



State and Non-State Cooperation for Crisis Prevention and Peace- Building Policy

International Expert Workshop

4 - 5 April 2006
Bonn, Germany

Workshop Report

FriEnt is a working group of: Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) | Church Development Service (EED) | Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation (FES) | Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) | Catholic Central Agency for Development Aid / Misereor | Civil Peace Service Group | Platform for Peaceful Conflict Management / Institute for Development and Peace (INEF)

The Institute for Development and Peace (INEF) is a research institute of the Department of Social Sciences of the University Duisburg-Essen, Location Duisburg. INEF cooperates with the Development and Peace Foundation (SEF), which was initiated by Willy Brandt. The aim of INEF's application-oriented research is to build bridges between theory and practice.

Authors: Angelika Spelten, Tanja Hausmann, Miriam Shabafrouz

Imprint

© Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt)
Institute for Development and Peace (INEF)

FriEnt
c/o BMZ, Adenauerallee 139 - 141
53113 Bonn
Tel. +49-228-535-3259
Fax. +49-228-535-3799
frient@bmz.bund.de
www.frient.de

INEF
Geibelstraße 41
47057 Duisburg
Tel. +49-203-379-4420
Fax. +49-203-379-4425
inef@uni-due.de
www.inef.de

Contents

Introduction	2
The role of academic actors in promoting crisis prevention and peace-building policy	3
Advantages of having a small and informal community – the case of Finland	3
Significance of the cooperation between non-state and state actors in the Dutch context	3
German state and non-state relations: having to overcome old patterns	4
Discussion highlights	5
Dynamics of concrete crisis intervention - The case of the Darfur crisis and the international mission to DRC	6
The Darfur case and the role of an NGO at international level	6
How NGOs can get their messages across - Experiences from the Sudan Focal Point	7
Requirements and challenges for policy advice in the case of the mission to DRC	8
Discussion highlights	8
The role of civil society and think tanks on the European level	9
Peace-building NGOs and the European Union	9
State and non-state cooperation in preparation for the UK EU and G8 presidencies	10
Finnish state-non-state cooperation for the EU Presidency and the expected input from the German side	11
Discussion highlights	12
Outlook	12
Appendix I: Programme	14
Appendix II: List of Participants	16

Introduction

How can NGOs and think tanks from the academic field contribute more effectively to shaping international strategies for crisis prevention at national and EU level? And how are state and non-state actors already cooperating in crisis prevention and peace-building policy? These were the questions at the core of the workshop documented in this report.

State actors increasingly acknowledge that their capacities to support or restore peace and security in places where these are challenged are limited and that there is a strong need for civil society engagement. This has clearly fostered closer cooperation with non-state actors in national and transnational policy arenas. In some countries, new instruments have been created to establish a new basis for interaction and cooperation between these different actors. The hope and intention is that civil society involvement, not only in implementation but also in shaping policy approaches, will make crisis prevention and peace-building efforts more sustainable and effective.

However, a closer relationship between government bodies, civil society organisations and academia also raises questions about the political implications, as well as the character and formats, of such cooperation and interaction.

How do research institutions and NGOs define their roles in such settings? What level of support and what degree of cooperation do they offer, and what are the demands from the governments' side? What are the formats that have been adopted so far in these settings, and what experiences have been gained with them? Is there a role for NGOs and think tanks to play in improving crisis prevention policy at the EU level as well?

The workshop was structured around three panel discussions and a final session of working groups. It opened with a general exchange about the different settings and formats for consultation between state and non-state actors in various countries. The second session looked at specific cases of crisis intervention and the impact of non-state actors on the international response. Panel discussion III reflected on lessons learned from NGO involvement at European level.

Panel discussion I

The role of academic actors in promoting crisis prevention and peace-building policy

Advantages of having a small and informal community – the case of Finland

The interaction between NGOs and the Government in Finland on peace and security issues started some years ago, and both sides consider it to be helpful and progressing smoothly. One of the reasons for this, as Anne Palm reported, is that the community specialised in peace issues is relatively small, everybody knows each other, and the sharing of information and exchange about options for governmental and non-governmental political involvement generally start on an informal basis. Anne Palm is Secretary General of KATU (Kansalaisten turvallisuusneuvosto), a network of about 50 NGOs and research institutions in Finland. KATU was founded in 1997 in order to help members strengthen their cooperation and coordination and raise the profile of conflict prevention and conflict resolution issues in national foreign and security policy.

