

# **Annex 6**

## **Prevention / Transformation Of Conflict Table**

**(by Country and Regional Organization)**

## Annex 6

### **Prevention / Transformation Of Conflict Table** **(by Country and Regional Organization)**

(Note: This Table should be viewed in conjunction with Table – CPS-specific Support)

#### **The Government of Canada:**

“Since the mid-1990s, conflict prevention has become an increasingly urgent priority for the international community, particularly in multilateral fora.

The horrors of Rwanda, Srebrenica, Darfur and elsewhere serve as stark reminders that the immediate and long-term human costs of not preventing armed violence are colossal.

In his 2006 Report on the prevention of armed conflict, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan described conflict prevention strategies as falling into several categories:

**Structural prevention** refers to proactive measures that ensure that crises do not arise, such as the work done by CIDA (The Canadian International Development Agency) to advance conflict prevention through development assistance.

**Operational prevention** refers to measures that are applicable in the face of immediate crisis, such as mediation.

**Systemic prevention** refers to measures that address global challenges. DFAIT’s\* conflict prevention work largely falls under this category.”<sup>1</sup> (\* Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT))<sup>2</sup>

**Past thinking and methods did not prevent world wars.  
Future thinking must make wars impossible.**

**You cannot simultaneously prevent and prepare for war.**

Albert Einstein<sup>3</sup>

**Every conflict is unique and demands its own answers.** For this reason there can be no blueprints or panaceas.<sup>4</sup>

(Strategies) can, however, indicate which methods and approaches must be used within the framework of development cooperation, and how development policy can be coordinated and rendered more coherent at national and international level, to allow us to ensure that it helps build peace...

“The average cost of one (violent) conflict is nearly equivalent to the value of annual development aid worldwide”<sup>5</sup>

“By 2010, half of the world’s poorest people could be living in states that are experiencing, or are at risk of, violent conflict”<sup>6</sup>

War is ten times more likely to occur where there is discrimination against ethnic groups. And state failure is five times more likely where there is ethnic discrimination.<sup>7</sup>

[Hence, Canada has a particularly effective basis from which to operate, given its celebrated multi-cultural heritage.](#)

Although, thankfully, the number of violent conflicts has fallen in recent years, other trends could increase the risk of violence. Mounting pressure on natural resources like land and water, aggravated by climate change, may bring competition at the local level which turns violent. And global competition to secure sources of energy and other minerals could contribute to instability and violence.<sup>3</sup> So it is more essential than ever that we address the causes of violent conflict in order to bring the MDGs within reach and defeat extreme poverty. <sup>8</sup>Poor people are increasingly concentrated in fragile states, where there is a high risk of violent conflict.

Development cooperation can help “**Prevent conflicts escalating** into violent crises or wars; **Strengthen the abilities** of governments and society to manage and resolve conflicts nonviolently; **Ensure that ceasefires and peace agreements are respected** by assisting with reconstruction, reintegration and coming to terms with what has happened.”

## Making the Shift to Prevention of Conflict and Peacebuilding<sup>9</sup>

### A Clear and Present Need – The Impact of Armed Conflict

“Current responses and methods built upon armed violence and militarized responses to conflict are not enough. Indeed, participants recognized that many of our current methods for dealing with conflicts are part of the logic and cycles that contribute to war and violence. There have been 125 armed wars since 1990, with a combined death toll of at least 7 million people, 75% of whom are estimated to be civilians. Of the 34 poor countries farthest from reaching the MDGs, 22 are in or emerging from violent conflict. The links between development, peace, conflict and human rights, the need to invest substantively in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, and the importance of long-term commitment and developing our capacity to deal with conflicts effectively across governments and society are increasingly recognized and understood both within countries and internationally. There can be no real peace without development, and no development without peace, and to build peace, we must be willing to prepare, invest in and do the practical work that will make peace possible. To realize the MDGs – and the goals of freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom to live in dignity – governments, civil society, and the UN must actively engage

to generate the commitment, resources, and action required for effective conflict prevention and peacebuilding.”<sup>10</sup>

#### **Making the Shift to Prevention and Peacebuilding**

“ Participants (50 from 30 countries ) called upon country governments, civil society and the UN system to work together to shift policy thinking and ‘tool-boxes’ away from violent responses to conflict and towards investment in and support for peacebuilding and the effective prevention of armed conflict through the creation and strengthening of infrastructures and coalitions for peace.”<sup>11</sup>

#### **Peacebuilding and conflict transformation can be effective**

“ Peacebuilding and conflict transformation can be effective, it was recognized, when joined with the commitment and resources required. Participants from governments and civil society underscored the need for greater research, collaboration, peace education, training, and strengthening practical cooperation and public awareness raising on peace and conflict resolution. In this, the important and complementary roles of both government and civil society were recognized. The vision of a shared relationship and future beyond violence and the leadership and moral imagination for peace – built upon human security and the fundamental affirmation and respect for human rights, and transcending the politics of fear, war and terror – are vital to make the transition towards finding effective ways of dealing with conflicts.”<sup>12</sup>

#### **Making Partnerships Effective**

“Inspiringly, numerous examples of how this is being done and steps to support governments and civil society actors in working effectively together were shared, including those of the AMANI Forum (The Great Lakes Parliamentary Forum on Peace), WANEP (West Africa Network for Peacebuilding) in Western Africa, in particular the cooperation with ECOWAS, and the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO) and civil society-government cooperation on policy development in Europe. Participants called upon governments and civil society to be willing to engage with one another, to learn from each other and to recognize the importance of the contributions each can make. Governments and civil society should work together with the UN, within countries and regionally, to put into place mechanisms and concrete forums for exchanging, dialogue, learning and practical cooperation for conflict prevention, early warning, early response, and peacebuilding. Furthermore, civil society should continue building links with other constituencies, such as regional organisations, parliamentarians for peace and together with like-minded governments, aim for a comprehensive Action Plan on Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Human Security. This Action Plan should be adopted by all stakeholders, including the UN, to build in such a way towards sustainable infrastructures for peace.”<sup>13</sup>

#### **Making Peacebuilding and the Prevention of Armed Conflict a Reality**

“Working to **promote acceptance** of the ideas **and understanding of the prevention of armed conflict** and advocating for the practical effectiveness of tools and methods for peacebuilding is part of the challenge facing all actors working for the promotion of peace. Civil society, government and UN should jointly mobilize for early response actions to prevent violence, and to effective coordination for peacebuilding and post-war recovery during and after violence. Policies and effective structures for conflict prevention at the local, country, regional and global levels should be supported, together with building national and regional capacity for effective prevention.

“**To achieve this**, peace and conflict resolution education, both formal and non-formal, within schools and in communities, and awareness raising, are essential. Legislation and capacity-building, including teacher training and school book and curriculum development to support peace education should be seen as priorities for educational reform. Increased research on lessons learned and best practices, collecting examples of what has and is being done, how to do it, how we can learn from each other, and success stories of effective resolution of conflicts is vital to bring about a shift in awareness, understanding, and policy.

“**To support this, civil society, governments and the UN should work together** to develop effective systems and indicators for early warning, as well as

indicators and means of assessing and making visible the successes of peacework and the prevention of violence. All three sectors should take the opportunities made available to cooperate on the development of effective policies and the strengthening of our toolboxes for peace. Civilian crisis response and peacebuilding should be seen as vital policy tools by governments and given effective support, including funding, resources, and political vision and leadership.

**“International policy frameworks** like the informal, intergovernmental Group of Friends on Conflict Prevention (which is composed of about 40 Permanent Missions to the UN in New York) should be strengthened and enhanced. Furthermore, another suggestion to enhance donor coordination and harmonization of frameworks is suggested by the World Bank in its recent report on civil society and peacebuilding.

