

**Thematic Evaluation of the European Commission  
support to Conflict Prevention and Peace Building**

**Preliminary study: scoping and mapping**

Final Report  
for the Preliminary study

Volume I

**EVA 2007/main-pol+strat LOT5**

Framework contract for

Multi-country thematic and regional/country-level strategy  
evaluation studies and synthesis  
in the area of external co-operation.

Ref.: EuropeAid/122888/C/SER/Multi

July 2009

*Evaluation for the European Commission*





A consortium of PARTICIP–ADE–DIE–DRN–ECDPM–ODI c/o Particip GmbH, leading company:  
Particip GmbH, Merzhauser Str. 183, D - 79100 Freiburg, Germany, Phone: +49-761-79074-0 Fax: +49-761-79074-90, info@particip.de



PARTICIP GmbH  
Germany



Aide à la Décision Economique  
Belgium

d.i.e



Deutsches Institut für  
Entwicklungspolitik

German Development  
Institute

Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik  
Germany



Development  
Researchers'  
Network

Development Researchers' Network  
Italy



European Centre for Development Policy  
Management  
Belgium



Overseas Development Institute  
United Kingdom

## LOT 5

**Evaluation of EC main policies and strategies in  
the areas of external cooperation.**

**Contract Number:  
EVA 2007/main-pol+strat LOT5**

**Thematic Evaluation of the European  
Commission support to Conflict Prevention  
and Peace Building.  
Preliminary study: scoping and mapping**

*Final report  
for the Preliminary study*

*July 2009*

The evaluation is being managed by the Joint Evaluation Unit (EuropeAid, DG Dev, DG Relex) together with the reference group composed of members of relevant EC services.

This study has been carried out by



The opinions expressed in this document represent the authors' points of view, which are not necessarily shared by the European Commission or by the authorities of the countries concerned.



# Table of Contents

---

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE PRELIMINARY STUDY .....	1
1.2 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT.....	2
<b>2. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. INTERVENTION LOGIC.....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 OVERALL INTERVENTION LOGIC .....	13
3.2 LINK WITH THE ACTIVITIES/INTERVENTIONS .....	18
<b>4. INVENTORY AND TYPOLOGY .....</b>	<b>25</b>
4.1 APPROACH DEVELOPED FOR COMPILING THE INVENTORY .....	26
4.2 LIMITS OF THE INVENTORY.....	37
4.3 RESULTS FROM THE INVENTORY .....	37
<b>5. INTERACTION WITH SECOND PILLAR INTERVENTIONS .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>6. PROPOSED SCOPE OF AND APPROACH TO THE EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>63</b>
6.1 PROPOSED SCOPE.....	63
6.2 PROPOSED APPROACH.....	65

## LIST OF ANNEXES – VOLUME II

ANNEX 1 :	TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE PRELIMINARY STUDY
ANNEX 2 :	LAUNCH NOTE FOR THE PRELIMINARY STUDY (MAIN ELEMENTS)
ANNEX 3 :	BIBLIOGRAPHY
ANNEX 4 :	LIST OF PEOPLE MET
ANNEX 5 :	LIST OF CPPB INTERVENTIONS
ANNEX 6 :	CPPB FUNDING PER COUNTRY/REGION
ANNEX 7 :	THEMATIC AND REGIONAL TYPOLOGY
ANNEX 8 :	OVERVIEW OF EU INSTRUMENTS RELEVANT TO CPPB



# List of Abbreviations

---

<b>€bn</b>	Billion Euro
<b>€m</b>	Million Euro
<b>ACP</b>	African, Caribbean and Pacific countries
<b>ADE</b>	Aide à la Décision Economique S.A.
<b>AIDCO</b>	EuropeAid Co-operation Office
<b>ALA</b>	Asia and Latin America
<b>AMIB</b>	African Union Mission in Burundi
<b>AMIS</b>	African Union Mission in Sudan
<b>AMISEC</b>	African Union Mission in the Comoros
<b>AMISON</b>	African Union Mission in Somalia
<b>APF</b>	African Peace Facility
<b>ARTF</b>	Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund
<b>CFSP</b>	Common Foreign & Security Policy
<b>COM</b>	Communication from the Commission
<b>COM(2001) 211</b>	Communication from the Commission on Conflict Prevention
<b>Commission</b>	European Commission (formally the Commission of the European Communities)
<b>CPDC</b>	Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation
<b>CPPB</b>	Conflict Prevention and Peace Building - <i>as covered in the COM(2001) 211</i>
<b>CRIS</b>	Common RELEX Information System
<b>CSP</b>	Country Strategy Paper
<b>DAC</b>	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
<b>DDR</b>	Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration
<b>DEV</b>	DG for Development
<b>DG</b>	Directorate General of the European Commission
<b>DRC</b>	Democratic Republic of the Congo
<b>EDF</b>	European Development Fund
<b>EIB</b>	European Investment Bank
<b>EIDHR</b>	European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights
<b>ELARG</b>	DG for Enlargement
<b>ENP</b>	European Neighbourhood Policy
<b>ENPI</b>	European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument
<b>EOM</b>	Election Observation Mission
<b>ESDP</b>	European Security and Defence Policy
<b>ESS</b>	European Security Strategy
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>EU MS</b>	European Union Member States

<b>EUMC</b>	European Military Committee
<b>EUSR</b>	European Union Special Representatives
<b>FOMUC</b>	Force Multinationale en Centrafrique
<b>GNI</b>	Gross National Income
<b>IFS</b>	Instrument For Stability
<b>INCAF</b>	International Network on Conflict and Fragility
<b>IRFFI</b>	International Reconstruction Fund Facility for Iraq
<b>LOFTA</b>	Law and Order Trust Fund
<b>MDGs</b>	Millennium Development Goals
<b>MDTF</b>	Multi Donor Trust Fund
<b>MEDA</b>	Euro-Mediterranean Partnership Programme; Mediterranean members of the partnership.
<b>MICOPAX</b>	Mission de Consolidation de la Paix en République Centrafricaine
<b>NGO</b>	Non Governmental Organisation
<b>NIP</b>	National Indicative Programme
<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>OLAS</b>	On Line Accounting System
<b>PSC</b>	Political and Security Committee
<b>RELEX</b>	DG for External Relations
<b>RG</b>	Reference Group
<b>RIP</b>	Regional Indicative Programme
<b>RRM</b>	Rapid Reaction Mechanism
<b>RSP</b>	Regional Strategy paper
<b>SALW</b>	Small Arms and Light Weapons
<b>SSR</b>	Security Sector Reform
<b>TACIS</b>	Technical Aid for the Commonwealth of Independent States; related countries
<b>TEU</b>	Treaty on European Union
<b>TIM</b>	Temporary International Mechanism
<b>ToR</b>	Terms of Reference
<b>UK</b>	United Kingdom
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>UNRWA</b>	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
<b>US</b>	United States
<b>WB</b>	World Bank
<b>WB&amp;GS</b>	West Bank & Gaza Strip



# 1. Introduction

---

This is the Final Report of the Preliminary Study for the Thematic Evaluation of the European Commission support to Conflict Prevention and Peace Building, which is part of the 2008 evaluation programme approved by the External Relations and Development Commissioners. Its purpose is to present the outputs of the Preliminary Study; its structure is presented in section 1.2 below. In addition, this introduction briefly reviews the mandate and scope of the Preliminary study.

## 1.1 Objectives and scope of the Preliminary study

Before launching the *Thematic Evaluation of the European Commission support to Conflict Prevention and Peace Building*, the Joint Evaluation Unit decided in agreement with the Reference Group (RG), to commission a Preliminary Study to pursue two **objectives**:

- provide an overview and typology of the European Commission (henceforth “Commission”) financial flows in terms of conflict prevention and peace building on the basis of the working definition contained in the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) of the above-mentioned thematic evaluation; this part also encompasses a description of the regulatory framework, as well as a reconstruction of the intervention logic based on official documents;
- prepare a proposal for the scope of the subject area for the next phases of the evaluation.

In terms of **scope**, one should distinguish between the scope of the Preliminary Study and the scope of the subsequent phases. The latter will be defined by the Joint Evaluation Unit in agreement with the RG on the basis of the outputs and results of the present Preliminary Study. The scope of the Preliminary Study can be summarised as follows:

- **Thematic** scope, based on that proposed in the draft ToRs for the subsequent phases, on which basis the study will relate to Commission support for conflict prevention (including crisis resolution) and peace building (including demobilisation, disarmament and reintegration) as defined by the Communication from the Commission on Conflict Prevention COM(2001) 211 and related subsequent documents. The purpose is to cover only activities for which the Commission has full responsibility, notably those covered under the first pillar of the European Union (EU) and the European Development Fund (EDF), while also addressing coordination and coherence issues with activities and policies under other pillars ;
- **Temporal** scope, which will cover the period 2001-2008 ;
- **Geographical** scope, which will cover third countries with the exception of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries and those covered by DG Enlargement.

## 1.2 Structure of the Report

The present Final Report is structured as follows:

- Chapter 1: Introduction
- Chapter 2: The regulatory framework ;
- Chapter 3: The intervention logic ;
- Chapter 4: The inventory and typology ;
- Chapter 5: Interaction with second pillar interventions;
- Chapter 6: Proposal for the scope of and approach to the evaluation.

The information presented in the report is based on documentary study, data analysis based on Commission database extracts, and interviews with RG members.

Further information is provided in the annexes. Annexes 1 and 2 contain respectively the ToRs and launch note for this preliminary study. The documents consulted and the list of persons interviewed are presented in Annexes 3 and 4. Annex 5 contains the compiled list of Commission-funded interventions in the field of conflict prevention and peace building, resulting from the evaluators' data analysis. Annex 6 provides the list of recipient countries/regions and Annex 7 gives a regional typology in absolute and relative numbers. Annex 8 provides a brief overview of the main EU instruments that may be used with respect to conflict prevention and peace building.

## 2. Regulatory framework

---


The Commission's interventions in the field of Conflict Prevention and Peace Building (CPPB) should be seen against a backdrop of diverse and successive policies over the last decade at European and wider international level. During the 1990s the international community increasingly considered that an integrated approach was needed in development cooperation for treating the root causes of conflict. The Commission took a significant step in this regard with its April 2001 Communication on **Conflict Prevention**, which introduced the approach of 'mainstreaming' conflict prevention into all elements of its development programming and policy-making. Soon afterwards, in the aftermath of the events of 9/11 in 2001, a renewed debate on **security** took place, with emphasis on perceived new political and military threats. Alongside these debates, international interventions in post-conflict settings were increasingly being analysed in terms of the 'security-development nexus'. This nexus referred to the emerging consensus on the causal relationship between security and development in rebuilding conflict-affected societies and promoted more comprehensive and integrated approaches to programming. This included new approaches to programmes focused on Security Sector Reform (SSR), Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW), Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR), as well as more conventional programmes of institution building, conflict resolution capacities, rule of law, and economic recovery. Specific EU policies on situations of **fragility** were further issued in 2007, while continuing to build on the externalactivities framework established over previous years. Despite these different policy concepts and the number of institutions and instruments involved, there was a growing policy consensus within the EU on the need for an integrated approach linking conflict prevention, development and security, requiring close cooperation between the Commission and the Council, as well as with international players.

The figure below presents a single schematic overview of the most important policies promulgated by the European **Commission** and by the European **Council**, along with **international** references marking out the regulatory framework and context for the Commission's interventions in conflict prevention and peace building. Policy documents issued jointly by the Commission and the Council<sup>1</sup> can be identified at the intersection of their respective areas in the figure. These documents are then described subsequently.

---

<sup>1</sup> Most *initiatives* involving both the Commission and the Council materialised in separate policy *documents* for the Commission and the Council. An example is the EU Concept for European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) Support for SSR (second pillar) issued by the Council in October 2005 and the Concept for European Community Support for SSR (first pillar) issued by the Commission in May 2006.

Figure 2.1 – General overview of policies in the field of CPPB<sup>2</sup>



<sup>2</sup> Legend of colours: *Bright yellow*: conflict prevention; *Salmon Pink*: conflict prevention in ACP; *Light yellow*: security; *Turquoise*: fragility. These colours only aim to facilitate lecture of the diagram, by providing an indication of a central theme addressed by these documents.

## **Background**

Before 2001, conflict prevention was considered essentially in terms of political and military activities. The consciousness of the international community of the need for an integrated approach treating the root causes of conflict grew gradually, based on a number of successes and failures. Concerning the Balkans, for instance, the Commission considered that the integrated Community strategy, based on a transparent and clearly structured process providing concrete benefits in return for commitment to peace and regional stability, would eventually lead to long-expected stabilisation. El Salvador and Guatemala were also considered good examples of such an integrated approach. A reconfiguration of ideas has taken place in the development policy of the EU since the mid-1990s; greater attention has been paid in development cooperation to civilian crisis prevention and to the socio-economic and political root causes of conflicts. Guidelines for tackling aspects of conflict prevention have appeared in a number of documents, initially focusing on African countries. This paved the way for the Commission's ambitious 2001 Communication on Conflict Prevention, which represented the first comprehensive Commission strategy in this field.

### ***COM(2001) 211 on Conflict Prevention and the Göteborg Council***

The central document for the Commission's intervention in the field of CPPB is the **Communication from the Commission on Conflict Prevention, COM(2001) 211 final**, issued on 11 April 2001 during the Swedish presidency of the Council. In this Communication, the Commission postulated the need to address the root causes of conflict throughout the world in an integrated manner. It stated that development policy and other co-operation programmes provided the most powerful instruments at the Community's disposal for treating the root causes of conflict. It stressed the importance of a genuinely long-term and integrated approach, in co-ordination with EU Member States (EU MS) and with international organisations. It identified thereby roles, objectives, tools, and co-operation needs with other organisations; this Communication is further detailed in Chapter 3, as it forms the core of the Commission's intervention logic over the evaluation period.

