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The CIVCAP Network

The Civilian Capacity Network (CIVCAP Network) works alongside governments, the UN and others to realize common interests in the CIVCAP agenda and to promote initiatives that will improve civilian capacity provision in crisis and post-conflict settings.

The CIVCAP Network partners are:

- African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (South Africa)
- Centre for Strategic and International Studies (Indonesia)
- Igarapé Institute (Brazil)
- Institute of Contemporary International Studies (Russian Federation)
- International Institute for Strategic Studies (China)
- Istanbul Policy Centre, Sabanci University (Turkey)
- Norwegian Institute for International Affairs (Norway)
- United Service Institution of India (India)

This seminar report was written by Paul Keating and Cedric de Coning from NUPI.

The CIVCAP Network Annual Seminar in Brasilia, November 28th-29th 2012 was co-organized by NUPI and Igarapé Institute and hosted by Igarapé:

This seminar was made possible due to the generous financial contribution from:
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Introduction

On November 28th-29th 2012 the Igarapé Institute hosted the inaugural Annual Seminar of the Civilian Capacity Network (CIVCAP Network) in Brasilia, Brazil.¹

The CIVCAP Network works together with governments, the United Nations (UN), and others to realise common interests in terms of the CIVCAP agenda and to promote initiatives that improve civilian capacity provision in crisis and post-conflict settings. At the opening of the seminar participants were reminded that the goals of the CIVCAP Network are to:

- understand national perspectives on CIVCAP;
- influence and support the CIVCAP agenda domestically; and
- impact international CIVCAP processes.

For the first time the seminar in Brasilia brought together CIVCAP Network partners,² official representatives of the CIVCAP Network countries, UN representatives, and experts on rosters and training.

The objectives of the 2012 Annual Seminar were to:

1. present the CIVCAP Network’s baseline research and share updates on recent CIVCAP developments;
2. discuss national perspectives on key CIVCAP issues; and
3. agree on future activities for the CIVCAP Network.

This report provides an overview of discussions during the one-and-a-half day seminar. The full list of participants can be found in Annex 1 and the Agenda in Annex 2.

¹ The event was co-funded by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI), the Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Centre (NOREF) and the German Centre for International Peace Operations (ZIF).

² 2012 CIVCAP Network partners were the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (South Africa), the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (Indonesia), the Igarapé Institute (Brazil), the Institute of Contemporary International Studies (Russia), the International Institute for Strategic Studies (China), the Istanbul Policy Centre, Sabanci University (Turkey), Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (Norway) and the United Service Institution of India (India).
The UN CIVCAP initiative

In order to situate the seminar discussions within the wider CIVCAP context, a representative of the UN Civilian Capacity (UN CIVCAP) initiative was invited to provide an overview of the UN’s approach and an update on recent developments.

It was noted that the UN CIVCAP initiative derives from several international developments over the past decade:

1. the evolution of the international peacebuilding discourse;
2. the recognition of the interconnectedness of development and security, including the continued growth of peacekeeping mandates with civilian peacebuilding roles;
3. the fact that the stabilisation of interventions over the past decade has revealed the limits of certain approaches to institution-building; and
4. the rise of middle-income countries, many of which have undergone their own major political transitions or have managed complex institutional reforms and inclusive peacebuilding and development activities.

The UN CIVCAP initiative builds on lessons learned from implementing peacebuilding and peacekeeping mandates. Some of these lessons include the recognition of the complexity of post-conflict institution-building and the need for “right fit” solutions; the dangers of capacity substitution and the failure to support the emergence of national capacity; the recognition that sustainability is not only a financial issue, but also a cultural and political issue; the difficulties faced by the UN and others in finding specialist experts with appropriate post-conflict experience; and the realisation that the “right” CIVCAP personnel will often come from domestic line functions in governments and may need special preparation for overseas service.

