



## **Civil Society Dialogue Network Funding Instruments Meeting:**

### **Instrument for Stability**

### **2013 Annual Action Programmes & 2014-2020 Strategic Programming Orientations**

**Thursday 6 December 2012, Brussels**

## **MINUTES**

The [final agenda](#) of the meeting is available to download from the Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) page of the EPLO website.

### **1. Welcome**

The European Commission (EC) welcomed participants and congratulated Joëlle Jenny on her recent appointment as Director for Security Policy and Conflict Prevention.

The European External Action Service (EEAS) welcomed participants and explained the roles of the different departments within the EU institutions in the programming and implementation of the Instrument for Stability (IfS): implementation of the Crisis Preparedness Component (Article 4.3) – EC Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI); implementation of the Global and Trans-regional Threats Component (Article 4.1) & the Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Risks Component (Article 4.2) – EC's Directorate General for Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid (DEVCO); and strategic programming of all of the above components: the EEAS' Directorate for Security Policy and Conflict Prevention.

EPLO welcomed participants and invited them to engage fully in the dialogue. It also introduced the CSDN project and set the meeting in the context of the ongoing negotiations over the next EU multiannual financial framework (MFF) for the period 2014-2020.

### **2. Instrument for Stability (IfS) 2013 Annual Action Programme (AAP) – Crisis Preparedness Component (Article 4.3)**

The EC presented key elements from the [draft 2013 IfS AAP – Crisis Preparedness Component \(Article 4.3\)](#):

Participants raised the following issues:

- Regarding draft Action *Fiche 7* (Support to the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States through the International Dialogue for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding) – Will the OECD-DAC Secretariat / International Network for Conflict and Fragility (INCAF) be the only beneficiary? Will civil society organisations (CSOs), including those which are currently working on the implementation of the New Deal commitments in-country, also be beneficiaries?

- Regarding draft Action *Fiche 8* (Promoting job creation and private sector involvement in fragile or conflict-affected states) – Will the World Bank be the only intended beneficiary or might there be others (e.g. CSOs)?
- Please provide a positive and a negative example of an IfS-supported project or programme, and explain why they were successful or not
- Did the Unit for Governance, Democracy, Gender and Human Rights in DEVCO share its evaluation of the Country-based Support Scheme (CBSS) component of the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR)? If so, is FPI planning to take its findings into account regarding the future of the Peacebuilding Partnership (PbP) in-country calls for proposals?
- Please provide a list of the EU delegations (EUDs) which have been selected to manage the in-country calls for proposals for the 2012 AAP and a timeline for the launch of the calls
- Regarding draft Action *Fiche 3* (Provision of European Resources for Mediation Support – ERMES) – Will CSOs be among the beneficiaries?
- How will Action *Fiche 1* (Support to in-country actors to prevent and respond to crisis in fragile and conflict-affected situations) also address the issue of local CSOs' limited capacities to apply for PbP support?
- Regarding draft Action *Fiche 4* (Continued Support to Regional and Sub-Regional Partners in Crisis Response) – Will this include support for CSO advocacy towards regional organisations?
- Regarding the difficulty of multistakeholder partnerships – The EC seems to impose ever more stringent requirements on applicants, and the call for proposal process only focuses on the experience and financial capacity of the lead partner rather than on the consortium as a whole. Are there different ways of approaching this issue?
- Regarding draft Action *Fiche 5* (Support to the implementation of the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR)) – How will it be implemented?
- What are the next steps in the consultation process? Will the EC circulate a draft document and ask for specific input from CSOs?
- Are there any plans to reactivate the PbP Portal?
- Could the FPI set up an IfS equivalent of the EIDHR website?
- What are the geographical priorities for all IfS actions?
- What are your impressions of the first two rounds of in-country PbP calls for proposals?
- Were PbP calls for proposals launched in Zimbabwe and Guinea-Bissau?

In response the EC said:

- For the time being, it had only foreseen to work with the OECD-DAC Secretariat / INCAF under Action *Fiche 8*. It also encouraged those CSOs who were working on the implementation of the New Deal to share their analysis
- The activity under Action *Fiche 8* would be implemented by the World Bank (via the Global Facility) and be focused on three or four pilot countries. The calls for proposals under Action *Fiche 1* are designed instead for co-operation with non-state actors (NSAs) on, *inter alia*, corporate social responsibility of the private sector in conflict-prone contexts and youth employment as a conflict prevention and peacebuilding tool
- Action *Fiche 8* would be supported by the calls for proposals
- Example of a good project: In the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), the IfS has been used to support organisations which have helped women to contribute to incriminating one of the warlords who had been involved in crimes against them
- Area of difficulty: creating multistakeholder / interagency approaches. There are lots of obstacles to good co-operation. (NB/ The EC will continue to push in this direction)
- It is aware of the human resource capacity problems in EUDs and has the same difficulties as DEVCO does with the management of the CBSS component of the EIDHR
- Regarding the call for proposals under the 2012 AAP, relevant EUDs were contacted in May/June 2012 and a number of positive responses were received. An interservice committee (FPI, DEVCO and EEAS) was convened and the following seven EUDs were selected: Brazil, the DRC, EI