... **“interested donor organisations (should) establish a joint platform** for ongoing discussion and sharing of experience on the issue of civil society and peacebuilding, e.g. as an informal working group of the OECD DAC Conflict, Peace and Development Cooperation network. Such a group could become the right forum for discussion with various actors, including practitioners, regional networks, UN and GPPAC. Several governments responded positively to the idea to further look for ways of cooperation with GPPAC in the future on matters of joint interest, such as further research, jointly-organized seminars or other activities that will enhance the shift towards conflict prevention and human security.”<sup>14</sup>

EVENT/ POLICY	Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution	Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation
<b>Austrian Development Agency (ADA), (within Ministry of Foreign Affairs)</b>		
<p>Draft guidelines for “Personelle Entwicklungszusammenarbeit” (personnel in development cooperation... explicitly mention “Civil Peace Service” as one category of projects for which co-funding by the agency is possible.<sup>15</sup></p> <p><u>Personelle Entwicklungs-zusammenarbeit: Kofinanzierung von Entsendeprogrammen österreichischer Nichtregierungs-organisationen</u> (Personnel in development cooperation: Co-funding of Austrian NGOs’ deployment programs<sup>16</sup></p>	<p>Active negotiations are currently underway between the Austrian Government and civilian peace service organizations on access to funding for CPS initiatives.</p> <p>“The actual implementation of Austrian Development Agency's program will not take place before 2009 due primarily to financial reasons. The process of forming a platform or consortium ... (initiated) by Austrian Peace Services (OeFD), is progressing rapidly nonetheless. A major obstacle in the draft as it is today, in (NGO) eyes, is the required 20% non-public funding in the total budget, which looks rather unrealistic knowing the amount of money peace NGOs (those involved in the platform as well as others) have been able to raise in recent years. Presently (NGOs) are negotiating to cut that down to some achievable figure.”<sup>17</sup></p> <p>“The aim is to deploy, by 2009, around 25+ people in</p>	<p>Austrian peace and development NGOs are establishing an umbrella organization to allow them to make use of the proposed ADA “Civil Peace Service” funding. (the required minimum number of 25 deployments per organization, per year, exceeds the capacities of any single existing Austrian peace and development NGO.<sup>19</sup></p> <p>“A wide range of NGOs that have not previously focused on peace work have become aware of Civil Peace Services as an interesting model of conflict resolution. Several CSOs and platforms beyond those more closely involved (e.g. the ones interested in establishing a consortium for CPS) mention CPS or something similar among the demands in their statements/press releases about the UN Decade for the Culture of Peace.”<sup>20</sup></p>

<b>EVENT/ POLICY</b>	<b>Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution</b>	<b>Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation</b>
	CPS projects around the world, though predominantly in the major target countries of Austria's Development Program." <sup>18</sup>	
<b>Canada – Foreign Policy</b>		
<p>Canada does not have a Foreign Policy statement.<sup>21</sup></p> <p>Any reference to the 2005 International Policy Statement, (which called for “a greatly expanded initiative in human security and peacebuilding”<sup>22</sup>) is no longer on the Government of Canada web site.</p> <p>In its place, there are initiative-specific posting on the Government of Canada home page.<sup>23</sup></p>	<p>Historically, Canada led the world in forging constructive government-nongovernment co-operation, including funding.</p> <p>The erstwhile 2005 foreign policy statement called for “a greatly expanded initiative in human security and peacebuilding: develop the 3-D (defence-diplomacy-development) approach in conflict and post-conflict situations in which FAC, DND and CIDA would work together in "whole-of-government" strategies; these departments would work closely with CSOs (civil society organizations) dedicated to this work;”<sup>24</sup></p> <p>In its place, there are initiative-specific posting on the Government of Canada home page, for example on conflict prevention (as shown below)</p>	<p>Announced with, and surviving the 2005 International Policy, was the Global Peace and Security Fund (GPSF) and its component programs (Global Peace and Security Program, Global Peace Operations Program, and the Human Security Program).</p> <p>The Global Peace fund was established on October 3, 2005, with a budget of “\$100 million per year for five years to support urgent contributions to crisis response operations, continue to address Canada's G8 Sea Island commitment to help build global peace support capacity, and provide resources to Canada's human security commitments”;... Provides resources “for a timely response with respect to countries at risk of crisis”, that are “not properly the responsibility of the Department of National Defence and are outside the core purposes of Canada's Official Development Assistance Program. These activities include supporting peace processes and mediation efforts, addressing small arms and light weapons proliferation, supporting transitional justice and reconciliation, and improving the peace enforcement and peace support capacities of African militaries.”<sup>25</sup></p> <p>“Shared Outcome(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ rapid, integrated and better coordinated Canadian responses to international requirements for short- and medium-term conflict prevention, stabilization, peacebuilding and reconstruction;</li> </ul>

EVENT/ POLICY	Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution	Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ improved Canadian contributions to the mitigation of natural disasters and complex emergencies and the restoration of peace, security and indigenous governance capacity in failed and fragile states;</li> <li>▪ expanded global and regional capacity for peace support operations; and</li> <li>▪ greater international support for freedom and security, democracy, rule of law, human rights and environmental stewardship.”<sup>26</sup></li> </ul> <p>“The GPSF is managed by the (DFAIT) Stabilization and Reconstructon Task Force (START) Secretariat in the context of a whole-of-government approach...comprising senior officials from across government... responsible for establishing whole-of-government strategic policy, priority-setting and direction with respect to failed and fragile states and complex emergencies.” Partners include: Royal Canadian Mounted Policy (RCMP); Department of National Defence (DND); Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA); and Justice Canada.”</p>
<b>Canada – Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT)</b>		
<p>DFAIT has no overall International Policy Statement.</p> <p>However, it does post issue-specific statements on its home page, including a statement about conflict prevention: “Since the mid-1990s, conflict prevention has become an increasingly urgent priority for the international community, particularly in multilateral fora.”</p> <p>“The horrors of Rwanda, Srebrenica, Darfur and</p>	<p>Civil society is one of a dozen categories of “eligible recipients” of the Glyn Berry Program funding (including: “*Academic institutions, research institutions and think tanks; *Multilateral, intergovernmental, international and regional organizations; *Canadian and foreign non-governmental and not-for-profit organizations; *Foreign governments; *Crown corporations”<sup>28</sup>).</p> <p>“Glyn Berry Program initiatives in 2007/08 will focus on the following five thematic priorities: * Democratic Transitions; *Human Rights and Protection of</p>	<p>Conflict Prevention is one of five themes listed in a recent announcement for a Glyn Berry<sup>30</sup> Program for Peace and Security, formerly known as the Human Security Program. The Program is a part of DFAIT’s Global Peace and Security Fund (GPSF).</p> <p>“The Glyn Berry Program supports the development of Canadian and international policies, laws and institutions that embed core human security objectives of freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law into international peace and security efforts.”<sup>31</sup></p>

EVENT/ POLICY	Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution	Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation
<p>elsewhere serve as stark reminders that the immediate and long-term human costs of not preventing armed violence are colossal.”</p> <p>“In his 2006 Report on the prevention of armed conflict, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan described conflict prevention strategies as falling into several categories:</p> <p><b>Structural prevention</b> refers to proactive measures that ensure that crises do not arise, such as the work done by CIDA (The Canadian International Development Agency) to advance conflict prevention through development assistance.</p> <p><b>Operational prevention</b> refers to measures that are applicable in the face of immediate crisis, such as mediation.</p> <p><b>Systemic prevention</b> refers to measures that address global challenges. DFAIT’s* conflict prevention work largely falls under this category.”<sup>27</sup></p>	<p>Civilians; *Rule of Law and Accountability; *Conflict Prevention; *Public Safety”<sup>29</sup></p> <p>DFAIT does operate an Intercultural Learning Centre which performs research activities and provides cultural education / orientation training sessions for diplomats and others preparing for international assignments.</p>	
<b>Canadian International Development Agency</b>		
<p>There is no Canadian White Paper or equivalent on peacebuilding or prevention of conflict, let alone on a civilian peace service</p> <p>Having disbanded the erstwhile, pioneering Peace Building Unit<sup>32</sup>, and inflated public relations around Canadians working abroad (under the label Canada Corps), CIDA created an Office for Democratic Governance on October 30, 2006, to “promote freedom and democracy, human rights, the rule of law and</p>	<p>The following two precedents give CPSC a potential platform for accessing CIDA funding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CIDA policy documents explicitly make the link between poverty and conflict (hence X% of current Canadian development assistance is focused on LLDC’s)<sup>35</sup>.</li> <li>▪ CIDA does have a long history of providing financial support to NGO’s and NGI’s working in international development.<sup>36</sup> Although the</li> </ul>	<p>There is no Canadian White Paper or equivalent on peacebuilding or prevention of conflict, equivalent to those of their partner organizations in the UK, Germany, EU, etc.</p> <p>(Insert short para on history of CIDA Peace Building Unit, pioneer in its time, now defunct)</p> <p>At least one entire CIDA country program (Colombia) has pioneered support to peace and the peace process (working with child soldiers, land</p>

