



**EN**

**THIS ACTION IS FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**ANNEX I**

to the Commission Implementing Decision on the financing of the annual action plan for the Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Crisis Preparedness part of the thematic programme Peace, Stability and Conflict Prevention for 2023

**Action Document for the Partnership with Civil Society Organisations**

**ANNUAL PLAN**

This document constitutes the annual work programme within the meaning of Article 110(2) of the Financial Regulation, and action plan within the meaning of Article 23 of the NDICI-Global Europe Regulation.

**1 SYNOPSIS**

**1.1 Action Summary Table**

<b>1. Title CRIS/OPSYS business reference Basic Act</b>	The Partnership with Civil Society Organisations OPSYS number: ACT-61690; JAD 1158009. Financed under the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI-Global Europe)
<b>2. Team Europe Initiative</b>	No
<b>3. Zone benefiting from the action</b>	The action shall be carried out globally
<b>4. Programming document</b>	Multi-Annual Indicative Programme for the Thematic Programme on Peace, Stability and Conflict Prevention 2021-2027
<b>5. Link with relevant MIP(s) objectives / expected results</b>	Priority 1: Continuing to enhance capabilities relating to analytical tools, methodologies, and mechanisms to better detect early signs of conflicts, monitor conflicts and design appropriate responses;  Priority 2: Promoting conflict prevention and conflict resolution measures, including by facilitating and building capacity in confidence-building, mediation, dialogue and reconciliation processes;  Priority 3: Supporting peace processes and transitions of conflict-affected societies/ communities, including stabilisation and peacebuilding efforts.
<b>PRIORITY AREAS AND SECTOR INFORMATION</b>	
<b>6. Priority Area(s), sectors</b>	Peace, Stability and Conflict Prevention
<b>7. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)</b>	Main SDG : 16 Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies Other significant SDG: 5 Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
<b>8 a) DAC code(s)</b>	15220 - Civilian peace building, conflict prevention and resolution

<b>8 b) Main Delivery Channel</b>	21000 International non-governmental organisations (NGO) 23000 Developing country-based NGO			
<b>9. Targets</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Migration <input type="checkbox"/> Climate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social inclusion and Human Development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Human Rights, Democracy and Governance			
<b>10. Markers (from DAC form)</b>	<b>General policy objective @</b>	<b>Not targeted</b>	<b>Significant objective</b>	<b>Principal objective</b>
	Participation development/good governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Aid to environment @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Gender equality and women's and girl's empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reproductive, maternal, new-born and child health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Disaster Risk Reduction @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Inclusion of persons with Disabilities @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Nutrition @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>RIO Convention markers</b>	<b>Not targeted</b>	<b>Significant objective</b>	<b>Principal objective</b>
	Biological diversity @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Combat desertification @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change mitigation @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change adaptation @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>11. Internal markers and Tags:</b>	<b>Policy objectives</b>	<b>Not targeted</b>	<b>Significant objective</b>	<b>Principal objective</b>
	Digitalisation @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	digital connectivity digital governance digital entrepreneurship digital skills/literacy digital services	<b>YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	/
	Connectivity @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	digital connectivity energy transport	<b>YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	/

	health education and research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Migration @	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reduction of Inequalities @	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Covid-19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>BUDGET INFORMATION</b>				
<b>12. Amounts concerned</b>	Budget line: BGUE – B2023-14.020230-C1 – STABILITY AND PEACE Total estimated cost: EUR 20 500 000 Total amount of EU budget contribution EUR 20 500 000			
<b>MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION</b>				
<b>13. Type of financing</b>	<b>Direct management</b> through grants			

## 1.2 Summary of the Action

The proposed action **aims to support in-country civil society actors in their effort to prevent conflicts, respond to crises and build peace.** It is envisaged to support actions implemented by local civil society and international non-governmental organisations in conflict-affected contexts to strengthen their institutional, operational and networking capacity on three specific conflict prevention and peace-building themes: a) Trauma healing as a support to transitional justice; b) Children and Armed conflict (CAAC), including a focus on Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR); and c) Youth in peace and security.

The proposed action will also **continue supporting and further strengthening a dialogue platform on conflict prevention and peace-building between EU policy and decision-makers and civil society actors.** The action will build upon the positive results and lessons learned during a twelve-year cooperation with the European Peace-Building Liaison Office (EPLO) in managing the “Civil Society Dialogue Network” (CSDN) as a robust dialogue mechanisms between EU policy and decision-makers and civil society actors on conflict prevention and peace-building issues.

Finally, the proposed action will **support local peacebuilding capacities** through strengthening networks of local organisations and ensure that **models of direct funding to local actors** can be developed.

The proposed action will thus continue to strengthen the role of civil society as an actor and beneficiary that 1. promotes the protection of people from threatening situations and create a conducive environment for stabilisation; 2. increases the sense of inclusivity of a wider population to prevent and respond to conflict and crises; 3. contributes to enhancing the capacities and agency of local actors to become positive change agents and the building blocks of more peaceful and resilient societies.

## 2 RATIONALE

### 2.1 Context

Empowering the active role civil society plays in conflict-affected contexts is essential to the resilience of communities, societies, vibrant state-society relations and to long-term peace. Civil society organisations (CSOs) play a crucial role in conflict prevention and peacebuilding in a wide variety of crises contexts. As conflicts continue to threaten global security, it remains crucial to gather local perceptions and experiences and organise tailored responses to bring about positive change for communities. Whether they are local and community based organisations or international non-governmental organisations, CSOs often detect early signs of tension and conflicts and are well placed to provide responses tackling root causes and symptoms of these tensions and conflicts. They also play a critical role in articulating citizens' concerns, in engaging in the public arena to promote responsive services, reforms and accountable governance, including in contexts where there are tendencies towards

a shrinking space for civil society.

Supporting and empowering civil society to play a role in conflict prevention and peacebuilding processes is a fundamental aspect of the EU External Action, including through EU's political, diplomatic and advocacy efforts, as highlighted in the 2016 EU Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy<sup>1</sup>; the 2017 Joint Communication on "A Strategic Approach to Resilience in the EU's External Action"<sup>2</sup>; the 2018 Council Conclusions on "the Integrated Approach to External Conflicts and Crises"<sup>3</sup>; the 2017 New European Consensus on Development, with its focus on peaceful and inclusive societies<sup>4</sup>; and, the 2012 Communication on CSOs, "The roots of democracy and sustainable development: Europe's engagement with Civil Society in external relations"<sup>5</sup>. Moreover, the 2022 Council Conclusions on Youth Action Plan in external action<sup>6</sup>, the 2021 EU Strategy on the Rights of the Child<sup>7</sup>, the 2020 European Democracy Action Plan<sup>8</sup> and the 2021 Joint Communication to the European Parliament and the Council about the EU strategic approach in support of Disarmament, Demobilisation, and Reintegration of former combatants<sup>9</sup> underline the critical role of civil society in this regard. Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 is also a strong policy foundation for civil society capacity building.

CSOs have a significant potential to identify opportunities for impact in the three thematic areas of support to in-country civil society actors prioritised for this action, hence contributing to EU overall engagement in effective and inclusive conflict prevention, peace building and crises preparedness. In this respect, continuous support has been provided to actions aiming at strengthening capacities of in-country civil society actors through different EU funding instruments, including the Instrument for Stability (IfS) (2007-2013), the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP) (2014-2020), and the current Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe (2021-2027).

