

## **Consultation Meeting on the Instrument for Stability (IfS) Crisis Preparedness Component (Article 4.3) Strategy Paper 2012-2013, Brussels, 24 January 2011**

### **Draft conclusions of break-out sessions**

#### ***1. Civil Society Break-out Session***

The break-out session addressed, in particular, issues mentioned in the 'Food-for thought' paper. In general, the discussion focused on two strands of support under the Peace-building Partnership (PbP): i) the disbursement of funding directly to non-state actors; and ii) the involvement of non-state actors in other components of the Partnership.

The multi-actor thematic approach to peace-building was broadly welcomed – with useful concrete examples mentioned, for example, the Confidence-building Early Response Mechanism in Georgia. Such a multi-actor approach may also serve to alleviate some concerns raised during the break-out session with respect to the share of PbP support channeled through the UN. In view of such a multi-actor approach, UN colleagues encouraged civil society to be in contact to discuss further co-operation possibilities. It was also suggested that member states could receive funding in order to channel it to civil society through joint projects and/or co-operation.

Several suggestions with regard to issues which could be included in such a thematic platform were put forward, including mediation/reconciliation and natural resources, climate change and conflict. It was further suggested that media and cultural relations also deserved attention as useful conflict prevention tools.

The proposal to explore possibilities relating to establishing civil society dialogue networks at a regional level was also generally welcomed, although the importance of ensuring that these are built on a solid basis of existing networks and that they have adequate links to policy-makers both at regional and EU level was underlined.

The break-out session emphasized that actions undertaken under Article 4.3 should be appropriately linked with other components of the IfS (Article 4.1 and 4.2, and Article 3 – including funds under the relevant facilities) and that - more generally - conflict prevention and peace-building issues should be better integrated into other EU instruments.

Finally, the discussion also went into more detail with regard to the proposed implementation of calls for proposals by EU Delegations - including the criteria for the selection of specific Delegations (political interest, capacity in terms of human resources, balance in geographical distribution, etc.); the amount of flexibility for individual Delegations to choose among the selected priority areas; and the inclusion of a regional element to the calls, where feasible. The usefulness of Delegations being able to organize the calls for proposals in two steps – first, the submission of a concept note, with only short-listed applicants requested to submit a full proposal - was underlined by several civil society participants.

#### ***2. International Organizations Break-out Session***

The break-out session examined the connection between IfS and broader peace-building strategies and how to ensure that strategies are informed by conflict assessments – not only from a crisis but also from a prevention angle. Related points included:

- The need to align assessments (EU, UN, other international organisations, different internal departments)
- Ensuring access of local actors to conflict assessment and strategy processes, in particular specific groups (women, economic actors)
- The overlap of themes across and within agencies, institutions and programmes, and the need to monitor risk of duplication between and within the EU and the UN, while ensuring coordination and complementarity.
- Important emerging themes where enhanced collaboration would be useful: natural resources and climate change; increasing importance of state fragility, gender mainstreaming and women's participation in peace processes.
- Considering alternative methodologies, for example, conflict mapping

The importance of focusing on not just the *what* but rather the *how*: the methodology of implementation was underlined. Common stumbling blocks include how different actors relate to each other. There is a need to facilitate dialogue between different actors, to support confidence-building measures, and to increase the mutual understanding of the different mandates and operational realities.

Moreover, the need to move from strengthening agencies' own capacity to sharing more broadly, making resources, tools and processes available to the broader field (across agencies and especially at country/local level) was emphasized. Joint training could be a good starting point: start strategising in training room. Ultimately, what matters is what happens in the field.

It was also felt that there is a need for more integrated strategies, both within agencies (UN, EU) and across agencies. It is necessary to look beyond the IfS as the sole funder of peace-building – and to also see it as a catalyst for other financial instruments and to consider its role in informing other instruments. It could also have a role in coordinating so that processes do correspond on the ground. However, there is a need to retain the flexibility of IfS, and to look beyond 2012 as well. There is a place for NGOs to participate in interventions – that in itself will build their capacity.