EVENT/ POLICY	Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution	Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation
<p>open and accountable public institutions in developing countries.” This Office has absorbed the work of the Canada Corps.<sup>33</sup> The Office Office for Democratic Governance focuses on “democratic governance to promote freedom and democracy, human rights, rule of law, and open and accountable public institutions in developing countries ..It aims to enhance aid effectiveness by leveraging Canada’s comparative advantage and establishing partnerships with key Canadian experts, organizations, institutions and other government departments whose work focuses on democratic governance.<sup>34</sup></p>	<p>pendulum swings with respective Governments, there has been an attempt to finance NGO efforts without eroding NGO/NGI autonomy, particularly in the early years.<sup>37</sup></p>	<p>mine removal and rehab, core funding for OAS paramilitary demobilization, core funding for National Commission for Peace and Reconciliation, support for IDPs, core funding UNHCR,etc), against some Agency resistance at the time, given that their country development results did not fit neatly into the MDGs for Agency reporting purposes, and without Agency guidance on such contentious issues as: paying kidnap insurance, negotiating with armed actors in order to deliver programs, negotiating informal release of child soldiers, etc.</p>
<b>Canada - Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)</b>		
	<p>INAC is involved with local entities, including communities, in both research and intervention in areas of conflict in aboriginal communities.</p>	<p>Much of the activity is focussed on conflict prevention and resolution, and using traditional means to resolve conflict. Furthermore the role of, and need for, healing of all those involved is included.</p>
<b>Canada - International Development Research Centre (IDRC)</b>		
<p><b>IDRC’s mission is</b><i>Empowerment through knowledge</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>it funds applied research</b> by researchers in developing countries on the problems they identify as crucial to their communities. Most supported projects result from direct exchanges between the Centre and developing-country institutions.</li> <li>• <b>it provides expert advice</b> to those researchers.</li> <li>• <b>It builds local capacity</b> in developing countries to undertake research and innovate</li> </ul>		<p>Through its Peace, Conflict and Development area, IDRC performs research into the nature, causes and prevention of violent conflict.</p>
<b>COSTA RICA</b>		

<b>EVENT/ POLICY</b>	<b>Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution</b>	<b>Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation</b>
Costa Rica abolished their military in 1948.		Costa Rica is currently in the process of establishing a Department of Peace, part of which may include a CPS.
<b>DENMARK</b>		
<p>Danish position links US and EU Positions ... to support candidature to UN Security Council, perhaps?</p> <p>Danish Government, “Report on priorities and actions against terrorism, June 2004”<sup>38</sup>: “The transatlantic ties between Denmark and the USA as well as between Europe and the USA are key elements of our policy. More than ever there is a need for a combined effort in the world from Europe and the USA...The international rule of law and respect for human rights must always remain high priorities. Our international involvement must be used to promote development towards a more just and well-ordered world.”<sup>39</sup></p>	Denmark’s candidature to the UN Security Council in 2005-2006 is one important aspect that must be exploited in this direction. Extremism in all its forms remains the greatest threat of our age.	After 11 September 2001 and the war in Iraq, Denmark must take initiatives to defuse the tensions between the Western world and the Arab and Muslim world. Supporting moderate energies will enable us to promote common understanding and common values.
<b>European Union</b>		
<p><b>Feasibility Study on the establishment of a European Civil Peace Corps (ECPC)</b> <i>Final Report, 29 November 2005</i><sup>40</sup> Pierre Robert (Channel Research), Knud Vilby (Cowi) Luca Aiolfi (B&amp;S Europe) Ralf Otto (Channel Research)</p>	<u>CPS-specific Support – insert details????</u>	
<b>European Union - Council of the European Union</b>		
<b>Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVCOM)</b>	Management and Prevention of Conflict (e.g. recommendations for enhancing co-operation with Nongovernmental Organisations (NGOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in the framework of EU Civilian Crisis Management and Conflict Prevention, as revised in CivCom on 20 November 2006.	

EVENT/ POLICY	Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution	Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation
	15574/06 DE/xl 2 <sup>41</sup>	
<b>Germany</b>		
<p>Inter-ministerial action plan for „Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building“</p> <p>German Government’s <u>Programme of Action 2015</u> ..(Germany’s contribution to halving extreme poverty worldwide).<sup>42</sup></p>	<p>...elaborated in close cooperation with state implementing organisations and the German Development Institute (GDI)<sup>43</sup></p>	<p>The strengthening of security and peace can be borne only as an inter-ministerial and internationally coordinated thrust.<sup>44</sup></p>
<b>Germany’s Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development</b>		
<p><u>Sector strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace-building in German development cooperation</u>; “Strategy for Peace-building” June 2005<sup>45</sup> (full summary provided below<sup>46</sup>)</p> <p>To help put into practice: Government of Germany “<u>Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building</u>“, and Government of Germany: <u>Programme of Action 2015</u><sup>47</sup></p> <p>Almost half of all cooperation countries of German development policy are in the throes of armed conflicts in the year 2005, or are in a post-conflict situation...<sup>48</sup></p> <p>The leader in governmental support of conflict prevention.</p> <p>Its <u>Strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peacebuilding</u> contains binding directives for the planning, implementation and steering of official German development assistance (ODA)<sup>49</sup></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ See CPSC White Paper Table – <u>CPS-specific Support</u></li> <li>▪ One of three visions underpinning the Sector Strategy is to “support civil society and state actors in non-violent conflict transformation”.</li> <li>▪ Strategy was “elaborated in close cooperation with state implementing organisations and the German Development Institute (GDI)”</li> <li>▪ Non-governmental organisations can use Strategy as a source of suggestions and orientation.<sup>50</sup></li> </ul>	<p>Germany leads all others with its binding Sector Strategy directives for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peacebuilding”<sup>51</sup></p> <p>See full Strategy Summary below.<sup>52</sup> Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “Crisis Prevention is an integral component of German Economic Cooperation and Development.”</li> <li>▪ It is the task of development policy to help prevent and dismantle the structural or root causes of conflicts in cooperation countries, and to promote mechanisms of non-violent conflict transformation...</li> <li>▪ <b>Three guiding visions:</b> (1) reduce structural or root causes of conflicts, help prevent escalation; (2) support civil society and state actors in non-violent conflict transformation. 3. help build peace once violent conflicts end.</li> <li>▪ <b>From vision to action:</b> ascertain that existing programmes are conflict-sensitive in their design (‘do no harm approach’ and strengthen factors likely to de-escalate conflicts and foster peace).</li> <li>▪ identify potential conflicts as early as possible, within the scope of annual crisis early warning system....</li> <li>▪ (the strategy shows how) development</li> </ul>

EVENT/ POLICY	Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution	Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation
		cooperation can help: <b>Prevent conflicts escalating</b> into violent crises or wars - <b>Strengthen the abilities</b> of governments and society to manage and resolve conflicts nonviolently ; <b>Ensure that ceasefires and peace agreements are respected</b> by assisting with reconstruction, reintegration and coming to terms with what has happened.”
<b>GLOBAL - Global Partner-ship for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC)</b>		
<p>“<b>The Global Partner-ship (GPPAC)</b> is an international network of civil society organisations working for conflict prevention and peacebuilding worldwide.”<sup>53</sup> “Since its inception in 2002, GPPAC has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• established the first truly global network on conflict prevention and peacebuilding;</li> <li>• held the first international conference on peace and security issues organised by civil society at United Nations Headquarters, with an agenda set by civil society;</li> <li>• formulated 15 Regional Action Agendas and one Global Action Agenda, setting the national, regional and global priorities for conflict prevention and peacebuilding;</li> <li>• highlighted the successful work of civil society in preventing or resolving violent conflicts, through the book <i>People Building Peace II: Successful Stories of Civil Society</i></li> <li>• stimulated the establishment of the Group of Friends on Conflict Prevention, consisting of 30 to 40 Permanent Missions to the UN.”<sup>54</sup></li> </ul>	<p>The details presented in the following row demonstrate the important role GPPAC plays in CPS-specific initiatives</p>	<p>“Divided into 15 regions, the Global Partnership has worked over the past three years to develop <u>Regional Action Agendas</u> on conflict prevention, and a <u>Global Action Agenda</u>, presented at the UN at the <u>Global Conference 19 - 21 July 2005</u>.”<sup>55</sup></p> <p>“It aims to support a shift from reaction to prevention through the following goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To create a sustainable network of individuals and groups committed to prevention and peacebuilding at global, regional, and national levels. This network will include multi-stakeholder partnerships involving governments, Regional Organisations and the United Nations in this partnership to create or improve mechanisms for interaction between these actors and civil society.</li> <li>2. To articulate and work towards the implementation of a policy change agenda, as articulated in the series of Regional Action Agendas and in the Global Action Agenda, that will strengthen the effectiveness of conflict prevention and peacebuilding.</li> <li>3. To generate and mobilise diverse public constituencies around the world who are informed about the need for prevention and peacebuilding and the important role of civil society in achieving it and</li> </ol>