## 2.2 Problem Analysis

**Priority 1: Support to in-country civil society actors will focus on the following three specific conflict prevention and peacebuilding themes:**

### a) Trauma healing as a support to transitional justice

During and after violent conflict or authoritarian rule, widespread violations of international humanitarian law (IHL) and human rights are very likely to occur. The traumatic experiences of survivors are often not addressed for several reasons: lack of mental health support capacities, cultural barriers, lack of funding, gender and other types of inequalities, stigma around sexual and gender-based violence, etc. Therefore, individuals, families, communities, and entire societies are suffering continued and inter-generational trauma, which could potentially feed continued or renewed violence. Providing mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) is a critical element of a comprehensive transitional justice approach and addressing trauma and healing the wounds of the past has a conflict prevention value, and contributes to reparations and reintegration into communities. The 2015 EU framework on transitional justice<sup>10</sup> includes a comprehensive approach in which addressing trauma from the past is critical. It offers guiding principles to ensure that the work on trauma healing contributes to addressing victims' and survivors' needs in a gender responsive way, to rebuilding social links in society and to ensuring the non-recurrence of violence. Trauma healing also plays an essential role in reconciliation: people cannot rebuild connections and come to mutual acceptance of crimes committed if they are not healed. MHPSS can provide an important space for creating sustainable conditions for conflict prevention and peace building.

<sup>1</sup> [https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/eugs\\_review\\_web\\_0.pdf](https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/eugs_review_web_0.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52017JC0021&from=en>

<sup>3</sup> <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-5413-2018-INIT/en/pdf>

<sup>4</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/international-partnerships/european-consensus-development\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/international-partnerships/european-consensus-development_en)

<sup>5</sup> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0492:FIN:EN:PDF>

<sup>6</sup> <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-15322-2022-INIT/en/pdf>

<sup>7</sup> [https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/rights-child/eu-strategy-rights-child-and-european-child-guarantee\\_en](https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/rights-child/eu-strategy-rights-child-and-european-child-guarantee_en)

<sup>8</sup> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0790&from=EN>

<sup>9</sup> [https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/joint-communication-eu-strategic-approach-support-disarmament-demobilisation-and-reintegration\\_en](https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/joint-communication-eu-strategic-approach-support-disarmament-demobilisation-and-reintegration_en)

<sup>10</sup> <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-13576-2015-INIT/en/pdf>

There is scope for enhanced exchange and cooperation between transitional justice practitioners, mental health experts, security sector governance and DDR specialists, artists, educators and others. The UNDP Guidance Note Integrating Mental Health and Psychosocial Support into Peacebuilding<sup>11</sup> suggests a “collaborative development of a process that brings together practitioners from the MHPSS field (clinical, social and community psychologists, psychiatrists, psychiatric nurses, community health workers, social workers, anthropologists, artists, educators, and religious and traditional healers) and the peacebuilding field (people working in transitional justice, conflict transformation, peace education, mediation, reconciliation, etc.)”.

## **b) Children and Armed conflict (CAAC), including a focus on DDR**

Approximately 426 million children (over one in six) live within 50 kilometres of a conflict zone<sup>12</sup>. This not only threatens the physical and mental health of children but it can often deprive them of education<sup>13</sup> and negatively impact their future life opportunities, as well as those of the communities they come from. At any given time, there are estimated to be at least 300 000 children associated with armed forces and groups (CAAFAG)<sup>14</sup> participating in conflicts. Child recruitment trends are projected to increase due to increased economic and social vulnerabilities brought about by different factors, including the COVID-19 recovery challenges, the impacts of climate change, food insecurity and a global recession. The participation of children in conflict seriously affects their physical, psychological and emotional well-being. Both girl and boy CAFAAGs are frequently victims of sexual violence, which is too often being used as a weapon of war. Conflict also deprives children of parents, care-givers, basic social services, health care and education. There are some 36.5 million displaced and refugee children<sup>15</sup>, while others are held hostage, abducted or trafficked. Children’s reintegration occurs under different conditions than reintegration for adults. No peace agreement or formal process is required for children to be released or to commence reintegration programming. Rather, children should be supported with release and reintegration before, during, and throughout conflict, to encourage them continuously to exit conflict, as per the UN Integrated Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration Standards (IDDRS) and the EU Joint Communications on DDR. Reintegration for children may be part of disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) programming, though not necessarily so. Many CAAFAG who require reintegration support may not qualify for DDR support because of their role in conflict, or because they exited the armed force or group outside such a process and may not be identified as formerly part of an armed group. Children should be treated primarily as victims while still being held accountable for their actions, rather than their alleged associations, by following the relevant international standards<sup>16</sup>.

Child protection as well as Children and Armed Conflicts (CAAC) are highly relevant policy areas for conflict prevention and peacebuilding. In line with the 2008 EU guidelines on Children and Armed Conflict<sup>17</sup> and its implementation strategy, the protection of children and prevention against the six grave violations,<sup>18</sup> the safeguarding of their rights and the reintegration of children associated to armed groups and armed forces are crucial to breaking the cycle of violence that is ravaging some of the most fragile regions in the world. The CAAC and child protection agendas need to be addressed with urgency, with a

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.undp.org/publications/integrating-mental-health-and-psychosocial-support-peacebuilding>

<sup>12</sup> [https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/pdf/ostby\\_rustad\\_tollefsen\\_-\\_children\\_affected\\_by\\_armed\\_conflict\\_1990-2019\\_-\\_conflict\\_trends\\_6-2020.pdf/](https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/pdf/ostby_rustad_tollefsen_-_children_affected_by_armed_conflict_1990-2019_-_conflict_trends_6-2020.pdf/)

<sup>13</sup> [Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies – https://inee.org](https://inee.org)

<sup>14</sup> A ‘child associated with an armed force or armed group’ refers to any person below 18 years of age who is or who has been recruited or used by an armed force or armed group in any capacity, including but not limited to children, boys and girls, used as fighters, cooks, porters, messengers, spies or for sexual purposes. It does not only refer to a child who is taking or has taken a direct part in hostilities (Paris Principles and Guidelines on Children Associated with Armed Forces or Armed Groups, February 2007).

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.unhcr.org/refugee-statistics/>

<sup>16</sup> <https://childrenandarmedconflict.un.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Gaps-and-needs-for-Successful-Reintegration-of-CAFAAG.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> [https://www.eeas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/01\\_hr\\_guidelines\\_children\\_en\\_1.pdf](https://www.eeas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/01_hr_guidelines_children_en_1.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> The Six Grave Violations Against Children During Armed Conflict 1. Recruitment and use of children 2. Killing or maiming of children 3. Sexual violence against children 4. Attacks against schools or hospitals 5. Abduction of children 6. Denial of humanitarian access (<https://www.unicef.org/stories/children-under-attack-six-grave-violations-against-children-times-war>)

focus on prevention and addressing the whole conflict cycle in which children can be agents for peace.

**c) Youth in peace and security**

There is a growing recognition of young people's essential role in peace and security. The role of young people in conflict prevention and peacebuilding therefore needs to be better understood and harnessed. Often youth is perceived as a monolithic segment of society. Their conflict prevention and peacebuilding activities are not adequately taken into account and their age, sex, ethnicity, religion, disability, location, wealth, marital status, sexual orientation and gender identity, and migratory status are often ignored. This frequently leads to a perception that they are a part of the problem rather than agents of change and essential actors in the solutions to conflict and wars, for the present and the future.

Structural barriers limiting the participation of young people and their capacity to influence decision-making, violations of their human rights, and insufficient investment in facilitating their inclusion and empowerment remain. Economic barriers, existing norms and lack of opportunities are particularly affecting youth in their political and economic engagement. Distrust in public institutions, the lack of information about participation opportunities and the lack of skills to participate are also key obstacles. These challenges are exacerbated in fragile and conflict affected contexts<sup>19</sup>. While risking their lives, young peacebuilders who are working in the conflict-affected areas are often not acknowledged and/or effectively protected.

Thus the protection of young activists, better representation of young people and their organisations at the institutional level both in conflict resolution, security dialogues and high-level humanitarian decision-making at the local, national and international levels are critical – with a focus on women and young girls in the field of peace and security. Moreover, with the vast majority of former fighters being young, disengagement and effective reintegration of former combatants in communities requires particular attention<sup>20</sup>.

