TOWARDS A FRAMEWORK OF ACTION FOR ILO ENGAGEMENT IN FRAGILE STATES

7-9 September 2015, Turin

Workshop report

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 7-9 September the ILO workshop "Towards a framework of action for ILO engagement in fragile states" was organized at the ITC ILO in Turin. The workshop brought together 30 colleagues from field, headquarters and ITC ILO, who jointly revisited the approaches and tools promoted by the ILO to create decent work in fragility and crisis situations and brainstormed on the building blocks of an office-wide, ILO-specific framework of action for ILO engagement in fragile states.

On the first day of the workshop, colleagues from the regions presented on-going ILO work in five different fragile contexts, together with the challenges encountered in promoting decent work in these settings. Colleagues from headquarters presented some of the issues and trends related to fragility at the global level and provided an overview of the work undertaken by the office to ensure an effective office-wide response.

The group work on day 1-2 centered on the following thematic leads:

1. ILO engagement in fragile contexts: where and when?
2. Enhancing constituents' capacity and social dialogue
3. Approaches and guidance for fragile context-specific responses
4. Forging partnership, mobilizing resources and the post 2015 debate
5. Office capacity and organizational arrangements
6. The flagship program on jobs for peace and resilience

The core messages that came out of the workshop are the following:

1. **Intervention principles:**
   a) We must be proactive in our response to fragile situations.
   b) We must prioritize our responses based on eligibility criteria and maximum value added.
   c) Preparedness is the key to effectiveness, including mapping the potential triggers and responses within each context.
   d) The ILO should be prepared for both immediate response and long term engagement (with modular programming), with one thing leading to the other.

2. **Working with constituents:**
   a) Social dialogue is key to reinforcing constituents' capacity and promoting ILO values.
   b) Building and consolidating social dialogue institutions and mechanisms requires a long-term strategy.
   c) Where possible, DWCPs should be entry points for building constituents' capacity.

3. **Context-specific responses and country ownership:**
   a) Approaches need to be demand-driven, based on consultation and needs assessments.

b) We need to work towards full national engagement through capacity building.

c) ILO responses to fragile situations should be led by country offices, facilitated by a task team. Where necessary (e.g. absence of ILO presence), the process can be led by the task team, supported by field structures, ROs, DWTs, administration, finance, etc.

4. Partnerships and the post 2015 debate:

a) The ILO remains a small player because we fail to communicate our value added and impact effectively to existing and potential partners, donors and constituents.

b) We need to forge an ILO specific response in the framework of the post 2015 agenda.

c) We need to be strategic on partnerships to ensure ILO values are being respected.

5. ILO capacity:

a) The ILO faces an increased demand to engage in fragile and disaster settings, while the organization's capacity to engage in these settings has decreased.

b) The absence of a coherent strategic framework and clear intervention model hampers the organization's ability to make effective use of existing partnerships and to forge new ones.

c) We need to develop a comprehensive capacity to anticipate fragility and build institutional capacity and agility to respond.

d) A global fragile response finance/task team with sufficient political backing needs to be put in place to facilitate rapid, coherent, effective and contextual specific response that can span action from the early onset to durable solutions.

6. The JPR Flagship Programme:

a) The Flagship Program on Jobs for Peace and Resilience needs a good coordination mechanism with the necessary authority.

b) The Flagship Program needs harmonization with a "one ILO" program model and a focus on core areas of intervention and special target groups.

c) The Flagship Program needs a holistic approach (micro-meso-macro) with flexible modular implementation strategies (people centered and context specific)

On day 3, participants presented the initial conclusions of the workshop to the DDG/FOP (through videoconference) and the senior advisor to the DDG/P, after which the below follow-up actions were identified:

1. Brief document on the need to streamline administrative procedures for ILO engagement in fragile contexts to be shared with the consultancy firm presently undertaking the ILO Business Process Review with an aim to embed necessary changes in the decisions that will be taken after this Business Process Review.

2. A strategic document outlining the creation of a task team facilitating the Organization's swift and multi-disciplinary responses to emergencies. This document should include necessary organizational arrangements, resource

mobilization and fragility response fund, capacity strengthening of ILO and its constituents, and also reviewing options for how the proposed task team interacts with the global technical teams.

3. Program development process for the Flagship Program Jobs for Peace and Resilience continues (to be facilitated by DEVINVEST).

4. Sharing of the outcomes of the workshop, the strategic document for the facilitation task team and the JPR program with the Global Management Team.

