CIVIL SOCIETY
PLATFORM
FOR PEACEBUILDING
AND STATEBUILDING

Safeguarding Inclusivity and the Role of Civil Society in Conflict Affected States:
Lessons from the New Deal for SDG Implementation

ROOM DOCUMENT for session
Fragility, Conflict and Violence Forum,
March 1, 2016, World Bank

Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (CSPPS)[1]

The principle of inclusivity is vital to delivering the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in societies affected by conflict and fragility. Where state-society relations are weak and where state institutions lack capacity, the meaningful involvement of civil society holds a pivotal key to ensuring whole-of-society ownership and implementation of the new global goals, particularly where the building of peaceful societies is centerfold. Yet while a consensus around the need for greater inclusivity in the design and implementation of policy has risen in recent years, there are unique challenges in contexts affected by conflict and fragility. This paradox lies at the heart of the SDG implementation challenge.

This room document serves as a context setting paper for the World Bank Fragility, Violence and Conflict Forum 2016 session on these issues. The session provides a space for reflection on these issues and on lessons from the experience of the *New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States*[2] – a major policy process involving states affected by conflict and fragility (the group of g7+),[3] international partners[4] and civil society.[5]

In setting a reflective context for this session, this room document 1) reviews evidence around why inclusivity matters, particularly in countries emerging from conflict and fragility, 2) reflects upon the debates around the nature and role of civil society and the particular challenges faced in these contexts, 3) examines lessons around the role of civil society in the New Deal process to date, and, 4) considers potential entry points for ensuring meaningful inclusion of civil society in the effective implementation of Agenda 2030. The document draws upon the lessons that have emerged through the New Deal implementation process,[6] a workshop held in Helsinki, Finland in June 2015,[7] and on related scholarship.[8]

1.0   Why Inclusivity Matters

Rising evidence illustrates that inclusivity matters in the forging of a consolidated, sustainable peace. Studies support the following lines of argument:[9]

- **National ownership lies at the core of peace sustainability, yet international actors have been slow to genuinely support this.** National ownership is indispensable to building and sustaining institutions and development, as "public and domestic stakeholders are best placed to understand the local dynamics that condition the achievement of peacebuilding goals."[10] There is also wide consensus that can be heard both historically from national actor recipients of aid, and scholars globally, that externally driven and Western modeled approaches have not produced intended results.[11] Critiques of this nature continue, despite over a decade of international community efforts to ensure greater attention to notions of "conflict and context sensitivity," and generally "doing things differently" in countries affected by conflict and fragility. As also recently observed by a UN Advisory Group of Experts, international efforts have focused almost exclusively on supporting government (elite) ownership, when what is needed is support for increasingly multi-stakeholder driven national ownership of plans and processes that will sustain peace for the long-term;[12]

- **Political settlements need to be domestically led and inclusive to support a sustainable exit from conflict.** Domestically led and owned processes of political settlement are considered more sustainable than externally imposed settlements.[13] While successful exits from violent conflict require deals between leaders including strategies to manage "spoilers,"[14] and sufficient trust for a cessation of violence to take hold, the escape from fragility requires that society as a whole also develops confidence in state institutions and arrangements for security, justice and political accountability.[15] It is also argued that "inclusive enough" agreements include all the actors necessary to implement the first stages of institution and confidence-building.[16] There is also wide recognition that peace agreements can establish political processes for ongoing, long-term dialogue among wider groups of political actors instead of defining policies and institutions immediately in an attempt to solve all the problems faced by countries dealing with conflict.[17]

- **Active civil society participation in peace negotiations correlates with peace durability.** One investigation of 83 (or 1/3 of) peace agreements between 1989-2004 concluded that where civil society was involved it increased the durability of peace.[18] Other research into 25 peace agreements (1996-2006) found a strong correlation between active civil society participation in peace negotiations and the durability of peace during the peacebuilding phase.[19] Research by scholars and the United Nations on the participation of women in peace processes indicates a correlation with peace process sustainability,[20] especially at the community and societal level.[21] Paffenholz's recent work has further elaborated how and under what circumstances civil society, and particularly women, make towards effective peace negotiations;[22]

- **The quality of inclusion matters.** Meaningful inclusion requires actual influence in agenda setting and actual policy formulation process.[23] The quality of participation relies in particular on the influence of political context, societal expectations of the process, and the method and organ of participation.[24] More recent research illustrates that when included actors can influence peace processes, such as by affecting the quality of agreements or implementation, or by pushing for negotiations, their influence is correlated with higher rates of sustained agreements.[25] Normative arguments posit that participatory peace negotiations are an important step toward achieving democracy.[26]

In summary, the evidence suggests that inclusive settlements and peace agreement processes contribute to greater likelihood of peace sustainability. But inclusion processes need to be meaningful – where actors feel their participation has influence in the substantive issues being addressed. Such practices can build legitimacy of the process as a whole, and as a result, government's leadership.

