

## I

(Resolutions, recommendations and opinions)

## RESOLUTIONS

## EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

**The evaluation of the PEACE Programme**

P6\_TA(2008)0205

**European Parliament resolution of 20 May 2008 on the evaluation of the PEACE Programme and strategies for the future (2007/2150(INI))**

(2009/C 279 E/01)

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to Article 158 of the EC Treaty,
- having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 of 21 June 1999 laying down general provisions for the Structural Funds <sup>(1)</sup>,
- having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 2081/93 of 20 July 1993 amending Regulation (EEC) No 2052/88 on the tasks of the Structural Funds and their effectiveness and on the coordination of their activities between themselves and with the operations of the European Investment Bank and the other existing financial instruments <sup>(2)</sup>,
- having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 2082/93 of 20 July 1993 amending Regulation (EEC) No 4253/88 laying down provisions for implementing Regulation (EEC) No 2052/88 as regards coordination of the activities of the different Structural Funds between themselves and with the operations of the European Investment Bank and the other existing financial instruments <sup>(3)</sup>,
- having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 214/2000 of 24 January 2000 on Community financial contributions to the International Fund for Ireland <sup>(4)</sup>,
- having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 2236/2002 of 10 December 2002 concerning Community financial contributions to the International Fund for Ireland (2003-2004) <sup>(5)</sup>,
- having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 1105/2003 of 26 May 2003 amending Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 laying down general provisions on the Structural Funds <sup>(6)</sup>,

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 161, 26.6.1999, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 193, 31.7.1993, p. 5.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 193, 31.7.1993, p. 20.

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ L 24, 29.1.2000, p. 7.

<sup>(5)</sup> OJ L 341, 17.12.2002, p. 6.

<sup>(6)</sup> OJ L 158, 27.6.2003, p. 3.

Tuesday 20 May 2008

- having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 173/2005 of 24 January 2005 amending Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 laying down general provisions on the Structural Funds concerning the extension of the duration of the PEACE programme and the granting of new commitment appropriations <sup>(1)</sup>,
  - having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 177/2005 of 24 January 2005 concerning Community financial contributions to the International Fund for Ireland (2005-2006) <sup>(2)</sup>,
  - having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 1968/2006 of 21 December 2006 concerning Community financial contributions to the International Fund for Ireland (2007 to 2010) <sup>(3)</sup>,
  - having regard to Regulation (EC) No 1082/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on a European grouping of territorial cooperation (EGTC) <sup>(4)</sup>,
  - having regard to the Commission's Communication entitled A Special Support Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland (COM(1994)0607),
  - having regard to the Commission's Communication entitled Report on the International Fund for Ireland pursuant to Article 5 of Council Regulation (EC) No 177/2005 (COM(2006)0563),
  - having regard to Court of Auditors' Special Report No 7/2000 concerning the International Fund for Ireland and the Special Support Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland and the border counties of Ireland (1995 to 1999), together with the Commission's replies thereto (paragraph 58) <sup>(5)</sup>,
  - having regard to the public hearing on evaluation of the PEACE programme and strategies for the future organised by the Committee on Regional Development of the European Parliament on the 20 November 2007,
  - having regard to the Task Force for Northern Ireland (TFNI) created after the visit of Mr Barroso, President of the Commission, to Belfast in May 2007,
  - having regard to Rule 45 of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Regional Development (A6-0133/2008),
- A. whereas the EU programmes PEACE I and II, funded under Council Regulations (EC) Nos 1105/2003 and 173/2005, were aimed at securing peace and included two main elements: taking the opportunities arising from peace and addressing the legacy of conflict and violence,
- B. whereas the EU's participation in the PEACE programmes was and is of great positive value and the EU connection with such peace-building projects, in addition to providing a financial instrument, further demonstrated the EU's importance as a neutral authority with the expertise and long-term vision necessary for designing the programme,
- C. whereas the reconciliation process operates at various levels, and whereas it must be actively encouraged but cannot be imposed <sup>(6)</sup>,

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 29, 2.2.2005, p. 3.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 30, 3.2.2005, p. 1.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 409, 30.12.2006, p. 86.

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ L 210, 31.7.2006, p. 19.

<sup>(5)</sup> OJ C 146, 25.5.2000, p. 1.

<sup>(6)</sup> Reconciliation after Violent Conflict, International IDEA, 2003, Stockholm.