1. CONTEXT

The preamble of the **ILO constitution** "Universal and lasting peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice" shows the historical importance of the organization's role in the maintenance of peace. Since its foundation, the ILO has highlighted the role of socio-economic programmes and policies in peace building and recovery. The **Employment (Transition from War to Peace) Recommendation**, 1944 (No. 71) proposed a pioneering approach to promote peace and social justice in the aftermath of world war II through employment-based recovery and reconstruction. This approach continues to be highly pertinent in similar contexts although the majority of conflicts are now taking place within States.

Post-conflict, fragile and disaster-affected environments are characterized by instability, insecurity, poverty and inequality. Lack of employment opportunities and livelihoods, (youth) unemployment and underemployment, inequalities and lack of participation are mutually reinforcing and can be catalysts for conflict. Conflict, natural disasters and fragility aggravate poverty, unemployment and informality, creating a vicious circle leading to even greater fragility.

Decent work can be a critical factor in breaking this circle and can lay the foundations for the construction of stable communities. Consistent with the decent work approach, the ILO's action in situations of fragility addresses gender-specific security needs. Women are driving forces for post-conflict recovery and their inclusion in state-building activities provides the foundation for inclusive development strategies.

The international community recognizes the centrality of decent work for peace, security and social justice even in the most complex and fragile settings. The UN has acknowledged that employment creation is essential for political stability, reintegration, socio-economic progress and sustainable peace. Similarly, the **g7+ Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals** of the "New Deal" call for the establishment of "economic foundations" to generate employment and improve livelihoods, and for "revenues and services" to manage revenue and build capacity for accountable and fair service delivery.

The **Sustainable Development Goals** provide a new framework for ILO's engagement in fragile contexts. Particularly relevant are SDG 16 "Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels", SDG 8 "Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all" and SDG 10 "Reduce inequality within and among countries".

The **2014 GB Conclusions on ILO technical cooperation in fragile states** require the Office to develop a strategy for its work in fragile states aimed at:

(a) **enhancing the capacity of the ILO's tripartite constituents** to develop swift national responses and support social dialogue as a means of consolidating peace;

(b) **developing guidance for context-specific responses** that tackle poverty, inequality and exclusion through the promotion of decent work by giving special consideration to women, youth and children, as well as to displaced and disabled persons; and

(c) **bringing the ILO's approach, expertise and TC experience in fragile States to the post-2015 debate**, as well as to the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation.

To achieve these objectives the Office would:

(a) **Make the necessary organizational arrangements**, including by strengthening the Office's capacity to respond to emergencies swiftly and in a multi-disciplinary way. One initiative envisaged is the creation of a task team with the involvement of the ILO's headquarters, field structures as well as the International Training Centre in Turin, and including employer and worker specialists, to raise awareness; develop a strategy; coordinate ILO operations as well as timely inputs into joint UN emergency responses; and support resource mobilization efforts.

(b) **Mobilize voluntary contributions** (i.e. XBTC) to establish a fragile States fund in order to launch emergency response activities, participate in operations with UN system organizations and IFIs; and engage staff through temporary secondments to countries where ILO capacity is limited.

(c) **Establish strategic partnerships** to involve the social partners in promoting decent work in fragile States, with a wide range of organizations from the international development community including the g7+, knowledge institutions and the private sector, including through South–South and triangular cooperation.

In February 2015 the Director General announced the **Flagship Program on Jobs for Peace and Resilience**. The five ILO flagship programs are core deliverables of the ILO development cooperation strategy and shall be supportive of relevant elements of the evolving post 2015 agenda. The ILO Flagship Program on Jobs for Peace and Resilience will operate in situations where ILO approaches can be applied to contribute to peacebuilding and enhancing resilience. There will be a strong focus on youth as a primary target group and employment-intensive investment strategies, an area where the ILO has a long and well-recognized experience, will be a key intervention modality.

2. OBJECTIVES

The objective of the workshop was to revisit the approaches and tools promoted by the ILO to create decent work in fragility and crisis situations, to brainstorm on the building blocks of an office-wide, ILO-specific framework of action for ILO engagement in fragile states and to promote a community of practice. The expected overall outcome of the workshop was an emerging consensus on the analytical framework for ILO engagement in fragile states, whereas one of the expected immediate outcomes was a field-led

roadmap for the development of the programme outline of the Jobs for Peace and Resilience flagship initiative.

3. METHOLODOGY

On the first day of the workshop, colleagues from the regions presented on-going ILO work in five different fragile contexts, together with the challenges encountered in promoting decent work in these settings. Colleagues from headquarters presented some of the issues and trends related to fragility at the global level and provided an overview of the work undertaken by the office to ensure an effective office-wide response.