**Priority 2: Support to the Civil Society Dialogue Network on conflict prevention and peace-building (CSDN V).**

The EU is a global actor in the field of conflict prevention and peace-building, partly thanks to the wide range of tools and instruments that it can leverage (humanitarian, diplomatic, development, trade, security & defence, crisis response). In order to maximise its impact, it is critical that EU initiatives, policies and decisions benefit from different and informed perspectives, including those from conflict affected communities and from organisations engaged in tackling conflict and violence and in building peace. The recognition of and commitment to the importance of engaging, supporting and dialoguing with civil society in EU policy frameworks are facilitated by a structured and systematic framework for these interactions to happen. Since 2010, the Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) has contributed to this purpose by establishing a robust and effective mechanism enabling fruitful and constructive exchanges between civil society and EU actors. This measure aims to sustain this mechanism with the aim of further enhancing the capacities of both EU actors and civil society to ultimately prevent conflict and build peace.

**Priority 3: Support peacebuilding capacities through strengthening networks of local organisations.**

As conflicts and crises persist in the world, frontline local peacebuilders are those who have the critical expertise and knowledge of conflict drivers and resilience factors at the local level, as well as of local conflict resolution and prevention mechanisms, and for conflict sensitive issues related to peacebuilding. They can flag early signs of conflict at local, regional, national level and propose solutions for peace and coexistence to governing bodies. Nonetheless, they receive very little support in terms of resources and opportunities to further develop their skills, and strengthen their organisational capacity. Local peacebuilding organisations also often lack the space and resources to engage in learning exchanges with their peers, which can hinder the sustainability of their work, undermine their potential to engage effectively

<sup>19</sup> [Analysis of the targeted consultation of the Youth Action Plan in EU External Action, 2022](#)

<sup>20</sup> [https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/joint-communication-eu-strategic-approach-support-disarmament-demobilisation-and-reintegration\\_en](https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/joint-communication-eu-strategic-approach-support-disarmament-demobilisation-and-reintegration_en)

on the ground, and weaken civil society resilience overall. Belonging to a network provides an answer to these challenges: it enables members to be part of a joint learning process rooted in members' expertise and experience. By coming together as a network, local peacebuilders are empowered to build their capacities and their self-confidence through peer-to-peer sharing and learning. This not only strengthens their organisational capacities, it also builds solidarity, amplifies their voices beyond their local context, bolstering their ability to contribute to and influence local, regional and global peacebuilding processes. Taking these challenges into account, this action aims to support peacebuilding capacities through strengthening networks of local organisations.

In addition to capacity building and learning, efforts to secure funding for local peacebuilders to sustain and develop their peacebuilding capacities are crucial. In view of donor legal and financial constraints, local peacebuilders usually manage to receive limited support as a subcontractor to a larger NGO or access one-off small grants, neither of which empower local capacities and ownership. This is a reason why innovative financing solutions to support local peacebuilders are becoming a necessity and should be tested. Building on the insights gained in their financing for peacebuilding work, and in collaboration with the partners involved, the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) has developed a proposal to set up a multi-year pilot mechanism to test innovative approaches to funding local peacebuilders. Bringing together donors, aid agencies and local peacebuilders, the pilot mechanism aims to test brand new funding approaches in an effort to learn and build an evidence base that can persuade donors and aid agencies to adjust the parameters of the aid system.

Identification of main stakeholders and corresponding institutional and/or organisational issues (mandates, potential roles, and capacities) to be covered by the action:

- Civil society organisations in Europe and in countries at risk of or affected by conflict that are active in the field of peacebuilding and conflict prevention, as well as EU policy makers, including within EU institutions and EU Member States: both target groups are in need of further strengthening their interactions and cooperation in order to enhance the effectiveness of their respective responses to conflicts;
- International and well established national civil society organisations, as direct beneficiaries: They have the thematic expertise as well as the operational and financial capacity to manage EU funding effectively and transparently. They have established partnerships with local civil society actors aiming to strengthen local capacities to deal with challenges to stability and peace. They are also able to engage national and international actors to advocate for changes at policy and practice levels;
- National and local civil society actors, as partners of direct beneficiaries: they have the relevant thematic expertise to partner in the implementation of EU funding. They have extensive networks with local communities, local and national authorities that allow them to detect early signs of conflict at local, regional, national level and propose solutions for peace. They will profit from capacity building support from international and/or national civil society organisations and potentially will be able to receive direct EU funding in future;
- Conflict-affected communities, community level structures such as peace committees, traditional leaders, youth and women's associations, Indigenous Peoples' organisations, human rights and environmental activists working on peace and conflict prevention, as ultimate beneficiaries: They often do not have any formal or legal existence and therefore little, if any, capacity to manage processes or large scale funding on their own. They can benefit from collaboration with local, national or international civil society organisations that support their local level peacebuilding initiatives in order to maximise their effectiveness and sustainability. They may take part and/or benefit from EU support;
- National and local authorities and stakeholders such as private sector organisations, media, unions, etc. may also take part in project activities. They also benefit from the projects' outcomes that support their mandate to better respond to communities' needs;
- The final beneficiaries are the populations of countries at risk of or affected by conflict or on post-conflict situation.

### 3 DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

#### 3.1 Objectives and Expected Outputs

The Overall Objective (impact) of this action is to build and strengthen sustainable, in-country capacities for effective conflict management and peace-building and continue to contribute to the enhancement of EU and civil

society capacities to anticipate, prevent and respond to violent conflict and crisis and to support conflict-affected countries in building peace.

The Specific Objectives of this action are to:

1. Strengthen the institutional and operational capacity of in-country civil society actors with regards to the three specific conflict prevention and peacebuilding themes, in a gender and age responsive manner;
2. Maintain and strengthen a robust dialogue mechanism between EU policy-makers and civil society actors on conflict prevention and peacebuilding issues;
3. Support peacebuilding capacities through strengthening networks of local organisations and innovative financing solutions for local peacebuilders through a conflict sensitive lens.

The outputs to be delivered by this action contributing to the corresponding Specific Objectives are:

- 1.1 Contributing to Outcome 1 (or Specific Objective 1):
  - 1.1.1. Institutional and operational capacity building interventions to better respond to challenges and opportunities in the three thematic areas;
  - 1.1.2. Peacebuilding interventions responding to the challenges and opportunities in the three thematic areas;
  - 1.1.3. Strategic capacity building interventions to strengthen advocacy engagement and networking among civil society actors.
  
- 2.1. Contributing to Outcome 2 (or Specific Objective 2):
  - 2.1.1. Strengthened the Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) as a mechanism for enabling civil society actors to engage in dialogue with EU policy- and decision-makers on conflict prevention and peacebuilding issues;
  - 2.1.2. Increased capacity of civil society actors involved in CSDN activities to contribute to the EU's peacebuilding policies and practices;
  - 2.1.3. Strengthened capacity to manage the CSDN through its networking, coordination and policy functions;
  - 2.1.4. Increased understanding by EU policy-makers and by civil society actors of conflict prevention and peacebuilding issues and the role of the EU in the world in this regard.
  
- 3.1 Contributing to Outcome 3 (or Specific Objective 3):
  - 3.1.1. Strengthened individual and collective peacebuilding capacities via GPPAC;
  - 3.1.2. Shared practices and expertise on how to build peace within and across regions;
  - 3.1.3. Increased learning and testing of innovative mechanism (subgranting) for financing local peacebuilding.

The action will be designed and implemented in complementarity with actions financed under the two NDICI Thematic Programmes on Human Rights and Democracy, and Civil Society Organisations. In terms of support to capacity building on peacebuilding and conflict prevention, complementarity will be sought also with the actions foreseen under the bilateral geographic multi-indicative country programmes targeting Civil Society. Synergies will be sought when addressing the shrinking space for civil society in politically complex contexts, including through the EU's political, diplomatic and advocacy efforts.

## 3.2 Indicative Activities

Most of the contracts under the different outcomes will be awarded through call for proposals. The indicative activities mentioned below may be included as type of activities that may be financed in the guidelines of the calls for proposals.

