



European Network of Civil Peace Services (EN.CPS)

Civilian Peace Services (CPS)

State-of-art, Achievements and Challenges in Europe.

June 2014



This document aims at shining a light on the CPS realities across Europe.

To analyse the developments, challenge and achievements in all our countries is essential to reflect about the CPS state-of-art in Europe and, thus, to design the future of EN.CPS.

In April 2014 the coordinator of this project prepared and sent to all EN.CPS Member Organizations (MOs) a questionnaire in order to gather information about the CPS' initiatives implemented by the MOs and to assess the state of CPS at national and European levels. By the end of May 10 MOs from 8 countries replied: APS (Austria), PDCS (Slovakia), BSV (Germany), ZDF (Germany), HRIDC (Georgia), NOVACT (Spain), PATRIR (Romania), Un ponter per... (Italy), CSDC (Italy) and MAN-UCP Committee (France).

A working group composed by representatives of MOs volunteered to support the coordinator to review the filled questionnaires received, to systematize the replies and analyze the available data in order to develop the present document.

In that sense, the whole document, including all data reported and the analysis regarding challenges, achievements and conclusion, does solely reflect the views, the knowledge and the data known and reported on the questionnaires by the MOs who participated in the survey.

*Romeral Ortiz Quintilla (PATRIR, Romania)
Katarína Bajžíková (PDCS, Slovakia)
Ilaria Zomer (CSDC and Tavolo ICP, Italy)*

Project coordinator: Graziano Tullio (CSDC - Italy)

*contacts: sc@en-cps.org
www.en-cps.org*

1. Introduction

The European Network for Civil Peace Services (**EN.CPS**) is an international network of **NGOs with the common goal of promoting Civil Peace Services (CPS)** on national, European and European Union levels as an instrument of nonviolent conflict intervention. For this purpose, EN.CPS network members co-operate transnationally in the fields of information sharing, political advocacy, and awareness raising as well as training and joint projects for the deployment of qualified civil society personnel in conflict areas.

Civil Peace Services (CPS) are publicly supported civil society driven long term conflict intervention initiatives that work on the transformation of conflicts with nonviolent means and aim at the reduction of violence.

CPS interventions have the aim to support stakeholders in conflict areas at the grassroots and middle-range levels of society so that they can engage in constructive dialogue, peacebuilding and reconciliation processes.

In different countries the CPS concept has slightly different meanings, however, all existing CPS schemes have the same overall aim of enhancing civil society capacities for handling violent conflict and its legacies.

In some countries CPS includes initiatives with volunteers whereas in other countries CPS is understood as a professional service of adult men and women.

By promoting the establishment and use of Civil Peace Services, the EN.CPS and its network members work in a pragmatic and constructive way for a culture of peace, for dialogue between people in conflict, for the support of democracy and for the respect of human rights and human dignity.

2. State of Art in EN.CPS MO countries

2.1. Germany: the most advanced framework for CPS

In Germany Civil Peace Service (CPS) stands for long-term deployment of trained peace consultants who cooperate with local partners to enhance dialogue and civil society structures in conflict regions.

In this context, the Institutional Framework of Civil Peace Service in Germany seems to be the most advanced.

Since 1999 there is the governmental program of Civil Peace Service, funded by the state (Ministry for Development) and run by 7 Non-Profit-Organisations; Forum CPS is the initiator and a strong promoter of the program. Program is institutional but projects are managed by civil society organisations.

CPS in Germany is rather well known, internationally speaking, in peace organisations and important political agencies, but not really in the national broader society and political stakeholders, in spite of civil society endeavours since many years.

The positive evaluation of the impact of the CPS Program has brought to the constituency of a Communal Conflict Advising within Germany by Peace Consultants in 4 places, bringing to an application of peace work not only abroad but also on national level. Investments on local level in Germany are quite interesting and have a counterpart also in the less developed Italian framework. In fact in Italy also local institutions, especially Regions and Municipalities,

are quite active on topic of peace civil services and NCCI. Some ex:
Provincia di Bolzano funded for years (not anymore) an university course for peace workers.
The Municipality of Bertinoro funds the Course "International Peace Mediator
The Municipality of Napoli is funding a peacebuilding project in the Balkans.
Years back CSDC and Assopace have published the feasibility study on local government and CPS (white helmet).

2.2. France and Italy: similar situation but recent developments in Italy

France and Italy seem to have a similar situation, but the recent developments in Italian CPS recognition look to bring to some important steps forward.