2.0 Civil Society in Politics and History

2.1 What is civil society?

Contemporary understandings of civil society vary, but development sector it is normally understood as associations of citizens that are formally and legally independent from the state and political society, but oriented towards and interacting with the state, and the political and economic sectors.[27] Civil society can include a broad range of actors, from professional associations, clubs, community groups, unions, faith-based organizations and more formal non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Traditional and clan groups can be part of civil society, but can also be officially part of government, with official status and even ministries devoted to their leadership on specific issues. Generally political parties and the media are not included.[28] While organized civil society is also often associated with progressive or altruistic values aimed at serving marginalized groups and sectors within society, civil society also is part and parcel of society, and reflects its characteristics.

Underlying operational understandings are competing narratives that tend to reflect very old, unresolved debates between liberal and socialist philosophers around the relationship of civil society with the state, political, market/economic and family/private spheres. In the liberal tradition, civil society is an autonomous realm of associational life above the family and below the state that plays a precautionary role, protecting citizen rights and liberties and holding the state accountable.[29] Marxist traditions tend to view state-society relations as more complex and conflicted, with civil society the site of economic relations upon which a legal and political superstructure is elevated, and both state and civil society serving the interests of the bourgeoisie.[30] Gramscian perspectives offer a middle ground, where civil society is neither entirely captive of the state nor autonomous – a site for problem-solving and defending society from incursions of both the state and market, while often supporting the spread of hegemonic projects of ruling elites and other powerful actors.[31]

Despite ongoing contestation around the concept of civil society, the liberal perspective has served as the norm in international aid delivery. The notion that civil society is the autonomous base to build democratic culture led to massive flows of funding to civil society in the 1980s.

This complemented the desire to reduce the role of the state, a key goal of neoliberal adjustment policies. Many critiques emerged around this orientation, which tended to target professionalized NGOs dedicated to political advocacy or civic education work on public interest issues directly relating to democratization, rather than older, established more development-oriented voluntary organizations and social movements.[32]

In recent decades the thinking around the nature of civil society and its relations with the state has evolved through the growing realization that civil societies are rooted in particular contexts with different trajectories of state formation and different cultural and ideological influences. African scholars for example have highlighted that in the context of post-colonial transitions, civil societies did not develop organically with strong social bases. They continue to represent myriad hybrid and diverse interests,[33] at times including politically aligned national interests as well as international donor country interests.[34] Wider views around state-society relations that are informing policy orientations around statebuilding suggest this awareness that the state and society possess many connections and ultimately cannot be assumed autonomous, and, that the emergence of a strong, capable state can only occur with strong and well distributed social control of the state.[35] The challenge is, how to ensure that such distributed social control of the state truly reflects the diversity of, and needs across, society.

2.2 Civil society in countries affected by conflict and fragility

Key characteristics of societies affected by conflict and fragility that often shape the nature of civil society and its relations with the state include the following:

- **Lack of trust,** between actors and weak social cohesion, both of which are needed to support frameworks and processes that allow actors to interact constructively to develop common goals;[36]
- **Weak and parallel institutions,** and low levels of state capacity and resources as well as social capital

in environments of insecurity and violence.[37] In such contexts where in the absence of full state capacity or reach across territory there are a plethora of parallel institutions at play and great lack of clarity around the structures and systems governing them all. On the one hand there are multilateral and international organizations including NGOs acting as proxies for the state in a range of functional areas, without clear transition strategies with associated plans to develop local capacity and ownership. There are also likely endogenous parallel systems – long standing or newly created or adaptive to the context – that may be playing very important and complimentary roles to the state, or alternatively seeking to profit directly, and undermine the role of the state; [38]

- **Politicization and radicalization of civil society,** in political environments where there are weak democratic institutions to support constructive political contestation and consensus building. In such settings, civil society can be seen (and is vulnerable to) myriad influences and interests at play in society. These can serve to undermine the moral authority that civic actors seek to bring to the policy table, and upon which they base their activities;

