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The EIB post-Lisbon: An Opportunity for Conflict-sensitive Lending?

By Josephine Liebl, Policy Officer with EPLO, European Peacebuilding Liaison Office in Brussels, Belgium

The launch of the European External Action Service (EEAS) on 1 December, one year after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, was mainly symbolic. A range of senior-level posts have not been filled yet and the detailed structure of the Service will be decided on in the coming weeks. As it is not yet clear whether the unit in charge of peacebuilding and crisis response will receive adequate financial resources and standing vis-à-vis the rest of the Service, the potential of the EEAS to fulfill the Lisbon Treaty commitments to ‘preserve peace, prevent conflicts and strengthen international security’ (Art. 21.2(c)) cannot be judged at this point.

The European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO) has long argued that the establishment of the EEAS could be used to overcome one of the key challenges the EU is facing in implementing its commitments to conflict prevention and peacebuilding, namely the lack of internal policy coherence. In that respect, the way in which the Service relates to policy areas that remain outside its mandate but that can potentially trigger or aggravate conflict will determine EEAS’s success in promoting peace. Trade and investment policy, the latter becoming an exclusive EU competence with the Lisbon Treaty, are cases in point. Another example is the European Investment Bank (EIB). The EIB is the EU’s long-term non-profit financing institution which only invests in projects that further EU policy objectives. A ruling of the European Court of Justice in 2008 further clarified the EIB’s function as a development bank and reiterated that EIB lending in third countries has to fulfill the EU’s development policy objectives.

Given the lending volume of the EIB - in 2009 lending amounted to € 79 billion, € 9 billion or which was spent outside the EU - and the type of activities that are typically supported by lending (natural resource extraction, construction of power plants, hydroelectric dams and other large scale infrastructure projects, for example), there is significant potential for the EIB to do harm by fueling and exacerbating conflict, but also to do good by promoting peace. In order to do good, though, adequate safeguards addressing human rights, as well as environmental and conflict risks, must be integrated into EIB lending.

So far, the EIB has included commitments to conflict sensitivity in the Panel of the Wise Persons’ Report on the Review of External Lending Mandate (p.16 & 18) and the Statement on Environmental and Social Principles which states that ‘the EIB does not finance projects that give rise to conflicts or intensify existing conflicts’ (para 47). However, despite this dedication to conflict sensitivity on paper, the EIB still needs to develop the necessary capacity, skill and institutional mechanisms to put it into practice.

The need to operationalise these commitments becomes especially important considering the countries eligible for EIB lending listed in the recent Commission proposal on EIB lending outside the EU, among them the West Bank and Gaza Strip, Israel, Georgia, Colombia, Iraq, Kazakhstan and Western Balkan Countries.
Apart from strengthening due diligence processes within the Bank, EIB lending projects should be subjected to further scrutiny regarding their potential to fulfill EU policy objectives in relation to development and the promotion of peace and human rights. For this reason, EPLO argues in the paper ‘Towards a Peacebuilding Strategy for the EEAS’ that the Service should play a role in the evaluation and appraisal of EIB project proposals. Moreover, the EEAS should be involved in the drafting of all regional operational guidelines. This would not only ensure that EIB lending is integrated into the overall political co-ordination of EU’s external action but also counter the tendency of the EIB to be a promoter of the unchecked economic interests of the 27 Member States who are the stakeholders of the Bank.

The EPLO Policy Paper “Towards a Peacebuilding Strategy for the EEAS” can be downloaded [here](#).

The EPLO Policy Paper “The EU as a Global Force for Good: Putting Peace at the Heart of the European External Action Service” is accessible [here](#).

For further information on the “Panel of the Wise Persons’ Report on the Review of External Lending Mandate” please see [here](#).

The EIB Statement of the Environmental and Social Principles and Standards is available [here](#).

What If: More Questions than Answers in the Climate Security Debate?

This fall season once again saw the release of a number of publications on the security relevance of climate change – with varying perspectives and audiences. With a strong focus on the scientific foundations of the climate security debate, the Swedish Defense Agency published the report “On Connecting Climate Change with Security and Armed Conflict”, which promoted a somewhat common storyline: different security concepts underlie the climate security debate. But the discussion if a state-based concept or a human-based approach of security is applied when politicians are talking about climate security is only one focus of the analysis. The report also outlines key research challenges that are of outmost interest for defense communities: Especially the results of extreme climate change scenarios and potential impacts of tipping elements may offer so far unknown consequences for security at all levels since they affect international politics as well as livelihood resources. Accordingly, the authors call for “what if exercises” to be carried out jointly by researchers and policy makers from a broad range of sectors. By doing so, contemporary policy processes can be improved for addressing the challenge of climate security.

