

KOICA Briefing Paper

Triple Nexus of ‘Humanitarian-Development-Peace’ : Concept and Korea’s Strategic Positioning¹⁾

Su Jin Kim²⁾

Researcher

ODA Research & Information Center, KOICA

I . Introduction

The triple nexus of humanitarian–development–peace is fundamentally not a new concept to bring about systematic change through greater coherence. The initial root of this concept, based on the universal effort to address the many challenges that humanitarian activities face, such as the lack of humanitarian funding and its effective uses and political and systematic challenges, is difficult to be addressed within the emergent and short-term period only by humanitarian involvement. Against this backdrop, humanitarian and development activities have collectively struggled to find ways to reduce risks and vulnerabilities in humanitarian operations by focusing on the dual ‘nexus’ of humanitarian and development aid.

However, as protracted conflicts and crises are major drivers of the most pressing needs in humanitarian operations as well as significant constraints on achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (hereinafter referred to as ‘SDGs’) in fragile situations, ‘sustaining peace’ is considered as a third silo adding to the existing dual

1) This is the executive summary version and the full report is available at <http://lib.koica.go.kr>(written in Korean)

2) Email: sujinkim1020@koica.go.kr

nexus of humanitarian and development silos. Statistically, due to the increasing protracted conflicts and crises over the past ten years, the volume, cost and length of the provisions of humanitarian aid have increased drastically. Furthermore, for two years between 2015 and 2016, USD 71 billion as ODA was spent on UN peacekeeping and humanitarian crisis response. In contrast, the UN Peacebuilding Fund received 0.2% of that amount (USD 152 million) over a three-year period. This trend has given new urgency to long-standing discussions centered on better interlinkage between humanitarian and development efforts.

Furthermore, as the consequences of the protracted conflicts and crises mostly contribute to the increase in the number of refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (hereinafter referred to as 'IDPs'), the amount of expenses to cover the global refugee and IDP crisis response has also increased. For instance, the amount of foreign aid that member states of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) spend on dealing with the impact of the refugee crisis domestically has almost doubled over the past year and now accounts for 9% of all development expenditures. This should drive common action among actors of triple nexus towards sustainable solutions to break the cycle of adverse global trends that threaten the peace.

Against this backdrop, these universal efforts have contributed to the universal adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (hereinafter referred to as '2030 agenda') in 2015 and agreement among participants in the World Humanitarian Summit (hereinafter referred to as 'WHS'), held in 2016, to go beyond meeting basic human needs, and to focus on reducing risks, vulnerabilities and sustaining peace. It has been emphasized that this does not come at the expense of humanitarian principles, but rather enables the larger humanitarian community to contribute to the 2030 agenda's long-term sustainability goals, realizing a future in which no one is left behind. In other words, delivery of assistance does not need to change, but rather how it is done needs to undergo greater scrutiny through joint understanding and conflict analysis, particularly at the country level. For instance, the manner in which humanitarian assistance is provided to communities can

enhance the subsequent development impact. These universal efforts to foster the coherence of humanitarian and development operation contribute to overcome deeply entrenched silos that hinder the organization working in a collective, complementary and effective manner to sustainably improve the lives of people.

II. What is the Triple Nexus of Humanitarian-Development-Peace?

Although the nexus of each silo of humanitarian, development, and peace has been considered for many years even before the WHS was held in May 2016, it would be a more strict explanation that the discussion of the dual nexus of humanitarian aid and development was buoyed by the summit while the concept of the triple nexus adding a peace silo to the dual nexus was triggered in earnest by the world bank's involvement in the peace and development arena after the summit in December 2016, primarily focusing on dealing with forced refugees and IDPs.

Furthermore, this transition from a dual nexus into a triple nexus has been elaborated by some of the UN's other related efforts such as UN reform and adaptation of SDGs, Grand Bargain, New Way of Working (NWoW), Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP), which all suggest ways to work in humanitarian, development and peace realms together more 'cohesively.'

