



Federal Ministry
for Economic Cooperation
and Development

The humanitarian- development-peace nexus in practice

A literature review



Table of contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Abbreviations | 03 |
| Introduction | 04 |
| Exkurs: The HDP-nexus in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic | 06 |
| 1. Coordination | 07 |
| 2. Resilience, impact measurement and evaluation | 09 |
| 3. Programming | 11 |
| 4. Financing approaches..... | 16 |
| Implications for BMZ's transitional development assistance | 18 |
| References | 20 |

Abbreviations

| | |
|------------------|--|
| 3RP | Regional Refugee Resilience Plan |
| AA | German Federal Foreign Office |
| ALNAP | Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance |
| BMZ | German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| CIC | Center on International Cooperation |
| CGD | Center for Global Development |
| CHA | Centre for Humanitarian Action |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee |
| DCA | DanChurchAid |
| DFID | (Former) Department for International Development |
| DI | Development Initiatives |
| ECDPM | European Center for Development Policy Management |
| EU | European Union |
| EUTF | Emergency Trust Fund for Africa |
| ETTG | European Think Tank Groups |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| HDP-Nexus | Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus |
| HRP | Humanitarian Response Plan |
| IDP | Internally Displaced Person |
| IRC | International Rescue Committee |
| IASC | Inter-Agency Standing Committee |
| IDPS | International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding |
| LRRD | Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development |
| MSF | Médecins Sans Frontières |
| NGO | Non-governmental organisation |
| NRC | Norwegian Refugee Council |
| NWOW | New Way of Working |
| OCHA | United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs |
| OECD | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNHCR | United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees |
| UNICEF | United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund |
| UNSDG | United Nations Sustainable Development Goals |
| WFP | World Food Programme |

Introduction

The German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) published the Strategy on Transitional Development Assistance in July 2020 with the objective of improving the operationalisation of the humanitarian-development-peace nexus (HDP-nexus). This literature review works towards this goal by summarising relevant international experience of implementing the HDP-nexus. Based on the findings, BMZ will draw conclusions for the coordination, harmonised planning and joint implementation of projects in the area of transitional development assistance designed to strengthen resilience. The literature review contributes to the BMZ 2030 reform process, which has created a new partnership category – peace and nexus partnerships – as a way of improving the operationalisation of the HDP-nexus in the context of conflict and displacement. The literature review offers links to relevant BMZ instruments (such as the Special Initiative on Displacement and transitional development assistance) and to implementation partners in the design and implementation of the HDP-nexus.

The rapid increase in humanitarian crises and their growing complexity and duration, along with the rise in violent conflict, displacement, extreme natural events and epidemics indicates that those working in humanitarian assistance and development cooperation need a more integrated, efficient and sustainable way of working if they are to achieve **better impacts in crisis contexts**. Alleviating recurrent humanitarian need while also achieving long-term development objectives remains one of the greatest challenges (CHA 2020). Bringing together humanitarian assistance, development cooperation and peacebuilding, the humanitarian-development-peace nexus ('HDP-nexus' or 'triple nexus') closely links these three pillars with the aim of ensuring a more sustainable approach to poverty, violent conflict and the underlying multisectoral causes of crises (DuBois/CHA 2020). Efforts to strengthen coherence between these three pillars revolve around the goal of effectively reducing the **needs and risks** of people affected by crises, promoting the **prevention** of crises and strengthening the **resilience** of particularly vulnerable population groups and local structures.

The idea of better dovetailing humanitarian assistance and long-term development approaches is not new and is rooted in the ‘linking relief, rehabilitation and development’ (LRRD) approach, which in turn is based on a 1996 European Commission report of the same name. Unlike earlier initiatives, nexus dialogue goes beyond a programmatic or conceptual approach. The HDP-nexus relates to ongoing structural change in the coherent planning and financing of humanitarian assistance, development cooperation and peacebuilding (Oxfam 2019). Integration of the ‘peacebuilding’ pillar both at policy level and in the implementation of the HDP-nexus is a more recent development and demonstrates that engagement in countries with recurrent and long-standing crises requires a coordinated stakeholder approach. **Recommendations on the HDP-nexus** published in 2019 by the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) are crucial to work on the HDP-nexus. As a reaction to international demands for greater coherence at both policy and operational level, 11 principles were formulated to provide actors from humanitarian assistance, development cooperation and peacebuilding with a framework for coordination, programming and financing within the HDP-nexus. The principles are expressed in calls for harnessing synergies and for complementarity across these three pillars, particularly in fragile contexts and crisis contexts. The recommendations call for a way in which the financing and implementation of humanitarian assistance and development cooperation programmes reflect this objective (OECD 2019). They also target the achievement of the promise to ‘leave no one behind’ (LNOB) that was made when the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were adopted. With the objective of transforming long-term crises, the United Nations and the World Bank devised the **New Way of Working (NWoW)** agenda at the 2016 UN World Humanitarian Summit: actors in humanitarian assistance and development cooperation undertake to use their comparative advantages to adopt collective outcomes to reduce humanitarian needs, risks and vulnerability over a period of between three and five years (OCHA 2017).