- **Weak enabling environment for civil society,** that derives from above, as well as restrictive laws pertaining to the conditions under which civil society can operate,[39] and on independent media upon which it relies. UN Special Rapporteur Maini Kiai has reported that the rights of freedom of peaceful assembly and of association democracy is receding throughout the world as governments continue denying rights and democracy to publics that demand and expect it;[40]

- **Low levels of capacity and funding,** commonly create a circular self-fulfilling prophecy, where civil society is not funded directly, and cannot build its capacity. Commonly, bi-laterals in countries emerging from conflict and fragility work with known counter-parts, e.g. their own country NGOs (international in the local setting), avoiding and undermining the building the core capacities of local civil society. In some countries, civil society organizations are restricted in receiving foreign funds by their own government.[41] While there are innovative efforts towards finding home grown, south-south, or "fragile-to-fragile" support for civil society aimed at ensuring less "donor-driven" and tagged support, these promising trends have not taken root yet sufficiently, to challenge deeply rooted thinking and practice that foster an aid-dependent sector.

2.3 Key roles and functions of civil society

Despite the myriad challenges facing civil society actors in fragile settings, much has been written about the important roles that civil society can play in peace-building and statebuilding. A major Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) publication[42] illuminated the myriad roles that civil society plays in conflict prevention and peacebuilding processes, including:

- Serving as a force for people centered security;
- Contributing depth and durability to peacebuilding;
- Shifting conflict attitudes by reframing issues and changing perspectives;
- Identifying central issues to be addressed and mobilizing advocacy campaigns, generating support and applying pressure;
- Resolving localized disputes, and responding to early warnings of conflict;
- Promoting security through civilian monitoring and peacekeeping;
- Helping peace-making by back-channel negotiations, facilitating negotiations or supporting public partici-pation in negotiations;
- Building public ownership of peace agreements;
- Transforming the structural causes and consequences of conflict, through many practical strategies that may involve service delivery, DDR, and education.

Another important study[43] outlines seven key roles that civil society plays in peacebuilding contexts: protection, monitoring, advocacy, socialization of the population at large, in-group socialization, intergroup social cohesion, facilitation and service delivery. The effectiveness of these functions can vary tremendously, depending on the context (notably the stage of the conflict/post-conflict setting), as well as factors that influence the space for civil society to act, including the behavior of the state, the level of violence and role of the media, the roles taken up by external political actors to support or limit the conditions for civil society peacebuilding, donor resources and funding flows, and divisions within society that affect civil society.

Given these contextual issues and the dynamism inherent in civil society, functional roles should never be viewed as static, or definitive, and efforts should be made to resist the creation of binary positions. For example, there is often the perception that civil society must either be a "watchdog" of government – common with the liberal tradition, or a "service provider" – common with g7+ governments but also those who fought for their

independence. This is understandable where those in government fought with those in society to achieve freedom from foreign rule, and now want civil society to be their partners in developing a new vision for the country.

Context and tradition shape political culture and forms of civic action. So too, civil society actors are sources of social innovation, shaping context and culture and expanding the forms of contention available to

succeeding generations of activists.[44] This certainly helps to explain the rise of transnational advocacy networks (TANS)[45] in an era of rising global "public" challenges that are transnational in nature, and the central role of civil society actors across borders in supporting these networks. These trends also suggest the need to engage more critical and nuanced views about the nature and role of civil society, challenging the more limited and often binary perspectives that have dominated the debates.

3.0 The Role of Civil Society and Inclusive Peace-building: The case of the New Deal

Constructive state-society relations and the empowerment of women, youth and marginalised groups, as key actors for peace, are at the heart of successful peacebuilding and statebuilding. They are essential for delivering the New Deal.[46]

At its core, the New Deal is about changing international norms in peacebuilding and statebuilding. This has meant placing recipient governments in the drivers seat to steer transitions out of fragility – and as the above quote from the New Deal suggests – doing so alongside a commitment to fostering greater inclusion of their own societies in the design and implementation of such transitions. The New Deal holds that without country ownership, underpinned by inclusive political dialogue, progress will be unlikely.[47] The New Deal framework identifies civil society actors as primary partners alongside state actors and donors, as the quote above vividly illustrates.