The group work on day 1-2 centered on the following thematic leads:
1.   ILO engagement in fragile contexts: where and when?
2.   Enhancing constituents' capacity and social dialogue
3.   Approaches and guidance for fragile context-specific responses
4.   Forging partnership, mobilizing resources and the post 2015 debate
5.   Office capacity and organizational arrangements
6.   The flagship program on jobs for peace and resilience

The workshop made use of a planning method applied in systemic project cycle management that allows to effectively integrate the knowledge of a group of persons into solutions. The six abovementioned thematic leads were discussed at the level of working groups, which met on a rotational basis, starting with a first round of three groups with five participants that each convened for about one hour – thus directly involving 15 participants into the debate. The other workshop participants followed the group work either in the role of reporters or in the role of critics. The critics from time to time provided feedback without otherwise directly intervening into the debate. In consecutive discussions capturing the other thematic threads the roles were changed, with observers and critics turning into discussants and vice versa. At the end of each consecutive round of discussions, the results were documented.

In the course of the process described above each discussion group met three times, in order to reflect on the additional insights won during previous debates and in different capacities, and to refine earlier statements of the working group based on this feedback. In a final session, the working group conclusions and core messages were fed back into a plenary discussion.

4. RESULTS OF THE GROUPWORK ON THE THEMATIC LEADS

THEMATIC LEAD 1: ILO ENGAGEMENT IN FRAGILE CONTEXTS: WHERE AND WHEN?

1.1) All fragile contexts are different, depending on whether the situation is caused by exogenous or endogenous factors. Different periods of fragility can be

distinguished (prevention and mitigation, preparedness, resilience, response, recovery). Until now, in what contexts and in what periods has ILO been engaged effectively?

The ILO has been both involved in endogenous and exogenous related fragility with more focus on post conflict and natural disaster settings.

The ILO has been directly involved in resilience, recovery and response.

The ILO has been involved (sometimes without "knowing it") in prevention and mitigation by promoting social dialogue, creating social pacts, promoting employment, social protection and international labour standards.

ILO involvement is sometimes driven by constituents' requests, sometimes by opportunities to generate resources, while in other instances it is more research-led.

The ILO is involved in countries whether or not there is a country office, but the presence of a country office or a specialist facilitates effectiveness and scale.

It is difficult to measure ILO effectiveness due to a lack of appropriate indicators.

1.2) What are the trends that make it necessary for the ILO to reconsider its engagement in certain types of contexts of fragility or in certain phases of the cyclicality?

- Climate change
- Ethnic/religious tensions
- Conflict migration
- Democratic pressure
- Rights at work
- Socio-political crisis
- Growing insecurity
- Social injustice and/or social unrest
- Violent extremism
- Weak governance and corruption
- Greater focus of ODA on fragile states

1.3) What should be the strategy for ILO effective engagement in different types and phases of fragility?

Interventions should focus on labor issues and should be based on the requests of constituents. Proposal should be based on consultation with the partners and an assessment of the situation and the needs.

HQ should take the lead on global analysis, while the Decent Work Teams should take the lead on regional analysis and intervention.

The ILO should be present both in stabilization, reintegration and transition.

In contexts where there is a need for stabilization, the focus should be on needs assessment (together with an assessment of costs), capacity building and building the capacity to intervene.

In contexts where there is a need for reintegration, the ILO should work with the UN system, focusing on the capacity building of the social partners

In contexts where there is a need to enhance preparedness, we need an all-encompassing tool, as well as capacity building for (project-based) staff on decent work promotion in fragile contexts.

We need to limit the number of countries in which we engage, for which we need to develop eligibility criteria, looking also at the share of the population affected.

THEMATIC LEAD 2: ENHANCING CONSTITUENTS' CAPACITY AND SOCIAL DIALOGUE

2.1) To what extent has the ILO been able to enhance the capacity of the tripartite constituents to develop national responses and support social dialogue as a means of consolidation peace? What have been the obstacles for the ILO doing this successfully?

The example of Algeria where the ILO stopped activities following the 2007 bomb in Algiers, shows that it can take a long time to rebuild trust.

The support provided to social dialogue in Tunisia was a positive experience that led to an ILO roadmap led by the constituents.

Some of the obstacles relate to the lack of capacity of the social partners, the existence of fake trade unions and the fact that our social partners are often excluded from the political dialogue.

There is a need to support social dialogue at the regional level. In countries with many different trade unions and employers organizations, it is necessary to strengthen cooperation between unions and organizations, and to advocate for genuine trade unions.

In many countries the membership of employers' organizations and trade unions is limited and the organizations do not represent sufficiently the informal economy.

There is a need to build the capacity of the social partners in order for them to engage meaningfully in project governance and in the design and implementation of the Decent Work Country Programs.

