful engagement of security forces. The military holds the keys to the operational decisions of most importance for humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding actors. Civilian government interlocutors noted that they would welcome a coordinated effort by the UN and other partners to develop a common understanding with the military on how development and humanitarian outcomes are important for peace. Nevertheless, a sustained, high-level dialogue with security commanders—on the importance of upholding international humanitarian law and humanitarian principles and of considering the social and economic impacts of military strategy—has not yet taken place. Those consulted felt that such a dialogue is needed at two levels:

- Between the civilian state government in Borno, the theater commander and his senior officers, and humanitarian and development partners (supported by the RC/HC or DHC)
- Between the theater commander and his senior officers in Abuja, senior officials involved in the recovery, the RC/HC, and ambassadors and heads of agencies

Based on experiences elsewhere, such as Colombia, it is all but assured that such a dialogue will take time to lead to any concrete changes in the nature of the security operation. (One challenge in this regard is the frequent replacement of the theater commander.) But existing engagements demonstrate that changes are indeed possible. In Yobe, dialogue with local security forces led to greater allowances for certain doctors to travel during curfews, while others received identity cards that enabled them to pass through checkpoints. But there are limits to what can be achieved at the local level—not least the sheer scale of the challenge. There are currently more than eight hundred thousand Nigerians completely cut off from state or humanitarian assistance because they remain outside military-controlled areas. Many IDPs are confined to “garrison towns,” where they are unable to access their homes, cultivate their fields, or trade goods in local markets. There is a lack of safe transit on major road axes. Movement restrictions continue to disrupt the flow of goods and materials, triggering devastating price shocks.

While these and other measures serve short-term security objectives, they exacerbate humanitarian needs and undermine prospects for peace and recovery in the longer term: without people of the region regaining their incomes, neither the humanitarian crisis nor conflict and terrorism threats are likely to be durably resolved. The links between price shocks, political unrest, and conflict, for instance, are well established.¹⁰⁹

3.2.8. Strategic objectives are not sufficiently specific to the complexities of each crisis

This study finds that although government counterparts and donors felt that they had generally been consulted around the HRPs and UNDAFs, such consultations often take place only after a plan is mostly or entirely developed, such that governments (and, to a lesser degree, donors) are mainly asked to sign off rather than contribute. There is a sense among national and local NGOs, as well, that strategic plans are written by expatriates, for expatriates. Governments, donors, and N/LNGOs also expressed that the documents and objectives are frequently too vague and dependent on international jargon—that is, insufficiently adapted to local realities. A sense that collective outcomes and other strategic plans are overly ambitious is also widespread in some contexts. These are not new challenges, and yet collective learning in this area appears to be elusive in many instances.

One exception is in Iraq, where the 2015–19 UNDAF identified several serious shortcomings with the previous UNDAF. It found that the expectation of continuing high resource flows had strongly influenced planning during the last UNDAF cycle. Interviewees in other contexts indicate that this is a common tendency—that is, that country teams often do not collectively plan ahead for funding cliffs. Thus, the prior Iraqi UNDAF attempted to address a broad range of national issues at a time when resource flows were soon drying up. Moreover, the priority areas of the UNDAF were mainly a grouping of existing interventions rather than an alignment of activities with national needs or comparative advantage. This, too, is a commonly cited concern. Other lessons included that the prior UNDAF’s objectives were not adapted to the complex realities on the ground and that they presupposed a quick transition from conflict to development and a strong capacity of Iraq to implement politically contentious reforms. The 2015–19 UNDAF attempts to address these issues. Similar lessons emerge from other contexts, and the new UNCF guidance expressly envisages that country teams will adopt a more context-specific approach.

Operationalizing collective outcomes

3.2.9. There are too many different and fragmented UNHQ-driven plans

“There are too many plans” is among the most consistent refrains emerging from interviews. It is not uncommon for a country to have an HRP, an RRP, a durable-solutions strategy, a UNDAF, a government-led recovery plan, an NDP, and a peacebuilding plan, in addition to agency country documents, sector strategies, joint programs, and donor agreements, all of which touch upon a given crisis. The blurriness between plans is also a challenge. While HRPs, UNDAFs, and NDPs are increasingly aligned, they tend to focus on their own priorities and constituencies without specifying how these relate across frameworks. Nigeria provides an exception in this regard: the 2019–21 HRP includes a description of a flagship World Bank program aimed at accelerating recovery and basic service delivery in the northeast, while the UNDAF clearly specifies the UN’s humanitarian activities. Somalia’s 2019 HRP provides another example.

In theory, introducing collective outcomes could help address the challenge of planning proliferation by encouraging country teams and partners to articulate shared priorities that can form one important basis of, and serve as a bridge between, the various planning instruments. While progress on this front remains elusive in many contexts, much of the confusion surrounding collective outcomes stems from the fact that country teams were already in the middle of their UNDAFs and multiyear HRP when they set about to identify outcomes; in the future, collective outcomes could conceivably contribute to a more rationalized planning landscape if they are identified at the outset of major planning processes. That would allow them to drive other plans rather than add to them.

3.2.10. Donors and others express concern about the quality of some multiyear plans and programs

One key impediment to greater multiyear financing is donors' concern about the quality of multiyear plans and programs. Many of those consulted pointed to examples of strategies or funding proposals that read more like three one-year plans than one three-year program. Several identified instances in which multiyear programs failed to make links with local systems or to develop clear transition or localization plans. Others lamented the lack of creativity among the proposals they receive. The issue of achievability is also a concern: "We don't want a big wish-list which can't be fulfilled." A consistent theme was the lack of genuine government engagement. As one donor put it, "Where is the government? There are so many positive externalities of roping in government from the beginning rather than waiting to 'consult' them once the plan is finalized."

Similar questions emerge regarding the participation of affected communities and local civil society. As a recent study of the triple nexus in Mali put it, "International efforts have insufficiently included local actors in planning and implementation processes."¹¹³ As noted elsewhere, the lack of clear transition strategies—including strategies for ensuring that adequate development support materializes in a timely and appropriate manner—is a further concern.

Box 17: 2019 HRPs and the new way of working

Recent humanitarian plans show that the need for a new way of working has been internalized, at least on paper, to a notable extent. In line with calls to take context as a starting point, there is a diversity of approaches incorporated into the latest generations of HRPs. One contextual factor that appears to influence the choice of approach is the extent to which, and pace at which, country teams expect development programming to begin tangibly improving conditions in affected areas.

Central African Republic

CAR's 2019 HRP notes that the humanitarian system has been called upon to "replace the state in order to ensure access to essential services."¹¹⁰ To ensure better complementarity with government activities and international development funding, it includes financial requirements that are 16 percent lower than those in 2018 due to a "clear prioritization and tightening of the proposed activities around the objective of saving lives, with a reduction in recovery and even development activities, which should be funded through mechanisms other than the HRP."¹¹¹ The plan identifies guiding principles to avoid duplication of humanitarian and development efforts and to initiate the gradual transfer of responsibilities to national authorities "as soon as possible."¹¹² To that end, it rates the severity of needs at regional level on a scale of 0–6.

The HRP commits the HCT to focus the response on those areas with a 3–6 ranking; in those ranking 0–2, coordination with recovery and development actors will be improved to ensure a smooth transition from humanitarian interventions.

Chad

Chad’s 2019 HRP promotes a coherence-focused approach to the nexus. Within its first several pages, the HRP clearly states that it is aligned with Chad’s 2017 UNDAF and the 2017–21 NDP in terms of targeting, geographic areas of work, durable solutions, resilience, the humanitarian–development nexus, and local development. Moreover, one graphic featured in the HRP compares the goals listed in each of these three strategic documents as a clear demonstration of their interrelatedness. This approach, of encouraging humanitarians and government/development actors to work through the same general goals in an integrated strategy, is also evidenced in the project-analysis grid of the HRP, in which one question posed asks, “Does this project reflect the priorities of the government?”¹¹⁴ This does not exclude other priorities, but it allows country teams to clearly identify overlap where this can be done in a principled way.

Afghanistan

In 2018 the HCT in Afghanistan substantially revised its methodology for identifying and targeting “people in need.”¹¹⁵ HCT members agreed to include people who had survived recent conflict, were currently on the move, or had just weathered the forces of nature. They therefore drew a line between those with “humanitarian” needs and those whose needs stemmed from “chronic” insecurity and impoverishment. The number of people targeted fell from 5.7 to 2.8 million between 2017 and 2018, on the assumption that those affected by “chronic issues” would be supported by development programs. By 2019, however, while lifesaving assistance remains the priority, the HRP includes a “temporary widening” of the scope of humanitarian action. It does so because “the initial assumption in the 2018–2021 HRP—that actors engaged in One UN programming would be able to more quickly meet the structural needs of affected people—has not yet materialized. Indeed, while millions of people continue to receive humanitarian assistance, they have yet to benefit from longer-term and large-scale government-led investments in basic service delivery . . . such that they now require additional support to aid their recovery.”¹¹⁶

This quick scan shows that humanitarian country teams are adapting to the new way of working. However, concerns remain as to whether domestic and international development resources will always bridge the gap to create robust local social services and safety net systems over time. In several contexts, concerns are rising that the growing involvement of development actors will lead to a premature reduction in humanitarian funding, even though development action often takes years before it begins to pay dividends and does not necessarily reach the furthest behind within affected countries.

3.2.11. Assistance from headquarters can result in processes seen as duplicative or unadapted to context

There is clear demand within country teams for advice and assistance when it comes to implementing the new way of working. Much of the support provided by headquarters thus far has been welcomed and appreciated. At the same time, many interlocutors in the field, within the UN and in donor offices, saw some efforts to implement the new way of working as too supply driven. Pressure from headquarters appears to have played an important role in expediting processes to identify collective outcomes in several countries. As one donor put it: “There is a lot of pressure to show results on these issues which goes against doing it right.” In one case, while a collective-outcomes document was produced in time for a high-level mission to the country, only a handful of UN agencies appear to have been involved and the initiative unfolded in parallel to a government-led planning process that the UN was also supporting, causing confusion and frustration. Similar concerns were expressed in other contexts.

3.2.12. Country teams struggle to provide integrated policy advice

The QCPR expressly calls upon the UN to “provide evidence-based and, where appropriate, integrated policy advice.”¹¹⁷ The secretary-general’s June 2017 report on repositioning the UN development system underscored the urgent need to strengthen the system’s “policy backbone.”¹¹⁸ Yet discussions surrounding the new way of working have tended to remain overly focused on issues of coordination and delivery of (international) assistance, with less attention being paid to upstream normative and policy work at country level. For instance, it is a common theme in interviews that policy work is “totally projectized,” rather than forming part of a broader strategic vision.

In some cases, competitive policy engagements are fragmenting government planning processes (for instance, by supporting separate processes and policies for returning refugees versus IDPs). While several UNDAFs, such as Ethiopia’s and Iraq’s, envisage a transition toward increased upstream policy work, they remain the exception. Funding for joint policy work is also difficult to come by. This is the case despite the fact that upstream normative and policy work is arguably the UN’s main comparative advantage and despite there being a hard limit to what can be achieved through direct delivery of assistance.

Adapting and harmonizing resources

3.2.13. UN pooled funds have insufficient flexibility and lack a critical mass of funding

In addition to supporting ownership and localization (addressed in section 2 on reinforcing national systems), country-level pooled funds represent one of the most promising mechanisms for improving coordination and financing collective outcomes. Most of those consulted indicated that such funds help to incentivize coherence, including by empowering RCs/HCs to ensure that plans and programs support shared objectives. Yet the current landscape of pooled funding poses a number of challenges. Humanitarian pooled funds are often constrained in their ability to fund nonlifesaving activities. Development-oriented funds are often too slow to link up with humanitarian activities.

Another challenge is that pooled funding is insufficient relative to overall funding, and pooled funds therefore often do not have the critical mass they need to generate a coherent international approach. On the humanitarian side, pooled funds represented 6 percent of all reported humanitarian funding in 2018. The percentage of humanitarian funding allocated via pooled funds varies considerably across countries (for example, from 3.5 percent in Iraq to 14 percent in Afghanistan), but it has yet to reach the 15 percent commitment made under the Grand Bargain.¹¹⁹

Box 18: Humanitarian–development(–peacebuilding) pooled funds

There are several notable examples of pooled funds capable of financing across the double and triple nexus. These include the following:

Country level

- Malawi’s One Fund, which contains a “Humanitarian Window”
- The Ebola Response MPTF, which supports humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding
- Colombia’s Post-Conflict MPTF, one outcome of which is the “transformative and constructive management of social conflicts and humanitarian situations in the territories”
- The Ezingo Fund in CAR, which is designed to support the objectives of both the development/peace plan and the humanitarian response
- The Bekou Trust Fund in CAR, an EU MPTF capable of funding a range of relief, early-recovery, and peacebuilding activities

Global level

- The Joint Fund, which supports catalytic efforts to “leave no one behind”
- The Delivering Together Facility, which includes a “cross-charter coherence” window specifically designed to support RCOs in complex crisis contexts with additional capacity

3.2.14. International actors need to make more consistent efforts to pass on the benefits of multiyear or core financing to civil society partners

One message emerging from conversations with N/LNGOs is that aid agencies do not generally pass on the benefits of the multiyear financing they receive to their implementing partners. One exception is an initiative spearheaded by IFRC and ICRC that provides flexible, multiyear funding and capacity building to national societies. The initiative has recently announced its first round of funding, with national Red Cross Societies in Lebanon and Ukraine selected to receive multiyear “accelerator investments” aimed at strengthening capacities in areas such as analysis, planning, resource mobilization, and evaluation and reporting.¹²⁰ UNHCR has also just recently announced that it will provide an overhead allowance of 4 percent to national and local NGO partners to help defray operational and risk-management costs. Additionally, according to the most recent progress report of Charter4Change, the German ministry of foreign affairs has begun requesting that its partners channel a portion of agreed administrative costs directly to local implementers.¹²¹ But these examples remain outliers.

3.2.15. World Bank partnership is not without challenges

While there is a growing, and increasingly productive, UN–World Bank relationship, the partnership is not a panacea. The Bank’s new financing instruments are a major step forward, but they have limitations. Firstly, the CRW does not address conflict spillovers (while the Refugee Sub-Window is limited to refugees). Secondly, the CRW is a *response* window: it does not provide for deferred-drawdown operations that can agree on assistance in advance of a shock, although conversations are ongoing about how to make the window more preventative. The RMR, in contrast, specifically provides for preventative investments in fragile and conflict-affected States, but the IDA 18 restriction to four countries has constrained its use.

There are also operational challenges. While UN–World Bank collaboration is increasing overall, in some cases interviewees note that coordination between the Bank and the UN in crisis settings could be improved. As one put it, “IDA 18 is like a super-CERF; a lot of donors consolidated their money in IDA 18 hoping it would lead to more coherence. But then the Bank gives the money to agencies outside of any shared framework, reinforcing the problem we are trying to overcome.” A recent evaluation of the Bank–UN program in CAR, noted above, identified several additional challenges, including overambitious objectives, weak targeting methodologies, and a questionable theory of change. Another notable shortcoming: no portion of project management costs were allocated to the relevant ministry; instead, all such costs were assigned to WFP and FAO (this is in contrast with Chad’s PARCA program, also mentioned above). According to the evaluation, “In the absence of separate and discrete financial support, [government] officials felt like they were doing the World Bank ‘a favor.’ At the time, funds for operating expenses in [the ministry] were scarce, and many of the costs incurred in support of the project were not recovered.”¹²²

The CRW provides an important source of financing for countries undergoing crises, though there appears to be room for improvement. As one example, according to an official evaluation of two CRW-funded projects, one achieved its objectives but not the other, and in both cases there was a high risk to the sustainability of development outcomes.¹²³ Similarly, recent assessment of the Refugee Sub-Window in Uganda identified many positive developments but also several important concerns, among them a lack of clarity regarding how sub-window financing relates to the CRRF, the lack of a clearly defined scope, the slow rate of project approval, the need for better collaboration with NGOs and civil society, and concerns regarding the centrality of protection.¹²⁴

As noted in the RMR midterm review, and as further emphasized in the report of the Fragility Commission, there is also the challenge that issues of fragility are often addressed in specific projects sponsored by relevant entities within the Bank but not necessarily incorporated into the overall country programs.¹²⁵

3.2.16. Coordination and advocacy with the IMF appear to be minimal

The IMF is a crucially important actor in many if not all of the countries considered for this review. Many crisis-affected governments are in receipt of IMF financing and are undertaking IMF-encouraged reforms. Even in contexts in which no IMF funding is at play, the IMF’s surveillance activities, policy advice, and analytical work help determine the fiscal and macroeconomic framework in which all other actors, including humanitarians, operate.¹²⁶

Analysis of IMF agreements with several affected countries reveals an apparent divergence of priorities between those agreements, which tend to focus on fiscal consolidation, and the new way of working, which is in most cases seeking to support governments to expand their public systems. Recent official evaluations also underscore the necessity of a proactive dialogue with the IMF to ensure that the international system is not pulling governments in two directions at once. A 2017 evaluation concluded, for instance, that the IMF’s approach to social protection diverges from that of the UN’s: “While the IMF’s preferred approach to targeting social protection to the poor and vulnerable was aligned with the World Bank’s approach, it meshed less well with the rights-based approach to social protection espoused by the International Labour Office and UN agencies which emphasizes universal benefits and targeting by category . . . rather than income.”¹²⁷

Nevertheless, minimal engagement with the IMF appears to be occurring at either country or global

level.¹²⁸ (One exception is the December 2018 Humanitarian Policy Forum, which featured an IMF speaker.) In one country, IMF representatives gave two presentations to the HCT on the economic dimensions of the crisis but there was little by way of a follow-up discussion. In another country, a UN official confided that the UN engages the IMF, if at all, only via the World Bank.