Civil society organizations (CSOs) were active in shaping the New Deal framework from the beginning and they feel a sense of joint ownership in the resulting framing of Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs), and many other aspects of the International Dialogue's work and achievements to date. The role of civil society as a solid third partner in the dialogue (alongside INCAF members and g7+ governments), while questioned at times, has grown with civil society persevering at all stages to formalise its role at national and global levels. A key step in this process was the creation in 2012 of the Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (CSPPS),[48] which serves the official mechanism for civil society participation in the New Deal process – both by supporting national civil societies to mobilize and effectively participate in New Deal processes within their countries, and to build concerted and coherent civil society engagement in the global dialogue process. CSPPS representatives now formally sit on all IDPS decision-making and technical working groups.

Many aspects of the New Deal can be assessed for inclusivity, and how the role of civil society has been engaged and evolved. These include the very principles upon which the New Deal rests – the FOCUS and TRUST principles and the related principles and instruments they have spawned, and the PSGs – which lay out a vision for what needs to be achieved. Within each of these areas, there are process considerations *(who can/should participate?)*, and substantive considerations *(will/how will results be inclusive?)*. Looking back over the past four years of New Deal implementation, it can be illustrated that considerable inclusivity has been fostered at national and global levels, while key opportunities and entry points for more inclusive processes to emerge and evolve can be identified. These include, by:

- shifting normative and practical debates around both the means and ends of peacebuilding, and around the norms of national ownership, tied with inclusivity;
- fostering a growing commitment amongst all relevant stakeholders to engage in structured dialogue at both national and global levels on the vital role of participatory analysis of problems in determining priorities, as well as the very fundamentals of what peace means and how it should be constructed;
- infusing substantive issues that are designed to foster greater inclusion of both processes to achieve PSGs and their inclusive outcomes into policy frameworks in g7+ countries, at times with key benchmarks against which actual performance can be measured;
- normalizing awareness and commitment to having wide societal ownership of the design and implementation of national peacebuilding policy, with organized civil society participation as a crucial means to achieve this;

- fostering greater civil society awareness of and engagement in policy design and implementation in contexts affected by conflict and fragility;
- creating the political space for the evolution of a transnational advocacy network that drove the development of peacebuilding considerations within the Agenda 2030 framework, notably around the Goal 16.[49]

Despite these achievements, gaps and challenges remain. Undoubtedly civil society has been a core partner in realizing these achievements, mobilizing participation at both country and global levels to engage in and influence the process. At country level, where it is agreed by all that implementation of the New Deal matters most, meaningful participation of civil society in the key driving processes as the fragility assessments, compacts and the development of indicators, the levels and quality of inclusion has been mixed. There are promising practices around inclusivity in the fragility assessment processes, such as DRC civil society's preparation of a conflict analysis that informed their active participation in the multi-stakeholder assessment that followed, and South Sudan civil society's active participation at both national and regional levels in the fragility analysis which informed the development of their draft compact. Across cases however, inclusivity in compact development has been far less consistent, a concern spotlighted regularly by civil society. Further, civil society is too often left out of the core decision-making around the strategy for national level New Deal implementation.[50]

3.1 Different constituency perspectives on inclusivity

Even in the context of these achievements, there are different views of the meaning of inclusivity amongst and undoubtedly within the key consistency groups engaged. The g7+ reports its mission as supporting "state-led transitions from fragility to agility," and their priority concern through the dialogue process has been to ensure governmental ownership over aid decision-making and the use of country systems to deliver aid in ways that build national institutional capacity. Over the years of New Deal implementation, g7+ governments, bearing their diversity in mind, have become more open to civil society participation. They do however have a concern around a propensity for civil society to be a proxy for opposition politics at a time when they are working to build trust in the state and its institutions and a unified national vision.

INCAF members, also bearing their diversity of interests in mind, are particularly interested in questions of inclusivity as tied to state legitimacy, as embedded in PSG 1- on inclusive and legitimate politics. They have held two workshops on the topic in 2014 and 2015, and commissioned a paper with a view to scaling up their assistance in this area. INCAF members have tended to support a meaningful role for civil society in the process at all levels while endeavouring to remain sensitive to g7+ leadership on these issues – at times a challenging balance. Further, the development motivations of development partners may sometimes confront other national priorities and interests, for example, security driven imperatives associated with military intervention or support, such as in Somalia and Afghanistan. Finally, in the pursuit of meeting ambitious aid oriented objectives with associated deadlines, the principles of inclusivity may sometimes fall victim to the interests of political expediency – as the rather rushed development of the Somali national compact has illustrated.