EVENT/ POLICY	Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution	Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation
		who actively support human security as an alternative to militarism.” <sup>56</sup>
<b>GPPAC Continued - elaborates on the above by outlining the results from the 2006 GPPAC Conference</b>		
<p>Strengthening Cooperation for Peace Conference, (October 12 – 13, 2006, The Hague).</p> <p>The meeting was organised by the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), and chaired by Kai Brand-Jacobsen, Director, PATRIR Romanian Peace Institute.<sup>57</sup></p>	<p>50 participants from 30 countries, made up of representatives of civil society organizations worldwide, governments and foundations, met for a strategy meeting on strengthening cooperation between governments, foundations and civil society in peacebuilding.)<sup>58</sup></p> <p>Participants called upon country governments, civil society and the UN system to work together to shift policy thinking and ‘tool-boxes’ away from violent responses to conflict and towards investment in and support for peacebuilding and the effective prevention of armed conflict through creation and strengthening of infrastructures and coalitions for peace. In this, the important and complementary roles of both government and civil society were recognized.<sup>59</sup></p>	<p>Participants from governments and civil society underscored the need for greater research, collaboration, peace education, training, and strengthening practical cooperation and public awareness raising on peace and conflict resolution.<sup>60</sup></p> <p>The vision of a shared relationship and future beyond violence and the leadership and moral imagination for peace – built upon human security and the fundamental affirmation and respect for human rights, and transcending the politics of fear, war and terror – are vital to make the transition towards finding effective ways of dealing with conflicts.<sup>61</sup></p> <p>Peace-building and conflict transformation can be effective ...when joined with the commitment and resources required.<sup>62</sup></p>
<b>IRELAND</b>		
<p>We will continue to work within the UN and with our European partners in the building of stability and justice in Iraq, the Middle East, the Balkans, Afghanistan and other areas of tension and conflict, and to address the longer-term issues which fuel such difficulties.</p>	<p>As a small country Ireland has a limited capacity to influence its external environment. Participation in the development of a foreign policy personality for the Union as a whole is consistent with the interests of Irish foreign policy. As an Irish defence white paper notes, “We have a practical as well as a principled interest in the maintenance of international peace and security in Europe and further afield. Our defence policy will seek to reflect this strategic interest.”<sup>63</sup>81</p>	
<b>ITALY</b>		
	Support to white helmets	
<b>NORWAY</b>		

EVENT/ POLICY	Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution	Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation
<b>FINLAND</b>		
<b>SWEDEN Contributing to international peace and security.</b> <sup>64</sup>		
<p>Statement of Government Policy in the Parliamentary Debate on Foreign Affairs, Wednesday 14 February 2007<sup>65</sup></p> <p>“(The Swedish policy of neutrality<sup>66</sup>) served us well ... However, the fall of the Soviet dictatorship and its empire, combined with increasingly intense European integration, created a fundamentally new situation... ... (through participation in the European) Union’s efforts to gradually strengthen cooperation and integration between the democracies of Europe, (to) help build a new order of peace in our part of the world.”</p> <p>“Strategy for development cooperation with the West Bank and Gaza, January 2007 – June 2008”<sup>67</sup>, By publishing this document, Sweden demonstrates how a small country, acting with intelligence and integrity, can help reduce conflict , despite international political pressure, historical sensitivities, and the double-edged sword of EU membership. See excerpt below.<sup>68</sup></p> <p>Short version of the Government Bill 1999/2000:30.<sup>69</sup></p> <p>“The entry into force of the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1999 strengthens the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy and makes crisis management, which includes humanitarian and rescue efforts and different types of peace support efforts, a central task for the Union. At the European Council meeting in</p>	<p>“For Sweden, participation in European cooperation and our contribution to common security-enhancing efforts and crisis management are also essential means of safeguarding our own security. Both civil and military resources should be used in this context. Sweden should act primarily within the framework of its membership in the EU, the UN, the OSCE, its status of observer in the WEU and its cooperation with NATO within the framework of the EAPC/PFP as well as in actual crisis-management efforts. In this way we can increase and strengthen our contribution to common-security enhancing activities and crisis management.”<sup>71</sup></p> <p>Eight out of ten “government priorities” mentioned by the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Swedish Parliament on 14 Feb 2007, included reference to peace<sup>72</sup></p>	<p>“An increased Swedish contribution to common security-enhancing activity and crisis management is fully compatible with Sweden.s non-participation in military alliances, since the cooperation does not involve defence guarantees in the event of armed attack.</p> <p>The European Union has a number of conflict- and crisis-prevention instruments. So far these instruments have been only political, diplomatic, economic or humanitarian in character, but now they can also be military. The aim of the EU military capacity is to manage the whole spectrum of crisis-management tasks . not to create a common standing army, a common territorial defence or promises of security guarantees. The European Union needs institutional structures to develop its capability to manage crises. Those WEU functions that contribute substantially to strengthening the Union’s crisis-management capability should therefore be transferred to the EU as appropriate.”<sup>73</sup></p>

EVENT/ POLICY	Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution	Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation
<p>Cologne member countries undertook to develop more effective European crisis-management resources to enable the EU to carry out its conflict prevention and crisis-management tasks...An increased Swedish contribution to common security-enhancing activity and crisis management is fully compatible with Sweden's nonparticipation in military alliances, since the cooperation does not involve defence guarantees in the event of armed attack."<sup>70</sup></p>		
<b>United Kingdom - The UK Government's Department for International Development (DFID)</b>		
<p><u>Preventing Violent Conflict</u>, DFID Policy Release, 2006<sup>74</sup> seeks to show how DFID understands and responds to conflict across the breadth of its work.</p> <p>(based on DFID's publication of many papers on the causes and effects of violence and insecurity, including the 2006 White Paper on International Development (peace and security in the context of promoting better governance for the benefit of the poor). Other policy papers, e.g. on social exclusion, security and development, (on fragile states and humanitarian issues specific aspects of violent conflict)<sup>75</sup></p>	<p><b>“Dealing with these frequently takes us into difficult, highly political territory. DFID works with other government departments to try to reduce the threat of violence – in particular, with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), in dealing with politics involving national governments and international organisations such as the United Nations (UN) and the Ministry of Defence (MOD), in collaborating to provide a stable environment for development and reconstruction efforts as well as broader security related activity. We also work with other donors and civil society, including women's groups. Much of DFID's development work focuses on the longer-term structural changes which can – if the politics works – reduce the underlying risks of violent conflict taking place.”<sup>76</sup></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Putting greater emphasis on preventing violent conflict;</li> <li>2. Improve the effectiveness of responses to violent conflict;</li> <li>3. Making all our development work "conflict-sensitive"<sup>77</sup></li> </ol> <p>“We will make greater efforts to address conflict before it turns or returns to violence. This means tackling underlying causes of conflict through our development work and supporting political and social processes that manage conflicts peacefully.”<sup>78</sup></p> <p>“Much of DFID's development work focuses on the longer-term structural changes which can – if the politics works – reduce the underlying risks of violent conflict taking place.”<sup>79</sup></p> <p>The July 2006 White Paper <u>“Making Governance Work for the Poor</u>, “commits DFID to nine concrete commitments (detailed below)<sup>80</sup> to reduce conflict and insecurity through assessment and programming</p>

EVENT/ POLICY	Government/ civil society/ UN cooperation for conflict resolution	Focus on Preventing violent conflict; on Peace Building/Transformation
		to tackle root causes of conflict and insecurity; including lobbying to address the trade in conflict resources; jump start UN talks on an Arms Trade Treaty, security and access to justice for the poor, action in specific cases relating to international agreement on the responsibility to protect (Iraq?!), adequate resources for UN, African Union (AU), European Union (EU) and other regional organisations' capacity to prevent and respond to conflict; implementing G8 2004 agreements regarding specific increases in high-quality peacekeepers internationally, creating an Africa Standby Force, commit to providing UK troops and assets, <b>subject to other commitments</b> (Iraq?! Afghanistan?!); diplomatic and financial support to the new UN Peacebuilding.
<b>United States of America - House of Representatives</b>		
<p>The US House of Representatives <b><u>RESOLUTION (HRES 213 IH)</u></b> argues that it is in the interests of the United States to have a UN Emergency Peace Service capable of intervening in the early Stages of a humanitarian crisis:</p> <p>On March 5, 2007, Democratic Representative Albert Wynn, Republican Representative James Walsh, amongst others, submitted the following resolution, referred by the House of Representatives to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.</p>	See text of HRES 213 IH in its entirety below <sup>81</sup>	

## Endnotes – Annex 6

<sup>1</sup> Human Security Policy Division (GHS), Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Conflict Prevention <http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/conflict-prevention-en.aspx>, August 2007

<sup>2</sup> Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Conflict Prevention <http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/conflict-prevention-en.aspx>, August 2007

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.brainyquote.com>

<sup>4</sup> Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Sector strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace-building in German development cooperation Strategy for Peace-building, June 2005, <http://www.bmz.de>