3.2.17. Constraints within donors' respective humanitarian and development departments can impede progress

Most humanitarian and development donors express support for efforts to ensure greater coherence and collaboration among humanitarian and development actors at country level. However, donors, government officials, and UN staff acknowledge that, with important exceptions, current financing instruments are largely unsuited to the task of collaborating on combined humanitarian and development objectives. On the humanitarian side, while multiyear financing has increased, it remains the exception, particularly for national and local actors. Humanitarian donors also struggle (to varying degrees) to finance nonlifesaving activities. Meanwhile, the humanitarian funding gap, which provided much of the impetus for the new way of working, continues to grow.

On the development side, the concern remains that financing continues to bypass populations affected by humanitarian crises. Analysis from Ethiopia demonstrates a nearly total geographic separation between development and humanitarian finance, with the former flowing mainly to major cities and stable regions while the latter is channeled toward drought- and conflict-stricken lowland areas. A recent study of subnational targeting of development aid in Africa recently found that “[development] aid does not flow to poorer people within countries. Rather, aid appears to flow to the places that hold the relatively rich.”¹²⁹ As Norway’s new Humanitarian Strategy puts it in regard to education: “National authorities and development actors have generally done too little to ensure that children and young people in countries and regions affected by conflict and fragility have regular access to quality education. In protracted refugee situations, too, there is a need for development actors to do more.”¹³⁰ Given that upward of 90 percent of development assistance is channeled outside the UN, it is especially critical to engage bilateral donors. SDG commitments to leave no one behind and to support equitable, universal service provision and social protection floors provide a crucial opening in this regard.

3.2.18. Divisions between donors' development and humanitarian departments can perpetuate rather than transcend humanitarian–development divides

Even where HDP actors are present in the same locations, many donors do not allow humanitarian and development funding to be pooled behind shared strategic objectives. Although some progress has been made, institutional silos persist: the review found several promising examples of greater collaboration between ECHO and DEVCO, for instance, but also examples of divided approaches. (Interviewees note that the silos are greater at headquarters level, with representatives in one country indicating that securing approval for a joined-up project required considerable and prolonged advocacy in Brussels.) Bilateral donors face similar challenges, with humanitarian, development, and peace projects still being funded and overseen by different departments with different objectives, working cultures, timelines, resources, and political incentives. As a recent evaluation of Finland put it, “Different mandates, principles, funding regimes and the lack of a common approach to situation analysis” largely explain “the limited engagement with HDN.”¹³¹ Governance systems are also siloed, which contributes to disparate financing and incentive structures and an absence of collaboration among those who receive donors’ funds. UN agencies and IFIs answer to separate governing boards

and member-state institutions: the IFIs are presided over by ministries of finance while UN agencies engage mainly with ministries of foreign affairs.

3.2.19. Earmarking of funding to the project level poses a critical challenge

The projectized nature of both humanitarian and development financing is another key challenge. As a recent report from FAO and the World Bank on assistance to agriculture in Somalia found, “Donor and government agricultural projects are small, fragmented, and isolated; many are pilots that are never scaled up, even after decades of ‘piloting.’”¹³² Another analysis estimates that, in fragile states, fully half of projects are budgeted at under \$80,000.¹³³ Earmarking is a prominent concern in this and other regards. Among UNDS entities, for instance, more than 90 percent of total noncore resources are “restrictively earmarked to single entity projects. Such high levels of earmarked funding discourage integrated approaches.” Indeed, as the secretary-general has put it, “The low predictability and donor-driven aspects of tightly earmarked funding make it difficult to plan and allocate resources strategically in order to strengthen coordination and coherence of activities on the ground.”¹³⁴ Shared development–humanitarian strategies, such as the ECHO/DEVCO joint guidance on social protection in protracted crises or Denmark’s joint humanitarian–development strategies (see box 19), could help to address this deficit, but vigilance is needed to ensure that humanitarian and equity concerns are not subordinated to other interests. Encouraging donors to meet or exceed their Grand Bargain commitment to provide 30 percent of funds unearmarked or lightly earmarked—as some, such as Norway, have done—could also help in this regard.

Box 19: Danish joint strategies at global and country levels

In 2017, Denmark adopted a joint humanitarian–development strategy that aims to strengthen coherence across Danish country programs and policies in fragile countries. The strategy affirms that “a new international approach to crises is required, in order to strengthen the coherence between political conflict resolution, humanitarian actions and development cooperation.”¹³⁵ In pursuance of the strategy, Denmark has started to blend humanitarian and development financing in protracted crises. Its recent country-program documents place a considerable emphasis on localization, national ownership, preparedness, and joint humanitarian–development cooperation.

The Somalia Country Programme 2019–2023 provides a good example: it references the new way of working, establishes “operative linkages” between humanitarian action and development cooperation, and prioritizes increasing protection, building resilience, and enhancing social safety nets. Denmark’s strategy for the Syria crisis is also notable. It takes as its point of departure the protracted nature of the crisis and “the need to ensure a gradual transition from short-term humanitarian relief to addressing medium- to longer-term development challenges affecting both host communities and refugees.”¹³⁶ To that end, it proposes to localize support to refugees and host communities, prioritizing three interventions: providing capacity-building support to local civil society in Lebanon; supporting social protection systems for refugees and vulnerable host communities in Lebanon; and strengthening the healthcare system in Jordan for the benefit of refugees and hosts.

Such efforts to foster coherence across donors' humanitarian, development, and political departments represent an important part of the new way of working. But they also give rise to certain risks that humanitarian action might be subordinated to donors' political and commercial objectives. Denmark's Mali strategy, for instance, appears to be concerned chiefly with stopping irregular migration to Europe. The very first paragraph notes: "Following the collapse of Libya, Sahel is only one border away from Europe. . . . The limited control of borders allows for increased irregular migration towards e.g., Europe."¹³⁷ Some donors have been explicit about the risks and trade-offs involved. As the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation noted in its strategic framework for the Global Program on Migration and Development, "The high political sensitivity around migration in Switzerland and other countries increases the risk for development aid to face instrumentalization and related calls for 'conditionality mechanisms.'"¹³⁸

Accountability

3.2.20. There is no clear pathway for ensuring that strategic plans, collective outcomes, and other frameworks are aligned with the priorities and aspirations of affected communities

Accountability to affected communities remains a critical challenge across country contexts. Global initiatives such as the Grand Bargain are focusing attention and resources on the need to ensure meaningful participation of, and accountability to, refugees, IDPs, and other groups. Promising efforts to increase participation and accountability are emerging at country level. In some cases, such as Chad and Haiti, humanitarian actors are increasingly making use of perception surveys to guide their planning and programming. Similarly, there are good examples of development actors taking account of the views of affected populations. In Ethiopia, consultations with refugees and other actors prompted the World Bank to broaden the focus of its large-scale jobs program beyond supporting employment in industrial parks (concerns about which included low wages and considerable distances between the parks and refugee-hosting areas).

Nevertheless, efforts to incorporate the priorities and preferences of affected populations remain ad hoc and small scale. Aid actors tend to consult affected groups only after crucial strategic and programming decisions have already been made. As a recent study of the accountability efforts of four humanitarian NGOs found, "Rather than being shared with the affected people, power to make decisions about the budget, targeting or the choice of activities remains in the hands of the aid organization, and is the basis of its contractual commitments to the donor."¹³⁹ As a result, there is often a persistent mismatch between community priorities and aid outcomes. Surveys of affected populations reveal the extent of the challenge, with many if not most respondents in countries as diverse as Afghanistan, Chad, Iraq, Lebanon, and Somalia indicating that their views and priorities are not sufficiently taken into account.¹⁴⁰

3.2.21. Internal UN incentives militate against coherent planning and programming

Although there are some cases of hot and rapidly evolving humanitarian crises necessitating a separate humanitarian plan, the persistence of multiple parallel plans and disparate programs over many years appears to reflect incompatible structures, bureaucratic inertia, funding (dis)incentives, and lack of suitable accountability mechanisms as much as, if not more than, conditions on the ground. Differing time horizons and working cultures play a role. One key factor is turf, given the outsized role some

agencies have over certain planning processes (many interviewees noted that the HRP is viewed as OCHA's process, the UNDAF/UNCF associated mostly with UNDP, and the RRP with UNHCR).

Another driver is the perception that the best way to secure funding in crisis settings is through the HRP, with doubts as to whether funding will be forthcoming if the HRPs are tightly coordinated with the UNDAF/UNCF. While there have been significant efforts to arrive at more realistic costings in HRPs (some 2019 HRPs, such as those of Afghanistan, Libya, Somalia, and South Sudan, deploy new methodologies that tighten the definition of "in need"), several development actors and humanitarian donors still underlined "appeal inflation," suggesting that organizations "push to get everything in the appeal." Meanwhile, the resilience and early-recovery components of these HRPs are almost always critically underfunded. Another issue is the lack of symmetry between HRPs and UNDAFs/UNCFs: whereas HRPs include NGOs, UNDAFs/UNCFs are limited to the UN (and Government). Mauritania's experience, however, suggests that it is feasible to include NGOs more fully in UNDAF processes, and indeed the new UNCF guidelines are expected to stress inclusive and consultative processes in their development.

The extent to which strategic plans and collective outcomes drive programming, rather than the other way around, is a further concern.¹⁴¹ Interviewees note that UNDAFs/UNCFs tend to touch on the full gambit of challenges facing a country, with little internal prioritization. Therefore, it is hardly a challenge for agencies to claim that their programming supports the UNDAF/UNCF. Similarly, a recent review of multiyear HRPs found an absence of prioritization: "Collective humanitarian strategies, such as the HRP, for example, have tended to act more as aggregators of multiple actors' individual contextual analysis and response plans, as opposed to acting as the drivers of these individual strategies."¹⁴² In at least two contexts, concerns about "retrofitting" emerged as well regarding collective outcomes. Crucially, these challenges are systemic: they reflect the set of incentives country-team actors face as they decide what to prioritize. In most cases, those incentives continue to favor agency-centric rather than collective approaches; accountability mechanisms that pull in the other direction remain, at this stage, largely elusive.

4. Anticipating crises before they occur

In countries experiencing humanitarian emergencies in the period 2017–19, the majority bore some form of additional shock after the initial emergency occurred. This is a given in hot-conflict situations such as Yemen, but it tends also to be true in situations perceived as much more stable: the additional emergencies in countries as diverse as Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, and Mauritania, for example, required new response planning. Across contexts, additional shocks have included renewed or deteriorating conflict within the country, spillovers from neighboring conflicts, natural disasters including drought and flooding, and economic shocks such as the closure of trading routes, currency movements, or fiscal contractions.

The new way of working calls for particular attention to be paid to such risks and shocks precisely because they are so often chronic and cyclical—and therefore predictable. Historical trends in the Sahel, for instance, show that the region experiences drought roughly every three years and a major drought occurs once or twice a decade. Somalia has two periods of floods and two periods of droughts. While the precise timing of each is variable, their (re)occurrence is entirely foreseeable, as are other risks, such as the risk of increased returns of refugees to Afghanistan; of returning nonstate armed-group fighters from Syria to various countries in the Middle East, North Africa, and beyond; and the spread of climate-related displacement.

Nevertheless, as the *One Humanity* report observed, “national and international actors continue to focus their financial and human resources on costly crisis response and post-conflict interventions rather than [on] increasing preparedness and reducing vulnerability.”¹⁴³ Without such efforts to prevent and prepare for crises—for instance, by building scalable social protection and universal service-delivery capacity over time—countries with chronic or repeated crises will remain locked in a state of “permanent emergency” for years or decades to come.

4.1. Promising developments and good practices

4.1.1. Some governments have established strong mechanisms for contingency planning and response
Several governments have made it a priority to enhance their prevention, preparedness, and response capacities. At regional level, ASEAN member States have adopted a Declaration on Culture of Prevention for a Peaceful, Inclusive, Resilient, Healthy, and Harmonious Society and a Vision 2025 on Disaster Management. At country level, Pakistan has increased its efforts in recent years to address disaster risks before they materialize. Ethiopia recently organized a simulation exercise to test its capacity to coordinate the response to natural disasters. ECOWAS and USAID have supported crisis-scenario planning in Nigeria. When floods again struck Niger in 2016, according to one source, the government undertook the required response using its own resources and preplanning. In Indonesia, after repeated natural disasters and communal conflicts, both national and state governments strengthened their capacity for response. Indonesia has also been a leader in

establishing the transparency and fiduciary mechanisms needed for nationally implementing major international humanitarian-assistance programs, through its experience in the post-tsunami response and the establishment of the Agency for the Reconstruction of Aceh and Nias. In the Philippines, local governments are legally obliged to channel 5 percent of their budgets into a disaster-management facility, with 30 percent of the facility's budget devoted to rapid response and the remainder to preparedness and risk reduction.¹⁴⁴ There are also promising examples when it comes to conflict prevention. In Somalia, for instance, several federal member states have established alternative dispute centers to settle disputes and address grievances before they escalate.

4.1.2. There are good examples of UN, donor, and NGO contingency planning, preparedness, and prevention efforts

Country teams are also starting to give more consideration to prevention, contingency planning, and preparedness. A number of common country assessments, HRPs, and UNDAFs/UNCFs look at how different risks affect activities. Some strategic plans have started to call for better contingency planning, although few specifically define contingencies themselves (see box 20). UNHCR carries out regular contingency planning related to refugee flows, for instance, but this does not cover other types of emergency nor does it play into the UNDAF/UNCF and wider HRP discussions.¹⁴⁵

There are also examples emerging of stronger preparedness and early-action efforts. On the humanitarian side, an integrated package of preparedness measures was developed several years ago, and it is being rolled out in a number of crisis-affected countries. Development actors continue to play a crucial role in prevention and preparedness through efforts aimed at disaster-risk reduction. Joint preparedness work is also emerging. In the Lake Chad basin, for instance, OCHA, UNHCR, UNICEF, and WFP have worked together to train emergency responders, improve data collection on displaced populations, and strategically pre-position relief items and supplies. In Haiti, development and humanitarian actors are supporting national and regional authorities to coordinate emergency assessments, develop sectoral contingency plans, and strengthen preparedness efforts. Individual agencies are also innovating when it comes to early warning/early action in ways that bridge traditional divides. FAO's Early Warning Early Action System provides a good example: it aims to translate warnings into early action aimed at mitigating the impact of specific disaster events. Crucially, it also focuses on strengthening national capacities for early warning and early action. For instance, FAO intends to support the Government of Uganda to monitor early-warning indicators and to prepare response systems related to droughts, dry spells, floods, and food-chain crises.

As these and other examples suggest, progress is more notable when it comes to disasters linked to natural hazards than it is to conflicts.¹⁴⁶ But direct links with conflict prevention and peacebuilding are also emerging. In Ethiopia, at the time of research, a proposal for the Peacebuilding Fund was being developed to address the peace component of the nexus specifically in line with the secretary-general's prevention agenda. Peace and development advisers are also pointed to as essential catalysts for prevention. The collaboration between DPA (now DPPA) and UNDP on the Joint Programme on Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention along with the growing engagement of PBSO and the Peacebuilding Fund in the deployment of PDAs is seen as a promising model for supporting country teams and national authorities in countries at risk of conflict and fragility.

Promising examples are also emerging among donors and NGOs. Germany, for instance, has recently released the "Preventing Crises, Resolving Conflicts, Building Peace" national guidelines, which aim to improve interministerial planning and approaches to fragility and conflict. Several NGOs,

including CARE, Danish Refugee Council, and MSF, have undertaken internal reforms to strengthen their overall strategic and operational capacities, including capacities related to long-term planning, conflict analysis, and preparedness/early action. Cordaid is working with local partners in several fragile states to integrate conflict analysis and conflict prevention into community-led disaster-risk-reduction efforts. World Vision has developed a “whole of organization” approach to ensure coherence between its humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding programming, including by incorporating crisis modifiers into its programming. In addition to regional and global reserves, its national affiliate offices are now equipped with a National Emergency and Preparedness Response Fund that can quickly disburse additional funds in the event of a shock. In addition, it has empowered national-office leadership to reallocate up to 20 percent of development funding toward humanitarian programming.

Box 20: Contingency planning in Afghanistan, South Sudan, and Iraq

Afghanistan

Afghanistan’s 2018 HRP, focusing on lifesaving assistance, is its first multiyear HRP and its first humanitarian plan to include a logframe. Further, it is one of the few HRPs to build explicit contingencies into the plan that might require the HCT to broaden its focus beyond the 2.8 million targeted people. These contingencies included:

- A further deterioration in the security context such that the number of projected new IDPs exceeds initial planning projections of three hundred thousand
- A reversal in the current political dynamic in Pakistan to one in which Afghans are compelled to leave in large numbers
- The occurrence of a major natural disaster, such as a significant earthquake or drought
- The inability of development partners to deliver on the commitments made at the Brussels conference or through the new One UN—One Programme
- The further degradation or eventual collapse of public institutions as a result of the conflict, rendering them unable to provide essential services to the Afghan people

The HRP thus foresaw that either a deterioration in conditions on the ground or a failure on the part of government and development partners to deliver meaningful change would make it difficult for the HCT to maintain its narrow parameters of “humanitarian need.” As it happened, a historic drought occurred in 2018, affecting two-thirds of the country, and an updated HRP for 2019 was developed.