In order to understand what the triple nexus is and what actors are leading the discussions of this concept by elaborating this concept into the realms, it is necessary to look into the two big agreements officially launched during the WHS in 2016: New Way of Working (NWoW) and Grand Bargain. In brief, the concept of the New Way of Working (NWoW), which was made by the commitment of the main key multilateral organizations—UN and World Bank—, expects humanitarian, development, and peace actors to work together towards collective outcomes over

several years, based on their comparative advantages. The Grand Bargain, which is an agreement between more than 30 donors and humanitarian aid organizations including the UN and its agencies, is a package of ten reforms, clustered around work streams to make financing for humanitarian response more efficient and effective.

1. UN-WB's Effort towards Cohesive Triple Nexus: New Way of Working (NWoW)

The New Way of Working (hereinafter referred to as 'NWoW') is a method of working. This method aims to reduce needs, risk and vulnerabilities in line with the 2030 agenda by facilitating a diverse range of humanitarian, development, and – when appropriate– peace actors working together toward collective outcomes over multiple years based on their comparative advantages, which are the three key elements of the NWoW. In actuality, the concept of NWoW was originally focused on removing the 'unnecessary barriers' which hinder collaboration between humanitarian and development actors, which is also called the double nexus. In particular, in protracted situations, such as protracted conflict affected or fragile areas, humanitarian and development actors must work side-by-side, not 'hand-over' from humanitarian to development actors, and collaborate. Therefore, in cases that allow the framework to proceed without undermining humanitarian principles, the NWoW approach can set a path for contributing to the shared outcomes of reducing humanitarian need, risk and vulnerability through a range of well-aligned short-, medium- and long-term contributions by side-by-side collaboration between humanitarian and development actors.

However, since the WHS was held in 2016, peace has been considered as another new silo of the nexus. In particular, with the continuous trends of increasing protracted conflicts and crises, 2016 reached the highest record of the number of the violent conflicts in 30 years, which called for placing urgency on these conversations. Largely, for the past few decades, both the humanitarian and

development communities had avoided talking about and dealing with issues of violence due to concerns of securitizing the space. However, in the SDGs paradigm, the issue of peace cannot be neglected.

The world bank's commitment to scale up the size of financing for the peace and development arena, particularly focusing on forced refugees and IDPs as well as their countries of origin and host countries, played a role as a game-changer for transferring the dual nexus into the triple nexus including the peace silo. For example, the World Bank's two major funding instruments for refugees are the Global Concessional Financing Facility (GCFF) for middle-income countries hosting large refugee populations and the IDA18 Sub-Window for Refugees and Host Communities for low-income countries. For these, in December 2016, the World Bank committed to provide USD 75 billion to the International Development Association (hereinafter referred to as 'IDA'), which is the World Bank's fund for the poorest countries. Furthermore, the additional financing enabled the IDA to double the resources to address fragility, conflict and violence, which amounts to more than USD 14 billion, as well as the root causes of these risks before they escalate, and USD 2 billion in additional financing for refugees and their host communities. In line with the efforts of the World Bank, UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres called for 'sustaining peace' to be considered as 'the third leg of the triangle' of the nexus in his statement upon taking office in December 2016.

Therefore, against this backdrop in 2016, the UN and the World Bank created their joint working initiative called 'Humanitarian-Development-Peace Initiative (HDPI),' which aims to have the UN and the WB work together in the NWoW across the triple nexus in countries affected by fragility, conflict and violence. Furthermore, the UN and the WB are exploring tools to achieve collective outcomes across the humanitarian-development-peacebuilding nexus by supporting operationalization at the country level, driven by ground realities. Therefore, with the UN-WB's joint initiative, both organizations are rolling out HDPI activities in cooperation with national governments, including Yemen, Sudan, Somalia, Cameroon, Central African Republic and Liberia.

In addition, it should be noted that the NWoW is not a multilateral-only agenda. It means that the NWoW is a multi-stakeholder agenda that requires the active engagement of all stakeholders beyond the UN and the World Bank: national governments, local authorities, national and international NGOs, bilateral and multilateral partners, humanitarian actors, development practitioners and peacebuilders.