In the same effort, the **Göteborg European Council** of 15-16 June 2001, ending the Swedish Presidency, gave rise to two important documents relating to conflict prevention: (i) the Presidency Conclusions; (ii) the EU Programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts. Moreover, a first Presidency report on European Security and Defence Policy, addressed to this Göteborg European Council, stated that the Commission had an essential role to play in helping to ensure coherence of the EU's external policies, including the Common Foreign & Security Policy (CFSP) and European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) (*see below*), and to strengthen co-operation with international organisations. The Commission was to contribute to the development of common political approaches, through proposing activities to the Council as well as through managing instruments relevant to crisis management and conflict prevention within its areas of competence. It also stated that the ongoing reform of external aid and financial management rules would make possible more effective delivery of Community support to EU crisis management operations.

### *International agenda on Conflict Prevention*

The Commission's April 2001 Communication on Conflict Prevention was issued in a context marked by a series of converging and mutually reinforcing norm-setting policies at international level in this field, in particular from the OECD-DAC, the United Nations (UN) and the G8:

#### **OECD-DAC**

- **1997: DAC guidelines on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation on the Threshold of the 21st Century.** For half a decade these guidelines were a key reference primarily in the design and implementation of development co-operation for conflict prevention in post-conflict recovery. They were drafted by the special Task Force established in 1995 to address this topic, the DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation (CPDC), renamed in early 2009 as the International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF), reflecting the merger with another DAC Network on Fragile States.
- **2001: DAC guidelines on Helping Prevent Violent Conflict: Orientations for External Partners.** These were a supplement to the 1997 guidelines, which addressed some new challenges and changes in certain areas. It included, for instance, information on how to mainstream conflict prevention in policy formulation; take account of the relationship between security and development; and to strengthen peace processes.

#### **UN**

- **2000: UN Security Council Report on the panel of UN peace operations (the "Brahimi Report").** This report aimed at providing a comprehensive overview of the whole question on peacekeeping operations in all their aspects. Key Commission and Council policies refer to this report, including COM(2001) 211 and the Göteborg Presidency Report.
- **2000: UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) on Women, Peace and Security.** This resolution reaffirmed the important role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and in peace-building. It also expressed the particular vulnerability of women and children in armed conflicts and the need to mainstream a gender perspective into peacekeeping operations.
- **2001: UN Secretary-General's Progress report on the prevention of armed conflict.** This was the first UN report specifically on conflict prevention. It aimed at bringing the UN from a culture of reaction to a culture of prevention. It contained analysis and recommendations on UN family initiatives for prevention of armed conflicts.
- **2005: UN Security Council Resolution 1645 (2005) on Establishing the UN Peacebuilding Commission.** This resolution set up the first globally mandated and specifically "peacebuilding" body, designed to take a longer term approach and focus on post-conflict peace and development.

## G8

- **2000: G8 Miyazaki Initiatives for Conflict Prevention.** In 2000 the G8<sup>3</sup> expressed their determination to make prevention of armed conflicts a priority issue in the coming years, and to nurture a “culture of prevention” throughout the global community. It proposed the adoption of a “comprehensive approach”, from pre-conflict to post-conflict, based on the observance of international law, including the UN Charter. It announced the undertaking of five specific initiatives relating to: (i) small arms and light weapons; (ii) conflict and development; (iii) illicit trade in diamonds; (iv) children in armed conflicts; and (v) international civil police.

### *Conflict Prevention in the cooperation with ACP*

Africa was the initial focus of conflict prevention. A landmark document in this respect is that containing the Conclusions of the European Council of 4 December 1995 on **Preventive Diplomacy, Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping in Africa**. It was followed by the Commission’s 1996 Communication on “**the EU and the issue of conflicts in Africa: peace-building, conflict prevention and beyond**”<sup>4</sup>, which put forward the concept of structural stability.

The **2000 Cotonou Agreement** between African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries and the European Community and its EU MS<sup>5</sup> is of further importance in this context as it refers explicitly to the field of this evaluation. Indeed, it has a specific article on Peace-building Policies, Conflict Prevention and Resolution (Article 11). This article states that the parties shall pursue an active, comprehensive and integrated policy of peace-building and conflict prevention and resolution within the framework of the Partnership; and that it shall be based on the principle of ownership. The **2005 revision** of the Cotonou Agreement allowed the process to focus more on the root causes of conflicts and the establishment of confidence-building measures, with a view to creating lasting solutions. It complemented Article 11 by adding Article 11a on the fight against terrorism and Article 11b on the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

A **Council Common Position concerning conflict prevention, management and resolution in Africa** was issued on 14 May **2001 (2001/374/CFSP)**. It was repealed three and four years later, respectively by the similarly-named common positions **2004/85/CFSP** and **2005/304/CFSP**. They specify common principles and objectives, relating for instance to dialogue with the African Union, strengthening of African peace support operation capabilities and restrictive policies with regard to arms exports and economic factors that fuel conflicts. In **2005**, the “**EU Strategy for Africa: Towards a**

---

<sup>3</sup> The G8 is an annual meeting of the top political leaders of the eight major industrialised countries of the northern hemisphere: Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The EU also has the privileges and obligations of membership, but does not chair summits; it is represented by the Commission and Council Presidents.

<sup>4</sup> SEC(1996) 332

<sup>5</sup> Partnership Agreement between the members of the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States of one part, and the European Community and its Member States, of the other part, signed in Cotonou, Benin, on 23 June 2000.

**Euro-African pact to accelerate Africa's development**" was adopted<sup>6</sup>. It specified explicitly that the EU should strengthen its support for fostering peace and security, which is a prerequisite for attaining the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); the EU would thereby step up its efforts to promote peace and security at all stages of the conflict cycle. Two years later in December 2007 a **joint Africa-EU Strategy**, the **Africa-EU Strategic Partnership**, was adopted at the EU-Africa Lisbon Summit. The EU was represented by members of the troika<sup>7</sup> responsible for concluding this policy framework. This joint strategy was followed by a specific **Africa-EU Partnership on Peace and Security in 2008**. These documents stressed the importance of continued and even better EU and MS support for the African Union (AU) in building an effective African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA), for example through the African Peace Facility (APF).

### *Governance*

Three other Commission policy documents of importance in the field of conflict prevention are its Communications on **EU Election Assistance and Observation (2000)**, and on **Governance and Development (2003)** and on **Governance in the European Consensus on Development (2006)**<sup>8</sup>. In the first, the Commission expresses the view that measures in support of democratisation and respect for human rights, including elections, can make a major contribution to peace, security and prevention of conflicts. Concerning the second, it states that structures and the quality of governance are critical determinants of social cohesion or social conflict, highlighting the direct link between security and development (*see below*). The last document states that poor governance of natural and energy resources in countries with resources such as diamonds, oil, timber and fish can lead to violations of human rights and the rule of law and, ultimately, to armed conflict.

### *CFSP and ESDP*

The **second pillar of the EU**, the **Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)**, was established by the **Treaty of Maastricht** on the European Union signed in **1992**. The Treaty specified that the Union and its Member States shall define and implement a CFSP covering all areas of foreign and security policy. One of its objectives was preserving peace and strengthening international security, in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter. It allowed Member States to take joint activities in the field of foreign policy. The initial focus of the CFSP concerned a number of regions (Central and Eastern Europe, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East), and a number of priority horizontal issues (e.g. domains within the security dimension), but there is no specific reference to conflict prevention.

---

<sup>6</sup> COM(2005) 489 final.

<sup>7</sup> The members of the troika were at that time the European Commission, the Council Secretariat, the then current presidency (Portugal) and the upcoming presidency (Slovenia). In the first half of 2007 this also included the previous presidency (Germany).

<sup>8</sup> COM(2006) 421 final.



The development of the **European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP)** was initiated by the June **1999** Cologne European Council. It was facilitated later in 1999 by changes introduced in the **Treaty of Amsterdam**. This Treaty also incorporated into the EU Treaty the Western European Union's "**Petersberg tasks**" (humanitarian and rescue tasks, peace-keeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking).

The European Council's **Nice Summit in December 2000** set goals for the development of **civilian crisis management** capabilities in four priority areas: police, strengthening of the rule of law, civil administration and civil protection. It also recognised that these capabilities, together with military capabilities, may serve conflict prevention purposes. The EU MS additionally decided to create bureaucratic structures in the **Council Secretariat** in support of future military operations, taking account of the fact that military aspects of crisis operations cannot be covered from the regular budget of the European Community. The objective was to make the second pillar more operational by providing military expertise to implement the CFSP and ensure sound Rapid Reaction Force military operations. Three new military structures were created: (i) the Political and Security Committee (PSC); (ii) the EU Military Committee (EUMC); and (iii) the EU Military staff. The **Laeken European Council** (December 2001) further adopted a declaration on the operational capability of the ESDP, stating that the EU is equipped to conduct crisis management operations.

### *European Security Strategy*

Following the 9/11 attacks, a debate appeared in the international security agenda, with emphasis on perceived new political and military threats. This debate and shifting trends formed the backdrop to the drafting of the **European Security Strategy (ESS)** under the supervision of the EU's CFSP High Representative Javier Solana, which was adopted by the Brussels European Council of 12 and 13 December 2003. A central notion is that "security is a pre-condition for development". It identified five key threats to the security of the Union: terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, state failure, and organised crime. The strategy advocates: (i) a more active EU, with a culture that fosters early and rapid intervention; (ii) a more capable EU, with more effective resources for defence and diplomacy; (iii), a more coherent EU, bringing together the different instruments and capabilities; and (iv) working with partners, in particular, international organisations, the United States (US), and EU neighbours. As it was required that the ESS be reappraised every five years, a **Report on the implementation of the ESS** was published at the end of 2008.

Furthermore, the Council issued two other important documents in December 2003. The **EU Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction** advocated a broad EU approach covering a wide spectrum of activities to combat the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. It included a multilateral approach, promotion of stable and regional development, and close co-operation with key partners such as the US, the Russian Federation, Japan and Canada.

Through the **EU Guidelines on Children and Armed Conflict**, issued in 2003, the EU made focus on children in the context of conflict a priority. These guidelines proposed

regular monitoring, reporting, assessments and tools for addressing the short, medium and long term impact of armed conflict on children.

In 2004 the European Council issued the **Headline Goal 2010** (in May) and the **Civilian Headline Goal 2008** (in November). For the former, the EU MS decided to commit themselves to be able to respond with rapid and decisive activities by 2010, applying a fully coherent approach to the whole spectrum of **crisis management** operations. For the latter, they identified needs-driven goals enabling the EU to further define and enhance its civilian capabilities before 2008, building on the European Security Strategy of enhancing the capacity of the EU in the field of **civilian crisis management**. In addition, it added the two priority sectors of monitoring missions and support to EU Special Representatives. As a continuation, a **Civilian Headline Goal 2010** was approved in November 2007.

Still in the context of the ESS, the European Council adopted the **EU Strategy to combat illicit accumulation and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons and their ammunition** in December 2005. The aim of this strategy was to devise a plan specific to small arms and light weapons (SALW) so as to develop a wider integrated approach and a comprehensive plan of activities to combat the illicit trade, including that in ammunition. Means include CFSP and ESDP instruments, development and assistance programmes financed by the EDF, and internal EU activities (Justice and Home Affairs).

### **Security Sector Reform**

The traditional concept of security has been redefined over recent years to include not only State stability and the security of nations but also a clear focus on the safety and well-being of their people. Development and security have been recognised as being inextricably linked. **OECD-DAC Guidelines on Security System Reform and Governance** were published in 2005, and reinforced in 2007 with the **OECD-DAC Handbook on Security System Reform (SSR)**. These guidelines provided donors with a new direction and understanding of the relationship between security and development, and also challenged them to consider how their programmes are designed, implemented, evaluated, and internally coherent to support SSR processes.

On this basis, the EU comprehensive and cross-pillar approach to Security Sector Reform was finalised in June 2006 with the Council Conclusions on a Policy Framework for Security Sector Reform. This framework brings together the views from the first and second pillar, drafted in close consultation. The **EU Concept for ESDP Support for Security Sector Reform (second pillar)** was issued by the Council in October 2005 during the United Kingdom (UK) presidency. It spelt out the specific contribution of the ESDP in supporting SSR. It also specified that the Council and Commission need to work in close co-operation to ensure a clear division of responsibilities and maximum coherence and effectiveness of EU support. The **Concept for European Community Support for Security sector Reform<sup>9</sup> (first pillar)**, from May 2006, defines the areas of engagement of Community support for SSR, relating in particular to conflict prevention, peace building and democratisation. It also spells out that the Community is required to focus more clearly

---

<sup>9</sup> COM(2006) 658 Final

on the governance aspects of SSR, including strengthening of parliamentary oversight, judicial independence and media freedom. Furthermore, the Community should take a more holistic approach to SSR by engaging in coordinated support for the different sectors of the SSR process.

In this context, the Council and the Commission developed an **EU Concept for support to Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR)**, which both approved in December 2006. This document acknowledged DDR as a key area for the EU's engagement in post-conflict peace building. DDR processes need to contribute to immediate security needs and be part of the foundation for longer-term stability and development in a country or region; they are often more successful when part of a broader Security Sector Reform. Activities in support to DDR can be undertaken by EU MS bilaterally, by the European Community (external intervention instruments) or by the CFSP including ESDP.

Building on the 2003 European Security Strategy and with the 2005 European Consensus on Development, the Council issued its conclusions on **Security and Development** in November 2007, reemphasising the nexus between development and security. These Council conclusions were preceded by a Joint Council Secretariat – Commission Services working paper on Security and Development **“Food for thought to strengthen EU policy coherence”** (October 2007). The Council conclusions and the joint working paper called on the EU MS, the Commission and the General Secretariat of the Council to further improve complete government coordination for SSR activities.