This systematic literature review identifies and evaluates approaches that either contribute to or hinder the successful practical implementation of the HDP-nexus. Literature relevant to transitional development assistance was reviewed, with a focus on publications published after 2018. The experiences of Germany, the EU, non-European states and international organisations in implementing the HDP-nexus approach were analysed, including both **HDP-nexus pilot countries and projects involving the World Bank, UN and EU and specific country reports and evaluation reports**. The findings of the study emphasise the importance of close coordination (section 1), making strengthening resilience an objective of HDP-nexus implementation and ongoing learning from evaluation (section 2), context-specific programming (section 3), and flexible financing (section 4).

THE HDP-NEXUS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

The COVID-19 pandemic is creating unprecedented challenges for governments around the world. Particularly in fragile contexts, it can have a dramatic impact on living conditions. Tackling the virus requires global solidarity and international cooperation, creating not only challenges but also opportunities: The United Nations Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) sees the response of the donor community to the global COVID-19 crisis as a **potential to make long-term changes to international cooperation in line with the HDP-nexus** (IASC 2020). IASC (2020) therefore calls on the international community to implement the existing high-level recommendations made at the extraordinary G20 summit on COVID-19 held in March 2020, OECD/DAC, and by the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission, the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS), the Global Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP), and the UN SDGs. This would, for example, mean making financing of social security networks more flexible, **stepping up the sharing of information and coordinated planning between humanitarian assistance, development cooperation and peacebuilding actors, and focusing on conflict sensitivity** in all three areas.

There is virtually no information currently available on how the HDP-nexus was implemented as part of the COVID-19 response. However, previous health crises, such as the Ebola epidemic in West Africa between 2014 and 2016, demonstrated that immediate humanitarian needs cannot not be tackled separately from development cooperation and peace efforts. Instability amplifies the negative effects of the pandemic but also impedes efforts to mitigate the direct health impacts and to ‘build back’ after the crisis. Meanwhile, humanitarian assistance alone is not enough to offset the socio-economic impact on the living conditions of vulnerable population groups.

Development Initiatives (DI) is one of the organisations that are, therefore, calling for a holistic approach to the COVID-19 response in line with the HDP-nexus and close coordination between actors from humanitarian assistance, development cooperation and peacebuilding. Wherever possible, measures should be coordinated at country level and implemented in close collaboration with local partners. Close cooperation between actors in each dimension and nexus experts is essential during all phases of a crisis, the literature finds (CI 2020).

Since the start of the pandemic, BMZ has offered implementation partners in transitional development assistance a high degree of flexibility in taking responsibility for refocusing projects and adapting measures to the changed context. In Iraq, for example, four emergency hospitals were built, enabling COVID-19 patients to be treated promptly. The aim was to relieve pressure on health care services in the long term and to strengthen the health care system.

1. Coordination

The literature often refers to a **mismatch between the abstract nature of the concept of the HDP-nexus and its implementation in specific contexts** (see CARE 2018; DI 2019; FAO, NRC, UNDP 2019, ETTG 2020). To close this gap, the **scope and purpose of the HDP-nexus approach needs to be defined more specifically** and a shared understanding of the three pillars of the nexus developed. For example, it remains unclear to many actors how the different pillars of the nexus are defined, particularly the peace component (Oxfam 2019; Voice 2019). There is still no shared understanding of the extent to which humanitarian approaches should be linked with development cooperation and peacebuilding in practice (FAO, NRC, UNDP 2019).