<sup>5</sup> Rt Hon Hilary Benn MP, Secretary of State for International Development, Preventing Violent Conflict, DFID Policy Release, 2006, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/preventing-conflict.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> DFID, from “Conflict and Development: Peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction”; House of Commons International Development Committee, 25 October 2006, in Preventing Violent Conflict, DFID Policy Release, 2006, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/preventing-conflict.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> DFID, from “State Failure Task Force Report: Phase III Findings, 2000”, in Preventing Violent Conflict, DFID Policy Release, 2006, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/preventing-conflict.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> HM Treasury, “Long-term opportunities and challenges for the UK: An Analysis for the Comprehensive Spending Review, November 2006, pp92ff”, in Preventing Violent Conflict, DFID Policy Release, 2006, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/preventing-conflict.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> The subsequent quotes are taken from Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) Report from Chair, Strategy Meeting on “Strengthening Cooperation for Peace Conference”, October 12 – 13, 2006, The Hague, Netherlands

<sup>10</sup> Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) Report from Chair, Strategy Meeting on “Strengthening Cooperation for Peace Conference”, October 12 – 13, 2006, The Hague, Netherlands

<sup>11</sup> Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) Report from Chair, Strategy Meeting on “Strengthening Cooperation for Peace Conference”, October 12 – 13, 2006, The Hague, Netherlands

<sup>12</sup> Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) Report from Chair, Strategy Meeting on “Strengthening Cooperation for Peace Conference”, October 12 – 13, 2006, The Hague, Netherlands

<sup>13</sup> Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) Report from Chair, Strategy Meeting on “Strengthening Cooperation for Peace Conference”, October 12 – 13, 2006, The Hague, Netherlands

<sup>14</sup> Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) Report from Chair, Strategy Meeting on “Strengthening Cooperation for Peace Conference”, October 12 – 13, 2006, The Hague, Netherlands

<sup>15</sup> Add reference from Kai email June 12 2007 when wider circulation permitted

<sup>16</sup> *draft; on demand from* [Jakob.steixner@oefd.at](mailto:Jakob.steixner@oefd.at)

<sup>17</sup> Steixner, Jacob, Austrian Peace Services, e-mail, June 29, 2007

<sup>18</sup> Steixner, Jacob, Austrian Peace Services, e-mail, June 29, 2007

<sup>19</sup> Add reference from Kai email June 12 2007 when wider circulation permitted

<sup>20</sup> Add reference from Kai email June 12 2007 when wider circulation permitted

<sup>21</sup> Any reference to the 2005 International Policy Statement, (which called for “a greatly expanded initiative in human security and peacebuilding”<sup>21</sup>) has been expunged from the Government of Canada web site. The 2005 statement called for “a greatly expanded initiative in human security and peacebuilding: develop the 3-D (defence-diplomacy-development) approach in conflict and post-conflict situations in which FAC, DND and CIDA would work together in "whole-of-government" strategies; these departments would work closely with CSOs (civil society organizations) dedicated to

this work; establish a Stability and Reconstruction Task Force (START) in FAC; establish a \$100 million Global Peace and Security Fund to provide assistance to failed and fragile states, as well as resources for post-conflict stabilization and recovery; expand the work of the Canada Corps in promoting human rights, democracy and good governance; support the to-be-established UN Peacebuilding Commission and a Peacebuilding Support Office to provide capacity for faster, more efficient peacebuilding operations”. [http://www.departmentofpeace.ca/executive\\_summary.php](http://www.departmentofpeace.ca/executive_summary.php)

<sup>22</sup> Department of Peace website, at: [www.departmentofpeace.ca/executive\\_summary.php](http://www.departmentofpeace.ca/executive_summary.php) (June 2007)

<sup>23</sup> Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Conflict Prevention <http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/conflictprevention-en.aspx>, August 2007

<sup>24</sup> Department of Peace website, at: [www.departmentofpeace.ca/executive\\_summary.php](http://www.departmentofpeace.ca/executive_summary.php) (June 2007)

<sup>25</sup> Canada’s Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade website at: [http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rma/eppi-ibdrp/hrdb-rhbd/gpsf-fpsm/description\\_e.asp](http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rma/eppi-ibdrp/hrdb-rhbd/gpsf-fpsm/description_e.asp) (August 2007)

<sup>26</sup> Canada’s Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade website at: [http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rma/eppi-ibdrp/hrdb-rhbd/gpsf-fpsm/description\\_e.asp](http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rma/eppi-ibdrp/hrdb-rhbd/gpsf-fpsm/description_e.asp) (August 2007)

<sup>27</sup> More specifically: **Canada’s Multilateral** focus, through policy development and capacity building, is on “enhancing multilateral cooperation and political will and improving regulatory systems and frameworks to prevent and resolve conflict. Since the UN Secretary-General’s 1992 report An Agenda for Peace, Canada has worked to support the integration and coordination of prevention approaches within the UN system”. E.g. It was \*one of ten countries to facilitate resolution 57/337 (2003), which commits states to work towards prevention of armed conflict, and outlines the roles of states, UN agencies, civil society, and the private sector in preventing armed conflict; \* supports the Peacebuilding Commission; strong supporter, and member, of the Human Rights Council. Created in March 2006, the Human Rights Council replaces the UN Commission on Human Rights; spearheaded the convening of the first Ministerial Conference of the Francophonie on Conflict Prevention and Human Security (Web site in French), in Saint-Boniface, Manitoba in May 2006; supported the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict; through its Human Security Program, helped the Institute for Security Studies to establish a civil society early warning focal point to complement the work of the Continental Early Warning System (CEWS) of the African Union. Canada’s **Operational Research**: In March 2006, DFAIT conducted a ‘Fast Talk’ on human security and conflict prevention asking experts to provide insights into current thinking about approaches to conflict prevention, emerging issues and knowledge gaps in the field; supported Réseau francophone des opérations de paix (Web site in French) to promote research and information exchange in the French-speaking world on conflict prevention and peace operations... Research will also focus on under-studied dimensions of contemporary conflict, such as the privatization of security. Human Security Policy Division (GHS), Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Conflict Prevention <http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/conflictprevention-en.aspx>, August 2007

<sup>28</sup> Human Security Policy Division (GHS), Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Glyn Berry Program for Peace and Security, at DFAIT web site: [http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/gbpffunding-en.aspx?lang\\_update=1](http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/gbpffunding-en.aspx?lang_update=1). (August 2007)

<sup>29</sup> Human Security Policy Division (GHS), Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Glyn Berry Program for Peace and Security, at DFAIT web site: [http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/current\\_discussions/csr-roundtables-en.asp](http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/current_discussions/csr-roundtables-en.asp) [http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/gbpffunding-en.aspx?lang\\_update=1](http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/gbpffunding-en.aspx?lang_update=1). (August 2007)

<sup>30</sup> “...Mr. Berry (killed in Afghanistan) was a principled humanitarian who worked tirelessly to advocate for peacebuilding efforts, as well as initiatives such as the Responsibility to Protect, to protect ordinary people from the most vicious manifestations of war such as war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide.” Human Security Policy Division (GHS), Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Glyn Berry Program for Peace and Security, at DFAIT web site: [http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/gbpfunding-en.aspx?lang\\_update=1](http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/gbpfunding-en.aspx?lang_update=1). (August 2007)

<sup>31</sup> Human Security Policy Division (GHS), Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Glyn Berry Program for Peace and Security, at DFAIT web site: [http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/gbpfunding-en.aspx?lang\\_update=1](http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/cip-pic/gbpfunding-en.aspx?lang_update=1). (August 2007)

<sup>32</sup> Insert info on erstwhile Peacebuilding Unit

<sup>33</sup> CIDA News Release (2004-64), December 21, 2004, Ottawa. (The Minister) today officially launched Canada Corps as she oversaw the departure of the Canadian delegation of 500 observers for the Ukrainian election and announced close to 500 new Canada Corps placements. "Canada Corps brings together Canada's many efforts to help developing countries strengthen their own capacity in governance. Canada Corps will build on existing Canadian efforts and explore new partnerships with other levels of government, civil society, and the private sector. Canadians of all ages will be able to share their skills and expertise with the world, including as elections observers, experts in justice systems and policing, development officers, and diplomats.”