In many instances the resources are missing to tackle the lack of capacity amongst constituents and to get the expertise on the ground.

Emergency response is not a priority area for ILO engagement with constituents.

Training of constituents outside the country has limited impact.

2.2) What are the opportunities for working with the constituents and supporting social dialogue as a means of consolidation peace?

Situations of fragility offer significant potential entry points to build and strengthen social partnership systems/mechanisms.

Working with the constituents can support national recovery from fragility to long-term development.

Capacity building of the social partners is a central pillar of ILO engagement in fragile contexts. The principles of FPRW/ILS should be injected at the earliest possible stage.

Social dialogue is essential in building peace and social justice for all as it creates entry points for social partnerships.

ILO can build the capacity of constituents to participate meaningfully in national dialogue to address fragility and build peace.

The existence of strong social partners is a cornerstone of the foundation for peace and social justice. Social dialogue is cement for the building blocks for peace, for building real socio-economic responses and for decent work.

Social dialogue can address social divisions that contribute to fragility.

There is an opportunity in working to empower the social partners and governments in identifying and prioritizing strategic entry points for economic growth, decent work, social development and the transition from fragility/emergency to development.

We have to give more thought to the (potential) role of the DWCPs. Whether we should work bottom up or top down depends on the context. Fragility can provide early entry point to the DWCP process.

Fragility can enhance resource mobilization opportunities but we need to ensure the support of the social partners and be innovative and strategic in leveraging entry points for social dialogue.

The ILO response to fragility should be informed where possible/feasible by social partners.

We need to look into other mechanisms for capacity building of constituents beyond training.

2.3) What should be the ILO strategy for working with the constituents and supporting social dialogue as a means of consolidating peace?

Where possible we need to use the DWCPs as entry points for building the capacity of constituents.

It is important to facilitate the emergence of constituents where they do not exist and improve their representativeness.

We need to use social dialogue to bridge social/ethnic/religious divides.

We need to build institutions and mechanisms of social dialogue where they don't exist and consolidate weak existing institutions.

We need to strengthen social dialogue as a mechanism in fragile states to:

- reinforce constituents' organizations (sustainability)
- promote ILO values
- reinforce the participation of constituents in social and political dialogue
- build confidence
- reinforce ownership

There is a need to train representatives of the constituents on fragile states issues and share experiences (Turin Center?)

The ILO needs to partner with the relevant worker's and employer's organizations at the global and regional level and in developed countries to develop social dialogue and enhance capacities.

It is necessary to complete an analysis of the situation of constituents' organizations and design a plan to create/reinforce their capacity.

In working with the constituents we need to maintain a focus on vulnerable groups.

THEMATIC LEAD 3: APPROACHES AND GUIDANCE FOR FRAGILE CONTEXT-SPECIFIC RESPONSES

3.1) What have been the main ILO approaches and guidance for responses in contexts of crisis, conflict and fragility?

Interventions are and need to be demand-driven, based on national ownership. They need to be context-specific, based on risk and needs assessments.

ILO interventions in fragile contexts need to have a holistic and rights-based approach to decent work.

There is a need to prepare a list of technical approaches used by the ILO in fragile contexts.

The ILO needs to be prepared both for immediate response (from day 1) as well as for long-term engagement, which requires different approaches.

We need to work through partners, building capacities and ensuring complementarity, with an institutional approach and a focus on sustainability.

Coordination is key: One UN, One ILO.

There is a need to strengthen our capacity to predict and forecast in order to have a meaningful role in prevention.

The Recommendation and other relevant standards provide guidance for ILO engagement.

3.2) What are the trends that would require an adoption of ILO approaches and guidance for responses?

At a conceptual level, the trends are:

- terrorism
- climate change, increase of frequency and intensity of natural hazards
- increase of instability (outside of non-conflict zones) in MENA, Sub-Saharan Africa, Eastern Europe (CIS)
- refugee and internally displaced people crisis
- weaker state legitimacy
- risk of the use of the "right of interference" (droit d'ingérence) by strong players where geo-political interests merge
- stronger ethnic/religious identities
- targeting of humanitarian workers

At an operational, the trends are:

- increased recognition of the role of livelihoods in fragile and disaster settings, but also more international organizations and NGOs entering this sphere (UNDP, IOM, UNICEF, WFP, UNHCR, UNFPA, UN HABITAT, FAO, UN WOMEN)
- increased donor focus on fragile states (with increased focus on livelihoods)
- increased government capacity (Asia)
- increased role of the military in development (with sometimes blurred lines and a risk of the UN being a target, but also with an opportunity in terms of funding)
- increased role of the state as a service provider in fragility
- more resources going through ONE UN and less to individual agencies
- new donors, including China, Russia, Qatar, BRICs and Kuwait

- Sustainable Development Goals

3.3) What should be the ILO strategy to make sure it's approaches and guidance for responses are adequate to the needs of our constituents in contexts of crisis, conflict and fragility?