It is also recommended that **political requirements** (e.g. for coherence) be translated into governing guidelines and **country-specific and/or regional strategies**. Existing instruments for implementing guidelines, including context analyses and programme design and coordination instruments, should be adapted and, where necessary, expanded or specified. One recommendation is to **create a nexus architecture**, particularly at country level, to reflect the absence of efficient coordination structures to enable actors from all pillars of the HDP-nexus (multilateral, bilateral and NGOs) to cooperate on an institutionalised footing (VOICE 2019). The challenge here is that those involved are generally reluctant to experiment with new process and planning levels (FAO, NRC, UNDP 2019). The literature also identifies a further challenge in **moving from joint analyses to (political) goals (collective outcomes) and indicators jointly defined by donor institutions and implementing organisations** (Center for Global Development, IRC, Mercy Corps 2019; DI 2019; ECDPM 2018; World Vision 2020). According to the authors, such a shift is urgently needed to secure more rigorous implementation of the HDP-nexus. Otherwise, there is a risk that different actors will continue to implement their own approaches in an uncoordinated way (World Vision 2020).

Strategic partnerships of actors from humanitarian assistance, development cooperation and peacebuilding are essential to secure successful implementation of the HDP-nexus (CGD, IRC, Mercy Corps 2019; ECDPM 2018; ECDPM 2019). Such cooperation arrangements can help actors with differing skills and experiences to avoid duplication in programming and, hence, inefficiency. Further, they can prevent the unintended exacerbation of tensions between communities. Challenges include the diverse normative frameworks adopted by institutions across the three pillars of the HDP-nexus: while development cooperation actors openly pursue political

In Ukraine, non-governmental organisations and UN agencies agreed on four collective outcomes in 2018 at the initiative of OCHA and as part of the HDP-nexus approach. Specifically, affected population groups should have access to adequate protection, high-quality and affordable basic services, and major civil structures and should be able to ensure their livelihoods. However, as the goals have not been officially ratified by the Government of Ukraine, they have had little influence on national framework planning (e.g. the UN partnership framework, the State Target Program and policy on IDPs) and were not reflected in the financing plans for the implementation of the HDP-nexus (NRC 2019).

The approach taken by the **Regional Refugee Resilience Plan (3RP)** reflects the approach adopted by the UN General Assembly to a comprehensive response in displacement contexts (the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework, or CRRF), which is part of the Global Compact on Refugees. In the context of the Regional Refugee Resilience Plan (3RP) to tackle the Syrian crisis, 270 partners from humanitarian assistance and development cooperation agreed on four strategic regional priorities under the joint leadership of **UNHCR and UNDP**. Support is, for example, to be given to host communities in Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey (3RP 2020).

goals, such as strengthening good governance, humanitarian assistance adopts the humanitarian principles of neutrality, impartiality and autonomy (ECDPM 2019). Project terms also vary, as do financing mechanisms (CGD, IRC, Mercy Corps 2019) and the capacity and willingness to implement the HDP-nexus. For example, non-political actors involved in humanitarian assistance may approach peacebuilding differently from state-mandated development cooperation actors (ECDPM 2018), while small non-governmental organisations have an entirely different budget from that available to major international aid organisations.

Implementation partners – and particularly partner organisations with a humanitarian aid or development cooperation mandate from more than one donor – are recommended to share knowledge and capacities and to ensure **cross-learning** over a number of areas as well as to promote **continuing training** for their staff (Oxfam 2019; DI 2019). These steps are intended to ensure that staff across the three pillars of the nexus can work together according to their respective expertise and the alignment of their organisation. Not every organisation needs to be active in all three pillars, and it is desirable that highly specialised experts are trained who share their knowledge and expertise with other organisations in cross-organisational teams to unlock synergies and achieve progress (Oxfam 2019, DI 2019). This applies particularly to cooperation in project regions in fragile states but also to head offices (Oxfam 2019, VOICE 2019, CARE 2018, DI 2019).

2. Resilience, impact measurement and evaluation

Both the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the former DFID in the United Kingdom emphasise the crucial importance of **approaches to resilience in implementing the HDP-nexus**. Development Initiatives notes, however, that donors and implementing institutions need to distinguish specifically between resilience per se and the HDP-nexus, so that the HDP-nexus is not perceived solely as the concept of resilience by another name (DI 2019).