Although KATU receives most of its funding from the state, mainly from the Department of Crisis Prevention in the Foreign Ministry, its membership solely comprises non-state actors. However, KATU's formation has helped to expand cooperation on a formal level as well, including official consultations and joint boards. One quite successful example is the board on small arms, composed of representatives of several ministries and NGOs. As the Finnish Government, especially the Foreign Minister, was convinced that the input of civil society and NGOs was needed on these issues, a real dialogue could evolve.

But cooperation does not always flow smoothly. Two years ago, various conflict prevention tasks were taken over by the Ministry of Internal Affairs. During the first year, communication was quite difficult, as Anne Palm remembered. From this Ministry's perspective, it was not yet obvious that discussions with NGOs could generate any benefits. But KATU did not give up, and again with the help of informal channels, the whole atmosphere has changed over time. The Ministry has now asked KATU to organise training programmes for its staff.

Despite these dynamics, in the view of KATU, the nature of the cooperation is still quite informal. Institutionalising a system of cooperation with the Government that establishes a routine of information-sharing and even facilitates joint analyses and research is therefore one of KATU's future aims. In this context, Anne Palm mentioned that KATU could draw ideas from FriEnt, the German Action Plan or the Advisory Board for Civilian Crisis Prevention, as appropriate.

Significance of the cooperation between non-state and state actors in the Dutch context

Caroline Ort from ICCO in Utrecht presented the possibilities for cooperation in the Netherlands. ICCO was established in 1964 as the Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation. It has its roots in the Protestant and ecumenical

traditions and has become one of the six main donor organisations in the Netherlands. A tradition of cooperation with the Dutch Government in the field of development has existed for some time. However, this interaction was not expanded to include peace and security issues until a later stage and has still not reached the same level of development.

In 2000, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs initiated regular meetings to share civil society experiences on conflict prevention, peace-building and post-conflict reconstruction. The Dutch Government was especially interested in new approaches to peace-building and was open to incorporating themes brought in by the NGOs – such as small arms, the diamond trade and the position of women and children – into government programmes. Unfortunately, the frequency of the meetings has declined in the past two years. One difficulty, as Caroline Ort explained, is that these meetings often depend on the involvement and interest of specific individuals and may well stop when these individuals are replaced or move into other positions.

A new forum for cooperation, the Knowledge Forum on Religion and Development, has recently been established by the Minister for Development Cooperation. The goal of this forum is to share and learn from experiences of state and non-state actors and increase knowledge on current issues in order to enhance the effectiveness of development cooperation. Working with two secretariats, one at the Ministry and one serving civil society organisations, the Knowledge Forum aims to define good practices on a variety of topics such as religion and conflict, HIV/AIDS, gender and good governance.

Also new is the growing interest in strengthening civil-military relations. In the past, hardly any cooperation took place between civil society organisations, the Ministry of Defence and peacekeeping missions. As roles and responsibilities in this field have now become less clear, NGOs and the military recognise the need to promote better mutual understanding. The Ministry of Defence took the initiative by inviting ICCO to participate in a training session for NATO troops due to be sent on peacekeeping and peace-enforcing missions as part of the International Security Assistance Force. ICCO was asked to share its experiences through role-plays and to explore why civilians speak a different language from the military. Caroline Ort pointed out that civil society actors consider it important for the military to focus its activities on improving security for the population in its various areas of operation. The Dutch Ministries of Defence and Foreign Affairs are increasingly taking this civil society perspective into account in their planning and implementation.

Caroline Ort concluded that the overall picture is rather mixed: while interesting initiatives for state and non-state cooperation in the Netherlands have started, it is often difficult to keep them going. However, the Government has signalled its interest in hearing the opinion of civil society organisations, which is helping to establish an atmosphere in which NGOs can also take the initiative and thus address the Government's concerns about particular international developments.

