

EPLO Briefing Paper 3/2012

The African Peace Facility

June 2012

List of Acronyms

ACP: African, Caribbean and Pacific
APF: African Peace Facility
APSA: African Peace and Security Architecture
ASF: African Stand-by Force
AU: African Union
AUC: African Union Commission
CENSAD: Community of Sahelo-Saharan States
CEWS: Continental Early warning System
COMESA: Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
COREPER: Committee of Permanent Representatives
CSDP: Common Security and Defence Policy
DAC: Development Assistance Committee
DEVCO: Directorate General for Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid
EAC: East African Community
EASF: East African Standby Force
EC: European Commission
ECCAS: Economic Community of Central African States
ECOWAS: Economic Community of West African States
EDF: European Development Fund
ERM: Early Response Mechanism
DCI: Development Cooperation Instrument
IGAD: Intergovernmental Authority on Development
JAES: Joint Africa-EU Strategy
MFF: Multiannual Financial Framework
MS: Member State
NARC: North African Regional Capability
NIP: National Indicative Programme
OECD: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PSC: Political and Security Committee (Council of the European Union)
PSC: Peace and Security Council (African Union)
PSD: Peace and Security Department
REC: Regional Economic Community
SADC: Southern African Development Community
RM: Regional Mechanism
RIP: Regional Indicative Programme
UN: United Nations

1. What is the African Peace Facility?

The African Peace Facility (APF) is the main EU funding instrument for promoting peace and security in Africa. It was created in 2003 at the request of the African Union (AU) in order to strengthen its nascent security structure and to 'support African solutions for African problems'.¹

The APF is financed through the European Development Fund (EDF). To date, more than € 1 billion has been allocated to it.²

It was originally designed to provide funding for:

1. African-led peace support operations managed directly or indirectly by the AU and validated by the UN
2. Capacity building activities.

However, since the establishment of the Joint EU-Africa Strategy (JAES) in 2007, the APF's remit has been broadened to support the JAES 'Peace and Security Partnership', the three priorities of which are:

1. To enhance dialogue on challenges to peace and security in Africa
2. To operationalise the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA)³
3. To provide predictable funding for African-led peace support operations

2. What has APF funding been used for?

As of January 2012, APF funds had been mainly allocated in support of the following three activities:⁴

Activities	Funds allocated ('Global commitments')	Funds contracted	Funds paid
Peace support operations	€ 840 million	€ 657 million	€ 560 million
Capacity building	€ 132 million	€ 49 million	€ 25 million
Early response mechanism (ERM)	€ 17 million	€ 15 million	€ 8 million

¹ Commissioner for Development and Humanitarian Aid, Poul Nielson (2004). See http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/fr/article_3984_fr.htm

² [African Peace Facility Annual Report 2011](#). The exact amount for the total of global commitments is EUR 1,039,800,000.

³ The APSA is made up of several components and structures, in particular an AU Peace and Security Council (PSC); a Continental Early Warning System (CEWS); a 'Panel of the Wise' with a mandate in conflict prevention and resolution; and an African Standby Force (ASF). There is also an African Peace Fund for promoting the work the AU Commission's (AUC) Peace and Security Department (PSD). African regional organisations with a mandate in peace and security (Regional economic communities (RECs) and regional mechanisms (RMs) form the pillars of the overall security architecture and regional components are key elements of the CEWS and the ASF.

⁴ In addition, funds have also been allocated for:

- a) Contingencies: € 25 million (4%) available under the tenth EDF (EDF 10)
- b) Audit, evaluation, monitoring, technical assistance, lessons learned and visibility: € 13 million (2%) available under EDF 10

There are major differences between the amounts of APF support which are allocated to each of the three main activities and the actual payments made. According to Part 1 of the Evaluation of the African Peace Facility (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Evaluation’), this is due to the AU and regional economic communities’ (RECs) limited ‘absorptive (and management) capacities’ and ‘structural deficiencies’ on financial management.⁵

Peace Support Operations

The objective of the APF support is to provide the sustainable and predictable funding required by the AU and African sub-regional organisations to plan and conduct peace support operations.

