Joint Programming in Conflict-Affected and Fragile States

JP Joint Programming

Joint Programming in Conflict-Affected and Fragile States

January 2019

Sibylle Koenig
Emery Brusset

Contents

Abbreviations

CAR   Central African Republic
EEAS   European External Action Service
ECHO   European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
EU   European Union
EUD   European Union Delegation
HoC   Head of Cooperation
HoM   Head of Mission
IcSP   Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace
JHDF   Joint Humanitarian-Development Framework
JP   Joint Programming
MS   Member States
UN   United Nations
WB   World Bank

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Nature of the study

Joint Programming (JP) is one of the key aid effectiveness commitments of EU development partners. It is enshrined in the 2006 European Consensus for Development and strengthened by the new European Consensus in 2017, which puts joined-up EU and EU Member State actions at the heart of the implementation of development cooperation efforts.

It is a process which involves the establishment of a single[1] country analysis and response strategy for a Partner Country, aimed at providing the EU institutions and Member States with an overall and shared rationale and direction for their assistance.

In May 2016, the Council's "Conclusions on Stepping up Joint Programming", the Council "stressed the opportunity of expanding Joint Programming including in fragile situations and conflict-affected countries, as well as in prevention or post-conflict contexts". In its June 2016 EU Global Strategy, the EU further highlights the need for a "Joined-up Union" and calls for increased efforts to better link "its humanitarian, development, migration, trade, investment, infrastructure, education, health and research policies, as well as improve horizontal coherence between the EU and its Member States".

The present study aims to use the learning gained in recent years from the EU and EU Member States in implementing Joint Programming in fragile contexts. The objective is to improve the effectiveness and impact of EU and EU Member States´ joint external action in these particular settings.

It must be pointed out that the concept of fragility is not a simple one and, quoting OECD report of the States of Fragility 2018, "has long been an ever-moving target within the development agenda". The OECD multidimensional framework identifies 5 different dimensions of fragility: political, societal, economic, environmental and security. Despite their notable differences, fragile states tend to display some common characteristics, namely a "weak capacity to carry out basic governance functions, and lack of ability to develop mutually constructive relations with society" (OECD 2012)[2]. Fragile states are also more vulnerable to internal or external shocks such as economic crises or natural disasters.

The study draws on evidence from the following case study countries: Burundi, Central African Republic Libya, Myanmar, Yemen, in addition to some other secondary examples.

1.2 Main Findings

Within international cooperation and diplomatic processes, the EU together with its Member States, enjoy a unique influence in fragile states, due to the fact that they are usually the top aid donor group and enjoy a significant degree of trade and diplomatic influence.

The EU´s new Global Strategy provides an impetus for change in EU interventions in fragile situations, by promoting **an integrated approach** to EU external action. This is further reinforced by the evidence that conflict is one of the principal causes of poverty around the world and that it is estimated that by 2030, most of the world´s poor will be living in fragile and conflict-affected states[3].

This study shows that EU Joint Programming has widely been recognised as a tool for bringing together the political and cooperation spheres, as well as involving other key actors (humanitarian, security, peacebuilding & stabilisation) in common planning processes.

Joint analysis exercises, with a focus on risk and conflict assessments and involving Heads of Mission, are seen as being of particular value in such contexts. A number of EU Delegations and Member States present in conflict-affected and fragile contexts have successfully launched their Joint Programming process by undertaking a shared risk and conflict analysis.

In pre-crisis, crisis and post-conflict situations, the EU and Member States´ role at country level is sometimes perceived as all too often limited to that of traditional, bilateral donors. The political resources available to the EU have however occasionally allowed it to lead in areas such as EU/MS humanitarian aid coordination (in particular the Humanitarian and Development Nexus), joint country situation analyses, and humanitarian-development-peace coordination.

The absence, or lack of dialogue with, a national government has a significant influence on the nature of Joint Programming, often exacerbated by rapid international policy shifts on how to tackle the crisis.

The study shows that the role played by some of the following, specific incentives has been particularly important for getting the Joint Programming process started in conflict and fragile settings:

- Many interlocutors primarily see Joint Programming as an opportunity for better information-sharing on the evolving

situation on the ground and systematising joint needs assessments.

- Others see it as an opportunity for adopting a more medium-term, resilience-based approach and joint vision. It can be seen as a way of strengthening joint EU and Member State positioning on certain key issues, vis-a-vis the government or other donors.
- In other cases the JP and assorted mechanisms are a way of eliciting an increasing effort from Member States which may not be present in country, and ensuring an effective dialogue with Partner Country governments.

Disincentives affecting Joint Programming are primarily about the lack of capacity by EU and Member State personnel in the country to deal with additional tasks. The workload of existing commitments often intrudes on the more strategic thinking that should occur. There may also be a reluctance to share security information. High staff turnover leads to conflicting priorities for 'above work horizon' programming.

When trying to go beyond the joint analysis stage, the term "Joint Programming" is often deemed inappropriate in situations of conflict and fragility – instead, terminology such as "joint coordination", "joint vision" are preferred. The reason being that the term ´programming´ is associated with (often non-existent) multi-annual bilateral planning and budgeting processes, based on a (sometimes non-existent) dialogue with an (often non-functioning) government and which are aligned with (often low quality) national development plans.

Establishing even indicative financial forecasts and sectoral divisions of labour is perceived by EU Delegations and Member States as an unrealistic exercise. This is because of the highly volatile environment, of reduced donor presence, and many uncertainties with regard to future volumes of aid portfolios. Rather, the way forward for JP in fragile contexts would appear to be joint risk and conflict analysis, improved coordination, joint policy dialogue, and joint financial implementation which targets key drivers of risk (or of conflicts) in the country. In some settings it may, however, also be worth exploring if JP can play a role in kick-starting a thoughts process on more innovative elements of financing within fragile contexts, including the promotion of private sector investment in high risk areas.

1.3 Conclusions

The EU´s collective ambitions need to be assessed against what can realistically be achieved, with a limited and constantly fluctuating pool of human resources, within the particular contexts of countries affected by fragility and crisis.

This may mean limiting the Joint Programming process, in its first phase, to measures of reinforced analysis and coordination in certain sectors or areas of shared interest. A particularly promising aspect is that of a common EU process which prepares a joint position ahead of multilateral planning. The inclusion of humanitarian and resilience interventions, development finance institutions, and security, can create much needed versatility to cover the multi-dimensional nature of fragility.

In the face of the complexity generated by conflict and State fragility, Joint Programming is both highly relevant, and in need of some revision. It can effectively advance the value of the EU operating as a whole, while reducing the more cumbersome aspects of programming in fast-moving conditions.

1.4 Recommendations

One core, overall message is emerging from the findings under this study: in complex, fragile and conflict-affected settings, JP cannot be implemented as a standardized mechanism merely focused on delivering a product (the joint strategy). It should be promoted as a flexible process, centred around joint conflict and risk analysis as an important starting point.

If accompanied by a light and pragmatic joint response and results framework, Joint Programming can help address fragmentation and create a critical mass. Joint Programming should provide a gradually evolving, multi-actor platform where a growing array of partners should find their own incentives to participate, as part of a fragility and resilience-focused strategy..

The key recommendations in Table 1 show options which have been applied in the case study country contexts and possible action to be taken at EU and Member States Headquarters´ level. The logic of the table is to answer the questions: "What" obstacles can be observed in fragile countries? "How" can they be addressed? And "Who" can/should address them?

Table 1: Joint Programming recommendations for overcoming key challenges in fragile states

Key Challenges in fragile states	Joint Programming process recommendations		Joint Programming document format and content recommendations	
	What? How?	Who?	How?	Who?
Absence or poor quality of National Development Plan	**Keep the process flexible and adaptable:** Allow for regular (annual/ bi-annual) reviews of the Joint Strategy document so as to be able to adapt it in case a national plan or results framework is still to be finalized.	EU/MS HQ	• **Accept alternatives for aligning JP, by looking at:** The subnational and/or sector level: Align joint strategy to sector policies and local development plans, where possible/ applicable. AND/OR • **Internationally shared commitments:** Use SDGs targets and indicators, and/ or UNDAF as an additional source for a light and flexible joint results framework including shared indicators.	EU/MS HoCs, HoMs
No or reduced EU/MS presence in country and/ or evacuation of EU/ MS staff to different locations. High staff workloads and turnover.	• **Some presence:** Start with present EU donors, by inviting others to join, when and where possible (Central African Republic) and considering the involvement of EU implementing agencies and EU and EU MS-funded Development Finance Institutions present on the ground. • Use existing donor coordination – e.g. around joint implementation initiatives (for example EU Trust Fund in Central African Republic) for JP discussions. And/ or: • Establish a rotating, JP Secretariat at country level or within evacuation location, with HR support co-financed by JP members, which will be responsible for coordinating the process (Mali) • **No presence:** Options used to coordinate from abroad: conference calls with occasional face-to-face meeting in evacuation countr(ies), joined by local actors, UN (Yemen, Libya). • Allocate sufficient HR and financial resources for supporting innovative coordination methods in-country or abroad. • Integrate JP into new staff job descriptions and staff performance evaluations.	EU/MS HoCs, HoMs in country. The above, plus EU Trust Fund Steering Committee. The above, plus, where appropriate implementing agencies/ EU funding operators. EU/MS HoCs, HoMs from evacuation location – if at HQ, involve geographic desks. EU/MS HQ EU/MS HQ	• **Make the Joint Strategy fit for handover:** notably joint considerations about the added value of JP in this complex, fragile setting should be clearly documented. Preparing a handover to national authorities from the outset has also proven effective. • So as to address **workload issues**, consider focusing JP on a few key sectors of special interest only (e.g. migration, local governance).	S HoCs, HoMs

Key Challenges in fragile states	Joint Programming process recommendations			Joint Programming document format and content recommendations	
What?	How?		Who?	How?	Who?
Absence of dialogue or interlocutor at national level	**Progressively move from a closed partnership…** • Where needed, start the JP process without or only occasional government involvement, • … while however maintaining the principle of JP as an inclusive, multi-actor exercise: - As a first step, organize a multi-stakeholder conflict sensitivity workshop so as to identify key drivers and spoilers of change and agree on how to work with them. - Localize joint risk and conflict sensitivity analysis, as well as joint response exercises, by going to the priority area/ region and talking to local humanitarian actors, authorities, civil society – rather than centralizing process at donor office level. – - Consider the option of establishing a dedicated core donor and multi-stakeholder group on stabilisation, as a neutral force within a divided territory (example from Yemen). **…to an inclusive, country-owned process:** Allow for maximum flexibility of the JP process, so as to progressively work towards ownership at country level – starting with local authorities & line ministries, where possible.		EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, ECHO EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, ECHO, civil society, UN and EU peace-keeping missions. EU/MS External relations actors at HQ level; EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, ECHO EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, UN, ECHO, EU and UN peacekeeping missions	**Resilience and local development as JP focus:** Centre JP objectives around community resilience, by adopting a harmonized, conflict-sensitive approach on how to work with local administrations and civil society without undermining national unity. **Label as confidential, if crucial :** If needed for political reasons, produce an internal, confidential version of the strategy, complemented by a shortened, public version . JP cannot, however be a fully confidential process - it should be considered as temporary and limited to the most sensitive issues.	EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, upon consultation with UN, humanitarian and security actors, Civil society. EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, ECHO

Key Challenges in fragile states	Joint Programming process recommendations		Joint Programming document format and content recommendations	
What?	**How?**	**Who?**	**How?**	**Who?**
A complex, political, security and aid landscape marked by fragmentation: Non-existing or only annual MS country strategies + funding; a high number of small-scale, short-term, humanitarian-type actions; multiple implementers.	**Assign new roles for a more integrated approach….** • **Involve HQs in JP from the start:** Start JP with an inception mission where EU HQ representatives (geographic and thematic desks) are invited in order to raise awareness about the complexity of the context, by making them participate in multi-actor consultations about the added value of EU Joint Programming (e.g. approach taken in Mali). Early buy-in from HQ may be crucial for ensuring an integrated approach. • **Consider establishing a JP-specific EU/MS external relations committee at HQ level for ensuring a more integrated approach at that level.** • At country level, Heads of Mission may need to be more involved than usual in the JP process, by taking on active roles in sectors where a political stand may be needed (e.g. Palestine: the Justice sector, where HoMs are leading the related donor coordination working group) or where links to the security, stabilisation and humanitarian sectors needs to be ensured. • Improve donor-internal relations between agencies/ units in charge of humanitarian aid and those in charge of development aid (e.g. EU Delegations and ECHO; EU Member State agencies and their embassies). To that end, the designation of a **"fragility / resilience focal point"** within country representations could be considered. **… and use JP to be strategic and overcome fragmentation:** • Link JP to existing UN and NGO coordination mechanisms– the perceived added value of EU Joint Programming being that it can provide such coordination with a medium-term vision going beyond annual plans. • Use JP to regularly bring EU/MS main operators/ implementers together to one table to ensure	EU/MS HQ, HoMs, HoCs. EU/MS HQ : All external relations departments. EU/MS HoMs, political sections	**Allow for flexible terminology:** "Joint Vision", "Joint Coordination" "Joint Approach" can be alternatives to "Joint Programming/ Strategy". • **Be ambitious, but balanced:** when selecting shared Joint Strategy objectives, a careful balance needs to be sought between, on the one hand, the ambition to adopt a joint vision based on common values and, and, on the other hand, taking into account donors´ operational limitations related to the conflict context (such as security and access issues, limited personnel and financial resources on the ground; divergent Member States political interests). • Consider using international, multi-annual pledges (where applicable) as a source for providing (very) indicative funding forecasts.	EU/MS HQ. EU/MS HoMs, HoCs.