In **Somalia**, for example, much greater use has so far been made of the concept of resilience than of the HDP-nexus, and this is reflected in the country's resilience programme as a **programmable framework**. According to ECDPM (2018), the concept is accepted equally by humanitarian and development policy actors, so the resilience approach should be used to ensure that actors in Somalia cooperate more across disciplines and sectors, regardless of whether they are working for humanitarian assistance, development cooperation or peacebuilding organisations. The literature stresses the importance of tackling the root causes of vulnerability, fragility and conflict as well as strengthening resilience and meeting humanitarian needs (OECD 2019). The programming of the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) is also geared to the concept of resilience and, in 2020/2021, is implementing the HDP-nexus through joint programming in Jordan (by FAO, WFP and UNDP), in Lebanon (by UNHCR and UNDP), and in Iraq, Jordan and Turkey (by UN Women and local partners) (3RP 2020).

The experience of the actors involved demonstrates that successful implementation of the HDP-nexus requires comprehensive knowledge of the context, a shared understanding of the issues and a shared vision. Joint **analyses and evaluations** are required to understand the context and need to take into account the full range of contextual factors, including local governance and power structures and power dynamics, and the risks, needs and resilience of the target groups (DI 2019; Oxfam 2019; World Vision 2020).

According to implementation partners, prioritising **holistically integrated context analyses** (including analysis of conflict, risk, gender and power) is crucial both as the basis for impact measurement and evaluation and for programming (CARE 2018; World Vision 2020). Such analyses should strengthen joint action while also ensuring that there is still space for individual and needs-oriented humanitarian assessment

(Oxfam 2019, World Vision 2020, DI 2019). Development Initiatives argues that successful interventions in risk contexts also require that analysis performed by different actors are coordinated in terms of their frequency and timing. In volatile contexts, where the situation changes rapidly and often unpredictably, the mostly longer analysis cycles of development projects need to be adapted to the shorter time-horizon of humanitarian projects (DI 2019). The Center on International Co-operation (CIC) meanwhile perceives significant challenges in organisations' limited willingness to share data. Concerns about data protection and about competition may, it argues, mean that important information is withheld rather than shared with other actors (CIC 2019). Efficient information management systems for recording and sharing information are, therefore, essential to successful implementation of the HDP-nexus according to Development Initiatives (DI 2019).

Practical lessons learned suggest that **interdisciplinary and ongoing learning** should be paramount particularly in evaluations to facilitate successful implementation of the nexus (DuBois/CHA 2020; DI 2019; World Vision 2020). One further challenge is to devise **indicators for resilience, peace and inclusion** that measure impact: to date actors have often found it difficult to define collective outcomes across multiple dimensions that are also detailed and realistic (DI 2019).

3. Programming

GENERAL APPROACHES

In practice, there is broad consensus that **bottom-up approaches** focusing on context-specific and local issues are most likely to enable the HDP-nexus to be implemented in a more targeted way (CARE 2018; CGD, IRC, Mercy Corps 2019; DI 2019; ECDPM 2018; FAO, NRC, UNDP 2019; World Vision 2020). **Localising the HDP-nexus and area-based approaches** are important to achieving cross-sectoral coordination and longer-term programming at local level (ECDPM 2018, CARE 2018). Consultation and coordination with local implementation partners are also considered important (CGD, IRC, Mercy Corps 2019; ECDPM 2019), **with participation** being cited as additional success factor. In cooperation with local civil society organisations and the private sector, the affected population groups should be involved in problem-solving, decision-making and the priority-setting of measures (e.g. World Vision 2020: Community-Based Programming Approach). CARE considers promotion of participation and local ownership to be crucial: target groups, particularly women and girls, should increasingly play a vital part in analysing and designing specific project measures (e.g. CARE 2018: Localization – Grounded in Bottom-Up Approach). World Vision notes that at country level, there are examples of thematic, sectoral and regional approaches that have the potential for scaling-up (World Vision 2020: DRC Rutshuru Area Rehabilitation Programme).

In South Sudan, local faith- and values-based groups are helping to tackle operational fragmentation between the three pillars of the HDP-nexus. They often provide humanitarian support during acute crises and are respected actors in mediation and long-term peacebuilding. Their orientation in this work is the needs of the affected communities (DCA 2019).