### *European Consensus on Development*

The **European Consensus on Development** from November 2005, a Joint Statement by the Council and the EU MS resulting from a meeting between the Council, the Parliament and the Commission, marked a milestone for a new EU Development Policy. It referred explicitly to conflict prevention as a development activity focused on achieving the MDGs, and the economic, social and environmental dimensions of poverty eradication. It set out an approach to “addressing state fragility”, providing guidance on a comprehensive response to fragility. It thereby specified that the EU will support the prevention of State fragility through governance reforms, rule of law, anti-corruption measures and the building of viable State institutions. Addressing the root causes of violent conflict is mentioned in its support for conflict prevention and resolution and for peace building, including poverty, degradation, exploitation and unequal distribution and access to land and natural resources, weak governance, human rights abuses, and gender inequality. In addition, it refers to a number of other themes such as: a strengthened role for the regional and sub-regional organisations in conflict prevention and limitation of the uncontrolled proliferation of small arms and light weapons. It reiterated a willingness to have EU interventions taking place in the framework of multilateral efforts including the UN Peace Building Commission, and re-established principles of ownership and partnership.

### *EU response to situations of fragility*

The topic of “fragility” has gained ground in the international agenda in recent years, emerging as a parameter for international policy and interventions in conflict situations<sup>10</sup>. Situations of fragility exacerbate the challenge of achieving the MDG and may involve global security risks. **OECD-DAC “Whole of Government Approach to Fragile States”** guidelines were issued in 2006, which required economic, development, diplomatic and security actors to cooperate closely in fragile states. It was followed in April 2007 by **OECD-DAC Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations**: a set of ten principles were defined, from basics such as contextualisation and a “do no harm” approach, to principles relating to the role of State-building and peace building and practicalities.

Within the EU, two specific documents on fragility were issued a few months later. The **Commission Communication “Towards an EU response to situations of fragility - engaging in difficult environments for sustainable development, stability and peace”**<sup>11</sup> was released in October 2007. The EU response aims at preventing and addressing fragility holistically through a consistent overall response linking peace, security and development. It is built on the existing external intervention framework, including the guidance on a comprehensive response to fragility provided in the 2005 European Consensus on Development. In the same direction, a month later the **Council conclusions on “An EU response to situations of fragility”** were issued.

As this chapter on the regulatory framework attests, conflict prevention and peace building can be understood as evolving and mobile concepts that have developed over the period of the proposed evaluation. We are therefore to some extent dealing with moving targets in terms of intentions and activities considered to come under the remit of CPPB. The themes outlined here reflect norms/strategies (e.g. stability, conflict prevention, development, security and peace) programmes (e.g. SSR, DDR, SALW, conflict resolution), and tools/capacities that the EU has developed in the global policy context. Despite this, conflict prevention and peace building are not codified by an agreed EU definition. Rather, the understandings have evolved in a sometimes piecemeal way in response to policy discussions and practice on the ground. This results in a policy mosaic of evolved understanding in responding to conflict risks and situations with a mix of peace, security and development interventions.

In this context, the present Preliminary study takes the 2001 Communication as its frame of reference and builds a logic of Commission interventions on that basis. Operational definitions, conflict prevention and peace building are proposed in chapter 3. They are compatible with the thematic coverage of “conflict prevention and peace building (CPPB)” by the 2001 Communication.

---

<sup>10</sup> The Commission acknowledges that “fragility” refers to weak or failing structures and to situations where the social contract/contact? is broken due to the State’s incapacity or unwillingness to deal with its basic functions, meet its obligations and responsibilities regarding service delivery, management of resources, rule of law, equitable access to power, security and safety of the populace and protection and promotion of citizens’ rights and freedoms. *Source: COM(2007) 643 final*

<sup>11</sup> COM(2007) 643 final

## 3. Intervention logic

---

### 3.1 Overall intervention logic

This section describes the intervention logic underlying the Commission's support of CPPB. It is a prerequisite for the evaluation as it facilitates an understanding of the hierarchy of objectives the Commission pursued over the evaluation period when providing this support. In the specific context of the present Preliminary Study, the intervention logic will serve first as a basis for deciding the scope to be covered by the evaluation itself. At a later stage the intervention logic, possibly amended once the scope has been fixed, will constitute the basis for formulating the Evaluation Questions and will serve as the benchmark against which the Commission support will be evaluated.

It is important to underline that the intervention logic aims at translating the objectives the Commission was pursuing, not the activities that were actually implemented. It is therefore exclusively based on official policy documents. In this particular case the key reference document is the 2001 *Communication from the Commission on Conflict Prevention*, COM(2001) 211, hereafter referred to as "the 2001 Communication". As explained below, other documents have also been taken into account, but it is the 2001 Communication that has served as the main strategic document on this specific subject. Moreover, since 2001 there has been no other overarching Communication focusing explicitly on either Conflict Prevention or Peace Building. It should also be noted that, although in its title the Communication does not refer to "Peace Building", this dimension is taken into account throughout the text, which makes it an adequate reference for the Commissions' strategy regarding Conflict Prevention *and* Peace Building over the period considered. Finally, it is important to bear in mind that the intervention logic focuses on those elements in the 2001 Communication that fall within the scope of the study, including in geographical terms. Box 3.1 proposes operational definitions of the central concepts of "conflict prevention" and "peace building".

### Box 3.1 – Operational definitions of the concepts of “conflict prevention” and “peace building”


**Conflict prevention:** “Actions undertaken to reduce tensions and prevent the outbreak or recurrence of violent conflict. Beyond short term activities, it includes the notion of long-term engagement. It consists of *operational prevention*, i.e. immediate measures applicable in the face of crisis), and *structural prevention*, i.e. measures to ensure that crises do not arise in the first place, or, if they do, that they do not recur”.

**Peacebuilding:** Actions and policies “aimed at preventing the outbreak, the recurrence or continuation of armed conflict”, encompassing, “a wide range of political, developmental, humanitarian and human rights programmes and mechanisms”, including “short and long term measures tailored to addressing the particular needs of societies sliding into conflict or emerging from it. Includes long-term support to, and establishment of, viable political and socio-economic and cultural institutions capable of addressing the proximate and root causes of conflicts, as well as other initiatives aimed at creating the necessary conditions for sustained peace and stability.”

*Source: OECD-DAC, Guidance on evaluating conflict prevention and peacebuilding activities, Working draft for application period, 2008,*

The intervention logic is represented in the form of an objectives diagram, as shown in figure 3.1 below. It displays four levels of pursued objectives: global, intermediate, specific, and operational objectives. Given the comprehensiveness of the strategy followed, it was not possible to display the corresponding planned activities in the same diagram. Accordingly, they are presented in section 3.2 and linked to one or several of the operational objectives.

**Figure 3.1 – Objectives diagram for the Commission’s support to conflict prevention and peace building**



The highest layer of the intervention logic identifies the **overall objectives** that the Commission pursued when supporting conflict prevention and peace building. They are stated in a series of major, highly-authoritative documents and can be brought back to two key, interrelated objectives:

- ***Foster the sustainable economic and social development of developing countries, their integration into the world economy and the campaign against poverty.*** This is specified in Article 177 of the consolidated Treaty establishing the European Community. The contribution of conflict prevention and peace building to sustainable economic and social development of developing countries has since 2001 been more and more present in strategic documents. For instance, it is clearly underlined in the European Security Strategy of 2003. Considering that “security is a precondition of development”, it does indeed explain that conflict “not only destroys infrastructure, including social infrastructure; it also encourages criminality, deters investment and makes normal economic activity impossible. A number of countries and regions are caught in a cycle of conflict, insecurity and poverty”. This is also clearly acknowledged by the 2001 EU programme for the Prevention of violent conflicts which states that, “all relevant institutions of the Union will mainstream conflict prevention within their areas of competence (...). The Commission is invited to implement its recommendations on ensuring that its development policy and other co-operation programmes are more clearly focused on addressing the root-causes of conflicts in an integrated way within the framework of the poverty reduction objective.” Here also the prevention of conflict is seen as a necessary condition for reducing poverty. In the same direction the Presidency Conclusions of the Göteborg European Council in 2001 state that “Conflict prevention is one of the main objectives of the Union’s external relations and should be integrated in all its relevant aspects, including the European Security and Defence Policy, development cooperation and trade”. The 2001 Communication considers that this also operates in the reverse direction, as it states that “development policy and other co-operation programmes provide without doubt the most powerful instruments at the Community’s disposal for treating the root causes of conflict”. In this sense, development and the reduction of poverty are seen as necessary conditions for preventing conflicts and building peace.
- ***Preserve peace and strengthen international security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, as well as the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and the objectives of the Paris Charter; promote international cooperation; develop and consolidate democracy and the rule of law, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; (...).*** This is mentioned as an objective for the CFSP in the 1992 Treaty of Maastricht on the EU (Title V, article J.1). While it is not mentioned as an objective specifically for the Commission (but for the EU second pillar), it can nevertheless be considered as a global objective also for the Commission’s intervention in the field of CPPB. Preserving peace and strengthening international security is also mentioned in other official documents such as the 2000 Cotonou Agreement with ACP<sup>12</sup> countries or, more recently, the 2005 European Consensus on Development.

---

<sup>12</sup> Article 11 states that, "the Parties shall pursue an active, comprehensive and integrated policy of peace-building and conflict prevention and resolution within the framework of the Partnership. (...) It shall in particular focus on building regional, sub-regional and national capacities, and on preventing violent conflicts at an early stage by addressing their root-causes in a targeted manner, and with an adequate combination of all available instruments."



- ***Contribute to developing and consolidating democracy and the rule of law, and to promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.*** This objective is specified in Article 177 of the consolidated Treaty establishing the European Community, as well as in Article 181a of the 2002 consolidated version of the Treaty Establishing the European Community. The 2001 Communication acknowledges the need to consolidate democracy and the rule of law, as well as respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, as components of conflict prevention and peace building. It considers for instance that, “*countries with conflict potential are usually those where the democratic process is the least advanced and where external support (...) is the most difficult to implement. In such conditions, EC support should aim, through targeted activities, at opening the way to a more favourable democratic environment.*” It also states that treating the root causes of conflict implies creating, restoring or consolidating structural stability in all its aspects and counts among the characteristics of stability, democracy and respect for human rights. In the same way the 2003 European Security Strategy states that, “*the best protection of our security is a world of well-governed democratic states*” and “*establishing the rule of law and protecting human rights are the best means of strengthening the international order*”. CPPB on the other hand, also aims at contributing to the global objective of developing and consolidating democracy, the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms. This is somewhat implicit in the 2001 communication, although for instance, it states in relation to Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) that such weapons can easily threaten the rule of law.

Within this context, the 2001 Communication provides the main lines of the Commission’s strategy for reaching these objectives. **The vault key of this strategy is an integrated approach to conflict prevention.** The Commission is indeed determined “*to mobilize Community instruments more effectively and in a co-ordinated fashion to support efforts deployed to prevent conflict, from far upstream to the last phases of a conflict developing into confrontation and crisis.*”

In this context, the EU uses a wide variety of means directly or indirectly relevant to the prevention of conflict. For reasons of clarity the Communication distinguishes three types of objectives, reflected in the diagram as **intermediate objectives**:

- “Projecting stability” or long term prevention ;
- “Reacting quickly to nascent conflicts” or short term prevention ;
- Improving co-ordination and co-operation on conflict prevention at international level<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>13</sup> The 2001 Communication places this objective alongside those of “projecting stability” and “reacting quickly”. Improving co-ordination and co-operation on conflict prevention at international level can in this context be considered on two levels. On the one hand, it should be seen as a means of enhancing the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the Commission’s interventions with respect to CPPB. In this sense one might wish to represent it one stage lower as a means of enhancing both long-term and short-term prevention. However, the Communication and other strategic documents show that improving co-ordination and co-operation at international level is also an objective in its own right, notably in terms of formulating a coherent international response to (nascent) conflicts. To give an example, the EU programme for the prevention of violent conflicts states that “*in keeping with the primary role of the UN in conflict prevention, EU activities will be undertaken in accordance with the principles and purposes of the UN Charter*”. In 2003 the Commission Communication on multilateralism stated that conflict prevention and crisis management are areas in which “*the goals and activities of the EU and the UN are united by the premise that the case for multilateralism and international co-operation is unequivocal*” (COM (2003) 256 final). The graphic presentation reflects this double dimension by placing this objective on the same level as long and short term prevention, while nevertheless showing that it also contributes to enhancing these objectives.

Furthermore, the 2001 Communication allows identification of **specific objectives** and, for each of these, **operational objectives**, which are the logical steps along the strategy. To give an example, achieving long-term prevention presupposes better integration (and notably regional co-operation), structural stability, and diminishing the impact of crosscutting factors in conflicts (such as Small Arms and Light Weapons, drugs, etc). Achieving structural stability presupposes from its side a comprehensive approach which works on addressing the root causes of conflict, enhancing macro-economic stabilisation, creating a more favourable democratic environment, reforming the security sector, and consolidating peace and the prevention of future conflicts.

Presenting the 2001 Communication in this way allows the presentation in a single overview – inevitably summarised – of the main lines of the Commission’s strategy with respect to CPPB.


However, the Commission’s strategy goes beyond the levels displayed in Figure 3.1 and announces a number of activities already implemented, instruments at its disposal and forthcoming possible activities in conflict prevention. Focusing on the latter, section 3.2 shows for each of the operational objectives the activities envisaged in the 2001 Communication. It should be noted that for many operational objectives, specific and more comprehensive strategies exist. However, for reasons of clarity and with a view to remaining within the scope of this evaluation, the next section focuses mainly on what is mentioned in the 2001 Communication in this respect.

### 3.2 Link with the activities/interventions

Figures 3.2 to 3.6 on the following pages show the types of activity or intervention foreseen by the 2001 Communication for attaining the operational and specific objectives shown in the overall intervention logic as presented in Figure 3.1. Although the intervention logic focuses on the planned *Commission* activities and interventions, it entails not only financial flows but also other types of intervention, such as the conduct of dialogue. Moreover, the Commission activities and interventions also interact with activities conducted under pillar II, as explained in chapter 5. Annex 8 provides a more general summary of EU instruments that can be used for CPPB.