Salvador, Haiti, India (regional call), Kyrgyzstan and Nicaragua (regional call). The PbP call for proposals for El Salvador has already been published on the EUD and DEVCO websites

- In 2013, FPI will have its own website which it will use to publicise the PbP calls for proposals so it will be able to take a more pro-active role in announcing which EUDs have been selected to manage them. The criteria for the selection of EUDs are: 1. the existence of sufficient human resource capacity; 2. priorities in the country in question; 3. their linkages to the overall IfS Strategy and complementarity; and 4. overall geographic distribution
- It is aware of the difficulties involved in submitting funding applications and staff in EUDs are providing assistance to selected CSOs to understand how to do proper financial reporting
- European CSOs, especially those with offices in the countries where PbP calls for proposals are launched, could play a mentoring role
- Regarding Action *Fiche* 3, FPI intends to award a service contract to a body or an organisation to be selected through a call for tenders and, therefore, also open to CSOs
- It does not foresee the involvement of CSOs in activities under Action *Fiche* 4. However, it recently launched a PbP call for proposals for CSO involvement in early warning activities which is complementary
- It is open to suggestions for how the requirements under calls for proposals with respect to partnerships can be improved but it has to work within the limits of the Financial Regulation
- It foresees working with the ICGLR Secretariat and national administrations for the implementation of Action *Fiche* 5
- The decision was taken to close the PbP Portal because there were issues with data protection and restricting the flow of information to registered users. There are no plans to reopen it but all information about PbP calls for proposals will continue to be published on the main DEVCO website and the websites of individual EUDs
- The IfS generally has global outreach
- It will reflect on the consultation process and respond later. It would like to receive more information about the EIDHR “best practices”. It will look into the possibility of an IfS equivalent of the EIDHR website. For the time being, relevant IfS information will be posted on the DEVCO and EEAS websites
- First impressions about the PbP calls for proposals are largely positive. It has received a number of requests from EUDs for top-up funds. Some EUDs which managed the first calls for proposals have also applied for the second round. There is more demand from EUDs than the financial envelope can accommodate
- In 2010, PbP support in Guinea-Bissau and Zimbabwe was provided by direct award. More information will be provided in the 2012 Annual Report on the Implementation of the IfS

The EEAS added:

- It had been asked to undertake a study on strengthening EU mediation support capacities, including the possibility of establishing a European Institute for Peace. The study, which was completed in October, had two main recommendations: 1. Strengthen the EU’s internal mediation support capacity; 2. Strengthen independent mediation support capacity. ERMES complements the EU’s efforts to strengthen its internal mediation support capacity. Regarding independent initiatives, the High Representative for Foreign and Security Policy has indicated that the EEAS would be willing to co-operate with them

### **3. IfS 2013 AAP – Global and Trans-regional Threats Component (Article 4.1) & Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Risks Component (Article 4.2)**

The EC presented key elements from the [draft 2013 IfS AAP – Global and Trans-regional Threats Component \(Article 4.1\) & CBRN Risks Component \(Article 4.2\)](#).

Participants raised the following issues:

- Regarding implementation modalities – CSOs also have an added value in the implementation of activities in areas such as countering radicalism, small arms and light weapons control etc.
- How are the activities supported under the long-term component of the IfS related to other work which is taking place at the grassroots level (e.g. in Pakistan?) How does the long-term component of the IfS support local initiatives?
- Is any of the financial assistance provided under this component allocated in the form of general- or sectoral budget support? If so, what are the conditionalities? Are they the same as for other areas of EU development assistance?
- Why does the upcoming drawdown of foreign troops in Afghanistan and its implications for conflict and security in the region not feature more strongly in the draft AAP?
- What are the implications of the drugs trade for conflict and instability in the region?
- Does the EU work with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) on issues relating to drug trafficking and terrorism in the Sahel region?
- To what extent does the EU look at the environment as a potential component in addressing certain security risks, especially in Afghanistan?
- Please elaborate on the IfS-supported activities relating to drugs- and arms trafficking
- Are there plans to expand the *Collège Sahélien de Sécurité* to cover other countries in the region, including Algeria?
- Regarding support for activities in the field of counter terrorism – Why has there been a lack of suitable project proposals?
- Regarding civil society participation in EU Member States' (MS) consortia – How can CSOs contact the relevant people in EU MS?
- Regarding the EC's workshop on combating violent extremism (CVE) – Who participated?
- Is there an interest from EU MS for civil society participation in their consortia?