Key Challenges in fragile states	Joint Programming process recommendations			Joint Programming document format and content recommendations	
What?	How?	Who?		How?	Who?
A complex, political, security and aid landscape marked by fragmentation: Non-existing or only annual MS country strategies + funding; a high number of small-scale, short-term, humanitarian-type actions; multiple implementers.	• coherence, information-sharing, non-duplication and adopt common medium-term vision for resilience. • Use JP to establish and ensure the effective implementation of a Joint CSO roadmap. • Link JP to ongoing or planned country processes under the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and State building, in the case of countries in the g7+ group of fragile countries. • Use JP to strategically discuss how to work with (especially EU MS-funded) development finance institutions and make use of existing, more flexible EU instruments (such as EU Trust Funds, IcSP funding) for linking security, development, humanitarian, resilience and stabilisation work on the ground.				

Key Challenges in fragile states	Joint Programming process recommendations			Joint Programming document format and content recommendations	
	What? / How?	Who?		How?	Who?
Sudden shifts in government policy, or the emergence of unknown forces and dimensions, calling into question the early optimism of Joint Programming.	• **Process over Product: Put more emphasis on joint analysis,** by making use of fragility-tested and piloted tools and approaches (e.g. the Joint Humanitarian-Development Framework) by opening them up (through JP) to the wider EU Member States group. Issue guidance about such tools (for example Joint Humanitarian-Development Framework) and make it available to EU and Member States in partner countries. **Jointly prepare for shocks:** Conduct a light conflict and shared risk analysis, by analyzing political scenarios, risks, resilience opportunities, drivers and spoilers of change.	EU and MS HoMs and HoCs; EU and MS political sections; ECHO; humanitarian, stabiliza-tion, security, de-velopment actors and multilat-erals (UN, WB) and civil socie-ty. EU HQ. Same actors as above, for joint risk analysis.		**A conflict and risk-sensitive, light, pragmatic and reviewable JP document:** • Risks and assumptions to be included in results framework, as well as mitigation measures. • Keep the JP document short, pragmatic and flexible (Mali), by choosing a limited number of key results indicators and including possibility of annual or bi-annual reviews.	EU/ MS HoMs and HoCs, ECHO.
Security concerns are hampering humanitarian and development programming and action.	**Peacekeeping and observation actors as partners in working towards shared integrated approach and JP objectives.** • Foresee regular exchanges/ consultations with UN and/ or EU (CSDP) peace missions to discuss how and where favorable security conditions need to be created to allow for humanitarian or development action (Mali). • Discuss also the risks of blending security humanitarian / development action to see how they can be addressed (Mali).	EU/MS HoCs, HoMs. Peace missions´ in-country representatives. Involve relevant EU/MS departments at HQ level if changes in mandates are needed.		• **Consider Security as a cross-cutting theme** to be mainstreamed within the JP sector analysis. • **Pilot approaches.** Include a list of possible joint actions in the JP document which could serve as exemplary pilot initiatives for the triple peace-humanitarian-development nexus, by using, for example, new mechanisms such as EU trust funds or linking to new approaches such as the Sahel alliance.	EU/MS HoCs and HoMS, with buy-in from HQs. EU/MS HoCs and HoMS, with buy-in from HQs.

2. Objective and Scope

2.1 Context of the Study

In May 2016, in "Conclusions on Stepping up Joint Programming", the Council "stresses the opportunity of expanding Joint Programming including in fragile situations and conflict-affected countries, as well as in prevention or post-conflict contexts". The Council also asked that joint programming be expanded to strategic issues such as migration, climate change, fragility, security and democracy.

These issues are not traditional to EU-wide development planning, due to the sensitivity and institutional complexity that often accompanies responses to crises and conflicts. This expansion of scope clearly places Joint Programming in a different category of policy-making, requiring great sensitivity to the context, and finely tuned coordination. The introduction of Joint Programming into conflictual situations requires careful exploration.

Crisis and vulnerability are increasingly being taken into account in development cooperation and EU foreign policy instruments, such as is the case for the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace, which forms part of the package of External Financing Instruments (EFIs). This has been adopted in 2014 under the Multiannual Financial Framework (2014-2020). The 2017 Council Conclusions on 'A Strategic Approach to Resilience in the EU's External Action' emphasised the importance of moving from crisis containment to a more structural and long-term approach to global challenges, including through strengthened early warning and prevention.

The introduction of the 'Peace' pillar in the new European Consensus on Development similarly reflects the importance of conflict prevention. Shifting the emphasis towards advanced efforts to tackle underlying risks and drivers of conflict and instability represents an investment to tackle wider challenges such as violent extremism, forced displacement, and migration, as well as less conflict-related issues such as climate change impacts.

As such, the direction of change is clear: the EU as a whole seeks to focus increasingly on fragility, and to do so by covering areas that are not considered central, or traditional, for international cooperation.

This twinning of development and interventions specific to fragile situations echoes a renewed focus on coherence and seeing stability as a tool to fight poverty – for example a recent paper ('Escaping the Fragility Trap') by the London School of Economics, in the significant literature on the convergence of poverty and situations of fragility. The compendium of policies and research is part of a shift in the way international cooperation is conceived and delivered.

This has obvious implications for Joint Programming. The Terms of Reference of the present study (contained in Appendix 1), point in the direction of early, coordinated and shared analysis. The TOR also call for improvements in the way in which joint priority setting, division of labour, implementation and results monitoring take place for the EU: the European External Action Service, the European Commission, but also the Member States.

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia's capital, is one of the fastest growing urban areas in the world.

2.2 Policy Basis

A brief definition of each of the key approaches to be assessed within this study is required, as the concepts present some degree of overlap:

- **The Comprehensive Approach:**

Although this approach is no longer in use as it has now been replaced by the so-called "integrated approach", the latter builds on and expands the concept of the comprehensive approach. According to the Joint Communication and the Council Conclusions on the Comprehensive Approach from 2013 and 2014, the EU's policies and priorities "should follow from common strategic objectives and a clear common vision of what the EU collectively wants to achieve in its external relations or in a particular conflict or crisis situation".

The elements of a Comprehensive Approach, as defined in the communication, are to:

1. Develop a shared analysis
2. Define a common strategic vision
3. Focus on Prevention
4. Mobilise the different strengths and capacities of the EU
5. Commit to the long-term
6. Linking policies and internal and external action
7. Make better use of EU Delegations
8. Work in partnership

- **Integrated Approach:**

The EU Global Strategy refers to the Integrated Approach to Conflicts and Crises as one of its priorities. The Integrated Approach builds on the Comprehensive Approach, contains its principal elements, but expands the scope towards becoming a multi-dimensional (multi-level, multi-dimensional, multi-phased and multi-lateral) approach, as described in the corresponding Council Conclusions (Jan. 2018).

The Integrated Approach is more ambitious than previous approaches in that it clarifies possible EU responses at each stage of the conflict cycle, is more action-oriented and more adaptable to respond to the changing conflict landscape by focusing on regional and local dynamics to a greater extent.

Based on a shared analysis of the context, the Integrated Approach requires EU institutions to further strengthen cooperation with Member States and the way it brings together institutions, expertise, capacities and instruments, in conflict prevention, peacebuilding, crisis response and stabilisation in order to contribute to sustainable peace.

The Council Conclusions on the Integrated Approach also state that "the joint Conflict Analysis will inform other processes of strategic engagement of the EU, such as regional and national programming and Joint Programming" (para 9).

It is crucial that integration happens on the ground. Delegations are encouraged to further promote an Integrated Approach and are supported by HQ in this endeavour.

The main focus areas of the Integrated Approach are:

1. **Shared analysis and conflict sensitivity:** improve the EU capacity to conduct conflict analysis to assess the underlying vulnerabilities and causes of conflicts, potential factors of resilience, and design options for context-specific engagement.

2. **Conflict Prevention: Early Warning System and early action:** implement the EU Conflict Early Warning System, with buy-in of the Member States, to identify more accurately and early the risks/dynamics of violent conflicts/fragility, contributing to taking early action to mitigate these risks.

3. **Mediation support:** embed mediation support capacity better in relevant structures and processes to raise its political profile

4. **Response to Crises and stabilisation:** base the EU response to crises on a solid understanding of the multiple vulnerability and risk factors that communities face, therefore promoting coordination and synergies at an early stage between CSDP engagements, civil protection/humanitarian aid and development cooperation; while also implementing stabilisation actions to support the exit of a conflict and prevent new crises.

5. **Security sector reform and Transitional Justice:** develop methodological tools to ensure complementarity and coherence of all EU actions in the area of SSR and Transitional Justice to break the cycle of violence.

- **Resilience Approach:**

According to the Joint Communication and the Council Conclusions on the Strategic Approach to Resilience in the EU's external action[4], one of the four building blocks for its implementation is "Integrating the resilience approach into EU programming and financing".

Men fish on the Ubangi River, which forms the border between the Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

For this "The EU will build on existing practice to make an assessment of risk and resilience factors a standard component of programming processes and project design across EU humanitarian, crisis response and development assistance, including the EU Trust Funds. Key lessons from the resilience approach include the need to be able to work at multiple levels, including community-driven interventions, the need for longer term programming cycles (including planning of humanitarian aid) combined with short term flexibility, and the need for contingency financing arrangements to address potential disruptive pressures and shocks that could otherwise derail the achievement of longer-term strategic objectives. This should be taken into account in joint programming processes with Member States, which will be further encouraged".

• **The Joint Humanitarian-Development Framework (JHDF):**

The common international humanitarian-development agenda has long been referred to as Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD). Following the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit, and as part of the EU's new strategic approach to resilience, the Council, in its Conclusions on Operationalising the Humanitarian-Development Nexus of 19 May 2017, reinforced this commitment, by encouraging the Commission and EU Member States to take forward humanitarian and development work in a number of pilot countries (Sudan, Nigeria, Chad, Uganda, Myanmar, and Iraq), starting with joint analysis and leading, where possible, to joint planning and programming of humanitarian and development partners. While the process builds on a long history of attempts to bridge EU humanitarian aid and development cooperation, the pilot country exercise now also explicitly includes conflict prevention and peacebuilding, in a so-called 'triple nexus' approach whereby all relevant actors (humanitarian, development and peace actors) are asked to work together to address the root causes of vulnerability, fragility and conflict and build resilience.

Key steps/ components of the approach:

• A joint analysis between the key humanitarian and development actors, where possible led by the government of the host country.
• On the basis of the joint analysis, an action plan / recovery framework should be agreed (e.g. in the form of a Joint Humanitarian and Development Framework).
• The implementation should be implemented via coherent multi-year programming both for development and humanitarian actors according to their specific mandates aiming at strengthening self-reliance and resilience.