German state and non-state relations: having to overcome old patterns

Regine Mehl, Director of the Peace Research Information Unit Bonn (PRIUB), reported on the experiences with cooperation in Germany, which seems much less relaxed than in Finland and the Netherlands. PRIUB was founded in 1984 as a national and international peace and conflict research transfer center. One of its main functions is the setting up, organising and running of workshops and dis-

discussion groups aimed at promoting mediation between academic peace research and political administration and civil society

To explain the sometimes difficult relationship between peace research institutions and civil society organisations on the one hand and governmental actors on the other, she referred to Germany's institutional development after the Second World War.

Civil society organisations were almost non-existent after the Second World War. The first organisations to involve thousands of citizens focussed on the issue of the rearming of the Federal Republic of Germany. At that time, civil society organisations did not see themselves as partners of government, but rather the opposite: relations between civil society and government were characterised by deep divides and hostility. This pattern is still apparent in the organisational structure: there is still an institutional gap between organisations which deal with foreign policy and security issues and those which focus on development cooperation and peace work.

The official status and financing of academic institutions after World War II profoundly influenced their interaction with government bodies and their role in policy development. These institutions, although fully funded by the government agencies of the *Länder* and the Federal Government, were committed to maintaining their independence. There is no official pressure to align research and teaching with the political direction of a federal or regional state body. There is, however, a requirement for institutions to account for how they spend public funds. So it is sometimes hard for them to remain independent without losing their funding; in some cases, this may depend on the position adopted by the governing coalition. Regine Mehl described the situation as a tightrope walk.

Due to this relationship, no dialogue evolved between state actors and the peace research community about their mutual expectations. As early as 1984, PRIUB set up a special working group on security policy issues, which could be considered one of the first state-civil society groups to be established in Germany. This group demonstrated that it was possible to cooperate with state actors "without selling one's soul". But for a long time, the conservative Federal Government was reluctant to consult with the critical peace research community and preferred to rely on its own think tank, the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP). The majority still denied that there was any need to seek advice from civil society.

In the 1990s, the end of the Cold War changed not only attitudes but also mutual expectations. Nonetheless, some time passed before the Social Democratic-Green Government, in 1998 – as part of its efforts to raise the international profile of non-state actors – emphasised the importance of an exchange of expertise and experience between government, researchers and NGOs.

Regine Mehl concluded that cooperation works best if the participating parties concentrate either on strategy or content, and avoid mixing these two aspects up. As a good example, she named the Action Plan on Crisis Prevention, whose content is largely based on a consensus among those who politically initiated it and those who finally wrote it. Now, the second step is to use it as the basis for a practical strategy that responds to at least some of the demands and challenges which the Action Plan identifies.

Discussion highlights

After the three very informative presentations, the participants in the discussion were very interested in comparing the different approaches taken by civil society to raise awareness of crisis prevention and civil peace-building strategies in the

political administration. There are many aspects to be taken into account in order to understand the differences in state and non-state interaction in Finland, the Netherlands and Germany. Three of these aspects were highlighted in the discussion:

1. The degree to which **informal and personal relationships** are possible and accepted as a means of initiating and facilitating practical cooperation varies remarkably.

There are advantages as well as challenges in more institutionalised cooperation. If interaction and exchange are independent from such relationships, they might be easier to maintain when staff move on. However, by building on personal relationships, it may be easier to approach the Government on a more flexible basis on issues and situations of current concern. Sometimes very quiet diplomacy is more appropriate, and sometimes the "naming and shaming" approach, challenging the responsibility of institutions or structures, works very well.

2. Strategies from civil society actors differ due to their balance between more **pragmatic approaches vs. a more bureaucratic understanding of cooperation.**

While KATU and ICCO are very open to providing their respective governments with expertise and use this interaction to achieve as much influence as possible, some German organisations would prefer to refrain from cooperation if they cannot participate in the development of policies based on the information and expertise they have contributed.

3. The willingness to cooperate even though the **cooperation might be difficult sometimes** is a prerequisite to grow over time.

While confrontation or disagreement on particular topics is perceived to be part of a well-functioning relationship in one context, it might be irritating and disturbing in another. The effectiveness of cooperation seems to depend on the history and national culture within a given country. Are governments, researchers and NGOs willing to accept and deal with possible confrontation?