The UN CIVCAP approach has a limited scope. It focuses on post-conflict and crisis settings, not on more stable development settings. It pursues a narrow set of priority areas, i.e. the rule of law, security, inclusive political processes, core government functionality and economic revitalisation after conflict. It does not focus on basic social services or long-term assistance programmes. CIVCAP is not about replacing the roles of uniformed peacekeepers, but is concerned with making peace operations more successful through the better execution of related civilian functions. Although the main focus is on obtaining government personnel, there is also interest in engaging civil society actors.

CIVCAP is also about promoting a global agenda for improving civilian capacity in post-conflict settings. As such, it seeks to support and harness global civilian capacity and global knowledge from multilateral, regional and national sources.
The UN CIVCAP initiative is at an important juncture and needs member state support in 2013 if it is to maintain momentum. The second Report of the Secretary-General has been submitted to the UN General Assembly and is being considered in the current session. The report seeks endorsement by member states for a set of modest proposals to advance CIVCAP across three broad work streams:

1. supporting country-based CIVCAP solutions (particularly in support of several new and transitioning UN missions);
2. changing UN internal processes to better support CIVCAP objectives (including planning, budgeting and financing improvements, and human resources innovation to bring on board government-provided personnel in peace operations); and
3. partnerships (including the launch of CAPMATCH as a first step in a matching process designed to meet civilian capacity requirements).

Baseline Study findings

Participants reviewed the findings of the CIVCAP Network’s first joint research activity: the Baseline Study on CIVCAP’s state of play among its partner countries.

From July to November 2012 six national case studies were produced (for Brazil, India, Indonesia, Russia, South Africa and Turkey). A synthesis report was produced to formulate general findings and observations drawing on the case studies and wider research. The following central observations were reaffirmed in the course of seminar discussions:

1. There is a good level of general support for CIVCAP among Network countries. CIVCAP is regarded by and large as an extension of existing South-South co-operation and technical co-operation programmes already implemented by these countries, albeit across a significantly wider range of activities than the UN CIVCAP framework.
2. The CIVCAP agenda needs to move quickly from the theoretical to the practical if interest is to be sustained. The UN and other “demand-side” partners need to begin to solicit CIVCAP assistance for real cases in order to gauge the availability of supply in practice and not just focus on in-principle commitments. In this regard the UN needs to play an ongoing facilitating role for CAPMATCH if the latter is to be a useful tool.
3. Network partners and the wider Global South are already significant contributors of overseas civilian capacity support. Network countries are primarily bilateral providers of assistance, while smaller/least-developed countries provide a high proportion of UN field staff and government-provided personnel (GPP).

4 In addition, a case study of a francophone country was contributed by the Peace Operations Network: Etienne Tremblay-Champagne, Baseline Study on Civilian Capacity: The Case of Burkina Faso, 2012.
4. The UN CIVCAP concept is not sufficiently broad to capture fully the CIVCAP-related activities of the countries studied. A wider construct is needed to capture what Network countries are doing through their technical co-operation programmes.

5. Bilateral assistance is likely to remain the predominant approach for Network partners in providing civilian capacity, although regional and UN CIVCAP deployments are also of real interest to several of the partners.

6. The need for strong national co-ordination and deployment support systems is recognised and these are being put in place in a number of countries, but tools for managing larger and more complex scales of CIVCAP deployment (e.g. rosters and standing training systems) are unlikely to become a priority until demand is substantial enough to warrant such investments.

### National case studies

**CIVCAP Network partners provided updates on their case studies for the Baseline Study.** The six draft studies will be finalised and circulated among CIVCAP Network members in early 2013. Partners will publish their case studies through their own channels, and these case studies will be available on partners’ websites and on the forthcoming CIVCAP Network website.

#### National case studies for the Joint Baseline Study


In addition to the updates from the Network partners, colleagues representing the CIVCAP Network countries provided further insights from each of their national perspectives. A brief summary for each of the Network countries follows.