Peace Support Operation	APF contribution ⁶
Ongoing	
African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM)	€ 225 million (since 2007)
Consolidation of peace in the Central African Republic (MICOPAX, previously FOMUC)	€ 74 million (since 2004)
Completed	
African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS)	€ 256 million (2004-2007)
African Union Mission for support to the elections in the Comoros (AMISEC)	€ 45 million (2006-2008)

Capacity Building

The objective of the APF support is to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the AU and the RECs and regional mechanisms (RMs)⁷ on the planning and conduct of peace support operations in Africa, and to operationalise the APSA.

A number of specific activities are mentioned in the Evaluation and the two APF annual reports which have been published to date. These include:

- supporting the AU Commission (AUC), including supporting the employment of personnel in the Peace and Security Department (PSD)⁸
- financing REC/RM liaison offices to the AU in Addis Ababa and AU liaison offices in the RECs and RMs
- AU/REC/ASF brigades
- ASF workshops
- supporting the establishment of a CEWS⁹
- funding an assessment of the APSA¹⁰

The breakdown of the costs for these activities for the period 2007 to 2011 is not publicly available.

⁵ [Part 1 of the African Peace Facility Evaluation](#), pp. 9-10

⁶ As of January 2012. [African Peace Facility Annual Report 2011](#)

⁷ There are currently two relevant regional mechanisms: the East African Standby Force and the North African Regional Capability.

⁸ This is known as the ‘Joint Salaries Financing Arrangement’

⁹ See http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/acp/regional-cooperation/peace/capacity_building/capacity_building_en.htm

¹⁰ [African Peace Facility Annual Report 2010](#), p. 6

Beneficiaries of capacity building support for the period 2011-2014 include:¹¹

Continental organisation	AU
RECs with a peace and security mandate	Community of Sahelo-Saharan States (CENSAD)
	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)
	East African Community (EAC)
	Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS)
	Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)
	Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)
RMs for conflict prevention, management and resolution	Southern African Development Community (SADC)
	East African Standby Force (EASF)
	North African Regional Capability (NARC)

Two new programmes are due to be developed in 2012:

- 1) Supporting 17 centres for training civilian, police and military personnel who can be deployed in African peace support operations and, therefore, be part of the ASF;
- 2) Supporting the creation of AU Liaison Offices in post-conflict countries.

Early Response Mechanism

The objective of the APF support is to finance the preparatory stages of peace support operations or the initial steps of mediation processes (where urgent funding is required). It is intended to provide the AU and RECs with a source of immediate funding for the first stages of actions aimed at the prevention, management or resolution of crises.

The ERM is primarily dedicated to supporting:

- the first stages of mediation actions decided by the AU or RECs within the framework of preventive diplomacy
- identification and fact-finding missions by the AU or RECs to initiate the planning process for a peace support operation
- temporary, ad hoc reinforcement of the planning cell for a potential peace support operation

In 2010, the ERM financed early action in Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Madagascar, Niger, Somalia and Sudan (the Mbeki Panel). In 2011, it financed early action related to the Lord's Resistance Army, the AU High-level Implementation Panel for Sudan and actions in Côte d'Ivoire and Libya.¹²

The costs for each mission range from EUR 250,000 to EUR 1.4 million.¹³

3. What are the sources of funding for the APF?

The legal basis for the establishment of the APF is Article 11 of the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement (Cotonou Agreement) which acknowledges the 'security-development' nexus. The

¹¹ [African Peace Facility Annual Report 2011](#), p. 28

¹² [African Peace Facility Annual Report 2010](#) and [African Peace Facility Annual Report 2011](#)

¹³ [African Peace Facility Annual Report 2011](#), p. 27

APF can, therefore, be considered as 'development' funding directed towards creating the necessary security conditions for development.¹⁴

This has legal implications in terms of limiting the use of APF funding: it can only be used to cover certain costs incurred by African countries in deploying their peacekeeping forces in Africa (e.g. per diems, rations, medical supplies and facilities, transport, fuel, troop allowances and communication equipment).¹⁵ It cannot be used to cover the costs of providing arms, ammunition, paying soldiers' salaries, providing military training for soldiers or any other activity with a direct lethal end.¹⁶

The European Commission (EC) has never tried to include any APF-financed commitments in its aid reporting. However, since the APF can cover pre- and post-conflict phases, some APF activities may be considered as ODA-eligible ('DAC-able').¹⁷