• **Joint Programming**

Joint Programming is one of the key aid effectiveness commitments of EU development partners – enshrined in the 2006 European Consensus for Development and strengthened by the new European Consensus in 2017, which puts joined-up EU and EU MS actions at the heart of the implementation of the EU development cooperation

efforts. This concept is further developed in the 2016 "Conclusions on Stepping up Joint Programming", which extend its scope towards incld fragile and conflict-affected contexts.

Joint Programming (JP) is a process which involves the establishment of a single[5] country analysis and response strategy for a partner country, aimed at providing the EU institutions and Member States with an overall and shared rationale and direction for their assistance.

It includes a 'joint analysis' of the country situation followed by a 'joint response' setting out how EU development partners will jointly support the partner country´s national development objectives and measure progress. Joint analysis and joint response together are hereinafter called 'joint strategy'.

The joint strategy is developed at the partner country level by EU institutions and Member States´ representations to ensure that it provides the best possible response to the partner country´s situation, by involving the partner country government and Parliament in the dialogue, and consulting key stakeholders such as civil society organisations and the private sector. Like-minded, non-EU development partners who share EU values and the principles of joint programming are also welcome to join the process.

The joint strategy, which should ideally (where possible/ feasible) be synchronised with the timing of the partner country's national development plan, sets out the overall rationale and direction, as well as some key joint objectives for EU and MS support. It also outlines which sectors/areas each of them will work in and gives provisional figures for their financing over the joint strategy period. It usually also includes a Joint Results Framework (JRF) so as to be able to measure progress against agreed, joint objectives or priorities. JP members may choose to either replace their own country strategies through the joint strategy, or to simply "endorse" it as a framing document for their own, bilateral country strategies.

Joint Programming, now implemented in 60+ countries, has already shown first, positive results, notably in terms of improving the EU´s visibility and ways of working together and speaking as one voice within the policy and political dialogue at country level.

In light of the 2016 Council's "Conclusions on Stepping up Joint Programming" aim to expand Joint Programming to fragile situations and conflict-affected countries, the JP model needs to be adapted to take account of the complexity of these particular contexts.

2.3 Approach for this Study

The objective of the study is to identify lessons learned and existing opportunities to strengthen the EU's Joint Programming processes in conflict-affected and fragile states. The degree to which Joint Programming is applied in such contexts varies widely. Each one reveals examples both of constraints and good practices, set against some unique characteristics. Furthermore, the challenge of developing Joint Programming is particularly significant in divided societies, and in the absence of country-owned development priorities and strategies. This means that there is no one model against which it would be possible to compare the evidence, and any assessment in this area requires a degree of professional judgment.

The analytical model applied is based on the four stages of Joint Programming and encompasses two dimensions relating to the state of governance:

- The primary elements of the Joint Programming approach can be divided into four stages: (1) situation assessment (joint analysis); (2) priority setting and resource allocation, division of labour and joint results (joint response): (3) joint strategy implementation; (joint policy dialogue/ joint implementation modalities) (4) monitoring & reporting, joint evaluation and joint review processes (annual reports and reviews…).

- The study has identified two important dimensions which determine the nature and scope of Joint Programming: on the one hand, the degree to which national institutions (and in particular the State) are able to play their role as regulator and holder of legitimate authority over the entire territory of the country; and, on the other hand, the presence and extent of organised violence, including extensive influence from organised crime.

The study has adopted a scenario-based approach for the selection of the evidence, designed to elicit certain typologies of responses. Case studies were selected on the basis of specific situations of fragility. Each case examines in some depth how and where Joint Programming is being applied, and then checks the evidence against other examples.

Country examples provided initially to the study team by the steering group were not based on any specific list, but were seen to contain some of the key challenges. For example the initial list included Burundi, Central African Republic, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Myanmar, Ukraine, and Yemen. The steering group subsequently also proposed the following additional options as country case studies: Cambodia, Ethiopia, Philippines, Somalia, Tunisia. It was agreed that the study should use purposeful sampling in its final selection.

On this basis, four broad scenarios have been identified for the study:

Scenario 1. Countries with strong States where a crisis leads to some loss of control in specific areas and some degree of open violent conflict.	Scenario 2. Countries which have for most of their recent history had a strong State, where an ongoing crisis does not lead to open violent conflict, but to sporadic violence and chronic vulnerability.
Scenario 3. Countries with non-functional central States, with considerable loss of control due to open conflict and continued fragility.	Scenario 4. Countries with less-functional central States, with some loss of control due to open conflict and chronic vulnerability.

It should be pointed out that situations of fragility and conflict are highly complex, and provide no watertight conceptual distinctions. What the study has used is simply a sampling tool to help cover as much ground as possible within the broad spectrum. It does not offer to categorise complexity.

This yielded the following selection:

- **Scenario 1:** Myanmar. While there are areas of the country which have been affected by conflict for decades, leading to significant international pressure, visitors still witness a significant degree of normality.
- **Scenario 2:** Burundi. This country is seeing sporadic but limited violent conflict and chronic vulnerability as the result of an ongoing crisis, by, however, maintaining a relatively strong central State structure (no loss of control).
- **Scenario 3:** Libya and Yemen. These are situations marked by either ongoing or very recent past high intensity conflict with significant loss of control (absence of government) and humanitarian implications affecting the whole territory. It poses particular foreign policy challenges, and an international involvement employing the UN and humanitarian assistance.
- **Scenario 4:** Central African Republic. This country has seen endemic violence and clear loss of control of part of its territory, while however retaining a more or less functional government at central level. It offers the particular characteristic of a country with very few resident Member State missions, and a long engagement in Joint Programming

The study calendar coincided with three unrelated visits to these countries by the study authors (the exception being Yemen), but it is important to note that there was no provision for country visits as such within the study, which had a small number of person-days. The evidence for the findings was drawn from documentation and in-depth interviews.

Beyond the four case studies, the study has drawn from a number of other countries which would fall within these scenarios: Haiti and to some extent Ukraine and Mali, plus other more marginal examples. The four case studies from which the study draws more heavily were approved through a consultation with the Reference Group, as stated in the Inception Report.

A key focus of the study was to look at the interlinkages between joint programming and the integrated approach. The complication for the study team was that very little evidence could be found in the case study countries about the implementation of the Integrated Approach as a concept and new policy. The approach was either not mentioned or not used in the case study countries, nor observed in the wider geographical space covered. Consequently it was agreed that the present study would be centred around the question of how to improve Joint Programming in fragile and conflict-affected settings, notably by adopting a more integrated approach.

The main evidence has been structured according to the study questions (written in italics at the top of each sub-section in the following pages), as set out in the ToR (in appendix) and approved by the reference group in the inception report. The evidence aims to lay the foundations for a common approach to conflict-sensitive Joint Programming in these particular contexts. Some 28 persons were consulted, and four group meetings were held. The study further included a mid-term presentation of preliminary findings at an EU Member States Joint Programming meeting in Brussels, in June 2018, the conclusions of which fed into the present, synthetic report.

3. Findings

3.1 Joint Programming and Integrated Approach

Resilience-centred Joint Programming as a tool for operationalizing the integrated approach

In highly sensitive and fast-moving contexts, political developments impact overwhelmingly the implementation of development cooperation. However, in the case study countries selected for the present study, there is little evidence to date about the systematic implementation of the "integrated approach". This seems to be due to an observed lack of understanding on the side of the respondents about how to operationalize the concept within their day-to-day work.

Nonetheless, EU Joint Programming has widely been recognised by respondents as a good opportunity for bringing together the spheres of politics and cooperation, as well as including other key actors (humanitarian, security), into common planning processes.

First steps have been taken in some countries to ensure that joint strategies are based on more integrated approaches: in Burundi and the Central African Republic, for example, Joint Programming (JP) strategic objectives selected by JP members have deliberately been centred around the broader notion of "resilience", in order to link both the more urgent humanitarian responses and medium-term development efforts.

In Burundi, some of the JP strategic objectives agreed upon by the EU (the Delegation and resident Member States) will

be implemented by drawing on lessons learnt from Member States´ experiences (for example Belgium, Netherlands, Switzerland) with the implementation of integrated, resilience-type approaches at community level. These link, for example, subsistence farming, rural development and local governance or participation.

Balancing political and operational priorities through an inclusive process

As seen in the case of Myanmar and Burundi, another step towards adopting a more integrated approach has been the higher and more regular participation of Heads of Mission and, as seen in Haiti, humanitarian staff or agencies (ECHO and Humanitarian Departments and Crisis Cells in the Member State Ministries) in EU Joint Programming processes.

The involvement of both the Heads of mission and Heads of Cooperation in the process has proven valuable in the context of the joint analysis exercise, and for easing the (in some cases still ongoing) joint response process. In Myanmar in 2010-2012, Joint Analysis was done through a process involving the many Member States operating in the country, on an equal footing, and leading to some division of labour.

However, in those cases where one side´s concerns are not being sufficiently heard and addressed, there is a risk that the process becomes either too politically-driven, or too centred around operational issues – both of which could hamper the ambition of moving towards an

Burundian men use new fish drying racks at Lake Tanganyika, improving livelihoods and nutrition.

integrated approach. In CAR, for example, the JP process has been limited to covering EU and Member States´ cooperation efforts and does not benefit from valuable political discussions taking place at other levels, for example in relation to the actions of non-EU permanent members of the Security Council. Conversely, in Burundi, the JP process has been very politically driven, with an important and generally positive participation from the HoMs side – however, essential operational concerns and constraints have, at times, been side-lined.

Ultimately, a careful balance needs to be sought between, on the one hand, the rightful objective of ensuring day-to-day programme implementation, and, on the other, adopting a joint vision aimed at providing a sense "of where we want to go, together"[6], based on shared values (peace and human rights for example).

More broadly speaking, ensuring a balanced participation by actors and representatives from all relevant spheres (e.g. peace and stabilisation, humanitarian, development) in Joint Programming, allowing for all views to be heard and reconciled, continues to be both essential for a more integrated approach, as well as challenging. For example, in Myanmar and Burundi, ECHO and other humanitarian actors in-country are, to date, not participating in the EU´s Joint Programming processes.

Linking JP to existing EU-MS LRRD initiatives

Some have argued[7] that linking Joint Programming to existing coordination around EU Emergency Trust Funds could help making the process more inclusive of humanitarian and peace actors. In the Central African Republic, for example, a draft Joint Programming strategy has been prepared over 2017-2018 to capture the EU Strategic Objectives and principal financial contributions. Prior to that, an EU Trust Fund had been established to build up resilience in the country. The Bêkou Fund is an important part of cooperation in the Central African Republic. Launched in July 2014, the Trust Fund brought together the European Union, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Switzerland, which allocated a total of €146 million to help the country emerge from the crisis and better support its reconstruction/development programmes with the humanitarian response (Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development - LRRD). At partner country level, the implementation of the fund´s activities is done in close consultation with humanitarian actors, and follows on directly where humanitarian projects left off.

However interlocutors have pointed to the difficulty of ensuring connections between Joint Programming and

the strategy of the Fund. For example, even though the Fund's contributions are reflected in the Joint Programming strategy, the Fund is managed by an annual Administrative Board and a Steering Committee which meet in Brussels, comprised of Brussels EU representations and chaired by the Regional Head of Unit. These have not made any links or provided references between Joint Programming and the Trust Fund.

Beyond some of the aforementioned assessment efforts, there are few measures taken by the EU and/or EU member states in the case study countries towards implementing the integrated approach. One exception being the "Sahel Alliance", which was established in 2017 by France, Germany and the EU, along with the World Bank, AfDB and UNDP, and recently joined by Spain, Italy and the UK. It is designed to complement the establishment of a new G5 Sahel military force and has a double objective of creating sustainable growth and lasting peace. However, it is currently still at its preliminary stages in most of its target countries (Burkina Faso, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Chad), which means that its value added with regard to other mechanisms such as EU Joint Programming is still incipient.

3.2 Joint risk and conflict analysis as a key starting point

The most significant point of convergence between Joint Programming and the Integrated Approach has been around enhanced risk assessment and context analysis. A number of conflict-affected and fragile countries (for example Burundi, Libya, Yemen) have chosen to start their JP process by undertaking a shared risk and conflict analysis, as a basis for the broader joint analysis. The increasing prevalence of foreign policy discussions in the ambit of the EU is contributing to these joint assessments.