Tuesday 20 May 2008

- D. whereas peace-building and reconciliation are by their very nature precarious but are essential in overcoming the political, economic and social problems in the region, and whereas projects for building confidence should therefore be given room for experimentation and for innovation in order to get started,
- E. whereas the conflict in Northern Ireland created segregated communities, leading to deep social, economic and political divides,
- F. whereas contact and confidence-building can result in changing negative views and whereas fostering mutual understanding among young people helps future leaders to understand the history and culture of both communities,
- G. whereas working in partnership with local communities may take more time as it involves more participants and procedures, although it is evident that the extra benefits obtained are essential, since delegating to a lower level of management and raising the level of participation increases awareness of both the programmes and the EU,
- H. whereas previously marginalised groups and people greatly affected by the conflict and violence have been empowered by the PEACE programmes to contribute to actively building peace; whereas projects under the PEACE programmes are serving the most marginalised segments of society by developing activities for individuals and groups such as victims of conflict, older and vulnerable people, the disabled, victims of domestic violence, ex-prisoners and unemployed young people <sup>(1)</sup>,
- I. whereas many people who have worked in peace-building and reconciliation projects have done so on a voluntary basis,
- J. whereas it is vital that peace building programmes, in particular those involving community and voluntary groups, continue to be financially supported when PEACE funding comes to an end,
- K. whereas the voluntary and community sectors are renowned for their achievements in confronting social decline and deprivation and are well-placed to develop and provide frontline services for the most disadvantaged in society, and whereas women have a very positive role in peace-building,
- L. whereas the PEACE programmes have assisted in the development of economic projects in deprived areas by establishing new enterprises,
- M. whereas many community and voluntary initiatives funded under PEACE II are operating on an ongoing basis providing essential community services for marginalised groups in particular and are awaiting confirmation of funding so that they can continue providing these services,
- N. whereas one aspect of the economic development resulting from the support granted under the PEACE programmes, was that it benefited both urban and rural areas,
- O. whereas funding under the International Fund for Ireland (IFI) is often complementary and both programmes, IFI and PEACE, made it possible for projects to reach a stage where they could access other EU funding, such as Interreg,
- P. whereas many of the actions in the PEACE sub-programmes, the IFI programmes and the Interreg initiative, have shown a high degree of similarity and some degree of duplication of activities in certain areas,

---

(1) The EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation — The impact, SEUPB.

Tuesday 20 May 2008

- Q. whereas accountability and transparency, participation, recognition of the interdependence of all people, successful elimination of inequality, promotion of diversity and attention to vulnerable groups and equal opportunities are important elements in peace-building and reconciliation,
- R. whereas the report of the Interim Commissioner for Victims and Survivors<sup>1</sup> stated that support groups for victims and survivors have a dependency on non-recurring PEACE funding and found a lack of clarity as regards how projects for victims and survivors would proceed when PEACE funding is no longer available, and whereas four new commissioners for victims have recently been appointed by the First and Deputy First Ministers of Northern Ireland (<sup>1</sup>),
- S. whereas the protection and promotion of human rights are an integral part of peace-building and the rebuilding of post-conflict societies,
1. Stresses that local empowerment is an essential part of peace-building and that the participation of civil society improves policy-making and the way in which society is governed;
  2. Points out that the development of various implementation mechanisms together with the voluntary sector, non-governmental organisations and local authorities has provided wide-ranging experience of dealing with EU funds; hopes that such bottom-up provision mechanisms may be used in the implementation of other funding programmes;
  3. Welcomes the contribution made by the PEACE and IFI programmes to economic and social development; notes that one enterprise centre established, before the implementation of the IFI, in a deprived area developed with the support of the IFI and the local district council into a network of thirty two enterprise centres, which helped boost confidence and hope amongst those involved;
  4. Emphasises that the cooperation between participants in programmes financed by PEACE and IFI should not cease when the programmes comes to an end; calls on government departments to maintain that work, which proved to be effective, in order to ensure that mainstream funding continues for this invaluable work once all PEACE funding comes to an end;
  5. Calls on the governments of both the United Kingdom and Ireland to put in place temporary funding arrangements for community and voluntary groups in particular in order to bridge the gap between the end of PEACE II funding programmes and the beginning of PEACE III funding programmes;
  6. Calls on the Commission and the governments of the United Kingdom and Ireland to engage with the Commissioners for Victims and Survivors with a view to finding a mechanism for victim and survivor support groups to continue to receive financial support after the termination of all PEACE funding;
  7. Calls on the Commission, in relation to the TFNI, to replicate the active citizenship approach of the PEACE I and PEACE II programmes, when structuring future initiatives; recalls the importance for the stabilisation of the peace process of balanced regional development including attention to infrastructure which is underdeveloped in comparison with that of other regions in the EU, and calls on the TFNI to be more positive in its support for infrastructure improvement;
  8. Calls for the further development of cross-border work, given that cross-border work has been central to the regeneration of urban and rural communities in the border areas; urges the further development of cooperation between local chambers of commerce and public sector bodies as well as forums for the voluntary and community sectors on both sides of the border and for voluntary organisations that already work on a cross-border basis;
  9. Calls on the Government of Ireland to implement Regulation (EC) No 1082/2006 immediately;

