



Civil Society Dialogue Network Funding Instruments Meeting

Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace

2019-20 Multiannual Action Programme (Article 4)

and

2019 Annual Action Programme (Article 5)

&

Implementation of Article 3

Wednesday 12 December 2018, Brussels

MINUTES

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

1. Session 1: Exchange of views on the implementation of Article 3 (Response to situations of crisis or emerging crisis to prevent conflicts)

The European Commission (EC) presented the main features of the [Article 3 \(Response to situations of crisis or emerging crisis to prevent conflicts\)](#) component of the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP).

Participants asked the following questions:

1. Please provide a breakdown of how Article 3 funding is divided between different recipients (i.e. civil society organisations (CSOs), international organisations (IOs) etc.).
2. What are the challenges involved in fully integrating the women, peace and security (WPS) agenda into Article 3 actions?
3. How can CSOs apply for Article 3 funding?
4. What advice would you give to CSOs which are interested in applying for Article 3 funding?
5. How do you ensure the conflict sensitivity of Article 3 actions?
6. At which levels (i.e. Track 1, Track 2 and/or Track 3) is Article 3 funding used to support mediation?
7. How do you measure the impact of Article 3 actions?
8. Is the Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI) required to report on the impact of Article 3 actions at the country level?
9. What happens when an Article 3 action requires funding over a longer period?
10. How does Article 3 funding complement other European Union (EU) external financing instruments (e.g. trust funds)?

11. Can Article 3 funding be used to support actions which are related to foreseeable events (e.g. elections)?
12. Are there any geographic or thematic priorities for Article 3 in 2019?
13. Is there a minimum amount for Article 3 actions?
14. How is FPI involved in the discussions on the humanitarian-development nexus?

In response, the EC said:

1. The breakdown of Article 3 funding between different types of recipients in 2017 is not available yet. The main implementing partners are United Nations (UN) agencies, Member States (MS) agencies, and international and local non-governmental organisations (NGOs). There are no benchmarks regarding the breakdown of Article 3 funding.
2. FPI tries to include the WPS agenda as much as possible in its work, including through Article 3 actions.
3. There are no calls for proposals for Article 3 funding as it is allocated through direct awards. If CSOs have an idea for an action which cannot be funded by another EU external financing instrument, they can present it to FPI staff members at any of the three levels (i.e. EU delegation (EUD), regional team or headquarters).
4. An action is most likely to receive funding when:
 - i. The following information is presented clearly in the concept: the planned activity(ies), the theory of change, the political component, the added value of EU funding etc.
 - ii. There is consistent communication with and between all EU counterparts (i.e. EUD, regional team and headquarters). CSOs can help to facilitate this by being very clear in their own communications (e.g. Which FPI staff members did you meet? What did you discuss? What was their response?).
5. Due to time constraints, it is not possible to undertake complete conflict analyses before Article 3 actions are implemented. However, FPI (headquarters) involves various other services from the European External Action Service (EEAS) (notably geographical directorates) and the EC (e.g. humanitarian aid and development), EUDs and regional teams in order to pull together their respective analyses when it is deciding whether or not to finance actions. Ultimately, implementing partners should also be aware of the local conflict dynamics and take them into account in the implementation of actions.
6. All types of mediation activities are supported through Article 3. Some actions are not labelled as 'mediation' actions *per se* but they still have a mediation component.
7. It is difficult to measure the impact of Article 3 actions as it is often difficult to attribute a particular political development to a single action. Implementing partners are required to provide indicators to measure the success or otherwise of their particular action(s). FPI has to present the results of Article 3 actions to the EU's Political and Security Committee (PSC).
8. No. FPI is held accountable for ensuring that Article 3 funding is properly contracted through appropriate implementing partners and that actions can be justified.
9. Following the provision of Article 3 funding (18 month duration), other IcSP funding (e.g. Article 4) or funding from other external financing instruments (e.g. Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI)) can be used to support longer-term actions.
10. To date, co-operation between Article 3 funding and EU trust funds has been positive.
11. Article 3 is a non-programmable crisis response mechanism. It is, therefore, not used to support actions related to predictable events.
12. FPI will present a list of possible geographic priorities to PSC in February 2019.
13. There is no minimum amount for Article 3 actions. However, in order to avoid excessive administrative burdens, different actions in the same country/region are packaged before being approved by the PSC.
14. FPI is not directly involved in the policy discussions on the humanitarian-development-peace nexus. However, it is clearly heavily involved in its implementation.

2. Session 2: Article 5 (Global and trans-regional threats and emerging threats)

The EC presented the [2018 AAP for Article 5 and initial thoughts on the 2019 AAP](#).

Participants asked the following questions:

1. How does the EU take into account the impact of counterterrorism (CT) legislation on CSOs' work in conflict-affected countries?
2. Please provide more information about the capacity building of military actors in support of development and security for development (CSBD) actions which are envisaged to take place in Burkina Faso.
3. How do CSOs access Article 5 funding?
4. Please provide more information about the 'Expert Support Facility'.