South Sudan

South Sudan’s 2019–21 UNCF calls for “cross-cutting approaches to adapt to shifting conditions on the ground.” It envisages “flexible and adaptable support” that is responsive to changes in government capacity and ownership, to development-partner contributions, and to UN reforms. It commits the UNCT to strengthen its internal capacity to rapidly adapt priorities through nimble annual joint work plans. It articulates a nonlinear theory of change, anticipates setbacks, and calls for conflict-sensitive

and risk-informed programming. It emphasizes the need to incorporate contingencies into subsequent planning efforts, particularly in regard to the peace process. It therefore calls for contingency planning to accommodate different scenarios, premised on the following:

- If peace talks result in positive outcomes, an increasing amount of support will be dedicated to national-level initiatives while supporting community peacebuilding and inclusive governance at subnational levels to consolidate peace dividends and begin the recovery and resilience-building process.
- If the peace process is less successful, while looking for national-level opportunities, community-level peacebuilding and support for inclusive local governance processes will be prioritized.
- The UNCT will support local-level peacebuilding that increases the voices of women and the participation of youth, and improves governance within centers of stability wherever possible, irrespective of the outcomes of national-level peace initiatives.

Iraq

Iraq's 2019 HRP contains perhaps the clearest call for collective contingency planning and preparedness. It notes that Iraq faces multiple environmental challenges and affirms that humanitarians will prioritize government-led prevention, preparedness, and immediate responses while development frameworks such as the UNDAF support longer-term risk reduction. It further underscores that humanitarian preparedness will prioritize natural disasters, disease outbreaks, and new conflict-induced displacement. This is notable given that most frameworks tend to focus mainly on one or the other even though disasters, diseases, and conflict often accompany and exacerbate one another.

4.1.3. The CERF is a sound rapid-response mechanism and is now piloting anticipatory measures

The CERF is appreciated by all country teams for the role it plays in filling gaps in other sources of financing and for catalyzing a more comprehensive international response. But the fund has two critical constraints. Firstly, it is (typically) triggered only after a crisis happens. Secondly, its recipients are humanitarian actors: the fund cannot seed a broader developmental response to an anticipated crisis. An independent evaluation of the El Niño response in 2016 identified both the strengths and limitations of the CERF: it was one of the first sources of international funding, but the study found that it would have had a greater impact if it could have taken effect before acute humanitarian needs arose.¹⁴⁷

It is noteworthy in this regard that CERF has recently released \$10.5 million to help mitigate the potential impact of the ongoing Ebola crisis spreading from DRC into neighboring countries. The funds have supported teams in Burundi, Rwanda, South Sudan, and Uganda to undertake preparedness measures, such as vaccination campaigns, health-worker training, and improved disease surveillance. These efforts provide a vital test case for determining whether and how the CERF might become more anticipatory.¹⁴⁸ They also demonstrate that the CERF can play an anticipatory role without needing to create a new dedicated window for that purpose. One key question moving forward is how to ensure that the fund maintains its focus on high-impact, lifesaving action, with a clearly defined mandate that is complementary to sister instruments (such as the FAM and other anticipatory/early-action funds).

CERF is also experimenting with intervening earlier in crisis settings. While not anticipatory per se (as the rains had already begun to fail), funds were disbursed at the outset of the drought in the Sahel in 2018—that is, before the full humanitarian impact had materialized. The fund worked closely with colleagues in the field to analyze drought and food-security forecasts and advised RCs/HCs in the affected countries on how to access CERF funding earlier than usual. Roughly \$30 million was subsequently allocated to Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, and Mauritania between March and June 2018, enabling country teams to safeguard livelihoods and animal health.

4.1.4. The Peacebuilding Fund is playing an important prevention role

The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF)'s strategic plan for 2017–19 envisages investments of at least \$500 million in efforts to support the UN's sustaining-peace, SDG, and prevention agendas. Interviewees highlight the unique role of the PBF, particularly as a catalyst for collaborative, risk-tolerant, and cross-disciplinary programming, in humanitarian contexts. Its support takes various forms. In Chad, PBSO and the PBF have supported the development of a peacebuilding program that is integrated into the UNDAF and the broader new way of working. In Mauritania, the PBF has helped the country team undertake efforts to minimize tensions and build coherence between Malian refugees and host communities, particularly around access to natural resources. In Sudan, the PBF is supporting the fragile transition process, including through a joint project that brings together the government, UN country-team members, and UNAMID. The PBF is likewise supporting country-team engagement in the peace process in Colombia, including by becoming the very first contributor to the UN's postconflict MPTF (highlighted in box 17 as an example of an MPTF that spans the triple nexus). In the Sahel, the fund has supported the establishment of a framework for ensuring compliance with human rights and humanitarian law for the operations of the G5 security force.

4.1.5. Human rights mechanisms can help incentivize preventative action

In several countries, human rights instruments are providing opportunities for principled engagement at the nexus of humanitarian, development, and prevention efforts. In Somalia, for instance, the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child has helped enable a dialogue on child protection, including the drafting of Somalia's first Committee on the Rights of the Child report and the Child Rights Bill. Treaty-monitoring and judicial bodies are also well placed to hold governments accountable for failing to live up to their obligations in crisis contexts. The Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, for instance, has urged States to integrate gender concerns and perspectives into all programs and strategies that respond to “natural” disasters, while the European Court of Human Rights has ruled that the failure to take precautionary measures in the face of foreseeable risks can constitute gross negligence.¹⁴⁹

4.1.6. Insurance and contingency funds are working well for natural disasters

Recent years have seen a significant increase in the financial instruments available for governments to anticipate humanitarian needs related to natural disasters. Insurance covers at least half of all natural-hazard costs in high-income countries. Catastrophic-risk insurance facilities provide coverage in the Caribbean and the Pacific for earthquakes, cyclones, and flooding and in Africa for drought. Where the risks are too high for private sector insurers, contingency-financing mechanisms have been established by the development banks that play the same role. “Cat-DDOs,” or Catastrophe Deferred Drawdown Operations, make available a certain amount of finance in advance that is automatically triggered at the request of a government when needed. WFP and the Start Network have also purchased “replica” climate-risk insurance from the African Risk Capacity, which complements the (often limited) insurance purchased by national governments.

Box 21: Anticipatory and early-action finance

Famine Action Mechanism. In 2017, Somalia, northeast Nigeria, and Yemen narrowly avoided descending into famine, while a localized famine was declared in South Sudan. Two years after the president of the World Bank and the UN Secretary-General declared “zero tolerance” for famine, early-warning systems such as the Famine Early Warning Systems Network continue to identify ongoing famine risks in several countries. To combat those risks, the Bank, the UN, ICRC, and other partners are in the process of rolling out the FAM. The mechanism is designed to support upstream measures to prevent, prepare for, and act early against famine. In contrast to other instruments, such as the crisis response window, it combines sophisticated early warnings with pre-established triggers to ensure that funds can be disbursed before a crisis (fully) takes hold.

African Risk Capacity. The African Risk Capacity (ARC) is an early-warning and anticipatory-financing mechanism that the African Union established to enable member governments to insure against climate-related risks. There are many features of the facility, including contingency planning processes and capacity development in early warning and response. Participating governments must develop operational plans to be activated in the event of a qualifying shock. While the ARC is a prominent example of a more anticipatory approach, experience with the facility is mixed. A recent evaluation found an uneven record with regard to payout, for instance, with a late payment to Malawi generating negative reactions among participants and observers.¹⁵⁰ The review also noted that the payout procedures are highly complex and civil society and NGOs are not meaningfully engaged at country level. Another finding is that social-assistance coverage among ARC participants is low, meaning they may lack institutions and procedures to rapidly disburse ARC payouts to vulnerable communities.

IFRC Forecast-based Action, Disaster Relief Emergency Fund. The Forecast-based Action (FbA) facility provides early funding to national societies according to pre-agreed forecast triggers and on the basis of approved Early Action Protocols (which are developed by the societies). Launched in 2018, the FbA is designed to complement the Disaster Relief Emergency Fund and encompasses support for prepositioning, readiness, and early action. At the time of research, there were more than twenty national societies implementing forecast-based pilot projects (though not necessarily with FbA support).¹⁵¹

Crisis Anticipation Window, Start Fund. The Start Fund is a rare pooled fund administered by NGOs. In late 2016, the fund established the Crisis Anticipation Window, making it among the first such global early-action funding mechanisms. The fund has continued to improve on the Crisis Anticipation Window in the intervening years, including by collaborating with forecasting experts, with the aim of embedding an anticipatory approach across its NGO network. As one example, the Crisis Anticipation Window supported risk-analysis and preparedness efforts ahead of the general election in Kenya in 2018. However, payouts tend to be low—in this case, £10,000.

Contingency Fund for Emergencies, WHO. The World Health Assembly established the Contingency Fund for Emergencies (CFE) in 2015 following what was perceived as a slow response to the Ebola crisis in West Africa. The CFE has enabled WHO to respond immediately—within as few as twenty-

four hours—to sudden crises and disease outbreaks, rather than waiting the weeks or months that it often takes to mobilize traditional funds, such as the World Bank’s Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility. Equally of note, the CFE is replenished through un-earmarked donations made in addition to WHO’s core emergency budget. The fund has played an important role in enabling an early response to the Ebola outbreak in DRC.

Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities, FAO. The Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities enables FAO to “stay and deliver” in crisis situations. It releases funds within a matter of days after a disaster strikes so that FAO can adapt its programming to the evolving situation. For instance, it supports efforts to identify critical needs of affected populations and facilitates flexible additional programmatic assistance tailored both to meeting needs and to building resilience. Such assistance takes a variety of forms depending on context. In South Sudan, funding has allowed FAO to help food-insecure communities restore and diversify their livelihoods, increase agricultural production, and improve resource-management practices. In Somalia, it has enabled FAO to provide integrated cash-and-livelihood support to pastoral communities and strengthen early-warning and preparedness systems.

WFP Early Action Funding, FoodSECuRE. WFP is currently rolling out a multiyear renewable Food Security Climate Resilience (FoodSECuRE) fund to support local efforts to reinforce and strengthen climate resilience. With its three distinct windows, the facility aims to (i) trigger anticipatory action, based on climate forecasts, before crises occur; (ii) support early responses to crises; and (iii) provide multiannual support to post-disaster resilience-building efforts. Early pilots in five countries (Guatemala, Niger, the Philippines, Sudan, and Zimbabwe) have already yielded promising results; further forecast-based financing pilots are being implemented in an additional five contexts (Bangladesh, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Nepal, and the Philippines).

4.1.7. Some mechanisms are in place to address macroeconomic challenges

The last three years have seen some significant efforts ongoing to ease the fiscal and macroeconomic burdens facing crisis-affected countries. In Bangladesh, for instance, both the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank have announced significant multiyear funding packages on 100 percent grant terms, in light of the severity and scale of the Rohingya crisis. Similarly, donors and IFIs are slowly reengaging in Somalia, thereby helping the government achieve eligibility for debt relief as a heavily indebted poor country (HIPC). In 2018 the World Bank provided pre-arrears clearance grants as well as IDA funding, while Norway and the EU both provided direct budget support. Jordan has received preferential trade concessions from the EU to help boost its economy while also providing opportunities for stimulating refugee employment.

4.2. Constraints

4.2.1. Overall, very few government or international plans or projects include contingencies

No government plans reviewed included concrete contingencies. Of international plans, there are a few promising examples (see box 20). But these are still the exception rather than the rule. For example, robust contingency planning does not frequently play a major role in UNDAFs, even in volatile contexts in which collective realignments are often necessary.¹⁵² Of ten

recent UNDAFs in crisis situations reviewed for this study, only three contained even elementary mention of contingencies.¹⁵³ While the revised guidance may contribute in this regard, concerns remain regarding the “agility” of the UNDAF and its capacity to accommodate timely revisions. Meanwhile, the projects that underpin the UNDAF—and, unlike the UNDAFs, are legally binding—generally do not contain authorizations to adapt activities and budgets for contingencies. (One promising exception is the use of “crisis modifiers” in development projects: for instance, in Somalia and Ethiopia, donors such as the US, the UK, and Sweden have inserted modifiers in certain programs.) Similarly, a review of the World Bank’s activities in fragile and conflict-affected states (FCS) called for country strategies to be “tailored better to FCS, with clear . . . contingencies for rapid adjustment if the country context changes.”¹⁵⁴ On the humanitarian side as well, recent shocks continue to catch aid actors off guard (such as the influx of hundreds of thousands of Rohingya refugees into Bangladesh and its impact on UN activities in both Bangladesh and Myanmar; or the arrival of more Congolese refugees in Uganda by February 2018 than the RRP had projected would arrive during the entire year).¹⁵⁵ UNCTs/HCTs therefore have difficulties in modifying existing activities in the event of a shock.

4.2.2. Few countries with humanitarian crises appear to have effective procedures in place to speed up budget allocation, procurement, or personnel deployment

Contingency plans and emergency procedures are essential to speed up national deployments of personnel, reallocate budgets, and accelerate procurement of goods and services. They can be adapted to capacity: in countries where some areas have low government capacity, for example, they can provide for contracting to independent implementing agencies or NGOs, and they can use procedures such as force account or community procurement. Yet supporting governments to put robust mechanisms in place does not appear to be a priority. Somalia has recently adopted disaster-management policies that cover the full range of crisis response, and CAR has tried to embed emergency-management systems into its line ministries. Both countries have very limited capacity, yet clear international humanitarian–development plans to help build the capacity that would make these policies a reality remain elusive.

A recent CADRI review of Lake Chad Basin countries similarly found that while they have policies in place, they lack implementation capacities, including in regard to contingency-planning and social protection measures. The review noted, for instance, that Burkina Faso “has not invested in a lean season intervention to protect household’s access to their basic food needs and their livelihoods.”¹⁵⁶ This is despite evidence that this approach can deliver benefits, including in least developed countries, and that governments in such countries will adopt such measures if supported in doing so.

Even in relatively wealthier countries, critical capacity gaps remain. While Pakistan has placed a greater emphasis on allocating disaster-related funding prior to a crisis, federal and provincial government officials “lack the technical basis to determine such allocations,” according to a recent World Bank assessment.¹⁵⁷ Meanwhile, provincial and regional governments struggle to spend the funds disbursed to them, returning upward of 50 percent of their budgets each year. Similarly, in Iraq, some ministries are unable to execute even half of their annual budgets. Meanwhile, the Iraqi government lacks clear plans for the deployment of staff, while poor coordination between federal and local authorities continues to hamstring prevention and reconstruction efforts.

4.2.3. Preparedness and prevention efforts remain projectized and small scale

Even as preparedness and prevention have moved from the margins to the mainstream of the

global policy agenda, programming on the ground remains heavily projectized and focused largely on small-scale trainings and technical advice. Analysis undertaken within the purview of the UN's Ready to Respond project found that while such trainings and advice are appreciated, in countries with low capacity and few resources "wider and deeper investment is needed, especially in infrastructural work and assets procurement."¹⁵⁸ Efforts to minimize vulnerability to droughts and floods in Somalia provide a stark example. As indicated above, the country once boasted an extensive system of flood controls, which allowed it to irrigate farmlands during droughts and prevent floods during heavy rains. Because of conflict, certainly, but also pervasive underinvestment, this infrastructure has fallen into disrepair. According to one donor, while analysis demonstrates the crucial importance of rehabilitating the system, in recent years only Turkey has initiated an ambitious reconstruction program. According to a recent FAO–World Bank report, "Although the proximate cause of [the humanitarian crisis in Somalia] was the drought, the root cause was the lack of preparation and risk-mitigation strategy, especially of feed and stored water, which could have contained the impact of the drought." The report further concluded, "The few modest cash-for-work donor-funded rehabilitation efforts of irrigation canals and feeder roads have had very little impact; most of this infrastructure is not functioning."¹⁵⁹

4.2.4. Funding for prevention and preparedness is insufficient

The moral and business case for greater financing of prevention and preparedness is by now well established. According to one estimate in the West African context, "The cost of preventing a child from suffering malnutrition is \$1 per day, compared to \$80 per day for treating acute malnutrition and saving that child's life."¹⁶⁰ Figures from a World Bank–financed project in Somalia suggest that the productivity gains from improved access to water are roughly \$11 for every \$1 invested, with a total cost (\$2.5 million) far lower than that for water provision through water trucks (\$36 million). The Ready to Respond project examined preparedness investments worth \$11.1 million and found that these generated \$20.3 million in net savings toward future crisis responses. Analysis by WFP estimates that one additional kilometer of road serving one thousand people in a given fragile context could reduce the need for food assistance by 12 percent¹⁶¹. Similarly, responding more quickly when crises do emerge is both a human and a financial imperative. According to one study of four countries, early funding could preempt 15 percent of household food deficits from materializing. Another found that as much as \$1 billion could have been saved by intervening early in Ethiopia—that is, before the worst consequences of the 2015–16 El Niño drought took hold.¹⁶²

Nevertheless, between 2005 and 2010, just \$1.30 was spent on disaster-risk reduction in fragile countries for every \$100 spent on disaster response. Of all ODA channeled to fragile countries in 2016, just 2 percent went to conflict prevention and 10 percent to peacebuilding. A recent analysis of regional funding for the Horn of Africa found that such funding is "unbalanced, with relatively few resources for regional level prevention and development interventions."¹⁶³