The strategy should be based on consultation with our constituents, other ministries and relevant national and UN institutions, to make sure the approaches and the guidance are demand-driven and based on a proper problem analysis and needs assessment.

The Decent Work Country Programs or a Decent Work Road Map should provide guidance for a gender-sensitive and right-based approach.

ILO engagement in fragile context needs to incorporate gradual capacity building with a vision to reform policies and applied capacity building (e.g. supporting national institutions to provide adequate services to the target population. These capacity building efforts should enable our partners to work at the micro, meso and macro level.

There is a need to develop internal ILO capacities and material/tools, both generic and for ad hoc contextual responses (migration/climate change).

ILO should invest more in its preparedness to prevent crisis and/or facilitate adequate and fast recovery.

We need to create a multidisciplinary task team with the capacity to support on generic issues as well as ad hoc specific interventions (health, migration, children soldiers…)

There is a need to encourage South-South and triangular exchanges and cooperation.

We need to develop a modular ILO program with mutually reinforcing projects/modules.

THEMATIC LEAD 4: FORGING PARTNERSHIP, MOBILIZING RESOURCES AND THE POST 2015 DEBATE

4.1) Which partnerships at the global and local level have increased ILO's effectiveness in engaging in contexts of fragility?

There are different levels of partnerships:

- Global actors: international organizations, UN agencies, South-South, Fragile-to-Fragile (g7+), Emerging Economies Inter-Agency Standing Committee, Early Recovery Cluster, Child Protection Working Group, Peace Building Fund, UNGWT
- Regional banks and institutions
- Donors, private sector, governments, employers' and workers' organizations, NGOs, universities, UN, International Development Agencies

How these partnerships help:

- Resources for long-term interventions
- Recognition of ILO technical expertise and agenda setting
- Local ownership of ILO work (decent work agenda)
- Logistics for implementing ILO programmes
- Sharing knowledge and experience
- Ensuring operationality

Tips for partnerships:

- Capitalize on the diversity of partners (enhance strengths, minimize weaknesses)
- Use ILO tools and techniques smartly to avoid piracy
- Work from fragility towards long-term development
- Explore partnerships with emerging economies (BRICs)
- Come up with clear indicators for effective use of partnerships

4.2) What are the trends that would make it necessary for the ILO to redirect or enhance its efforts in terms of these partnerships?

Some of the external trends are:

- The post 2015 agenda/SDGs
- Increased demand for ILO engagement in fragile states
- increased donor focus on fragile states
- increased demand from donors for documented results/impact
- increased channeling of funds through ONE UN mechanisms
- new donors (e.g. BRICs, private sector, domestic funding…)
- multi-stakeholder partnerships
- increased demand on governments to respond to the (refugee) crisis
- trade union involvement in protecting migrants through bilateral agreements
- increased role of the military in development agenda in conflict settings
- negative perceptions from donors, partners and constituents of ILO capacity to engage systematically and in the long-term in fragile states

Some of the internal trends are:

- Adaptation of the ILO to the SDG agenda and related new funding opportunities
- The field structure reform, which should enable us to work more effectively with partners in the field (clusters)
- A focus on in-house "efficiency" and reporting on results
- A decreased office capacity to respond to the demand (need to increase capacity x capacity building)

- Adaptation of the ILO to new donors: local funding opportunities, PPPs, emerging donors (BRICs, Russia, etc...) and other donors (Qatar, Kazakhstan, etc.)

4.3) What should be the ILO strategy in forging and enhancing partnerships, mobilizing resources and bringing the ILO approach to the post 2015 debate?

FORGING & ENHANCING PARTNERSHIPS	MOBILIZING RESOURCES	BRINGING THE ILO APPROACH TO THE POST 2015 DEBATE
- Communicating better our values, results, successes and the impact of ILO work - Designing projects that are better aligned to the current situation and past experiences (with clear quantifiable indicators and impact assessment) - Effective strategy to help constituents address fragility issues and to communicate our strategy to partners and donors (including meaningful engagement)		
- Review existing partnerships and align to better address fragility issues - Actively engage in Inter Agency Standing Committee and other platforms (UNCTs + RCs) - Create knowledge-based partnerships on thematic platforms	- Strategy to mobilize resources from private sector (business cases), local funding (govt) and specific funds for SDGs - Global partnerships with donors who commit funds for fragile states → Peace building fund	- Lobby and lead debate on relevant thematic discussion (e.g. SDG goal 13 & 16) - Create knowledge-base on relevant SDG-goals for fragile states - Political leadership endorsement

THEMATIC LEAD 5: OFFICE CAPACITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

5.1) How do we presently organize ourselves for working in contexts of fragility and how do we evaluate our capacity?

