

Civil Society Dialogue Network Funding Instruments Meeting:

Instrument for Stability Strategy Paper 2012-2013 & Multiannual Indicative Programme 2012-2013 & Instrument for Stability Crisis Preparedness Component Annual Action Programme 2012

Thursday 8 December 2011, Brussels

DRAFT MINUTES

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

1. Draft Strategy Paper 2012-2013 and the draft Multiannual Indicative Programme 2012-2013

The European External Action Service (EEAS) presented key elements from the draft Strategy Paper (SP) 2012-2013:

- Since the SP is still in draft form it has not been possible to distribute it
- Preliminary consultations took place in December 2010 and January 2011 and their [conclusions](#) have been largely integrated into the draft SP
- No major changes are foreseen from the current SP; it will have three objectives: non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, counteracting global and trans-regional threats, and building capacity for effective crisis response
- Effort to respond to political priorities of EU external action (e.g. counteracting trafficking, piracy etc.)
- Innovative aspects include measures to address cyber security and trafficking of counterfeit medicines
- Guiding principles:
 - Added value: The Instrument for Stability (IfS) is a thematic instrument; it should not replicate what is being done under the geographic instruments. Emphasis has been put on addressing trans-regional issues which cannot be addressed under specific geographical instruments
 - Complementarity with other instruments (thematic and geographic)
 - Coherence with EU development policy and Common Foreign and Security Policy (including Common Security and Defence Policy)
- The draft SP envisages continuing the focus on upstream investment with partners (i.e. civil society organisations (CSOs), international- and regional organisations, and EU Member States)
- To date, co-operation with EU Member States has been focused primarily on training personnel to participate in stabilisation missions; there are plans to broaden it under the new SP
- There are also plans to explore the issue of multi-stakeholder actions but they might be constrained by the Financial Regulation
- In recent years, co-operation with CSOs has been increasingly focused on working through the EU Delegations (EUDs); it is envisaged that this will continue under the new SP

- There are plans to explore the possibility of applying the Civil Society Dialogue Network model on a regional basis (depending on certain preconditions such as the existence of sufficiently well-organised CSO partners and its potential for producing useful policy input)
- There are also plans to continue to strengthen policy dialogue with the relevant parts of the international community (e.g. UN agencies, regional organisations and EU Member States)
- The crisis preparedness component of the draft multiannual indicative programme (MIP) 2012-2013 is at an even more initial stage than the draft SP but ideas for its content are based on the draft SP
- The draft SP will go for inter-service consultation as soon as the EEAS gets approval from the HR's *cabinet*

Participants raised the following issues:

- Have the conclusions from the recent European Court of Auditors (ECA) special report on 'The efficiency and effectiveness of EU contributions channelled through United Nations Organisations in conflict-affected countries' been taken into consideration in the draft SP?
- The proposal to explore multi-stakeholder approaches is very welcome. How will transparency be ensured with respect to the selection of partners?
- Regional CSOs could be a very important entry point for work with regional organisations
- Which countries and themes will be prioritised?

In response:

- The EEAS reminded participants that under the IfS, the EU is required to work with a series of implementing partners, including international- and regional organisations. The European Commission (EC) added that UN agencies are the only ones which are able to operate in certain theatres and that the EU was trying to change the relationship from being the EU as a funder and the UN as an implementer to one in which the EU plays a more strategic role. It was also recalled that the ECA special report did not cover the IfS
- The EEAS noted that the multi-stakeholder approach may be particularly complicated to implement, given that – under the Financial Regulation – differing funding modalities needed to be applied to different types of partner. However, within these constraints, the maximum possible amount of transparency of funding would continue to be assured
- The EC highlighted the criteria (e.g. interest, geographical distribution, needs etc.) which it uses to select EUDs to implement calls for proposals for CSOs

2. Draft Annual Action Programme 2012

The EC presented key elements from the [draft AAP 2012](#) with the caveat that it had not yet been submitted for inter-service consultation nor approved by the EU Member States. It also reminded participants that the approval of the draft AAP was also linked to the prior adoption of the abovementioned SP and MIP:

- Less focus on UN agencies than in the AAP 2011
- Since 2010, 14 EU Delegations in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East have managed calls for proposals
- Calls for proposals for CSOs, implemented by EUDs, under draft Action *Fiche* 1 will be published on the EC website, the Peacebuilding Partnership portal and EUD websites
- It is envisaged that there will be a global call for proposals on early warning under draft Action *Fiche* 2 and a pilot project on support for artisanal miners under draft Action *Fiche* 5
- If the SP process goes ahead as planned, the AAP drafting process will take place in parallel with a view to adoption by the end of March 2012. Suggestions from participants with respect to the AAP are welcome until the end of the year

Participants raised the following issues:

- Is the EC planning to launch any calls for proposals on climate change, natural resources and conflict in the Sahel region?
- What is the proposed financial allocation for the different thematic areas under draft Action *Fiche* 1? What was the equivalent figure under the AAP 2011?
- How many EUDs will manage calls under the AAP 2012 and how will they be selected?
- Will the EC publish statistics regarding Europe's New Training Initiative for Civilian Crisis Management (ENTRi) (e.g. gender, nationality, deployment etc.)? Are there any plans to broaden the scope of training from police and justice to other areas such as mediation and dialogue?
- Will draft Action *Fiche* 6 include any focus on conflict prevention?
- How will the € 22 million which have been proposed for the AAP 2012 be divided between the six draft Action *Fiches*?
- What exactly is being proposed under draft Action *Fiche* 2 in terms of links to policy?
- What is the timeline for the calls for proposals which are foreseen under the 2011 AAP?

In response:

- The EC reminded participants that it does not impose the management of calls for proposals on EUDs; it asks them to express interest. Under the AAP 2011, the EC will sign an agreement with UNDP to develop the strategic capacity of non-state actors in the sustainable management of natural resources. It is planned that the Sahel region will be included within its scope
- It is not possible to determine the financial allocation for the different thematic areas in advance; it depends on the requests received from the EUDs. Under the AAP 2011, EUDs were requested to express interest and a final selection was made in consultation with the EEAS and the EC's Directorate General Development Cooperation – EuropeAid. Information on the final financial allocations between the selected EUDs will be presented in the IfS Annual Report for 2011
- In 2010, the following six EUDs were allocated funding to work with CSOs on peacebuilding-related priority areas: Bolivia, Nicaragua (for Central America), Pakistan, Timor Leste, Yemen and Zimbabwe. In 2011, eight EUDs (Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Lebanon Jordan and the Solomon Islands) have been selected on a preliminary basis. It is envisaged that there will be around the same number for the AAP 2012 but it depends on their interest. In 2011, the selection of EUDs was based on the following criteria: potential relevance of actions under a call for proposals in-country; the EUD's interest and staff capacity; and the conflict relevance
- It is planned to extend gradually the scope of ENTRi activities to include mediation and dialogue skills for those deployed in civilian crisis management and stabilisation missions. Details on ENTRi statistics can be provided on request but general information on results to date will be presented in the IfS Annual Report for 2011
- The EC is engaging with the UN on discussions on civilian capacities. For example, it has signed a contract with the UN's Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) on mediation to support the building of mediation capacities at the local level. It is also trying to build synergies with the UN's Department of Political Affairs (DPA), including on building civilian capacities
- It is not possible to say at the moment how the total proposed budget for the AAP 2012 will be divided between the six draft Action *Fiches*
- The EC needs to be able feed information to the Political and Security Council in order to promote the link between early warning and early action. The EEAS is also trying to develop the necessary mechanisms to ensure that early warning information reaches policymakers in real time
- The eight EUDs who have requested to manage a call for proposals under the AAP 2011 have until the end of 2012 to launch a call and to contract. Common guidelines for the launch of the calls will be issued to the selected EUDs in early 2012

3. Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention in the EU Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020: the new Instrument for Stability Regulation

The EC presented an overview of its proposal for the external component (Heading 4) of the [Multiannual Financial Framework \(MFF\) 2014-2020](#) and on the proposal for the new [Instrument for Stability](#):

- The proposal foresees the replacement of Articles 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 of the IfS by a new presentation format as follows: Article 3 (crisis response), Article 4 (crisis preparedness, conflict prevention and peacebuilding) and Article 5 (global- and trans-regional threats)