The first three Figures show the activities, interventions and operational objectives linked to each of the specific objectives pursued in the interests of enhanced stability that is long term prevention: promoting integration (Figure 3.2), achieving structural stability (Figure 3.3), and diminishing the impact of crosscutting factors in conflicts (Figure 3.4). Figure 3.5 shows the path that leads from the planned activities to the intermediate objective of reacting quickly to nascent conflicts (short-term prevention), and Figure 3.6 shows how the Commission intends to improve co-ordination and co-operation on conflict prevention at international level.

**Figure 3.2 – Promote Integration<sup>14</sup>**




<sup>14</sup> White boxes with a dashed arrow refer to activities which are out of the scope of this study (except for TACIS).

**Figure 3.3 – Achieve structural stability (Address the deep-rooted cause of violent conflict)**



**Figure 3.4 – Diminish the impact of crosscutting factors of conflicts**



**Figure 3.5 – React quickly to nascent conflicts (Short-term prevention)**





Figure 3.6 – Strengthen cooperation with international partners on conflict prevention







## 4. Inventory and typology

---

This chapter presents the inventory and typology of the Commission's funding in the field of CPPB. Given the scope of the Preliminary study, the inventory aims at covering to the maximum possible extent the Commission's interventions that fall within the scope of the 2001 Communication, as presented in the intervention logic in Chapter 3.

**The key elements of the inventory and typology are presented in section 4.3. They are summarised in the box below.**

### Summary box : Main findings of the inventory and typology

- The Commission's funding with respect to CPPB for the period 2001-2008 adds up to €6.2bn ; it continuously increased between 2001 and 2007. This trend also continued in 2008, although the total amount decreased owing to lower commitments in three large recipient countries;
- 90% of the contracted funds went with comparable parts to three regions: ACP (33%), ENP - MEDA (30%) and Asia (27%);
- Four countries (the West Bank and Gaza Strip, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Sudan) received 59% of the total amount contracted ;
- 84% of the funds went to 5 thematic categories, each of them with a particular emphasis on one or two regions :
  - Peace consolidation and prevention of future conflicts (21%, mainly in ACP);
  - Rapid intervention (20%, mainly in ENP - MEDA);
  - Democracy, rule of law and civil society (15%, mainly in ACP and Asia);
  - Population flows and human trafficking (14%, mainly in ENP - MEDA);
  - Reconstruction and Infrastructure (14%, mainly in Asia);
- The majority of the funds was channelled through International organisations;
- Priorities and contracting modes differed by region.

A listing of CPPB interventions was not readily available, but required the evaluators to develop a specific approach to identifying relevant interventions and compiling them in a single list. This chapter is accordingly structured as follows:

- Section 4.1 presents in detail the approach developed for building an inventory and typology;
- Section 4.2 describes the limitations of this exercise; *and*
- Section 4.3 provides the results of the inventory and typology.

Additional information from the evaluators' inventory and typology is provided in the annexes:

- Annex 5: full list of CPPB interventions;
- Annex 6: details on CPPB funding per country/region; *and*
- Annex 7: thematic and regional typology.

## 4.1 Approach developed for compiling the inventory

As explained in Chapter 3, the Commission's strategy with respect to CPPB covers a very wide range of activities in a large number of fields. Indeed, activities that fall within the scope of the 2001 Communication may concern regional initiatives, trade related activities, macro-economic assistance, SALW, the fight against drugs, etc. The main source for identifying activities that are relevant to the 2001 Communication is the Commission's Common RELEX Information System (CRIS). One problem however is that in this database many of the activities that might be relevant are not identified as CPPB activities as such. Hence the extraction of a readily available list of relevant activities was not possible.

This explains why the team needed to develop a specific and systematic approach to compiling an inventory of the Commission's interventions in CPPB. This approach consisted of four phases:

- extraction of a first list of interventions that can easily be linked to CPPB;
- analysis by search keys on a broader list to identify CPPB interventions;
- compilation of a final list and conduct of additional quality checks;
- provision of a broad categorisation of the interventions.

It should be noted at the outset that the CRIS database gathers operational data (decisions, projects, contracts descriptions) and financial data (budget lines, commitments, payments) on the Commission's external assistance managed by the EuropeAid Co-operation Office (AIDCO) and DG for External Relations of the European Commission (RELEX), for Development (DEV) and for the Enlargement (ELARG). Since 15 February 2009 CRIS also encompasses data relating to the European Development Funds (previously in the On Line Accounting System -OLAS- database), in addition to data on interventions financed by the general Community budget. Therefore, as of that date it is the sole source for identifying Commission interventions in the field of CPPB.


CRIS allows extraction of data at decision, project, and contract level. One decision can relate to one or more projects, for each of which one or more contracts may exist. The evaluation team has made data extractions at these levels and decided to elaborate the inventory with the information extracted at contract level, which provides the most detailed information<sup>15</sup>.

Figure 4.1 summarises the four-phase approach used to elaborate the basis for the inventory.

---

<sup>15</sup> Example: the decision TACIS/2004/016-767: TACIS 2004 Regionalactivities programme encompasses contracts in security system management, civilian peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution but also other contracts in, for example, the development of equipment certification centres for the transportation of perishable goods. It is thus important for the elaboration of the inventory to distinguish these different interventions which can be done at the contract level and not at the decision level.

**Figure 4.1 - Approach used to produce the inventory**



## Phase 1: Extraction of a first list of activities easily linked to CPPB

As mentioned previously, activities relevant to CPPB are not listed in CRIS under one single code. However, a number of codes do allow identification of activities for which the link to CPPB is clear. This concerns certain “DAC sector”, “domain” and “theme” codes. The selection of directly relevant codes is listed below.

- 1) Data extractions using the *DAC sector* code on conflict prevention and peace building:

<b>15200</b>	Conflict prevention and resolution, peace and security
<b>15210</b>	Security system management and reform
<b>15220</b>	Civilian peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution
<b>15230</b>	Post conflict peace-building (UN)
<b>15240</b>	Reintegration and SALW control
<b>15250</b>	Land mine clearance
<b>15261</b>	Child soldiers (Prevention and demobilisation)
<b>15061</b>	<i>Old DAC code for</i> Post conflict peace-building (UN)
<b>15064</b>	<i>Old DAC code for</i> Demobilisation
<b>15066</b>	<i>Old DAC code for</i> Land mine clearance

- 2) Data extractions using the following *Domain* codes<sup>16</sup>:

<b>IFS</b>	Instrument for stability
<b>RRM</b>	Rapid reaction mechanism
<b>IFS-RRM</b>	Instrument for stability – Rapid reaction mechanism
<b>MAP</b>	Antipersonnel mines

- 3) Data extractions using the following *Theme* codes:

<b>PA000</b>	Peace, disarmament and development
<b>PV000</b>	Conflict prevention/resolution

The combination of the data extracted for these different codes generated a list from which double-counted interventions were extracted. This allowed compilation of a **list of 546 interventions for a total amount contracted of €914m (“list 1”)**.

## Phase 2 : Analysis by search keys on a broader list

As has been previously explained, the coverage of the 2001 Communication is broader than can be grasped through the above-mentioned codes. Moreover, CRIS has a number of limitations, notably in terms of categorisation of activities under the appropriate headings, as experienced and detailed in earlier evaluations<sup>17</sup>. Therefore, the team deemed it necessary

<sup>16</sup> As defined in CRIS, a Domain is a “geographical or thematic environment/programme: PHARE, MED, ALA, Human Rights, for instance.”

<sup>17</sup> See the Inventory Notes for the *Evaluation of Commission’s external cooperation with partner countries through the organisations of the UN family*, ADE, May 2008, and the *Evaluation of Commission’s aid delivery through development banks and EIB*, ADE, November 2008, available on the Joint Evaluation Unit’s website.

to expand the CRIS search so as to identify interventions that fall within the scope of the 2001 Communication, but are not ranked under the above-mentioned codes.

The first step in this respect was to constitute a broad base of listed interventions in which the evaluators could then identify those covered by the 2001 Communication. Accordingly, additional extractions were made from CRIS using different entries through 133 different codes, so as to maximise the chance of including all potentially relevant activities. This concerned the following “domain”, “geographical zone”, “theme” and “target group” codes.

- 1) Data extractions using the following 25 *Domain* codes<sup>18</sup>:

<b>ALA</b>	Latin America
<b>ASIE</b>	Asia
<b>DCI-ALA</b>	Development - Latin America
<b>DCI-ASIE</b>	Development – Asia
<b>DCI-FOOD</b>	Development - Food Security
<b>DCI-GENRE</b>	Development – Gender
<b>DCI-HUM</b>	Development - Human and social
<b>DCI-MIGR</b>	Development - Migration and asylum
<b>DCI-REH</b>	Development - Rehabilitation ACP
<b>DDH</b>	Human rights & Democracy
<b>DRG</b>	Drugs
<b>EIDHR</b>	New Democracy and Human Rights
<b>ENPI</b>	Neighbourhood - Mediterranean & Eastern Europe
<b>ENPI-CBC</b>	Neighbourhood - Cross Border Cooperation
<b>FED</b>	European Development Fund
<b>FOOD</b>	Food Security
<b>GENRE</b>	Gender
<b>MED</b>	Mediterranean
<b>MIGR</b>	Migration and asylum
<b>NSI</b>	Nuclear Safety
<b>ONG</b>	Other NGOs
<b>ONG-ED</b>	NGO Co-financing (ED)
<b>ONG-PVD</b>	NGO co-financing (PVD)
<b>REH</b>	REHABILITATION/REFUGEES
<b>TACIS</b>	TACIS

<sup>18</sup> The selection of these 25 “domain” codes is based on the geographical scope of this preliminary study and the thematic/activities described in the 2001 Communication. Example: “ALA” domain is included but not the “CARDS” domain; the “human rights and democracy” domain is included but not the “sugar” domain.

2) Data extractions using the following 89 *Geographical zone*<sup>19</sup> codes:

<b>ACP</b>	ACP COUNTRIES
<b>ACP GRP</b>	EDF GLOBAL PROJECTS GPR – reserve/non reparti par pays
<b>ACP RPR</b>	REGIONAL EDF – reserve/non reparti par region
<b>ACPTPS</b>	Intra ACP allocations
<b>AF</b>	Afghanistan
<b>AO</b>	Angola
<b>APR</b>	EDF ACP GPR GLOBAL PROJECTS
<b>BD</b>	Bangladesh
<b>BI</b>	Burundi
<b>CD</b>	Congo Democratic Republic of
<b>CF</b>	Central African Republic
<b>CG</b>	Congo Brazzaville
<b>CI</b>	Ivory Coast
<b>CO</b>	Colombia
<b>CV</b>	Cape Verde
<b>DJ</b>	Djibouti
<b>ER</b>	Eritrea
<b>ET</b>	Ethiopia
<b>GH</b>	Ghana
<b>GRP</b>	EDF GLOBAL PROJECTS GPR
<b>GT</b>	Guatemala
<b>GW</b>	Guinea Bissau
<b>HT</b>	Haiti
<b>IN</b>	India
<b>IQ</b>	Iraq
<b>IR</b>	Iran
<b>KE</b>	Kenya
<b>KH</b>	Cambodia
<b>LB</b>	Lebanon
<b>LK</b>	Sri Lanka
<b>LR</b>	Liberia
<b>ML</b>	Mali
<b>MR</b>	Mauritania
<b>MTR</b>	EDF PALOP PROJECTS
<b>NI</b>	Nicaragua

<sup>19</sup> As defined in CRIS, a Geographical Zone is: “a country or region concerned”. The selection of these 89 countries/regions out of a total of 375 countries has been made in three steps. First, the countries that do not fall within the scope of the present study have been eliminated. Then the 2006 Commission document on *Supporting peace building. An overview of European Community activities* was consulted. This document lists a number of peace building interventions in 23 countries/regions which have thus been included in the selection for data extraction. Then an extraction from CRIS with a list of all the sectors of intervention mentioned in the CSP/PIN and RSP/RIN by country/region from 1998 to 2013 was made. The sectors are listed with their DAC sector code. In this list, 47 countries'/regions' CSP/PIN/RSP/RIN mention the DAC sector codes for *conflict prevention and resolution, peace and security* (15200, 15210, 15220, 15230, 15240, 15250, 15261, 15061, 15064, 15066). These 47 countries/regions included the 23 countries/regions mentioned in the 2006 Commission document and thus 24 additional countries/regions were included in the selection for data extraction. In addition to these documents, it was decided to include all region codes such as ACP, ROR (East Africa region), RMD (Mediterranean region) in the selection so as to capture large regional projects covering more than one country.