A distinction is made between **sequential programming** and **simultaneous programming** in implementing the HDP-nexus. Sequential programming is most common in disaster contexts and includes transitional financing. Simultaneous programming is relevant to both disaster and conflict contexts; it ensures that all three pillars of the HDP-nexus can be tackled simultaneously and in a complementary manner (DI 2019).

Oxfam emphasises that **transformation processes** take longer than (short) **project cycles**, especially in fragile contexts, and recommends switching gradually, and in line with the HDP-nexus, first to projects with a term of between three and five years and then to long-term projects with a term of between 10 and 15 years. This should be accompanied, Oxfam recommends, by a move from output-based programming to outcome-based programming – that is, from results to impact. This would enable long-term partnerships and local capacity to be developed beyond project-related results (Oxfam 2019). This transformation would also require a change of mindset in relation to financing instruments (see section 4).

Adaptive management, which enables rapid adaptation to change in context, is identified as a further success factor in flexible HDP-nexus programming. It should be integrated by implementation partners and donors so that reaction to rapidly changing situations and new information can be accelerated in fragile contexts (CARE 2018; DI 2019; Oxfam 2019; World Vision 2020). This, experts suggest, requires flexibility in activities, budgets, implementation plans and indicator measurement (see, for example, World Vision 2020).

In many EU pilot countries, **workshops** have already been held to bring relevant actors together to conduct joint context analyses. The objective is to improve the sharing of information between actors and to develop more integrated approaches. However, the potential of these workshops in terms of programming and results orientation has not yet been fully harnessed, according to ECDPM. The quality of these events needs improvement, and local actors should be more actively involved (ECDPM 2018; CARE 2018). Priorities need to be set on the basis of joint needs analyses formulated in these workshops, but a lack of agreement about the results participants wish to achieve and a lack of specialist knowledge among them are still common (ECDPM 2018 DI 2019). Participation by local and national actors is, according to CARE, particularly relevant in terms of setting priorities and making context-specific specialist expertise available (ECDPM 2018; CARE 2018).

LINKING HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

The international community already has many years of experience of combining humanitarian assistance with development cooperation. The LRRD approach serves as the basis for dovetailing humanitarian assistance and development cooperation. However, the sequential approach to programming is not in line with the aims of the HDP-nexus (CHA 2020). There is, moreover, little experience so far of linking all three nexus components. In the experience of implementation partners, the challenges to better linkage include the twin-track aid system, separate financing instruments, and different mandates and working cultures (CHA 2020; CARE 2018).

Some humanitarian actors also fear that focusing too much on the HDP-nexus will result in the weakening of humanitarian principles such as neutrality and impartiality (CHA 2020; Pedersen and MSF Analysis; Oxfam). Politicising humanitarian assistance – for example, through cooperation with governments – could, in their view, hamper or prevent access to individuals and project regions and put humanitarian personnel at risk. By contrast, Marc DuBois, former Executive Director of MSF-UK, argues in a discussion paper for the Centre for Humanitarian Action that the role of humanitarian assistance is not apolitical. DuBois contends that humanitarian actors should use the HDP-nexus concept to strengthen the value attached to, the understanding and operationalisation of humanitarian principles. In particular, he emphasises the principle of humanity, based on protecting human dignity, which is the central focus of development and peace work. He calls for implementation of this principle to be considered as the shared basis of the nexus (DuBois/CHA 2020).

Since 2014, **CARE Jordan** has been taking a new approach to linking humanitarian assistance and development cooperation. The new approach requires programming and organisational changes, which have an impact on job advertisements, local partnerships and donor contracts, among other things. At organisational level, some donors are enabling flexible bridging finance, for example by integrating emergency budgets. Teams are also sharing knowledge and learning from each other. An important element of implementing the HDP-nexus is improving economic living conditions by introducing savings groups and (micro-)loans at local community level in combination with activities to improve social cohesion (CARE 2018).

Oxfam (2019) notes that if humanitarian assistance is strengthened disproportionately in crisis contexts, local systems may not be strengthened adequately or sustainably in their ability to provide core social services independently and in the long term or to prepare themselves for tackling or preventing recurrent crises. Side-stepping existing systems and ignoring the systemic causes of conflict and vulnerability may, Oxfam argues, be counterproductive in the long term.