Panel discussion II

Dynamics of concrete crisis intervention - The case of the Darfur crisis and the international mission to DRC

The Darfur case and the role of an NGO at international level

Lotte Leicht is Director of Human Rights Watch (HRW) Europe, based in Brussels. She gave an account of her work and reported that despite the overwhelming evidence of massive violations of international law against hundreds of thousands of people in Darfur, policy-makers in the international system spend a lot of time justifying their position that they cannot, will not and should not take any action.

Against this background, HRW's objective over the past three years was to pressurise the UN Security Council into taking prompt and decisive action. The key instrument for that purpose was data collection on war crimes, crimes against humanity, rape, murder, abuse and destruction. HRW published these facts fre-

quently in its reports, demanding that policy-makers bring the persons responsible for these crimes before the International Criminal Court (ICC). But pursuing justice for crimes can only take place with the mandate of the UN Security Council, and it is difficult to impact on decision-making at that level.

HRW applied various strategies, working along multiple channels and always remaining flexible in order to choose the most appropriate approach for the situation. Sometimes it is better to work in the public domain; at other times, it is more helpful to work behind the scenes, as Lotte Leicht explained. But the ability to engage in quiet diplomacy has various preconditions. Personal access and a trustful relationship to policy-makers are key and are usually based on longstanding engagement in the political arena. Solid expertise is required as well. Politicians are only likely to be interested in listening and perhaps even discussing political options with an NGO if they acknowledge and appreciate the information and recommendations which the NGO has provided. Due to its excellent network on the ground, involving human rights activists who entered Darfur illegally and work under dangerous conditions, HRW was able to provide first-hand information and present arguments on this basis. HRW acknowledged that sometimes it can be very powerful to let actors from the international community know you can prove that they knew about certain incidents or are aware of the whereabouts of a suspected war criminal despite their official denials. HRW's efforts finally paid off when the UN Security Council, on 31 March 2005, passed a resolution referring Darfur to the International Criminal Court (ICC).

In her conclusion, Lotte Leicht pointed out that extensive advocacy with the press and diplomats worldwide was crucial in achieving this success and that only 15 – 20% of the interactions were public; the rest took place behind the scenes.

How NGOs can get their messages across - Experiences from the Sudan Focal Point

Wolfgang Heinrich is Head of the Desk for Peace and Conflict Management Issues in the Church Development Service (EED), Bonn. He explained the working methods and strategies of the Sudan Focal Point (SFP), an umbrella organisation of European NGOs with local partner networks in Sudan. Their main objective is to identify and agree on coherent activities and political strategies in and about Sudan. This includes developing a common lobby agenda towards political actors in European countries within the structures of the European Union and the United Nations. SFP has been working with key Sudanese actors for many years and has been able to establish a trustful relationship to the different parties involved in the various conflicts, as well as on the international level with actors like IGAD. This was only possible because SFP made the process open and transparent. Over a number of years, all SFP's European member NGOs have thus been able to establish good communication links with their respective foreign ministries.

An important aspect of the strategy that helped SFP to play a role in shaping at least part of the European response to the Darfur crisis was that it would only work on extremely focussed issues that were identified as most relevant or urgent. The members agreed on one or two recommendations which would be presented in a coordinated approach to European governments. In other words, in all these countries, SFP members provided their governments with the same set of facts, analyses and recommendations. Every government was thus made aware of this crucial information and informed that SFP had provided it to all the other governments as well. Nonetheless, it is necessary to have "counterparts" in the governments, and to know whom to contact on specific topics. Entry points in government for building a relationship must be identified. Through these channels, it was possible for members of governments and SFP to meet to discuss

strategies and conflicting issues. Indeed, the relationship developed to the point where SFP has been asked to assist with drafting policy papers for presentations at EU and UN level. In contrast to the approach outlined by HRW in the previous presentation, SFP adopted an explicitly non-confrontational strategy. It did not include "naming and shaming", nor did it pressurise European governments but tried to encourage them to cooperate in a constructive manner.

Requirements and challenges for policy advice in the case of the mission to DRC

Annette Weber is the Coordinator of the Ecumenical Network Central Africa (ÖNZ, Ökumenisches Netz Zentralafrika) which was founded by five Catholic and Protestant NGOs working in development: Bread for the World, Diakonisches Werk of the Protestant Church in Germany, MISEREOR, Pax Christi, and the United Evangelical Mission.