For example a conflict sensitivity workshop concerning Libya was organised in Tunis by EEAS and the EU Delegation as a preparatory step towards a joint analysis in December 2015 (the joint analysis was not finalised). This was carried out with the participation of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, the United Nations Development Programme, and a number of Libyan and international experts. It allowed participants to reflect freely on lessons learnt from 2011-2014 and on ways to plan future EU cooperation taking into account conflict sensitivity. One of the key lessons learnt was that cooperation assistance in the past had been "left to technicians, whereas all engagement in such a crisis context is political and requires political understanding and a political steer"[8]. Hence, participants agreed on the need for continued analysis to understand the conflict context, the political economy and

A farmer collects arabica coffee beans at the plantation in Taizz, Yemen.

the key stakeholders, so as "to avoid risks that interventions inadvertently contribute to national fragmentation, and feed into violent competitive behaviour"[9].

Similarly, a European donor consultation on Joint Programming in Yemen was carried out on 8 November 2017, with a related mapping exercise. It recommended that European donors invest in establishing effective coordination in their priority sectors. There was a shared EU perception of the *"huge risks associated with not comprehensively and efficiently managing the transition from a humanitarian to a recovery, stabilisation and development approach"*[10]. It was suggested that this coordination should focus on addressing risks and priorities at a sector wide level related to the transition, most notably by *"ensuring that humanitarian investments are protected and transferred without aggravating conflict, ensuring shared messaging to the government and to international organisations on the intention to eventually phase out coordination based on the UN's humanitarian architecture in favour of coordination based on the Government of Yemen's own division of labour/ organisation"*[11].

In some cases (e.g. Libya and Yemen) this has immediately resulted in a closer collaboration between actors from the political, security, humanitarian, development and specific conflict prevention/stabilisation and peacebuilding, due to a shared interest in keeping each other informed about the latest developments in country.

In the Libya case, this had led to the establishment of a "conflict-sensitive assistance" group which has, according to the EU Delegation, for some time provided a valuable forum for jointly discussing how to integrate the conflict-sensitive approach into EU programmes in Libya. The joint work within this group has, according to some involved stakeholders, had an impact on the design and implementation of programmes – not least through the

systematization of peer reviews between donors on integrating conflict sensitivity into programme design.

In Myanmar political analysis conducted by Political Sections of the EU and Member States has provided a reactive framework for the Country Partner Group, for example influencing the policies of EU Member States on budget support, in some cases limiting it. It has determined, between 2010 and 2016, the shift from support to civil society and UN programmes and trust funds, to bilateral development and support to the security sector by some of the EU Member States (a policy opposed by others). At the same time, it has failed to create an EU-wide common analysis of these sectors, and a clear sectoral division of labour within cooperation.

However, opinions differ among donors on how well follow-up has been provided to the conclusions and guidelines which emerged from such joint assessment exercises. While some Member States claim that "little had happened" in terms of implementation since the conclusion of the first conflict sensitivity workshops in Libya, Central African Republic and Myanmar, others (such as the EU Delegations in Libya and Myanmar) highlight that real impact had been achieved in terms of mainstreaming conflict sensitivity within new EU / EU MS programmes on the ground.

According to the EU Delegation in Tunis, for example, an April 2016 Libya JP workshop was organized to follow-up to the December 2015 workshop, and monthly EU coordination meetings were subsequently organized for the same purpose with Tunis-based MS representatives. Conversely, some Member States deplore that these encounters were not taking place on a monthly, but rather a very irregular basis, and that they had not received any shared meeting minutes nor reports – which, in their view, meant that the process had somewhat been stalled since April 2016. According to the respondents, this problem

was related to a lack of staff availability at EU Delegation level. At the same time, they acknowledged the added value that such meetings could have for EU-Member State coordination - the good collaboration with ECHO and the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace around the topic of stabilisation was highlighted as a good practice example in that context.

In Central African Republic the analysis and conflict sensitivity and risks elaborated by the EU was deemed highly relevant to both the EU Member States and the way in which the EUD does its own programming. The latter however remains compartmentalised between humanitarian and recovery programmes on the one hand, and development, and political departments, on the other. There is also a considerable difference between the level of analysis done by the different Member States, not least due to the fact that only one Member State has a resident Ambassador. There was a UN-EU Conflict Analysis on Central African Republic in 2016 in Brussels which but it was reportedly not used for the joint programming process.

Some respondents pointed to the need of localizing joint risk and conflict sensitivity analysis by going to the priority area/ region and talking to local humanitarian actors, authorities, civil society – rather than centralizing the process at donor office or partner country capital level.

3.3 Impact of phases of conflict and State presence on Joint Programming

The study finds that defining in analytical terms the phase or the stage of a cycle of a particular conflict at a specific point in time is very difficult to do. While it is easy to do so in hindsight, none of the case studies would enable a clear prognosis of future evolution, and thus none are open to a statement concerning the phase of conflict. Even in cases where crisis prevention is recommended (for example as regards the Rakhine crisis in Myanmar in 2010-2016) the empirical reality is one of the emergence and expansion of one particular crisis among many others in ways that were not anticipated. The study has not pursued the 'stage of conflict' model as a significant frame of reference for JP as a foresight and planning instrument.

On the other hand, there are two other clear and related factors influencing the progress of Joint Programming within a particular country situation. This first is the degree of strength of the State as expressed by its ability to control its territory. The other is the footprint of EU presence, in other words the presence of Embassies and EU Delegations. This refers of course to the criteria used in the sampling of the case studies, and offers some important learning. The evolving nature of the state, in particular according to the four scenarios identified for the purpose of this report, is

at the root of the wide fluctuations witnessed with regard to the nature of Joint Programming, which are usually exacerbated by rapid international policy shifts on how to tackle the crisis.

Common obstacles to Joint Programming in crisis and fragile states

Table 2 highlights some of the key obstacles to Joint Programming identified for each case study country scenario, which are rooted in their crisis or fragility situation. Some of these are related to the intensity of a conflict, which in a way could be related to its 'phase'. Strikingly, despite their highly differing contexts, the key challenges are comparable across all countries (with the exception of Myanmar)namely:

- The absence or quasi-absence of a policy dialogue with the government
- A non-existing or poor quality national development plan.
- No or at least a reduced EU/Member State presence in country.
- Evacuation of at least part of EU/ Member State staff to different locations (neighbouring Partner Country or headquarters) which complicates the organisation of regular JP meetings and exchanges within the group.
- EU and Member States provide mainly humanitarian aid (more than 60% of overall EU/Member State assistance, according to OECD DAC figures as an average worldwide) to the country.
- Non-existing or only annual Member States country strategies and funding forecasts due to the volatility of the context.
- The majority of the EU´s (including Member State) implementing partners on the ground (according to the OECD DAC database) are multilaterals and civil society organisations. In the case of Yemen, for example, just over three fifths of EU donor programming in Yemen goes to international organisations and international NGOs. This is contrary to the EU´s usual preference of working with and through the governmental channels at country level.

Table 2: Key obstacles to Joint Programming

Obstacles to JP process	Scenario 1. Countries with strong govt where a crisis leads to some loss of control and open violent conflict. (Myanmar)	Scenario 2. Countries with strong govt –where crisis leads to sporadic violent conflict and chronic vulnerability. (Burundi)	Scenario 3. Countries with non-functional central government, with loss of control due to open conflict and continued fragility (Yemen, Libya)	Scenario 4. Countries with less-functional central government, with loss of control due to open conflict and continued fragility. (CAR)
Absence of dialogue or interlocutor at national level	x - moderately	x	x	
Absence or poor quality of implementation of a National Development Plan		x	x	x
No or reduced EU/MS presence in country			x	x
Evacuation of EU/ MS staff to different locations		x	x	x
EU+MS provide mainly human. Aid (60%+)			Yemen (2017)	x (2016)
Non-existing or only annual MS country strategies + funding		x	x	x (except FR-SCAC: bi-annual)
EU+MS main (60%+) or only implementing partners are Multilaterals + CSOs		x	x	x
Sudden shifts in country context has led to temporary stalling of JP process	x	x	x	x

In Haiti, the "greenhouse revolution" is improving harvest yields, increasing incomes, and countering environment degradation.

In this scenario Yemen and Libya would occupy one end of the spectrum, and Myanmar the other. However, it should be noted that Joint Programming is not very advanced in any of the cases to date. This points to the need to consider other factors, which may be independent from the country´s conflict cycle or the strength of central State, when looking at key obstacles to Joint Programming. It indicates the importance of other incentives and disincentives for engaging in the process.

Generally-speaking, EU and EU Member States' limitations can be both specific to the crisis context, as well as related to each development partner´s budget, regulatory and workload constraints.

The need for a light and overarching framework, using flexible terminology

The term "Joint Programming" is often deemed inappropriate in situations of conflict and fragility – instead, terminology such as "joint coordination", "joined-up approach" or "joint vision" are preferred to describe the processes that do clearly pertain to Joint Programming. The reason being that the term ´programming´ is usually associated with (often non-existing) multi-annual bilateral planning and budgeting processes, based on a (sometimes non-existing) dialogue with an (often non-functioning) government and which are aligned with (often non-existing/ poor quality) national development plans.

In Burundi, for example, the consensus reached between JP participants was to use the term 'joint vision'. This wording is seen by EU partners as more appropriate than 'joint programming' or ´joint strategy´, as it reflects best the group's tempered ambition to continue supporting Burundi's

resilience in the short-term, while keeping a "door open" for the possibility of a more dynamic trajectory after the 2020 elections. This "joint vision", once elaborated, could, if successful, be a lighter, non-binding document – based on a succinct/ synthesized core text, accompanied by more in-depth analysis "fiches" for each strategic objective. This is intended to be used by EU partners as an overarching framework for their development cooperation in country.

Generally-speaking, balancing the need for a structured Joint Programming process, including agreed results and accountability frameworks, against the need for flexibility in a context of fragility, and for leaving the door open for other actors to join (e.g. humanitarian, security etc), continues to be a challenge in all case study countries.

In CAR and in Myanmar there has been a reluctance to use a programming document as a framework for action in peace-building, humanitarian or early recovery. The views of respondents from different countries seem to generally align on the question of the preferred format for Joint programming, namely: a light and adaptable, overarching framework, serving the purpose of improved and reinforced coordination in areas where EU joint action can have an added value.

For example, according to the 2017 Evaluation on Joint Programming12, the JP process in Ethiopia and Palestine (both arguably fragile countries) led the EU and Member States to discuss country priorities no longer along the lines of sector priorities but along the lines of strategic, more overarching, groupings of sectors ('clusters' in Ethiopia, 'pillars' in Palestine). In these cases a limited number of sectors (3 to 5) were considered together because they shared similar concerns or contributed to

A woman works at a silk weaving factory in Mandalay, Myanmar, famous as a center of silk production for centuries.

the same objective or had other common features which made a common approach/consideration a sensible choice. This approach helped stakeholders from different sectors to work together, to consider their sector in a more strategic manner and to collaborate across administrative and institutional boundaries to address common overarching problems.

Start with what is feasible, to then move towards what is desirable

As addressing all core elements of joint programming (joint analysis, joint response, joint results framework, division of labour and joint financial forecasts) from the start is often challenging in fragile and crisis contexts, some countries may decide to initiate the process on the basis of what can been called the principle of concentric circles, by limiting the exercise, in its first phase, to what is considered feasible in the specific country context, for example:

- a joint risk and conflict analysis and/or a joint donor mapping;
- reinforcement of EU coordination in a limited number of sectors or areas;
- participation of a limited number of EU donors and, where appropriate, non-EU actors within a strengthened coordination;
- creation of joint humanitarian-development appeals, or funding mechanisms

For example, as a result of the 2015 and 2016 Joint Programming and conflict sensitivity workshops in Libya,

two working groups were created in Tunis, which focused on two topics of particular, shared interest among European donors, namely migration and local governance. The groups bring together actors from different fields (humanitarian, security, political, development).

Such focused approach comes with the objective of progressively extending the scope for 'joined up' action if the situation improves and leaving a door open for new participants among the Member States, and to other stakeholders willing and able to join the process.

When it comes to the JP principle of division of labour, many respondents agree that sector concentration often seems unrealistic due to shifting priorities in Member State capitals, and the sheer scale and immediacy of needs within JP members in some countries decided to focus more on effective division of labour within key sectors, rather than between sectors (particularly in Myanmar). Moreover, a better geographic division of labour and coverage was also seen as a priority – in some cases (Burundi), work in this area was initiated on the basis of the UN´s humanitarian response plans and related vulnerability maps.