In a 2020 analysis, the Centre for Humanitarian Action (CHA) directly addresses the '**chapeau**' approach to the nexus taken by AA and BMZ. This approach allows joint financing of humanitarian and development project components with a shared objective and is designed to counter the long-standing criticism of the strict division of German financing (CHA 2020). In 2019, BMZ launched three nexus pilot projects in Somalia, Iraq and Lebanon with the help of the 'chapeau' approach.

INTEGRATING THE PEACE COMPONENT

So far there has been **little agreement between implementing organisations on the understanding and implementation of the peace component** of the HDP-nexus. Nor is there complete clarity about the impact that peace work can and should have on humanitarian assistance and development cooperation; this discussion is part of long-running debates (VOICE 2019; Oxfam 2019; DI 2019). For example, international NGOs (including World Vision) focus on integrating improved conflict sensitivity and strengthening social cohesion. The EU, by contrast, interprets 'peace' as comprising a range of factors, from early warning and mediation to security and stabilisation. There are also concerns, in particular among humanitarian organisations, that tackling the issues of peace processes could jeopardise independence, impartiality and access to vulnerable groups and put their staff at risk (Oxfam 2019). Oxfam argues that peace interventions could form part of a spectrum ranging from conflict sensitivity, improving local peace capacity, consolidating peace, peace processes and political diplomacy to ensuring peace through peacekeeping missions. This very diverse definition and the varied implementation of peace activities make it more difficult for non-governmental organisations to adopt joint positions and restrict opportunities to learn from each other in practice (CHA 2020). VOICE and Oxfam therefore recommend implementing the peace component of the HDP-nexus through a **bottom-up approach**. In this context, peace should be seen – and implemented – as a community-based approach that promotes 'positive peace', tackles the root causes of crisis, and targets the (re-)establishment of local systems; security policy issues should not be the focus (VOICE 2019; Oxfam 2019). In the German debate, the peace pillar of the nexus has a dual significance (Rural 21, 2019) and builds on the German Government's vision of positive and lasting peace, in which peace is a long-term and overarching goal in fragile contexts. The activities of peace actors should therefore,

the German Government argues, contribute to political processes of conflict resolution. The peace pillar also emphasises the need for a joint approach by all actors in the areas of diplomacy, peacebuilding, stabilisation and civil crisis prevention. Actors from humanitarian assistance, development cooperation and peacebuilding must, therefore, be involved in joint analyses and planning processes.

The **Durable Peace Programme (DPP)** in Myanmar, which is funded by the EU, is an example of how to integrate the peace component in the HDP-nexus. The DPP is a consortium of 27 international, national and local NGOs, ranging from local municipal development associations to global actors wishing to contribute to the peace process. The objective is to meet the humanitarian and development needs of communities within the peace process. Experience so far shows that a bottom-up approach and strong inclusion of and responsibility by local communities can be a positive influence on successful programming and change. Multi-year financing (seven years) is also advantageous because the longer-term engagement it enables builds trust and consensus locally. Programmes implemented by consortia have, in many cases, also enhanced key competencies, such as conflict sensitivity (Oxfam 2019).

4. Financing approaches

Implementation partners very often identify **substantial flexibility in the use of resources** as a success factor in HDP-nexus implementation (DI 2019; ECDPM 2018; ECDPM 2019; FAO, NRC, UNDP 2019; World Vision 2020). Implementation partners at country level can respond rapidly to changing contexts and risk profiles and experiment with new approaches only if they can make flexible use of resources as part of adaptive management (see section 3). One good example is a World Vision project in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Here, during a monitoring discussion, the target group expressed concerns about the risk of deforestation and other climate-related impacts. In response, World Vision was able to implement additional activities, such as improving the quality of seed and enhancing social cohesion, in order to counter potential tensions as a result of rising food prices and theft. These activities had not originally been planned, but ALNAP rated them highly due to their positive impact (World Vision 2020).

CARE Mozambique links humanitarian assistance and transitional assistance by involving disaster risk management activities in long-term programme activities and in the Early Childhood Education programme, to ensure a high level of flexibility in responses to shocks including natural phenomena, such as drought. Emergency instruments are integrated into existing development programmes.