2. Donors-UN's Collaboration towards Cohesive Triple Nexus: Grand Bargain

The Grand Bargain is an agreement to address the humanitarian financing gap. More than 30 donors and humanitarian organizations agreed to change their existing working practices that would deliver billions of extra dollars over a span of five years for people in need of humanitarian aid. Furthermore, the Grand Bargain set a 2020 goal to allocate 25% of the humanitarian funding to local and national responders to ensure greater predictability and continuity in humanitarian responses.

Amongst ten packages of work stream, it is necessary to look into the 10th work stream, aiming to 'Enhance engagement between humanitarian and development actors.' This work stream highlights the importance of using existing resources and capabilities better to lessen humanitarian needs, including crises caused by forced displacement, over the long term with the view of contributing to the outcomes of the SDGs. Also, this work stream has synergies with other Grand Bargain work-streams, including the work streams on greater transparency, supporting and funding tools for local and national responders, improved joint and impartial needs assessments and increased collaborative humanitarian multi-year planning and funding.

Within the 10th work stream in the Grand Bargain considering the nexus of humanitarian and development actors, the UNDP and Demark as co-chairs, are making efforts to launch a knowledge-sharing platform consolidating best practices. Also, as the working group for the nexus, the 'IASC Humanitarian Financing Task

Team (TFTT)' and 'IASC Task Team on the Humanitarian–Development Nexus' were created under the Inter–Agency Standing Committee (IASC) in the UN system. Furthermore, the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) initiative of currently 42 donor countries is committed to advancing the coherence and effectiveness of donor action on the grounds through sharing practical experiences and recommendations.

Furthermore, in the follow–up to the WHS and NWoW commitments, it is imperative that the development and humanitarian actors seek cooperation for multi–year planning and financing, and diversify the funding tools. This is to better align humanitarian and development planning tools and interventions while simultaneously respecting the principles of both. Also, although the Grand Bargain is initially focused on how to improve the collaborated engagement of humanitarian and development actors, it also considers 'peace' issues following the universal commitments to ensuring the triple nexus of humanitarian, development and peace.

3. Key Issues & Challenges for Triple Nexus

Collective accountability and Conflict and Fragile Context

In order to implement the collective activities for the triple nexus, there are needs for common understanding and collective accountability between the HQ and intercountry office of the donor agency (intra–agency) as well as among a range of humanitarian, development and peacebuilding actors (inter–agency). As protracted conflicts and crises worsen, especially in the fragile and conflict setting, this reality calls for stronger strategic and concerted efforts to understand the complex relationships and dynamics among individuals, armed groups, politicians and security forces meshed into a complex network. Also, it is called upon for the HQ of the donor agency to make a comprehensive mind–shift towards not take mistakes including existing top–down restructuring efforts, roll–out missions and distribution of guidance notes. These mean that since the triple nexus activity can only be implemented through interconnection amongst diverse stakeholders from different areas using difference working languages and mandates, it cannot rely on one single

party, but requires collective efforts and the use of resources.

Also, it is required to take note that the international community cannot help countries exit the cycle of violence unless it changes its deeply entrenched habits of working in silos, which is incongruent with global policy commitments. Consequently, emphasis should be placed on the responsibilities of the top leadership of each organization and entity participating in the humanitarian, development or peacekeeping/building response to fulfil their roles as an integral part of the bigger picture, with professional integrity.

Collaboration with Local Capacities

Local capacities can serve as highly effective and efficient means for concurrently achieving humanitarian, development, peace and security goals. They can also enable a more demand-driven modus operandi, and reduce the duplication of efforts or misalignment with national priorities and needs. Actively involving local populations or IDPs/refugees and creating channels for them to contribute stabilization, peace and creation of livelihoods can be quite effective in helping attain the sustainable development goals. The risk of a relapse of conflict can be greatly reduced if the UN and the broader international community can anchor its actions more deeply in the communities in which they operate during and after their operational presence.

