

This page is under construction

Support to the discussion of security aspects in the frame of the peace process

Agreements in any Peace Agreement are usually strong promises or commitments to work for a compromise. They are leading to the silencing of the arms. As such they are a very big relief to the people. But the negotiation of how to *do and materialise* these things, how to implement the promises and compromises, is taking place only afterwards. This usually take a lot of time and energy.

The parts in the agreements of Nepal's process on how to proceed with the security actors, the Nepal Army, the Maoist ex combatants (PLA) is relatively less clearly regulated in the agreements. They relatively vaguely mention words like *adjustment, rehabilitation, integration*. It was clear to the major stakeholders at the time that, no one has won the war. And the idea was to take up the negotiations very soon, in 2007, to come to more precise frameworks on how to go about with this complex. The UN was asked to help, and the UNMIN was set up. The Nepal Army stayed in the barracks, the PLA in the cantonments. In that way both helped for creating a certain stability. But de facto this whole question was then frozen in for about two years. Priority in 2007 and early 2008 clearly was on successfully holding of the CA elections.

In the last few months of the year 2008 only the security aspects of CPA have been progressed. It is obvious that the issue has become even more difficult than it might have been if it was taken up early 2007. Certainly, the forming of the *Army Integration Special Committee (AISC)* and the *Army Integration Technical Committee (AITC)* are very good steps. But unfortunately the whole unsolved issue of the security aspects of the CPA has in the meantime been a potential platform for escalation. As examples I would like to name the recruitment issues, the issues of the retirement of the 8 brigadiers, the participation in the national games. There is an urgent need for the main stakeholders of the peace process to sit together and to agree to an active support to the AISC and most probably even additional type of negotiations on this issue. If not, this issue might become a source of even more problems.

How the Swiss support Nepal's discussion re the security aspects in the peace agreements

- On the request of various stakeholders in government, political parties and civil society, we support, together with other bilateral donors, the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, DCAF, for a long term oriented programme which aims at supporting Nepal in the process of re-orienting its organisation of the sector of the security providers, including strengthening the role of the parliament and the government.

- A programme on experience sharing was organized, together with the GTZ, in May 2009, with protagonists of the processes of integration and rehabilitation of ex combatants from guerrillas and from the regular armies, as well as the security sector reforms in El Salvador (early 1990s), Ethiopia, and Germany (1990-1994). Intense programmes took place with representatives of political parties, with the technical committee, with the Nepalese Army, with the PLA, with Civil Society leaders, with academics and security experts and with the International Community.