In **Brazil**, the process of building both political will for and technocratic interest in CIVCAP is proceeding well. An informal inter-ministerial co-operation task force is in place and partner ministries are interested in participating and see its relevance. Challenges are being addressed, ranging from the need to review legislation to mobilisation issues and incentives-based challenges for encouraging ministries and individuals to deploy overseas. Training for civilians also remains an issue, but dialogue is under way to collaborate with the Brazilian military peacekeeping centre on training issues. Although Brazil’s focus has primarily been on bilateral civilian deployments, its priority in the multilateral arena is the deployment of Brazilian civilians with UN peace operations.

**India** has five decades of experience in implementing its technical co-operation programmes and has large numbers of both civilian and military personnel in UN missions. India’s focus is on the provision of overall national capacity and it does not see utility in maintaining sharp distinctions between civilian and military approaches to providing such capacity. For civilian capacity deployment, India’s top priority is dispatching governmental personnel, because civil society actors can apply through other channels. The UN’s force-generation model is seen as an appropriate modality for UN peace missions to adapt for mobilising civilians. India has noted how few UN requests have been made for CIVCAP to date.

For **Indonesia**, CIVCAP is still a new concept for the Indonesian government and civil society. At both the UN and policy level there is real interest in CIVCAP. Indonesia is pursuing a three-pronged approach – multilateral, regional and national. The government is steadily building the necessary national policy and legislative frameworks to engage with CIVCAP, and has set about identifying technical co-operation programme priorities. Alongside the policy and legislative work, already plans are under way to train and deploy civilians in peacebuilding or post-conflict settings. Already five Indonesian civilians have been deployed to Mindanao, and discussions are under way regarding Timor Leste and Afghanistan. Indonesia is interested in triangular co-operation opportunities.

**Russia** has only quite recently re-emerged as a significant provider of international assistance (it was a major provider of such assistance prior to the 1990s). In 2006, in advance of the G8 meeting in St Petersburg, a concept note on overseas assistance was produced as the basic framework. Although Russian assistance has increased steadily, national policy and institutional management decisions are still pending. Upcoming political events (e.g. Russia’s G20 chairmanship in 2013, and those of the G8 and BRICS in 2014) will become an impetus for clarifying the country’s overseas and technical co-operation approaches. Russia’s overseas co-operation focus has switched from being primarily multilateral to bilateral. This shift has been driven by concerns arising from the country’s experiences with UN entities regarding efficiency and value for money, as well as concerns about Western bias and the visibility of Russia’s contributions.

**South Africa** has adopted a “Three-Plus-One” focus within its international co-operation priorities. In order of priority, these are: (1) bilateral; (2) contributing to the African Standby Force via the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC); and (3) the African Union (AU), with a secondary focus on the
UN. South Africa is actively reviewing its policy and institutional machinery in this field. A new South African Development Partnership Agency has been established and a revision of the national South African peacekeeping policy of 1999 has now been submitted to parliament that contains much more focus on civilian capacity than before. The Department of International Relations and Co-operation is also developing a policy focusing more narrowly on civilians in peacekeeping. Within government, a process of co-ordinating technical co-operation efforts uses joint task teams to overcome silos and provide capacity.

**Turkey** has for two decades provided significant overseas assistance and technical co-operation that draws on both governmental and civil society capacities. Turkish popular pressure to be involved in overseas co-operation has been a real driver of this focus, as has deliberate government policy. Turkish civil society actors are highly autonomous in responding to situations abroad and Turkish NGOs are found in many post-conflict/crisis settings. At the government level Turkey has developed a more positive disposition to UN peacekeeping over time, including a growing comfort with the idea of sending civilians. Turkey has had some experience in working with rosters and training for civilians deploying on higher-risk overseas missions such as in Afghanistan. Turkey’s institutional arrangements for co-ordinating and managing its international co-operation activities are currently under review.