For civil society (both international and national) inclusivity means strong, and inclusive, societal and civic ownership of peacebuilding and development processes linked to accountable and responsive leadership of governments that serve society; civil society wants good government to succeed, and the development of trusted processes and relationships is core to this. Throughout the New Deal process, CSOs have emphasized – consistent with evolving understandings of statebuilding as state-society relations – that mutual accountability and strong partnerships at the core of the TRUST principles should apply not only or even primarily to relations between donors and g7+ governments – but as first priority, between the governments and their own societies. A major challenge for civil society is representation, and self-selecting their best representatives; often g7+ governments and INCAF bilateral donors select, and donors also financially support, CSOs whom they wish to work with, which undermines the potential for organic democratic processes to evolve their civil society leaders.

Civil society, through the CSPPS at global and national levels, is actively engaged in research, advocacy and dialogue to deepen understanding around how issues of inclusivity should be approached. In one major study undertaken across New Deal Ebola-affected countries,[51] CSPPS found that New Deal principles were not well understood – societies had little knowledge of the New Deal – and nor were they well operationalized. Civil society was not well engaged early on as a partner in cultivating a nationally owned and effective response to the Ebola crisis. Weak national institutions and systems and weak state-society relations (and the related structures, processes for communication and

participatory governance) characterised the environments – even in countries considerably post conflict (Sierra Leone, 13 years and Liberia, 11). As the Ebola crisis wore on, g7+ governments did however make increasing efforts to involve civil society in the strategic response, in particular to effectively engage communities. This more inclusive approach contributed to the improved management of the crisis.

Civil society has also consistently argued that for New Deal implementation to be effective, more concerted attention is needed towards ensuring that instruments align and link up in an overall strategy. This means that fragility assessments are not "one off" events, that they must better incorporate the drivers of conflict and fragility and serve as a foundation to realize other key agreed principles and goals, serving as a basis for national development frameworks ("one-vision-one-plan") and other relevant policy processes such as SDG implementation. Inclusive development of these instruments and the political dialogue around the whole process is central to forging the needed trust between state and society, that should be the core focus of the TRUST principles, that relations with international partners are built upon.

3.2 Emerging Lessons on civil society and inclusivity

The below lessons around civil society's role emerge from experiences to date. Notably they draw upon a June 2015 workshop in Helsinki, Finland on these issues, organized by the CSPPS together with UNDP, Finn Church Aid and the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Each of these interacts and builds upon one another in important ways, and inclusive outcomes will be maximized if they are all taken on board:

- **Inclusion fosters legitimacy and increases perceptions of fairness, building the confidence of different stakeholders to present differing perspectives and providing means to grow tolerance;**

- **Inclusion fosters accountability of governmental and donor stakeholders and transparency of the overall process, and, builds ownership over the challenges and how strategies to tackle them;**

- **Inclusion is not only about who participates, but the quality of participation and the substantive issues at play.** For example, quality includes strong women and youth candidates participating, but also that gender and youth issues are mainstreamed through substantive aspects of policy and process – notably national development plans;

- **Major policy initiatives such as the New Deal, simply will not be successful (take root across society in ways that ensure implementation) unless they meaningfully engage civil society as active partners;**

- **To enable collaboration towards achieving common goals, trust between state and society needs to be built, and the New Deal offers practical pathways to do this** – notably the commitments to country owned fragility assessments and a culture of dialogue and inclusive decision-making around priorities that emerge from these assessments, offer practical means to build this trust;

- **Civil Society, marked by its diversity and its relationships with government and international partners, requires capacity development to play a meaningful and effective role**; much like arguments around the use of country systems to achieve national capacity, so too must civil society be fully engaged and utilized to develop this role. Donor funding criteria should be adjusted to facilitate this;

- **Information sharing lies at the heart of developing capacity and trust, both between civil society actors, and civil society and government.** The development of mutual accountability portals and shared reports to identify funding pledges and gaps can build trust domestically, and provide a basis for fragile-to-fragile cooperation across g7+ countries;

- **Inclusive dialogue takes time, and while practices will manifest differently in different settings, a commitment to inclusivity can be fostered through the promotion of nationally agreed benchmarks.**

4.0 Conclusions and Recommendations for the Role of Civil Society in SDG Implementation

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted on 25 September 2015 by the United Nations General Assembly lays out a set of Sustainable Development Goals (the SDGs) that aim to wipe out poverty, fighting inequality, promoting sustainability, building peaceful and inclusive societies and tackling climate change. The universally applied goals are far broader in ambition than their predecessors, the Millennium Development Goals (the MDGs).