The ILO responds directly to member requests and at times even without such requests.

In ad-hoc response country offices, DWTs, regional offices and HQ departments are involved, through focal points (both in Geneva and in local offices)

The ILO is often involved as part of a UN-cluster and through crisis teams

We work with other international organizations:

- on certain technical areas through bilateral/multi-department agreements
- on crisis and disaster-led response with other international agencies, e.g. the International Recovery Platform
- in general under UN-coordination
- in knowledge sharing, e.g. training: post disaster needs assessment

The office needs:

- A preparedness mechanism, when possible, through a formed body or group
- A knowledge sharing mechanism: training, circulated reports, good experiences as part of the preparedness mechanism
- A task team with a more facilitative role, where leadership comes from the local office
- A task team which coordinates technical efforts and needs based on the needs assessment.

We may also need to develop tools such as:
- A consultants rosters made available in a rapid manner
- A mapping of available in-house competencies
- A mechanism to prioritize requests, with established criteria

Decisions to engage in a certain country are also framed by security issues and available support services regarding health, security, logistics, etc.

There is a need for long-term plans with focus on sustainability.

5.2) What are the challenges, trends and opportunities that require adaptation of the institutional arrangements and strengthening of our capacity?

Some of the challenges identified are:

- in-house coordination, including field-HQ
- intervention capacity
- international partnerships that are sometimes of ad-hoc nature
- expectations are still uncertain regarding the role of the ILO in fragile states
- political/hierarchical headaches
- structure of security and logistics missing or undefined
- lacking flexibility in the HR structure

Some of the opportunities identified are:

- growing attention of the donor community means additional financial opportunities
- strength of the decent work mandate
- the sustainable development goals

- future institutional system in place, mandate defined, technical capacity in place, financial resources sufficient, decentralized functionality, better responsiveness in fragile situations

Some of the trends identified are:

- missed opportunities
- decentralization
- shift from administrative to technical services
- more players present in fragile situations

5.3) What would be the recommendation regarding organizational arrangements and strengthening our capacity?

There is a need to establish a fund as per GB decision

We need to establish a task team responding to fragility situations (conflict and disaster) with a facilitative role (response led by local/regional offices when possible)

The functions of the task team would be:

- prioritizing of requests
- allocation of resources
- facilitating (and possibly initiating) the response
- creating and updating a roster of experts/consultants
- facilitating the deployment of internal staff
- securing past knowledge is shared, documenting experiences and identifying and addressing knowledge gaps
- training to enhance our capacities
- reviewing and nurturing partnerships with other organizations/mechanisms
- mobilizing resources
- determining program criticalities
- establishing M&E criteria for the program and facilitating program interventions (including monitoring)
- evaluation of the impact of our partnership agreements
- agreeing on the "message" to the public

The composition of the task team should be:

- HQ, local and regional offices
- ITC, employers and workers
- chaired by high-level officials
- technical departments
- administration and finance
- security

- DCOMM to increase awareness on our response/crisis programme, deal with media relations

We need to:

- secure insurance arrangements for external staff going to the field: how are we going to deal with it?
- create a fast-track procedure to respond (HR, security, finance, etc...), and develop recommendations as part of the business process review
- create a support mechanism for staff (before/after missions for example)
- create an informal process for generating ideas
- create mechanisms for quick decisions

THEMATIC LEAD 6: FLAGSHIP PROGRAMME ON JOBS FOR PEACE AND RESILIENCE

6.1) How do we expect the flagship programme to enhance ILO's role in fragile contexts?

The objective of the flagship program should be to support country-level work, targeting around 10 countries, either before, during or after a crisis/disaster.

The principles of the flagship program should be the following:

- analytical role (observatory)
- harmonization (program model → fast track)
- special administrative procedures
- clarity on what we do in different contexts, on the technical expertise we can offer, the building blocks, strategy and operational model
- predictability (resources, be equipped)
- program coordination (draw on units/capacities authority)
- knowledge management (impact)
- decentralization, respecting lines of hierarchy
- partnerships

Where should the program sit and how should it operate? → To be further discussed.

The program should have an ILO label and not a departmental identification.

The flagship program should have a "One ILO" approach and can be a catalyst to support ILO reform.

6.2) What should be the technical building blocks and how do these blocks fit together?

