

# ANNEX 3: TAKE-AWAYS FROM VALIDATION WORKSHOP

The validation workshop for the CSO evaluation held 11<sup>th</sup> January 2022, discussed enablers and barriers for HD and HDP approaches in SPA 2 (launched in December 2021), together with enablers and barriers for strengthening peace elements in SPA 2. The meeting also explored the link between resilience and nexus approaches and the potential for bringing nexus approaches into scenario planning.

Points from the discussions and notes from white board stickers are summarised below:

## Enablers and barriers for further development of nexus approaches in SPA 2 and for working more on peace elements (Questions 1 and 2):

*The organisations pointed to the following **enablers**:*

- Flexible multi-year funding is the trademark of SPA 2 (as it was in SPA 1).
- SPA funds can be mixed with other funding from MFA, which gives opportunities to broaden the perspectives and engagements. SPA funds can also be combined with other funding.
- Local leadership is in focus in the SPA, this promotes localisation and people centered approaches. Localisation enhances opportunities to work on peace ('peace writ little')
- HDP integration in portfolios is a priority in the dialogue between MFA and the organisations.
- Dialogue between embassies on political context and peace processes in fragile and conflict affected countries ('P writ large') and the peace work of CSO's at community level will result in coherence and joint advocacy and implementation of actions promoting peace. The enhanced dialogue will showcase local level peace efforts by CSOs at higher levels and inform peace processes.

*The organisations also expressed **concern and uncertainty**:*

- Work with caution in order to ensure that nexus does not become a "grand plan" and remains context specific and "a means to an end".
- Complexities and difficulties with regard to reporting on nexus results.
- The strong focus on fragile and conflict affected contexts and displacement contexts in SPA 2 may tilt focus away from crisis prevention in seemingly more stable contexts, i.e., focus on other nexus relations such as development-peace nexus.
- Peace should also be addressed as a theme in its own right and not only as a nexus element.
- Nexus approaches carry a risk, and caution should be taken not to transfer risks to local actors, who may be accused of not being impartial in emergency situations or interfering

politically in conflicts. This includes stay clear of stabilisation interventions and establish clarity of grey areas between peace and stabilisation.

- The organisational anchoring of nexus in MFA is unclear, the CSOs also look for a clearer position in MFA on CSOs peace related work.
- The guidelines for SPA 2 are not yet issued, and there are concerns that compliance requirements could hamper the further development of nexus approaches as well as localization.

#### **Potential links between scenario planning and nexus approaches (Question 3):**

- The potential link depends on the mandates of the individual organisations, their work methods and specific contexts they work in.
- The interface could be explored and possibly facilitate adaptiveness and quick disbursement of crisis modifier funds when humanitarian situations occur.

#### **Relation between resilience building and nexus approaches in programming (Question 4):**

- Resilience and HDP nexus are different. A nexus approach facilitates resilience building.

Questions 3 and 4 were not answered by two out of three groups due to time constraints.