In the new framework peace related issues are strongly featured, as are issues of inclusion, and they are intermixed in important ways. Peace is named as one of the five areas of critical importance identified in the Preamble, and is defined in broad and universal terms: "we are determined to foster peaceful, just and inclusive societies". The centerpiece of this approach is a dedicated goal, goal 16, focused on promoting peaceful and inclusive societies, access to justice and accountable institutions. A number of other goals and targets, including Goal 10 on reducing inequalities, and Goal 5 on gender equality and empowerment also contribute to peace being seen as more than simply an enabler of development. Peace becomes a core aspirational goal relevant to all countries universally in the development process, not just those considered fragile and conflict-affected.

The process leading up to the agreement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in September 2015 was arguably the most inclusive policy process at the global level, to date – involving complex and wide-ranging negotiation processes involving member states and intergovernmental bodies, a wide array of actors from within the United Nations system, and a broad range of civil society actors globally, and countless individual citizens. Notably, some 11 million citizens from 194 countries participated in the UN-led 'MY World' survey to choose goal areas. Civil society participated extensively in the development of the new Agenda – as partners in the process – engaging and interacting in new

ways in a more open, inclusive policy formulation context.[52] To date, despite the space created for civil society in forging Agenda 2030, there is a perception within civil society that discussions around implementation, measurement and review processes, and financing are being forged within narrow high level spaces, with limited engagement for meaningful civil society participation.[53]

As amply illustrated by both the evidence of the value of inclusive peace-making, peacebuilding and statebuilding processes to ensure peace consolidation on the one hand, and the experience of the New Deal buttressing these findings to date, Governments need civil society to effectively implement the SDGs. One only needs to bear in mind the breathtaking number of 17 goals and 169 targets that demand extraordinary institutional attention, capacity, resources to address. Governments cannot do this alone and if they try there is a risk for a very selective implementation process and results. This is all the more true in fragile and conflict-affected situations, where the capacity of the state is currently lacking in many of the policy areas covered by the goals. Civil Society will not only be vital partners in selecting the right prioritization, sequencing and implementation methods for the SDGs, as delivery partners and service providers, and also, as critical monitors contributing to the accountability in and of the process.

As lessons have illustrated through the New Deal process, inclusivity cannot be taken for granted. Garnering effective civil society support to implement the SDGs, and other core policies central to the realization of national development visions, requires two primary things: developing the capacity of civil society to fully engage, and developing a clear path to strengthen state-society relations – and the social contracts that these sustainably forge. As commonly understood and illuminated in this paper, civil society is a complex, multi-faceted phenomena, dynamic and manifesting uniquely in every context. Its functions are not and never

should be viewed as monolithic; rather they adapt and flourish depending on a host of enabling factors. Governments and international partners can and should value this diversity and work with it, building principle-based processes, practices and institutions to forge meaningful paths for interaction and collaboration that ultimately will support and sustain inclusive, robust and peaceful national development.

Endnotes

1   This document was authored by Erin McCandless, the co-chair of the CSPPS workstream on New Deal Instruments, Academic Director of Peacebuilding at The New School and Honorary Senior Lecturer at the University of KwaZulu Natal. The author thanks reviewers for extremely useful comments: Paul Okumu, Claire Leigh, James Cox, Theophilus Ekpon, Melanie Greenberg and Peter van Sluijs.

2   http://www.pbsbdialogue.org/en/

3   http://www.g7plus.org/

4   Including Northern donors, the UN, and the World Bank, through the OECD-DAC's International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF). http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance-peace/conflictand-fragility/theinternationalnetworkonconflictandfragility.htm/

5   Both international and national, from g7+ countries. http://www.cspps.org

6   It draws on two major reviews of the New Deal (2014, 2016), and numerous New Deal affiliated civil society-led publications (see www.CSPPS.org), and on the collective learning of the stake-holders involved, including g7+, INCAF members, UNDP, and civil society.

7   See the report of this conference, "Ensuring Impact and Inclusivity in Fragile States," 2016. http://bit.ly/1mUZ9zT

8   The analysis draws upon the lead author's independent research in this area (www.erinmccandless.net) over the last two decades, and on relevant bodies of scholarship.

9   See Center for International Cooperation, "Independent Review of the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States," (NIDR) for a useful review of literature focusing in particular on the first two bullet points, from which sources are drawn.