Exemplary approaches taken to address common challenges

Table 3 goes beyond the ownership question by summarising some of the approaches taken by donors in the case study countries in order to address multiple identified challenges.

Table 3: Approaches taken by donors to address Joint Programming challenges

Obstacles to JP process	Approaches taken in case study countries to address these challenges
Absence of dialogue or interlocutor at national level	In some cases, the EU and Member States started joint programming as an exercise limited to EU development partners, without government involvement (in Burundi, to a lesser extent CAR). For political reasons, it was decided to produce an internal, confidential version of the strategy, complemented by a shortened, public version (e.g. Burundi.). In the absence of a national government counterpart, EU and EU MS missions in some countries decided to centre their work around strengthening local administration service delivery (Libya, CAR, Burundi) – if possible, by using local systems and plans – and avoiding action which could be seen as too political or as challenging the national administration.. In Libya, both the EU and MS coordinated their financing for various local governance projects, which adopted an integrated approach of focusing on 3 types of actors (local authorities, CSOs and Libyan Universities) in order to improve strategic planning and service delivery at local level despite the uncertainties at central level.
Absence or poor quality of National Development Plan	In some cases, sector policies and local development plans were used as a reference instead of the national development plan (Libya, Yemen, Burundi). The complexity can however be significant. In Myanmar there is a high commitment from international donors to support the Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan, which includes however some 250 individual plans with State priorities and is supported by 28 donor coordination groups. In CAR the existence of a limited donor-driven strategy for resilience and security does not serve well to underpin a comprehensive response to the more significant aspects of the crisis, in particular the political economy of the armed groups that control a large part of the territory.
No or reduced EU/MS presence in country	Some presence: Some countries decided to start with the donors present in country, while "leaving the door open" for others to join, when and where possible (for example in CAR). No presence: the EU has, in some countries, established coordination systems abroad to which in-country actors are regularly invited (e-g- in Libya).
Evacuation of EU/ MS staff to different locations	In some of the more extreme insecurity scenarios, the EU has set up regular JP meetings in strategic and, at times, rotating locations (case of Yemen) or by using conference call facilities.
EU+MS provide mainly humanitarian aid (60%+)	The Member States have in cases where humanitarian aid is predominant been able to link JP to existing humanitarian coordination mechanisms, in or outside the country, for example in Haiti.
Non-existing or only annual MS country strategies + funding	The perceived added value of EU Joint Programming (by some donors to Yemen and Libya) is seen in the potential for providing existing humanitarian-type coordination in country with a medium-term vision going beyond annual plans.
EU+MS are main or only implementing partners are Multilaterals + CSOs	JP at times provides an opportunity for bringing these implementers/ operators together to one table to ensure coherence, information-sharing, non-duplication and adopt common medium-term vision for a resilience or national reconciliation approach (this was done in case of Libya, for example). Using JP to establish and/or ensure the effective implementation of a Joint CSO roadmap by EU donors is also seen by some (Burundi, Yemen) as a means for achieving these goals.

3.4 Joint Programming financial forecasts and financial options within fragile settings

Forecasting remains challenging in volatile contexts

In some contexts it can also be difficult, if not impossible, to provide JP financial forecasts. In Burundi, for example, including even indicative financial forecasts in the "Joint Vision" document was deemed inappropriate, in light of the political situation and associated uncertainties with regard to the EU donors´ future funding and presence in country. Instead, a simple sector overview (excluding financial information) was preferred. What can - and cannot - be financed by EU partners within the current Burundian context of the application of Article 96, is precisely one of the key questions where the JP exercise could help in reaching an agreement/ harmonised position between EU partners – as well as in their relation to other development partners in country.

According to some respondents, multi-annual funding pledges made at international level could potentially be used as a very indicative source for JP financial forecasts.

Promoting new ways of financing in fragile settings may, however, be worth exploring within JP

In some settings there is, however, scope to include more innovative elements of financing, including the promotion of private sector investment in high risk areas, and the latter may be worth exploring in the context of JP.

There is, for example, an uneven presence of loan-making agencies (such as Agence Française de Développement) and a striking absence of the European Development Banks (such as Finnfund for example) in fragile contexts.

Small and medium-sized enterprises form a large part of European industry, but these companies often lack the necessary resources to make investments in difficult markets. It would be possible for an EU strategy to address political economy drivers by, for example, promoting private sector actors that could operate ethically in the affected zones.

Consequently, the possibility of promoting the collaboration of grant making bodies and banks which can support individual companies in the preparation and implementation of projects in fragile countries could be explored and discussed within the Joint Programming context.

3.5 Incentives/disincentives for Joint Programming / joined-up work

The widely recognized importance of coherent EU action in highly fragmented contexts

Most EU Members States and Delegation personnel recognise that reinforcing and improving coordination and the way of working together as an EU group is all the more important in contexts which are often marked by what is a very fragmented aid landscape: namely, the proliferation of mostly short-term, humanitarian interventions, accompanied by - in some cases[13]- a high number of relatively small-scale, pilot-type development and dialogue initiatives.

If Joint Programming is kept flexible with regard to its format and terminology, it can be a tool to that end. Developing a so-called "joined-up approach" was, for example, recognized by all partners in Yemen as a particularly important tool for increasing coordination and coherence among EU donors, even when based abroad. Since the start of the conflict, an increasing part of the EU's and EU Member States assistance to Yemen has been channelled away from large-scale government programmes towards smaller-scale, humanitarian or resilience-type initiatives implemented by multilateral organisations or CSOs (currently, over three fifths of EU and Member State programming in Yemen is channeled using this way) which creates a priority for more joint planning.

A wide array of differing incentives

Beyond the widely acknowledged need for coherent EU action, specific incentives for moving forward an EU Joint Programming process differ considerably according to EU donor and/or country context. For example, some member states in Yemen or Libya primarily see it as an opportunity for **better information-sharing** on the evolving situation on the ground, systematising joint needs and risk assessments, as well as conflict sensitivity analysis. In others, such as CAR, there is an impetus to see the EU go a step further to reinforce the Government and state structures.

Some of the respondents see JP simply as a way of **better coordinating already ongoing or new joint implementation initiatives**, for example around multilateral, CSO or EU pooled and trust funds. Others see it as a way of strengthening **joint positioning** around issues of particularly high political interest for EU and MS donors in country – e.g. creating a common understanding of how to interpret and work with the measures related to Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement in Burundi. Similarly, some respondents in Yemen highlighted that JP could help EU donors take a joint stand on issues where they have

common views not necessarily shared by other, non-European donors – for example with regard to adopting a so-called "Whole-of-Yemen" approach, providing assistance in a non-biased way to all regions of the country, regardless of who is controlling these regions.

In other cases the MS may see JP and assorted mechanisms as a way **of eliciting an increasing effort** from largely absent Member States. Last but not least, as flagged by several respondents in Libya and Yemen, the **limited implementation capacities** of the State often oblige EU donors to work with the same limited pool of implementing partners. Ensuring an effective dialogue and information-sharing between EU donors on their respective ways of working with these partners and on how to best complement each other´s support therefore appears all the more relevant in order to avoid duplication and increase the EU´s aid effectiveness.

Disincentives for Joint Programming

Sadly, there are just as many, if not more, disincentives for Joint Programming as there are incentives in such fragile contexts. The first one is **duplicating existing coordination mechanisms.** In Myanmar, for example, the EU Delegation and EU member states are members of the Country Partner Group forum, which is accompanied by more than a hundred sector working groups, including the Cooperation Policy Group and its several 'workstreams' (sub-groups), as well as Sector Coordination Groups. Within that, the EU group of Member States has to date struggled to define the added value of EU joint programming. Hence, attempts to draft a Joint Programming strategy have been abandoned in 2012, and not been replaced by common assessments.

Other disincentives which most commonly affect JP processes in fragile contexts are high workloads due to often limited numbers of staff (notably in partially evacuated, acute crisis countries, but also in less attractive, fragile country postings) leading to high workloads, as well as high staff turnover and the associated loss of institutional memory. There is also a sense within EU Delegations that Member States expect them to shoulder the burden of leading Joint Programming, without being given the necessary human resources for going beyond the day-to-day management of its own large and complex aid programmes.

The perceived, **additional workload** created by JP has been the most often quoted disincentive. Another perception is that excessive importance is given by JP processes to lengthy documents and unrealistic tasks, such as the synchronization of programming cycles across EU Member States - an idea which has been de-prioritised by EU headquarters levels, but which continues to be misperceived as a top JP priority at partner country level.

Other disincentives are more particularly linked to fragile and conflicted-affected settings. One can cite, for example, the perception that the **volatile, political context does not allow for medium-term planning** (voiced notably by Member States in Libya, Yemen and to some extent also Burundi). Moreover, **integrating security and peacebuilding** into the JP agenda may be a disincentive for some (for example in the case of Myanmar and of Libya), because initiatives in this sector are often strongly linked to donors´ bilateral political agendas.

Ukraine has initiated a national renewable energy development strategy, which aims to increase renewable energy capacity to 5GW by 2020.

3.6 Joint Humanitarian-Development Frameworks

Parallel humanitarian and development coordination processes

Coordination in the area of humanitarian aid in most case study countries (CAR, Yemen, Libya, Burundi) is often left to the lead of the UN through a humanitarian response plan, and only exceptionally done on the basis of (EU-co-lead) Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments (in Central African Republic). The UN Humanitarian Response Plans and Clusters bring different stakeholders together under shared objectives.

The EU has, however., in some cases taken on a particular role where a political dimension required a more coherent approach. The multiple conflicts affecting Myanmar, for example, have triggered humanitarian operations in a number of locations. Many of these have to deal with displacement in conditions where a relatively organised state response needs to be supplemented by the work of independent NGOs. This has led ECHO, in consultation with some of the EU Member States, to develop area based plans that integrate peace-building and resilience alongside the emergency response. These are called Profiles, and contain an analysis of the drivers of conflict, maps of the geographic distribution of contributions, and propose steps for the future against bilateral multi-annual facilities. They present a highly precise analysis which can be used directly by various programming processes.

In such contexts, the added value of EU Joint Programming as such has, at times, however been questioned, as existing humanitarian processes are seen by some as being more structured and more inclusive (open to multiple actors) than joint programming or other development processes.

On the other hand, even if the UN´s response plans often go beyond purely humanitarian concerns in order to also address resilience issues, a truly integrated approach, as highlighted by a number of respondents, is often not achieved in practice, due the short-term nature of the response plans, and to the high dependence on international NGOs. In CAR in particular there has been a two-tier effort to complement the highly reactive but short-term actions of humanitarian agencies with an EU resilience strategy integrated into JP. However, the implementation of this resilience strategy has, in the absence of a finalized JP strategy, to date mainly been assured through the actions of the Bêkou Fund.

Against this light, the added value of Joint Programming could specifically be seen in promoting a more medium-term approach an vision which could serve as a frame for joint resilience efforts.

In most cases, Joint Programming has however been conducted separately from ECHO's (admittedly very limited) teams in country, who often however also exclude themselves. Some respondents pointed to the institutional culture of ECHO itself being based on the premise of responding to crisis and not to medium-term planning of interventions which is the core of JP.

Nonetheless, as flagged by some participants, there are positive examples of collaboration between EUDs and ECHO that the JP process could build upon, notably in DRC (regular consultations between EUD and ECHO), Haiti (linking JP and JHDF) and Nepal (integration of the ECHO office within the EU Delegation following the 2015 earthquake).

The Humanitarian-Development Nexus: existing tools and lessons learnt

In most case study countries, existing tools, such as the Joint Humanitarian Development Framework (JHDF), have not been utilised due to a lack of knowledge and familiarity with the tool among EU donors at country level – possibly because it is, to date, promoted by EU officials as an "EU institutions" tool, rather than a joint EU-MS approach. Generally speaking, there are examples of good collaboration between EUDs and ECHO on the one hand – and ECHO and Member States Humanitarian agencies on the other – but using Joint Programming for bringing all these actors – i.e. EU and MS development as well as humanitarian actors - together to one table is not yet a very common practice in most countries.