<sup>34</sup> <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/CIDAWEB/acdicida.nsf/En/NIC-54102116-JUN>

<sup>35</sup> Insert footnote

<sup>36</sup> Insert CIDA web page info on Partnership Branch overview and history

<sup>37</sup> Insert CIDA web page info on Partnership Branch overview and history

<sup>38</sup> Danish Government, “Report on priorities and actions against terrorism, June 2004”

[http://www.um.dk/en/menu/ForeignPolicy/?wbc\\_purpose=basic&WBCMODE=presen%2cpresen%2cpresentationunpublished%2cpresentationunpublished](http://www.um.dk/en/menu/ForeignPolicy/?wbc_purpose=basic&WBCMODE=presen%2cpresen%2cpresentationunpublished%2cpresentationunpublished)

<sup>39</sup> Danish Government, “Report on priorities and actions against terrorism, June 2004”

[http://www.um.dk/en/menu/ForeignPolicy/?wbc\\_purpose=basic&WBCMODE=presen%2cpresen%2cpresentationunpublished%2cpresentationunpublished](http://www.um.dk/en/menu/ForeignPolicy/?wbc_purpose=basic&WBCMODE=presen%2cpresen%2cpresentationunpublished%2cpresentationunpublished)

<sup>40</sup> “Feasibility Study on the establishment of a European Civil Peace Corps (ECPC)”, Final Report, 29 November 2005

Pierre Robert (Channel Research), Knud Vilby (Cowi) Luca Aiolfi (B&S Europe) Ralf Otto (Channel Research)

<sup>41</sup> UNION NOTE from : Presidency to : Delegations Subject : Recommendations for Enhancing Co-operation with Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in the Framework of EU Civilian Crisis Management and Conflict Prevention<sup>41</sup> Delegations will find attached the recommendations for enhancing co-operation with Nongovernmental

Organisations (NGOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in the framework of EU Civilian Crisis Management and Conflict Prevention, as revised in CivCom on 20 November 2006. 15574/06 DE/xl 2 DG E IX EN

<sup>42</sup> Germany’s Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Sector strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace-building in German development cooperation

Strategy for Peace-building , June 2005, <http://www.bmz.de>

<sup>43</sup> Germany’s Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Sector strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace-building in German development cooperation

Strategy for Peace-building , June 2005, <http://www.bmz.de>

<sup>44</sup> Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Sector strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace-building in German development cooperation

Strategy for Peace-building, June 2005, <http://www.bmz.de>

<sup>45</sup> Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Sector strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace-building in German development cooperation

Strategy for Peace-building, June 2005, <http://www.bmz.de> “**Summary:** Almost half of all cooperation countries of German development policy are in the throes of armed conflicts in the year 2005, or are in a post-conflict situation. For the inhabitants of these countries this brings with it uncertainties as to rights and wrongs, fear of neighbours or of armed groups, anger over injustices and oppression they have seen and experienced, a feeling of powerlessness to shape their own future, and all too frequently a threat to life and limb. **Every conflict is unique and demands its own answers.** For this reason there can be no blueprints

or panaceas. This strategy can, however, indicate which methods and approaches must be used within

the framework of development cooperation, and how development policy can be coordinated and rendered

more coherent at national and international level, to allow us to ensure that it helps build peace. **This strategy for Crisis Prevention, Conflict Transformation and**

**Peace-building is a BMZ sector strategy, which looks at a cross-sector issue in German development cooperation.** If development cooperation is to make a significant contribution to preventing crisis, transforming conflicts and building peace, it must be strategically planned, integrated into country concepts and used in a targeted manner. **Thus, this paper contains binding directives for the planning, implementation and steering of official German development assistance (ODA).**

Non-governmental organisations can use it as a source of suggestions and orientation. It is the task of development policy to help prevent and dismantle the structural or root causes of conflicts in cooperation countries, and to promote mechanisms of non-violent conflict transformation. On the basis of this, we can pinpoint three guiding visions: 1. Development cooperation plays a part in reducing the structural or root causes of conflicts, and helps preventing escalation to a fullblown crisis at an early stage. 2. Development cooperation supports civil society and state actors in non-violent conflict transformation. 3. Development cooperation helps build peace once violent conflicts have been ended.

**To put these visions into action, the hands-on approach taken in every conflict or post-conflict state and in all countries suffering a heightened or acute risk of crisis, must be reviewed and it must be**

**ascertained that existing programmes are conflictsensitive in their design.** In this way any impacts liable to aggravate conflicts can be avoided (do no harm approach) and those factors likely to de-escalate

conflicts and foster peace can be strengthened. **The strategy is relevant for cooperation with all developing countries and transition states, but it focuses in particular on conflict and postconflict**

**states.** Development cooperation should, in principle, become active at an early stage, when conflicts are still latent, at the stage when structural preventive measures still have a chance of succeeding. For this reason, an important element of development-policy planning is to identify potential

conflicts as early as possible, within the scope of annual crisis early warning system. In many cooperation

countries, governments are struggling to perform the tasks entrusted to them. These countries are termed **fragile states**. Where state institutions are unable to act and operate satisfactorily, violent conflicts often emerge, with a destabilising impact on neighbouring states. This strategy is thus also relevant for cooperation with fragile states. Of the three fields of action of development policy, in its role as global structural policy, the strategy *Past thinking and methods did not prevent world wars.*

*Future thinking must make wars impossible.* *Albert Einstein* targets the level of cooperation with partner countries and regional organisations. **The strengthening of security and peace can, however, at the same time, be borne only as an inter-ministerial and internationally coordinated thrust.** Thus, this strategy helps put into practice the inter-ministerial action plan for „Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building“, as well as the German government's Programme of Action 2015, which is Germany's contribution to halving extreme poverty worldwide. This strategy of the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, which has been elaborated in close cooperation with state implementing

organisations and the German Development Institute (GDI), indicates how development cooperation can help | Prevent conflicts escalating into violent crises or wars | Strengthen the abilities of governments and

society to manage and resolve conflicts nonviolently | Ensure that ceasefires and peace agreements are respected by assisting with reconstruction, reintegration and coming to terms with what has happened.

<sup>46</sup> Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Sector strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace-building in German development cooperation

Strategy for Peace-building, June 2005, <http://www.bmz.de>

<sup>47</sup> Thus, this strategy helps put into practice the inter-ministerial action plan for „Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building“, as well as the German government's Programme of Action 2015, which is Germany's contribution to halving extreme

<sup>48</sup> Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Sector strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace-building in German development cooperation

Strategy for Peace-building, June 2005, <http://www.bmz.de>

<sup>49</sup> Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Sector strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace-building in German development cooperation

Strategy for Peace-building, June 2005, <http://www.bmz.de>

<sup>50</sup> Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Sector strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace-building in German development cooperation

Strategy for Peace-building, June 2005, <http://www.bmz.de>

<sup>51</sup> Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Sector strategy for crisis prevention, conflict transformation and peace-building in German development cooperation

Strategy for Peace-building, June 2005, <http://www.bmz.de>

<sup>52</sup> See footnote xxxx above

<sup>53</sup> <http://www.gppac.net/>

<sup>54</sup> <http://www.gppac.net/>

<sup>55</sup> <http://www.gppac.net/>

<sup>56</sup> <http://www.gppac.net/>

<sup>57</sup> Add reference from Kai email June 12 2007 when wider circulation permitted

<sup>58</sup> Add reference from Kai email June 12 2007 when wider circulation permitted

<sup>59</sup> Add reference from Kai email June 12 2007 when wider circulation permitted

<sup>60</sup> Add reference from Kai email June 12 2007 when wider circulation permitted

<sup>61</sup> Add reference from Kai email June 12 2007 when wider circulation permitted

<sup>62</sup> Add reference from Kai email June 12 2007 when wider circulation permitted

<sup>63</sup> Dowling, Des. Keynote Speeches: The White Paper on Defence. (Dublin: Institute of European Affairs, 2000.). <http://www.iea.com/keynotes/20000628-dowling.html> in Lake, Brian William “Neutrality and the Common Foreign and Security Policy: an Analysis”, for Bachelor of Arts (Honours) degree, Department of Political Science, Memorial University of Newfoundland, September, 2001 [www.ucs.mun.ca/~brian/academic/Irish\\_neutrality\\_pdf](http://www.ucs.mun.ca/~brian/academic/Irish_neutrality_pdf)

<sup>64</sup> Government of Sweden, “Short version of the Government Bill 1999/2000:30” [www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/73/90/a8f1a1d8.pdf](http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/73/90/a8f1a1d8.pdf)

<sup>65</sup> Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Statement of Government Policy in the Parliamentary Debate on Foreign Affairs,” Wednesday 14 February 2007 [www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/03/96/05/23e521a9.pdf](http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/03/96/05/23e521a9.pdf)

<sup>66</sup> “For almost two centuries... our policy was ultimately about trying to prevent our country from being drawn into the general European war that was always a looming threat. During the latter part of the last century, it was this endeavour that led to the policy often called a policy of neutrality”. Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs,

“Statement of Government Policy in the Parliamentary Debate on Foreign Affairs,” Wednesday 14 February 2007  
[www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/03/96/05/23e521a9.pdf](http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/03/96/05/23e521a9.pdf) See also CPS WHITE PAPER TABLE: NEUTRALITY

<sup>67</sup> Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Strategy for development cooperation with the West Bank and Gaza. January 2007 – June 2008,” 21 December 2006  
[www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/04/67/07/3c171310.pdf](http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/04/67/07/3c171310.pdf)