A new series of papers on climate security released by the German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) offers a stronger policy orientation. Nick Mabey, author of one of the four papers, calls for a more effective “whole-of-government” approach to the risk management of climate change. Such an approach needs to be supported by regular assessment of the effectiveness of climate security action at both national and
international levels. The risk-management framework to be applied should expand responsibilities for climate change outcomes well beyond environment and energy ministries. As outlined by this and the other GMF papers there are already some entry points for policy responses such as the development of adaptation strategies in a conflict sensitive way to mainstream climate change concerns into development, foreign and security policies. *(Dennis Taenzler)*

The report “On Connecting Climate Change with Security and Armed Conflict” commissioned by the Swedish Defense Agency is available as pdf (1 MB) at [http://www2.foi.se/rapp/foir3021.pdf](http://www2.foi.se/rapp/foir3021.pdf)


**Guidance for the UN and EU on Natural Resources and Conflict**

An international partnership of the United Nations and the European Union dealing with the interlinkages of sustainable natural resource management and conflict prevention has now received some guidance. The EU and six UN partners want to equip national stakeholders, UN Country Teams and EU Delegations with the skills and tools needed to prevent and mitigate potential conflicts over natural resources. The reason behind this cooperation is that, e.g., the exploitation of high-value natural resources, including oil, gas, minerals and timber has been a key factor in triggering, escalating or sustaining wars around the globe. Also, climate change and environmental degradation are more and more discussed as factors that increase conflict potentials.

Against this backdrop the partnership asked a number of researchers to compile guidance on how to deal with conflicts related to land, the activities of extractives industries and other forms of resources scarcity and how to strengthen capacities for conflict avoidance or, at the least, mitigation. In addition, approaches of capacity development for managing land and natural resources are discussed. As a starting point, the partnership commissioned an inventory to outline what capacities in the UN systems already exist. Apart from a comprehensive review this inventory allows to access relevant material, manuals, tool-kits and a selection of trainings directly. The guidance notes, as the second step, will now be validated during the second phase of the project and updated accordingly. Stakeholders and practitioners are invited to review and comment on these documents until next June.

The partnership is coordinated by the UN Framework Team for Preventive Action and financed by the EU’s Instrument for Stability. Apart from the provision of technical assistance it should also help to enhance policy development and programme coordination between key actors at the field level. *(Dennis Taenzler)*

See [here](http://www.gmfus.org/cs/pressroom/viewpressrelease?newsarticle.id=1543) for more information on the guidance notes and the further work of the partnership.

To download the capacity inventory, please see [here](http://www.gmfus.org/cs/pressroom/viewpressrelease?newsarticle.id=1543).
Food Systems in Africa and Their Repercussions on Livelihoods

Food systems affect livelihoods through a complex web, most importantly through health. The continued lack of cohesive policy and research only exacerbates the vicious circle that we witness across most of sub-Saharan Africa at present. This is the bottom line of Pinstrup-Andersen’s new book, “The African Food System and its Interactions with Human Health”.

Inadequate food systems have a devastating impact on health and nutrition, decreasing life expectancy, and increasing the proportion of underweight people, as well as increasing mortality rates, particularly of children under five. A crucial factor is that insufficient nutrition worsens resistance to diseases. It is estimated that 50 percent of all deaths in developing countries could have been avoided by good nutrition. Moreover, patterns of food production itself can have severe health implications through flood irrigation, for example, which both increases the risk of waterborne diseases and the excessive use of pesticides. In turn, low health and bad nutrition lessen the productivity of workers, most of whom are employed in the agricultural sector, completing the vicious circle. Adding to the complexity, improving food quality involves a difficult trade-off: It tends to increase prices, which, in turn, decrease food access of the poor.

But there are other channels, too: A previous empirical study by Pinstrup-Andersen suggests that poor health and nutritional status play a key role in inducing armed conflicts in poor countries. This relationship is taken up by a new research paper published by the Initiative for Peacebuilding (IfP) that emphasizes the importance of incorporating a conflict sensitive approach into land policies and land reform in Africa. In particular, conflict analysis is crucial when reforming poor land use regulation in the context of land tenure insecurity as well as of unequal distribution of land.

Practitioners and decision makers have often failed to address these interlinkages. Pinstrup-Andersen holds responsible what he calls ‘silo thinking’: Both the lack of interdisciplinary research and the lack of collaboration between policy and research communities prevent cohesive solutions. (Stephan Wolters)

The book can be purchased at
http://www.cornellpress.cornell.edu/cup_detail.taf?ti_id=9886

The 2008 study “Do poverty and poor health and nutrition increase the risk of armed conflict onset?” is available here.

More information on the topic is available here:
http://www.initiativeforpeacebuilding.eu/environment_Natural_Resources_Economy.php
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Toward an International Organization for Environmental Refugees?