The challenge can be seen at a sector level. Despite the devastating effects of droughts and floods in recent years, commitments to the water sector fell by more than 25 percent between 2012 and 2016. It is well known that humanitarian crises continue to have a disproportionate effect on rural farmers and pastoralists, yet aid to agriculture accounted for just 6 percent of sector-allocable ODA in 2016, down from nearly 20 percent in the 1980s. Decent employment is a priority across the triple nexus, yet aid to small and medium-sized enterprises (which account for 90 percent of all employment in many fragile countries) totaled just 0.31 percent of ODA. Inequitable service provision is an important driver

of conflict grievances and humanitarian needs. Yet a recent study of the WASH sector in Niger found that donor support and government allocations reflect “a bias of public expenditures toward the more affluent population in the capital city.”¹⁶⁴

Box 22: DAC Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus

The OECD DAC adopted the Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus in February 2019. The recommendation affirms donors’ collective commitment to strengthening coherence within and across the HDP nexus, with “the aim of effectively reducing people’s needs, risks and vulnerabilities.” It is the result of several years of efforts within the DAC and INCAF, the DAC’s subsidiary network focused on conflict and fragility, to develop a comprehensive policy framework for incentivizing and implementing coherent and collaborative HDP action in crisis- and conflict-affected settings. To that end, the recommendation encompasses a number of principles intended to guide donor engagement across the triple nexus. Among the most notable are calls to “prioritize prevention,” including by:

- Calling for an approach animated by “prevention always, development wherever possible, humanitarian action when necessary”
- Recognizing that decisions should be grounded in a keen understanding of how power is distributed and used, on the grounds that all interventions affect, and are affected by, political dynamics
- Supporting collective efforts to understand and measure the impact of ODA and other measures on political and conflict economies, conflict dynamics, social cohesion, exclusion, and local accountability chains
- Utilizing political, diplomatic, and other tools and approaches to ensure that security interventions are coherent with humanitarian, development, and peace outcomes and respect humanitarian principles
- Integrating and incentivizing do-no-harm and conflict-sensitive approaches
- Supporting and incentivizing peace and development actors to address the structural drivers of crises and conflicts
- Thinking and acting across borders
- Putting affected people at the center of decision-making

Notably, the recommendation also calls for the provision of appropriate resourcing to empower leadership and strengthen coordination across the triple nexus, including by supporting local and national authorities, and legitimate nonstate authorities, wherever possible and appropriate. It urges donors to support collective outcomes to expand and transfer service delivery to nonhumanitarian providers or local and state institutions over time as conditions permit. It stresses the importance of incentivizing international actors to invest in local capacities. These and other provisions ensure that the recommendation is well placed to support a new way of working.

4.2.5. Insurance and contingency financing do not cover most conflict spillovers

There are reasons why conflict risks may not always be easy to insure. First, private insurers may see the risk as too high: they might want to specify premia that would be greater than the cost of responding to a conflict if one occurs. This could be addressed through public multilateral guarantees. Second, and even more fundamentally, there is a concern about moral hazard: in many conflicts the government may be an actor, and hence insurers will not want to provide a cushion that decreases the cost to governments of carrying out security actions that affect their own people or infrastructure. The moral hazard question, however, does not affect countries which have simply suffered because of conflict spillovers from their neighbors. The World Bank's GCFF and its Refugee Sub-Window are a significant step forward to address this risk for refugee-hosting countries. But they do not cover the many other types of spillover from conflict. Tunisia, for example, has suffered greatly in economic terms from the conflict in Libya, but no specific mechanism exists to compensate for this suffering.

4.2.6. Other risk mechanisms have only partial coverage of the poorest countries

As noted above, there are increasing numbers of instruments available to help countries cope with shocks. However, the rules of most of these require that projects be negotiated only after a shock hits. This disadvantages countries that might benefit from negotiating advance packages for predictable crisis response—Ethiopia or Nigeria for drought risk, for example. While the CRW, the GCFF, and the Refugee Sub-Window, as described in box 13, do not presently offer funding before a crisis has occurred, they are certainly potential means of anticipatory financing. As noted, the RMR in contrast specifically provides for preventative investments in fragile and conflict-affected states, but the IDA 18 restriction to four countries has constrained its use.

4.2.7. The amount of bilateral development funding channeled through public systems in affected states is falling

Challenges related to whether and how development finance can best reinforce national systems to prevent and respond to crises are also evident. This report identifies several promising new modalities for maintaining or increasing development support to crisis-affected countries and areas. Such instruments are, however, emerging within an overall funding landscape that is becoming more austere, rather than less, in certain crucial respects. Both the amount of funding channeled to affected countries and the amount channeled through public systems in those countries appear to be falling. Thus, development funding fell for the second year in a row in 2018, while support to the poorest countries and to African countries also declined. According to one estimate, of the twenty-seven countries that have required five or more consecutive humanitarian appeals within the last two decades, the inflow of humanitarian aid totaling \$3 billion in year five of the relevant crises is outweighed by the outflow of development aid totaling \$9 billion, for a net loss of \$6 billion.¹⁶⁵

Meanwhile, aid channeled in the form of general budget support has fallen significantly since 2010, dropping from \$4 billion to \$2.5 billion by 2016 and accounting for just 1.7 percent of ODA.¹⁶⁶ This is in spite of donors' repeated commitments to channel aid through country systems, including in fragile states, whenever feasible. Recent decisions by Norway, the EU, and the World Bank to provide budget aid to Somalia represent a notable exception in this regard, but the government remains otherwise ineligible for traditional development support.

4.2.8. Debt is a rising risk

Given the significant debt levels in many refugee-hosting and crisis-affected countries, governments' capacity to assume additional debt as a means to finance prevention and recovery is an important concern. Already, there are growing warning signs that a new African debt crisis may be forming. Between 2011 and 2018, Africa's gross debt-to-GDP ratio rose from 38 to 57 percent.¹⁶⁷ It grew even faster in many crisis-affected countries. For instance, external-debt stocks rose by more than 200 percent in Cameroon, Ethiopia, and Uganda from 2010 to 2017.¹⁶⁸ Overall, the continent's debt is approaching pre-HIPC levels. Nevertheless, among all countries experiencing protracted crises, the amount of ODA loans has increased by an estimated 875 percent since 2007, growing roughly nine times faster than ODA loans to noncrisis developing countries. Almost two-thirds of ODA channeled to Mauritania in 2017 came in the form of loans, while that figure was 38 percent in Chad and 25 percent in CAR, despite all three countries being at high risk of debt distress.¹⁶⁹

Humanitarian crises are by no means solely responsible for this deteriorating fiscal landscape. But they do play a major role. IMF research demonstrates that humanitarian crises have considerable, often permanent, fiscal impacts, including rising indebtedness.¹⁷⁰ Particularly for refugee-hosting countries, which are providing a global public good and with which donors have committed to a more equitable responsibility-sharing scheme, the idea of taking on added debt to provide for refugees is a politically and financially complicated question. Many host countries are already struggling to provide for their own citizens.

Meanwhile, efforts to manage existing debts are forcing governments to make impossible choices. Chad's external public debt stood at roughly \$2.8 billion by the end of 2017, accounting for roughly 27.2 percent of GDP. The IMF has declared that "Chad's external debt is . . . in distress at this time and there are heightened public debt vulnerabilities."¹⁷¹ To avoid defaulting on its loans, Chad has had to slash public services in recent years, at precisely the same time that the international community is seeking to localize the refugee response under the CRRF. In Uganda, another CRRF country, interest payments alone are consuming 11.2 percent of its 2018/19 budget. One country—Tanzania—has pulled out of the CRRF process at least in part over debt issues, leading some, including most recently a UK parliamentary committee, to question "whether this [providing loans] is the best approach."¹⁷² In Jordan, a deteriorating fiscal stance prompted the government to request IMF assistance. Its agreement with the IMF requires a major fiscal consolidation over the period 2018–22 to reduce government debt by 17 percent.¹⁷³ Jordan recently discontinued refugees' access to subsidized healthcare, citing fiscal costs, prompting refugees' healthcare utilization to plummet and household indebtedness to soar. Other measures have sparked widespread protests, leading to the dismissal of fully half the cabinet in 2018.

Far from being extraneous to humanitarian action, issues such as debt, fiscal consolidation, and domestic-resource mobilization help determine the larger environment in which such action takes shape.

5. Recommendations

5.1. For governments and local civil society

5.1.1. Reaffirm state commitments to humanitarian principles and international humanitarian and human rights law

As noted in section 2, states are in fact primarily responsible for addressing crises that occur within their territories, in accordance with international human rights, refugee, and humanitarian law. And in many countries, from Indonesia to Nigeria to Japan to Cuba to Somalia, states both can and do take a leading role in crisis response, albeit to varying degrees. To foster a strong state role in more situations, it is imperative that more countries at all income levels—high income, middle income, or low income—affirm respect for humanitarian principles and human rights in their own territories. It is equally important that government authorities in all branches and at all levels, including local levels, understand their responsibilities under international humanitarian and human rights laws and frameworks. Additional mechanisms to support and incentivize compliance are required. The ICRC/ECOWAS partnership, mentioned in box 4, may provide a model in this regard that could be adapted for other circumstances.

5.1.2. Consider whether repeated and chronic humanitarian crises and conflict drivers merit attention in national development–peace planning and analysis

Where crises are repeated—frequently the case for natural disasters, drought, or flooding—or chronic, it makes sense to include the capacity to respond and recover in national development planning and analysis, including in cases in which a separate HNO/HRP is also necessary. This is important not only for ensuring that a government’s own programs are crisis responsive but also for enabling development partners to channel resources toward affected areas. Several countries described in this review have taken this approach when it comes to, for example, natural disasters. Less common is to include the risks of conflict-induced humanitarian issues, but this practice too is increasing. In Nigeria, Colombia, and Somalia, for example, government development plans speak to conflict prevention and recovery and associated humanitarian needs. Timor-Leste’s development roadmap establishes national institutions for conflict prevention and includes an international chapter that looks at global opportunities and risks. Humanitarian objectives may also be referred to in ways that reflect national rather than international norms or concerns—“looking after the most vulnerable,” for example. National planning exercises therefore provide an opportunity to consider responses to natural disaster, domestic-conflict-induced humanitarian needs, and humanitarian needs created by conflict and other shocks among neighboring countries. Inclusive national development plans and contingencies can be formed by consulting with civil society, and indeed this is a norm in both high-income and developing countries. (CAR’s national peace-and-development plan, for instance, reflects consultations with roughly fourteen thousand people from across the country.)

5.1.3. Clarify roles and responsibilities within government and between government and its partners

Who does what within a government, and within broader society, to respond to a new or a chronic emergency is not a given. In some countries, the analysis of and response to exceptional needs is driven nationally; in others, state and local authorities have specific lead roles. In many countries governments have explicit civil society partnerships that are triggered in the event of an emergency, such as that between the government of Turkey and the Turkish Red Crescent. However, there is a notable lack of clear, *ex ante* delineations of responsibility within and among governments and their partners. How line ministries and emergency-management departments should collaborate among themselves and with the security and justice sectors is often unclear.

There is also a need for greater advance thinking when it comes to the composition of coordination mechanisms: how high up in the political hierarchy they should sit, who should be included, and what powers they should have all affect the government's ability and resolve to respond. The relative role of international partners can also be considered in advance: who do the government and leading local civil society actors want to partner with to build capacity? Whatever the most appropriate division of labor for a given context, it is important for relevant authorities to build in expectations that responsible parties within and outside of government will work coherently and across silos at the outset.

5.1.4. Strengthen response and recovery procedures and transparent fiduciary standards

Donors consistently mention concerns over bureaucratic delays, lack of respect for humanitarian principles, and lack of transparency as constraints to more localized funding. The point regarding humanitarian principles is addressed above. Governments and local NGOs can also address bureaucratic delays and transparency concerns. Useful lessons from governments that have successfully done this include the need for (i) emergency procedures that lay out exceptional financial-transfer and procurement mechanisms, often enshrined in law; (ii) pre-agreed decision-making structures to approve actions and delegate responsibilities in the case of an emergency (see recommendation 5.1.3); (iii) establishing emergency and recovery entities that have transparent fiduciary procedures that will attract international confidence, often associated with independent management and civil society monitoring; and (iv) strengthening service-delivery capacity in crisis-affected areas, including through guidelines and incentives related to the (re)deployment and retention of civil servants (see also recommendation 5.1.5).

5.1.5. Ensure access of vulnerable and affected populations to public services, including by prioritizing commitments to universal service provision and social protection floors for all

A consistent finding of the review is that the absence of adequate and equitable service provision and social assistance in “normal” times creates an environment in which otherwise preventable or resolvable shocks devolve into prolonged emergencies. Beyond the humanitarian and developmental impacts, access barriers and the dearth of equitable services pose significant peacebuilding challenges. The review found examples from Sudan to Haiti where inequitable or inadequate social spending fomented political unrest and undermined resilience. It also found promising examples of efforts to expand coverage. The SDGs are especially relevant here, as they reflect commitments on the part of all states to build inclusive institutions, combat inequality, and provide universal services and social protection floors for all. Unless progress on these commitments is made, humanitarian assistance will continue to serve as a stop-gap substitute for more transformative public systems for years if not decades to come.

5.1.6. Advocate greater support for insurance and contingent-financing mechanisms

Insurance mechanisms still cover only 5 percent of natural hazards in developing countries. Many governments that might be able to agree on attractive insurance arrangements do not yet have them in place. Other governments should push the envelope in devising multilateral rules and instruments that reflect the diversity of challenges countries face. Tunisia, for example, is not obviously eligible for the World Bank's different postconflict, crisis-response, and refugee-related windows, despite the impact of the Libya conflict. governments could also advocate that IDA's RMR include conflict spillovers and that a similar facility be made available to IBRD countries. Similarly, there are existing but underutilized contingent-financing instruments, such as France's countercyclical loan facility, that could help to mitigate some of the macroeconomic costs of humanitarian crises.

5.2. For the UN system

5.2.1. Prioritize and utilize political economy analysis

The importance of robust, ongoing analysis of the political economy of crises is difficult to overstate. Fiscal-consolidation measures are currently a substantial driver of vulnerability in countries such as Chad and Jordan. Market dependency and especially food price shocks are primary drivers of food crises in countries such as Ethiopia. Commercialization is a major cause of hardship among pastoralists across the Horn and Sahel. A key impediment to localized approaches is the lack of adequate fiscal decentralization in countries such as Lebanon, Nigeria, and Ukraine.

Addressing these challenges, or simply planning around them, requires a strong literacy in matters of political dynamics, fiscal policies, market regulation, inflation, unequal bargaining power, reserve capacity, and the business cycle. In line with the new UNCF guidance, it is also crucial for country teams to understand not only how politics impacts programming but how programming impacts politics. Finding ways to factor political economy analysis more systematically into CCAs, HNOs, and other relevant frameworks will be crucial to ensure that programming is politically and financially sustainable. Initiatives such as UNDP's Development Finance Assessments and UNICEF's political economy and budgetary analyses provide solid entry points that could be built on. Afghanistan's 2019 HNO/HRP provides another good example of how country teams can incorporate political economy issues into strategic plans.

5.2.2. Agree on a strong, systematically strategic role for the Joint Steering Committee

The JSC is an excellent opportunity to increase the level of strategic ambition in reaching those furthest behind in crisis situations and to develop a coherent approach to humanitarian–development–peacebuilding linkages. We recommend that the JSC consider several functions. Our top recommendation for an initial priority is to work toward establishing a comprehensive UN discussion with governments as the default approach to a given crisis, where collective outcomes are identified and where UNDAFs/UNCFs are designed to cover UN humanitarian and peacebuilding activities, with flexibility to adapt to new developments through annual work plans or HRPs/Peacebuilding Plans where necessary. This could focus initially on the seven JSC priority countries rather than attempting to introduce systemic changes in all contexts at once. A first step could be to develop an ongoing dialogue with governments in these countries with the aim of encouraging their commitment to lead strategic activities, with appropriate support.

We also encourage the JSC to build on other scanning/anticipatory discussions of potential conflicts or emergency situations so as to support country teams to develop strategies that are as forward

looking and preventative as possible. Finally, the JSC is uniquely well positioned to address systemic and strategic challenges related to development financing, notably by leading or encouraging a robust dialogue on the UN–IFI relationship in crisis contexts (see recommendation 5.2.11) and with bilateral donors on implementing the new OECD DAC recommendation (see box 22).

5.2.3. Select and staff up RCs and RC/HCs to play a bridging role

The review found that RCs and RC/HCs have an increasingly important role in fostering longer-term, more strategic approaches to humanitarian crises and are essential in initiating and leading processes around collective outcomes. It is important that they not delegate strategic planning to individual UN entities but invest in setting out a clear, system-wide plan. It is equally important that RCs and RC/HCs be truly “empowered” to ensure that such a plan drives agency-specific plans and programs. There are also many cases in which their services are in demand, in a low-profile way, to help bridge gaps in perceptions and approaches within domestic leadership—whether state and national, civilian and military, between different line ministries, or between the state and civil society. These functions require RC/HC selection to focus on strategic, diplomatic, and operational skills. They also argue for specific capacity in RC/HC offices to adequately respond to the convening and strategic roles required of them, which are not resourced through specific projects. We suggest, in particular, establishing four levels of UN support to RCs and RC/HCs, as part of the rollout of the new UNDAF/UNCF guidelines and the UNDS reforms.