A notable example of good practice is Haiti, where a continuous and fruitful collaboration was established between EUD and ECHO in the context of the EU Joint Programming process, which led to the elaboration of a Joint Humanitarian Development Framework, including the following components:

- Joint analysis of the main risks (probability against impact);
- Joint assessment of population groups or systems affected by these risks;
- Prioritization of these groups or systems;
- Problem tree (causal links by type of groups or systems and by context) and solutions; potential complementarities, duplications or inconsistencies;
- Resulting priorities;
- Road map on how to address them.

On the basis of this coordinated work and analysis and by

Rapid urbanisation and increases in middle class incomes in Uganda has fuelled growth in Kampala.

using JP as the framework process for regularly bringing all relevant actors together, a joint EU-ECHO response plan was developed by all partners, which, on various occasions, allowed for the rapid mobilisation of EDF reserve funds to tackle the humanitarian crisis, when disaster struck.

Another example of strengthened EU-MS humanitarian coordination is Myanmar, where ECHO has developed a Protracted Conflict and Forced Displacement Nexus strategy, in particular with France and Germany, for three affected States within the country. This includes a strong contextual analysis pointing to the peace and resilience aspects that are directly relevant to development programmes. It is also closely linked to the work of the UN Humanitarian Coordinator, and seeks to be innovative in integrating conflict sensitivity[14]. These efforts are, however, led by ECHO with some involvement from the development programmes of some of the Member States. It is not integrated into a broader policy on dealing with the crises affecting the country, nor is there an effort to bring EU Member States and EUD together to create a common position within the broader partner coordination mechanism, the Country Partner Group.

Other interesting attempts to promote the humanitarian-development nexus can be observed within wider development partner groups in certain countries which implemented a nexus approach. The study finds that these can be achieved while respecting the need for the neutrality, impartiality and independence of humanitarian action. This is based on the fact that Joint Programming, Nexus interventions, and Joint Humanitarian and Development Frameworks do not affect the delivery of assistance nor the mandates or the agencies, but provide objectives with a high degree of connectedness – in other words, the interventions reinforce each other without reducing the room for manoeuvre.

In the Malian context, for example, the implementation of the 'Nexus' approach began in 2017 following the recommendations of a high level mission. A donor Executive Cooperation Group has been mandated by the Post-Conflict Area Rehabilitation Commission to facilitate the implementation of the humanitarian-development Nexus.

While in Mali humanitarian needs persist or even increase in some areas, mainly due to insecurity, the humanitarian Nexus has not been limited to promoting a strict transition from humanitarian to development. The Nexus is understood as an optimisation of the effectiveness of available humanitarian and development resources, by ensuring continuity and even programmatic and operational coordination combining various options according to the specificity of the dynamics in each area concerned.

For example, it is considered a tool for the transfer of some basic social services from humanitarian actors to state services. Where it is recognised that the context is not conducive to ensuring a full transition, a form of contiguity and complementarity of humanitarian and development approaches is organized.

A Nexus Task Force in Mali has been dedicated exclusively to supervising and supporting the process mainly in the central and northern regions, where most humanitarian assistance is concentrated.

Despite such seemingly promising efforts the EU Delegation and ECHO reported in 2017 and 2018 that the lack of availability of actors and the lack of clarity in the Nexus approach, have not allowed for a sufficiently inclusive progress to initiate a constructive dialogue with national counterparts (ministries and technical services of the State). The influence of humanitarian and development assistance

strategies is limited to sectoral policies of Mali. Moreover, the lack of a common understanding of the Nexus' key stages and the multiplicity of actors involved constitute a major obstacle to the progress of this approach and its implementation.

3.7 Collective impact on the ground

Many of the existing JP strategies in fragile and conflict-affected countries address both the country´s short- and long-term needs. The JP strategic objectives when they are elaborated, tend to be tailored so as to address the immediate humanitarian or resilience needs of the population, while also adopting a longer-term vision towards democratic development (such as a joint vision in Burundi and informally in Myanmar).

The three strategic objectives selected by EU partners for their "joint vision" in Burundi, for example, are centred around strengthening the population´s both short and long-term resilience, in the wider sense of the term, as coined by the EU´s Global Strategy. In other words, the aim is to support the Burundians´ more immediate humanitarian and resilience needs in the short-term, while keeping the door open for a potentially more dynamic trajectory towards democratic development after the 2020 elections, notably by accompanying any potential opening up of democratic spaces both at the local and national levels.

Delivering a joint EU impact has to be assessed carefully, on a case-by-case basis, by identifying where there is validated perception that a result can be attributed to EU joint action. Due to the very recent launch of JP in all of the analyzed case study countries, assessing its impact in terms of outcomes was premature at the time of writing the present study.

Nonetheless, some preliminary, output-type results of early measures taken to initiate joint programming have been documented in the case study countries. For example, in the case of Libya, Joint Programming has led to the adoption of strong conflict sensitivity guidelines, as well agreed joint steps to implement these guidelines, thus helping the EU donor community to collectively abide by shared "Do-no-harm" principles and values.

In the context of the JP workshop in December 2015, the following Principles of conflict sensitivity were developed, for Libya:

- Assistance should be based on ongoing conflict analysis, and especially the analysis of conflict actors. How assistance will be perceived by those not benefiting should also be analysed.
- Assistance should be delivered in an inclusive and impartial way. That means it should be provided equally across all

geographical areas and across societal divisions.
- Assistance should strengthen the accountability of partners to their communities and constituencies.
- Assistance should strengthen the connection between state institutions and communities across the country by delivering tangible improvements. There needs to be a balance between assistance at the local level and assistance to the centre.

However, as noted by some respondents, trying to sustain such preliminary commitments over time within what is usually a very changing and volatile environment, marked by high staff turnover, continues to be a challenge.

According to the EU Delegation in Tunis, an April 2016 workshop was organized to follow-up to the December 2015 workshop, and monthly EU coordination meetings were subsequently organized for the same purpose with Tunis-based MS representatives. However, the perception about the regularity and impact of these encounters is mixed. Some Member States deplore that these encounters were not taking place on a monthly, but rather a very irregular basis, and that they had not received any shared meeting minutes nor reports – which, in their view, meant that the process had somewhat been stalled since April 2016. According to the respondents, this problem was related to a lack of staff availability at EU Delegation level. At the same time, they acknowledged the added value that such meetings could have for EU-Member State coordination - the good collaboration with ECHO and the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace around the topic of stabilisation was highlighted as a good practice example in that context.

Generally speaking, the EU´s collective ambitions need to be assessed against what can realistically be achieved, with a limited and constantly fluctuating pool of human resources, within the particular contexts of fragility and crisis. This may mean limiting the JP process, in its first phase, to measures of reinforced coordination in certain sectors or areas of shared interest (for example in Libya: Migration and local governance). It may also mean accepting formally that in some countries the process will from the start only include some Member States.

From a results point of view, the main achievements may, in the short- and medium-term, be limited to the creation or improvement of joint coordination and/or implementation mechanisms and the systematization of joint (including conflict and risk) analysis. While joint results frameworks agreed upon by the EU group may be centred around outputs, a few key outcomes can be included for the purpose of having a common vision for the country´s development in the long-run.

Fishermen unload the catch of the day from fishing boats in Al Hudaydah, Yemen.

4. Conclusions

One core, overall message is emerging from the findings under this study: In complex, fragile and conflict-affected settings, JP cannot be implemented as a standardized mechanism, merely focused on delivering a product (the joint strategy). It should be promoted as a flexible process, centred around joint conflict and risk analysis as an important starting point. If accompanied by a light and pragmatic joint response and results framework, JP can provide partners on the ground with a more strategic and coordinated, medium-term approach and vision, and thus help addressing fragmentation within contexts usually marked by short-term planning and action.

JP should further be seen as a tool for ensuring a more integrated approach at partner country level, by providing a gradually evolving, multi-actor platform where a growing array of partners should find their own incentives to participate, as part of a fragility and resilience-focused strategy

Main Findings

1. Joint Programming can be a tool for bridging and balancing political and operational priorities.

• JP enables various fields to come together.

• Balance between political and operational/programming priorities, both in MS and in EU remains a challenge.

• Some areas of cooperation remain less easy to include in Joint Programming, in particular security sector reform, development finance in the form of loans, and, in some cases, humanitarian assistance.

2. Key obstacles to Joint Programming are comparable across different conflict scenarios, but existing options to address them need to be tested within each context.

• Absence of government interlocutor or dialogue and national development plan

• No or reduced EU/MS presence in country.

• An aid landscape marked by fragmentation: high number of small-scale, short-term, humanitarian-type actions; multiple implementers.

• Mostly annual donor planning and strategies.

• Sudden shifts in government policy, or the emergence of unknown forces and dimensions, calling into question the early optimism of Joint Programming.

3. Joint Programming needs to be shaped to adequately respond to particular incentives and disincentives in fragile contexts.

Incentives (non-exhaustive list):

• Need for common understanding of context or crisis

• Application of joint conflict sensitivity standards

• Ensuring strong humanitarian coordination transforms into effective development coordination,

• Conducting joint monitoring and joint needs assessments

• Joint assessments of implementers to avoid duplication and better geographic coverage

• Setting the agenda for shared priorities,

• Speaking with 'one EU voice' particularly in priority sectors,

• Improve sharing of lessons learned especially in priority sectors and on cross-cutting issues.

Disincentives (non-exhaustive list):

• Staff workloads and high turnover

• Large formal planning processes lose importance in relation to decentralised and rapid response mechanisms.

• Dominance of national priorities in certain sensitive areas (e.g. security)

• Active encouragement by the host government of bilateral approaches

• Unequal presence of Member States means that other mechanisms may be preferred

Shape and Format of Joint Programming in these contexts:

• Full-fledged JP process is rarely feasible in fragile/conflict-affected countries – the terminology of "programming" is not conducive.

• Division of Labour: Sector concentration is not realistic due to scale and immediacy of needs within sectors.

• Results monitoring: Need for flexibility is valued over the need for structured results.

• Financial forecasts and synchronisation make little sense in the absence of multiannual donor strategies/plans and high likelihood of donor exits

4. Efforts to effectively integrate the principled approach to humanitarian assistance within Joint Programming are limited to date but could expand.

• Joint Humanitarian-Development framework (JHDF) under-utilised due to a lack of knowledge, and good examples joined-up EU and EU MS efforts for implementing a humanitarian-development nexus are scarce.

• Coordination of humanitarian efforts often led by UN (annual humanitarian response plans) but with little or no structured medium-term approach.

• Even where humanitarian needs are overwhelming, local CSOs & CBOs are asking for sustainable approaches that include long term resilience objectives.

5. Shared context, risk and conflict sensitivity analysis seen as a necessary and valuable component of Joint Programming, but systematic follow-up remains challenging.

• Shared context analysis (conflict but also resilience) in all its forms has a direct immediate impact on quality of Joint Programming.

• Conflict sensitivity is valued as a topic to be mainstreamed throughout programme implementation.

• JP processes in most case study countries (Burundi, Libya, Myanmar, Yemen, CAR) were either preceded by or started with a shared risk and conflict analysis, including the identification of different political scenarios.

• In some cases (e.g. Yemen, Libya), full-fledged conflict sensitivity guidelines were agreed upon, with follow-up to be ensured by specifically dedicated donor or multi-actor groups – but different views among donors about the effectiveness of actual follow-up.

5. Recommendations

Table 4 provides a list of key recommendations by encountered challenge in order to show options which have been applied in the case study country contexts and possible action to be taken at EU and Member States Headquarters´ level. The reasoning behind the table´s questions is: "What" obstacles can be observed in fragile countries? "How" can they be addressed? And "Who" can/should address them.