<sup>68</sup> “The need for such a review arose in connection with the success of Hamas in the local elections, the movement’s victory in the Palestinian parliamentary election at the beginning of 2006 and the subsequent formation of government. The situation is unique. Never before has a movement subjected to EU sanctions against terrorism come to power through free and democratic elections. This fact entails both political and legal challenges also for development cooperation, giving rise to a revision of the strategy. The election successes of the Hamas movement imply a marked change in the political situation in the West Bank and Gaza, as the Palestinian Authority’s ministries and some municipalities are now governed by representatives of a movement under EU sanctions against terrorism. This alters the conditions for giving support through the government and the Palestinian Authority’s ministries and certain municipalities. The legal situation associated with the sanctions list has led to restrictions in international development assistance to the Palestinian territories. The EU regulations on restrictive measures (sanctions) to combat terrorism TPF 1 are based on United Nations Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001), which prescribes sanctions against terrorists and terrorist groups in general. The sanctions include freezing of assets and a ban on making funds, other financial assets or economic resources or financial services available – directly or indirectly – to terrorists or terrorist groups TPF 2 FPT. As long as any organisation on the EU terrorist list TPF 3 FPT controls the Palestinian Authority’s ministries and certain municipalities, development assistance must be carried out with increased care and control. It should, however, be pointed out that the President, who belongs to the Fatah movement, also has some executive power in the Palestinian Authority, which means that this cannot be said to be wholly controlled by a terrorist listed organisation. The EU legislation imposing sanctions only directly affects those parts of the Palestinian Authority – above all the ministries – that are controlled by representatives of a terrorist listed organisation. Support channelled via the President’s office, PLO bodies and institutions independent of the government is not restricted by the legislation. Both Israel and the Palestinians are responsible for the emergence of the conflict and its solution. Palestinian terrorist actions against civilians lead to continued escalation of violence and severely obstruct a peaceful solution to the conflict. At the same time Israel’s continued occupation of the West Bank and Gaza has serious negative consequences for the conditions of life and local economy of the Palestinians. Israel’s decisions to severely reduce Palestinians’ freedom of movement and to freeze transfers of Palestinian funds for customs and VAT have created a humanitarian crisis. A number of countries have also decided to redirect development assistance away from the Palestinian Authority. Taken together, this has put the Palestinian Authority, which is dependent on the support of other countries, in a very difficult financial situation. Swedish support to the Palestinian territories, in the light of the difficult political and humanitarian situation in the area, continues to be directed towards improving the conditions of life of the Palestinians and contributing to a peaceful solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The previous country strategy for Swedish support was based on the uncertain situation prevailing and focused on the importance of flexibility in the assistance given. Difficulties resulting from various restrictions, including the corrupt environment, security problems and violence on the part of different parties to the conflict, have always influenced development assistance to the Palestinians. The previous strategy does not, however, fully reflect the political, humanitarian and legal situation arising from the Hamas-led government taking office. The changed situation raises the need for a revised, integrated strategy that can be adapted to the uncertain political developments in the area. The aim of the strategy is to influence Palestinian development (including the Hamas-led government) in a positive direction, find a way to safeguard Palestinian institutions and retain a long-term perspective for cooperation, enable active Swedish measures in the EU and international fora to seek a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and to counteract and prepare for handling an even more acute humanitarian situation. In the opinion of the Government, the long-term perspective for development in the Palestinian territories must continue to be safeguarded. Sweden must continue to seek common European and international solutions, including strengthened control mechanisms, that secure both short-term humanitarian needs and long-term development cooperation. *[(1) PT The Council Common Position 2001/931/CFSP on the application of specific measures to combat terrorism and Council Regulation (EC) No 580/2001 on specific restrictive measures directed against certain persons and entities with a view to combating terrorism. TP (2) PT In the EU regulations, terrorists and terrorist groups refer to persons, groups or entities who commit, participate in or facilitate terrorist acts, or entities owned or controlled directly/indirectly by such persons, or persons or entities that act on behalf of such persons. (3) PT A terrorist-listed organisation refers here to a group or entity covered by the EU’s sanctions against terrorism. The groups or entities covered are specified in annexes to the Council Common Position 2001/931/CFSP on the application of specific measures to combat terrorism and Council Regulation (EC) No. 2580/2001 (Hamas is no. 17 on the list attached to the Common Position as most recently updated in Common Position 2006/380/CFSP and no. 10 on the list in the Council Regulation in its most recent*

wording in Council Decision 2006/379/EC). Ministry for Foreign Affairs 3(17) 21 December 2006, Ministry for Foreign Affairs (4)(17) 21 December 2006]” Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Strategy for development cooperation with the West Bank and Gaza. January 2007 – June 2008,” 21 December 2006

[www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/04/67/07/3c171310.pdf](http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/04/67/07/3c171310.pdf)

<sup>69</sup> Government of Sweden, “Short version of the Government Bill 1999/2000:30” [www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/73/90/a8f1a1d8.pdf](http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/73/90/a8f1a1d8.pdf)

<sup>70</sup> Government of Sweden, “Short version of the Government Bill 1999/2000:30” [www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/73/90/a8f1a1d8.pdf](http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/73/90/a8f1a1d8.pdf)

<sup>71</sup> Government of Sweden, “Short version of the Government Bill 1999/2000:30” [www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/73/90/a8f1a1d8.pdf](http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/73/90/a8f1a1d8.pdf)

<sup>72</sup> These included Sweden’s “proactive role in developing the European Union as a global actor, especially in peace and security policy”; championing of countries wanting EU membership (“Ultimately this is about peace and freedom in our part of the world in our time”); “strengthening and improving work in the United Nations...(and) “the ability of the international community as a whole to conduct peacebuilding and state-building operations in different parts of the world”; strengthening “work for democracy and human rights in all countries.”; “a clear voice for peace, freedom, international law and reconciliation, not least in the Middle East ... (“We are working for a stronger European role in peace efforts. More specifically, we want to prepare the creation of an independent and functioning Palestinian state living in peace with Israel”); seeking a clear decision from the UN Security Council that will make it possible to obtain clarification about the future of Kosovo, and, not least, “Sweden’s foreign, development, trade and security policies will work together so as to be better able to contribute both to poverty reduction and to sustainable peace and stability in countries with a history of war, conflict and under-development. This is how Sweden can be a clear force for freedom, peace and reconciliation.” <sup>72</sup> Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Statement of Government Policy in the Parliamentary Debate on Foreign Affairs,” Wednesday 14 February 2007 [www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/03/96/05/23e521a9.pdf](http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/03/96/05/23e521a9.pdf)

<sup>73</sup> Government of Sweden, “Short version of the Government Bill 1999/2000:30” [www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/73/90/a8f1a1d8.pdf](http://www.sweden.gov.se/content/1/c6/02/73/90/a8f1a1d8.pdf)

<sup>74</sup> DFID Preventing Violent Conflict, Policy Release, 2006, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/preventing-conflict.pdf> “Summary: The costs of violent conflict are enormous. It is not only the obvious and immediate toll on lives and property. Development is a victim too. During the 1990s, half of the countries where life expectancy, income and education went backwards had experienced violent conflict. Of the 34 countries furthest from reaching the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), 22 are in the midst of – or emerging from – violent conflict.1 Like other countries, the United Kingdom has a strong interest in reducing the likelihood of violent conflict. There are economic as well as security benefits. The average cost of one conflict is nearly equivalent to the value of annual development aid worldwide. An increase in violent conflict, as the UK Parliament’s Select Committee on International Development observed, could in effect cancel out all the new aid commitments made in 2005.2

Although, thankfully, the number of violent conflicts has fallen in recent years, other trends could increase the risk of violence. Mounting pressure on natural resources like land and water, aggravated by climate change, may bring competition at the local level which turns violent. And global competition to secure sources of energy and other minerals could contribute to instability and violence.3 So it is more essential than ever that we address the causes of violent conflict in order to bring the MDGs within reach and defeat extreme poverty. Poor people are increasingly concentrated in fragile states, where there is a high risk of violent conflict. By 2010, half of the world’s poorest people could be living in states that are experiencing, or at risk of, violent conflict.4 That is why we are committed to working more in fragile states – in fact we have already increased expenditure in our country programmes from 17% in 2000/01 to 30% in 2005/06.

But the way we do so has to take account of the impact our aid might have in increasing or reducing the chances of violence. We can then act accordingly to make sure it does help.

The UK Government’s Department for International Development (DFID) has published a number of papers which refer to the causes and effects of violence and insecurity. The 2006 White Paper looked at peace and security in the context of promoting better governance for the benefit of the poor.5 Other policy papers – such as those on social exclusion, security and development, fragile states and humanitarian issues – cover specific aspects of violent conflict.6 What this paper seeks to do is to show how we understand and respond to conflict across the breadth of our work.