A critical consequence of climate change that has been inadequately addressed at the policy level so far is climate-induced migration. Apart from the potential number of climate refugees, the issue of their legal status is also the subject of a controversial debate. A recent study commissioned by the German Federal Environment Agency (UBA)
attempts to identify solutions relating to legal implications in dealing with environmental refugees.

The authors recommend the establishment of an international coordination mechanism given that the rights and obligations of the countries of origin and of host and third countries are not explicitly enshrined in primary law. Such an organization should put in place binding instruments and define the resulting responsibilities. The authors also suggest establishing a fund financed through contributions from third countries or taxes on emission-intensive activities. This fund could be used for financing measures for adaptation, resettlement or disaster relief. An equalization fund for internal burden-sharing is also conceivable. The specific responsibilities of individual states should be agreed on the basis of the “polluter pays” principle or the principle of common-but-differentiated responsibility, measured, for instance, in terms of per capita greenhouse gas emissions and per capita income. An inter-state sanction mechanism could form part of an enforcement system, in case a third state does not comply with its financial obligations. The study however leaves open the contours of such a sanctions regime and how it would be enforced effectively.

Political acceptance for such an organization would also depend on whether its jurisdiction is restricted solely to cases of migration caused by climate change or whether other natural environmental changes would be accepted as well. Ultimately, the decision on setting up such an institution largely depends on developments in the international climate regime. In the absence of a comprehensive agreement that has the buy-in of all countries it is difficult to envisage a consensual and decisive approach to the issue of climate refugees. *(Stefanie Schaefter)*

The study of Margit Ammer, Manfred Nowak, Lisa Stadlmayr and Gerhard Hafner on behalf of the German Environmental Agency is available under [http://www.umweltdaten.de/publikationen/fpdf-l/4035.pdf](http://www.umweltdaten.de/publikationen/fpdf-l/4035.pdf) (in German only).

A summary in English can be downloaded [here](http://www.umweltdaten.de/publikationen/fpdf-l/4035.pdf).

**CONFERENCE REPORTS**

**Not only a Threat: Climate Change in the Middle East**

The 14th New Faces Conference, organized by the German Society of Foreign Policy (DGAP), Heinrich Böll Foundation and the Royal Marine Conservation Society of Jordan (JREDS), “The Impact of Climate Change on the Middle East – Converging and Diverging Perceptions of Development and Human Security”, was held in Jordan in November 2010. Aiming to bring together participants with different regional and professional backgrounds, the conference focused primarily on security implications in the areas of energy, water and food security. Thereby, not only risks, but also chances have been highlighted throughout the discussion.

The energy panel concentrated mainly on the shift toward renewable energy in the region. It was pointed out that this development would possibly create a new type of dependency on foreign technology. Drawbacks and incentives for nuclear energy were
also discussed. However, the threats of nuclear power in this politically volatile region and the potential of contaminating valuable land, and therefore hampering tourism in the case of an accident, are high.

In the water panel the need for a combination of national adaptation and efficiency improvement; one highlight, for example, focused on managed aquifer recharge with transboundary cooperation. Climate change was ambiguously seen as increasing the benefits of cooperation on shared water resources on the one hand, while similarly increasing the conflict potential on the other hand. The food security panel discussed the enhancement of national food production to achieve food security, taking into account traditional diets and livelihoods of farmers.

General technical problems include the current subsidies for water and energy, as well as a lack of transparency with respect to data. Further underlying problems are inefficient structures in the countries, but also mistrust between states. As a result, the participants figure the need for accountability of governments, public pressure, and participatory decision making. Although international cooperation in the region is difficult, it yields strong benefits in all three areas of action and could even increase political stability. Climate change itself was more seen as a chance to create significant pressure in order to initiate positive changes in the region. (Franziska Piontek)

More information concerning the New Faces conference 2010 is available under http://www.boell-ameo.org/

In Need of Implementation: Climate Change and Security in Southeast Asia

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has in several declarations drawn attention to the threats posed by climate change. Yet, despite the urgency, there has been slow progress in moving from analysis to concrete actions, particularly in mitigating the effects of natural disasters. This was the key finding of the seminar on the International Security Implications of Climate Change that was jointly organized by the Philippine government and the European Commission in Brussels on 18 and 19 November 2010. Representatives from 21 countries, including India, China, Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia and Myanmar, attended the seminar along with experts from Europe and Southeast Asia.

This was the second seminar devoted to the issue. While the security risks posed by climate change were the focus of the first seminar held in March 2009 in Phnom Penh, the Brussels seminar emphasized risk prevention. Growing climate variability and the resultant potential for natural disasters are perceived as a threat to economic development. Access to food and water no longer appear assured. In the long term this may weaken governments in the region and impact regional cooperation. Many of those present however doubted that this would result in violent conflicts.