While complementary strategies on the higher/strategic level may increasingly be happening, this does not necessarily mean that it is reflected on the ground. There is a need to learn from those instances where this is working on both levels.

Both EU and UN struggle with tensions between HQ and the field. Similarly, there are some tensions between the conflict prevention/peace-building field and the development field. NGOs too need to consider how to bridge this gap (for example, how to relate to CONCORD).

The utility of building inclusive multi-actor platforms on the regional level was stressed. As part of this, there is the challenge of engaging Member States.

It was emphasized that there is a need to also look beyond strategies and to create political entry points for intervention. Peace-building/conflict prevention rhetoric is not always appropriate (for example, where local actors/government do not agree with the analysis); it is sometimes better to speak of 'change management'. The involvement of local actors is key in these interventions. The potential of regional organisations was highlighted in this context, since they can be perceived as 'insiders' and not as external intervention. The dialogue between civil society and regional organisations (for example, through the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, GPPAC) is in some

cases only at beginning stages. The EU and the UN can facilitate/promote that dialogue and the inclusion of civil society actors in their collaboration with regional organisations. There was consensus on moving from organisational to thematic clusters, but in doing so the need to be careful not to allow thematic clusters to become restrictive or prescriptive was emphasized. It is important to ensure both linkages between thematic clusters and to allow for holistic analyses, especially at country and local level.

In summary, the break-out session addressed:

- bringing collaboration (EU/UN/CSOs) at the strategic level to the ground/field
- bringing the focus of capacity-building from inward to outward -looking
- facilitating joint analysis and the joint development of capacities
- considering alternative methodologies and confidence building amongst actors

### ***3. Member States Break-out Session***

This break-out session addressed two main topics:

#### **1. Policy/thematic dialogue and co-operation with member states on CP/PB through exchanges /meetings with MS PB FM and DEV Agencies CP/PB units in view of :**

(i) scoping/identifying key actors/units, policies and financial instruments; (ii) examining practices of mainstreaming CP in EU and MS, as identified by INCAF; (iii) exploring synergies/consistency between EU and MS actions in fragile and conflict countries/regions settings; (iv) contributing to EU wide (EU/MS) conflict prevention/crisis response/peace building strategies; (v) identifying constraints and opportunities for MS DEV Agencies and other bodies to operate as implementing partners under IfS (and other EU instruments), in particular with regard to MS Agencies networks or consortia, like EUNIDA; (vi) in line with recommendations made at a recent seminar of the East-West institute on same topic and following best practices highlighted, undertaking joint CP missions (identification, assessment), joint evaluations and setting up joint learning portals .

#### **2. Training programmes through MS agencies/consortia (so far, EUPFT and ENTRI)**

(i) Examine possibilities for widening scope of PbP training to support CP/PB actions fitting within regional strategies, like the EU-Africa strategy. Example of training on protection of civilians in Africa currently taking place in African training institutes with support from UN; (ii) Worthiness of existing two PbP training projects acknowledged, whilst suggestions made to look at possible synergies between civilian and military training centres/methods; (iii) Consider also post-deployment training for personnel deployed in stabilization missions (traumatism, re-integration ..); (iv) Explore synergies between training and exercises (both military and civilian). However, it was noted that IfS PbP is a relatively small instrument, which is not designed to chart policies on exercises (designed by operational crisis management Directorates) nor on overall EEAS or MS training policies; (v) Put enhanced focus on training experts from third countries (both beneficiary countries and non-EU countries participating in missions); (vi) Importance of selecting/recruiting also civil society experts (as distinct from MS officials) for stabilization missions, and hence of associating CS experts to relevant training; (vii) Recruitment problem of civilian experts for stabilization missions is much broader than PbP 2012-13 Strategy paper can address. Nonetheless, it could contribute to supporting research and dialogue on the issue (including on constraints and possible solutions).