Indicative activities relating to Output 1.1

### **Activities related to thematic area a) Trauma healing as a support to transitional justice**

It is proposed to support civil society's role in the design and implementation of context-specific actions that respond to the needs of individuals and communities facing trauma in conflict-affected contexts, in a

gender and age responsive way, and through a do-no-harm and leave-no-one-behind approach. A participative approach will be therefore promoted, especially by working with communities which are active partners in deciding what to do and when to do it, based on their needs and resources. Each society has different coping mechanisms and it is important to identify them and to build appropriate activities to address trauma and the stigma associated with it. Developing sustainable and culturally-appropriate activities will be key. In case of societal trauma, an inter-generational approach is a priority. The following activities, inter alia, could be envisaged:

- Conduct community-led trauma healing sessions, stakeholder mapping, research and scoping, outreach, etc. to better understand the scope of trauma linked to crises and conflicts. These will take into account gender/age/do-no-harm and inter-generational implications;
- Conduct capacity building of civil society organisations, networks and communities on trauma healing activities, through training, peer-learning and exchanges;
- Facilitate initiatives aiming to establish dialogue and cooperation mechanisms between communities, local authorities, non-state actors, and state actors where feasible to jointly address traumatic events of the past in an inclusive, conflict sensitive and dignified way;
- Support intra-community dialogue to prevent repetitions of trauma across communities;
- Raise awareness on the positive impact of trauma healing to overcome possible cultural, gender and age barriers;
- Support initiatives addressing trauma, including arts and culture programmes, MHPSS activities;
- Support the use of traditional and new media to promote access to trauma healing services and to open and safe discussion on the wounds of the past;
- Undertake advocacy towards, and partnerships with, national level authorities, regional and international stakeholders on the design and implementation of trauma healing actions.

**Indicative activities related to thematic area b) Children and Armed conflict (CAAC), including a focus on DDR.** It is proposed to engage with relevant local communities and civil society organisations in developing strategies to ensure that children living in and/or affected by armed conflict are effectively protected and able to claim and enjoy their rights:

- Incorporate children's rights and child protection into conflict prevention and post-conflict recovery activities, as well as peacebuilding planning and strategies, including DDR and other specific types of disengagement and reintegration specific to CAFAAG;
- Include the views of children and youth in the design and implementation of such policies and programmes, where possible;
- Facilitate consultations in a gender and age sensitive manner with youth and children formerly associated with armed forces and armed groups and provide them with platforms for discussion and advocacy;
- Promote peace education at primary, secondary and tertiary levels;
- Contribute to addressing root causes related to the specific context-related causes that exacerbate youth and child recruitment, including economic, social, ethnic, cultural, and gender dimensions;
- Address challenges related to child reintegration, and provide relevant services for effective child protection and reintegration, with a particular focus on local reintegration mechanisms;
- Strengthen the capacities of local/grass-roots conflict prevention/peacebuilding organisations in child protection and children's human rights;
- In the framework of DDR processes, where applicable and feasible, ensure a specific focus on reintegration of the children, including through social, educational and healthcare institutions providing age- and gender-specific services, in an individualised way when so required.

**Indicative activities related to thematic area c) Youth, Peace and Security**

The following activities, inter alia could be envisaged:

- Support the collection of disaggregated data including age, sex, ethnicity, religion, disability, location, wealth, marital status, sexual orientation and gender identity, and migratory status and ensure that final data sets are available to young people as open-source information to better inform the design of projects;
- Provide the means to youth to harness the potential of social media for peace, including awareness-raising amongst their peers and communities and advocacy;
- Strengthen media literacy to strengthen young people's resilience in relation to violent extremism and hate speech content;
- Create and strengthen inclusive spaces for genuine and regular input from young people into policy and

decision-making for peacebuilding and security, providing them with the means and strengthening their capacities to contribute to solutions and raise their concerns, and facilitating access to national and international fora;

- Support youth-led peacebuilding organisations;
- Facilitate consultation with youth formerly associated with armed forces and armed groups and provide them with platforms for discussion and advocacy, especially in DDR processes;
- Address challenges related to gender and age sensitive youth reintegration, and provide relevant services for effective youth reintegration, with a particular focus on effective local reintegration mechanisms based on rights based approaches and social inclusion.

### **Activities relating to Output 2.1**

The following activities, inter alia could be envisaged:

- Organising dialogue meetings on various thematic and geographic issues relating to the EU's peacebuilding policies and practices;
- Preparing publications to stimulate discussions in CSDN events, to provide summaries of discussions in CSDN meetings and to stimulate discussion and reflection on pertinent peacebuilding issues;
- Facilitate the continuation of EU-civil society dialogue between dialogue meetings;
- Managing the interface at the European level between civil society and the EU institutions on peacebuilding issues, and capacity building activities;
- Organising training seminars on the EU's peacebuilding policies and practices;
- Producing communications products such as videos on issues with relevance for the EU's peacebuilding policies and practices.

### **Activities relating to Output 3.1**

The following activities, inter alia could be envisaged:

- Reinforce regional networking activities to strengthen local peacebuilding and institutional capacities;
- Bolster cross-regional Communities of Practice (e.g. learning working groups) to share experience and expertise on specific issues selected by network members (e.g. Human Security, Early Warning and Early Response, Peace Education, Influencing global policy (advocacy), Meaningful inclusion of youth and women peacebuilders);
- Organise cross-regional and cross-thematic peer-to-peer capacity-strengthening and training activities;
- Adapt and develop toolkits and manuals to support and strengthen network peacebuilding practices;
- Foster linkage between local to global as well as global to local during the implementation of global policy processes and frameworks;
- Support the development of an Emergency Response Fund aimed at providing easily accessible funding to network members to address emerging or escalating conflict situations rapidly;
- Conduct research on innovative funding approaches;
- Map and build a strong foundation of local stakeholders and partners to help design - and then manage – an innovative mechanism for local peacebuilders through gender, social and ethnic inclusion.

## **3.3 Mainstreaming**

### **Environmental Protection & Climate Change**

Environmental degradation, such as access to, and management of, natural resources, biodiversity loss, and pollution, are critical drivers of conflicts, especially when aggravated by the effects of climate change. Implementing partners will ensure that the design of their respective projects and the implementation of activities take these risks into account and address them when relevant.

### **Gender equality and empowerment of women and girls**

The action will contribute to the implementation of the EU Gender Action Plan III (GAP III) and the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda. As per OECD Gender DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this action is labelled as G1. This implies that projects to be funded in the framework of this action should take into account the differences in the experiences and needs of men, women, boys and girls when designing and implementing activities. At community level, careful attention should be given to the possible negative impacts on gender and women's equality when supporting traditional leaders and/or community representatives that do not actively include women, youth and minorities in consultations.

---

**Human Rights**

Projects to be funded in the framework of this action should aim to uphold human rights principles and a human rights based approach, in particular: participation in decision making processes, accountability of duty bearers, equality and non-discrimination, empowerment of individuals and communities to exercise their rights. The action should also take into account specific human rights of Indigenous Peoples, such as the right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent supported in the 2017 Council Conclusions on Indigenous Peoples, and where applicable, specific provisions for Indigenous Peoples in peace agreements.

---

**Disability**

As per OECD Disability DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this action is labelled as D0., Specific security and safety concerns related to people with disabilities should be addressed across the three thematic areas to the extent possible, as well as their right to participate in peacebuilding when appropriate and relevant for the objectives of each project. The concept of “inclusivity” needs to be read broadly, referring to aspects of gender, age, nationality, sexual orientation, language, religion, ethnicity, socio-economy, persons with disabilities, etc. It is very likely that children and youth seriously affected by conflict or forcibly recruited by armed groups might have suffered mental health trauma and physical injuries that could amount to disability.

---

**Reduction of inequalities**

Projects to be funded in the framework of this action should aim at reduction of inequalities, related to age, gender, ethnicity, religion, socio-economic and so on. Strengthening the role of civil society as an actor and beneficiary is conducive to reduction of inequalities and the promotion of social cohesion. Moreover, it increases the sense of inclusivity of a wider population to prevent and respond to conflict and crises and contributes to enhancing the capacities and agency of local actors to become agents of positive change and the building blocks of more peaceful and resilient societies.