ASEAN has issued several political declarations in response to climate change, which seek to intensify regional cooperation. The establishment of the ASEAN Coordinating Center for Humanitarian Assistance can play a key role in this context. One of the Center’s primary tasks will be to promote regional coordination in disaster management and emergency assistance in Southeast Asia. The participants underlined the need for
resolute implementation of existing political declarations. There was also a call for more research into the complex linkages among climate change and other economic and social trends so as to develop effective crisis prevention measures. Greater interaction and the implementation of joint projects by research institutions from the EU and ASEAN were suggested for this purpose. (Achim Maas)

More information on the ASEAN Regional Forum is available at http://www.aseanregionalforum.org/

The ASEAN statement on climate change can be downloaded under http://www.aseansec.org/24515.htm

Manifold: Approaches to Assessing Environmental Security

On November 21st the Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC) and the Institute for Environmental Security (IES) brought together a group of experts on Environmental Security Assessments (ESA) to discuss with policy makers and practitioners. The workshop tried to give a comprehensive picture of the field and foster discussion about what the next steps could be in regard to ESAs.

The presentations illustrated the broad range of different assessments and tools that hide behind the term ESA. On one side, these include more comprehensive approaches that try to cover environmental security as a whole. Examples included the EnviroSecurity Assessments developed by IES and the Environmental Security Assessment Framework developed by the Foundation of Environmental Security & Sustainability (FESS). On the other side, more specialised methodologies exist, like two tools adelphi presented: 1) the Water, Crisis and Climate Change Assessment Framework (WACCAF) that is currently being developed as part of the EC’s Conflict Prevention Network and aims at understanding and solving water conflicts, and 2) the Guidance Notes on National Sustainable Development Strategies in Post-Conflict Countries that are being developed for UN DESA to help national governments link sustainable development and peacebuilding.

Military actors were a much-discussed user group of ESAs. The realisation that linkages between conflict and the environment should already be addressed during the planning stage brought the subject back on the political agenda during the last NATO summit. On the ground, the environment already plays a role for the military, as illustrated by a presentation on how NATO tries to minimise its environmental impacts in Bosnia-Herzegovina and another presentation of a tool for the Swedish Armed Forces that helps to assess the environmental vulnerability of peace operations.

At the end Jeffrey Stark of FESS outlined some important lessons learned in the application and development of ESAs by emphasising that toolkits and methodologies have to be flexible enough to adapt to complex and different conflicts. They should be understood as a methodology, but not as a straitjacket. (Lukas Ruettinger)

The Environmental Security Assessment Framework is accessible at http://www.fess-global.org/ESAF.cfm
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UPCOMING EVENTS

Upcoming events are also regularly published at http://www.ecc-platform.org/.

"Global Forum for Food and Agriculture Berlin 2011 - Trade and Global Food Security: Global - Regional – Local" in Berlin, Germany (20-22 January)
Organized by the German Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection, this year’s Global Forum for Food and Agriculture aims to provide impetus to further discussions on the topic of trade and world food security. Policy makers as well as industry and consumer representatives are invited to exchange their experiences and concepts on the role of an integrated trading system for food security. Moreover, agriculture ministers from around the globe will address challenges to global food security in a panel discussion.

For more information including a detailed programme, please visit http://www.gffa-berlin.de/en.html
▲Top

Organized by the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, this intermediate-level workshop aims to provide natural resource managers with the facilitation skills to effectively plan projects, convene meetings, and manage logistics. The workshop employs role-playing exercises involving governmental and non-governmental stakeholders, creating an interactive forum for developing and applying basic facilitation skills.

▲Top

"Illegal Logging Update and Stakeholder Consultation Meeting" in London, UK (27-28 January)
This event is part of a series of meetings with respect to illegal logging, organized by Chatham House and funded by the UK Department for International Development. It will focus on European timber regulation, timber public procurement, as well as progress on FLEGT and REDD. It will also address issues surrounding the impact of illegal logging on livelihoods.

A draft agenda is available at http://www.illegal-logging.info/item_single.php?it_id=206&it=event
▲Top
IN BRIEF

The Repercussions of Resource Scarcities, Water Conflicts in Kenya and Ethiopia, Women's Vulnerabilities to Climate Change and new EU Rules to Prevent Illegal Logging


Environment 360 of Yale University produced a short video entitled “When The Water Ends: Africa’s Climate Conflicts”. It documents how dwindling water supplies affect livelihoods of pastoralists and farmers in Kenya and Ethiopia. It provides a vivid demonstration of the negative effects of a changing climate.

The Women's Environment & Development Organization (WEDO) has released a new book entitled “Gender and Climate Change: An Introduction”. It examines the actual and potential effects of climate change on women’s vulnerabilities as well as the role of women in climate change adaptation and mitigation processes.

The EU has adopted new rules to prevent illegal timber from being sold on the European market. Companies will now have to verify the origin of timber or timber products they sell. The regulation is expected to help preserve biodiversity as well as avert negative effects of illegal logging on livelihoods.
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