10 UN Advisory Group of Experts, *The Challenge of Sustaining Peace*, 2015, p.17. Available at: http://www.un.org/pga/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2015/07/300615_The-Challenge-of-Sustaining-Peace.pdf

11 See Lant Pritchett and Michael Woolcock, "Solutions When the Solution is the Problem: Arraying the Disarray in Development," *World Development* Vol.32, No.2, pp.191-212, 2004, and for brief discussion, Erin McCandless, http://ecdpm.org/great-insights/cautions-conflation-peacebuilding-statebuilding-distinct-complimentary-policy-agendas/

12 UN Advisory Group of Experts, 2015.

13 Quantitative research consistently identified exclusion, particularly of former rebels, as a significant factor in relapses into violent conflict. Detailed analysis of supporting literature in NIDR (2016).

14 OECD 2011; Roy Licklider, "The Consequences of Negotiated Settlements in Civil Wars, 1945-1993," *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 89, No. 3, 1995; Caroline Hartzell, "Institutionalizing Peace: Power Sharing and Post-Civil War Conflict," *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 47, Issue 2, 2003; Stedman, Steven J. "Spoiler Problems in Peace Processes," *International Security*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Fall 1997), pp.5-53

15 Diamond, Larry, "Three Paradoxes of Democracy", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 1, No 3, Summer 1990; Jones, Bruce D. et al. "From Fragility to Resilience: Concepts and Dilemmas of Statebuilding in Fragile States", NYU CIC, 2008

16 Jarstad, Anna K. and Desiree Nilsson, "From Words to Deeds: The Implementation of Power-Sharing Pacts in Peace Accords", *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, Vol. 25, Issue 3, 2008, pp. 206-223; di John, Jonathan and James Putzel, "Political Settlements: Issues Paper", GSRDC, June 2009.

17 Papagianni, Katia, "*The Role of Political and Development Actors in Mediation Processes*," (Geneva: Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, 2009), p.3. These views are also resonant in the Secretary-General's report on *Enhancing Mediation and Its Support Activities*. (s/2009/189) (United Nations, 2009).

18 Nilsson, Desirée, "Anchoring the Peace, Civil Society Actors in Peace Accords and Durable Peace, International Interactions: Empirical and Theoretical Research," *International Relations*, 38:2 (2012).

19 Wanis-St. John, Anthony, and Kew, Darren, "Civil Society and Peace Negotiations: Confronting Exclusion," *International Negotiation*, Vol 13-1, 2008, p11-36.

20 O'Reilly, Marie; Ó Súilleabháin, Andrea and Paffenholz, Thania, *Reimagining Peacemaking: Women's Roles in Peace Processes*, 2015; Cordaid, GPPAC, WPP, *Candid Voices from the Field*, 2015

21 UN Global Study on Implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (2015), *Preventing Conflict, Transforming Justice, Securing the Peace*, available at: http://wps.unwomen.org/~/media/files/un%20women/wps/highlights/unw-global-study-1325-2015.pdf

22 Paffenholz, Thania. "Civil Society and Peace Negotiations: Beyond the Inclusion-Exclusion Dichotomy." *Negotiation Journal* 30, no. 1 (2014): 69-91.

23 This has been debated and evidenced for decades in the context of participation in development, and the design of poverty reduction strategies in particular. African, social movement and civil society scholars and practitioners are amongst those that have provided evidence on this point. The African Charter for Popular Participation in Development, suggests that people must be empowered and capacity developed to effectively participate (Arusha 1990). See McCandless, Erin 2011, for full discussion.

24 Christian Aid. "Quality Participation in Poverty Reduction Strategies: Experiences from Malawi, Bolivia, and Rwanda." London, 2002.

25 Paffenholz, T. "Broader Participation Project' Briefing Paper. Centre on Conflict, Development and Peacebuilding," (Geneva: The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, 2015).

26 Paffenholz (2014), p.73.

27 Adapted from Spurk, Christoph, "Understanding Civil Society," in Paffenholz, Thania (ed), *Civil Society and Peacebuilding. A Critical Assessment* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2010).

28 Paffenholz, Thania, in Paffenholz, Thania (ed), Civil Society and Peacebuilding. *A Critical Assessment*, (Lynne Rienner, Boulder 2010), vii.