EDF 9 (2000-2007)¹⁸	
1.5% of the EDF allocations to African countries via national indicative programmes (NIPs) ¹⁹	€ 126 million
Unallocated resources (reserves) from EDF 9	€ 124 million
5 successive replenishments from: 1) The Intra-ACP Regional Programme envelope 2) Additional voluntary contributions (approximately € 40 million) for specific support to AMISOM from eight interested EU Member States (MS) ²⁰	€ 50 million (2006) € 45 million, € 37 million, € 2 million and € 55 million (2007)
TOTAL	€ 439 million (2004-2007)²¹

EDF 10 (2008-2013)	
Intra-ACP Indicative Programme	€ 300.6 million
2011 replenishment from the general reserve for the Intra-ACP Regional Programme	€ 300 million
2012 replenishment from an internal reallocation of funds after the EDF mid-term review process	€ 100 million
TOTAL	€ 700.6 million (2008-2012)²²

¹⁴ [Part 1 of the African Peace Facility Evaluation](#), p. 14-15

¹⁵ [African Peace Facility Annual Report 2010](#), p. 5

According to the EC, these items account for 70% of the costs involved in peace and security operations.

¹⁶ The EU's eligibility criteria do not appear to be directly related to the OECD-DAC's criteria.

¹⁷ [African Peace Facility Annual Report 2010](#), p. 11

¹⁸ *ibid.*, p. 13

¹⁹ This is known as the 'NIP slicing mechanism'

²⁰ A special fund was created for this purpose. It is now a permanent legal feature of the APF but has not been used under EDF 10 because it has not yet all been allocated.

²¹ This total is the amount which has been earmarked for the APF. However, as explained in Section 2, the amounts contracted and actually spent are lower.

What would be the implications of funding the APF through the general EU budget?

When the APF was established in 2003, the EU budget strictly precluded any financing of operational expenditure having ‘military or defence implications’.²³ Since the EDF is not part of the general EU budget – and is therefore subject to different rules – it was agreed that the APF would be funded through this instrument.

There have been numerous calls for the EDF to be ‘budgetised’ (i.e. incorporated into the general EU budget). This would have a number of implications:

1. The APF would become subject to European Parliament scrutiny
2. It may be the case that the EU would have to establish a new funding mechanism, outside the general EU budget, in order to continue to support African-led military peace support operations. However, since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty this is no longer clear.²⁴

4. How is APF funding divided between peace support operations and non-military activities?

Although the APF page of the DG Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid (DEVCO) website lists capacity building – and not peace support operations – as the first priority of the Facility, the Evaluation indicates that there is a major imbalance between military-related and non-military activities and spending:

‘While [peace support operations] are well-managed, the comparative lack of long-term strategic thinking for the rest of APSA within the AUC and RECs will weaken the long-term impact of APF if it continues to be implemented with a narrow focus on intergovernmental organisations rather than a wider range of relevant stakeholders.

The 2010 APSA Assessment emphasised the need to focus on APSA policies, which are covered in MoU between the AU-RECs on APSA. These policies may have been underestimated to the benefit of [peace support operations] and military build-up. AU demands presented as APSA operationalisation, tend to see APSA pillars as objectives as such, rather than instruments to enable policy implementation. Such policies or corresponding initiatives should be the object of more targeted and specific APF support through, for example, the capacity building component.

Beyond the capacity building component, which should be granted sufficient strategic and political prioritisation, it appears that the police and civilian [peace support operations] components and training require more attention compared to the military

²² This total is the amount which has been earmarked for the APF. However, as explained in Section 2, the amounts contracted and actually spent can be lower. More information should be available when the APF Annual Report 2012 is published.

²³ [Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union](#), 29 December 2006, Article 28 (3).

²⁴ According to the EC, the Lisbon Treaty framework does not strictly preclude the future possibility of the EU using its general budget to finance support for African-led military peace support operations – as long as there would be unanimous support from EU MS. However, this does not seem very likely at present.

side. A lot has been written about the operationalisation of the African Stand-by Force and comparatively little about the other APSA pillars.²⁵

‘(...) African critics of APF say that the current arrangement only treats the symptoms of African conflicts, without contributing to the resolution of the causes. APF will be more effective – and its funding more firmly supported by its partners and stakeholders in Europe and in Africa – if APF is able to show that it is strengthening the institutional development of APSA as a whole, rather than mainly funding the AUC/RECs and [peace support operations].’²⁶