- Firstly, we suggest that DCO, together with other members of the UNDS and IASC, support RCs and RCs/HCs on how to respond to government wishes to better link the development, humanitarian, security, and justice sectors and actors, in support of humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding goals.
- Secondly, we suggest that the People Pipeline initiative be supported to enhance the pool of internal experts that can be deployed to strengthen nexus capacities in RCOs and in country teams more broadly and to establish deployment mechanisms better suited to coordinating short- and long-term deployments based on the needs and requests from the field.
- Thirdly, this initiative could build on lessons learned from the productive partnership between UNDP and DPPA on peace and development advisers, which could similarly be further strengthened to support RC capacity on prevention.
- Fourthly, we suggest that UNDP’s country-support platforms be viewed as an indispensable “public good” that can support the empowered RCs and the whole UN system. It will be important to ensure that such platforms do not become too independent of the RC system and that they build on years and decades of efforts related to, for example, disaster-risk reduction, rule of law, local governance, and other areas.

5.2.4. Prioritize UNDP’s strategic objective to strengthen national prevention, response, and recovery capacities in countries affected by chronic and repeated crises

Our field visits and interviews identified significant government interest in capitalizing on lessons learned in national response systems for emergencies (at present this happens in disaster response, but not in conflict-affected situations). We also find a catch-22 situation in which donors are concerned about bureaucratic delays, fiduciary risk, and respect for humanitarian principles in government systems, but governments have few offers of assistance to improve these issues

specifically around emergency response. UNDP's strategic objective to build resilience to shocks and crises provides an opportunity in this regard, as it emphasizes the importance of directly supporting governments' prevention, coordination, and response capacities. Achieving that objective should be a key priority, with either country-level or global funding attached. Critical areas identified during the review as especially important to focus on include helping governments to put in place:

- Emergency budgeting and procurement rules
- Planning and analysis processes that incorporate humanitarian needs and potential contingencies into development plans
- Whole-of-government coordination structures that bring together emergency-management agencies, line ministries, ministries of finance and planning, subnational authorities, and, where appropriate, justice and security agencies
- Systems and incentives for deploying or retaining civil servants in crisis-affected areas
- Rules regarding fiscal transfers to local governments that take into account population movements and other consequences of crises
- Equitable and universal services and social protection floors that can be scaled up ahead of or during crisis situations (see also recommendations 5.1.5 and 5.2.5)

5.2.5. Design and implement programs in ways that reinforce existing systems and services, including public systems wherever appropriate

The review has uncovered a range of promising approaches through which humanitarian, development, and peace actors can reinforce rather than replace indigenous systems. Additional efforts are needed to ensure that these become the norm rather than the exception. While the appropriateness of any one approach varies by context, we can discern certain loose typologies. In countries such as Jordan, where government services already exist and continue to function, supporting such services—directly or indirectly—to provide more of the population with higher-quality services can be an overriding priority. In countries such as Yemen, where functioning welfare institutions existed until quite recently, significant efforts can be made to preserve and strengthen such institutions, for instance through techniques such as shadow alignment. Meanwhile, in countries such as Chad, where public systems and services have long been absent, parallel services and programs can be designed in ways that facilitate their gradual or eventual metamorphosis into nationally owned systems once conditions allow.

5.2.6. Consider a pool of strategic external advisers

The challenges facing affected countries have grown more complex and more intractable in recent years. In some cases, deep geopolitical issues are at play; in others, macroeconomic and fiscal constraints are at odds with the need for a localized humanitarian response; in others, there are gaps between security, humanitarian, and development objectives. In many countries, high-level delegations from headquarters helped to galvanize momentum to unblock these challenges. Yet these deployments tend to take place over a matter of a few days, while more sustained support to governments and country teams largely occurs at a technical level. A pool of senior advisers (retired RCs/HCs, for instance, or former government ministers) who could help national leadership and the UN country teams assess options for high-level, more strategic collective outcomes would benefit field-planning processes. DCO may wish to consider managing such a pool in coordination with UNDP and

OCHA. The pool of advisers could also be cultivated as part of the People Pipeline initiative.

5.2.7. Move toward a comprehensive analytical and planning approach in most circumstances, with interim response plans where needed

As noted in the constraints portion of section 3, a key concern among country teams, governments, and donors is the proliferation of analytical and planning processes, many of which duplicate or compete with one another. Moving away from this reality does not require that there be only one plan for a given country, but rather that there be a holistic, coherent vision for resolving a given crisis, to which all relevant plans contribute, as appropriate. An inclusive CCA provides a strong starting point for all sectors to develop such a vision. Collective outcomes, when formulated within a nationally led process, can be an effective organizing principle in uniting stakeholders around common priorities.

In support of such outcomes, a comprehensive planning model could take a number of forms. Firstly, where a crisis is of such magnitude that it affects overall development in the country, the CCA and UNDAF/UNCF should probably be quickly updated or revised. Secondly, where crises are more localized or sectoral, overall parameters for a UN response can generally be laid out with crisis-specific joint analyses and interim response plans developed for a subnational or sectoral problem to fit within the UNDAF/UNCF/national development plan. Ensuring that the latter include space for contingencies will be crucial in this regard. Thirdly, in some cases (Syria is an example) development actors should incorporate activities in the HRP rather than the reverse: the situation is so dominated by humanitarian needs that development actors should fit their much more targeted activities within this larger picture. These shifts are, we understand, compatible with the approach to be taken in the new UNDAFs/UNCFs with regard to adaptation to country rather than UN-agency priorities. There is also room to consider what links might be made to other diagnostic mechanisms, such as human rights instruments.

5.2.8. Make contingency planning in UNDAFs/UNCFs, HRPs, and project agreements the norm

The natural counterbalance to moving toward a more comprehensive approach is to include far more contingencies in plans and programs. At the level of the UNDAF/UNCF or HRP, this should include laying out how modalities will change in response to contingencies and the likely impact on outcomes and budgets. For the UN and NGOs, it will also be crucial to include contingencies and crisis modifiers in projects. This does not mean the traditional approach to including a percentage of project budgets as unnamed contingencies. Rather it means laying out a specific governance process whereby activities will be adjusted, with eligible items and modalities agreed in advance, and a larger part of the project budget apportioned to facilitate this circumstance. Crucially, this need not require specifying concrete contingencies in advance but rather establishing a clear process for responding effectively when a new crisis emerges or an existing situation deteriorates—for instance, by establishing and empowering a committee composed of representatives of government, UN agencies, donors, and NGOs to adjust a certain percentage of activities or funding in the face of an emergency (see recommendation 5.1.3).

5.2.9. Design UN country-based pooled funds in ways that incentivize HDP collaboration

There are remarkably few incentives or structures that encourage collaboration at country level. Pooled funds are among the most important, yet they themselves are frequently both underfunded and siloed. The review has noted several examples of cross-pillar or transitional pooled funds, however, and experiences with these could be analyzed and built on. In addition, the UN could consider making existing funds more flexible and establishing (flexible) pooled funds in countries that currently lack them, such as Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Mauritania, and Niger. In countries such

as Sudan where there are multiple UN pooled funds, RCOs, OCHA, and UNDP could aim to develop a plan for consolidating the various funds under the leadership of the RC/HC.

5.2.10. Pass on multiyear funding to NGOs, with clear expectations

UN agencies could commit to pass an equivalent ratio of their own multiyear funding to NGO partners (national or international) within one year of their commitment. This might be accompanied by guidelines laying out clear expectations. As with transfers from donors to agencies, multiyear funding cannot be divorced from performance, and performance expectations should therefore be built in.

5.2.11. Hold a UN–MDB–IMF retreat on the missing middle and fiscal and macroeconomic linkages

The review found that the collaboration between humanitarian and development actors in general, and the UN and the World Bank in particular, has greatly increased. However, there is still a missing middle in countries with relatively high capacity but relatively low interest in government convening or planning to address humanitarian issues. An increasing number of fiscal and macroeconomic factors surround humanitarian crisis responses, including fiscal-decentralization linkages and debt management. A retreat to garner positive lessons learned on UN–IFI engagement and to discuss the challenges would be useful. Follow-on meetings could focus on a set of concrete thematic issues, such as the role of debt within the new World Bank Fragility, Conflict and Violence strategy, divergences in approaches to social protection, or the challenge of fiscal consolidation in affected countries.

5.2.12. Consider commissioning a study in cost-effectiveness of multilateral cooperation in crisis-affected countries

Several country teams expressed concerns that more and more financing is being channeled bilaterally. Even in countries that have strengthened the UN-government aid architecture, many donors appear still to be providing substantial proportions of their assistance outside of any collective coordination framework. In peacekeeping, the US Government Accountability Office reviews of cost-effectiveness of UN peace operations have been influential in arguing against more bilateral approaches. No similar initiative exists for humanitarian crises. The UN could consider commissioning a study on the cost-effectiveness of multilateral responses to crisis contexts, with the aim of encouraging donors at capital and country levels to increase their use of nationally-driven coordination structures and supporting multilateral trust funds. This could build off recent OECD surveys of donors' views on multilateral cooperation, which find that donors support the multilateral system firstly because of the role multilateral organizations play in setting and monitoring international norms and standards, and secondly because of their ability to operate in risky contexts and in contexts in which donors lack presence or experience.

5.3. For donors

5.3.1. Invest in national capacity for whole-of-government emergency preparedness, response, and recovery, and equitable service delivery

Donors should support responsible government and UN efforts to put in place appropriate public and civil society systems for preventing, responding to, and recovering from crises, including through equitable service delivery, as suggested in recommendations 5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.1.5, 5.2.4, 5.2.5 and the DAC recommendation. This can include support for specific collective outcomes where these have been identified, as well as concerted support for coordination, analysis, and planning capacities. In keeping with aid-effectiveness principles, such support should flow through country

systems to the extent feasible (see 5.3.2). At the same time, donors can seek to minimize the shortcomings of conventional funding mechanisms. On the humanitarian side, they could prioritize supporting governments and civil society to respond to slow-onset crises, including procedures that trigger anticipatory or early action in advance of a crisis reaching emergency threshold levels. On the development side, donors could aim to minimize the contribution of ODA to indebtedness and identify concrete ways of ensuring that development support can be maintained, if not increased, as conditions deteriorate.

5.3.2. Create clear guidance on the circumstances in which funding can be provided to different recipients while respecting humanitarian principles

The review found uncertainty in the field regarding the approach to be taken when working with governments and local partners. We recommend that more bilateral and multilateral donors issue guidance to country offices on applying humanitarian principles to partnerships with national and local actors and on management of risk—building on lessons learned from the Norway and WFP examples.¹⁷⁴ Particular attention should be paid to neutrality. At the same time, there is scope for donors to further incentivize more-localized and government-led approaches wherever this is appropriate. Indeed, a key finding of the review is that prioritizing government ownership is appropriate wherever key government sponsors genuinely support humanitarian principles, even when the state lacks capacity and strong accountability mechanisms. In these cases (Somalia is an example), most funds and services will still be provided outside state structures, at least over the near and medium terms. But the government can be involved in setting priorities and standards for such parallel service delivery, while being supported to build its own capacity and accountability over time. In line with recent European Commission guidance, donors could, for instance, call upon their grantees to “justify if they are not working with existing social protection systems, programmes, or approaches to support a crisis response.”¹⁷⁵

5.3.3. Provide incentives to move toward comprehensive planning at country level through combined peace–development–humanitarian strategies and flexible funds

With the new DAC recommendation, donors have committed to strengthening coherence within and across the HDP nexus, with “the aim of effectively reducing people’s needs, risks and vulnerabilities.”¹⁷⁶ Donors can make progress on this score in a variety of ways. The first is by not supporting conflicting headquarters initiatives. Often unintentionally, donors may agree to fund headquarters’ processes that target the production of a certain number of refugee response plans, protection plans, or peacebuilding plans. Donors should ask whether these targets support coherence or the achievement of collective outcomes on the ground before agreeing to support such programs. The second is by avoiding conflicting country-level incentives. Donors can develop shared humanitarian–development strategies at country level that explicitly incentivize cooperation across different parts of the UN system, and that support the authority of the RC/HC, in line with the new DAC recommendation to “provide appropriate resourcing to empower leadership for cost-effective coordination across the humanitarian, development and peace architecture.”¹⁷⁷ (Donors can also encourage and support governments to call for greater UN coherence.) They can introduce more flexibility in funding across pillars and sectors, specifically considering the ability to fund collective outcomes by pooling humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding funds in country-level multidonor partnership funds. The crucial objective here, of which pooled funds are one important tool, is for financing strategies to contribute to coherence in resourcing and programming across the HDP nexus.

5.3.4. Adapt the IDA Crisis Response Window, the RMR, and the GCFF to address conflict spillovers and contingencies

The World Bank's new financing instruments are significant steps forward, but they have several constraints in their current form. Firstly, the CRW does not address conflict spillovers (while the Refugee-Sub-Window and GCFF are limited to refugees). Secondly, the CRW is a response window: it does not provide for deferred-drawdown operations that can agree on assistance in advance of a shock. The current IDA midterm review includes proposals to increase the use of contingent components in project design and to top up funds that have been drawn down because of existing Contingent Emergency Response Component activation for crisis response. These merit support. The challenge of conflict spillovers could also be more comprehensively addressed in the CRW and (for IBRD countries) the GCFF. This would need to include qualitative and quantitative assessments of conflict-spillover impact, as for other types of economic shock. Finally, the RMR could productively be adapted for IDA 19 to be more selective and yet more flexible in its response—that is, focused (as it is presently) on a small number of country situations, while avoiding the rigidity of identifying these situations three years in advance.

5.3.5. Review progress on humanitarian–development–peacebuilding links and UN–World Bank partnership during IDA 19

We recommend that IDA deputies ask for a review of development–humanitarian–peacebuilding links and the UN–World Bank partnership during IDA 19 to identify good practices that can be made more consistent. As with the RMR, one focus of the review could be to ascertain to what degree there is systematic strategic support on fragility- and conflict-related issues provided across the entirety of FCV (fragility, conflict, and violence) country programs.

5.3.6. Clearly demonstrate the additionality of development support in refugee-hosting contexts

The GCR includes clear commitments to greater responsibility sharing of the “burdens” of hosting refugees. When it comes to the developing countries that host the vast majority of the world's refugees, providing development support additional to existing commitments is important both as a functional matter (most major refugee-hosting countries already struggle to provide adequately for their own citizens) and politically. Otherwise governments will see development funding channeled toward refugees as detracting from other vital development objectives. Efforts to measure such additionality could usefully benefit from robust civil society monitoring.

5.3.7. Use the ECOSOC–World Bank session to address humanitarian cooperation

There would be value to more discussion among member states on the evolving partnership between the IFIs and humanitarian actors. We suggest that the upcoming ECOSOC presidency might consider addressing this issue. In particular, the ECOSOC–World Bank session could provide a significant opportunity for high-level dialogue between the two institutions on the Bank's new FCV strategy and on financing the nexus more broadly.