Table 4: Joint Programming recommendations for overcoming key challenges in fragile states

Key Challenges in fragile states	Joint Programming process recommendations		Joint Programming document format and content recommendations	
What?	How?	Who?	How?	Who?
Absence of dialogue or interlocutor at national level	**Progressively move from a closed partnership…** • Where needed, start the JP process without or only occasional government involvement, • … while however maintaining the principle of JP as an inclusive, multi-actor exercise: - As a first step, organize a multi-stakeholder conflict sensitivity workshop so as to identify key drivers and spoilers of change and agree on how to work with them. - Localize joint risk and conflict sensitivity analysis, as well as joint response exercises, by going to the priority area/ region and talking to local humanitarian actors, authorities, civil society – rather than centralizing process at donor office level. – - Consider the option of establishing a dedicated core donor and multi-stakeholder group on stabilisation, as a neutral force within a divided territory (example from Yemen). **…to an inclusive, country-owned process:** Allow for maximum flexibility of the JP process, so as to progressively work towards ownership at country level – starting with local authorities & line ministries, where possible.	EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, ECHO EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, ECHO, civil society, UN and EU peace-keeping missions. EU/MS External relations actors at HQ level; EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, ECHO EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, UN, ECHO, EU and UN peacekeeping missions	**Resilience and local development as JP focus:** Centre JP objectives around community resilience, by adopting a harmonized, conflict-sensitive approach on how to work with local administrations and civil society without undermining national unity. **Label as confidential, if crucial :** If needed for political reasons, produce an internal, confidential version of the strategy, complemented by a shortened, public version . JP cannot, however be a fully confidential process - it should be considered as temporary and limited to the most sensitive issues.	EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, upon consultation with UN, humanitarian and security actors, Civil society. EU/MS HoCs, HoMs, ECHO

Key Challenges in fragile states	Joint Programming process recommendations		Joint Programming document format and content recommendations	
What?	How?	Who?	How?	Who?
Absence or poor quality of National Development Plan	**Keep the process flexible and adaptable:** Allow for regular (annual/ bi-annual) reviews of the Joint Strategy document so as to be able to adapt it in case a national plan or results framework is still to be finalized.	EU/MS HQ	**Accept alternatives for aligning JP, by looking at: The subnational and/or sector level:** Align joint strategy to sector policies and local development plans, where possible/ applicable. AND/OR **Internationally shared commitments:** Use SDGs targets and indicators, and/ or UNDAF as an additional source for a light and flexible joint results framework including shared indicators.	EU/MS HoCs, HoMs
No or reduced EU/MS presence in country and/ or evacuation of EU/ MS staff to different locations. High staff workloads and turnover.	• **Some presence:** Start with present EU donors, by inviting others to join, when and where possible (Central African Republic) and considering the involvement of EU implementing agencies and EU and EU MS-funded Development Finance Institutions present on the ground. • Use existing donor coordination – e.g. around joint implementation initiatives (for example EU Trust Fund in Central African Republic) for JP discussions. And/ or: • Establish a rotating, JP Secretariat at country level or within evacuation location, with HR support co-financed by JP members, which will be responsible for coordinating the process (Mali). • **No presence:** Options used to coordinate from abroad: conference calls with occa-sional face-to-face meeting in evacuation countr(ies), joined by local actors, UN (Yemen, Libya).	EU/MS HoCs, HoMs in country. The above, plus EU Trust Fund Steering Committee. The above, plus, where appropriate implementing agencies/ EU funding operators. EU/MS HoCs, HoMs from evacuation location – if at HQ, involve geographic desks.	• **Make the Joint Strategy fit for handover:** notably joint considerations about the added value of JP in this complex, fragile setting should be clearly documented. Preparing a handover to national authorities from the outset has also proven effective. • So as to address **workload issues,** consider focusing JP on a few key sectors of special interest only (e.g. migration, local governance).	EU/MS HoCs, HoMs

Key Challenges in fragile states	Joint Programming process recommendations		Joint Programming document format and content recommendations	
What?	How?	Who?	How?	Who?
	• Allocate sufficient HR and financial resources for supporting innovative coordination methods in-country or abroad. • Integrate JP into new staff job descriptions and staff performance evaluations.	EU/MS HoCs, HoMs in country. EU/MS HQ EU/MS HQ		
A complex, political, security and aid landscape marked by fragmentation: Non-existing or only annual MS country strategies + funding; a high number of small-scale, short-term, humanitarian-type actions; multiple implementers.	**Assign new roles for a more integrated approach** • **Involve HQs in JP from the start:** Start JP with an inception mission where EU HQ representatives (geographic and thematic desks) are invited in order to raise awareness about the complexity of the context, by making them participate in multi-actor consultations about the added value of EU Joint Programming (e.g. approach taken in Mali). Early buy-in from HQ may be crucial for ensuring an integrated approach. • **Consider establishing a JP-specific EU/MS external relations committee at HQ level for ensuring a more integrated approach at that level.** • At country level, HoMs may need to be more involved than usual in the JP process, by taking on active roles in sectors where a political stand may be needed (e.g. Palestine: the Justice sector, where HoMs are leading the related donor coordination working group) or where links to the security, stabilisation and humanitarian sectors needs to be ensured. • Improve donor-internal relations between agencies/ units in charge of humanitarian aid and those in charge of development aid (e.g. EU Delegations and ECHO; EU Member State agencies and their embassies). To that end, the designation of a **"fragility / resilience focal point"** within country representations could be considered.	EU/MS HQ, HoMs, HoCs. EU/MS HQ : All external relations departments. EU/MS HoMs, political sections	• **Allow for flexible terminology:** "Joint Vision", "Joint Coordination" "Joint Approach" can be alternatives to "Joint Programming/ Strategy". • **Be ambitious, but balanced:** when selecting shared Joint Strategy objectives, a careful balance needs to be sought between, on the one hand, the ambition to adopt a joint vision based on common values and, and, on the other hand, taking into account donors´ operational limitations related to the conflict context (such as security and access issues, limited personnel and financial resources on the ground; divergent Member States political interests). • Consider using international, multi-annual pledges (where applicable) as a source for providing (very) indicative funding forecasts.	EU/MS HQ. EU/MS HoMs, HoCs.

Key Challenges in fragile states	Joint Programming process recommendations		Joint Programming document format and content recommendations	
What?	How?	Who?	How?	Who?
A complex, political, security and aid landscape marked by fragmentation: Non-existing or only annual MS country strategies + funding; a high number of small-scale, short-term, humanitarian-type actions; multiple implementers.	**… and use JP to be strategic and overcome fragmentation:** • Link JP to existing UN and NGO coordination mechanisms– the perceived added value of EU Joint Programming being that it can provide such coordination with a medium-term vision going beyond annual plans. • Use JP to regularly bring EU/MS main operators/ implementers together to one table to ensure coherence, information-sharing, non-duplication and adopt common medium-term vision for resilience. • Use JP to establish and ensure the effective implementation of a Joint CSO roadmap. • Link JP to ongoing or planned country processes under the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and State building, in the case of countries in the g7+ group of fragile countries • Use JP to strategically discuss how to work with (especially EU MS-funded) development finance institutions and make use of existing, more flexible EU instruments (such as EU Trust Funds, IcSP funding) for linking security, development, humanitarian, resilience and stabilisation work on the ground.			
Sudden shifts in government policy, or the emergence of unknown forces and dimensions, calling into question the early optimism of Joint Programming.	**Process over Product: Put more emphasis on joint analysis**, by making use of fragility-tested and piloted tools and approaches (e.g. the Joint Humanitarian-Development Framework) by opening them up (through JP) to the wider EU Member States group.	EU and MS HoMs and HoCs; EU and MS political sections; ECHO; humanitarian, stabiliza-tion, security, de-velopment actors and multilat-erals (UN, WB) and civil socie-ty. EU HQ.	**A conflict and risk-sensitive, light, pragmatic and reviewable JP document:** • Risks and assumptions to be included in results framework, as well as mitigation measures.	EU/ MS HoMs and HoCs, ECHO.

Key Challenges in fragile states	Joint Programming process recommendations		Joint Programming document format and content recommendations	
What?	How?	Who?	How?	Who?
	Issue guidance about such tools (for example Joint Humanitarian-Development Framework) and make it available to EU and Member States in partner countries. **Jointly prepare for shocks:** Conduct a light conflict and shared risk analysis, by analyzing political scenarios, risks, resilience opportunities, drivers and spoilers of change.	Same actors as above, for joint risk analysis.	• Keep the JP document short, pragmatic and flexible (Mali), by choosing a limited number of key results indicators and including possibility of annual or bi-annual reviews.	
Security concerns are hampering humanitarian and development programming and action.	**Peacekeeping actors as partners in working towards shared integrated approach and JP objectives.** • Foresee regular exchanges/ consultations with UN and/or EU (CSDP) peacekeeping missions to discuss how and where favorable security conditions need to be created to allow for humanitarian or development action (Mali). • Discuss also the risks of blending security humanitarian / development action to see how they can be addressed (Mali).	EU/MS HoCs, HoMs. Stablisation missions´ in-country representatives. Involve relevant EU/MS departments at HQ level if changes in mandates are needed.	• **Consider Security as a cross-cutting theme** to be mainstreamed within the JP sector analysis. • **Pilot approaches.** Include a list of possible joint actions in the JP document which could serve as exemplary pilot initiatives for the triple peace-humanitarian-development nexus, by using, for example, new mechanisms such as EU trust funds or linking to new approaches such as the Sahel alliance.	EU/MS HoCs and HoMS, with buy-in from HQs. EU/MS HoCs and HoMS, with buy-in from HQs.

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference
Study on Joint Programming in conflict-affected and fragile states: *lessons from the Comprehensive Approach and implications for implementation of the Integrated Approach to Conflicts and Crises*

Policy Context

Joint Programming of EU and Member States development cooperation instruments aims at enhanced coherence, efficiency and impact and is embedded in various EU policy documents. It is an element in the **2015 Joint Communication on the Comprehensive Approach to Conflicts and Crises**, which, as an organising principle, aims at joined-up EU instruments and resources, and shared responsibilities of the EU and Member States in order to attain the Lisbon Treaty's objective of consistency between the different areas of EU external action and between these and its other policies[15]. Promoting Joint Programming is a task under a subsequent Action Plan[16].

In its **May 2016 Conclusions on Stepping up Joint Programming**, the Council *"stresses the opportunity of expanding Joint Programming including in fragile situations and conflict-affected countries, as well as in prevention or post-conflict contexts. In this context, the Council recalls its conclusions on the EU's comprehensive approach, noting that the starting point of the comprehensive approach must be early, coordinated and shared analysis. This provides a strategic basis for conflict-sensitive EU programming. This also contributes to the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States"*[17]. The **June 2017 Joint Communication on "a Strategic Approach to Resilience in the EU's external action"**[18] commits the EU to making an assessment of risks, vulnerabilities and resilience factors a standard component of EU programming processes to better address fragility and the underlying causes of vulnerability and conflict.

Furthermore, the **June 2016 EU Global Strategy**[19] calls for a *"Joined-up Union"* and for *"the EU (to) adopt a joined-up approach to its humanitarian, development, migration, trade, investment, infrastructure, education, health and research policies, as well as improve horizontal coherence between the EU and its Member States"*. The Global Strategy also calls for enhanced efforts on Joint Programming and commits the EU to an **Integrated Approach to Conflicts and Crises** building on, and expanding further, the Comprehensive Approach. This is further developed in the **June 2017 Joint EEAS/Commission Working Document on the Ly**, shared with Member States. It applies a conflict sensitive approach, including through joint conflict analysis, and

strengthens the way the EU (including Member States) address the whole conflict 'cycle', across prevention, crisis management, conflict resolution, stabilisation, and investment in long term peacebuilding, using the full range of instruments at the Union's disposal. The document also highlights the relevance of strengthened information sharing, joint analysis, Joint Programming and joint implementation with and between Member States and other partners as key elements for increasing the EU's impact on the ground.

Council Conclusions on the Integrated Approach adopted in January 2018[20] similarly connect joint conflict analysis with Joint Programming. Recent developments include the development of an EU concept for an integrated approach to stabilisation.

Council Conclusions of May 2017 on operationalising the humanitarian-development nexus[21], including in situations of protracted crises and conflict, also emphasise the need for joint analysis and a coordinated programmatic approach between the EU and Member States. The Humanitarian Development nexus operationalisation in six pilot countries is further testing how working together with Member States can improve results. Joint Programming processes are launched, or are ongoing, in a range of conflict-affected countries and fragile contexts, including countries at risk of, or experiencing ongoing violent conflict, as well as stabilisation and longer-term peacebuilding. Under the Comprehensive Approach, more deliberate efforts were made to combine Joint Programming processes and the conflict prevention, stabilisation and peacebuilding agenda, through joint analysis and joint responses.

EEAS and the European Commission have adopted a joint approach to conflict analysis and jointly developed guidance on conflict sensitivity[22].