In France, there is civil service dedicated to social projects in general. This could be used to develop CPS but at the moment there is no institutional recognition. The UCP Committee advocacy work focuses on raising awareness on UCP and nonviolence effectiveness in conflict areas (national and international level). Organizations use international volunteer status to send peacekeepers on the field.

In Italy, according to national law, Civil Service should be considered an (unarmed and nonviolent) instrument for State defence as the military forces.

However, until now civil service volunteers are mainly employed in social work and there was only a limited space for peacebuilding projects within the National Civil Service: from 2004 to 2011 was working the Advisory Committee of Unarmed Nonviolent Civil Defence under the National Civil Service Office and Council of Minister Presidency. The Committee has developed researches and one on-field experimental project of Peace Civil Service on 2011-12 involving 6 volunteers in Albania working of the violent phenomenon of blood feud.

The very turning moment was December 2013 when the Italian Government approved funding for 9 million Euros in three years for Civilian Peace Corps' pilot projects to be implemented in the framework of the National Civil Service.

Talks are currently taking place between the National Office for Civil Service, the Min. of FFAA and CSOs to structure a system that would allow CPS pilot projects to start within the end of 2014. This result is due to the constructive action of a group of about 100 parliamentarians from different parties, who call themselves "[Parliamentarians for Peace](#)", they are at the moment very important civil society interlocutors.

If we consider on the side of campaigning and lobbying: in 2007 Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs established the Tavolo Interventi Civili di Pace" (Tavolo ICP) as a place of dialogue between the Minister FFAA, the National Office for Civil Service and civil society organizations working on Nonviolent and Civilian Conflict Intervention.

This mechanism helped in get approved by the Minister FFAA a project proposed by the CSO's gathered in the Tavolo ICP aimed at raising awareness on Civil Peace Intervention on the public sphere: workshop in school, residential advanced course and a tool-kit were developed within this project.

Differently from Italy, where, at least some small campaign have been funded, partners from France denounce the lack of energy and funds to develop an important CPS campaign, to gather other civil society organizations working on civil services or international volunteering, to give visibility to nonviolent projects and results, to do a dynamic follow-up with key political representatives. On the other side in France there has been a real trying to build network at European level with politicians working on European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps in 2012-2013. For example has been met Mrs Striffler (European parliament, reporter of this initiative) and she has been put in connection with NP in Brussels.

Italian civil society framework seems to be much more structured around the issue of CPS than French counterpart. The main actor on this topic is Tavolo Interventi Civili di Pace. The platform *Tavolo Interventi Civili di Pace* includes about 30 national CSOs, which are interested in promoting Civilian Peace Services/Corps/Interventions and occasionally organize events and participate in advocacy activities on this topic. Since 2013 a wider network of organizations working on disarmament acknowledged the importance of CPS as a constructive alternative to military action and decided to converge with the platform for civil peace interventions. Together with national networks and forums of the more general field of Civil Service has been launched a national campaign for Civil Nonviolent Defence on April 25. The idea is to submit to the Parliament a draft law to establish a department for Civil Nonviolent Defence, including the Italian Civil Service, the Civilian Protection body, and a new division of Civilian Peace Corps.

Tavolo ICP from 2007 is lobbying to get institutions recognize the role of nonviolent civilian in conflict zone and to make the institution acknowledge this on-field peace work as an official form of “defence of the State”.

On 2012 Tavolo ICP has developed a document in which CSOs find a common framework for nonviolent civilian intervention. This document shapes a model for Italian Civilian Peace Intervention including principles, values, standard and activities.

Instead of the efforts and the structure of civil society organisations, similarly to Germany, in public opinion there is still a lack of knowledge about peacebuilding and unarmed civilian intervention (UCP), from here comes the prejudice shared by many politicians that CPS is only a utopian idea of the anti-war movement.

In Italy, the actual funding, for CPS pilot projects don't solve the main problem: there is no law that describes and institutionalizes NCCI (Nonviolent and Civilian Conflict Intervention), inside or outside the peace Civil Service. Therefore, the actual funding for 3 years (2014-15-16) risks to be over after the end of the first triennial experimentation.

Moreover, the actual Italian model of civil service puts a lot of limits to the actions of volunteers (especially connected to security standards) that cannot be considered coherent with NCCI.

From here come the risk that the absence of an institutional framework leaves space to the single initiative of civil society organizations creating a fragmented situation where is difficult to find a common model of Italian intervention.