‘[The] AUC is developing lop-sided capacities, with only PSD showing real strength through [peace support operations].’²⁷

5. How does the EU ensure coherence between the APF and other funding instruments?

According to the EC, ‘efforts are being made to further strengthen coherence and complementarity between EU activities funded by the APF, EDF regional indicative programmes, the Instrument for Stability, [Common Security and Defence Policy] CSDP and others.’²⁸

a) EDF RIPs

RIPs can also fund capacity building activities for the APSA. For example, in 2007, the EC initiated a support programme through an RIP to help develop the capacity of ECCAS in the domain of peace and security.²⁹

According to the EC, the APF is focused on strengthening the link between the AU and the RECs, while RIPs support the link between RECs and their respective member states. Meetings take place between those officials with responsibility for the APF and their counterparts with responsibility for RIPs in order to avoid the risk of overlap.³⁰ An APF steering committee on capacity building meets once a year and representatives from the RECs and from the EU delegations to the RECs (who are in charge of the RIPs) are invited to attend so that they are aware of what is being funded through the APF.

b) (Proposed) Pan-African Programme

The EC has proposed the establishment of a ‘Pan-African Programme’ (PAP) as part of the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) under the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) (2014-2020). According to the EC’s proposal, the Pan-African Programme will provide support for the ‘objectives, initiatives and activities agreed in the Joint Africa-EU Strategy and its successive action plans’, covering *inter alia* ‘peace and security’. It is unclear at this stage how the proposed Pan-African Programme will differ from the existing capacity building component of the APF.

²⁵ [Part 1 of the African Peace Facility Evaluation](#), p. 16

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 17

²⁸ [African Peace Facility Annual Report 2011](#), p. 24

²⁹ *Programme d’Appui Paix et Sécurité* (PAPS)

³⁰ [Part 1 of the African Peace Facility Evaluation](#), p. 45

According to the EC, it is envisaged that a number of activities which are currently funded under the APF (EDF) will be gradually integrated into the general EU budget (DCI).

No information about the extent of formal and ad hoc coordination with the Instrument for Stability and CSDP missions is available on the APF page of the DEVCO website or in either of the annual reports which have been published to date.

6. Who are the direct beneficiaries of the APF? Are CSOs eligible for APF funding?

Under EDF 9, only the AU and the RECs/RMs (as pillars of the APSA) could be direct beneficiaries of the APF.

The scope of beneficiaries has been increased under EDF 10 to include other organisations (including CSOs) provided that they are formally linked to the APSA. The definition of beneficiaries was broadened in order to include training centres linked to RECs/RMs.³¹ However, these new beneficiaries cannot request any funding from the APF. The right of initiative only belongs to the AU and African regional organisations with a mandate in peace and security.

In March 2012, € 11 million were earmarked for funding 17 African training centres for the period February 2012 to January 2014. According to the EC, the training centres will provide 'specific trainings requested by five African regions and coordinated by the AUC.'³²

The only way CSOs can receive funding from the APF is indirectly (i.e. if the funding has been requested by the AU or an REC for a project which could involve CSOs.) However, since the AU or the REC would be wholly responsible for managing and administering the funding, there is no guarantee that the CSO(s) involved would have any meaningful input into how it is used.

The Evaluation is critical about the involvement of CSOs in the APF:

'Civil Society has not been engaged in [peace and security] in Africa (nor in Europe) yet CSOs are vital strategic partners.'³³

'CSO networks in Africa are strong and effective: their mobilisation potential is huge if APF can support or leverage APSA and RECs and NIPs in using them.'³⁴

Many other actors, such as individual African member states, but also civil society groups, research and training centres, specialised entities, private sector and other international organisations should be eligible for funding.³⁵

However, it seems unlikely that CSOs will become direct beneficiaries of APF funding after 2013 because APF funding is awarded in the scale of millions of euros and requires very heavy financial and management bureaucratic procedures.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2

³² European Commission, Press Release: '[The EU supports training of police, civilian and military personnel for African Peace Support Operations](#)', 12 March 2012

³³ [Part 1 of the African Peace Facility Evaluation](#), p. 17

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 18

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 37

On the other hand, the EC has suggested that a number of APF-funded activities may be integrated into the proposed DCI Pan-African Programme. This could result in CSOs becoming eligible for funding to build the capacity of the APSA (see Section 5).