Like SFP, ÖNZ promotes a systematic exchange of information and more coherent project planning among its members, and works on joint recommendations and statements as part of its lobby agenda at national level in Germany. On the political level, ÖNZ focuses on Members of Parliament. As contacts have shown, many parliamentarians feel that they have very poor information on which to take decisions on situations like the Great Lakes, Sudan or DRC. Annette Weber reported that a number of Members of the German Parliament have travelled to DRC in the context of the elections and the European Union's military mission. But in many cases, attention focuses primarily on the issue of whether German soldiers should be part of the mission or not. The objective of ÖNZ in this situation is to offer a broader perspective and develop a coherent political strategy for the time after the elections and even after the military mission. So instead of merely providing information or making specific policy recommendations, ÖNZ also aims to explore wider issues: what dynamics are introduced by the international troops, and what dynamics might be created by their withdrawal?

In general, the experience of ÖNZ is positive in the sense that parliamentarians and members of the political administration are interested in obtaining further information, which is provided by ÖNZ. But the frequent changeover of people in certain positions creates discontinuity. Every new government appointee has a tendency to work on their own public profile. They appear to be more interested in setting a new agenda than following up on the decisions taken by their predecessors.

Discussion highlights

The three presentations made it very clear that there is still a role for NGOs to play, even though decision-making on crisis prevention is increasingly being transferred to the international arena and multilateral actors. But the setting and the dynamics in which NGOs have to define their strategy and approaches are becoming increasingly challenging. The discussion concentrated on the following:

- o There is a certain **ambiguity in cooperating** very closely with government structures.

In many cases it is difficult, if not impossible, for think tanks and NGOs to know, let alone control, how the information they provide will be used by government bodies. A step-by-step approach was therefore recommended. It is important to know one's "enemies" as well as one's "friends" in order to be prepared and avoid unpleasant surprises.

- Distinguishing **between lobby work and consulting services is important.**

Whereas lobby organisations have a clear understanding of what political action is needed and likely to be effective, consulting services are more interested in generating options and discussing pros and cons.

For lobby work as much as for consulting services, the key requirements are to stay focussed, react swiftly and follow up if events appear to be moving in the wrong direction. Sometimes, issues have to be dealt with in a variety of languages. The output of information – papers, strategies, field studies etc. – has to be integrated into the administrative systems quickly. Good knowledge of internal routines of government and administration is therefore essential.

- It is a challenge to **develop a common understanding of the situation** in the local networks.

It is important to ensure that different actors work together towards the same objective. However, this is quite a difficult task, as leaders and members of civil society are also influenced by atrocities and the suffering that their families may have been or are still exposed to. Nonetheless, disengaging from partisan politics is essential.

Panel discussion III

The role of civil society and think tanks on the European level

The third session of the workshop concentrated on European institutions and the activities of NGOs and think tanks in Brussels. The upcoming German Presidency of the EU in 2007 is a good opportunity to put crisis prevention and peace-building topics on the international agenda. What can NGOs do to strengthen the EU's civilian crisis prevention policies? How can NGOs use the presidency to push their issues forward? Is the forthcoming report about the implementation of the German Action Plan "Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building", which will be presented to Parliament in May, a useful instrument for cooperation with state actors on these issues?

Peace-building NGOs and the European Union

Nicolas Beger, Director of the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO), shared the experiences of EPLO in lobbying on civilian crisis prevention policies at EU level. EPLO was founded in 2001 as an umbrella organisation for NGOs and think tanks based in European countries and specialising in development, peace and security issues. The objective is to promote sustainable peace-building policies among decision-makers in the European Union and draw attention to the crucial role NGOs have to play in sustainable conflict prevention, crisis management, and peace-building.