Alongside more flexible financing, implementation partners also call for **improved planning ability** (VOICE 2019) **through longer-term financing pledges** (FAO, NRC, UNDP 2019; Oxfam 2019; World Vision 2020): upscaling and making successful nexus programmes sustainable requires longer-term investment. This is the conclusion of a study entitled ‘Financing the nexus. Gaps and opportunities from a field perspective’ (FAO, NRC, UNDP 2019), which is based on research in Cameroon, Congo and the Central African Republic between November 2018 and March 2019. For its part, the former DFID uses the **‘crisis modifier’** as an approach with a flexible budget component, enabling rapid and proactive response to crises as well as long-term development and greater resilience (DI 2020, CHA 2020).

Implementing organisations identify **pooled funds** as one approach to better finance HDP-nexus programmes at country level, by directly forwarding funds to national and local actors (Oxfam 2019). The EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa (EUTF) is a case study of successful pooling of financial resources, which guaranteed more rapid coordination and implementation locally (ECDPM 2018). As the EU's first multi-donor trust fund, meanwhile, the Békou Trust Fund successfully supports HDP-nexus approaches for the Central African Republic (USD 230 million over a five-year term) (NRC 2019a).

One **challenge** posed by new and flexible global financing approaches is that they offer little scope for consultation at country level or for robust context analysis.

Substantial earmarking in some cases and **vertical accountability** also pose the risk that programme decision-making is significantly influenced by priorities within implementation partners' head offices at the expense of possible bottom-up processes. In Cameroon, for example, concerns were expressed that EUTF's priorities might well be shifted to higher-ranking conflict situations, jeopardising the financing of existing programmes (FAO, NRC, UNDP 2019).

Implications for BMZ's transitional development assistance

This literature review summarises current knowledge on approaches that can help or hinder the successful implementation of the HDP-nexus. BMZ wishes to learn from these experiences and is drawing initial conclusions about the implications for managing and implementing transitional development assistance projects with the aim of strengthening resilience.

- **Transitional development assistance is an HDP-nexus instrument.** The literature survey confirms that, from a development cooperation perspective, transitional development assistance is an appropriate instrument for tackling the interface between humanitarian assistance, development cooperation and peacebuilding. Important approaches to successful HDP-nexus implementation are already firmly embedded in both strategy and practice, in setting goals for strengthening resilience, focusing on the local level and local partners, and reflecting a bottom-up approach and the 'leave no one behind' principle.
- **Resilience is the goal, and the HDP-nexus is an important way of achieving it.** Resilience is compatible with linking humanitarian assistance, development cooperation and peacebuilding. Strengthening resilience is the objective of transitional development assistance, while better linkage of actors and greater complementarity, coherence and cooperation is a crucial way of achieving that objective. The HDP-nexus sets out important principles for implementing measures in crisis regions.
- **The peace dimension is a key element.** The literature review emphasises the centrality of the peace pillar in the HDP-nexus. BMZ's response is to make this part of the framework for the BMZ 2030 reform process through the introduction of specific peace and nexus partnerships, the core area of peace and social cohesion as well as a new area of action – peaceful and inclusive coexistence – in its strategy for transitional development assistance. Thus, peacebuilding measures have become an important element of transitional development assistance. The contribution of transitional development assistance to the peace component lies in promoting peaceful and inclusive coexistence and social cohesion in line with its bottom-up principle.
- **Close coordination and regular exchange are essential.** Not all organisations need to work simultaneously in a humanitarian, development-oriented and peacebuilding way, but all should play to their comparative advantage. BMZ

supports implementation partners in transitional development assistance in tackling one or more dimensions of the HDP-nexus in line with their experience and mandate(s).