**Issues arising during seminar discussions**

An important objective of the seminar was to discuss CIVCAP-related issues from the perspective of Network countries. The following were some key issues raised:

There is a definitional hurdle that has practical implications for CIVCAP. Network partners prefer to work with an expanded definition of CIVCAP that emphasises both bilateral and multilateral CIVCAP, and which should take note of the other capacity-related activities undertaken by partner countries – including short-term missions, workshops, training programmes, study tours, etc., because these all contribute to building national capacity and take place across a wider range of activities than the five CIVCAP priority areas. If CIVCAP is too narrowly construed (e.g. if it only focuses on a small number of long-term specialist deployments), then it will be difficult for supplying countries to justify investing in the necessary policy, legislative and administrative changes to enable CIVCAP domestically. One partner felt that the CIVCAP concept should also be broadened to include military contributions to civilian capacity support.

There are also broader awareness and conceptual challenges. Proponents of CIVCAP should recognise that the new concept is being overlaid on well-established, pre-existing approaches to international co-operation (South-South co-operation, technical co-operation, peacekeeping, etc.) and that national stakeholders will view CIVCAP through these lenses at the national level. In dealing with national stakeholders, CIVCAP proponents should use established concepts/terminology rather than expecting others to readily adopt new terms that have little resonance beyond New York. Several partners noted that many of their national interlocutors in relevant governmental roles had limited or
no knowledge of CIVCAP. Others noted that some interlocutors were already engaged in CIVCAP- and peacebuilding-related work, but they did not know of or prefer not to use that terminology.

**Political will is a prerequisite for progress.** Different partner countries have varying levels of political interest at this time. For some partners, political (as well as technocratic) interest and commitment are still being built. For others, the will is there and work is now under way to overcome bureaucratic, legal or other hurdles. For yet others, the machinery to support CIVCAP is reported to be in place and they simply await specific requests for CIVCAP from the UN side.

**Accountability is an important underlying principle for CIVCAP.** Many participants referred to the importance of accountability in CIVCAP efforts – i.e. accountability to the host country and population, as well as to sending governments and institutions. Some partners felt strongly that deploying government personnel or government-sponsored personnel would help increase the accountability of staff in the field in order to produce good results. Others queried whether such accountability would be to their home government or to the host country.

**There is insufficient focus on national capacity in the CIVCAP discussion.** Although national ownership and national capacity are key themes in CIVCAP, several partners noted that they appear to be among the less-developed areas of implementation. Tools for nationally driven needs assessments, identifying extant national capacity and assessing capacity needs are often rudimentary. Others noted that there is insufficient focus on understanding national and local perceptions of international support, as well as a lack of tools to assess wider demand for capacity/assistance beyond the level of central governments.

**Clarifying demand and obtaining specific requests are now important to test CIVCAP.** Several participants noted that without more information about the level of likely demand, it is hard for supplying countries to clarify further what they have to offer. Several suggested that this now needs to be done in practice, and theoretical discussions of requirements should not continue (i.e. that specific requests for CIVCAP are needed, not in-principle discussions of needs). Others noted the difficulty of projecting the likely demand to the supply side, given that each situation is so different.

**Partner countries prefer to field requests for capacity across a broad spectrum, not just in niche areas.** In response to suggestions that countries should identify their niche areas of specialisation, several partners noted that they have very broad potential for supplying assistance and that requests would be considered case by case. It was noted that smaller countries might find it useful to focus on niche contributions, but most felt that larger CIVCAP providers would prefer to remain open to a wider range of requests.

**Significant improvements are under way in national systems for managing overseas assistance.** For some partners there is ongoing policy-level deliberation about the best ways to manage overseas co-operation in the future and priorities for their engagement. For others, new governmental entities have recently been established with stronger national co-ordination roles and these will be important interlocutors for CIVCAP. There was some interest in sharing experiences about how these co-ordination
focal points were assigned and in sharing experiences as they begin to exercise their strengthened co-ordination roles.