<b>NP</b>	Nepal
<b>PFR</b>	Regional EDF
<b>PFT</b>	EDF PTF REGIONAL PROJECTS
<b>PH</b>	Philippines
<b>PMO</b>	PROCHE ET MOYEN ORIENT
<b>PNR</b>	EDF PTN REGIONAL PROJECTS
<b>POR</b>	EDF PTO REGIONAL PROJECTS
<b>PPR</b>	EDF PTO GPR PROJECTS
<b>PS</b>	West Bank and Gaza Strip
<b>PUR</b>	EDF PTU REGIONAL PROJECTS
<b>RAC</b>	CENTRAL AMERICA REGION
<b>RAE</b>	SOUTH EAST ASIA REGION
<b>RAL</b>	LATIN AMERICA COUNTRIES
<b>RAO</b>	EASTERN ASIA REGION
<b>RAU</b>	SOUTHERN AFRICA REGION
<b>RCA</b>	CARIBBEAN REGION
<b>RCE</b>	CENTRAL AFRICA REGION
<b>RDV</b>	REGION MISCALLANEOUS
<b>REG</b>	REGIONAL EDF
<b>RIN</b>	INDIAN OCEAN REGION
<b>RMD</b>	MEDITERRANEAN REGION
<b>RMS</b>	SOUTH AMERICA REGION
<b>ROC</b>	West Africa region
<b>ROR</b>	EAST AFRICA REGION
<b>RPA</b>	PACIFIC REGION
<b>RPR</b>	REGIONAL EDF
<b>RSA</b>	Eastern and Southern Africa
<b>RSC</b>	CENTRAL ASIA REGION
<b>RSS</b>	SOUTH ASIA REGION
<b>RVS</b>	REGION NEIGHBOURHOOD
<b>RW</b>	Rwanda
<b>SAD</b>	SOUTHERN AFRICAN REGION 9EDF
<b>SD</b>	Sudan
<b>SL</b>	Sierra Leone
<b>SN</b>	Senegal
<b>SO</b>	Somalia
<b>SV</b>	El Salvador
<b>TD</b>	Chad
<b>TL</b>	Timor Leste
<b>TP</b>	East Timor
<b>TPS</b>	ALL COUNTRIES
<b>UG</b>	Uganda
<b>YE</b>	Yemen

3) Data extraction using the following 13 *Theme* codes<sup>20</sup>:

<b>DD000</b>	HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY
<b>DD010</b>	Torture prevention
<b>DD030</b>	Abolition of death penalty
<b>DD040</b>	Fight against discrimination
<b>ED000</b>	STRENGTHENING STATE OF LAW
<b>EL000</b>	SUPPORT TO ELECTORAL PROCESS
<b>MI000</b>	REFUGEES, MIGRATIONS
<b>PE000</b>	EU police
<b>PR000</b>	Drug prevention
<b>RE000</b>	Rehabilitation
<b>SA030</b>	Discrimination prevention
<b>TF000</b>	TRAFFIC
<b>VN000</b>	Vulnerable group

4) Data extractions using the following 6 *Target group* codes<sup>21</sup>:

<b>EF000</b>	Childhood
<b>GV000</b>	Vulnerable group
<b>GV010</b>	Indigenous
<b>GV020</b>	Ethnic minorities
<b>GV030</b>	Torture victims
<b>GV040</b>	Prisoner

This resulted in 133 extracted items, many of which relate to the same interventions. As an example, a specific intervention in the Ivory Coast might be included not only in the corresponding extraction but also in that on Gender, Human Rights, or other. In other words, different data items extracted might turn out to be different entries of the same interventions. Combining these different extraction processes obviously maximises the chance of capturing relevant interventions.

At this stage the challenge was to identify, within the 133 “basis” lists, those interventions that were relevant to the 2001 Communication and therefore to the scope of the present study.

---

<sup>20</sup> These themes have been selected given their direct link with the 2001 Communication.

<sup>21</sup> These target groups have been selected given their direct link with the 2001 Communication.



In order to do so, the team first identified 64 search keys on the basis of which these lists could be screened. These search keys were identified on the basis of 30 key concepts covered by the 2001 Communication and other information sources (e.g. on specific interventions such as the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS)). They included the following search keys (wherever useful English, French and Spanish search keys were used):

Key concepts	Search keys
<b>Arm</b>	Arm Arme Arma
<b>Asylum</b>	Asylum Asile Asilo
<b>Conflict</b>	Confli
<b>Crisis</b>	Cris
<b>Demobilisation</b>	Demobilisa Démobilisa desmoviliza
<b>Disarmament</b>	Disarm Désarm Desarm
<b>Disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration</b>	DDR
<b>Drug</b>	Drug Drogue Droga
<b>Election</b>	Election Eleccion
<b>Electoral observers</b>	Elector EOM MOE
<b>Emergency</b>	Emergenc Urgence
<b>Good governance</b>	Governance Gouvernance Gobierno
<b>Justice</b>	Justic Judicial Juridique
<b>Kimberley process</b>	Diamond Diamant Diamante Kimberley
<b>Migration</b>	Migra

Key concepts	Search keys
<b>Mine</b>	Mine Mina
<b>Peace</b>	Peace Paix Paz
<b>Peace keeping operations</b>	AMIS AMISEC AMISON AMIB FOMUC MICOPAX
<b>Police</b>	Polic
<b>Reconciliation</b>	Reconcilia Réconciliation
<b>Reconstruction</b>	Reconstru
<b>Reintegration</b>	Reintegra Réintégra
<b>Sanction</b>	Sanc
<b>Security</b>	Securi Seguridad
<b>Security Sector Reform</b>	SSR
<b>Small Arms and Light Weapons</b>	SALW ALPC
<b>Terror Terrorism</b>	Terror
<b>Traffic Trafficking</b>	Traffic Trafico
<b>Violence</b>	Violen
<b>Weapon</b>	Weapon

The 133 “base” lists were then screened on the basis of these 64 search keys. An intervention containing at least one of the search keys in its title was added to a new list. This list was then again checked item by item to make sure the intervention was relevant (some interventions needed to be eliminated). For example, intervention titles containing the name of the contractor “BCEOM” were identified in the list through the search key “EOM” (Election Observation Mission). This allowed compilation of a second list (“**list 2**”) of interventions in the field of CPPB.

### **Phase 3 : Obtaining a final list and additional cross-checking**

Lists 1 and 2 were then merged and double-counted interventions were erased. A final verification of the quality of the list was then done by cross-checking it with the following:

- **Commission documents on CPPB<sup>22</sup>**, to verify whether interventions mentioned there were present in the list. Most of them were included in the list but in the case of the African Peace Facility (APF) for example, one contract for capacity building activities in the field of CPPB mentioned in a Commission information note on the APF financial overview, was not selected through the screening of titles’ interventions. Indeed, none of the search keys selected could grasp the title of this contract which was encoded in CRIS as “contribution agreement capacity building African Union”. This intervention was thus added to the list;
- **Inventories compiled for the evaluations of funds channelled through the World Bank (WB) and the UN<sup>23</sup>**, to ensure that relevant interventions in these inventories were included. This was the case for the large majority of them, but in some cases additions to the list were needed. For example, the WB TF for demobilisation and reintegration in the Great Lakes regions was not included in the CPPB intervention list because it is encoded in CRIS as “World Bank Trust Fund TF 50574”. It was indeed not possible on this basis alone to decide whether or not it related to CPPB. HAS the inventory of the Commission’s interventions through the WB had identified this TF n°50574 as a demobilisation and reintegration programme, it has been added to the list;
- **Quality check** of the list of interventions by sector experts in CPPB to ensure that the **major interventions** were included; *and*
- **Cross-check with decision-level extractions** from CRIS. When titles at the level of ‘financing decisions’ could clearly be linked to the field of CPPB, all contracts under those decisions were incorporated into the list of interventions.

A final list of interventions was then obtained, “**list 3**”, which can be found in annex 5. It contains 3,080 interventions in CPPB for a total amount contracted of €5.9bn.

---

<sup>22</sup> Examples of documents consulted: European Commission, *African Peace Facility Financial overview*, 2009 ; European Commission, *Supporting peace building. An overview of European Community activities*, 2006 ; European Commission, *EC activities (EC+EDF) in the area of SALW up to date*, 2006.

<sup>23</sup> *Evaluation of Commission’s external cooperation with partner countries through the organisations of the UN family*, ADE, May 2008; *Evaluation of Commission’s aid delivery through development banks and EIB*, ADE, November 2008.

## Phase 4: Categorisation of interventions

Although the Commission's strategy with respect to CPPB is to implement an integrated approach (see chapter 3), by definition often over a wide range of activities, the evaluators deemed it useful to provide an overview of the main "thematic" focus areas. It should however be clear that such an overview is provided only to refine the inventory for the present study. It does not in any way aim at challenging the integrated approach or at setting a norm for the classification of CPPB interventions in general.

To provide such an overview, the main challenge was to make sure that each intervention from the list mentioned above was classified under a specific category or "theme".

Such categorisation was however not included in the list of interventions extracted from CRIS. DAC sector codes were only completed in about 30% of the cases. It was also not possible to rely on the domain codes used in CRIS, as many of them were geographical codes (e.g. "MED" for the Mediterranean region) and thus did not allow for thematic categorisation.

Therefore, another approach had to be found. As a first step in this respect, the team defined a set of thematic categories to be used. This set of categories was derived from the Intervention Logic diagrams presented in Chapter 3. Indeed, for each intermediate, specific or operational objective the evaluators examined the activities specified by the 2001 Communication. They then defined a set of thematic categories that together allowed coverage of all these activities while also striving for a workable level of aggregation.<sup>24</sup> Table 4.1 shows, on the one hand, to which part of the Intervention Logic each proposed thematic category relates, and on the other hand, the type of activities covered by that thematic category (except in cases where this is self-evident).

---

<sup>24</sup> As far as possible the team strove for the construction of "mutually exclusive" categories. This however could not always be done, and several categories are to a certain extent overlapping. For example, the category "reconstruction and infrastructure" covers post-conflict reconstruction activities carried out through Multi Donor Trust Funds, while the category "peace consolidation and prevention of future conflict" covers other post-conflict reconstruction activities.

**Table 4.1 – Thematic categories**

	INTERVENTION LOGIC REFERENCE (2001 COMMUNICATION)	THEMATIC CATEGORIES	TYPE OF ACTIVITIES PER THEMATIC CATEGORY
P R O J E C T I N G  S T A B I L I T Y	Promote integration		
	Achieve structural stability		
	Enhance macro-economic stabilisation	<b>Economic support and trade cooperation</b>	WB/IMF instruments; General Budget Support; Macro-economic assistance; Generalised system of Preferences; Trade Capacity Building; Economic Cooperation; Private sector
	More favourable democratic environment	<b>Democracy, rule of law and civil society</b>	Electoral processes; Electoral observers; Parliamentary activities; Local governance; Good Governance, including the administration of justice; Civil and political rights, including gender initiatives; Freedom of expression and independent media
	Reform the security sector	<b>Security sector</b>	Police services; Conversion and decommissioning of mass destruction and conventional weapons; HR training on Security Sector; Prisons; Terrorism
	Consolidate peace and the prevention of future conflicts	<b>Peace consolidation and prevention of future conflict</b>	Rehabilitation; DDR; Demining; Child rehabilitation; Reconciliation programmes; Peace Keeping operations (mainly APF); SALW, including trafficking of SALW; Support to regional structures
		<b>Reconstruction and infrastructure</b>	Multi-donor Trust Funds for reconstruction
		<b>Multi sector</b>	<i>Interventions covering more than one sector and cannot be linked to other thematic categories (e.g. the peace research laboratory in Colombia)</i>
	Diminish the impact of cross-cutting factors of conflicts		
	Anti-drug action	<b>Anti-drug actions</b>	
	Improve the control of SALW		<i>(Included in the category Peace consolidation and prevention of future conflict)</i>
	Fair management of natural resources	<b>Environment and natural resources</b>	Water; Geological resources (including diamonds), Biological resources; land reform
	Combat environmental degradation		
	Access to care for communicable diseases	<b>Health and communicable diseases</b>	
Detect better destabilising population flows	<b>Population flows and human trafficking</b>	Asylum and migration; Fight against discrimination and illegal migration; Human trafficking and border management; Refugees & Internally Displaced People	
Encourage private sector to behave responsibly		<i>(Has been integrated under economic support and trade cooperation)</i>	
R E A C T I N G  Q U I C K L	Enhance early warning and swift reaction	<b>Rapid intervention</b>	Early warning systems; Emergency economic assistance; Infrastructure reconstruction; Political and diplomatic instruments; Sanction related activities; Training programmes for rapid intervention; Food aid & food security
	Optimise community instruments		
	Use political and diplomatic instruments		
	Use sanctions preventively		
	Adapt EU crisis management tools to pre-crisis role		
<b>STRENGTHEN COOPERATION WITH INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS</b>			

On the basis of these categories, the team went through the list of interventions again, classifying each under one specific category. For some groups of interventions the DAC code or domain could be used; for many the team had to make a choice in terms of classification. This choice was mainly based on the title of the intervention. For some large interventions the team referred to the description of the type of activities, when available on the internet. In that sense, interventions were placed in the category that seemed most applicable. This allowed creation of the necessary basis for a thematic breakdown as presented in section 4.3.3.

## 4.2 Limits of the inventory

The specific approach used for the elaboration of the inventory is considered by the evaluation team as the best possible and most comprehensive way of tackling the complex exercise of providing an inventory of the Commission's support to CPPB. However, it obviously has a number of limitations, and the following in particular:

- 1) **The approach implies that a number of choices were made by the evaluators**, for instance, in terms of codes used for constituting the new base lists or of search keys to be used for screening. Although there is a rational basis for these choices and although they have been chosen with a view to maximising coverage, one cannot exclude the possibility that relevant interventions have not been grasped by the codes or search keys selected. Another type of choice concerns the use of thematic categories and the classification of each intervention under a single category only. Here again, while there is a sound basis for each choice made, it is clear that other choices in terms of category sets and classification could have been possible. Nevertheless, the team considers that this approach meets the objective of providing an overall overview of the Commission's funding accurately.
- 2) **Certain limitations inherent in CRIS are particularly difficult to address**. As an example, a number of interventions have been encoded in such a way that it is impossible to identify them through search keys or other means based on their title only. For example, the World Bank Trust Fund on "Greater Great Lakes demobilisation and reintegration" is encoded in CRIS as: "WORLD BANK TRUST FUND TF 50574". In a data extraction of more than a thousand interventions, this title does not provide enough information to reveal whether or not it is a conflict prevention and peace building intervention. Nevertheless, in this specific case the data cross-checking carried out in phase 3 of the elaboration of the inventory allowed the team to identify this CPPB intervention.

## 4.3 Results from the inventory

The results from the inventory are presented below:


- Section 4.3.1 describes the **trend** in funds contracted and disbursed by the Commission for CPPB interventions over the period 2001-2008, as well as the trend in the number of CPPB interventions financed by the Commission over that period.
- Section 4.3.2 gives the allocation of Commission funds (contracted and disbursed) by **region and country**. It also shows the trend in the amounts contracted for each region.
- Section 4.3.3 provides a **thematic** breakdown of CPPB interventions and indicates their regional allocation.
- Section 4.3.4 presents the distribution of funds contracted and disbursed by the main Commission **contractors** which implement the CPPB interventions.
- Section 4.3.5 describes the breakdown of the amounts contracted and disbursed under the Commission financing instruments (**budget lines**).