(<sup>1</sup>) Support for Victims and Survivors — Addressing the Human legacy, January 2007.

Tuesday 20 May 2008

10. Urges the widespread use of consultation, both large and small-scale and with a local focus, within the funding programmes and emphasises the importance of securing schemes that allow for the approval of small grants to fund work that is needed at short notice and work where its results cannot be easily quantified as well as schemes that allow for long-term sustainability and can make a contribution to local communities;
11. Calls for a reduction in bureaucracy to ensure that small projects are not overburdened;
12. Recognises that peace-building is a long-term, evolutionary process and that robust development towards peace and reconciliation takes time; calls for a longer time-frame for individual grants in order to allow projects to make a difference; recognises that not only economic initiatives but also cultural and sporting initiatives can make a significant contribution to peace and reconciliation and should therefore continue to be promoted;
13. Notes that the social economy sector is a sub-sector of the voluntary and community sectors the consultation of which is important in order to develop local strategies and areas; considers that other local businesses are also influential participants;
14. Emphasises that development in rural areas requires greater synergies between agricultural, rural and regional development funding and between nature conservation, ecotourism and the production and use of renewable energy than has been the case to date;
15. Emphasises that people should have easy access to information on the success stories of projects funded by PEACE I and PEACE II as well as the IFI; believes that the experience gained from such projects should be shared with those engaged in other international peace-building work; calls, in this connection, for the establishment of a database as a learning tool for peace and reconciliation work at home and abroad; calls, in addition, for every level of participation to be included in the creation of regional and metropolitan networks;
16. Recommends that comprehensive strategies be put in place to ensure not only that examples of good-practice are available, but also that they are used at every stage of the project cycle, i.e. project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation;
17. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the Committee of the Regions, the European Economic and Social Committee and the governments and parliaments of the Member States.

---

## Trade in raw materials and commodities

P6\_TA(2008)0209

### European Parliament resolution of 20 May 2008 on trade in raw materials and commodities (2008/2051(INI))

(2009/C 279 E/02)

*The European Parliament,*

— having regard to its resolutions of 3 September 2002 on trade and development for poverty eradication <sup>(1)</sup>, of 30 January 2003 on world hunger and the elimination of barriers to trade with the poorest countries <sup>(2)</sup>, of 10 April 2003 on the crisis in the international coffee market <sup>(3)</sup>, of 1 June 2006 on trade and poverty: designing trade policies to maximise trade's contribution to poverty relief <sup>(4)</sup>, of 15 February 2007 on the macroeconomic impact of the increase in the price of energy <sup>(5)</sup>, of 22 May 2007 on Global Europe — external aspects of competitiveness <sup>(6)</sup>, of 23 May 2007 on the EU's Aid for Trade <sup>(7)</sup> and of 29 November 2007 on Trade and Climate Change <sup>(8)</sup>,

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 272 E, 13.11.2003, p. 277.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ C 39 E, 13.2.2004, p. 79.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ C 64 E, 12.3.2004, p. 607.

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ C 298 E, 8.12.2006, p. 261.

<sup>(5)</sup> OJ C 287 E, 29.11.2007, p. 548.

<sup>(6)</sup> OJ C 102 E, 24.4.2008, p. 128.

<sup>(7)</sup> OJ C 102 E, 24.4.2008, p. 291.

<sup>(8)</sup> Texts Adopted, P6\_TA(2007)0576.