The challenges of both scale and long-term sustainability in crisis and post-conflict settings remain underexplored. While most partners have good experience with short-term deployments in higher-risk (political, security and reputational risk) settings, fewer have been tested with long-term, multiple rotation deployments of large numbers of civilian personnel in these environments. Scale and sustainability in risky settings can bring additional mobilisation challenges and increased administrative overhead and duty-of-care (security, insurance, health, etc.) considerations, as well as higher demands for pre-deployment preparation. Several partners have experience in this area and others are examining the implications further.

Civil society inclusion is a challenge. Although several countries strongly endorsed the notion of civil society inclusion in CIVCAP, others noted the difficulties of doing so, including challenges of co-ordination, quality control and means of funding. For UN missions too it is as yet unclear what sort of modalities might be used to bring on board civil society capacity (other than direct recruitment and consultancy options for individuals). Others partners described dynamic relations with civil society, which in some settings are autonomous from government, while in others they co-operate closely (such as in combining first-, second- and one-and-a-half track diplomacy). Most partners felt that civil society had not been very engaged in CIVCAP dialogues thus far, although CIVCAP Network partners are notable exceptions to this, since they have played an analytical and at times advocacy role on CIVCAP domestically.

Regional organisations are not yet significant actors in the CIVCAP discussion. With the notable exception of South Africa’s high-priority engagement with the AU and SADC, other regional organisations relevant to Network partners are not significant players in CIVCAP at this time. The UN-centric nature of the CIVCAP debate to date has perhaps exacerbated this. The AU has followed the same direct hiring approach as the UN for its civilian staff, although in future there may be greater expectation of member states to provide certain civilian capacities in support of AU missions. Combining regional resources for civilian training may be one area in which a regional approach may be effective, and there may be the possibility of exploring this in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the Americas.

Training priorities are relatively clear, but capacity is limited. A relatively clear set of training priorities was identified: the focus should be on preparation for the context and not on technical skills development (technical skills should be assumed, and addressed through recruitment); preparedness training should focus on the specific country context, on post-conflict issues and on the context of working in international organisations); while language skills are critical, together with cultural sensitivity, motivation and attitude training. Some noted that pre-deployment training had proven to give a better return on investment than general training courses. Others suggested that once-off training is not sufficient and it may need to be followed up (including potentially through remote training options). Training for national/local staff was identified as important to ensure that a combined national/international team can function. Some felt that the UN should guide training standards, although the UN felt that it would have limited capacity in-house to do this beyond setting basic standards. Overall capacity for civilian training is relatively low (especially if compared to uniformed personnel training)
and there may be a need for new approaches, such as regional approaches, or a division of labour using centres of excellence, or else co-operation with uniformed personnel training facilities.

Rosters are not in use at present, but may emerge as scale increases. A suggested good practice for roster establishment and management was discussed, based on Norway’s experience, which focused on the need to:

1. establish partnerships (with co-operation modalities);
2. recruit suitable capacity (either to rosters or initially to specific positions);
3. develop deployment procedures;
4. establish performance-management system;
5. develop a roster-management system; and
6. ensure sufficient funding and contributions.

Several partners indicated that they had explored or were thinking about rosters, but foresaw difficulties with these. Others noted that they did not have a central roster, but could draw on the rosters/databases of other stakeholders. It was noted that ZIF has produced a roster-management handbook that is publicly available.6

CIVCAP Network future roles

The future role of the CIVCAP Network and possible future activities were discussed during the seminar and at the subsequent CIVCAP Network Partners Meeting on November 29th 2012.

One partner described the group’s raison d’être as “understanding, influencing and impacting” on the CIVCAP agenda. Another partner suggested that the roles could be “partnering, networking, advocacy and training”. The UN representative exhorted the Network to work as an active partner at both the international and domestic levels through “advocacy for national support to CIVCAP, providing support to governments in the use of CAPMATCH and other tools, documenting and recording experience and assisting with civilian training”.