Participants raised the following issues:

- What kind of governance mechanisms will be put in place for the programming of the “unallocated funds” under the DCI?
- How do ‘Exceptional Assistance Measures’ (EAMs) differ in practical terms from interventions under the EU’s humanitarian assistance policy?
- Will the Common Implementing Regulation replace the current Financial Regulation or the current set of implementing rules?
- Will the extension in the duration of EAMs be accompanied by additional financial allocations?
- How does the EU decide to implement an EAM? Are the EUDs involved in the decision-making process? What is the timeframe? Who is eligible to receive funding? Has the EC considered the use of framework partnership agreements?
- Who will manage the Partnership Instrument? How will it be programmed?
- Will the multi-stakeholder approach apply in all three components of the new IfS?
- Will the Peacebuilding Partnership be maintained in the new IfS?
- Is support for peacebuilding and conflict prevention foreseen in the proposal for the European Neighbourhood Instrument?
- How much of the overall IfS budget will be allocated to the crisis preparedness component?
- Could the Common Implementing Regulation be used to promote multi-stakeholder partnerships?

In response:

- Unallocated funds are, by definition, not programmed at the level of MIPs which set detailed financial envelopes for a three- or four-year period per country/region. They are kept in reserve in the MIPs for a subsequent allocation according to adjustments, reviews or mid-term reviews of the MIPs
- EAMs enable the EC to respond to political crises in ways in which humanitarian assistance cannot. The EU can use EAMs to allocate funding for any potential crisis/crisis/post-conflict situation which it considers to be politically important at any given moment. The design of EAMs is decided upon in consultation between headquarters (EEAS and EC) and the EUDs
- The Financial Regulation is the EU’s point of reference for the principles and procedures governing the establishment and implementation of the EU budget and its control. It therefore applies to all funding instruments (internal and external). The provisions of the Common Implementing Regulation – which covers the EU’s external action instruments – are complementary to the general provisions of the Financial Regulation and detail specific areas such as support measures, evaluations, reporting, and committees
- The extension in the duration of an EAM does not imply an additional financial commitment on the part of the EC. Any additional financial commitment will require a second EAM or another appropriate follow-up arrangement depending on an assessment of the situation on the ground (e.g. crisis, post-crisis or protracted conflict)
- The Partnership Instrument will be programmed by the EEAS and implemented by the EC. It has three specific objectives, including the implementation of the international dimension of the ‘Europe 2020’ Strategy where climate change and environment are prominent. It will focus on bilateral co-operation with emerging economies and strategic partners. Numerous Directorate-generals with responsibility for internal EU policies will also be involved in programming. The

instrument will allow supporting co-operation, stemming from policy dialogues, with third countries in areas of mutual and EU interests

- The multi-stakeholder approach is a pilot approach still under development under the crisis to pre- and post-crisis capacity building component. It would be difficult to apply it to the crisis response component. It is not currently being considered for the global- and trans-regional threats component. Real operational interest of concerned multi-stakeholders to work together also needs to be confirmed in concrete terms for other IfS components
- The crisis preparedness, conflict prevention and peace-building component (the Peacebuilding Partnership) remains in the proposal for the new IfS (new Article 4)
- The reference in the MFF Memo to 'promoting confidence building and other measures that contribute to security and the prevention and settlement of conflicts' refers to all areas of the European Neighbourhood. The IfS has several advantages over the geographical instruments in that it enables the EU to intervene without the prior consent of a partner government or governments (frozen conflicts), it is not fully DACable and it has a global reach
- The only financial indication which is included in the IfS proposal is that 65% of the total budget should be earmarked for crisis response (Article 3)
- The Common Implementing Regulation will not include specific policy prescriptions

The EC gave a short overview of the [recommendations](#) from the evaluation of the EC's support to conflict prevention and peacebuilding (2001-2010) and requested participants to send comments about the AAP 2012 and examples of effective multi-stakeholder partnerships.

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](#).

EPLO asbl, Rue Belliard 205, Box 12, 1040 Brussels, Belgium
Tel.: +32 (0)2 233 37 37 – Fax: +32 (0)2 233 37 38
E-mail: office@eplo.org – Web: <http://www.eplo.org>