7. How are funding decisions made?

The APF is a demand-driven instrument. The decision-making process for APF interventions is as follows:

Step 1: The EC receives a proposal from the AU and/or an African regional organisation with a mandate in Peace and Security (REC/RM) with a description of the intervention and a detailed budget.

Step 2: The EC packages the proposal into either an action programme or an informative note for the relevant Council preparatory working groups.

Step 3: The Council (either PSC or COREPER, depending on the nature of the document to review and the amount requested) approves the political appropriateness of the intervention by unanimity.

Step 4: The EC launches its own decision procedure to approve the funding (with inter-service consultation).³⁶

8. How is the use of APF funding monitored and evaluated?

Since 2009, the EC has published an annual report on the APF.

In 2010, the EC also commissioned a comprehensive evaluation of the APF. The first part (policy-oriented review focusing on procedures and possibilities of alternative future sources of funding) was published in late 2011. The second part will be a substantive evaluation of the overall implementation and results. According to the EC, it will be published in late 2012/early 2013.

Part 1 of the Evaluation does not mention any regular monitoring or evaluation efforts – except for ‘lessons-learned exercises’ that are actually missing:

‘APF regulations demand that ‘joint lessons learned exercises on APF implementation be held systematically’, so that outcomes can be discussed in relevant fora, in particular at the APF Joint Coordination Committee; and recommendations followed. However, since 2007 in Djibouti, such an exercise has never taken place. According to DEVCO C5 in Brussels, this issue has been extensively discussed in every capacity-building APF steering committee meeting. This is regrettable: these formal exercises provide a good opportunity to discuss the problems related to APF implementation more deeply and in a more detailed manner. Instead, DEVCO has to deal with problems on a case-by-case basis.’³⁷

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 19-23

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 25

EPLO Members

Berghof Foundation
Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HD Centre)
Civil Society Conflict Prevention Network (KATU)
Conciliation Resources
Crisis Management Initiative
Dialogue Advisory Group
ESSEC IRENÉ
European Network for Civil Peace Services
Fractal
Glencree Centre for Peace and Reconciliation
Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict
International Alert
International Center for Transitional Justice
International Crisis Group
Interpeace
Kosovar Centre for Security Studies
Kvinna till Kvinna
Life and Peace Institute
Nansen Dialogue Network
NGO Support Centre
Nonviolent Peaceforce
Oxfam International
Partners for Democratic Change International
Pax Christi International
Quaker Council for European Affairs
Saferworld
Search for Common Ground
swisspeace
Toledo International Centre for Peace (CITpax)
World Vision International

European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO)

The European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO) is the platform of European NGOs, networks of NGOs and think tanks which are committed to peacebuilding and the prevention of violent conflict.

EPLO aims to influence the EU so that it promotes and implements measures which lead to sustainable peace between states and within states and peoples, and which transform and resolve conflicts non-violently. EPLO wants the EU to recognise the crucial connection between peacebuilding, the eradication of poverty, and sustainable development worldwide and the crucial role NGOs have to play in sustainable EU efforts for peacebuilding, conflict prevention, and crisis management.

EPLO advances the interests of its members through common policy positions and consequently advocating for those common positions. EPLO disseminates information and promotes understanding of EU policies of concern to its Members. The Office builds also solidarity and cooperation amongst its members and with other relevant NGO networks.

Finally, EPLO raises awareness about the contribution the EU should make to peacebuilding and the need to hold the EU accountable to its own political commitments of helping secure peace within and outside its borders.

About EPLO's Briefing Papers

EPLO's briefing papers are succinct and accessible guides to EU policies on conflict prevention, peacebuilding, security and development. Their purpose is to inform those working in the broader peacebuilding field about developments at the EU-level.

EPLO Contacts

Catherine Woollard
Executive Director
Phone +32 (0)2 233 37 32
E-mail: cwoollard@eplo.org

Ben Moore
Senior Policy Officer
Phone : +32 (0)2 233 37 33
E-mail: bmoore@eplo.org

EPLO
Rue Belliard 205, Box 12
1040 Brussels
Belgium
Phone: +32 (0)2 233 37 37
Fax: +32 (0)2 233 37 38
E-mail: office@eplo.org
Web: www.eplo.org