Where possible, on the basis of information contained in the list of projects, the team has provided explanations of certain observations, such as, for instance, a sudden fall in funding in a certain region. Such explanations remain however purely descriptive and seek to avoid any interpretation. Deeper analysis would indeed be covered by the evaluation itself where relevant.

### 4.3.1 Trends in Commission funding between 2001 and 2008

The Commission contracted a total amount of €6.2bn for CPPB interventions over the period 2001-2008 in the countries falling within the geographical scope of this study<sup>25</sup>. The total amount disbursed (i.e. “paid” by the Commission to its contractors<sup>26</sup>) was €5.3bn, or 85% of the total amount contracted. The financing of these interventions derives from the Commission’s general budget for 74% of the total amount contracted and from the European Development Fund (EDF)<sup>27</sup> for 26%. The corresponding disbursements were €4bn (or 86% of the amount contracted from the general budget) and €1.3bn (81% of the amount contracted from the EDF). Figure 4.2 shows the trend in the amounts contracted over the period 2001-2008.

**Figure 4.2 - Trend in the amount contracted between 2001 and 2008 (€m), breakdown between Commission general budget and EDF**



The amounts contracted by the Commission for CPPB interventions increased substantially from 2001 (€128m) to 2007 (€1.1bn), while remaining at a level of a billion Euros in 2008. The rationale behind this evolution needs to be investigated by the forthcoming evaluation. At this stage it is nevertheless interesting to mention the largest

<sup>25</sup> All third countries with the exception of OECD countries and those covered by DG Enlargement – see section 1.1

<sup>26</sup> This does not necessarily reflect the amount paid to the beneficiary. For TFs, for instance, the amount disbursed by the Commission would refer to the amount paid by the Commission to the TF manager (e.g. the World Bank), not the amount paid by the TF manager to its contractors for implementation.

<sup>27</sup> European Development Funds (successive Funds for ACP countries, consisting of EU MS contributions, managed by the Commission).

intervention for which funds were allocated over the years, which are also shown in figure 4.3 below:


- In 2002 substantial amounts were contracted by the Commission for the Direct Budgetary Assistance to the Palestinian Authority (€98m) and the first contribution to the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund -ARTF- (€30m);
- In 2003 the Commission continued to support the Palestinian Authority with the Finance Facility (€80m) and increased its support to Afghanistan with €50m for the Law and Order Trust Fund -LOFTA- and €32m for the ARTF;
- In 2004 there was a significant increase in funds contracted by the Commission. It can be explained by the first main contribution to the International Reconstruction Fund Facility for Iraq (IRFFI) of €160m and also by the support the elections in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) (€145m) and the first contribution to a peacekeeping operation under the African Peace Facility (APF) in Sudan (€74m);
- In 2005 the Commission contributed to the Public Financial Management Reform Trust Fund in the West Bank & Gaza Strip (€70m) and continued its support of the reconstruction of Iraq (€105m) and for the APF in Sudan (€70m);
- In 2006 the Temporary International Mechanism (TIM) to support the Palestinian Authority was created and the Commission contributed to it for an amount of around €100m during that year. An additional €120m was also contracted for the Iraq reconstruction Trust Fund;
- In 2007 the amount contracted peaked at €1,142m, with mainly €342m Commission support for the TIM and the extension of financing to the Afghanistan and Iraq reconstruction trust funds as well as to the APF;
- In 2008 the total amount contracted of €998m was around €150m lower than in 2007, back to the level of 2005. This drop is explained by the decrease in annual funding for three of the four largest recipients, namely Iraq, Afghanistan and Sudan<sup>28</sup>. However, there is a continuation in the general rising trend, and even a significant increase, with the amount for all contracts except in the four largest countries soaring from €423m in 2007 to €552m in 2008 (+30%).

The figure below illustrates the annual funding to the four major recipients, which represented 59% of the total amount contracted by the Commission for CPPB interventions over the period 2001-2008. It further shows the overall trend for the other interventions, which was broadly similar.

---


<sup>28</sup> No funds were contracted for the Iraq reconstruction Trust Funds and for the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Funds according to the CRIS data extracted for 2008. In the West Bank & Gaza Strip the contributions to the TIM were smaller in 2008 compared to 2006 and 2007. The amount contracted to the APF also decreased in 2008 compared to the large amounts contracted from 2004 to 2007 - the funds contracted in Sudan for support to the APF were for instance respectively €76m in 2004, €70m in 2005, €80m in 2006, €76m in 2007, and zero in 2008.

**Figure 4.3 - Trends in the amounts contracted for the 4 major recipient countries and for the other country recipients of Commission cooperation in CPPB**



With regard to the number of contracts, a total of 3,095 were signed during the period 2001-2008. It reached an annual level of 625 contracts for CPPB interventions in 2008 (*see figure below*).

**Figure 4.4 - Trend in the number of CPPB contracts between 2001 and 2008**






### 4.3.2 Country / regional breakdown

The Commission intervenes in the field of CPPB in all regions where its external cooperation is implemented. The distribution of the amounts contracted and paid for CPPB interventions between these regions is shown in the figure below.

**Figure 4.5 – Regional breakdown of CPPB funding, contracts, 2001-2008**




The regional breakdown is as follows:

- the **ACP** region (33%) represents the largest share of amounts contracted for CPPB interventions, mainly in support for the APF, other interventions in Sudan, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) ;
- the **ENP – MEDA** region represents 30% of the total amount contracted; this mainly relates to interventions in the West Bank & Gaza strip (€1,793m out of €1,896m for the whole region) ;
- the **Asia** region receives 27% of the total amount contracted, most of which (81%) goes to Afghanistan (€695m) and Iraq (€668m) ;
- the **ENP – TACIS** region represents 4%, Latin America 4% and the multi-region category<sup>29</sup> 2%.

The levels of disbursements per region are shown in the figure below.


<sup>29</sup> Multi region covers several regions or unspecified locations.

**Figure 4.6 – Disbursement levels for CPPB contracts, per region, 2001-2008**



The trend over the period 2001-2008 in the amount contracted by region is presented in the figure below.

**Figure 4.7 - Trend in the funding for CPPB, per region, contracts, 2001-2008**



The figure shows the following:

- In **ACP** countries, the Commission increased its funding for CPPB interventions over the whole period, with a strong increase in 2004 owing mainly to support for the elections in the DRC and the start of the support for the APF. The amounts contracted remained relatively stable from 2004 onwards, including additionally contributions to Multi Donor Trust Funds (MDTFs)<sup>30</sup> for reconstruction (e.g. in Southern Sudan) and for post-crisis rehabilitation programmes (e.g. in Haiti, East DRC and Northern Uganda);
- In the **ENP – MEDA** region, the Commission financed direct budgetary assistance to the Palestinian Authority in 2002 totalling €98m and maintained its support until 2005. The funding increase in 2006 and 2007 relates predominantly to the Commission contributions to the TIM (around €100m in 2006 and €342m in 2007). In 2008, the TIM was replaced by a new financing mechanism called PEGASE which is envisaged for a period of three years and for which amounts contracted in 2008 were around €253m;
- In **Asia**, funding for CPPB interventions increased strongly from 2001 to 2006 owing to the Commission’s large contributions to MDTFs for reconstruction in Afghanistan and Iraq. From 2007 to 2008 the Commission kept supporting these interventions but with lower amounts and more specific activities within these MDTFs (e.g. support for the electoral process and public financial management reform in Iraq within the IRFFI).

The table below itemises the 20 largest recipient countries or regions, which receive 86% of the total amount contracted by the Commission for CPPB interventions. The remaining 14% consist in 88 countries or regions where the Commission has been intervening (see the detailed list of all countries or regions in annex 6). It also provides the share of the amounts contracted that were disbursed for each country or region in both absolute and relative terms.

**Table 4.2 - Breakdown of the amounts contracted and paid by country/region**

Country/region	Amount contracted (€m)	% on total amount contracted	Amount disbursed (€m)	Disbursement rate
WEST BANK AND GAZA STRIP	1.793	29%	1.761	98%
AFGHANISTAN	695	11%	667	96%
IRAQ	668	11%	613	92%
SUDAN	479	8%	409	86%
CONGO ( DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF )	290	5%	253	87%
ANGOLA	146	2%	124	85%
COLUMBIA	141	2%	116	82%
ALL COUNTRIES	131	2%	84	64%
IVORY COAST	129	2%	107	83%
HAITI	125	2%	72	58%
SOMALIA	115	2%	83	72%
TACIS REGION	99	2%	82	83%
BANGLADESH	94	2%	35	37%
LIBERIA	86	1%	73	85%
UKRAINE	69	1%	40	58%
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	67	1%	42	62%
TIMOR LESTE	54	1%	48	88%
ACP COUNTRIES	50	1%	35	69%
INDONESIA	50	1%	40	79%
ERITREA	48	1%	30	63%
OTHER	852	14%	566	66%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6.182</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5.279</b>	<b>85%</b>

Source: CRIS and ADE analysis


Note: Other includes 88 countries/regions (see annex 6 for the complete list)

<sup>30</sup> “A MDTF is a mechanism which combines the contributions of multiple donors, generally for a program of activities over a number of years. This arrangement includes essentially standard legal agreements with all donors, which specify governance procedures covering management, operational and financial reporting, and uses of the funds”. World Bank 2006 Trust Funds Annual Report.

### 4.3.3 Thematic breakdown

The figure below illustrates the breakdown of funding per thematic category, following the approach described above in section 4.1 (see also the list of interventions in Annex 5).

**Figure 4.8 - Thematic breakdown of CPPB funding, amounts contracted, 2001-2008**




The main thematic categories are peace consolidation and prevention of future conflict (20.8% or €1,286m); rapid intervention (19.9% or €1,233m); democracy, rule and law & civil society (14.7% or €911m); population flows & human trafficking (14.5% or €898m); reconstruction and infrastructure (14.4% or €889m); economic support and trade cooperation (5.8% or €357m); security sector (4.8% or €280m); and multi-sector (3% or €177m).

For each thematic category, the main activities (as described in table 4.2 in section 4.1) can be identified, as shown in the following examples:

- *“Peace consolidation and prevention of future conflict”*: three main activities represent 79% of the total amount contracted: peace keeping operations (34%), rehabilitation programmes (27%) and de-mining activities (18%);
- *“Rapid intervention”*: the main activities are emergency economic assistance (66%) and food aid & food security (28%);
- *“Democracy, rule of law and civil society”*: the main activities are support for the electoral process (39%) and the electoral observers (16%);
- *“Reconstruction and infrastructure”*: all the funding goes towards MDTFs for post-conflict reconstruction;
- *“Population flows and human trafficking”*: activities for refugees and internally displaced persons represent 71% of the amount contracted.

Figure 4.9 displays a thematic breakdown per region.

**Figure 4.9 - Thematic breakdown of CPPB funding per region, contracts, for the 4 largest recipient regions and 7 main thematic categories, 2001-2008**



This figure shows the following:


- CPPB interventions for **peace consolidation and prevention of future conflict** are mainly concentrated in the ACP countries.
- The Commission's contributions for **rapid interventions** are mainly in the ENP – MEDA region, including emergency economic assistance to the Palestinian Authority and to ACP countries with food aid and food security programmes.
- **Democracy, rule of law & civil society** interventions are mainly financed by the Commission in ACP States and to a lesser extent in Asia.
- **Reconstruction & infrastructure** interventions are mainly focused on Asia with Commission contributions to large MDTFs in Afghanistan and Iraq.
- Contracts for CPPB interventions in **population flows and human trafficking** are concentrated in the ENP – MEDA region (activities for Palestinian refugees through the UNRWA<sup>31</sup>) and ENP – TACIS (border management and migration and asylum programmes).
- **Economic support and trade cooperation** interventions are mainly implemented in the ENP – MEDA region.
- **Security sector** activities are concentrated in Asian countries.

<sup>31</sup> United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

#### 4.3.4 Breakdown by contractor


The Commission worked with 1,484 different contractors for the implementation of its CPPB interventions over the period 2001-2008. Of these contractors, 48 accounted for €5.1bn or 83% of the total amount contracted and €4.5bn or 86% of the total amount disbursed. These 48 main contractors have been classified by the evaluators under the following six categories: international organisations, national governments, regional organisations, private companies, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and development agencies. As shown in the figure below, the main channels, in terms of amount contracted, used by the Commission for CPPB interventions are the international organisations and mainly the UN and the WB. Indeed, these two organisations administer reconstruction Trust Funds through which the Commission channels large amounts of funds such as the IRFFI for the reconstruction of Iraq (€600m) and the LOTFA (€195m) and ARTF (€237m) in Afghanistan. The Commission also contributes to UNRWA's general budget (a total amount of €476m from 2001 to 2008) and to the support of elections mainly through the UNDP (€324m for election support in more than 20 countries).

**Figure 4.10 – Breakdown of CPPB funding per contractor, amounts contracted, 2001-2008**



The Commission's levels of disbursement per type of contractor are shown in the figure below<sup>32</sup>.

**Figure 4.11 - Disbursement levels for CPPB contracts, per type of contractor, 2001-2008**




<sup>32</sup> This figure does not show the disbursement rate of the contractors themselves for the implementation of the activities

### 4.3.5 Breakdown per financing instruments (budget lines)

For the financing of CPPB interventions, the Commission uses different geographical and thematic budget lines, as illustrated in the figure below. It should be noted that over the period 2001-2008, some budget lines have only existed since 2007 such as the ENPI, IFS and DCI geographical and thematic budget lines. Others ended financing interventions in 2006, such as MEDA and TACIS.