- **Facilitating risk-informed and context-specific programming.** BMZ is currently developing a pragmatic instrument for resilience analyses of individual projects and for portfolio development. The aim is to boost the mainstreaming of risk- and context-specific work in transitional development assistance. In future, analyses will be jointly developed and shared to a greater extent with a range of actors in Germany and on the ground.
- **Promoting work on collective outcomes.** BMZ is helping to formulate and implement collective outcomes at national and, where appropriate, regional level (e.g. in Syria's neighbour countries). Formulation of collective outcomes will take place on the ground, with local partners and over the medium to long term, to avoid 'the creation of parallel systems. What are known as 'nexus projects' also promote collective outcomes: the joint BMZ and AA nexus 'chapeau' approach offers German NGOs an opportunity to implement two projects in multiple HDP-nexus dimensions with a common objective (collective outcome). The joint commissioning of joint programmes enables UN organisations to work in a coordinated way and in line with their core competencies. Complementary commissioning enables coordinated intervention by bilateral and multilateral actors, designed to increase the impact of measures.
- **Learning through evaluation is also possible within the HDP-nexus.** Learning from a variety of approaches to operationalising the HDP-nexus (joint programming, the 'chapeau' approach, complementary commissioning) is also important. This requires critical consideration of both process and impacts. Shared learning can lead to valuable improvements in future nexus programming.
- **Flexible financing is conducive to rapid reaction and adaptation,** particularly in fragile contexts. BMZ's transitional development assistance and the Special Initiative on Displacement represent a high level of flexibility of which implementation partners should continue to make intensive use.

With the practical lessons learned and the implications derived from them for transitional development assistance, BMZ is taking a significant step towards better implementation of the HDP-nexus, which is now incorporated in its transitional development assistance strategy as a strategic priority. To support ongoing learning processes, the study offers specific linkages and a platform for specific issues related to implementation of the HDP-nexus. BMZ intends to make use of these learning experiences in designing the new peace and nexus partnerships category in the context of conflict and displacement as part of the BMZ 2030 reform process.

References

- CARE (2018).** Doing Nexus Differently: How can Humanitarian and Development Actors link or integrate humanitarian action, development, and peace?
- Center for Global Development, CGD, IRC, Mercy Corps (2019).** The Role of the World Bank in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations.
- Centre for Humanitarian Action, CHA (2020).** Triple Nexus to Go.
- Center on International Cooperation, CIC (2019).** The Triple Nexus in Practice: Toward a New Way of Working in Protracted and Repeated Crises.
- DanChurchAid, DCA (2019).** The Triple Nexus, Localization, and Local Faith Actors: The intersections between faith, humanitarian response, development, and peace.
- Development Initiatives, DI (2019).** Key Questions and Considerations for Donors at the triple nexus: lessons from UK and Sweden.
- Development Initiatives, DI (2020).** Looking at the coronavirus crisis through the nexus lens – what needs to be done.
- DuBois/CHA (2020).** The Triple Nexus – Threat or Opportunity for the Humanitarian Principles? Discussion Paper.
- ECDPM (2018).** All Together Now? EU Institutions and Member States' Cooperation in Fragile Situations and Protracted Crises.
- ECDPM (2019).** Think Local. Governance, Humanitarian Aid, Development and Peacebuilding in Somalia.
- European Think Tanks Group (ETTG) (2020).** EU humanitarian aid: Caught between nexus and independence.
- FAO, NRC, UNDP (2019).** Financing the Nexus. Gaps and Opportunities from a Field Perspective.
- IASC (2020).** Commitments into Action: A holistic and coherent response to COVID-19 across the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus.
- Norwegian Refugee Council, NRC (2019).** Ukraine Country Study.
- NRC (2019a).** Central African Republic Country Study.
- OCHA (2017).** The New Way of Working.
- OECD (2019).** DAC Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus.
- Oxfam (2019).** THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT-PEACE NEXUS. What does it mean for multi-mandated organizations?
- Pedersen, J. und MSF Analysis (2016).** The Nexus of Peacebuilding, Development and Humanitarianism in Conflict Affected Contexts: A Respect for Boundaries.
- Regional Refugee & Resilience Plan (3RP) (2020).** Regional Strategic Overview.
- Rural 21 (2019).** Closing the gap – The German perspective on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus.
- VOICE (2019).** NGO Perspectives on the EU's Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus.
- World Vision (2020).** Navigating the Nexus in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

PUBLISHED BY

Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation
and Development (BMZ)
Division 222 Crisis management, transitional development assistance,
reconstruction, infrastructure in crisis situations

BMZ OFFICES

BMZ Berlin
Stresemannstraße 94
10963 Berlin, Germany
T +49 (0)30 18 535-0
BMZ Bonn
Dahlmannstraße 4
53113 Bonn, Germany
T +49 (0)228 99 535-0

CONTACT

uebergangshilfe@bmz.bund.de
www.bmz.de

PHOTO CREDIT

© WFP / Melissa Bailey

LAYOUT

EYES-OPEN, Berlin

AS AT

05/2021