Endnotes

1. UN General Assembly, *One Humanity, Shared Responsibility: Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit*, A/70/709 (February 2, 2016), para. 113.
2. *Ibid*, para. 125.
3. *Ibid*, para. 118.
4. Mark Lowcock, “A Casement Lecture: Towards a Better System for Humanitarian Financing” (lecture, Iveagh House, Dublin, March 23, 2018).
5. See Afghanistan Humanitarian Response Plan January 2018–December 2021, p. 12, https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/documents/files/afg_2018_humanitarian_response_plan_7.pdf.
6. OECD, *DAC Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus*, OECD/LEGAL/5019, 2019, <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/public/doc/643/643.en.pdf>.
7. Interviewees were granted anonymity.
8. See for instance, “Financing the Nexus: Gaps and Opportunities from a Field Perspective,” published by FAO, the Norwegian Refugee Council, and UNDP, July 2019, <https://www.nrc.no/globalassets/pdf/reports/financing-the-nexus-report/financing-the-nexus-report.pdf>; Liam Perret, “Operationalizing the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus: Lessons Learned from Colombia, Mali, Nigeria, Somalia and Turkey,” IOM, 2019, https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/operationalizing_hdpn.pdf; “The New Way of Working Examined,” an ICVA briefing paper, September 2017, https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/NewWayOf%20Working_Explained.pdf.
9. For instance, the Commitment to Action, signed at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit by the Secretary-General and the heads of eight UN agencies and endorsed by the World Bank and International Organization for Migration, adopts this framing. See World Humanitarian Summit, “Transcending Humanitarian-Development Divides- Changing People’s Lives: From Delivering Aid to Ending Need: Commitment to Action,” press release, accessed October 18, 2018, https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/whs_commitment_to_action_-_transcending_humanitarian-development_divides_1.pdf.
10. UN General Assembly, *One Humanity, Shared Responsibility: Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit*, A/70/709 (February 2, 2016), para. 113.
11. *Ibid*, para. 125.
12. UNDP, “UN Humanitarian and Development Chiefs Join Forces to Support Crisis-Affected People in North-East Nigeria,” news release, October 6, 2018, United Nations Development Programme, <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/news-centre/news/2018/un-humanitarian-and-development-chiefs-join-forces-.html>
13. UN General Assembly, *One Humanity, Shared Responsibility: Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit*, A/70/709 (February 2, 2016), para. 118.
14. Mark Lowcock, “A Casement Lecture: Towards a Better System for Humanitarian Financing” (lecture, Iveagh House, Dublin, March 23, 2018)..
15. The Agenda also places considerable emphasis on populations affected by crises, including internally displaced persons (IDPs), and on the importance of creating peaceful, just, and inclusive societies.
16. UN General Assembly, *Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System*, A/RES/71/243, para. 24, <https://undocs.org/A/RES/71/243>..
17. *Ibid*.
18. UN General Assembly, *One Humanity, Shared Responsibility: Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit*, A/70/709 (February 2, 2016), para. 111
19. Government of Uganda, Office of the Permanent Secretary- Public Relations Unit, “Government Launches the Health Sector Integrated Refugee Response Plan (2019–2024),” news release, January 25, 2019, <https://reliefweb.int/report/uganda/government-launches-health-sector-integrated-refugee-response-plan-2019-2024>. The plan itself is available here: <http://health.go.ug/sites/default/files/Final%20HSIRRP%2031%20Jan%202019%20MASTER.pdf>.
20. Action Against Hunger, “Joint Statement: Uganda Launches Health Sector Integrated Refugee Response Plan,” news release, January 25, 2019, <https://www.actionagainsthunger.org/story/uganda-launches-health-sector-integrated-refugee-response-plan..>
21. UNESCO Office Beirut and Regional Bureau for Education in the Arab States, “Sustainable Development Goal 4: The Dubai Roadmap for Education 2030 in the Arab Region (2017-2018)—

- UNESCO Digital Library,” 2017, p. 2., <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000266103>.
22. UNICEF and Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, “Equitable Access to Quality Education for Internally Displaced Children,” July 2019, <https://www.unicef.org/reports/equitable-access-quality-education-internally-displaced-children>.
23. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Ministry of Education, *Education Strategic Plan 2018–2022*, p. ix, http://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/sites/planipolis/files/ressources/jordan_education_strategic_plan_esp_2018–2022.pdf.
24. Supporting the Future of Syria and the Region,” Jordan Partnership Paper, Brussels II Conference, April 24–25, 2018, <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/34144/jordan-partnership-paper.pdf>.
25. UNHCR, “Regional Refugee & Resilience Plan (3RP): 2018 Annual Report,” p. 6, <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/68557>.
26. United Nations Children’s Fund; Iraqi Ministry of Planning, *Child Poverty in Iraq: An Analysis of the Child Poverty Trends and Policy Recommendations for the National Poverty Reduction Strategy 2017–2021*, January 2017, https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/UN064563_Child_poverty_in_Iraq.pdf
27. Although they continue to require humanitarian support, refugee schools in Chad have transitioned to teaching the Chadian curriculum and are now formally part of the Government’s public education system. The number of Chadians enrolling in refugee schools has increased precipitously (by 77 percent between 2017 and 2018 alone). When refugee students outperformed their Chadian peers on a recent baccalaureate exam, it prompted at least one Government official to start viewing refugees as a major source of untapped potential for Chad.
28. Handover of Emergency Response Equipment to the Benadir Regional Administration / Mogadishu Municipality,” European Union, April 30, 2019, https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/61631/handover-emergency-response-equipment-benadir-regional-administration-mogadishu-municipality_en.
29. Timo Voipio, “Reducing Inequalities and Promoting Social Inclusion through Social Protection— Promising Approaches at Local, National, Regional and Global Levels,” United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, June 22, 2018, <https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2018/06/Timo-Voipio-for-DESA-EGM-June18.pdf>.
30. See Rodolfo Beazley, Ana Solórzano, and Valentina Barca, “Study on Shock Responsive Social Protection in Latin America and the Caribbean: Summary of Key Findings and Policy Recommendations,” Oxford Policy Management and World Food Programme, March 2019, <https://www.opml.co.uk/files/Publications/a1537-shock-responsive-social-protection-latin-america-caribbean/summary-of-key-findings-and-policy-recommendations.pdf?noredirect=1>
31. UNHCR, “Aligning Humanitarian Cash Assistance with National Social Safety Nets in Refugee Settings,” 2019, p. 12.
32. Approaches vary by context. Oxford Policy Management has usefully identified five main ones: design tweaks (adjusting the design of existing social protection systems, for instance by loosening eligibility criteria); piggybacking (working through the architecture of an existing program); top-ups/ vertical expansion (temporarily increasing the value, duration, or frequency of transfers to existing recipients); horizontal expansion (temporarily increasing the number of recipients eligible for assistance); shadow alignment (aligning parallel interventions with existing or future public systems).
33. Others have reached similar conclusions. The European Commission stated recently that “any operational instruments used in crisis contexts are similar to those used in social protection. The clearest overlap, and where most of the evidence to date is based, concerns cash transfers.” European Commission, “Providing Social Protection across the Humanitarian-Development Nexus,” guidance note, 2018, p. 15.
34. UNHCR, “Aligning Humanitarian Cash Assistance with National Social Safety Nets in Refugee Settings,” 2019, p. 13.
35. “Statement from the Principles of OCHA, UNHCR, WFP, and UNICEF on Cash Assistance,” 2018, <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2018–12–05-FINAL%20Statement%20on%20Cash.pdf>.
36. Inter-Agency Standing Committee, “15 NGOs Endorse Global Collaboration for Greater Efficiency and Effectiveness in Cash Programming,” July 8, 2019, <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain/documents/15-ngos-endorse-global-collaboration-greater-efficiency-and-effectiveness>.
37. Government of Sweden, Government of Denmark, Government of the United Kingdom, Government of the United States of America, Government of Switzerland, European Commission’s Directorate-

General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations, Government of Canada, Government of Australia, Government of Germany, Government of Norway, “Common Donor Approach for Humanitarian Cash Programming,” February 2019.

38. As but one example, a recent WFP report found that “the distribution of different cash transfer values in similar contexts by different respondents, during the El Nino response in 2016–2017, resulted in tension amongst the stakeholders in several countries in [southern Africa].” See WFP, *Considerations in Determining Cash Transfer Values: Towards Harmonizing Cash Transfers Programming in Southern Africa*, June 2018, <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/2019/04/SARTCWG-Paper-on-Considerations-in-Determining-Cash-Transfers-Values-in-Southern-Africa-%281%29.pdf>.

39. See, e.g., Henk-Jan Brinkman and Cullen S. Hendrix, “Food Insecurity and Violent Conflict: Causes, Consequences, and Addressing the Challenges,” WFP Occasional Paper no. 24, 2011, p. 14. (They note that “there are several ways social protection measures both lower food security and directly weaken its link to conflict: by mitigating the impact of high food prices or other shocks, they reduce the risk of violent protests; by contributing to growth and reducing inequality, they often address root causes of conflicts; and by delivering social services, they can undermine the organizing principles of insurgents or terrorist organizations.”)

40. See, e.g., “Country Engagement Note for the Republic of Yemen for the Period FY20-FY21,” World Bank Group, April 16, 2019, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/757121557938303017/pdf/Yemen-Country-Engagement-Note-for-the-Period-FY20-FY21.pdf>.

41. See Afrah Alawi Al-Ahmadi and Samantha de Silva, “Delivering Social Protection in the Midst of Conflict and Crisis: The Case of Yemen,” World Bank Discussion Paper, October 2018.

42. For an excellent case study of social protection amid conflict in Yemen, see Afrah Alawi Al-Ahmadi and Samantha de Silva, “Delivering Social Protection in the Midst of Conflict and Crisis: The Case of Yemen,” World Bank Discussion Paper, October 2018, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/217071538405216183/pdf/130400-WP-PUBLIC-REVISED-P159053-SPJDiscussionPaperOctDeliveringSocialProtectionintheMidstofConflictandCrisisTheCaseofYemen.pdf>.

43. See, e.g., ICVA, “Localization Examined,” Briefing Paper, September 2018, p. 9.

44. “Allocation Strategy Paper: 2019 1st Standard Allocation,” Jordan Humanitarian Fund, <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/68686>.

45. OCHA, “World Humanitarian Data and Trends,” 2018, p. 26. Some individual donors, such as Norway, have recently increased their contributions to country-based pooled funds.

46. French Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs, “France’s Humanitarian Strategy 2018–2022,” https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/strategie_humanitaire_2018-_eng_cle4c3b27.pdf.

47. Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Norway’s Humanitarian Strategy: An Effective and Integrated Approach,” 2018, https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/departementene/ud/dokumenter/hum/hum_strategy.pdf.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 35..

49. The Kingdom of the Netherlands, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Aid for People in Need: Policy Framework for Humanitarian Aid,” <https://www.government.nl/binaries/government/documents/reports/2012/03/29/aid-for-people-in-need/aid-for-people-in-need.pdf>.

50. Abby Stoddard, Monica Czwarno, and Lindsay Hamsik, “NGOs & Risk: Managing Uncertainty in Local-International Partnerships: Global Report,” <https://www.interaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Risk-Global-Study.pdf>.

51. Notably, the UN regional 3RP appeals for the Syria crisis have fallen from 66 percent coverage in 2015 to 42 percent coverage in 2018.

52. Development Initiatives, “Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2018,” p. 51, <http://devinit.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/GHA-Report-2018.pdf>.

53. Additionality is particularly crucial in refugee-hosting situations because (i) the Government in question is providing a global public good and (ii) there is no moral hazard dilemma since the Government is not responsible for the creation of the crisis.

54. UNICEF, “Uganda: Political Economy Analysis,” March 2018, https://www.unicef.org/esaro/UNICEF_Uganda_-_2018_-_Political_Economy_Analysis.pdf.

55. Indeed, GHD principle 8 calls on humanitarian donors to “strengthen the capacity of affected countries and local communities to prevent, prepare for, mitigate and respond to humanitarian crises, with the goal of ensuring that governments and local communities are better able to meet their responsibilities and coordinate effectively with humanitarian partners.”

56. Dan Honig and Sarah Cramer, “Strengthening Somalia’s Systems Smartly: A Country Systems Risk Benefit Analysis,” World Bank, December 2017, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/779801520341781240/pdf/123945-WP-PUBLIC-P164350-UseofCountrySystemsReport.pdf>.
57. United Nations General Assembly, A/RES/46/182 (December 19, 1991).
58. Jean Pictet, *The Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross* (Geneva: International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 1979).
59. After the World Humanitarian Summit: Better Humanitarian-Development Cooperation for Sustainable Results on the Ground,” a think piece drawing on collaboration between OCHA, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, and the World Bank, supported by the Center on International Cooperation, note 3, <https://www.agendaforhumanity.org/sites/default/files/resources/2017/Sep/WHS%20HDAG%20thinkpiece.pdf>.
60. Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Norway’s Humanitarian Strategy: An Effective and Integrated Approach,” 2018, Box 4.4.
61. Ibid.
62. Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Ensuring Respect for the Humanitarian Principles: Guidance Note for Support Provided from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs to NGOs,” December 19, 2016, https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/departementene/ud/vedlegg/hum/ensuring-respect-for-the-humanitarian-principles---guidance-note-for-sup.._.pdf.
63. Jérémie Labbé and Pascal Daudin, “Applying the Humanitarian Principles: Reflecting on the Experience of the International Committee of the Red Cross,” *International Review of the Red Cross* 97 (2016), p. 187, https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/irc_97_1-2_bookmark-compressed.pdf.
64. Federal Republic of Somalia, Ministry of Planning, Investment and Economic Development, “Aid Flows in Somalia: Analysis of Aid Flow Data,” March 2018.
65. Notably, the 2019 HRP envisages gradual exit strategies from two ministries: Afghanistan’s National Disaster Management Agency and its Ministry of Refugees and Repatriations. It notes, “This will include capacity-building through formal and on-site trainings, higher Government involvement in cluster coordination functions through coordinated shelter response and material support.”
66. UNDP, “Evaluation of UNDP South Sudan Country Programme Outcomes, Final Report,” May 24, 2017, p. viii, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7847>.
67. Charter for Change, “From Commitments to Action: Progress Report 2018–2019,” p. 17, <https://charter4change.org/2019/06/24/new-charter4change-annual-report-2019/>.
68. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. “Democratic Republic of the Congo Country Refugee Response Plan (CRRP): January 2019 - December 2020,” February 2019. <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/67883>, p. 17.
69. Ibid, p.18.
70. A term used by Hugo Slim in a blog post on Oxfam’s *From Poverty to Power* blog: <https://oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/hugo-slim-sets-me-straight-on-the-state-of-humanitarianism/>.
71. As one analysis has found, “There can be a significant gap between formal processes and informal practices, between the formal rules of the budget process and the informal institutions shaping budget outcomes.” See “Understanding the Politics of the Budget: What Drives Change in the Budget Process?” DFID practice paper, January 2007.
72. See, e.g., Thierry Hounsa, Mohamed Coulibaly, and Aly Sanoh, “The Redistributive Effects of Fiscal Policy in Mali and Niger,” World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 8887, June 2019..
73. See, e.g., Isabel Ortiz, Matthew Cummins, and Kalaivani Karunanethy, “Fiscal Space for Social Protection and the SDGs: Options to Expand Social Investments in 187 Countries,” ILO/UNICEF ESS Working Paper no. 48, 2017.
74. UNICEF has adopted a multipronged approach that encompasses the following:
- Building the evidence based on which to advocate greater and more equitable public expenditures
 - Engaging actively in the budgeting process by working with line ministries and local governments to strengthen their budget submissions; with ministries of finance to reflect child-related priorities in budget laws and policies; and with parliamentarians to monitor whether budgets are being appropriately designed and executed
 - Supporting communities and civil society to track spending and participate in national and subnational budgeting processes
 - Supporting governments to mobilize resources, including through sector financing plans, against which donors can provide funding, and through nontraditional approaches such as sin taxes and

health insurance schemes.

This approach has allowed UNICEF to help support the capacity of both sector ministries and local governments to improve their budget planning and execution and their resource mobilization. In Uganda, for instance, UNICEF has helped establish a mechanism for tracking budget allocations from the central government down to the district level; the mechanism is being used to strengthen budget-execution processes. For more on UNICEF's approach, see, e.g., UNICEF, "UNICEF's Engagement in Influencing Domestic Public Finance for Children (PF4C): A Global Programme Framework," 2017, https://www.unicef.org/socialpolicy/files/UNICEF_Global_Programme_Framework_for_PF4C.pdf. Other promising examples in this regard include a pro-poor analysis of Kenya's FY2018/19 budget by Development Initiatives and a 2012 analysis of fiscal space for social protection in Nigeria by ODI. See Boniface Owino, "Pro-poor Analysis of Kenya's 2018/19 Budget Estimates," Development Initiatives, June 2018, <http://devinit.org/post/pro-poor-analysis-kenyas-201819-budget-estimates/>. See also Jessica Hagen-Zanker and Heidi Tavokoli, "An Analysis of Fiscal Space for Social Protection in Nigeria," ODI, February 2012, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/7580.pdf>.

75. See, e.g., Stephen Kidd and Diloa Athias, *Hit and Miss: An Assessment of Targeting Effectiveness in Social Protection*, Development Pathways Working Paper, March 2019, <https://www.developmentpathways.co.uk/publications/hit-and-miss-an-assessment-of-targeting-effectiveness-in-social-protection/>. As one example, a review of the PSNP in Ethiopia recently found that "nearly half of the poorest households in Afar were not selected for the PSNP in 2016, while 46 percent of the richest were included." It further found no evidence of targeting improvement in the Somali region: "Across all four survey rounds from Somali, the group least likely to be included in the PSNP were households in the poorest livestock quintile." See Jeremy Lind et al., "Targeting Social Transfers in Pastoralist Societies: Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme Revisited," IFPRI, Working Paper 124, September 2018, p. 5. In another example, an evaluation of a voucher program in Burkina Faso found that the use of the "proxy means test" was no more effective than random distribution in reaching the most food insecure. See Sonia Fortin et al., "Targeting Vulnerable Households in Urban Burkina Faso: Effectiveness of Geographical Criteria but Not of Proxy-Means Testing," *Health Policy and Planning* 31, no. 5 (June 2016), 573–81. A recent REACH assessment in Somalia found that aid agencies were mainly targeting recently displaced IDPs, even though those displaced for protracted periods appeared to be more vulnerable. The assessment recommended that agencies expand coverage to include all IDPs and focus as well on host communities, "which are also living in dire conditions." See REACH, "Multi-cluster Needs Assessment Highlights Concerning Access to Water and Food," February 2018, <http://www.reach-initiative.org/somalia-reach-multi-cluster-needs-assessment>.

76. See, e.g., perception surveys undertaken by Ground Truth Solutions in Afghanistan, Haiti, Lebanon, Somalia, Uganda, and other countries, available at <https://groundtruthsolutions.org/>. The survey of refugees in Uganda found that one-third of respondents believed aid does not reach those most in need and nearly half said they see no improvement in their lives. Four in five said aid is not preparing them for a better future. A survey of affected people in Chad found that only 28 percent indicated they know how agencies make targeting decisions. The vast majority—79 percent—of refugee respondents in Lebanon reported that aid does not adequately meet their essential needs and that it does not reach those who need it most. More than half feel poorly informed about the extent and nature of the aid to which they are entitled.

77. United Nations, Department of Social and Economic Affairs, "Promoting Inclusion through Social Protection," *Report on the World Social Situation, 2018*, <https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2018/07/1-1.pdf>.