---

**Democracy**

Projects to be funded in the framework of this action should uphold fundamental democratic principles such as transparent and accountable governance, participation and fair representation, balance of power, respect of human rights. Specific attention will be given to the risks related to the participation and activism of peacebuilders, including those working on human rights, on advocating against the shrinking space to civil society, on environment and climate degradation, on security forces accountability and so on.

---

**Conflict sensitivity, peace and resilience**

In line with the NDICI-GE regulations and the relevant requirements on conflict sensitive programming, projects to be funded in the framework of the action should be based on a solid understanding of local conflict dynamics, should do no harm and maximise opportunities to make positive contributions to build peace and resilience at all levels, while at the same time mitigating risks of unintended negative impacts. Heightened visibility of peacebuilders might have the undesired effect of making them more vulnerable or targets of violence. Specific conflict sensitivity assessments should be undertaken for specific areas of work as appropriate (e.g., security forces, DDR, community security, etc.). It will be implemented through a Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus approach, ensuring coordination, coherence and collaboration in order to reduce overall vulnerability of unmet needs, strengthen risk management capacities, build resilience and address root causes of conflict.

---

**Disaster Risk Reduction**

Projects to be funded in the framework of this action should take into account any risks of environmental degradation, climate change and natural disasters overall and aim to reduce those risks, especially when constituting an opportunity to strengthen communities’ resilience or achieving peacebuilding objectives.

---

### 3.4 Risks and Lessons Learnt

Category	Risks	Likelihood (High/ Medium/ Low)	Impact (High/ Medium/ Low)	Mitigating measures
----------	-------	---	-------------------------------------	---------------------

1	Deterioration of a security or political situation within countries/regions of implementation making it impossible or dangerous for implementing partners and final beneficiaries to conduct or take part in the planned activities.	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>	FPI regional teams, in close cooperation with relevant EU Delegations, will maintain regular contacts with, and ensure that, implementing partners put in place adequate security measures adapted to the level of identified risk.
3	Lack of a reasonable pool of local civil society actors working on peace-building and conflict prevention issues and capable of effectively implementing projects.	<b>Low</b>	<b>High</b>	Partnerships between well established international or national NGOs and local civil society actors in-country should be actively encouraged.
4	Unintended negative impact on women, youth and minorities, and peacebuilders, due to lack of inclusion and participation and/or increased vulnerability linked to greater activism.	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>	Carry out systematic conflict sensitivity assessments and monitoring;  Link up with EU funded and other protection mechanisms; ensure specific protection measures for local peacebuilders in a gender and age responsive way.
5	CSDN: lack of continuation of dialogue between civil society and EU policymakers outside the dialogue meetings that are part of the action.	<b>Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	On-going dialogue between members of the CSDN steering group will ensure that dialogue topics remain relevant to each part and that meetings are fruitful and constructive (notably via a targeted selection of topics and participants).
6	Civil society participants in the dialogue meetings face security threats in their home country.	<b>Low</b>	<b>High</b>	All necessary provisions will be discussed and anticipated with civil society from the given contexts to ensure a do not harm approach so as to ensure a safe and meaningful participation of civil society actors in dialogue meetings.

## Lessons Learnt:

A final sector evaluation of **support to in-country civil society actors in conflict prevention, peacebuilding and crisis preparedness** under the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP) for the period 2014-2020 underlines the following conclusions:

- EU ‘localisation’ efforts are not yet a clear objective/ambition across the portfolio and throughout the project cycle, thus reducing sustainability and potential impact. Nevertheless, the difficulties encountered by the implementation of the 2014-2020 IcSP projects were not unique to the EU and its partners. It is a serious common challenge to support local CSOs in building peace globally;
- EU under-utilises its size and status to (i) link/leverage its development and political efforts, and (ii) coordinate efforts within IcSP in-country/regional programmes and subsequent EU Delegation programming.

As a result, the following lessons learned were drawn:

- Local CSOs closely engaged in analysis, design, decision-making and monitoring took ownership of projects, which improved sustainability;
- Increasing funding directly to local CSOs can substantially increase reach and scale of activities;
- Inclusive dialogues with stakeholders that have an adequate thematic and operational capacity and activities sustained over time are critical for bridging across divides;
- Longer-term support, building on previous projects’ results, increases the chances of sustainability and enhances donor and implementing partners’ credibility;
- Identify and pursue links with government or donor relevant projects running in parallel, for instance through referral systems, ensuring alternative options in case of underfunding or termination of activities by referral programmes;
- EU political engagement can be even greater, ideally coupled with direct EU dialogue with local CSOs;
- Women empowerment is effective in several locations, but there are still significant hurdles to advance gender equality and challenge stereotypes, especially in growing religious and highly conservative environments.

After twelve years of implementation, the **Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN)** is well established as a relevant and effective platform for dialogue between EU and civil society on peace-building issues as proven by the continuous and increasing demand for CSDN events from both EU and civil society side. Drawing upon the experience of the previous four phases of the CSDN project and based upon findings and recommendations of the CSDN III final evaluation<sup>21</sup>, the key lessons learnt are the following:

- CSDN helps to fill a gap between civil society (from the EU and beyond, notably from countries affected by conflict) on one side and policy-makers within EU-institutions and Member States on the other. It facilitates access to relevant civil society conflict prevention and peacebuilding expertise to EU policy-makers and is highly relevant to the needs of both sides. The design of the CSDN responds to the complex realities of engagement in peacebuilding and conflict transformation;
- The European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO) has proven over the past years to be very well equipped to effectively manage the CSDN, turning it into an effective, inclusive and lively dialogue platform at EU level, reaching out to CSOs and experts beyond its own network of organisations and contributing to developing high quality policy work on peace-building and conflict prevention issues. EPLO has also invested in strengthening facilitation expertise for CSDN meetings to better manage convergent and divergent exchanges between stakeholders, and to connect outcomes with agenda design;
- The different organisational set-ups according to the topics discussed and purpose of the meetings, e.g. small-scale experts meetings, larger round-table discussions, policy and geographic meetings, meetings organised in Brussels and in EU Member States, are appropriate to fulfil target groups expectations and should be kept unchanged. The diversity of perspectives and experiences among participants – and its contribution to the high-quality of discussions – is frequently highlighted as positive;
- The following functioning principles have proved effective and shall be maintained: running CSDN dialogue meetings under the Chatham House Rule allows for active participation and frank discussions; a targeted selection of participants including field experts and representatives of grass root organisations, as well as the provision of background documents (such as discussion papers) and prior preparation of participants and speakers allow to enrich the debates and bring in pertinent analysis and recommendations.

<sup>21</sup> Final Evaluation of the Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) project Phase III, March 2020.

On direct **support to local peacebuilding actors**, as part of their periodic lesson learning exercises, the EU Early Warning System identified the need to work on a more bottom-up approach and complement EU conflict analysis with inputs provided by civil society organisations on the basis of data collected at grassroots level. This would better capture diverse perspectives on existing or emerging crises and conflicts and, at the same time, develop local capacities for conflict analysis and conflict prevention, through for example national/local conflict barometers, monitoring and critical discourse analysis in media or public discourse, observatories of conflict risk variables (including climate change and environment), etc. For such reasons, a direct support to local peacebuilding actors is critical not only for inclusive participation purposes but also for embracing more perspectives in EU conflict analysis and detecting early signs of tensions and conflict.

### 3.5 The Intervention Logic

The underlying intervention logic for this action is that if the EU continues to provide support to in-country civil society actors in key conflict prevention and peacebuilding areas, then relevant in-country capacities and processes will be more effective at tackling conflict and security challenges because:

- Local civil society actors themselves will be better able to engage on these areas on their own and in collaboration with others;
- Relevant state institutions and state led processes will benefit from civil society expertise, analysis and support;
- Partnerships between relevant actors active in specific fields will be strengthened and collective efforts and impact will be maximised.

