

## Key messages from the learning basket «Inclusive Societies» @ F2F 2019 CHRnet «X-Change 4 Peace & Human Rights»

---

The following elements emerged while discussing inclusive societies during the F2F:

### (a) What does inclusive societies mean for SDC as an institution and at policy level?

The discussion on **pluralism and the role of civil society** for inclusion & cohesion raised the highest number of comments during the F2F including on legal restrictions, on innovative ways to support minorities, avoid stigmatization and polarization, as well as on promoting whole-of-society and multi-stakeholders approaches (with the private sector, with armed non-state actors, etc.). Participants stressed the importance of multilevel partnership (international, national, local) that are truly inclusive (including the youth and women, the media and the academia, or on expanding our understanding of civil society).

The question as to **how SDC should (re)act when authorities divide societies** has been of particular concern to the group. Participants insisted on gathering experiences from States having dealt successfully with divisions, and highlighted the importance for SDC of aiming at transformative change and, at the same time, avoiding regression. SENAP's experience raised a lot of interest in the group, especially the planned learning journey on this very issue.

SDC has a **pragmatic approach to social cohesion** while focusing on context-specific and on parameters such as trust, decent work, respect, etc. It does not have a specific policy. In that respect, participants stressed the importance of adopting the right **mix of instruments, in order to be fit for purpose**, while exchanging on opportunities for synergies and for breaking down silos **across the HDP Nexus**. Participants also invited for a differentiated **appreciation of roles**, including of SDC's role, especially with regard to values & principles, trust, communication, political engagement. The **importance of communication** was also highlighted: both towards all levels of government, including at the local level, and towards supporting communities in reducing stigmatization. Part of the group finally highlighted that **conflict sensitivity** should not be limited to programming but expanded to team management too, arguing that being truly inclusive starts within the team.

### (b) What does inclusive societies mean for the CHRnet (learning, capacity, QA)?

The SENAP Division plans for a Learning Journey on **authoritarian regimes** raised quite some interest among the network. This phenomenon is becoming an increasing challenge to an effective implementation of aid. The CHRNet will participate and support this learning.

**On accountability**, several discussions converged together while stressing: the links between CSPM & Aid Effectiveness, the role of beneficiary's assessments, the importance of enhanced analysis of power structures or that of adaptive management. These exchanges continue.

**On partnerships**, the group reflected the need to reflect on opportunities to foster inclusive societies by engaging a broader spectrum of actors, including religious actors, responsible private sector actors, but also to take the diversity of civil society into account.

### (c) What could inclusive societies mean for the Peace & Governance Cluster in the future in terms of learning, communicating, joint trainings, etc.

As an enabler, inclusive societies and social cohesion are essential to consider when fostering peaceful, just and inclusive societies. Even more, **inclusive societies is a critical concern of all the thematic units involved in promoting policies related to Peace, Governance and Equality** (LNOB, Gender, Human Rights...). In that context, the direct contribution of the CHRnet on HRBA, on the space for civil societies or, more generally, on fostering whole-of-government (w. local authorities) and whole-of-society approaches (w. NGOs, private sector, religious actors, etc) contributes significantly to SDC's granular analysis of contexts and dynamics of change.

Reconcile & accountability with existing instruments  
 INNOVATION  
 STRENGTHENING STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS FOR INCLUSIVE SOCIETY

**INCLUSIVE SOCIETIES**



**What have we learnt?**

What are the next steps/actions?		What needs in terms of "table level"?
<p><b>PARTNERSHIPS</b></p> <p>ROLES REFLECTION ON STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS FOR INCLUSIVE SOCIETY</p> <p>PLAYERS FOR INCLUSION BY RELIGIOUS ACTORS</p> <p>Identify &amp; work with responsible private sector actors</p> <p>Intensity of Civil Society? &amp; involvement</p>	<p><b>ACTION</b></p> <p>Seeking synergy between CSPTM and Social HR</p> <p>Africa</p> <p>Andrea Z. (16)</p> <p>Jane S. (16)</p> <p>J. (16)</p>	
<p><b>NARRATIVE ON INCLUSION PLURALISM</b></p> <p>Power structure</p>		
<p><b>AUTHORITARIANISM</b></p>	<p>Militaria</p> <p>Militaria</p> <p>Militaria</p> <p>Learning from authoritarianism</p> <p>Interest from AfH colleagues</p> <p>HR</p>	
<p><b>ACCOUNTABILITY</b></p> <p>CSPTM &amp; Aid effectiveness exp. accountability</p> <p>Accountability towards Affected Population (AAP)</p> <p>Expanding on the role of CSPTM</p> <p>Operational Adaptive Management</p> <p>Clarify Accountability &amp; related instruments</p>	<p>AAP's in Onk Network Monitoring</p>	
<p><b>ADAPTIVE MANAGMT</b></p>	<p>ALICE</p> <p>Adaptive Manag. learn</p>	