In various presentations and interventions specific ideas were tabled about how to leverage the baseline research prepared by the CIVCAP Network, as well as possible roles that could be played by each of the CIVCAP Network partners in future.

In this regard the Network should:

- build on existing research by continuing to track each country’s CIVCAP deployments and by documenting innovations and successes in national deployments;
- examine the practical implications of CIVCAP deployments by conducting a more in-depth analysis of CIVCAP requirements in a selected sector;

• exchange good practice across Network countries on co-ordination structures, deployment mechanisms, and supporting tools such as training and rosters;

• promote and support wider stakeholder engagement on CIVCAP domestically so as to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of relevant CIVCAP issues;

• advocate for the use of CAPMATCH and encourage support for the GPP approach by advocating for constructive engagement in UN forums and working with governments to use the CAPMATCH tool domestically; and

• identify opportunities for mobilising resources, including through trilateral CIVCAP partnerships either as recipients or funders of CIVCAP by third countries.

Proposed activities for 2013

At the Partners Meeting on November 29th the CIVCAP Network partners took the following in-principle decisions to inform their work planning for 2013, subject to the availability of resources:

RESEARCH

1. Partners agreed to finalise national case studies by early 2013. Funding is in principle available for the translation of the baseline study research into national languages. Interested partners should provide cost estimates to NUPI.

2. CIVCAP Network partners will continue to update their national baseline research by tracking CIVCAP deployments and produce an update in the second half of 2013.

3. As an extension of the baseline study, partners could undertake CIVCAP reviews with neighbouring countries (e.g. Ukraine and Kazakhstan by Russia).

4. Studies of national lessons learned and the documentation of national good practice on CIVCAP were encouraged for each of the Network countries.

WORKSHOPS/SEMINARS

1. A workshop on the rule of law and justice was proposed to examine in practical detail the issues involved in supporting CIVCAP in this sector. The workshop would involve representatives from the UN and a limited number of sector experts from interested Network countries.

2. A seminar linked to the BRICS Summit in Durban was agreed with the objective of raising the profile of the CIVCAP agenda in the BRICS research/academic forum.

3. A meeting in Asia was proposed to continue dialogue on the CIVCAP Baseline Study and discuss regional experiences further.

4. CIVCAP Network partners agreed to arrange national events in order to engage national stakeholders on CIVCAP issues.
PARTNERSHIPS

1. Partners agreed that the Network’s research should be used to engage and influence other possible partner forums, including the International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centres and the International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations. It was agreed that ACCORD and NUPI would follow up with these entities.

2. Although Network partners agreed to maintain the group’s current size and composition, it was agreed that the Network should remain open to inviting other countries to join on a case-by-case basis and that it should actively reach out to interested countries and institutions (including, for example, the League of Arab States and Egypt, which had expressed an interest).

ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES

1. It was agreed that one of the thematic/regional meetings suggested for 2013 would also serve as the annual meeting for next year and would include only Network partners.

2. The CIVCAP Network website and logo and their usage were agreed by partners.

3. Partners agreed to provide NUPI with an assessment of the value of their baseline research and its impact on national stakeholders for inclusion in donor reporting.

4. A revised work plan and cost estimates will be submitted to the donor for approval based on the proposed 2013 work plan, which will be finalised once the availability of funding is confirmed.
Annexes