Nicolas Beger reported about EPLO's activities in the context of the EU presidencies. In November 2004 under the Dutch Presidency, initial cooperation between EPLO, Dutch NGOs and the Dutch Government began. The idea was to put civilian crisis prevention issues on the EU presidencies' agenda and keep them there despite the rotation of presidency among the EU members every six months. This is

a challenging objective. Not only must the peacebuilding community, NGOs and think tanks in the country responsible for the next presidency be convinced that there is something worth taking up in what has been done previously. This message needs to be put across to Members of Parliament and the government administration as well. So far, experience has been mixed. It started slowly with Luxembourg (EU presidency in the first half of 2005) and developed quite well in April last year with Austria. Three conferences have been held with civil society organisations and government representatives from Austria and from the previous presiding country. These processes gave rise to a project which is now being developed by Finland. Its aim is to promote increased understanding and awareness among Member States and ESDP decision-makers on the impact that the civil society can have in promoting a human security-based approach to security. The next step which could now be taken by German state or non-state actors in the context of the German EU presidency would be to put the proposals and recommendations into a more practical framework. The project, named "The Role of Civil Society in European Civilian Crisis Management" (ROCS), is seeking to introduce mechanisms and processes for exchange and interaction on civilian peace building between relevant EU bodies and civil society actors.

To carry this project forward and maintain its dynamic, it is important for EPLO to establish good cooperation with both NGOs and government in the countries scheduled to take over the EU presidency. Nicolas Beger defined various key factors which have a visible impact on the agenda during EU presidencies: an early start (eight months before the presidency begins), strong advocates in the country (based on interaction and trust), and a climate of mutual interest between governments and civil society organisations (what is on their agenda, and what is on ours?). Personalities are also very important, and it is necessary to be specific and concentrate on policy-oriented interaction. In other words, it is important to be focussed and not take on too many topics.

There is also a need for good communication channels between the capitals concerned and the administration in Brussels. For this reason, it is very important for EPLO to have members in the country concerned to cooperate with.

State and non-state cooperation in preparation for the UK EU and G8 presidencies

Marie-Kristin Höbert reported how Saferworld, an NGO based in the UK, has been involved in preparations for the United Kingdom's presidency of the EU and G8. Saferworld combines research and the publication of country studies with field work in Africa, (South) Eastern Europe and Asia. In the political sphere it is engaged in advocacy at the EU level and organises training for EU staff. One of its key topics is small arms control. In preparation for the UK presidency of the EU and G8, Saferworld provided analyses and empirical data for policy-makers. Together with other academic institutions and NGOs, Saferworld also played an active role in larger networks, lobbying state actors in Britain and organising joint campaigns and events.

In the context of the G8 presidency, Saferworld wanted to push five topics on the international agenda and in public debate. These were: the promotion of an International Arms Trade Treaty, crisis management, fragile states, conflict prevention and the link between development and security. Having already established good communication links with the UK Government, it was possible to discuss these issues with government officials as well as with members of the Prime Minister's Commission for Africa. An important element of Saferworld's strategy is the combination of two aspects: providing topical publications with solid information, analyses and political recommendations and, at the same time, maintaining

a good relationship with government officials who were interested in Saferworld's contribution. Achieving this exchange and interaction was essential. A number of statements and recommendations from Saferworld on arms control were incorporated into the report by the Commission for Africa, which resulted in a voluntary commitment by the UK Government to implement the Saferworld recommendations made in this paper. Some of the recommendations were also taken up in the Gleneagles Declaration adopted by G8 in 2005, and the topic of arms control was recognised as being a central issue in conflict prevention.

The lobbying for the UK's EU presidency was different in some ways as other state actors had to be addressed and more non-state actors engaged – which meant more potential partners for Saferworld. Besides Saferworld, International Alert, BOND (British Overseas NGOs for Development) and its European Policy Group, and CONCORD (European NGO Confederation for Relief and Development) played an active role as well.

As part of the preparations, Saferworld, together with International Alert, published a report on action plans on fragile states to establish the parameters for discussion at an early stage. It also drafted a note about possible priorities for the UK Presidency and organised meetings with the Conflict Prevention Pool to discuss it. These activities finally led to an Expert Seminar on "Developing an SSR Concept for the EU", organised jointly with the European Commission and the UK Presidency.

Finnish state-non-state cooperation for the EU Presidency and the expected input from the German side

Anne Palm presented the activities of research institutions and NGOs in Finland in preparation for the forthcoming Finnish Presidency of the EU, starting in July 2006. The Finnish institutions' priority is to contribute to a shift from a conceptual and theoretical level to a more practical implementing stage. As a strategy they opted to make reference to a document produced by the EU itself: the "Action Plan for Civilian Aspects of ESDP" adopted by the European Council in June 2004. In this paper, the European Council commits itself to developing cooperation with non-state actors and invites incoming presidencies to facilitate this cooperation by holding regular meetings with NGOs. A key challenge for KATU (see above), as Anne Palm explained, is to identify specific proposals for this process, including the issues to be addressed and the level at which it should take place. KATU is convinced that dealing with these questions would prepare the way for practical implementation.