**Figure 4.12 - Breakdown of the amounts contracted by Commission financing instrument (budget lines)**




The figure shows the following:

- More than half of the resources come from the EDF (for ACP countries) and the MEDA geographical budget line, representing 26% and 25% of the total amount contracted respectively.
- Other geographical budget lines, relating to Asia and Latin America, and South Africa represented 16% of the total amount contracted in the field of CPPB (they are gathered under the heading “Other GEO BL”).
- In terms of thematic budget lines, the most important are the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) and the Instrument For Stability - Rapid Reaction Mechanism (IFS-RRM), representing 5% and 2% respectively.
- Sixteen other thematic budget lines are used to finance CPPB interventions (migration and asylum, food security, NGO and non-State actors, environment, human and social development, gender, rehabilitation and refugees, health, antipersonnel mines, drugs and the new 2007 DCI thematic budget lines for migration and asylum, environment, food security, gender, human and social, non state actors and local authorities). They together represent 11% of the total amount contracted. Each of them accounts for less than 2% and is therefore represented in the figure as “Other Thematic BL”.

The Commission’s levels of disbursement per instrument (budget line) are shown in the figure below.



**Figure 4.13 – Disbursement levels for CPPB contracts, per instrument (budget line)**



### 4.3.6 Summary and regional typology

To summarise the main features of the Commission’s support for CPPB, a regional typology is provided in the table below. It displays, for each region, which thematic category they focused on and through which type of contractor support was provided (coloured areas in the table). The detailed amounts contracted in absolute and relative values by thematic categories, regions and contractors are provided in annex 7. In addition to this regional typology, a box at the end of this section summarizes the key findings of this inventory.

Thematic categories	ACP					ENP - MEDA					ASIA					ENP - TACIS					Latin America					Multi region										
	DA	IO	NG	NGO	PC	RO	DA	IO	NG	NGO	PC	RO	DA	IO	NG	NGO	PC	RO	DA	IO	NG	NGO	PC	RO	DA	IO	NG	NGO	PC	RO	DA	IO	NG	NGO	PC	RO
Anti-drug actions																																				
Democracy, rule of law and civil society																																				
Economic support and trade cooperation																																				
Environment & natural resources																																				
Health and communicable diseases																																				
Multisector																																				
Peace consolidation and prevention of future conflict																																				
Population flows and human trafficking																																				
Reconstruction & infrastructure																																				
Security sector																																				
Rapid intervention																																				

Source: CRIS and ADE analysis

Note: **DA**: Development Agency; **IO**: International Organisation; **NG**: National Government; **NGO**: Non-Governmental Organisation; **PC**: Private Company; **RO**: Regional Organisation.

The table shows that:

- In **ACP**, the focus has been on interventions for "Peace consolidation and prevention of future conflict", implemented through mainly Regional Organisations and International Organisations. "Democracy, rule of law and civil society" is also an important theme that has been supported by the Commission through International Organisations.
- In **ENP – MEDA**, there is a balance between "Rapid intervention" (short-term prevention) through the direct support to National Governments, International Organisations and Private Companies, and long-term prevention mainly for "Population flows and human trafficking" and "Economic support and trade cooperation".
- In **Asia**, the Commission has worked mainly through International Organisations for "Reconstruction and infrastructure" (mainly post-crisis MDTF), for "Democracy, rule of law and civil society" as well as for the "Security sector".
- In **ENP – TACIS**, the majority of the interventions tackle "Population flows and human trafficking" and are implemented through International Organisations and Private Companies. "Anti-drugs activities" is also a focus of the Commission in this region.
- In **Latin America**, the majority of the interventions are in "Democracy, rule of law and civil society" and in "Multi sector", such as the "*Laboratorios de Paz*" in Colombia for the latter. They have been implemented by National Governments, International Organisations as well as Development Agencies.
- The category "**Multi region**" includes all interventions that cover several regions or with an unspecified location. These interventions are mainly for "Rapid intervention" implemented by NGOs<sup>33</sup> and for long-term prevention implemented by International Organisations in "Population flows and human trafficking", "Environment and natural resources" and "Anti-drugs activities".

---

<sup>33</sup> Food aid programmes for assistance for victims of armed conflict.



## 5. Interaction with second pillar interventions

---

This chapter aims at presenting a brief overview of:

- the competence sharing between the Commission and the Council in the field of CPPB;
- the evolution of the funds committed under the CFSP budget to Council-led operations; and
- the potential complementarities between activities carried out under the first and second EU pillars.

### 5.1 Competence sharing between the Commission and the Council

The Commission's interventions in the field of CPPB should be considered in light of the CPPB and wider peace and security interventions implemented under the EU second pillar. EU competences in CPPB are indeed shared between the European Community (EU first pillar) and the CFSP (EU second pillar). CPPB interventions falling under the EU third pillar such as the fight against terrorism, organised crime and drug trafficking are implemented within the EU and, as a consequence, are not within the scope of this preliminary study.

The European Community, represented by the Commission, derives its competences in external relations from the Treaty establishing the European Community (TEC). The Community's external powers encompass a number of areas relevant to CPPB: common commercial policy, development cooperation, environment, etc. Decisions are taken by the Community method<sup>34</sup> involving the Commission, Parliament and the Council.

Under the EU second pillar created by the Treaty on the European Union (TEU), crisis management operations launched in the framework of the ESDP fall under the competence of the Council. The latter is the driving force behind the decision-making process under the CFSP. Indeed, the EU MS preserve their independent decision-making powers and restrict themselves to an intergovernmental form of cooperation where the Council adopts all legislative acts.

From the outset of the TEU, the question of competence sharing in the area of external relations between the Commission and the Council has been posed. Whereas overlapping competences were identified by the Treaty with provision made for a consistent and coherent approach, other issues such as election monitoring, border management, civilian crisis management, actions in support of the rule of law and control of SALW are sources of overlap which do not have clear-cut responses<sup>35</sup>.

---


<sup>34</sup> The EU's usual method of decision-making, in which the Commission makes a proposal to the Council and Parliament who then debate it, propose amendments and eventually adopt it as EU law.

<sup>35</sup> Sources: Duke, S, "Areas of Grey: Tensions in EU External relations Competences", Eipascope, N°1, 2006 and Weiler, Q., Bruges Regional Integration and Global Governance Papers; "The European Union and Security Sector Reform in Africa: a Leader in Theory, a Laggard in reality?", 2009

## 5.2 Evolution of funds committed under the CFSP budget to Council-led operations

In addition to the Commission's funding to CPPB, one should also consider the amounts committed by the European Community to the CFSP budget, since this budget is administratively managed by the Commission. However, as EU second pillar activities fall under the operational remit of the Council, they are outside the scope of the evaluation. The amounts committed by the European Community for Council-led operations increased substantially between 2003 (€48m) and 2008 (€285m) (*see figure below*).

**Figure 5.1 – Evolution of the funds committed by the European Community to the CFSP budget for Council-led operations**



### 5.3 Potential complementarities between first and second pillar activities

This sub-section aims at presenting how Community interventions under the first pillar may complement measures carried out under the second pillar and vice versa. The purpose is to enable the evaluation team to have a first overview of the activities conducted under the second pillar. This interaction between the first and second pillar will be addressed in more depth during the evaluation through the coordination and coherence issues.

In order to give an overview of EU CPPB operations financed from the Community budget and falling under the second pillar, the evaluation team relied on the nomenclature of the 2008 EU General Budget - Title 19 03 Common Foreign and Security Policy<sup>36</sup>.

This nomenclature enabled the evaluation team to identify several types of activities and a detailed list of activities funded from the CFSP budget. This Community budget line is managed by the Commission but the use of funds is decided by the Council.

Figure 4.1 hereunder illustrates the various categories of EU CPPB activities financed from the Community budget that fall under the EU second pillar; as the activities are financed from the Community budget, they are all civilian in nature. It also illustrates the potential complementarities with EU first pillar interventions and vice versa. The categories, as well as the list of detailed interventions over the period 2003-2008,<sup>37</sup> are then described together with their potential complementarity with EU CPPB measures that fall under the EU first pillar.


It should be noted that ESDP military operations are not considered in this presentation since, in accordance with the Treaty on European Union (TEU), ESDP operations with military or defence implications cannot be financed from Community funds. They are financed through EU MS contributions, based on a Gross National Income (GNI) scale, to a special mechanism created in 2004 called ATHENA.

---

<sup>36</sup> Source : 2008 EU General Budget : [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/budget/data/D2008\\_VOL4/EN/nmc-titleN188CA/nmc-chapterN19003/index.html#N19003](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/budget/data/D2008_VOL4/EN/nmc-titleN188CA/nmc-chapterN19003/index.html#N19003).

<sup>37</sup> The purpose here is to show how funding under the first and the second pillar sometimes concern similar activities. As the idea is not to provide an exhaustive overview, this presentation concentrates on the period 2003-2008, for which the EU General Budget could be retrieved on the Internet.

**Figure 5.2 - Overview of EU second pillar CPPB operations financed from the Community budget and of their potential complementarities with EU first pillar interventions**



Source: 2008 EU General Budget and ADE analysis



### ***Monitoring and implementation of peace and security processes through ESDP crisis management operations***

This category includes ESDP crisis management operations in the area of monitoring and verification of peace processes. Operations are established to monitor border crossings, peace or ceasefire agreements, or more generally, political and security developments.

These activities may complement Community activities in the area of border management.

Over the period 2001<sup>38</sup>-2008 the following operations were implemented:

<b><i>Actions</i></b>	<b><i>2001-2006</i></b>	<b><i>2007</i></b>	<b><i>2008</i></b>
<i>EU Monitoring Mission in the Balkans (EUMM)</i>	x		x
<i>EU Border Assistance Mission for the Rafah crossing point (EU BAM Rafah)</i>		x	x
<i>EU Monitoring Mission in Aceh (Indonesia) (AMM)</i>		x	

*Source: 2003 to 2008 EU General Budget*

### ***Non-proliferation and disarmament***

This category covers:

- measures which contribute to non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical and biological), primarily in the framework of the strategy against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction from December 2003; *and*
- operations to combat the destabilising accumulation and trafficking of SALW, provided that they are not already covered by the provisions of the Cotonou Agreements for similar measures in the ACP countries.

These operations may complement Community activities in the areas of conversion and decommissioning of mass destruction and conventional weapons as well as trafficking in SALW.

Over the period 2003-2008, the following operations were carried out:

---

<sup>38</sup> The 2003 EU General Budget indicates that the only activity still ongoing since 2001 under this category is the EUMM.

<i>Actions</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>
<i>Non-proliferation and disarmament in Russia</i>	x	x	x			
<i>EU contribution to combating the destabilising accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons in Mozambique</i>	x	x	x			
<i>EU contribution to combating the destabilising accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons in Cambodia</i>	x	x	x			
<i>EU contribution to combating the destabilising accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons in South Ossetia</i>	x	x				
<i>EU contribution to combating the destabilising accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons in South America</i>	x	x	x			
<i>EU contribution to combating the destabilising accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons in Albania</i>	x	x				
<i>Specific activities of the European Union in the field of assistance for mine clearance</i>	x					
<i>EU contribution to the international negotiating process leading to the adoption of an international code of conduct against ballistic missile proliferation</i>		x	x			
<i>EU contribution to combating the destabilising accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons in South-East Europe</i>		x	x	x		
<i>EU contribution to destruction of ammunitions for small arms and light weapons in Albania</i>			x	x	x	
<i>Contribution to EU cooperation programme for non-proliferation and disarmament in the Russian Federation</i>				x	x	x
<i>EU contribution to combating the destabilising accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean</i>				x		x
<i>Contribution to EU cooperation programme for non-proliferation and disarmament in the Russian Federation (chemical weapons destruction facility and nuclear security)</i>				x	x	x
<i>Support for IAEA activities under its Nuclear Security Programme, in the framework of the implementation of the EU Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction</i>				x	x	x
<i>EU contribution to combating the destabilising accumulation of small arms and light weapons in Cambodia</i>				x	x	
<i>Support for the physical protection of a nuclear site in the Russian Federation (physical protection of nuclear facilities in the Russian Federation and on provision of technical expertise to assist the Commission in supervision, control and monitoring of the implementation of WMD activities, and especially for the physical protection of nuclear sites in Russia)</i>				x	x	x
<i>Support for OPCW activities in the framework of the implementation of the EU Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (OPCW = Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons);</i>				x	x	x
<i>European Union contribution to ECOWAS in the framework of the Moratorium on Small Arms and Light Weapons</i>					x	x
<i>Support for IAEA activities in the areas of nuclear security and verification,<sup>105</sup> in the framework of the implementation of the EU Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction</i>					x	x
<i>Destruction of Small Arms and Light Weapons and their Ammunition in Ukraine</i>					x	x
<i>Support for the Biological and Toxic Weapons Convention in the framework of the EU Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction</i>					x	x
<i>Support for activities of the Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organisation (CTBTO) in the area of training and capacity-building for verification, in the framework of the implementation of the EU Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction</i>					x	x

<i>Support for implementation of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540 (2004), in the framework of the implementation of the EU Strategy against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction</i>					x	x
<i>Support for chemical weapons destruction in the Russian Federation in the framework of the EU Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction</i>						x
<i>Support for activities of the Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organisation (CTBTO) to strengthen its monitoring and verification capabilities, in the framework of the implementation of the EU Strategy against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction</i>						x
<i>Support for the convention on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects, in the framework of the European Security Strategy</i>						x
<i>Support for IAEA monitoring and verification activities in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the framework of the implementation of the EU Strategy against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction</i>						x

*Source: 2003 to 2008 EU General Budget*

## Conflict resolution and stabilisation measures through ESDP crisis management operations

This category covers activities undertaken or supported by the EU in the following areas:

- security sector reform;
- strengthening of the rule of law (judicial and penitentiary system); and
- conflict resolution.

These activities may complement Community activities in the areas of SSR and the rule of law.