In the longer term, continued support provided through the projects, capacity building and learning will contribute to further empower these local actors to become agents of positive change and the building blocks of more peaceful and resilient societies.

Moreover, if EU actors and civil society further strengthen its dialogue mechanism on conflict prevention and peacebuilding, then both parts will enhance their respective capacities to anticipate, prevent and respond to conflicts and crisis because they will be better informed about the risks and opportunities to promote stability and human security.

### 3.6 Logical Framework Matrix

This indicative logframe constitutes the basis for the monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the intervention. On the basis of this logframe matrix, more detailed logframes may be developed at contracting stage for each intervention under this action. In case baselines and targets are not available for the action, they should be informed for each indicator at signature of the contracts linked to this AD, or in the first progress report at the latest. New columns may be added to set intermediary targets (milestones) for the output and outcome indicators whenever it is relevant.

The indicative logical framework matrix may evolve during the lifetime of the action depending on the different implementation modalities of this action.

The activities, the expected outputs and related indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix may be updated during the implementation of the action, no amendment being required to the Financing Decision.

PROJECT MODALITY (3 levels of results / indicators / Source of Data / Assumptions - no activities)

Results	Results chain (a): Main expected results (maximum 10)	Indicators (a): (at least one indicator per expected result)	Baselines (values and years)	Targets (values and years)	Sources of data	Assumptions
<b>Impact</b>	To build and strengthen sustainable, in-country capacities for effective conflict management and peacebuilding, to contribute to the enhancement of EU and civil society capacities to anticipate, prevent and respond to violent conflict and crisis, and to better support conflict-affected countries in building peace	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of civil society actors supported (local and international) disaggregated by population groups (gender and age)</li> <li>2. Number of conflict prevention and peace processes supported</li> </ol>	To be determined according to each intervention's priority area and specific objectives	To be determined according to each intervention's priority area and specific objectives	Final reports	<i>Not applicable</i>

<p><b>Outcome 1</b></p>	<p>1.1 Strengthened institutional and operational capacity of in-country civil society actors with regard to the three thematic areas.</p> <p>1.2 Improved in-country civil society actors networking and advocacy skills, including increased civil society involvement in the three thematic areas relating to both long-term and short-term conflict prevention and peace-building.</p> <p>1.3 Enhanced cooperation between civil society actors and local, national, regional or international institutions on subjects related to the three thematic areas.</p>	<p>To be adapted to each country context and priority area(s)</p> <p>1.1.1 Number of appropriate locally-led measures identified and implemented by civil society to prevent conflicts and their outcomes</p> <p>1.1.2 % of targeted population expressing confidence in and satisfaction towards civil society's effectiveness in tackling conflict risks, managing conflicts and building peace (disaggregated by sex, age, ethnicity)</p> <p>1.2.1 Number of people directly benefiting from EU supported interventions that specifically aim to support civilian post-conflict peacebuilding and/or conflict prevention (disaggregated by sex, age and, if relevant and appropriate, other relevant criteria)</p> <p>1.2.2 Number and type of policy advocacy actions undertaken by in-country civil society actors and their outcomes</p> <p>1.2.3 Number of members of CSOs trained by the EU-funded intervention</p> <p>1.3.1 Number of civil society actors consulted by local/national authorities and involved in peace processes (e.g. conflict resolution initiatives, recovery plans)</p>	<p>To be determined according to each project's priority area and specific objectives</p>	<p>To be determined according to each project's priority area and specific objectives</p>	<p>Final reports</p>	

<p><b>Outcome 2</b></p>	<p>2.1 Strengthened dialogue between EU policy-makers and civil society actors on conflict prevention and peacebuilding issues.</p> <p>2.2 Strengthened capacities of civil society actors to engage in dialogue with EU policy-makers on conflict prevention and peacebuilding issues.</p> <p>2.3 Strengthened EPLO capacity to manage the CSDN through its networking, coordination and policy functions.</p>	<p>2.1. Number of EU decisions (e.g. policy, planning/programming/technical) informed by CSDN meeting recommendations</p> <p>2.2. Number of recommendations about improving EU policies and practices made by civil society actors</p> <p>2.3. Number of civil society participants in CSDN meetings and training seminars whose knowledge of the EU's peacebuilding policies and practices is increased</p>	<p>To be defined</p>	<p>To be defined</p>	<p>Final report</p> <p>Targeted follow-up questionnaires to CSDN participants combined with a regular analysis of EU policy documents</p> <p>Project evaluation</p>	<p>Sufficient and shared interest of the main CSDN stakeholders (including civil society actors, EU institutions and Member States) in exchanging on conflict prevention and peacebuilding issues</p>
<p><b>Outcome 3 (specific objective)</b></p>	<p>3.1 Peacebuilding capacities are supported through strengthening networks of local organisations.</p> <p>3.2 Learning is available on innovative financing solutions for local peacebuilders</p>	<p>3.1 Number of network members/CSOs joining the network, disaggregated by number of youth-led and women-led organisations</p> <p>3.2 Number of learning exchanges/consultations held as part of the innovative mechanism learning agenda</p>	<p>2023: XX network members, of which XX youth-led and XX women-led (TBC)</p> <p>XX learning exchanges and expert consultations</p>	<p>To be defined</p>	<p>Final report</p> <p>Annual Member Survey</p> <p>Output monitoring/data analysis of participation</p>	<p>Generating and exchanging knowledge results in improving network members' methodologies and ways of working as well as on the innovative funding mechanism for local peacebuilders</p>

<p><b>Outputs relating to Outcome 1</b></p>	<p>The direct tangible outputs will differ depending on the priority areas selected and the contexts of implementation. These should be along the following general lines:</p> <p>1.1 Institutional and operational capacity building interventions to better respond to challenges and opportunities in the three thematic areas;</p> <p>1.2 Peacebuilding interventions responding to the challenges and opportunities in the three thematic areas;</p> <p>1.3 Strategic capacity building interventions to strengthen advocacy engagement and networking among civil society actors.</p>	<p>Indicators will be defined according to the priority areas selected and the contexts of implementation and should include the following:</p> <p>1.1 Alignment of the intervention with the correct understanding of the conflict situation. (not at all, limited degree, medium, significant , fully)</p> <p>1.2 % of supported stakeholders which use new tools to address potential harmful content (disaggregated by sex, age, profile, geographical area)</p>		<p>To be defined</p>	<p>Final reports</p>	
---	---	--	--	----------------------	----------------------	--

<p><b>Outputs relating to Outcome 2</b></p>	<p>2.1 Strengthened CSDN as a mechanism for enabling civil society actors to engage in dialogue with EU policy-makers on conflict prevention and peacebuilding issues.</p> <p>2.2 Increased capacity of civil society actors involved in CSDN activities to contribute to the EU's peacebuilding policies and practices.</p> <p>2.3 Strengthened EPLO capacity to manage the CSDN through its networking, coordination and policy functions.</p> <p>2.4 Increased understanding by EU policy-makers and by civil society actors of conflict prevention and peace-building issues and the role of the EU in the world in this regard.</p>	<p>2.1 Number and regularity of CSDN meetings</p> <p>2.2 Number of CSDN meetings that are positively evaluated by participants</p> <p>2.3 Number of civil society participants in CSDN meetings and training seminars whose knowledge of the EU's peacebuilding policies and practices is increased</p> <p>2.4 Number of civil society participants in CSDN meetings and training seminars from non-EPLO member organisations</p> <p>2.5 Number of participants in CSDN meetings and training seminars who report that they have increased their knowledge of the EU's peacebuilding policies and practices, and/or broader issues relating to peacebuilding and conflict prevention.</p>	<p>1.1 18 in 22 months (March 2022)</p> <p>1.2 18 meetings (March 2022)</p> <p>2. 88% of respondents in 16 dialogue meetings and 100% of respondents in 3 training seminars (March 2022)</p> <p>3. 44% (March 2022)</p> <p>4. 90% of respondents in 16 dialogue meetings and 100% of respondents in 3 training seminars (March 2022)</p>	<p>To be defined</p>	<p>Final report</p>	<p>Sufficient consensus is achieved between CS, EU and MS agreeing on a schedule of themes and issues for dialogue</p>
---	--	---	--	----------------------	---------------------	--