The work started in autumn 2004, two years before the Finnish Presidency of the EU, by promoting the message, consulting with organisations in Finland and involving EPLO (European Peacebuilding Liaison Office). At the beginning, the process was dominated by discussions about fundamental questions: what is crisis management and what role should civil society play, if any? However, the discussion became more focussed when KATU started to draft papers and structure the debate on the basis of more specific examples. At a certain stage, KATU together with EPLO and CMI (Crisis Management Initiative), a highly specialised NGO with excellent connections in the international diplomatic network, took the lead. At the time of this workshop, a project proposal has been drafted, entitled "The Role of Civil Society in European Civilian Crisis Management" (ROCS). The project purpose is to develop a concrete action plan for the better utilisation of NGO expertise in civilian crisis management. As provided for in various official EU documents, the participation of civil society actors should be considered for information exchange and early warning, recruitment of personnel, training and evaluation / "lessons learned" exercises, and better cooperation in the field.

The ultimate objective is to have a ROCS Action Plan presented to and discussed by the European Council, so it was important to get the Finnish Government involved in the development of the Action Plan, which KATU managed to do. In any case, in Anne Palm's experience, an administration only supports issues if it has been involved in developing them, so it was necessary to adopt a measure of compromise and pragmatism even during the early stages of drafting the Action Plan.

KATU hopes that the EU will adopt the Action Plan during the Finnish Presidency but together with EPLO is also establishing contact with the German administration to see if it would be interested in following up the process. It would be very helpful for the process if there were German NGOs who also supported the idea.

Discussion highlights

The three presentations helped to focus the discussion on very specific questions about the character of interaction between the EU and civil society actors. The audience generally endorsed the following findings, mainly drawn by the resource persons.

- It is important to recognise that there is still considerable reluctance on the part of governments to cooperate with civil society on sensitive issues such as security or preventive strategies. To overcome these obstacles, it seems to be helpful if researchers and NGOs push their priorities in small but practical steps. In order to be successful, it is important to focus on key priorities and to invest financial, human and material resources in cooperating with government administrations.
- Some governments are interested in cooperating with non-state actors as there is the opportunity to present the NGO topics and suggestions at EU level as their own initiative if there is prospect for appreciation by other EU partners, if not, they would still be in a position to downsize the issue. Some non-state organisations are most willing to cooperate on that basis, others not.
- Different presidencies follow different agendas, often shaped by current dynamics on the international level and not thinking further than six months ahead. To successfully establish civilian crisis prevention issues on the EU agenda, it is necessary to sustain the work of different presidencies on this topic. Research institutions and NGOs can play a role here and can do so even more effectively with good cooperation at international level. However, close relationships with the national governments are also essential.
- A general criticism focussed on the lack of transparency and communication among presidencies. They should be pushed to be more open and transparent so that civil society can have a greater impact. There is no reason for civil society not to know what the Council talks about. NGOs are spending too much time playing detective, which conflicts with their own principles. This situation therefore needs to change.

Outlook

Finally the participants split up into working groups to deepen the discussion on single issues and to phrase proposals how to follow up with the general topic of

state and non-state cooperation. There were two practical proposals addressed to FriEnt:

- FriEnt should organise an exchange between German and Finnish NGOs, the German administration and EPLO on how to cooperate more effectively on crisis prevention issues in preparation for the upcoming German Presidency of the EU.
- To improve the level of state and non-state cooperation on crisis prevention and peace-building in the German context, expert meetings should be organised on specific political processes. The administration and parliamentarians should be involved already in planning such and expert meeting to ensure that the agenda includes urgent issues relating to their own working contexts.