Needs to Change Funding Mechanism

Donors' projectized and risk-averse approach to funding was referenced as a direct obstacle to the triple nexus. The nexus emphasizes multi-year goals while many donors fund these programs and plan their budgets and disbursements on an annual basis. Existing funding mechanisms do not have an instrument for humanitarian-development initiatives as well as lead to the systematic mismatch between multi-year programming and annual earmarked shorter-term donor

funding. Without funding it is difficult to achieve collective outcomes.

However, the multi-year planning system requires greater risk-taking and management, foresight and smoother transitions from humanitarian to longer-term development programming. It was suggested that donors could enable joint analysis and evidence-based common outcomes by changing funding patterns to avoid earmarking project funds and increasingly move towards country-based multi-year pooled funding mechanisms. This would ensure a greater level of complementarity amongst the UN, INGOs and local actors, and spread risk across the participating agencies and organizations.

Capacity to speak Common Language at Interagency Level

Over time, the humanitarian, development and peace actors have shown deeply entrenched silos between these three different spheres. Against this backdrop, it is actually not easy to draw out the common understanding of problems, definition and terms between them. Furthermore, different languages across these spheres cause these actors to miss the holistic thinking beyond each silo of triple nexus, including an understanding that common outcomes require common country analysis to enable data and evidence-based programming. Therefore, it is imperative to make an effort to enhance the capacities of individuals to be fluid in the different languages in each sphere at an interagency level.

Furthermore, it is significant to note that work in the triple spheres of humanitarian, development, and peace is fluid and often interconnected, even in a fragile, protracted conflict or transition setting or where the development and peace components are missing. Therefore, more careful language and conceptualisation between triple spheres are necessary in particular in these contexts.

Alignment of Programmatic Plan

The multilateral planning and programming frameworks such as the UNDAF and

the HRP are provided for the humanitarian and development activities, however, they have not been systemically aligned with each other in countries. Furthermore, each framework includes activities, but there is little or no relationship between the plans. The distinction between humanitarian aid, peacebuilding and development is often artificially reinforced by separate analytical tools, planning exercises and funding mechanisms. For the triple nexus implementation, it is necessary to change structures that carry out any given program with a built-in foresight to plan how the next set of actors carry on that work in the long run.

Besides, when considering that donors cannot be free from pursuing the visibility of ODA when they implement projects, the projects that they select as strategically important are not necessarily conducive to addressing the needs of the most vulnerable as well as long-term sustaining peace and recovery goals of communities. These tendencies have often times come at the expense of more long-term and peacebuilding/dialogue-oriented programs. Therefore, it is appropriate for donors to pursue multi-year programs to ensure the sustainable transformation of conflict-ridden societies while they do not always make immediate or short-term results and concrete measurability as humanitarian or peacekeeping outputs do.

III. Triple Nexus and Korea's Strategic Positioning

The concepts of NWoW and Grand Bargain can be considered as the main approaches to implement triple nexus and ensure that no one is left behind in the achievement of the SDGs. Moreover, in the triple nexus discussion, the concept of peace is being extended from the existing 'peacekeeping' into 'peacebuilding' and 'sustaining peace.' These two long-term peace concepts are led by the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), of which Korea is a permanent representative of. Furthermore, Korea has pledged to contribute to SDG16 (peace, democracy and institution), primarily focusing on conflict prevention and

peacebuilding around the world. In this regard, it is expected for Korea to actively participate in international efforts, such as the NWoW approach and Grand Bargain, and find how Korea can take a leading position in the discussions about peacebuilding and sustaining peace, Korea's SDGs priority, and more elaborately interlink with humanitarian and development spheres.

In addition, after the historic inter-Korean Summit held in April 2018, the advent of a new era of peace on the Korean peninsula is expected since split over 70 years ago. Furthermore, in 2016, North Korea announced the "Democratic People's Republic of Korea (hereinafter referred to as 'DPRK') UN Strategic Framework 2017–2021" through a joint agreement with UN agencies and set four priority development goals within the SDGs framework. Therefore, under this amicable atmosphere, the international community starts to unfold discussions on how to provide assistance via the triple nexus. However, when considering existing way to support DPRK has been mainly conducted by humanitarian aid while achieving SDGs requires efforts in the development sphere, there is a significant gap between the SDGs universal standards, calling for its universal application in all countries, and DPRK's own country context. Thus further discussions are necessary on how to tailor SDGs universal standards into North Korea's specific country context.