This paper steps back from addressing the effects of violence and asks instead: how can DFID play a part in tackling the problems that contribute to violent conflict? A mixture of underlying causes and immediate events are often the triggers.

Dealing with these frequently takes us into difficult, highly political territory. DFID works with other government departments to try to reduce the threat of violence – in particular, with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), in dealing with politics involving national governments and international organisations such as the United Nations (UN) and the Ministry of Defence (MOD), in collaborating to provide a stable environment for development and reconstruction efforts as well as broader security related activity. We also work with other donors and civil society, including women's groups. Much of DFID's development work focuses on the longer-term structural changes which can – if the politics works – reduce the underlying risks of violent conflict taking place.

This paper explains what we will do in three areas:

**Putting greater emphasis on preventing violent conflict :**

We will work harder to prevent conflict before it turns, or returns, to violence and support local, national and international mechanisms to manage and resolve disputes peacefully.

**Making our response to armed conflict more effective:**

We will improve our practical and political support to peace processes and help build the capacity of international and regional organisations and civil society, as well as national governments, so that they can manage conflicts better. What we do when conflict breaks out will be tied more closely to dealing with the underlying causes.

**Making our development work more 'conflict-sensitive':**

We will ensure that our development work takes conflict into consideration through our Country Governance Assessments. We will develop better corporate approaches and systems to support our work in countries affected by conflict, including through strengthening our staff capacity, expertise and deployability and by improving the way we assess and deal with risk in planning country programmes.

*1 Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals, UN Millennium Project, 2005. 2 Conflict and Development: Peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction; House of Commons International Development Committee, 25 October 2006. 3 Long-term opportunities and challenges for the UK: An Analysis for the Comprehensive Spending Review, HM Treasury, November 2006, pp92ff. 4 DFID calculations based on World Bank estimates in Global Economic Prospects: Economic implications of Remittances and Migration, World Bank, Washington 2006. 5 Making Governance Work for the Poor, A White Paper on International Development, July 2006. 6 See, for example, the following papers, which all refer to the impact of violent conflict and all agree that we need greater understanding of the factors that could lead to violent conflict. In the main, they do not focus on the importance of preventing violent conflict. – Why we need to work more effectively in Fragile States, DFID, January 2005, which outlines how to improve the effectiveness of aid to deliver services for poor people in fragile states. – Fighting poverty to build a safer world, DFID, March 2005, which shows how promoting the security of poor people can help address global security concerns. – Reducing poverty by tackling social exclusion, DFID, September 2005, which highlights the impact of social exclusion on efforts to reach the MDGs. – Saving lives, relieving suffering, protecting dignity: DFID's humanitarian policy, DFID, June 2006, which outlines how we can improve our response to the impact of disasters and violence. 7: Making Governance Work for the Poor, A White Paper on International Development, July 2006.*

<sup>75</sup> See, for example, the following papers, which all refer to the impact of violent conflict and all agree that we need greater understanding of the factors that could lead to violent conflict. In the main, they do not focus on the importance of preventing violent conflict. – *Why we need to work more effectively in Fragile States*, DFID, January 2005, which outlines how to improve the effectiveness of aid to deliver services for poor people in fragile states. – *Fighting poverty to build a safer world*, DFID, March 2005, which shows how promoting the security of poor people can help address global security concerns. – *Reducing poverty by tackling social exclusion*, DFID, September 2005, which highlights the impact of social exclusion on efforts to reach the MDGs. – *Saving lives, relieving suffering, protecting dignity: DFID's humanitarian policy*, DFID, June 2006, which outlines how we can improve our response to the impact of disasters and violence. 7: *Making Governance Work for the Poor, A White Paper on International Development*, July 2006.

<sup>76</sup> DFID, Preventing Violent Conflict, DFID Policy Release, 2006, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/preventing-conflict.pdf>

<sup>77</sup> DFID, Preventing Violent Conflict, DFID Policy Release, 2006, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/preventing-conflict.pdf>

<sup>78</sup> DFID, Preventing Violent Conflict, DFID Policy Release, 2006, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/preventing-conflict.pdf>

<sup>79</sup> DFID, Preventing Violent Conflict, DFID Policy Release, 2006, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/preventing-conflict.pdf>

<sup>80</sup> Specifically DFID makes a commitment to: “• Assess the causes of conflict and insecurity as part of our new governance; assessment and use this to shape UK development policy and programmes; • Press the international community to do more to tackle the trade in conflict resources; • Work with governments and civil society to secure agreement at the UN General Assembly in 2006 to start talks on an Arms Trade Treaty; • Work with developing countries and other international partners to improve security and access to justice for the poor; • Work with others to ensure that the international agreement on the responsibility to protect’ is turned into a willingness to act in specific cases; • Work with others to ensure that the UN, African Union (AU), European Union (EU) and other regional organisations have adequate capacity to prevent and respond to conflict; • Continue to push for a significant increase in the number of high-quality peacekeepers internationally and with G8 partners train 75,000 troops by 2010, as agreed by the G8 in 2004. We will support the creation of an Africa Standby Force; • Contribute directly to UN mandated missions by providing UK troops and assets, subject to other commitments; • Provide diplomatic and financial support to the new UN Peacebuilding”. DFID, Making Governance Work for the Poor, A White Paper on International Development, July 2006,

<sup>81</sup> RESOLUTION (HRES 213 IH): “Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a United Nations Emergency Peace Service capable of intervening in the early stages of a humanitarian crisis could save millions of lives, billions of dollars, and is in the interests of the United States. “Whereas genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity have occurred in Rwanda, Cambodia, the former Yugoslavia, East Timor, Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Uganda, Liberia, and elsewhere; Whereas the United States Government has found that genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity are occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan; “Whereas, at the September 2005 World Summit, the Member States of the United Nations declared that the international community has a responsibility to protect these populations when countries are unable or unwilling to prevent genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity; Whereas, at the 2005 World Summit, over 150 heads of state signed a document which the United Nations General Assembly adopted, declaring that ‘we are prepared to take collective action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the Security Council ... should peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities manifestly fail to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity...; “Whereas failed and failing states can become breeding grounds for terrorism, crime, trafficking, humanitarian catastrophes, and other threats to the United States; Whereas the 2006 National Security Strategy clearly states that preventing humanitarian disasters and strengthening fragile states is in the national security interests of the United States; Whereas numerous studies have shown that early intervention in humanitarian crises could save millions of lives and billions of dollars; “Whereas the international community spent approximately \$200,000,000,000 on conflict management during the 1990s; “Whereas approximately \$130,000,000,000 of that amount could have been saved through a more effective preventive approach to conflict management; “Whereas the United Nations does not have a rapid deployment capacity to intervene to avert humanitarian catastrophes; “Whereas there is a need for a United Nations Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS) that could be rapidly deployed during the early stages of a humanitarian crisis to save lives; “Whereas UNEPS could assist in the early implementation of peace accords by providing a ready reserve corps that could be deployed immediately; “Whereas UNEPS would complement, but not replace, existing peace operations of the United Nations, regional organizations, and national governments; “Whereas, if UNEPS had existed at the time that the Government of Sudan and the rebels in Darfur signed the May 2006 Darfur Peace Agreement, UNEPS could have been quickly deployed to cement peace before it unraveled and prevented the loss and displacement of thousands of individuals; “Whereas, if ongoing ethnic and sectarian mass killings and crimes against humanity continue to occur in Iraq and if the Iraqi Government does not have the capacity to protect its citizens from these crimes, then all members of the international community, should, through the United Nations, exercise their mutual responsibility to protect the citizens of Iraq; “Whereas, if the Security Council and the Iraqi Government identified the need for a peacekeeping force to guarantee a negotiated agreement between factions in Iraq and UNEPS existed, a UNEPS force could be quickly deployed to seize the opportunity and help facilitate the implementation of that agreement in advance of a traditional United Nations peacekeeping force or as a surge capacity to buttress peacekeepers already in place; and “Whereas UNEPS could be created for a start-up cost of \$2,000,000,000 and annual costs of less than \$1,000,000,000:

“Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that-- (1) the United States should use its voice, vote, and influence at the United Nations to facilitate and support the creation of a United Nations Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS); and (2) UNEPS-- (A) should be a permanent entity based at designated sites of the United Nations, should include mobile field headquarters, and should be able to act immediately to address an emerging humanitarian crisis; (B) should be comprised of individuals who are recruited from United Nations Member States and who are carefully selected, expertly trained, and coherently organized; (C)

should be a dedicated service with a wide range of professional skills within a single command structure, prepared to conduct multiple functions in diverse United Nations operations; and (D) should be able to provide an integrated service encompassing 12,000 to 18,000 civilian, police, judicial, military, and relief professionals.”