

Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP)

Midterm Evaluation (MTE)

Open Public Consultation

Brussels, March 2017

Briefing items

- IcSP purpose
- MTE scope
- Global context
- Main findings
- Recommendations

IcSP purpose

Purpose

- Increase the efficiency and coherence of the Union's actions in the areas of crisis response, conflict prevention, peace-building and crisis preparedness, and in addressing global and trans-regional threats
- Contribute swiftly to stability by providing an effective response that helps preserve, establish or re-establish the conditions essential to the proper implementation of the Union's external policies and actions in accordance with Article 21 TEU (Article 3)
- Contribute to the prevention of conflicts and to strengthen capacity and preparedness to address pre- and post-crisis situations, and build peace (Article 4)
- Address specific global and trans-regional threats to peace, international security and stability (Article 5)

Portfolio (2014-2016) at a glance

- 322 contracts/projects and EUR 542,668,853 in commitments from 2014-October 2016
 - Article 3 (71.7% or 231 contracts), Article 4 (9.6% or 31 contracts), and Article 5 (18.6% or 60 contracts)
 - Article 3 (76.9% or EUR 417,339,448, Article 4 (6.4% or EUR 34,902,151), and Article 5 (16.6% or EUR 90,427,254)
- 42 countries and territories in Europe (non-EU), MENA, Africa, Asia/Pacific, Central/Latin America and Caribbean; and at regional level
- Private companies (27.6%), UN agencies (21.1%), international NGOs (20.3%); other international organisations and Member State agencies (14.7%)

MTE scope

- Assess whether the IcSP is fit for purpose
- Assess complementarity and synergy between the IcSP and other EU External Financing Instruments (EFIs)
- Inform:
 - The Impact Assessment for the next generation of Instruments (proposal due mid-2018)
 - The final evaluation of EFIs from 2014 to 2020
 - The next programming and implementation steps of the IcSP

Global context

- The global peace and security context of the IcSP is fast evolving
 - Emerged peace and security threats today include fragmented conflicts, criminalised conflict, extremism and terrorism, and climate change
 - Key trends are the rise of hybrid conflicts, securitisation of development and peace, and highest recorded levels of refugee and migration flows
- Global peace and security governance (architecture level) challenges
 - Uneven regional peace and security capabilities
 - A peace-making and peace-building methods deficit
 - A potential sustained dip in funding
 - Increased, but still weak coordination among actors and instruments

Global context

- A bolstered EU commitment to tackle global peace and security challenges and responsiveness to emerged threats and trends that builds on the TEU Article 21
 - EU support to SDGs
 - Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe. A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign And Security Policy
 - The security of the Union
 - State and societal resilience in the EU's East and South
 - An integrated approach to conflicts and crises
 - Cooperative regional orders
 - Global governance
 - European Commission Proposal for a new European Consensus on Development to support to peaceful and inclusive societies, democracy, effective and accountable institutions, rule of law and human rights for all
 - Programming on peace and security issues in the EDF, Trust Funds, and other EFIs

Main findings

- The IcSP plays an important role and is of critical relevance to the EU
 - Balances EU and partner countries' priorities and needs
 - Aims at increasing security, state and societal resilience in the EU's South and East
 - Promotes cooperative regional orders and global governance
 - Enables political dialogue and strengthens conflict prevention
- It is a key vehicle to deliver on the EU's external priorities
 - Driver to mainstream conflict sensitivity in other EFIs (entry points, taking risks)
 - Synergy with other EU EFIs, funds and funding modalities is an important prerequisite for effectiveness, impact and sustainability (need for exit strategies and transition mechanisms)

Main findings

- Its relevance will increase in the years to come
 - Fast evolving security context with new and emerging threats and trends (hybrid conflicts, migration/refugees, cyber security, global warming, CBRN – S&T)
 - Need for an instrument that can respond quickly, and that is flexible, adaptive and context sensitive
- Challenges
 - Capacity to address new threats (hybrid conflict, global warming, cyber security)
 - Leverage its position as a significant part of the global peace and security architecture with other global peace and security initiatives
 - Address EU security priorities and promote European values and principles, including how to manage securitisation of peace and development
 - Promote actions and programmes that are more responsive to the current dynamics of modern organised violence

Recommendations

High-level recommendations

European Commission, EEAS, European Parliament, and European Council:

- Ensure IcSP continuity post 2020
- Consider a stronger political focus for a future IcSP

EEAS and European Commission:

- Develop an EU EFI, EDF, and EUTF strategic framework that sets strategic directions and principles for efforts to strengthen the global and regional peace and security architecture and address the global funding deficit for peace and development

European Commission, EEAS, and European civil society:

- Define how the IcSP manages negative knock-on effects of the securitisation of peace and development

European Commission:

- Apply conflict sensitivity and a 'do no harm' approach to actions and programmes in securitised sectors

European Parliament and European civil society:

- Track and report on securitisation trends in the IcSP and other EU EFIs, EDF and EUTFs

Recommendations

Technical recommendations

FPI and DEVCO B5:

- Ensure analytical grounding of IcSP actions and programmes
- Discourage over-ambitious metrics in IcSP actions and programmes
- Enhance mainstreaming of human rights and gender
- Require explicit Theories of Change in IcSP actions/programmes
- Regularly liaise with DCI, ENI, IPA II, EIDHR, as well as EDF and EU Trust Funds personnel to develop effective interfaces between complementary activities
- Identify mechanisms to better exploit synergies between the IcSP and other EFIs/EU interventions
- Where appropriate, promote policy and political dialogue by EUDs with beneficiary governments on IcSP actions and programmes
- Consider absorbing funds from other EU EFIs to bolster IcSP peace and security actions and programmes
- Bolster strategic dialogue between the IcSP and other (non-EU) global peace and security funds and initiatives
- Provide guidance for EU personnel and implementing partners on hybrid conflicts and threats

Recommendations

FPI:

- Improve, where necessary and possible, speed and flexibility in Article 3 actions
- Create a facility under the IcSP to fund small actions without a formal decision-making procedure
- Identify opportunities for greater investment under Article 3 to seize windows of opportunity for peace
- Require transition or exit strategies for Article 3 actions