78. World Humanitarian Summit, "Transcending Humanitarian-Development Divides—Changing People's Lives: From Delivering Aid to Ending Need: Commitment to Action," press release, accessed October 18, 2018, https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/whs_commitment_to_action_-_transcending_humanitarian-development_divides_1.pdf.

79. General Assembly resolution 71/243, *Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System*, A/RES/71/243 (February 1, 2017), para. 24a, <https://undocs.org/A/RES/71/243>.

80. United Nations, Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs, Peacebuilding Support Office, "The Peace Promise," <https://www.agendaforhumanity.org/sites/default/files/THE%20PEACE%20PROMISE.pdf>.

81. As one interviewee in Somalia put it, "The drought response has been much more effective [than

- prior responses] because we finally had Government counterparts at all levels wanting to engage.”
82. Recent academic research corroborates this finding. As but one example, a study of successful nutrition advocacy in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, and Vietnam concluded that “strong leadership, especially government leadership driven by experienced and senior persons is critically important.” Nicholas Nisbett, Elise Wach, Lawrence Haddad, and Shams El Arifeen, “What Drives and Constrains Effective Leadership in Tackling Child Undernutrition? Findings from Bangladesh, Ethiopia, India and Kenya,” *Food Policy* 53 (May 2015), 33–45.
83. UNHCR, “Lebanon: Inter-Agency—Health Sector Chapter,” 2019, <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/68655>.
84. UN General Assembly, *Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System*, A/RES/71/243, para. 56, <https://undocs.org/A/RES/71/243>.
85. United Nations Development System, “UNDS Repositioning—Explanatory Note #2: The Reinvigorated Resident Coordinator System,” 2018, https://www.un.org/ecosoc/sites/www.un.org.ecosoc/files/files/en/qcpr/2_%20The%20reinvigorated%20Resident%20Coordinator%20system.pdf.
86. United Nations, “Report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the 2015 Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture,” June 29, 2015, p. 52. (It recommended that “where a peace operation with a substantial peacebuilding mandate is drawing down, the reforms currently underway to strengthen the Resident Coordinator with formal authority over the Country Team should be accelerated and the offices of Resident Coordinators should be appropriately strengthened to absorb the relevant political and peacebuilding capacity of the departing mission. In appointing Resident Coordinators for such contexts, the Secretary-General should pay particular attention to ensuring candidates have strategic, diplomatic and political skills, familiarity and sensitivity with conflict or post-conflict settings, and that they and their country teams are afforded appropriate levels of political support on the ground and from HQ.”).
87. A summary of the workshop is available here: <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/improve-joint-and-impartial-needs-assessments/content/workstream-5-strengthening-joint-humanitarian>.
88. Haiti’s 2019 HRP identifies, in addition to cholera, emergency preparedness as an opportunity to strengthen humanitarian–development linkages, and identifies support to the Government’s emergency management systems at central and local levels as “an essential focus of joint work.” Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, “Haiti: 2019–2020 Humanitarian Response Plan—Summary,” January 2019, <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/haiti/document/haiti-2019-2020-humanitarian-response-plan-summary-january-2019>.
89. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, “Humanitarian Response Plan: Sudan 2018,” https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Sudan_2018_Humanitarian_Response_Plan.pdf.
90. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. “UNHCR Global Appeal 2020–2021: 2019 Update.” UNHCR, December 2018. http://reporting.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/ga2019/pdf/Chapter_Financial.pdf, p. 47.
91. For instance, the HCT’s Health Cluster is contributing to the One-UN strategy under the “Health” and “Return and Reintegration” thematic groups.
92. Victoria Metcalfe-House and Lydia Poole with Sarah Bailey and Julie Belanger, “Grand Bargain Annual Independent Report 2018,” Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute, June 2018, p. 16, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12256.pdf>.
93. Lewis Sida, Simon Levine, Bill Gray, and Courtenay Cabot Venton, “Multi-year Humanitarian Funding in Ethiopia,” Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute, July 2019, p. 26, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12791.pdf>.
94. World Bank Group, International Development Association *IDA18 Mid-term Review: Fragility, Conflict and Violence*, p. 25, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/259151542812499052/pdf/ida18-mtr-fcv-10252018-636762750035047342.pdf>.
95. Report of the Secretary General, Advance Unedited Version, *Implementation of General Assembly Resolution 71/243 on the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System (QCPR): 2018* (January 9, 2018), p. 12, <https://www.un.org/ecosoc/sites/www.un.org.ecosoc/files/files/en/qcpr/2018-sg-report-adv.pdf>.
96. United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Population Fund, United Nations Office for Project Services, United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, United Nations Children’s Fund, World Food Programme, *Report of the Joint Field Visit to Uganda by Members of the Executive Boards of UNDP/UNFPA/UNOPS, UNICEF, UN-Women and WFP, 30 April*

- to 4 May 2018, DP/FPA/OPS-ICEF-UNW-WFP/2018/CRP.1 (July 10, 2018), p. 5, https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/board-documents/main-document/DP.FPA_.OPS-ICEF-UNW-WFP.2018.CRP_1_-_Joint_Field_Visit_to_Uganda_-_FINAL_-10Jul18.pdf.
97. “SIDA’s Experiences/Examples of Operationalizing HUM DEV Nexus,” <http://www.globalcrrf.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Examples-Sida-operationalizing-hum-dev-nexus.pdf>.
98. Among other things, the agreement commits UNHCR to safeguard asylum space, ensure a holistic response in non-camp and protracted settings, strengthen engagement across the spectrum of forced displacement, provide assistance according to need, and strengthen relief and development coherence by continuing its collaboration with the World Bank and other development actors. The agreement also includes an expectation that the number of countries with mechanisms in place to roll out the CRRF will increase by 10 percent each year. United States Department of State, *2018–2019 Framework for Cooperation between the United States Department of State’s Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*, 2018, <https://www.state.gov/j/prm/releases/frameworknew/281921.htm>.
99. International Organization for Migration, “Netherlands, IOM Partner to Provide Opportunities for Youth in Conflict-Affected Areas of Iraq,” news release, August 7, 2018, <https://www.iom.int/news/netherlands-iom-partner-provide-opportunities-youth-conflict-affected-areas-iraq..>
100. As one interlocutor put it, “The Government has so many different plans and frameworks and programs, and the ministries don’t know what the others are doing.”
101. Dirk-Jan Koch and Lau Schulpen, “An Exploration of Individual-Level Wage Effects of Foreign Aid in Developing Countries,” *Evaluation and Programming Planning* 68 (June 2018), 233–42..
102. Another agency country representative noted, “I need 3 year posts, not 6-month surge support. Otherwise there is no institutional memory, no capacity to sustain gains, building trust with the population and with Government becomes difficult.”
103. As one informant noted, “It’s hard to get people to go to Maidurugi for any length of time.”
104. As one interlocutor explained, “Joint analysis is not happening. For us it means inter-cluster, not humanitarian-development.”
105. See OCHA, “Afghanistan: Humanitarian Needs Overview”, 2019, p. 48, <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/afghanistan/document/afghanistan-humanitarian-needs-overview-2019..>
106. UNDP, Guidance for PDNA in Conflict Situations, <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/guidance-pdna-conflict-situations..>
107. Laurence Chandy and Johannes F. Linn, “Taking Development Activities to Scale in Fragile and Low Capacity Environments,” Brookings Institution, 2016, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Scaling-Up-Fragile-States.pdf..>
108. The UN Security Council’s recent recognition of the climate-conflict link in Somalia reaffirms that this an issue that spans the triple nexus.
109. See, e.g., Henk-Jan Brinkman and Cullen S. Hendrix, “Food Insecurity and Violent Conflict: Causes, Consequences, and Addressing the Challenges,” WFP Occasional Paper no. 24, 2011, p. 2 (noting that “food insecurity—especially when caused by a rise in food prices—is a threat and impact multiplier for violent conflict”).
110. See OCHA, “Humanitarian Response Plan: Central African Republic, 2019,” p. 9, https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/2019/02/2018_hrp_CAR_english_final_o.pdf..
111. *Ibid.*, 13..
112. *Ibid.*, 14..
113. Emmanuel Tronc, Rob Grace, and Anaïde Nahikian, “Realities and Myths of the ‘Triple Nexus’: Local Perspectives on Peacebuilding, Development, and Humanitarian Action in Mali,” *Humanitarian Action at the Frontlines: Field Analysis Series*, Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, June 2019, p. xxv..
114. See OCHA, “2019 Humanitarian Response Plan: Chad,” January 2019, https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/documents/files/tcd_str_hrp2019_20190304.pdf.
115. See OCHA, “2018–2021 Humanitarian Response Plan: Afghanistan,” December 2017, <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/afghanistan/document/afghanistan-humanitarian-response-plan-2018–2021..>
116. See 2019 Update to “2018–2021 Humanitarian Response Plan: Afghanistan,” December 2018, <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/documents/files/>

afg_2019_humanitarian_response_plan.pdf.

117. UN General Assembly, *Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System*, A/RES/71/243, para. 21(a), <https://undocs.org/A/RES/71/243>. The QCPR also calls for UN agencies to provide normative support, where appropriate, and to strengthen their support of national institutions when it comes to planning, data management, and evaluation.

118. United Nations, *Repositioning the UN Development System to Deliver on the 2030 Agenda: Ensuring a Better Future for All*, Report of the Secretary-General (June 30, 2017), para. 40, <https://www.un.org/ecosoc/sites/www.un.org.ecosoc/files/files/en/qcpr/sg-report-on-unds-qcpr-june-2017.pdf>.

119. One reason for these low percentages is that some donors allocate almost none of their funding via pooled funds. The United States provided 0.50 percent of its 2018 humanitarian financing via such funds while Canada provided 5.7 percent (compared to the Netherlands' 51 percent, Sweden's 27 percent, Denmark's 15 percent, and the UK's 16 percent).

120. IFRC, "The National Society Investment Alliance: First Funding Announcement," May 6, 2019, <https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/2019/05/06/national-society-investment-alliance-first-funding-announcement/>.

121. See Charter for Change, "From Commitments to Action: Progress Report 2018–2019," p. 14, <https://charter4change.org/2019/06/24/new-charter4change-annual-report-2019/>.

122. Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank Group, "Central African Republic: Emergency Food Crisis Response and Agriculture Re-launch Project," Report no. 127422, June 18, 2018, p. 19, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/516941531419159046/pdf/127422-PPAR-P149512-P165993-PUBLIC.pdf>.

123. See Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank Group, "Learning from IDA Experience: Lessons from IEG Evaluations," 2016, p. x, http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/sites/default/files/Data/reports/lp_ida_0716_o.pdf.

124. International Rescue Committee, "New Responses to the Refugee Crisis: Promises and Challenges in Uganda: A Case Study of World Bank Financing for Refugee-Hosting Nations," 2018, <https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/3286/ugandacasesudyoct262018final-final-update.pdf>.

125. Commission on State Fragility, Growth and Development, *Escaping the Fragility Trap*, April 2018, p. 39, https://www.theigc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Escaping-the-fragility-trap_Aug-2018.pdf.

126. In Somalia, it is the IMF's assessment of Government reform efforts (under three Staff Monitoring Programs) that will determine when and how the Government can access essential debt relief and begin to normalize its relations with development donors. In Chad, it is the IMF country director rather than the RC/HC who co-leads the development/donor coordination forum.

127. Independent Evaluation Office, "The IMF and Social Protection: 2017 Evaluation Report," International Monetary Fund, 2017, p. 2.

128. There are important institutional barriers to greater UN–IMF engagement. The IMF's internal security protocols prevent staff from working in or even visiting certain countries, such as Afghanistan, depriving the IMF of local knowledge and in-country relationships. The IMF also tends to engage different parts of the Government (finance ministries) than humanitarians (line ministries, disaster-response agencies). Those with influence over IMF policymaking tend to be donors' ministries of finance rather than their humanitarian or development agencies, with whom the UN engages..

129. Ryan C. Briggs, "Poor Targeting: A Gridded Spatial Analysis of the Degree to Which Aid Reaches the Poor in Africa," *World Development* 103 (2018), 133–48..

130. Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Norway's Humanitarian Strategy: Toward an Effective and Integrated Approach," 2018, p. 31, https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/departementene/ud/dokumenter/hum/hum_strategy.pdf.

131. Roger Zetter, James Mackie, Héloïse Ruadel, Maaria Seppänen, and Noemi Cascone, "Evaluation on Forced Displacement and Finish Development Policy," *Particip/Indufor* (2019), 60..

132. FAO and World Bank, "Rebuilding Resilient and Sustainable Agriculture in Somalia," 2018, p. 142..

133. Laurence Chandy and Johannes F. Linn, "Taking Development Activities to Scale in Fragile and Low Capacity Environments," Brookings Institution, 2016, p. 12, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Scaling-Up-Fragile-States.pdf>..

134. Report of the Secretary General, Advance Unedited Version, *Implementation of General Assembly Resolution 71/243 on the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for*

- Development of the United Nations System (QCPR): 2018* (January 9, 2018), p. 15, <https://www.un.org/ecosoc/sites/www.un.org.ecosoc/files/files/en/qcpr/2018-sg-report-adv.pdf>.
135. Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “The World 2030: Denmark’s Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action,” January 2017, <http://amg.um.dk/en/policies-and-strategies/stategy-for-danish-development-cooperation/>.
136. Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Support to Syria’s Neighbourhood: Lebanon and Jordan, 2018–2021,” August 2018.
137. Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Denmark—Mali Country Policy Paper 2016–2021,” February 2016, p. 3.
138. Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC), “Strategic Framework 2013–2017: Global Programme Migration and Development,” p. 6, https://www.eda.admin.ch/dam/deza/en/documents/themen/migration/strategic-framework-migration-2013–2017_EN.pdf.
139. Lisa Daoud, “Accountability: How Are We Doing? Theory and Practice in Aid Operations in Crisis and Post-crisis Contexts,” Groupe URD, 2019, p. 5, <https://www.urd.org/en/publication/study-report-on-accountability-2019/>.
140. Two rounds of Ground Truth Solutions surveys of affected communities and humanitarian personnel in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Haiti, Iraq, Lebanon, Somalia, and Uganda are available here: <https://groundtruthsolutions.org/our-work/tracking-the-grand-bargain-from-a-field-perspective/#downloads>.
141. Notably, the timeline attached to a collective-outcomes workshop document appears to reflect headquarters schedules and concerns more than those of the country team.
142. OCHA, “Evaluation of Multi-year Planning,” February 2017, p. 9, https://www.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/MYP%20Evaluation_Final%20Report.pdf.
143. UN General Assembly, *One Humanity, Shared Responsibility: Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit, A/70/709* (February 2, 2016), para. 118..
144. See IFRC, *World Disasters Report 2018*, p. 124.
145. In September 2018, UNHCR reported to its standing committee that, of the twenty-one refugee contingency plans finalized by country operations in 2018, all included participation of local Governments, 90 percent included local or national NGOs as contingency/preparedness partners, and 24 percent included local communities.
146. Of course, efforts to prevent and prepare for the effects of disasters can in and of themselves play a crucial conflict-prevention role. Put differently, the absence of such efforts poses a conflict risk. As noted in a recent analysis from the Armed Conflict Location and Events Dataset (ACLED), “A commonly cited cause for public protest activity is poor state response to natural disasters.” The analysis also notes that when disaster responses fail to meet the expectations of affected populations, “discontent can trigger episodes of riots and protest.” ACLED, “Missed Expectations and Disorder: The Dilemma of Political Responses to Disasters,” August 2019, <https://www.acleddata.com/2019/08/14/missed-expectations-and-disorder-the-dilemma-of-political-response-to-disasters/>.
147. As noted in Mark Lowcock, “A Casement Lecture: Towards a Better System for Humanitarian Financing” (lecture, Iveagh House, Dublin, March 23, 2018).
148. For a helpful synthesis of these and other issues related to anticipatory CERF financing, see Florence Pichon, “Anticipatory Humanitarian Action: What Role for the CERF? Moving from Rapid Response to Early Action,” Working Paper 551, Overseas Development Institute, April 2019, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12643.pdf>.
149. For these and other examples, see Marie Aronsson-Storrier and Karen de Costa, “Regulating Disasters? The Role of International Law in Disaster Prevention and Management,” *Disaster Prevention and Management* 26, no. 5 (2017), 502–13.
150. e-Pact, *Independent Evaluation of the African Risk Capacity (ARC): Formative Phase 1 Report*, October 27, 2017, <https://www.opml.co.uk/files/Publications/a0603-independent-evaluation-african-risk-capacity/arc-evaluation-report.pdf?noredirect=1>.
151. For additional information on the Forecast-based Action facility, see, e.g., IFRC’s 2018 Grand Bargain Self-Report, available here: https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/ifrc_-_narrative_summary_22.03.2019_0.pdf.
152. Notably, a real-time evaluation of the 2011 response to famine in Somalia found that the lack of contingency planning inhibited desperately needed early action. “The HCT and donors in Somalia missed . . . key warning signs and failed to develop effective scenario and contingency planning for a food emergency.” Hugo Slim, “IASC Real-Time Evaluation of the Humanitarian Response to the Horn of