<p><b>Outputs relating to Outcome 3</b></p>	<p>3.1 Strengthened individual and collective peacebuilding capacities and shared experience and expertise on how to build peace within and across regions.</p> <p>3.2 Strengthened regional and global policies and practices which are rooted in the learnings of locally-led and locally-grounded peacebuilding.</p> <p>3.3 Improved learning on an innovative funding mechanism for local peacebuilding.</p>	<p>3.1.1 % of members /CSO's engaged in learning activities of the network, disaggregated by number of youth-led and women-led organisations</p> <p>3.1.2 % of network members indicating an increased level of knowledge through network engagements</p> <p>3.1.3 number of joint peacebuilding actions initiated as a result of network engagements</p> <p>3.1.4 Network members apply lessons learned from network engagements in their own peacebuilding practice</p> <p>3.2.1 Number of interactions between local peacebuilders and global, regional and national policymakers (disaggregated by national/regional/global and by gender)</p> <p>3.2.2 Global, regional and national policymakers act on locally-led and locally-grounded peacebuilding (influencing practice)</p> <p>3.3.1 Number of participants in learning exchanges on the innovative funding mechanism</p>	<p>3.1.1 2023: XX% of which XX% youth-led and XX% women-led (TBD)</p> <p>3.1.2 2023: XX% (TBD)</p> <p>3.1.3 2023: 0</p> <p>3.1.4: 2023: 0 (Most Significant Change (MSC)/Impact stories</p> <p>3.2.1 2023: 0 (TBD) Most significant change (MSC)/Impact stories</p> <p>3.2.2 2023 0 (Most Significant Change (MSC)/Impact stories)</p> <p>3.3.1 XX participants in learning exchanges</p>	<p>3.1.1 2025: XX% of which XX% youth-led and XX% women-led (TBC)</p> <p>3.1.2 2025: XX% (TBC)</p> <p>3.1.3 2025: XX (TBC)</p> <p>3.1.4 2025: X Most significant change (MSC)/Impact stories per year</p> <p>3.2.1 XX (TBC) Most significant change (MSC)/impact stories per year of which: - 1 specifically related to localisation of the YPS and WPS agendas; - and 1 specifically related to integrating climate and risk-sensitive approaches to peacebuilding; - 1 specifically related to promoting support for locally-led peacebuilding</p> <p>3.2.2 same as above</p>	<p>Final report</p>	<p>Members are open to learning from other members and apply learning in their context.</p> <p>Members are willing and able to transfer knowledge within the network</p> <p>Policymakers have the power and are willing to change policies</p> <p>Windows of opportunity for policy implementation will open during the project period</p> <p>The peacebuilding expertise/knowledge that is imparted in policy fora is inclusive and representative of a diverse set of peacebuilding actors</p>
---	--	---	---	---	---------------------	--

## 4 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

### 4.1 Financing Agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not envisaged to conclude a financing agreement with a partner country regional organisation/territory

### 4.2 Indicative Implementation Period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 3 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 60 months from the date of adoption by the Commission of this Financing Decision.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission's responsible authorising officer by amending this Financing Decision and the relevant contracts and agreements.

### 4.3 Implementation Modalities

The Commission will ensure that the EU appropriate rules and procedures for providing financing to third parties are respected, including review procedures, where appropriate, and compliance of the action with EU restrictive measures<sup>22</sup>.

#### 4.3.1 Direct Management (Grants)

##### **Grants: (direct management)**

##### **(a) Purpose of the grant(s)**

The purpose of the grant is to build and strengthen sustainable, in-country capacities for effective conflict management and peace-building and continue to contribute to the enhancement of EU and civil society capacities to anticipate, prevent and respond to violent conflict and crisis and to support conflict-affected countries in building peace.

Actions aimed at reaching out and enhancing the dialogue with local civil society actors – in particular from conflict-affected countries – and where relevant with other stakeholders such as third countries authorities, international and regional organisations and private sector shall be encouraged.

##### **(b) Type of applicants targeted**

Civil society actors as defined in recital (46) of the NDICI Regulation 2021/947 are considered eligible under this Action. For international non-governmental organisation applicants, partnerships with local organisations established and active in the countries targeted will be particularly important in order to meet this measure's objectives.

Interventions will target: countries affected by/emerging from a conflict; countries affected by high levels of violence, or whose peace and stability is threatened; fragile states with weak capacity to perform core governance functions; countries in democratic transition, or where the lack of civic engagement and opportunities for participation in public life is seen as a factor threatening peace.

##### **(c) Justification of a direct grant**

Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the recourse to an award of a grant without a call for proposals is justified because the action has specific characteristics requiring a specific type of beneficiary for its technical competence and specialisation as per article 195, paragraph f) of the Financial Regulation (as specified under 1, 2 and 3).

1. Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to international and local civil society organisations selected using the following

<sup>22</sup> [www.sanctionsmap.eu](http://www.sanctionsmap.eu). Please note that the sanctions map is an IT tool for identifying the sanctions regimes. The source of the sanctions stems from legal acts published in the Official Journal (OJ). In case of discrepancy between the published legal acts and the updates on the website it is the OJ version that prevails.

criteria: experience working in, and good knowledge of, the country of implementation, expertise in community resilience and peacebuilding, expertise in inclusion and diversity and more particularly engaging children and youth on peace and security issues; capacity and credibility to foster trauma healing and psychosocial support as well as collaborations with mental health experts, experience working with and strengthening capacities of local civil society organisations, institutional and financial capacity to manage EU funds, including sub-granting.<sup>2</sup> Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, a grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to the **European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO)**. The recourse to an award of a grant without a call for proposals is justified because of EPLO's unique position and outreach capacity, as well as its high degree of specialisation and its proven technical competence in managing the CSDN project since 2010:

- Singularity and outreach: EPLO is the sole existing civil society network working on peace-building issues at European level. EPLO has a global reach: its members are active in all situations of conflict and working on all the thematic issues of importance to the EU. EPLO works in close cooperation with other civil society networks and organisations notably those working on development, human rights and humanitarian issues, and has consistently demonstrated an inclusive approach to dialogue, facilitating the participation of the best civil society experts, be they linked to EPLO or not. EPLO has proven to be well placed to bring together civil society, EU and international actors, and thereby to maintain and further develop a dialogue at European level, inclusive of all interested civil society actors in peace-building and related fields;
- Technical specialisation and expertise: EPLO's mandate is focused on bringing peace-building expertise into EU policy-making. EPLO has more than twenty years technical expertise and experience in the management of dialogue between its member organisations and other civil society actors in order to develop common positions on EU policy and EPLO's work. EPLO also has a strong track record of managing dialogue processes bringing together civil society and EU representatives ever since its establishment in 2001. Moreover, a majority of EPLO members work in partnership with local civil society and bring their representatives and expertise into EPLO's work;
- Technical competence: EPLO's technical competence in managing the CSDN has been confirmed by the evaluations referred to above and confirmed during phase IV of the CSDN that started in 2019. EPLO's technical competence is demonstrated also by its prominent profile both within and outside Brussels and frequency with which it is consulted by those interested in EU's peace-building work.

3. Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, a grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to the **Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC)**. The recourse to an award of a grant without a call for proposals is justified because of GPPAC's unique position as the only global member-led network fostering collaboration and learning between local peacebuilders across the globe, as well as its high degree of specialisation and its proven technical competence.