In response the EC said:

- CSO input is indeed considered useful and, dependent on eligibility rules for specific assignments, CSOs should consider participating in calls for proposals, in most cases probably as partners in EU MS' consortia
- It will do more internal reflection about the possibility of CSO involvement in the implementation of projects and programmes
- All financial assistance is provided in grant form. It is linked to development assistance in that the IfS projects and programmes are complementary to activities which are supported under the geographic programmes
- It needs to take the post-2014 situation in Afghanistan into consideration
- Youth issues and problems relating to single-parent families are also potential sources of conflict and extremism in the region
- It is very active in the Sahel region and working closely with ECOWAS. It is supporting several initiatives, including the West African Police Information System (WAPIS), the *Collège Sahélien de Sécurité* and, most recently, EU MS expert analysis of Boko Haram. IfS projects and programmes are also linked to the CSDP missions in the region
- The EU is currently supporting activities to address environmental issues under other funding instruments. However, the EC has included addressing the destabilising impact of climate change as a priority in its proposal for the next IfS Regulation
- Action Fiche 4 of the [2012 IfS AAP – Crisis Preparedness Component](#) on 'Climate change and security in Eastern Europe and Central Asia' foresees substantial civil society involvement
- Women, peace and security will be a priority of the PbP call for proposals in Kyrgyzstan which will be launched in the first half of 2013
- Regarding the control of small arms and light weapons (SALW) – it is supporting the Regional Centre on Small Arms in the Great Lakes Region the Horn of Africa and Bordering States

(RECSA) in Kenya, the Central American Programme on Small Arms Control (CASAC) in Central America, and INTERPOL's Illicit Arms Records and Tracing Management System (iARMS)

- Regarding counter-terrorism – It is focusing on the countries and regions which are specified in the programming documents: Pakistan, the Sahel and the Horn of Africa, including Yemen
- Regarding CVE – it organised a workshop in November and is currently in the identification/formulation phase of two projects in Pakistan and the Horn of Africa, including Yemen. It is possible that it will work with CSOs
- It has a € 15 million programme in Central Asia to address the issue of uranium tailings
- The *Collège Sahélien de Sécurité* started with three countries (Mali, Mauritania and Niger) for practical reasons. It may be expanded to cover other countries in the future
- Regarding CVE – it needs to think carefully about what it can do; it will continue internal reflection and welcomes civil society input
- It can provide the names of the EU MS contact points for CBRN risk mitigation. For other areas, activities are centralised in Brussels with assistance from implementing agencies in partner countries
- The aim of the workshop on CVE was to sensitise EU staff in headquarters and EUDs about the possibility of supporting certain activities through traditional development instruments. Participants included representatives from EU MS and several third countries, UN officials, representatives of youth groups and academics

#### **4. Brainstorming on the possible orientations for the 2014-2020 Strategy Paper (SP) and accompanying Multiannual Indicative Programme (MIP)**

The EEAS presented an overview of the proposal for the next IfS Regulation IfS (2014-2020) and possible orientations for the accompanying SPs and MIPs with two caveats: 1. this meeting represents the very first stage of a consultation process which will involve other EU institutions, EU MS and other actors; 2. the approval of the SP and the MIP cannot be launched until the Regulation is adopted:

- The proposed financial allocation for the IfS is € 2.8 billion, of which approximately one-third would be programmable and two-thirds would be for crisis response
- It will continue to not be bound by ODA eligibility requirements, although it is expected that most IfS assistance will still meet these requirements and be reported as ODA to the OECD-DAC
- The global scope of the IfS will be maintained (i.e. all countries will be eligible for IfS funding regardless of whether they are developing countries or not)
- The current Article 4.3 (Pre- and post-crisis capacity building) will be replaced by a new Article 4 (Assistance for conflict prevention, crisis preparedness and peace-building)
- The current Article 4.1 (Threats to law and order, to the security and safety of individuals, to critical infrastructure and to public health) and Article 4.2 (risk mitigation and preparedness relating to chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear materials or agents) will be replaced by new Article 5 (Assistance in addressing global and transregional and emerging threats)
- Programming Principles:
  - Subsidiarity – IfS is an “instrument of last resort” (i.e. it should not be used to support activities which can be supported under other instruments, especially geographic instruments)
  - Added value – 1. when the issue addressed exceeds the scope of a geographic instrument; 2. when an activity is not “DAC-able”; 3. when assistance is not country-specific; 4. when there is a need to pursue a “continuous thematic approach”
  - Complementarity with other instruments
  - Consistency – 1. with overall EU external action; 2. with development policy (i.e. policy coherence for development); 3. with internal EU policies
  - Coordination
  - Multilateralism
  - Partnership
  - Ownership

Regarding the proposed Article 4, preliminary thoughts are:

- Focus will continue to be on capacity building for the EU and its partners (i.e. CSOs, international and regional organisations, and EU MS) in four areas:
  1. Promoting early warning and conflict-sensitive risk analysis (including working with regional organisations, and improving and refining conflict risk assessment tools)
  2. Facilitating confidence building, mediation and reconciliation, (including enhancing mediation support activities and focus on dialogue with civil society)
  3. Strengthening capacities for participation in civilian stabilisation missions (including flanking measures for CSDP missions and deployment-linked training)
  4. Improvement of post-conflict and post-disaster recovery

Regarding the proposed Article 5:

- Two sub-articles:
  1. Threats to law and order, critical infrastructure, public health and destabilising effects of climate change
    - Under threats to law and order: counter-terrorism (including CVE), addressing organised crime (including cybercrime) and all forms of trafficking
    - Under critical infrastructure: transport (e.g. civil aviation, maritime security), protection of energy infrastructure, and cyber security
    - Under public health threats: falsified and other unsafe medicines, pandemics
    - Under climate change: global and trans-regional climate change effects having a destabilising impact
  2. Mitigation of CBRN risks – continue as before but with less focus on former USSR countries

Participants raised the following issues:

- Are there plans to create regional CSDNs?
- Regarding the ODA-eligibility requirement under the next IfS Regulation – What type of activities can the EU not support under the current IfS (due to the current ODA-eligibility requirement)?
- Regarding Article 3 – Have there ever been any regional crisis response activities or are they always country-specific?
- What is the timeline for the programming process and what type of civil society input would be most useful?
- When will you know the financial allocation for the next IfS? Will the decision on the financial allocation trigger another round of consultation on priorities?
- Regarding reference to support for resilience in new Article 4 component – What does it mean in practical terms?
- In a recent reflection paper, the EU's Counter-terrorism Coordinator, Giles de Kerchove, argued that the EU could use the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) and the European Development Fund (EDF) to support certain types of counter-terrorism measures (e.g. certain criminal justice measures)
- How do you plan to limit the scope of the new IfS so that it does not become a “catch-all” instrument?
- Is the next IfS likely to be even more oversubscribed than the present one?
- What can CSOs do to support the EC proposal for the external spending part of the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) and the IfS?
- A limited awareness of the OECD-DAC criteria among certain members of the European Parliament (EP) and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) poses an obstacle to the inclusion of support for peacebuilding in development instruments

- What are the prospects for the integration of the FPI into the EEAS following the latter's mid-term review in 2013?
- What do you think about the idea of outsourcing the management of larger grants to big international NGOs (in order to free up human resources in the EU institutions to focus on strategy)?

In response the EEAS said:

- It could be useful to continue to explore the possibility of applying the CSDN model on a regional basis, which is already mentioned in the current SP. It is conscious of the constraints (e.g. need to find viable partners in the region, need to connect it to ongoing EU policy and activities in country/region and need for buy-in from EUDs.) It might try to work on it within the framework of the existing CSDN
- If the IfS was bound by ODA eligibility criteria it would not be able to support a number of activities, including the CSDN
- The decision on the financial allocation for the IfS will certainly have an impact on the choice of priorities. However, it is not yet clear how or to what extent
- This is the first stage of a long and complex process which will involve other EU institutions, EU MS and other actors. All input is welcome as soon as possible
- The term resilience is not very precise but generally refers to the ability of conflict-affected or conflict-prone countries to (re-)emerge from a crisis situation
- Regarding the use of development assistance for counter-terrorism activities, it is technically possible in certain cases if they support development objectives (e.g. criminal justice, border management, money laundering, counter-radicalisation etc.)
- It is also trying to sensitise the geographic desks about the need to address conflict prevention and peacebuilding in the geographic programmes. In this context, it has prepared programming guidance which is currently being consulted with DEVCO
- It is very conscious of the need to mainstream conflict prevention and peacebuilding into the work of the geographic directorates. It has participated in country team meetings for a number of countries which are in situations of fragility and/or conflict
- There are a lot of misconceptions about ODA eligibility in the EP and in certain NGOs
- It is not legally possible for the EEAS to manage the implementation of operational funding under the EU Budget other than its own administrative expenditure. However, the EEAS has excellent co-operation with both the FPI and DEVCO regarding the implementation of the IfS

The EC added:

- There have been multi-country IfS crisis response activities (e.g. Niger and Mali, and Syria and four other countries in the region)
- It is still working within the constraints of the Financial Regulation

## 5. Conclusions

EPLO thanked the speakers and participants, and invited them to send comments on the draft AAPs to the EC by Friday 14 December 2012.

### Civil Society Dialogue Network

The Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) is a three-year project funded by the European Commission aimed at facilitating dialogue on peacebuilding issues between civil society and EU policy makers. It is managed by the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO). For more information please visit the [EPLO website](http://www.eplo.org).