QUALITY ASSURANCE	Coordination; management & technical team		
PREPARDNESS	Research, situational analysis, early warnings, M&E		
INTERVENTION MODEL Job placement & Orientation	EMPLOYMENT -Employment intensive investment strategies - Post disaster needs assessment - Vocational training - Small business promotion	FUNDAMENTAL PRICIPLES	- Simplified procedures - Innovation - Documentation - Visibility - One-ILO
STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK	Rights at work: Cross cutting		SPECIAL FOCUS - Women - Children - Youth - PLHIV - Persons with disabilities
	Social dialogue: Cross cutting		
	Social protection: Cross-cutting & gradual		

Prioritization should be done in consultation with the constituents, constructing a roadmap that would lead to a decent work program which should:
- Focus on core areas
- Be cross cutting
- Target special target groups

6.3) Which countries should be covered by the initiative? Why?

Criteria	Potential countries / contexts
- At least 7 countries - g7+ high priority - Regional spread - Demand driven - Mix of small and big countries - Multi-hazard coverage - Possibility to launch a program in the country on 1st January 2016 - Country assessment prior to decision - Availability of $3-5 M per country to start	- Afghanistan - Solomon Islands - Haiti - Yemen - Guinea - Central Africa Republic - Somalia - South Sudan - Chad - Sao Tome & Principe - The Syria crisis - Sierra Leone

	- Togo - DR Congo - Ivory Coast - Ukraine

5. CORE MESSAGES

The workshop participant identified the following core messages:

1. **Intervention principles:**
   a) We must be proactive in our response to fragile situations.
   b) We must prioritize our responses based on eligibility criteria and maximum value added.
   c) Preparedness is the key to effectiveness, including mapping the potential triggers and responses within each context.
   d) The ILO should be prepared for both immediate response and long term engagement (with modular programming), with one thing leading to the other.

2. **Working with constituents:**
   a) Social dialogue is key to reinforcing constituents' capacity and promoting ILO values.
   b) Building and consolidating social dialogue institutions and mechanisms requires a long-term strategy.
   c) Where possible, DWCPs should be entry points for building constituents' capacity.

3. **Context-specific responses and country ownership:**
   a) Approaches need to be demand-driven, based on consultation and needs assessments.
   b) We need to work towards full national engagement through capacity building.
   c) ILO responses to fragile situations should be led by country offices, facilitated by a task team. Where necessary (e.g. absence of ILO presence), the process can be led by the task team, supported by field structures, ROs, DWTs, administration, finance, etc.

4. **Partnerships and the post 2015 debate:**
   a) The ILO remains a small player because we fail to communicate our value added and impact effectively to existing and potential partners, donors and constituents.
   b) We need to forge an ILO specific response in the framework of the post 2015 agenda.
   c) We need to be strategic on partnerships to ensure ILO values are being respected.

5. **ILO capacity:**

e) The ILO faces an increased demand to engage in fragile and disaster settings, while the organization's capacity to engage in these settings has decreased.

f) The absence of a coherent strategic framework and clear intervention model hampers the organization's ability to make effective use of existing partnerships and to forge new ones.

g) We need to develop a comprehensive capacity to anticipate fragility and build institutional capacity and agility to respond.

h) A global fragile response finance/task team with sufficient political backing needs to be put in place to facilitate rapid, coherent, effective and contextual specific response that can span action from the early onset to durable solutions.

6. The JPR Flagship Programme:

a) The Flagship Program on Jobs for Peace and Resilience needs a good coordination mechanism with the necessary authority.

b) The Flagship Program needs harmonization with a "one ILO" program model and a focus on core areas of intervention and special target groups.

c) The Flagship Program needs a holistic approach (micro-meso-macro) with flexible modular implementation strategies (people centered and context specific)

6. FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS

At the end of the workshop, follow-up actions were defined as follows:

1. Brief document on the need to streamline administrative procedures for ILO engagement in fragile contexts to be shared with the consultancy firm presently undertaking the ILO Business Process Review with an aim to embed necessary changes in the decisions that will be taken after this Business Process Review.

2. A strategic document outlining the creation of a task team facilitating the Organization's swift and multi-disciplinary responses to emergencies. This document should include necessary organizational arrangements, resource mobilization and fragility response fund, capacity strengthening of ILO and its constituents, and also reviewing options for how the proposed task team interacts with the global technical teams.

3. Program development process for the Flagship Program Jobs for Peace and Resilience continues to be facilitated by DEVINVEST.

4. Sharing of the outcomes of the workshop, the strategic document for the facilitation task team and the JPR program with the Global Management Team.