At this point, Korea, which is in a situation of division with the DPRK, needs to lead the discussion regarding how to build 'sustaining peace' on the Korean peninsula by implementing the triple nexus. To this end, it needs to think about how to generate synergy effects between humanitarian and development spheres, and also connect these effects to peacebuilding on the Korean peninsula. It is also important to ensure that the denuclearization debate of the DPRK should be recognized separately from the implementation of the SDGs so that the development funding for the DPRK is not affected. In this situation, based on its experience and lessons learnt from ODA provision to transition countries and conflict–fragile states, Korea needs to play a leading role in the international community to realize sustaining peace on the peninsula as well as help the DPRK achieve the SDGs

through cooperation of humanitarian aid and development.

IV. KOICA's Triple Nexus Implementation and Peace ODA

Peace, in particular, is one of the SDGs five principles (5P) –Peace, Prosperity, People, Planet and Partnership– and is also a key component of SDG16. In line with this, KOICA has also set 'peace' as one of the three key principles for ODA implementation –Peace, Prosperity, and People– and is setting up a 'Peace ODA strategy,' which aims to align the principles of the SDGs into KOICA's specific contribution plan for building sustaining peace in the world. Additionally, KOICA endeavors to make the Peace ODA strategy a comprehensive strategy by incorporating the existing KOICA guidelines for 'humanitarian assistance and support for conflict–fragile states' together.

Since KOICA currently selects conflict prevention and support for refugees as a major target of the peace ODA, the scope of core partners for the peace ODA will need to be expanded to multilateral organizations and NGOs for humanitarian aid beyond the existing development NGOs and organizations. It is also necessary to expand the scope of NGO partners from domestic level to the local level in partner countries, because participation of local NGOs familiar with local circumstances is very important in situations where conflicts and crises are protracted or when the nexus–based approach is required.

In addition, in order to operate the triple nexus program in accordance with the NWoW approach, KOICA needs to gradually shift from annual and risk–averse approaches into a multi–year financing mechanism. KOICA also needs to deeply think about how this approach can be assisted to set goals regarding evidence–based common outcomes, resilience goals and localized solutions. To do this, in pursuit of transformative change in mindsets and behavioral habits, KOICA should take a step

back and link the policy design to the intercountry conditions and implications of the framework for ground operations.

Furthermore, to achieve a collective outcome via the triple nexus, it is also important to reduce the gap between different mandates, languages, and goals among actors of humanitarian aid, development and peace. As a result, KOICA needs to act as a major platform in the domestic level for discussing the triple nexus and NWoW approach by encouraging the engagement of humanitarian communities as well as strengthening its partnership with a diverse range of actors in the triple nexus.

In addition, the logic of the layered composition of the triple nexus might make sense in abstract policy discourses, but not in many country situations. Against this backdrop, elaborating the concept of the triple nexus is still ongoing, therefore, KOICA should continue to follow-up on related discussions. It is also necessary to enhance the capacity of experts within KOICA who can understand the triple nexus deeply and speak the different languages of each silo at the interagency level. It also needs to actively participate in related initiatives such as the NWoW or Grand Bargain and funding mechanisms for triple or dual nexus, and continuously determine what 'comparative advantage' the Korean government has in order to achieve the SDGs through global peacebuilding as the 'collective outcome.'

Lastly, all actors in the triple nexus of humanitarian, development and peace spheres should not stop the effort to find answers to how our mindset and capacities can be receptive to existing local capacities in any given country and the context we operate in. Therefore, KOICA also needs to keep this question in mind to help secure common outcomes favorable for the people, and sustained beyond our engagement and departure.

MEMO

Area for handwritten notes, consisting of multiple horizontal dashed lines.

연구자료

ODA연구 2018-09-161

※ This paper is also available at KOICA ODA Library Website (<http://lib.koica.go.kr>)