Annex 1: List of seminar participants

1. Seun Abiola, Senior Programme Officer, Peacekeeping Unit, ACCORD
2. Pinar Akpinar, Assistant Manager of International Conflict Resolution Practice and Research Center, Yalova University, Turkey
3. Lina Alexandra, Researcher, Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) – Jakarta, Indonesia
4. Melissa Andrade, Consultant, Igarapé Institute and Network for the Humanization of the Development, Brazil
5. Dr. Bülent Aras, Chairman, Center for Strategic Studies, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkey
6. Sumila Bahadu, Member of the United Services Institution of India, CIVCAP Project Team, India
7. Gustavo de Carvalho, Coordinator: Peacebuilding Unit, ACCORD
8. Dr. Cedric de Coning, Head, Peace Operations and SSR Research Group, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI), and Peacekeeping & Peacebuilding Advisor, ACCORD
9. José Joaquim Gomes da Costa Filho, Third Secretary, International Peace and Security Division, Brazilian Ministry of External Relations
10. Julia Costa, Brazilian National School of Public Administration (ENAP)
11. Luis Henrique D’Andrea, Chief of International Cooperation, Brazilian National School of Public Administration (ENAP)
12. Commander Sandeep Dewan, Research Fellow, United Services Institution of India
13. Nolufefe Dwabayo, Director, National Office for Coordination of Peace Missions (NOCPM), Department of International Relations & Cooperation, South Africa
14. Dr. Renata Dwan, Senior Project Officer, Civilian Capacities Project, United Nations
15. Ingvild Magnæs Gjelsvik, Research Assistant, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)
16. Irina Gorelova, Director of Development, Center of World Politics and Public Diplomacy, Russian Federation
17. Dr. Eduarda Passarelli Hamann, Coordinator of International Cooperation Programme, Igarapé Institute, Brazil
18. Ramadansyah Hasan, Head of Sub-Directorate for International Security, Directorate of International Security and Disarmament, Indonesian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
19. John Karlsrud, Head of Training for Peace Programme, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)
20. Col. Gopal Karunakaran (Retd), Director, Shiv Nadar School, NOIDA, U.P, Indonesia
21. Paul Keating, Research Associate, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)
22. Lisa Kirkengen, Project Coordinator at NORDEM, Norwegian Centre for Human Rights, University of Oslo
23. Marianne Kvan, Senior Adviser, Section for Security Policy and North America, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
24. Anneli Lyster, Adviser, Emergency Response Department, Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
25. Mlungisi Cedric Mbalati, Political Counsellor, Permanent Mission of South Africa to the United Nations
26. Eugenio Mengarini, Defense College, NATO
27. Rodrigo Moraes, Institute for Applied Economic Research (Ipea), Brazil
28. Minister Norberto Moretti, Head of the International Peace and Security Division, Ministry of External Relations of Brazil
29. Marina Motta, Research Assistant, Igarapé Institute, Brazil
30. Mikkel Pedersen, Adviser, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)
31. Galina Prozorova, Senior Research Fellow, Centre for Eurasian Studies, Diplomatic Academy, Russian Federation
32. Antonio Jorge Ramalho da Rocha, Pandia Calógeras Ministry of Defence, Brazil
33. Dr. Ivan Safranchuk, Deputy Director, Institute of Contemporary International Studies, Diplomatic Academy, Russian Federation
34. Dr. Mustafa Şahin, Director of the Development Research Centre, Ministry of Development, Turkey
35. Ebru Saner, Project manager, Bridging South-South Cooperation and Emerging Donor Roles, UNDP Turkey
36. Bríg (Retd) Virender Kumar Saxena, Member of the United Services Institution of India, CIVCAP Project Team, India
37. Dr. Yury Shcherbanin, Director, Centre for World Economy Diplomatic Academy, Russian Federation
38. Maíra Siman, Researcher at the BRICS Policy Centre, International Relations Institute- (IRI/PUC-Rio), Brazil
39. Meri Binsar Simorangkir, Deputy Director, Directorate Technical Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Indonesia
40. Lt. Gen. (Retd) PK Singh, Director, United Services Institution of India
41. Sissel Hodne Steen, The Norwegian Embassy in Brazil
42. Anna Subbotina, Junior Fellow in the Center for East Asian and SCO studies, Russian Federation
43. Rudi Sukandar, Associate Researcher in the Maarif Institute, Jakarta
44. Sharon Wiharta, Head of Policy and Best Practices, Challenges Forum Secretariat, Folke Bernadotte Academy
45. Brooke Smith-Windsor, Defense College, NATO
Annex 2: Agenda for the CIVCAP Network Annual Seminar, 2012