ANNEX I: WORKSHOP AGENDA

Monday 7 September

Opening	
08.30 -08.45	**Welcome remarks** Jürgen Schwettmann, DDG/FOP Terje Tessem, DEVINVEST

ILO experiences in fragile contexts	
08.45 – 10.00	**Africa** **Arab States** **Asia and the Pacific**

Coffee break

ILO experiences in fragile contexts - continuation	
10.30 – 13.00	**Europe and Central Asia** **Latin America and the Caribbean**

Lunch

Stocktaking	
14.00 – 15.30	**The ILO approach in fragile contexts: where do we stand?** Jürgen Schwettmann Terje Tessem Donato Kiniger-Passigli **Introduction to the methodology and the thematic leads** Linda Deelen

Coffee break

Thematic leads	
15.45 – 17.00	**First round of group discussions**

Tuesday 8 September

Thematic leads	
8.30 – 10.00	**First round of group discussions – continued** **Sharing of group conclusions**

Coffee break

Thematic leads	
10.30 – 13.00	**Second round of group discussions**

Lunch

Thematic leads	
14.00 – 15.30	**Sharing of group conclusions** **Third round of group discussions**

Coffee break

Thematic leads	
15.45 – 17.00	**Third round of group discussions – continued** **Sharing of group conclusions**

Wednesday 9 September

Presentations and feedback	
8.30 – 10.00	**Presentations on the thematic leads**

Coffee break

Integration and consistency check	
10.30 – 13.00	**Discussion on integration and consistency**

Lunch

The way ahead	
14.00 – 15.00	**Finalization of a roadmap for the next steps**

Conclusions	
15.00 – 15.45	**Concluding remarks** Gilbert Houngbo Tine Staermose

ANNEX II: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

FAMILY NAME	NAME	OFFICE/DEPARTMENT	POSITION
ALCOCER	Joel	ITC-ILO EMLD	Senior Programme Officer
ASFAHA	Samuel	ITC-ILO EPAP	Senior Programme Officer
BERGER	Hervé	FPRW	Heads of Operations
CRISETTI	Maria	PARDEV	Senior adviser rapid intervention strategies
DA VERA CRUZ	Tomas	DWCT YAOUNDE	Senior EIIP Specialist
DARU	Patrick	RO ARAB STATES	Senior Skills and Employability Specialist
DOMINGUEZ	Jean-Louis	INTSERV	Field Safety & Security Coordinator
DONNGES	Chris	DEVINVEST	Economist
ELDER	Sara	YEP	CTA, Work4Youth Project
GRISEWOOD	Nicholas	WORKQUALITY / MIGRANT	Technical Specialist
GULABZOI	Najibullah	LIAISON OFFICE AFGHANISTAN	Programme Officer
HUNT ORTIZ	Juan Felipe	PARDEV	Deputy Director
KINIGER-PASSIGLI	Donato	EMPLOYMENT	Coordinator Fragile States and Disaster Response
MAGNAT	Julien	ILO HAITI	Coordinator
MAIGA	Aminata	CO-KINSHASA	Director
MARTINEZ GARZA	Daniela	ENT/SME	Junior Technical Officer
NEBULONI	Valter	ITC-ILO EPAP	Programme Manager
NEGRO	Federico	DEVINVEST	Crisis specialist
NKAMBU	Mavinga	ILO KINSHASA	Programme Officer
OROKOV	Bolotbek	DWT/CO MOSCOW	National Coordinator Kyrgyz Republic
PAQUETE-PERDIGAO	Vera	DWCT YAOUNDE	Director
PRASAD	Naren	RESEARCH	Economist
ROMERO BOLANOS	Walter	DWT/CO SAN JOSE	Program Officer
SAVCHUK	Sergiy	RO/EUROPE	National Coordinator for Ukraine
SCHWEITZER	Julian	DEVINVEST	Junior Technical Officer
SCHWETTMANN	Jürgen	DDG/FOP	Senior Advisor on Development Cooperation
STAERMOSE	Tine	DDG/P	Special Adviser to the DDG/P
SYED SAAD HUSSAIN	Gilani	CO-ISLAMABAD	Senior Programme Officer
TESSEM	Terje	DEVINVEST	Chief
TOTH	Evelin	ITC-ILO ACTRAV	Officer in Charge
VAN PANHUYS	Clara	SOCPRO	Technical Officer Social Protection

OBSERVERS

FAMILY NAME	FIRST NAME	OFFICE/DEPARTMENT	POSITION
ROSSI	Monica	ITC-ILO PRODEV	Senior Programme Officer
SHALABI	Jeannette	ITC-ILO PRODEV	Programme Manager