Over the period 2003-2008 the following operations were carried out:

<i>Actions</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>
<i>Support operations for the Middle East peace process under the responsibility of the EU Special Envoy for the Middle East peace process (Moratinos)</i>	x	x				
<i>Second EU assistance programme in support of the Palestinian Authority in its effort to counter terrorist activities emanating from the territories under its control (Eriksson)</i>	x	x	x			
<i>EU contribution to the mission to facilitate dialogue among the Togolese</i>	x					
<i>EU contribution to strengthening the capacity of the Georgian authorities to support and protect the OSCE observer mission on the border between the Republic of Georgia and the Republic of Chechnya of the Russian Federation</i>	x	x	x			
<i>EU contribution to the conflict resolution process in South Ossetia</i>	x	x	x			
<i>EU support for the establishment of an interim multinational security presence in Burundi</i>	x	x				
<i>Contribution from the EU to the conflict settlement process in South Ossetia</i>				x	x	
<i>EU rule of law mission in Georgia (EUJUST THEMIS)</i>				x		
<i>EU integrated rule of law mission in Iraq (EUJUST LEX)</i>				x	x	x
<i>EU mission to provide advice and assistance for SSR in the DRC (EUSEC DR)</i>					x	x
<i>Establishment of an EU planning team (EUPT Kosovo) regarding a possible EU crisis management operation in the field of rule of law and other possible areas in Kosovo</i>					x	x
<i>Establishment of an EU team to contribute to the preparations of the establishment of a possible international civilian mission in Kosovo</i>					x	x
<i>Establishment of an EU team to contribute to the preparations of the establishment of a possible international civilian office in Kosovo</i>						x

Source: 2003 to 2008 EU General Budget

## Police missions undertaken in the framework of ESDP crisis management

This category concerns any police operation, ranging from advisory, assistance and training tasks to substitution for local police forces.

These activities may complement Community operations in the areas of training and institutional capacity-building provided to the police services.

Over the period 2003-2008, the following activities were carried out:

<b>Actions</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
<i>EU contribution to the establishment of the EU Police Mission (EUPM) in Bosnia and Herzegovina to ensure follow-on to the United Nations IPTF</i>	x	x	x			
<i>EU contribution to settlement of EU Police Mission in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (EUPOL Proxima)</i>			x			
<i>Extension of the European Union Police Mission in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (EUPOL Proxima)</i>				x		
<i>European Union Police Mission (EUPM) in Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>				x	x	x
<i>European Union support to the establishment of the Integrated Police Unit in the Democratic Republic of the Congo</i>				x	x	
<i>European Union Police Mission in Kinsbasa (DRC) regarding the Integrated Police Unit (EUPOL Kinsbasa)</i>				x	x	
<i>European Union civilian-military supporting activities to the African Union missions in the Darfur region of Sudan and in Somalia</i>					x	x
<i>European Union Police Mission for the Palestinian Territories (EUCOPPS)</i>					x	x
<i>European Union Police Mission for the Palestinian Territories</i>						x
<i>European Union Police Mission in Afghanistan (EUPOL AFGHANISTAN)</i>						x
<i>European Union Police Mission undertaken in the framework of reform of the security sector (SSR) and its interface with the system of justice in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (EUPOL RD Congo)</i>						x

Source: 2003 to 2008 EU General Budget

### **Appointment of EU Special Representatives (EUSR)**

This category covers:

- the salaries of EUSR for setting up their teams or support structures (including staff costs);
- the costs of any projects implemented under the direct responsibility of an EUSR.

These activities may complement Community activities at political or diplomatic levels. Over the period 2003-2008 the following activities were carried out:

<b>Actions</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
<i>EUSR for Afghanistan</i>		x	x	x	x	x
<i>EUSR for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</i>		x	x	x	x	x
<i>EUSR for the African Great Lakes region</i>			x	x	x	x
<i>EUSR for the Middle East peace process</i>		x	x	x	x	x
<i>Special Coordinator of the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe</i>	x	x				
<i>EUSR for South Caucasus</i>		x	x	x	x	x
<i>EUSR in Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>				x	x	x
<i>EUSR for Moldova</i>				x	x	x
<i>EUSR for Central Asia</i>					x	x
<i>EUSR for Sudan</i>					x	x
<i>EUSR to the African Union</i>						x

Source: 2003 to 2008 EU General Budget



## 6. Proposed scope of and approach to the evaluation

---

One of the main purposes of this preliminary study was to propose a scope for the evaluation as such.

Indeed, discussions with the Reference Group and the Joint Evaluation Unit led to the conclusion that the boundaries of the scope as defined in the draft ToRs for the evaluation were not sufficiently clear as a basis for launching the evaluation. It was agreed that a preliminary study was necessary to allow better delimitation of this scope, firstly, on the basis of the reconstructed intervention logic of the Commission's support to CPPB as described in the 2001 Communication, and secondly, of the mapping of Commission funding provided.

The proposed scope is accordingly described in Section 5.1. Section 5.2 examines the implications of the results of the scoping exercise for the overall approach to the evaluation.

### 6.1 Proposed scope

#### 6.1.1 Key findings related to the inventory and intervention logic

The work carried out on the regulatory framework, the reconstruction of the intervention logic and the inventory allows formulation of a number of findings relevant to the scoping exercise.

First, the **scope of the 2001 Communication** and subsequent documentation is **very wide and diverse**. As shown in chapter 3, it encompasses interventions related to trade, regional integration, macro-economic stabilisation, the security sector, the environment, SALW, the private sector, and others. In other words, many of the activities are part of other already quite all-encompassing sectors or themes.

A second characteristic, which explains the first, is that the **integrated approach** is at the core of the Commission's policy with respect to CPPB. Indeed, when intervening in CPPB the Commission's strategy consists of tackling the different influences that may lead to conflict and jeopardise peace, so as to ensure both short-term and long-term prevention. The object is to ensure that an all-encompassing and integrated strategy is implemented, taking into account the potential impact on conflicts of activities as diverse as macro-economic stabilisation, SSR or interventions in the health sector. In this context conflict is not a single aspect of the situation in a country or region, but rather the paradigm within which all interventions should be designed and implemented within that country or region.

A important third dimension, closely related to the other two, is that **Commission funding takes place in a wider context** of other Commission initiatives, as well as funding and other initiatives conducted under Pillars I and II and by other organisations. Examples of interaction with the second Pillar have been provided in chapter 5. The

inventory shows examples of the Commission's cooperation with international organisations such as the UN and the WB, *inter alia* through Trust Funds.

Finally, the inventory has shown that a substantial part of the **Commission's funding is concentrated on a limited number of countries or regions.**

### 6.1.2 Different options

In this context it appears that three leads should be examined in the context of scoping, of which the first two should be ruled out.

A **first option** would consist of covering the different thematic dimensions of the Communication as displayed in the reconstructed intervention logic. This option seems unrealistic. Indeed, as explained above, most of the dimensions that need to be taken into account in an integrated approach to CPPB represent comprehensive themes or sectors in their own right (e.g. "security sector", "border management", "trade", and "regional integration"). Covering the different dimensions of the intervention logic would then entail conducting numerous complex thematic evaluations simultaneously. This would be unrealistic in terms of the time and human resources required. Moreover, it would end up with a set of inevitably diverse thematic conclusions which would not convey clear messages in terms of the Commission's support to CPPB.

A **second option** would be to try to identify, within the intervention logic, one specific facet on which the evaluation could focus, such as "long-term prevention", "short-term prevention", or at a lower level "diminishing the impact of crosscutting factors of conflicts". This would be counterproductive for three reasons:

- firstly, because by definition it would not be an evaluation of the Commission's support to CPPB, but would only capture one of its dimensions ;
- secondly, because this approach would, in most cases, still imply conducting numerous complex evaluations at the same time; even an aspect such as "diminishing the impact of crosscutting factors of conflict" cuts across several themes or sectors, such as population flows, drugs, SALW, management of natural resources, private sector, environment, and health;
- and finally, because such coverage would miss what can be called the "vault key" of the Commission's strategy with respect to CPPB, namely an integrated approach to CPPB.

Therefore, the team recommends a **third option**, which would allow a realistic response to the request to conduct an evaluation of the Commission's support to CPPB, and thus tackle the challenge of evaluating the integrated approach that is the essence of the Commission's strategy. This option would consist of tackling the intervention logic, not in the sense of evaluating each of its dimensions, but by verifying whether, how, and with what results the Commission applied the integrated approach when providing support to CPPB. As a substantial part of the funding concentrates on a limited number of countries or regions, this could be done by building the approach mainly around country or regional case studies. For each of these case studies the objective would be to determine to what extent the integrated approach was applied. This approach would have the following advantages:

- It would permit an evaluation of the Commission's support to CPPB as such, rather than tackling only one of its dimensions or ending up with an unrealistic approach involving numerous thematic evaluations. This does not mean that the evaluation will



not cover specific aspects of one or more dimensions (themes) or instruments. These can indeed be expected to emerge during specific country or regional case studies. The evaluation might, for instance, reveal and highlight a specific feature of the interventions in terms of SSR and their impact on CPPB in a specific country or across countries. However, this should not be confused with a thematic approach in which the evaluation investigates specific themes and in the end draws conclusions on their specific contribution to CPPB.

- In this context, several dimensions of the CPPB intervention logic could be taken into account through an appropriate selection of countries. It might indeed be decided, for instance, to include a country where interventions in SSR took place, not with a view to investigate SSR specifically, but rather to ensure that the countries chosen better represent the different dimensions of the intervention logic.
- It would allow a grasp of the broader context of other Commission and EU interventions and initiatives, as well as those of other actors, by examining at country and regional level the Commission's funding in this context ;
- It would ensure that due consideration is given to the conflict context. Indeed, by definition the specific country or regional context is key to an understanding of strategies in respect of CPPB.
- It would facilitate the answering of the Evaluation Questions and the drawing out of Conclusions and Recommendations in relation to CPPB as such.

### **6.1.3 Summary on the scope**

Under the hypothesis that this third option is selected, and also taking account of the draft ToRs for the evaluation and the discussions with the RG, the scope of the evaluation could be summarised as follows:

- the period covered would remain 2001-2008;
- the geographical scope would be all third countries except those that fall under the responsibility of DG Enlargement and OECD countries;
- the evaluation would cover the 2001 Communication and subsequent documents as displayed in the intervention logic and more specifically the extent to which the integrated approach was applied in the Commission's support for CPPB;
- the evaluation would address not only the Commission's funding but also the wider context of other Commission and EU initiatives, as well as those of other organisations through the themes of coherence and coordination.

The scope proposed and the option of constructing the evaluation around country or regional case studies has consequences in terms of the approach to the evaluation, as discussed in the next section.

## **6.2 Proposed approach**

Broadly speaking, the Joint Evaluation Unit's overall methodology and process for thematic or sector evaluations can be applied to this specific evaluation, despite its peculiarities.

The major difference concerns the importance of the country or regional case studies. Indeed, the scope proposed implies that the evaluation is constructed around these country or regional case studies. The approach will not consist of examining different dimensions

of the Commission's strategy with respect to the sector or theme concerned (in this case CPPB), with countries chosen with a view to understanding these dimensions (for both desk and field phases). On the contrary, the chosen countries will be those in which the evaluation will examine whether, how, and with what results the integrated approach was applied. Countries or regions would be selected on the basis of several criteria with a view to reflecting different contexts and approaches in terms of the Commission's support to CPPB:

- geographical coverage : inclusion of the main regions, type of instruments used (MEDA, EDF, ALA, etc.);
- financial criteria : making sure that the countries or regions represent a critical mass in terms of Commission support;
- thematic criteria: ensuring that countries or regions are selected to illustrate varying emphasis on the strategic approach (for instance, countries where the emphasis was more on the rule of law, others where destabilising population flows play a role, etc.), as well as on the type of conflict;
- the importance of cooperation with the activities of other authorities (second EU Pillar, other international organisations and NGOs);
- inclusion of countries where no conflicts took place but where activities were undertaken in terms of CPPB might be envisaged as these countries might offer lessons for successful conflict prevention;
- practical criteria : whether information is available on the country (e.g. baseline data), whether the country was previously covered by thematic, sector or regional evaluations, whether the local security situation allows a country visit;
- security issues.

The number of countries or regions to be included will depend on the available budget.

Given the almost all-encompassing scope of the Commission's strategy with respect to CPPB, these case studies will require substantial work. By definition it will indeed be necessary to acquire a thorough understanding of the country contexts with respect to conflict, as well as of the extent to which the Commission's strategy responded to this situation. This also includes the wider context of collaboration with other actors (e.g. with the Council, international organisations, NGOs) and interaction with the political and diplomatic roles of the international community. Sufficient time and resources should thus be allowed in this respect. It will also be essential to clearly distinguish these studies from country or regional evaluations. The country or regional studies should remain case studies with a view to providing findings as a basis for answering the Evaluation Questions and for drawing out Conclusions and Recommendations at the overall level of the evaluation, rather than at the level of each country or region.

Depending on the resources made available, a differentiated approach may be applied where some countries or regions are examined only through a desk study, while for others, field studies take place. Sufficient time should be allowed for these field visits. It is also important to bear in mind the specific complexity of regional case studies, which combine several country case studies to allow a grasp of the regional dimension, as well as an assessment of the support provided by the Commission at the regional level, particularly where there has been significant investment from the Commission in regional approaches and organisations.

In addition to these country and regional case studies, provision for the following inputs is also advised:

- a questionnaire targeted on the Commission Delegations of a substantial number of countries so as to address a number of key issues (e.g. whether a conflict analysis<sup>39</sup> took place) in a more transversal manner;
- the examination of the role played by Commission Headquarters with respect to CPPB (e.g. has the 2001 Communication provided a good basis for CPPB work ? Did the EC provide sufficient guideline and guidance on CPPB?).

These are the main features that would differ from a "classical" thematic or sector evaluation. They will be further fine-tuned first in the Launch Note for the evaluation, and then in the Inception Report.

---

<sup>39</sup> "Conflict analysis" should be understood here as *"a systematic study of the political, economic, social, historical and cultural factors that directly influence the shape, dynamics and direction of existing or potential conflicts. It includes an analysis of conflict causes and dynamics as well as assessments of the profiles, motivations, objectives and resources of conflict protagonists"*. OECD-DAC, *Guidance on evaluating conflict prevention and peacebuilding activities*, 2008.