28 NOVEMBER 2012

09:00-09:30 Welcome  
Minister Norberto Moretti, Head of the International Peace and Security Division, Ministry of External Relations of Brazil  
Dr. Eduarda Passarelli Hamann, Coordinator of the International Cooperation Program, Igarapé Institute  
Dr. Cedric de Coning, Head, Peace Operation and SSR Group, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)

09:30-10:30 Session 1: Situating Civilian Capacity within the wider international system  
Dr. Renata Dwan, Senior Project Officer, Civilian Capacities Initiative, United Nations

10:30-10:45 Official Photo

10:45-11:15 Coffee break

11:15-13:00 Session 2: The Baseline Study on Civilian Capacity  
Overview: Paul Keating, Research Associate, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)  
& Sharon Wiharta, Head of Policy and Best Practices, Challenges Forum Secretariat, Folke Bernadotte Academy  
BRAZIL: Dr. Eduarda Passarelli Hamann, Coordinator of the International Cooperation Program, Igarapé Institute  
INDIA: Commander Sandeep Dewan, Research Fellow, United Services Institution of India  
INDONESIA: Lina Alexandra, Researcher, Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) - Jakarta  
RUSSIA: Dr. Ivan Safranchuk, Deputy Director, Institute of Contemporary International Studies, Diplomatic Academy  
SOUTH AFRICA: Gustavo de Carvalho, Coordinator: Peacebuilding Unit, ACCORD  
TURKEY: Paul Keating, Research Associate, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) presenting the findings from Turkey

13:00-14:30 Lunch

14:30-16:00 Session 3: National Policies and Approaches to Mobilizing Civilian Capacity  
BRAZIL: Minister Norberto Moretti, Head of the International Peace and Security Division, Ministry of External Relations  
INDIA: Lt. Gen. (Retd) PK Singh, Director, United Services Institution of India  
INDONESIA: Dr. Ramadansyah Hasan, Head of Sub-Directorate for International Security, Directorate of International Security and Disarmament, Indonesian Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
NORWAY: Marianne Kvan, Senior Adviser, Section for Security Policy and North America, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
RUSSIA: Dr. Yury Shcherbanin, Director, Centre for World Economy Diplomatic Academy
**SOUTH AFRICA:** Nolufefe Dwabayo, Director, National Office for Coordination of Peace Missions (NOCPM), Department of International Relations & Cooperation

**TURKEY:** Dr. Bülent Aras, Chairman, Center for Strategic Studies, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

16:00-16:30  Coffee break
16:30-17:15  **Session 3: National Policies and Approaches to Mobilizing Civilian Capacity (continued)**
17:15-17:30  Wrap-up & Closing Session Day 1
19:00-22:00  Dinner at the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Brasilia

29 NOVEMBER 2012

09:00-09:15  **Reviewing Day 1 / Administrative Remarks**
09:15-10:00  **Session 4: Training for Civilian Capacity**
Seun Abiola, Senior Programme Officer, Peacekeeping Unit, ACCORD
Col. Gopal Karunakaran (Retd), Director, Shiv Nadar School, NOIDA, U.P.
10:00-10:30  Coffee break
10:30-11:30  **Session 5: Organizing and Deploying Civilian Capacity, and the Role of Rosters**
Lisa Kirkengen, Project Coordinator at NORDEM, Norwegian Centre for Human Rights, University of Oslo
Anneli Lyster, Adviser, Emergency Response Department, Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
11:30-12:30  **Session 6: Civilian Capacity: The Way Forward**
12:30-13:00  Concluding remarks
Dr. Eduarda Passarelli Hamann, Coordinator of the International Cooperation Program, Igarapé Institute
Dr. Cedric de Coning, Head, Peace Operation and SSR Research Group, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)
13:00-14:00  Lunch
14:00-16:00  Civilian Capacity Network Partner’s Meeting
19:00-22:00  Dinner (out of the hotel)