- Africa Drought Crisis in Somalia, Ethiopia and Kenya: Synthesis Report,” IASC, June 2012, p. 10.
153. Jordan JRP 2018–2020; Yemen UNSF 2017–2019; Cameroon UNDAF 2018–2020; Mauritania CDDP (no contingency plan but mentions that flexibility will be enabled at level of annual work plans); Sudan UNDAF; South Sudan UNCF (includes contingencies); Somalia (one mention); Nigeria UNDAF; Afghanistan One UN; Pakistan One UN (one reference but not a plan).
154. Michael Woolcock, “Engaging with Fragile and Conflict-Affected States: An Alternative Approach to Theory, Measurement and Practice,” WIDER Working Paper 2014, United Nations University, World Institute for Development Economics Research, July 2014, <https://www.wider.unu.edu/sites/default/files/wp2014-097.pdf>.
155. For instance, UNICEF had begun preparing for the Rohingya crisis long before it was front-page news, yet “the massive scale of the influx in 2017 was not anticipated.” UNICEF, “Update on Humanitarian Action with a Focus on Emergency Preparedness,” Executive Board, first regular session, UNICEF/2018/EB/3 (February 2018), p. 2, https://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2018-EB-3-Humanitarian_Update-2018.01.08-EN.pdf.
156. As summarized in “Humanitarian Implementation Plan: West Africa,” European Union, ECHO, December 4, 2018, p. 12, https://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/echo_-wf_bud_2018_91000_v9.pdf.
157. World Bank, “Fiscal Disaster Risk Assessment; Pakistan,” 2015, p. 8..
158. Gabrielle Roudaut, “Ready to Respond ‘Strengthening Humanitarian Preparedness in High-Risk Countries,’” World Food Programme, August 2017, <https://www.preventionweb.net/publications/view/56524>.
159. FAO and World Bank, “Rebuilding Resilient and Sustainable Agriculture in Somalia,” 2018, p. 16..
160. Debbie Hillier, “Managing the Risk, Not the Crisis,” *Humanitarian Exchange* 53 (2012)..
161. WFP, “World Food Assistance 2018: Preventing Food Crises,” May 2018, p. 22, <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000070719/download/>.
162. Both studies are cited in IFRC, *World Disaster Report 2018*, p. 128, <https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/world-disaster-report-2018/>.
163. UN Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office, “Mapping the Financing for Regional Drivers of Fragility in the Horn of Africa,” final report for the Partners of Horn of Africa Initiative, 2017, p. 3.
164. World Bank, “A Destiny Shaped by Water: A Diagnostic of Water Supply, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) and Poverty in Niger,” 2019, p. xviii.
165. See Development Initiatives, “Key Trends in Global Humanitarian Assistance,” June 2019, http://devinit.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Factsheet_key-trends-in-global-humanitarian-assistance_2019.pdf.
166. See Inter-agency Task Force on Financing For Development, “Financing for Sustainable Development Report 2019,” United Nations, p. 79, https://developmentfinance.un.org/sites/developmentfinance.un.org/files/FSDR2019_ChptIII-C.pdf. See also Development Initiatives, “Investments to End Poverty,” 2018, p. 48, <http://devinit.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Investments-to-End-Poverty-2018-Report.pdf>.
167. International Monetary Fund, “World Economic Outlook Update,” World Economic Outlook, July 2018, <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2018/07/02/world-economic-outlook-update-july-2018..>
168. World Bank Group, “International Debt Statistics 2019,” p. 10, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/30851/IDS2019.pdf?sequence=5>.
169. Robert Tew and Cecilia Caio, “What Do Emerging Trends in Development Finance Mean for Crisis Actors?,” online webinar, May 30, 2019.
170. See, e.g., Dongyeol Lee, Huan Zhang, and Chau Nguyen, “The Economic Impact of Natural Disasters in Pacific Island Countries: Adaptation and Preparedness,” IMF Working Paper, May 10, 2018, <https://www.imf.org/~media/Files/Publications/WP/2018/wp18108.ashx>.
171. Prepared by the staffs of the International Monetary Fund and the International Development Association, “Chad: First Review under the Extended Credit Facility Arrangement, Request for a Waiver of Nonobservance of Performance Criteria, Rephasing of Disbursements, and Financing Assurances Review—Debt Sustainability Analysis,” 2018, <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/dsa/pdf/2018/dsac18108.pdf>.
172. See Moses Owori, “Pro-poor Analysis of the 2018/19 Uganda Budget,” *Development Initiatives*, July 17, 2018, <http://devinit.org/post/16807/>.
173. See, e.g., Mark Plant, “Refugee Spending and the Macroeconomic Program in Jordan,” Center

on Global Development, June 28, 2018, <https://www.cgdev.org/publication/refugee-spending-and-macroeconomic-program-jordan>.

174. Like Norway, WFP has specific policies on the humanitarian principles. A recent evaluation of those policies found them to be “highly relevant” but further concluded that WFP has not “invested sufficiently in their dissemination and implementation,” which leads to a high degree of variation in understandings and approaches. It noted that WFP performs most strongly on humanity, relatively strongly on impartiality, and “less strongly on neutrality, while operational independence is the least understood of the principles.” Julia Steets, Claudia Meier, Adele Harmer, Abby Stoddard, and Janika Spannagel, “Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Contexts: Evaluation Report,” commissioned by WFP Office of Evaluation, May 2018, <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000072044/download/>.

175. European Commission, “Providing Social Protection across the Humanitarian-Development Nexus,” Guidance note, 2018, p. 8.

176. OECD, *DAC Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus*, OECD/LEGAL/5019 (2019), <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/public/doc/643/643.en.pdf>.

177. Ibid.

Annex: topic guide

Acknowledgments.....	iii
Abbreviations.....	iii
Executive summary.....	vi
Reinforcing, not replacing, national and local systems.....	vii
Transcending the humanitarian–development(–peacebuilding) divide.....	viii
Anticipating rather than waiting for crises.....	xi
Conclusions and recommendations.....	xii
1. Introduction	1
1.1. <i>About the study</i>	1
1.2. <i>Background to the new way of working</i>	1
1.2.1. Three objectives.....	1
1.3. <i>Context for the study</i>	2
1.3.1. Staggered implementation.....	2
1.3.2. Member-state support.....	3
1.3.3. A complex global landscape.....	3
2. Reinforcing, not replacing, national and local systems.....	5
2.1. <i>Promising developments and good practices</i>	5
2.1.1. Government ownership of crisis response and recovery is rising.....	5
2.1.2. Sector-based strategies are a crucial entry point to reinforce national and local systems.....	7
2.1.3. Local authorities may also provide a pathway to reinforce national and local systems.....	8
2.1.4. Well-timed joint analysis can help galvanize inclusive national development planning.....	9
2.1.5. UN agencies and NGOs are increasing their localization and capacity-building efforts.....	9
2.1.6. Linking emergency response to scalable safety nets is key to successful localization	12
2.1.7. Coordinated cash programming is helping forge humanitarian links with public safety nets.....	12
2.1.8. Links with national systems are being created even in very active conflict settings.....	13
2.1.9. Multidonor trust funds constitute an important means of supporting governments.....	15
2.1.10. UN humanitarian pooled funds play a crucial role in supporting national and local NGOs.....	15
2.1.11. Some donors are trying to incentivize a shift toward ending parallel services.....	15
2.1.12. The UN and other partners are establishing more sophisticated risk management to further facilitate localization and national ownership	16
2.2. <i>Constraints</i>	16
2.2.1. Most governments lack procedures to provide a fast emergency response or to maintain or increase normal service delivery in affected areas.....	16
2.2.2. Governments are concerned about cost shifting	17
2.2.3. Humanitarian funding of government capacity remains low.....	17
2.2.4. Funding through national and local institutions is constrained by three sets of concerns....	18
2.2.5. Donors continue to bypass government-led coordination structures	20
2.2.6. State–NGO service partnerships often lack a clear transition strategy.....	20
2.2.7. From an NGO perspective, localization is viewed far too narrowly	22

2.2.8.	Humanitarian actors are insufficiently engaged in long-term national budgeting processes.....	23
2.2.9.	Sustainability needs to be political as well as technical.....	23
3.	Transcending the humanitarian–development divide.....	25
3.1.	<i>Promising developments and good practices.....</i>	<i>26</i>
3.1.1.	There is a step change in collaboration between humanitarian and development actors.....	26
3.1.2.	Collaboration has moved fastest where government ownership is deepest.....	27
3.1.3.	Insecurity is also a short-term driver of collaboration.....	28
3.1.4.	Ensuring that RCs and RC/HCs have adequate nexus expertise is essential.....	28
3.1.5.	Adequate support—for example, from nexus advisers—is equally critical.....	29
3.1.6.	Joint analysis of the causes and consequences of crises is a crucial starting point.....	29
3.1.7.	Joint coordination structures are (slowly) emerging.....	30
3.1.8.	Collective outcomes are playing an important role in bridging silos.....	31
3.1.9.	There are promising examples of joint or aligned planning processes.....	32
3.1.10.	Multiyear humanitarian planning is a (potential) vehicle through which to operationalize collective outcomes.....	35
3.1.11.	Country teams are adapting UNDAFs/UNCFs to meet the needs of affected countries.....	35
3.1.12.	Multiyear financing is increasing.....	37
3.1.13.	The World Bank’s partnership with humanitarian actors has become much closer.....	38
3.1.14.	Direct Bank funding of UN agencies and other nongovernmental actors is increasing.....	39
3.1.15.	World Bank–financed activities coordinated behind shared objectives are even more significant.....	39
3.1.16.	There is promising World Bank–UN collaboration on convening, analytical, and policysupport.....	39
3.1.17.	Member state boards can play a crucial role in incentivizing humanitarian– development collaboration.....	41
3.1.18.	...As can individual donor partnership agreements.....	41
3.2.	<i>Constraints.....</i>	<i>42</i>
3.2.1.	There is a “missing middle” in humanitarian–development cooperation.....	42
3.2.2.	Governments frequently need sensitive support for leadership and coordination.....	42
3.2.3.	Despite the envisaged positive impact, there are risks associated with UN reforms.....	43
3.2.4.	High staff turnover and lack of in-country expertise are major challenges.....	43
3.2.5.	Disjointed analysis remains the norm in many instances.....	44
3.2.6.	Lack of development coordination is hindering progress.....	45
3.2.7.	Collective outcomes often do not target the most-strategic issues.....	45
3.2.8.	Strategic objectives are not sufficiently specific to the complexities of each crisis.....	47
3.2.9.	There are too many different and fragmented UNHQ-driven plans.....	47
3.2.10.	Donors express concern about the quality of some multiyear plans and programs.....	48
3.2.11.	Assistance from headquarters can result in duplication and supply-driven approaches.....	50
3.2.12.	Country teams struggle to provide integrated policy advice.....	50
3.2.13.	UN pooled funds have insufficient flexibility and lack a critical mass of funding.....	50
3.2.14.	International actors need to make more consistent efforts to pass on the benefits of multiyear or core financing to civil society partners.....	51

3.2.15.	World Bank partnership is not without challenges.....	51
3.2.16.	Coordination and advocacy with the IMF appear to be minimal.....	52
3.2.17.	Constraints <i>within</i> donors' respective humanitarian and development departments can impede progress.....	53
3.2.18.	Divisions <i>between</i> donors' development and humanitarian departments can perpetuate rather than transcend humanitarian–development divides.....	53
3.2.19.	Earmarking of funding to the project level poses a critical challenge.....	54
3.2.20.	There is no clear pathway for ensuring that strategic plans, collective outcomes, and other frameworks are aligned with the priorities and aspirations of affected communities.....	55
3.2.21.	Internal UN incentives militate against coherent planning and programming.....	55
4.	Anticipating crises before they occur.....	57
4.1.	<i>Promising developments and good practices.....</i>	<i>57</i>
4.1.1.	Some governments have established strong mechanisms for contingency planning and response.....	57
4.1.2.	There are good examples of UN, donor, and NGO contingency planning, preparedness, and prevention efforts.....	58
4.1.3.	The CERF is a sound rapid-response mechanism that is now piloting anticipatory action measures.....	60
4.1.4.	The Peacebuilding Fund is playing an important prevention role.....	61
4.1.5.	Human rights mechanisms can help incentivize preventative action.....	61
4.1.6.	Insurance and contingency funds are working well for natural disasters.....	61
4.1.7.	Some mechanisms are in place to address macroeconomic challenges.....	63
4.2.	<i>Constraints.....</i>	<i>63</i>
4.2.1.	Overall, very few government or international plans or projects include contingencies.....	63
4.2.2.	Few countries with humanitarian crises appear to have effective procedures in place to speed up budget allocation, procurement, or personnel deployment.....	64
4.2.3.	Preparedness and prevention efforts remain projectized and small scale.....	64
4.2.4.	Funding for prevention and preparedness is insufficient.....	65
4.2.5.	Insurance and contingency financing do not cover most conflict spillovers.....	67
4.2.6.	Other risk mechanisms have only partial coverage of the poorest countries.....	67
4.2.7.	The amount of bilateral development funding channeled through public systems in affected states is falling.....	67
4.2.8.	Debt is a rising risk.....	68
5.	Recommendations.....	69
5.1.	<i>For governments and local civil society.....</i>	<i>69</i>
5.1.1.	Reaffirm state commitments to humanitarian principles and international humanitarian and human rights law.....	69
5.1.2.	Consider whether repeated and chronic humanitarian crises and conflict drivers merit attention in national development–peace planning and analysis.....	69

5.1.3.	Clarify roles and responsibilities within government and between government and its partners.....	70
5.1.4.	Strengthen response and recovery procedures and transparent fiduciary standards.....	70
5.1.5.	Ensure access of vulnerable and affected populations to public services, including by prioritizing commitments to universal service provision and social protection floors for all.....	70
5.1.6.	Advocate greater support for insurance and contingent financing mechanisms.....	71
5.2	<i>For the UN system</i>	71
5.2.1.	Prioritize and utilize political economy analysis.....	71
5.2.2.	Agree on a strong, systematically strategic role for the Joint Steering Committee.....	71
5.2.3.	Select and staff up RCs and RC/HCs to play a bridging role.....	72
5.2.4.	Prioritize UNDP’s strategic objective to strengthen national prevention, response, and recovery capacities in countries affected by chronic and repeated crises.....	72
5.2.5.	Design and implement programs in ways that reinforce existing systems and services, including public systems wherever appropriate.....	73
5.2.6.	Consider establishing a pool of strategic external advisers.....	73
5.2.7.	Move toward a comprehensive analytical and planning approach in most circumstances, with interim response plans where needed.....	74
5.2.8.	Make contingency planning in UNDAFs/UNCFs, HRPs, and project agreements the norm.....	74
5.2.9.	Design UN country-based pooled funds in ways that incentivize HDP collaboration.....	74
5.2.10.	Pass on multiyear funding to NGOs, with clear expectations.....	75
5.2.11.	Hold a UN–MDB–IMF retreat on the missing middle and fiscal and macroeconomic linkages.....	75
5.2.12.	Consider commissioning a study on the cost-effectiveness of multilateral cooperation in crisis-affected countries.....	75
5.3	<i>For donors</i>	75
5.3.1.	Invest in national capacity for whole-of-government emergency preparedness, response, and recovery and equitable service delivery.....	75
5.3.2.	Create clear guidance on the circumstances in which funding can be provided to different recipients while respecting humanitarian principles.....	76
5.3.3.	Provide incentives to move toward comprehensive planning at country level through combined peace–development–humanitarian strategies and flexible funds.....	76
5.3.4.	Adapt the IDA Crisis Response Window, the RMR, and the GCFF to address conflict spillovers and contingencies.....	77
5.3.5.	Review progress on humanitarian–development–peacebuilding cooperation and UN-World Bank partnership during IDA 19.....	77
5.3.6.	Clearly demonstrate the additionality of development support in refugee-hosting contexts.....	77
5.3.7.	Use the ECOSOC–World Bank session to address humanitarian cooperation.....	77

Boxes

Box 1:	Humanitarian needs in national development planning.....	6
Box 2:	Incorporating refugees into the education sector in Jordan.....	7
Box 3:	Analysis supporting government action.....	10
Box 4:	A diversity of approaches to supporting local governments, communities, and NGOs.....	11
Box 5:	Yemen: localization in active conflict situations.....	14
Box 6:	Humanitarian principles and working with state institutions.....	19
Box 7:	Somalia: not ripe for implementation, but why undermine ownership?.....	20
Box 8:	Promising transition strategies: Nigeria, Somalia, and DRC.....	21
Box 9:	Collective outcomes: a few key questions.....	25
Box 10:	Planning across humanitarian and development divides in Lebanon.....	27
Box 11:	Linked plans: Mauritania, Burkina Faso, and Sudan.....	34
Box 12:	Mainstreaming, acceleration, and policy support for 2030 Agenda as an entry point.....	37
Box 13:	World Bank facilities.....	38
Box 14:	Ethiopia's Refugee Proclamation.....	40
Box 15:	Language barriers as a crucial impediment in some countries.....	44
Box 16:	Peacebuilding linkages in Nigeria.....	46
Box 17:	2019 HRP's and the new way of working.....	48
Box 18:	Humanitarian–development(–peacebuilding) pooled funds.....	51
Box 19:	Danish joint strategies at global and country levels.....	54
Box 20:	Contingency planning in Afghanistan, South Sudan, and Iraq.....	59
Box 21:	Anticipatory and early-action finance.....	62
Box 22:	DAC Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus.....	66

Tables

Table 1:	Summary of recommendations.....	xiv
Table 2:	A sample of collective outcomes.....	32

NYU | CENTER ON
— | INTERNATIONAL
CIC | COOPERATION

726 Broadway, Suite 543
New York, NY 10003
cic.nyu.edu