With the Integrated Approach now building on and expanding the scope of the Comprehensive Approach, it is a timely moment to draw lessons from emerging practice under the Comprehensive Approach and to consider how Joint Programming could be an even stronger aspect of the implementation of the Integrated Approach going forward. As a deliverable of the Comprehensive Approach Action Plan 2016-2017, the EEAS and the European Commission are launching a study that can feed into the implementation of the Integrated Approach.

Scope of review

The objective of the study is to identify lessons learned

and opportunities to strengthen Joint Programming processes[23] as part of wider efforts to increase the EU's efforts to address conflicts/crises and to support fragile countries through the Integrated Approach. This includes opportunities in different contexts across the conflict/crisis 'cycle' – in upstream early warning and prevention/preparedness settings; in crisis response and stabilisation settings; and longer-term peace-building and reconstruction efforts. A representative range of country cases will be examined, including Joint Programming in different conflict situations and cases where there is a conflict dimension but Joint Programming is not applied. Specific attention will be dedicated to the challenge of developing a joint response in the absence of a country-owned development strategy/priorities.

The study should answer the following questions drawing on country-based examples:

1. To what extent is Joint Programming connected with the Comprehensive/Integrated Approach of the EU (including Member States)? How is this operationalised, and what role does Joint Programming fulfil in the overall EU institutional framework of resilience, fragility and conflict-affected contexts?

2. How does the particular "phase of the conflict cycle", in which a fragile and/or conflict-affected country finds itself, impact and/or impede the progress of Joint Programming?[24]

3. Both in general terms and in case-study countries, what are the specificities and implications of such contexts for Joint Programming or for (any type of) joined-up work:

    i. Can you identify (types of) incentives/disincentives for Joint Programming / joined-up work? What are they?
    ii. What shape do Joint Programming processes take in these contexts (e.g. a full Joint Programming Strategy? or a light overarching framework of joint work? or a joint analysis, that includes enhanced information-sharing and coordination)?
    iii. When joint analysis is undertaken in the Joint Programming context, how and to what extent is conflict-sensitivity being incorporated /addressed?
    iv. How is the EU's principled approach to humanitarian assistance being integrated in/reconciled with Joint Programming processes? Are tools, such as Joint Humanitarian Development Frameworks, being used in support of/in synergy with Joint Programming processes?
    v. What are the challenges of undertaking Joint Programming in the absence of a country-owned development strategy/priorities and how they be addressed? What are the alternative options in the absence of engagement from the government of the partner country, bearing in mind the need to ensure country ownership?

    vi. How are immediate short-term and long-term needs in such countries reflected and addressed in Joint Programming documents or joint analysis?
    vii. To what extent are any risks induced by EU and Member States interventions identified and mitigated?

4. Is it possible to define a concept of conflict-sensitive Joint Programming?

    To what extent is Joint Programming, as a mechanism of delivering collective EU impact, relevant to conflict prevention, stabilisation and peacebuilding objectives? Does Joint Programming in these contexts support the connection between political, security, humanitarian, development and specific conflict prevention/stabilisation and peacebuilding actions and how does it bring them together?

The conclusions and recommendations of the study should draw from the country cases examined and placed within the global framework of 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals on the following:

1. How can Joint Programming support the implementation of the Integrated Approach with EU Member States, particularly in achieving greater EU impact on the ground in fragile and conflict-affected contexts?

2. How can early warning/conflict, security and political economy analysis, as well as conflict sensitivity, be embedded in Joint Programming processes to further support the EU concept on stabilisation and the operationalisation of the humanitarian-development nexus?

The conclusions/recommendations should be elaborated in the format of draft guidance for EU and Members States country level staff.

Examples to look at include Central African Republic, Libya, Burundi, Mali, Ukraine, Myanmar, Iraq and Yemen [additional cases also to be considered and final sample list to be agreed with consultants].

Methodology

The assignment is desk-based. Starting date should be 1st April 2018.

Phase 1: Literature review and preliminary assessment (estimated 10 days)

• Develop an in-depth understanding of the state of play of Joint Programming (including the upcoming Joint Programming Guidance), Comprehensive Approach (Communication, Council Conclusions and Action Plans),

Integrated Approach (Council Conclusions, PSC paper, internal documents, including new stabilisation concept), guidance note on conflict analysis and conflict sensitivity and the EU Global Strategy.

- Review existing literature on relevant country examples.
- Inception report of max. 12 pages, incl. work plan and approach, and structure of the main report. The inception report should also include preliminary hypotheses to be tested in phase 2.

Phase 2: Interviews with EEAS/DEVCO/NEAR, ECHO HQ, EU Delegations, Member States in capitals and in the field (estimated 12 days). Travel to and accommodation in Brussels may be required (up to two return tickets between location of origin and Brussels)

- Conduct interviews (phone and/or face-to-face) with above-mentioned contact points, including with Member States most active in fragile and conflict situations and on Joint Programming (3-4 Member States), and with selected EU representatives in most relevant countries (mentioned above).

Phase 3: Findings and recommendations drafting (estimated 8 days, including responding to comments on the draft report)

- Extract lessons learnt and best practices from both positive and less positive cases of Joint Programming
- Formulate recommendations in the form of guidance as outlined above.

Deliverables/outputs

The assignment will lead to a report answering the questions presented in the "scope of review" section and containing the following elements:

- Overall description of existing and potential synergies between Joint Programming and the Comprehensive Approach and the Integrated Approach.
- Detailed description of those links illustrated with country-based case studies.
- Methodological lessons learned by EU and MS in developing Joint Programming in fragile/crisis situation, including recommendations in the form of actionable points.
- Update the relevant chapter of the Joint Programming Guidance, including country case study boxes elements for a training module: how to draw on Joint Programming approaches in fragile and conflict-affected countries as part of a wider EU comprehensive/integrated approach and how to incorporate conflict sensitivity in Joint Programming processes. Inputs to be written for EU and MS and like-minded Joint Programming practitioners at country level.

Appendix 2: List of Persons Consulted

Name	Position	Organisation
Benfield, Andrew	Consultant	European Union Delegation, Myanmar
Benlloch Miranda, Alvaro	Desk Officer – EEAS - MENA — Moyen-Orient et Afrique du Nord	EEAS – Brussels
Bouteiller, Clément	Team Leader	Resilience and Fragility Unit B2, DEVCO
Brickenkamp, Sabine	Head of Development Cooperation	German Embassy Tripoli, currently based in Tunis.
Brouillet, Pascal	Représentant Résident	Agence Française de Développement, République Centrafricaine
Busto, Matteo	Trainee	PRISM Division: Prevention of Conflict, Rule of Law/Security Sector Reform, Integrated Approach, Stabilization and MediationEuropean External Action Service
Cantoni, Clementina	Head of ECHO	ECHO Myanmar
CUMPS, Annemie	International Aid/Cooperation Officer - Libya	DG NEAR – Brussels.
Curradi, Paolo	Chargé de Coopération	Délégation de l'Union Européenne en Centrafrique
Devaud, Philippe	Attaché de Coopération	Ambassade de France au Myanmar
Diop, Saffia	Policy Officer	Global 5 Development Cooperation Coordination, EEAS
Doyle, Michael	Mediation, Myanmar	PRISM Division: Prevention of Conflict, Rule of Law/Security Sector Reform, Integrated Approach, Stabilization and MediationEuropean External Action Service
Dupont, Patrick	Head of Political Section	EU Delegation Burundi
El Ghuff, Danuta	Programme Manager, Regional Development and Cooperation	EU Delegation to Yemen, currently based in Jordan

Name	Position	Organisation
Gravellini, Jean-Marc Gravellini, Jean-Marc	Head of Sahel Alliance Coordination Unit	AfD (HQ – Paris)
Graziotti, Piergiorgio	Attaché	EU Delegation to Libya – currently based in Tunis.
Heath, Timothy	Peace & Conflict Adviser	PRISM Division: Prevention of Conflict, Rule of Law/Security Sector Reform, Integrated Approach, Stabilization and MediationEuropean External Action Service
Hesse, Johann	Head of Cooperation	European Union Delegation, Myanmar
Kovacevic, Katarina	Consultant	Unit A2 - Development Financing Effectiveness, Relations with Member States, DEVCO, European Commission
Madsen, Anne-Marie	Peace & Conflict Adviser	PRISM Division: Prevention of Conflict, Rule of Law/Security Sector Reform, Integrated Approach, Stabilization and MediationEuropean External Action Service
Marazopoulos, Christos	Policy Officer Working Better Together	Unit A2 - Development Financing Effectiveness, Relations with Member States, DEVCO, European Commission
Patterson, Liz	Private Sector Development Adviser	UK Department for International Development (DFID) Myanmar
Piccagli, Mr. Augusto	Minister Counsellor	EU Delegation to Yemen, currently based in Jordan
Ramsey, Fiona	Team Leader Working Together Better	Unit A2 - Development Financing Effectiveness, Relations with Member States, DEVCO, European Commission
Scalorbi, Massimo	Head of Cooperation	EU Delegation Burundi
Spiess, Katarina	Head of Cooperation	German Embassy Myanmar
Stefanini, Davide	Coordonnateur Bêkou	Délégation de l'Union Européenne en Centrafrique
Vetter, S.E.M. Wolfram	Head of Delegation	EU Delegation Burundi
Wavrin, Hugo	Responsable géographique, Myanmar	Ministère des affaires étrangères, Paris
Wolfrum, Peter	Head of Cooperation for Yemen	Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (BMZ) – Berlin, Germany

Endnotes

1. EU institutions plus member states.

2. https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/policies/fragility-and-crisis-management_en

3. https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/policies/fragility-and-crisis- management_en

4. JOIN(2017)21, 7.6.2017.

5. EU institutions plus member states.

6. Quote from interview with a Head of Mission, held for the purpose of this study.

7. Member states interviewed during 2017 Joint Programming mission undertaken by the JP consultants´ team.

8. Conclusion from the report on the conflict analysis workshop in Tunis, December 2015.

9. Conclusion from the report on the conflict analysis workshop in Tunis, December 2015.

10. Source: Report on Mapping European Donor (the EU, EU Member States, Norway and Switzerland) Assistance to Yemen and, Results of a European Donor Consultation (of November 8th, 2017) on Programming to Yemen.

11. Source: Report on Mapping European Donor (the EU, EU Member States, Norway and Switzerland) Assistance to Yemen and, Results of a European Donor Consultation (of November 8th, 2017) on Programming to Yemen.

12. Arne Disch et al., 2017.

13. According to a mapping of EU assistance to Yemen in 2017, projects classified as developmental in nature constituted over half of all indivisual allocations (number of projects) to Yemen in 2017, but only a quarter of the overall financial budget.

14. Conflict sensitivity is designed as building development and humanitarian interventions which maximise their positive effects on peace, and minimise their negative effects.

15. Document JOIN(2013) 30 final; Council Conclusions: https:// www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/ EN/foraff/142552.pdf

16. The 2016-2017 Comprehensive Approach Action Plan, included a task to further establish lessons learned on Joint Programming and Comprehensive Approach synergies based on experiences in a number of countries.

17. http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-8831-2016- INIT/en/pdf

18. https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/ les/join_2017_21_f1_communication_from_commission_to_inst_en_v7_p1_916039.pdf

19. Joint Communication: https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/en/ global-strategy-foreign-and-security-policy-european-union

20. http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-5413-2018- INIT/en/pdf

21. http://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/24010/nexus-st09383en17.pdf

22. https://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/devco/eu- development-policy/resilience-fragility/Documents/Update%202017/Guidance%20note%20on%20the%20use%20of%20Con ict%20Analysis%20in%20suppor t%20of%20EU%20external%20action.pdf

23. For the purposes of this study, Joint Programming includes contexts where the JP approach is being applied even if it is not explicitly being labelled as Joint Programming for different reasons.

24. List to be provided by EEAS/Commission, incl. countries identified through the EU's conflict Early Warning System, fragile and conflict-affected states and in 'post-conflict', EU Humanitarian-Development Nexus pilot countries, SSR coordination matrix pilot cases, etc.

For more information contact:

EEAS JOINT PROGRAMMING:
joint-programming-support@eeas.europa.eu

DEVCO JOINT PROGRAMMING:
devco-joint-programming-support@ec.europa.eu

NEAR JOINT PROGRAMMING:
near-joint-programming@ec.europa.eu