In response the EC said:

1. The EC's Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DG DEVCO) has developed [operational guidelines on the preparation and implementation of EU-financed actions specific to CT and violent extremism \(VE\) in third countries](#) and the '[Operational Human Rights Guidance for EU external cooperation actions addressing Terrorism, Organised Crime and Cybersecurity](#)'. DEVCO does take into account the security and/or credibility risks associated with labelling actions 'countering/preventing violent extremism' (C/PVE) in its engagement with CSOs.
2. If approved, the Article 5 CSBD actions which are envisaged to take place, among other places, in Burkina Faso would be focused on the provision of training in the areas of human rights, good governance and human resources management, the provision of protective equipment, the improvement of information and technology (IT) systems, etc.
3. The Article 5 funding which is allocated in support of CT actions is normally provided through MS agencies' calls for proposals.
4. The Expert Support Facility is a technical assistance facility with several objectives, including to contract experts to assist DEVCO in the identification, formulation, evaluation and implementation of actions under Article 5.

3. OPSYS

The EC gave a short presentation on the [new EU system for the management and monitoring of EU actions: OPSYS](#).

Participants asked the following questions:

1. Have you identified common indicators for IcSP-funded projects? If so, will their use be mandatory?
2. Were CSOs involved in the identification and formulation of common indicators?
3. Will there be individual (i.e. personal) access to OPSYS or will access be limited to one user per implementing partner?

In response, the EC said:

1. A set of indicators for IcSP-funded actions (projects) has been developed based on the architecture and the logic of articles 3 and 4 of the IcSP Regulation. This set of indicators corresponds to the indicators which are identified in the [FPI Results Framework](#). Where necessary, implementing partners will also be able to propose new indicators which may be agreed with FPI programme managers.

Indicators for Article 5 will correspond to those indicators which are identified in the [EU International Cooperation and Development Results Framework](#) (EURF). Where necessary, implementing partners will also be able to propose new indicators which may be agreed with DEVCO programme managers.

2. CSOs were not involved in the identification and formulation of common indicators. However, the process was informed upstream by peer consultations with international partners (e.g. the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), the World Bank and the United States Institute of Peace (USIP)) and supplemented by technical inputs from an external consultant.
3. It will be possible for anyone to search OPSYS in order to find information about EU-funded actions. For actions which are being implemented by a consortium, the lead implementing partner will be able to input information into OPSYS.

4. Session 3: Article 4 (Conflict prevention, peace-building and crisis preparedness)

The EC presented the [2018 AAP for Article 4 \(Conflict prevention, peace-building and crisis preparedness\) and initial thoughts on the 2019-2020 Multiannual Action Programme \(MAAP\)](#).

Participants asked the following questions:

1. Do you foresee any specific activities on multilateralism in addition to support to the UN? Will any other IOs also be supported?
2. What kind of in-country support is provided in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region?
3. Given that the MAAP will cover a two-year period, will there be any possibility to adapt it mid-term?
4. Please provide more information about the 'EU Police and Civilian Services Training' (EUPCST) action.
5. Is it possible to implement IcSP actions which merge different themes (e.g. natural resources, youth, peace and security (YPS) and/or WPS)?
6. Please provide more information about the 'innovative peacebuilding initiatives'.
7. Given the importance of investing in long-term peacebuilding activities, why is the financial allocation for Article 4 so much smaller than the financial allocation for Article 3?
8. Apart from Haiti, are any other country-specific calls for proposals foreseen in 2019?

In response, the EC said:

1. The EC is currently considering providing Article 4 support to African regional organisations and will continue its support to other regional organisations.
2. A call for proposals was published for Tunisia in 2017 and five projects have been launched.
3. It is possible that part of the financial envelope for Article 4 (e.g. 10-15%) will not be allocated at the start in order to allow for some flexibility later on.
4. EUPCST is a continuation of the [EU Police Services Training \(EUPST\)](#) II action. It is separate from the CBSD action.
5. Most Article 4 actions do take into account and/or encourage the mainstreaming of elements such as YPS and WPS throughout other thematic priorities (e.g. natural resources and conflict, mediation etc.) without necessarily targeting them directly. FPI encourages complementarity and synergy between different Article 4 actions and calls for proposals are generally fairly broad in order to facilitate context-specific adaptation.
6. FPI is currently considering alternative funding modalities (e.g. seed funding). This will be the focus of one of the small group discussions in the next session.
7. The financial allocations for Article 3 and Article 4 are determined by the [IcSP Regulation](#) which was adopted by the European Parliament and the Council of the EU in 2014.
8. Although no decisions have been taken yet, it is possible that there will be a regional call for proposals in Central Asia, and both multi-country and country-specific calls for proposals in Southeast Asia, the Horn of Africa and West Africa.

5. Session 4: Small group discussions on priority areas for Article 4 in 2019-2020

A civil society participant gave a summary of the issues which had been raised in the small discussion group on '[Youth peace and security](#)'.

A civil society participant gave a summary of the issues which had been raised in the small discussion group on '[Social media and conflict](#)'.

A civil society participant gave a summary of the issues which had been raised in the small discussion group on '[Seed funding for peacebuilding](#)'.

A civil society participant gave a summary of the issues which had been raised in the small discussion group on '[Business for peace](#)'.

Civil Society Dialogue Network

The Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) is a mechanism for dialogue between civil society and EU policy-makers on issues related to peace and conflict. It is co-financed by the European Union (Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace). It is managed by the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO), a civil society network, in co-operation with the European Commission (EC) and the European External Action Service (EEAS). The third phase of the CSDN will last from 2017 to 2020. For more information, please visit the [EPLO website](#).