29 Seligman, Adam, *The Idea of Civil Society* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992). This tradition emerged from the second half of the 18th century, by Ferguson, Paine, and then Tocqueville, while prior, Aristotle, Rousseau and Kant argued that civil society was synonymous with the state or political society. Keane, John, *Democracy and Civil Society* (London and New York: Verso, 1988, 36).

30 Bobbio, Norberto. *Democracy and Dictatorship*: The Nature and Limits of State Power (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989, 27).

31 Hearn, Julie, "The 'Uses and Abuses' of Civil Society in Africa," *Review of African Political Economy* 87 (2001): 43-53.

32 For fuller discussion see Carothers, Thomas, and Marina Ottaway, (eds.) *Funding Virtue: Civil Society and Democracy Promotion*. (Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2000); and, *Polarization and Transformation in Zimbabwe: Social Movements, Strategy Dilemmas and Change*, Maryland, Lexington Press, 2011 & South Africa: University of Kwazulu-Natal Press, 2011;

33 See for example, Moyo, Sam, Kirk Helliker, and Tendai Murisa (eds.) *Contested Terrain: Land Reform and Civil Society in Contemporary Zimbabwe* (Pietermaritzburg: S&S Publishers, 2008), p2.

34 At the same time it is always the case that motives and interests that propel civil society action, as with individuals, are always multi-faceted.

35 See for example, Migdal, J.S., *Strong Societies and Weak States: State-society Relations in the Third World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), and Alexandre Marc who argues the state is embedded in a network of relationships that are rooted in society. Marc, Alexandre, et al, *Societal Dynamics and Fragility* (Washington DC: World Bank, 2013).

36 Marc, A. p.32

37 Ohiorhenuan, John and Kumar Chetan, "Sustaining Post-conflict Economic Recovery: Lessons and Challenges," BCPR Occasional Paper 1 (New York: United Nations Development Programme, October 2005), p.4.

38 McCandless, Erin, "Non-state Actors and Competing Sources of Legitimacy in Conflict Affected Settings" in *Building Peace: A Forum for Peace and Security in the 21st Century*, September 2014. http://buildingpeaceforum.com/2014/09/non-state-actors-and-competing-sources-of-legitimacy-in-conflict-affected-settings/

39 In 2014, CIVICUS documented significant restrictions of civil society rights in at least 96 different countries. CIVICUS, State of Civil Society Report, http://civicus.org/index.php/en/media-centre-129/reports-and-publications/socs2015 (2015), 77.

40 UN Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, January 2014 op. cit. (citation from CIVICUS 2015 p 77)

41 CIVICUS, 2015, 79.

42 Barnes, Catherine, "Agents for Change: Civil Society Roles in Preventing War and Building Peace," Issue Paper 2, (GPPAC 2006).

43 Paffenholz (2010).

44 McAdam, Doug, and David Snow, (eds.) Social Movements: Readers on their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics (Los Angeles: Roxbury, 1997).

45 TANS involve actors working internationally on an issue – be they from civil society, international organizations, or governments – who are "bound together by shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information and services. Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink (1999) "Transnational Advocacy Networks in International and Regional Politics," *International Social Science Journal* 51:159, 89.

46 IDPS, "A New Deal."

47 IDPS, "New Deal Monitoring Report," 7.

48 http://www.cspps.org/

49 These summary points stem from the Helsinki report, as well as a comprehensive review of the New Deal and in particular, reports of and about civil society inclusion in the process of the New Deal. The forthcoming study: Donais, Timothy and Erin McCandless, "International Peacebuilding and the Emerging Inclusivity Norm," *presently under consideration with scholarly journal*.

50 See CSPPS statements on their website: www.cspps.org

51 McCandless, Erin and Nicolas Bouchet (editors), "Tackling and Preventing Ebola while Building Peace and Societal Resilience," Cordaid, 2015.

52 For a fuller examination of this, see McCandless, Erin, "Civil Society and the 2030 Agenda: Forging Sustainable Peace through Policy Formulation," in (eds. Greenberg, Cortright and Stone), *Strengthening Civil Society's Role in Peacebuilding* (Lexington Press, forthcoming).

53 See for example, blogs by Paul Okumu: http://www.actionsupportcentre.co.za/drums-of-change/the-transformative-potential-of-the-post-2015-development-agenda/how-the-post-2015-agenda-has-changed-the-world-forever/ and Tom Wheeler, Saferworld: http://www.saferworld.org.uk/news-and-views/comment/182-peace-finds-its-place-at-the-heart-of-the-new-global-development-framework