2.3. Austria: developments in connection with new defence strategies

In Austria the process of development of the new [“Strategic Guideline on Security and Development”](#) in 2010, the discussion and decision on a new Austrian Security Strategy (decided in 2013) and the ongoing discussions on a “Comprehensive Concept for Austrian Deployments Abroad” (military and civilian, state and non-state) have facilitated the foundation of the “Austrian Peacebuilding Platform” (APP) in January 2014, in which relevant state (ministries of Exterior, Interior, Defence, Education; Austrian Development Agency) and non-state actors (ASPR Schlaining, Center for Peace Research and Peace Education Klagenfurt, Kelman Institute, FOR/APS, ...) are members and which should serve as a platform for exchange of information and the promotion of civilian peacebuilding measures. Among the 7 goals defined for the platform the 3rd reads: “Developing and putting into practice of new options for foreign deployments, for example Civil Peace Services”. The structure seems to be similar to Dutch one. At the same time, some kind of “pilot projects” for CPS have started: the FOR Peace Presence in Colombia (one year terms of volunteers in the accompaniment of the peace community of San José de Apartadó and other organisations), and the Ecumenical Accompaniment Programme in Palestine and

Israel/EAPPI Austria (three months deployments of Ecum.

Accompaniers from Austria in the WCC programme in the West Bank). By they seem to be managed only by civil society organisations. Austrian Development Agency (ADA) funded a cooperation with CNA Sarajevo/Belgrade, as well as for the Colombia accompaniment project (which was not easy to communicate, because it is a bit “out of the way” of what the Austrian Development Agency usually fund, but in their guidelines they have the topic “Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention”, and with the help of the responsible person in ADA for this guideline we succeeded).

There is a quite good contact with the Green Party and their general support, and some individual MPs of Social Democrats.

Generally spoken, Austria’s foreign policy seems to undergo some change at the moment in regard to take (again) a more pro-active role in matters related to “peace issues”.

From the civil society point of view the “scene” in Austria is relatively small in regard to these topic, mostly active are Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR Schlaining); partially some other members of Austrian Peacebuilding Platform.

Ha been raised awareness in public opinion about CPS and also a certain recognition in political (governmental) circles through the above mentioned activities, that there is a general acceptance of a concept/instrument of CPS, but there is still a gap to the real decision makers in politics (ruling parties, especially those who decide about money). But there is still not enough political will on the top level to allocate a budget point to realize CPS despite of the verbal encouragement and approval.

Awareness raising in public also mostly happened on a project level than a political level, except for the participation in the policy processes described above.

The main challenge is a lack of resources: personal and financial. There is no public funding (yet) for CPS, and the organisations doing some pilot projects have very small budgets and therefore a lack of capacities to implement a really visible CPS.

2.4. Slovakia: CPS implementation through peace education

CPS as a concept in Slovakia is not yet part of public discussion neither of national policies. Slovakia is lacking the peace tradition, which could shape the public discourse towards achievements in this area. Nevertheless, the peace movement and peace education is part of global education, which is also stated in National Strategy in Global Education (2012 – 2016) adopted by Government in 2012.

CPS in Slovakia is trying to find the space of possible implementation in realm of development education and awareness raising and facilitation of participatory public processes. In both areas developments are in very initial phase.

The main achievements are the possibility to deploy civil experts abroad and adoption of Law on volunteering in 2011.

2.5. Georgia: interest on nonviolence and Human Rights defence but not specifically on CPS

The Georgian government declared that peaceful resolution of conflicts, peacebuilding and non-violence are parts of the public policy of the Government. But it is still not clear, from the information we got, which kind on effects have, on the field of CPS, Government Declarations. Some decisions have been taken on recognition of Human Rights and anti-discrimination policy but it seems not to be a clear institutional involvement on supporting civil interventions in conflict zones.

2.6. Romania: no framework to implement a CPS program

2.7. Spain: CPS as new defence structure in Catalonia

Conclusions: challenges to face for CPS programs at national level

The main challenges could be identified in four main areas:

- 1) Lack of resources: personal and financial;
- 2) Absence of institutional framework;
- 3) Lack of political support and interest in CPS programs and;
- 4) Lack of visibility of CPS program.

Given all that, there is the need for awareness-raising initiatives towards citizens and decision makers in order to increase the interest of wider public and politicians in CPS, non-violent actions and culture of peace in general.

To conclude, it seems that the EN.CPS members are facing at national levels very similar problems, to overcome them one of the possible steps could be a closer cooperation on CPS-alike projects currently implemented by members and to identify solutions to make national actions more visible across the EN.CPS network. Also sharing know-how could be an asset for some of the members and possible starting point for future joint projects.

To conclude, we present hereafter a scheme that gives an overview of the CPS main challenges and achievements at institutional and civil society levels.