Appendix I: Programme

04.05.2006

14.00 **Welcome and introduction**

Angelika Spelten, FriEnt

Session I **The role of societal actors in promoting crisis prevention and peace-building policy**
14.30 – 16.30

Moderation: Natascha Zupan

- State and non-state relations and the Finnish Action Plan
Anne Palm, KATU, Helsinki
- What significance does the cooperation between non-state and state actors have in the Dutch context?
Caroline Ort, ICCO (Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation), Utrecht
- How German non-state actors perceive their role in policy advice
Regine Mehl, PRIUB (Peace Research Information Unit Bonn)

Key question:

- What do you (and your respective “communities”) expect from the different modes of exchange, discussion and cooperation?

16.30 – 17.00 Coffee break

Session II **Dynamics of concrete crisis intervention - The case of the Darfur crisis and the international mission to DRC.**
17.00 – 18.45

Moderation: Angelika Spelten

- The Darfur case and the role of international NGOs on the European/international level.
Lotte Leicht, Human Rights Watch, Brussels
- How NGOs can get their messages across – Experiences from the Sudan Focal Point
Marina Peter, Sudan Focal Point, Alfeld
- Requirements and challenges for policy advice in the case of the mission to DRC
Annette Weber, ÖNZ (Ecumenical Network Central Africa), Berlin

Key question:

- What impact could non-state actors have on the national and international response to crisis and on crisis prevention?

05.04.2006

9.00 Introduction to the second day

Session III **The role of civil society and think tanks on the European level**

9.15 – 11.00

Moderation: Christoph Weller

- Inputs from civil society for EU presidencies – successes and limitations
Nicolas Beger, EPLO, Brussels
- State and non-state cooperation in preparation for the UK EU and G8 presidencies
Marie-Kristin Höbert, Saferworld, Brussels
- How did the Finnish state-non-state cooperation for the EU Presidency look like and what input or contribution would they expect from the German side?
Anne Palm, KATU, Helsinki

Key question:

- How do interactions take place in Brussels and to what extent are preparation and work “at home” still an important factor in shaping EU agendas and policy-making?

11.00 – 11.15 Coffee break

Session IV Working groups to concretise the previous discussions

11.15 – 12.45

Guiding questions:

Which lessons are to be learned for practical interactions between academia, civil society and policy-makers?

- Role and instruments of NGOs
- Role and instruments of academic institutions and think tanks
- Strengthening coherence through new forms of consultation – the Working Group on Peace and Development (FriEnt) and the Advisory Board for Civilian Crisis Prevention in Germany

12.45 – 13.15 Outlook and concluding remarks

Appendix II: List of Participants

Name	Organisation
Ashkenazi Michael	Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC)
Beger Nicolas	European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO)
Debiel Tobias	Institute for Development and Peace (INEF)
Drescher Rolf	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
Frey Ulrich	Platform for Peaceful Conflict Management
Grävingsholt Jörn	German Development Institute (DIE)
Grigat Martin	Bundeswehr Centre for Transformation
Hausmann Tanja	Peace Research Information Unit Bonn (PRIUB)
Heinemann-Grüder, Andreas	Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC)
Heinrich Wolfgang	Church Development Service - An Association of the Protestant Churches in Germany (EED)
Höbert Marie-Kristin	Saferworld
John Marei	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES)
Kloke-Lech Adolf	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
Leicht Lotte	Human Rights Watch
Lohmann Annette	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) / FriEnt
Mehl Regine	Peace Research Information Unit Bonn (PRIUB)
Ort Caroline	Interchurch Organisation for Development and Cooperation (ICCO)
Palm Anne	KATU
Peter Marina	Sudan Focal Point
Pietz Tobias	Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC)
Roth Michèle	Development and Peace Foundation (SEF)
Runge Peter	Association of German development non-governmental organisations (VENRO)
Schetter Konrad	Center for Development Research (ZEF)
Schuetz Heide	Women's Network for Peace, Germany
Shabafrouz Miriam	Institute for Development and Peace (INEF)
Spelten Angelika	Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt) / INEF
van den Berg Paul	Interchurch Organisation for Development and Cooperation (ICCO)
Vermeer Andréa	Journalist

Voss-Kyeck Silke	Amnesty International
Wardenbach Klaus	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
Weber Annette	Ecumenical Network Central Africa (ÖNZ)
Weiss Stefani	Bertelsmann Foundation
Weller Christoph	Institute for Development and Peace (INEF)
Zupan Natascha	Working Group on Development and Peace (FriEnt)