- Singularity and outreach: GPPAC is the sole existing global member-led network fostering collaboration and learning between local peacebuilders across the globe. GPPAC has a global reach: its 200+ members are active across the globe and organised across 15 regional networks. GPPAC is a truly locally-led global network of people building peace, and as such GPPAC has become a unique, key sector leader in light of the current policy debates on the localisation of peacebuilding and preventive action;
- Technical specialisation and expertise: GPPAC is a global network of local peacebuilders that comes together to mobilise against violence and armed conflict by 1) pooling locally-led and locally-grounded lessons from different places and spaces and by 2) using that collective learning to shape and transform peacebuilding policies, practices and infrastructures to help strengthen people's peace and security. GPPAC does so by focussing on three pathways of change 1) strengthen regional and cross-regional platforms for collective analysis and peer-to-peer exchange, learning and capacity development in order to deliver greater peacebuilding impact on the ground; 2) mobilise collective action to act as an effective force for peace and protection to civil society by forming a strong, adaptable, inclusive network, connected locally, regionally and globally; and 3) open up policy space for meaningful engagement of local peacebuilders at all levels to advance more locally-informed decision making and practise at local, national and regional levels;
- Technical competence: GPPAC's technical competence has been confirmed by positive evaluations that certifies that GPPAC has the financial and operational capacities to lead and manage both small and multi-million consortium projects. In addition, GPPAC is ISO 9001:2015 certified. GPPAC has a

track record of working together with partners at the global level (EU Member States, UN agencies, the World Bank, and other key peacebuilding donors), at the regional level (e.g. African Union and Association of South East Asian Nations), and the national and local level (e.g. community leaders, national governments, UN Country Offices, embassies). The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), GPPAC's main donor, has recently commissioned a helpdesk review of how SIDA's partners contribute to linking local and global peacebuilding in the implementation of the Strategy for Sustainable Peace. The study shows that networks like GPPAC are very conducive to local leadership in global spaces, as this modality prioritises the equal standing of all network members in organisational activities.

#### 4.3.2 Changes from indirect to direct management mode (and vice versa) due to exceptional circumstances (one alternative second option)

In case the selection of implementing partners as per the criteria and conditions set out above might not prove successful, changes from direct to indirect management mode will provide the possibility to identify other types of applicants according to the same criteria. Specific expertise on peace and security, conflict prevention and peacebuilding and inclusive approaches in the domain will be used as identification criteria to identify partners for either direct or indirect management.

#### 4.4 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply subject to the following provisions.

The Commission's authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of services in the markets of the countries or territories concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where application of the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult (Article 28(10) NDICI-Global Europe Regulation).

#### 4.5 Indicative Budget

<b>Indicative Budget components</b>	<b>EU contribution (amount in EUR)</b>
<b>Support to in-country civil society actors on three specific conflict prevention and peacebuilding themes, composed of</b>	
Grants (direct management) – cf. section 4.3.1	16 700 000
<b>Support to the Civil Society Dialogue Network on conflict prevention and peace building (CSDN V)</b>	
Grant (direct management) – cf. section 4.3.1	2 500 000
<b>Support peacebuilding capacities through strengthening networks of local organisations</b>	
Grant (direct management) – cf. section 4.3.1	1 300 000
<b>Grants – total envelope under section 4.3.1</b>	<b>20 500 000</b>
<b>Evaluation</b> – cf. section 5.2 <b>Audit</b> – cf. section 5.3	May be covered by another Decision
<b>Totals</b>	<b>20 00 000</b>

## 4.6 Organisational Set-up and Responsibilities

The European Commission Service for Foreign Policy Instruments will oversee the Action. In order to promote synergies with other actions, other relevant Commission services and the EEAS will be regularly updated.

The selection and subsequent management of the projects to be funded under priority 1 - **support to in-country civil society actors**, under this measure will fall under the responsibility of FPI Regional Teams unless a regional/local focus cannot be ensured, in close cooperation with relevant EU Delegations, the European External Action Service (EEAS) and EU Commission Services. In some instances, deconcentration of signature of interventions to the Head of Delegation can be envisaged. FPI regional teams will monitor and report against the projects specific objectives and expected results, in line with those set out in this document.

With regard to priorities 2 and 3, they will fall under the responsibility of FPI Headquarters. For CSDN, a close cooperation and mutual agreement between European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO), the European Commission represented by the Service for Foreign Policy Instrument, and the EEAS will be at the core of CSDN functioning. For GPPAC, FPI will maintain frequent contacts and participate in project meetings.

As part of its prerogative of budget implementation and to safeguard the financial interests of the Union, the Commission may participate in the above governance structures set up for governing the implementation of the action and may sign or enter into joint declarations or statements, for the purpose of enhancing the visibility of the EU and its contribution to this action and ensuring effective coordination.

## 5 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

### 5.1 Monitoring and Reporting

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process, and part of the implementing partner's responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partners shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (Outputs and direct Outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the logframe matrix (for project modality) and the partner's strategy, policy or reform action plan list (for budget support).

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

Roles and responsibilities for data collection, analysis and monitoring:

Data collection, analysis and monitoring will be the responsibility of, and carried out by, each project's implementing partners and will be financed under the regular budget of each project. In the case of multi-country projects, implementing partners will be requested to present how monitoring and data collection will be operated.

### 5.2 Evaluation

Having regard to the nature of the action, an evaluation will not be carried out for this action or its components.

The Commission may, during implementation, decide to undertake such an evaluation for duly justified reasons either on its own decision or on the initiative of the partner.

The Commission shall inform the implementing partner at least 30 days in advance of the dates envisaged for the evaluation missions. The implementing partner shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as

access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports may be shared with the partners and other key stakeholders following the best practice of evaluation dissemination<sup>23</sup>. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, apply the necessary adjustments.

The financing of the evaluation may be covered by another measure constituting a Financing Decision.

### 5.3 Audit and Verifications

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audit or verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

## 6 STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

The 2021-2027 programming cycle will adopt a new approach to pooling, programming and deploying strategic communication and public diplomacy resources.

In line with the 2022 guidance document “[Communicating and Raising EU Visibility: Guidance for External Actions](#)”, it will remain a contractual obligation for all entities implementing EU-funded external actions to inform the relevant audiences of the Union’s support for their work by displaying the EU emblem and a short funding statement as appropriate on all communication materials related to the actions concerned. This obligation will continue to apply equally, regardless of whether the actions concerned are implemented by the Commission, partner countries, service providers, grant beneficiaries or entrusted or delegated entities such as UN agencies, international financial institutions and agencies of EU member states.

However, action documents for specific sector programmes are **in principle** no longer required to include a provision for communication and visibility actions promoting the programmes concerned. These resources will be consolidated in Cooperation Facilities established by support measure action documents instead, allowing Delegations to plan and execute multiannual strategic communication and public diplomacy actions with sufficient critical mass to be effective on a national scale.

---

<sup>23</sup> [https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation\\_guidelines/wiki/disseminating-evaluation](https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/wiki/disseminating-evaluation)

## Appendix 1 REPORTING IN OPSYS

A Primary Intervention (project/programme) is a coherent set of activities and results structured in a logical framework aiming at delivering development change or progress. Identifying the level of the primary intervention will allow for:

Articulating Actions or Contracts according to an expected chain of results and therefore allowing them to ensure efficient monitoring and reporting of performance;

Differentiating these Actions or Contracts from those that do not produce direct reportable development results, defined as support entities (i.e. audits, evaluations);

Having a complete and exhaustive mapping of all results-bearing Actions and Contracts.

Primary Interventions are identified during the design of each action by the responsible service (Delegation or Headquarters operational Unit).

The level of the Primary Intervention chosen can be modified (directly in OPSYS) and the modification does not constitute an amendment of the action document.

The intervention level for the present Action identifies as (tick one of the 4 following options);

<b>Action level (i.e. Budget Support, blending)</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single action	Present action: all contracts in the present action
<b>Group of actions level (i.e. top-up cases, different phases of a single programme)</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Group of actions	Actions reference (CRIS#/OPSYS#):
<b>Contract level</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 1	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 2	
	(...)	
<b>Group of contracts level (i.e. series of programme estimates, cases in which an Action includes for example four contracts and two of them, a technical assistance contract and a contribution agreement, aim at the same objectives and complement each other)</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Group of contracts 1	