Main challenges

Country	Institutional level	Civil Society level
Austria	Lack of resources at personal and financial levels: no public funding (yet) for CPS.	Organisations doing some pilot projects have very small budgets and therefore a lack of capacities to implement a visible CPS.
Germany	The stability of money – and that the positive effects of peace projects are not enough reflected in a foreign and defence policy that is really changing from military to civil means. Instead military intervention is proposed by the vast majority of politicians.	
Italy	No law that describes and institutionalizes NCCI (Nonviolent and Civilian Conflict Intervention), inside or outside the peace Civil Service.	The lack of knowledge and culture about peacebuilding in Italy, and the prejudice by politicians that civilian means are not so advanced and effective and the military ones.
Georgia		Need to raise awareness among citizens to participate in decision-making process.
France	Energy and funds to develop an important CPS campaign.	To gather other civil society organizations working on civil services or international volunteering, to give visibility to nonviolent projects and results, to do a dynamic follow-up with key political representatives.
Romania	No framework for implementing a CPS programme.	
Spain	Institutional recognition for funding and Political backing.	
Slovakia	Lack of capacities within emerging global or development education, awareness raising and cooperation to focus and get professionalize in area of CPS.	Explaining to wider public importance and relevance of CPS in Slovak context.

Main achievements

Country	Institutional level	Civil Society level
Austria	Knowledge and awareness in political circles that CPS exists as one instrument of an active peace policy, that it gets mentioned in (some) official papers as a good idea, but not yet adequately supported from public money.	
Germany	To keep the money for German CPS stable.	An evaluation of CPS projects etc. was on the whole very much favourable and positive in its outcome.
Italy	In December 2013 the Italian Government approved funding for 9 million Euros in three years for pilot projects of Civilian Peace Corps, to be implemented through the National Civil Service.	Tavolo ICP document on principle and standards of Civilian peace Intervention.
Georgia	Since 2012, the government implemented serious reforms in the field of anti-discrimination and adopted the strategy and action plans on various fields of human rights.	
France	No important achievement.	
Romania	No important achievement.	
Spain		The work being done at civil society level for eventual implementation as 'Defence' in a new State (Catalonia).
Slovakia	Recognized need and role of facilitator in various participatory process of decision-making.	

3. Scenarios and perspectives at European level

The EN.CPS members from Georgia consider that promoting a CPS at European level would probably be the most effective option to support civilian nonviolent interventions and into developing a strong civil society at European level.

Nonviolent interventions are seen as a viable alternative at EU level, and would continue to use this 'build-up' of experience to propose alternatives to military peace (MO Spain perspective).

MO from Germany observed that **there is the need to continue proposing concrete alternatives to armed and military interventions** as European citizens have mobilized against war but need to be properly informed about these alternatives solutions in order to effectively back it up.

For some others (MO Italy and Austria), **at European level the CPS seems to have been on stand-by in the past few years, not gathering enough interest. CPS at national level seems perhaps more feasible.**

To build momentum, there is a suggestion that each MO should be working at national level in order to reach the European stage.

Examples of actions taken by some members (France) in that sense are:

- Development of nonviolent projects in order to strengthen visibility to the positive results;
- Introducing nonviolent standards in University programs and other international organizations and;
- Emphasizing nonviolence effectiveness to gain a better support of institutions.

But this strategy depends on the country that is under the focus; in fact, for some MO a work on national level could be challenging due their limited impact at such level.

However, European institutions have recently created an EU Aid Volunteers programme. For some members (Italy) these spaces could represent an opportunities among others to develop an advocacy strategy to incorporate at nonviolent civilian interventions that would go in the sense of CPS considering peacebuilding and humanitarian work as two faces of the International Cooperation for Development framework.

In the same way, peacebuilding activities could be introduced in an eventual future European Civilian Service that is being extensively discussed these days among Italian institutions and CSOs. It may be easier to start by building CPS as a sub-section of these other programmes. From that observation, a suggestion from Italy MO would be that instead of developing a full new proposal of European CPS that might be quite complicated to take off, **CPS could rather be promoted by mainstreaming nonviolent alternatives within existing programmes** or new ones where there is room for that.

Other channels to implement nonviolent civilian alternatives going beyond CPS could be through the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and **Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP)**.

On this regard the two MOs from Italy and the MO Austria joins this idea: **through new debate around CSDP there would be a chance to enlarge its civilian dimension based on the Comprehensive approach**. There might be some interest in endorsing this perspective also from some Parties in the EP.

The challenge would then to **lobby EU making readable how the civilian dimension of the CSDP can contribute to the reduction of violent conflict** and to long-term peacebuilding in conflict-affected countries.