

Editorial

FORUM

- **Copenhagen – the Munich of Our Times?**

POLICY & RESEARCH

- **Forests: From 'Hinterland' to CO2-Market**
- **Cash for Leaving Oil in the Ground?**
- **Green Reconstruction: UNIFIL Plants Trees in Southern Lebanon**
- **Defence Takes on 'Climate Change and Security'**

CONFERENCE REPORTS

- **Global Energy and Climate Policy at a Crossroads?**
- **New Resources for Security?**
- **Security Perspectives in Climate Change**

UPCOMING EVENTS

- **"Negotiation and Mediation for Water Conflict Management II" in Delft and The Hague (1-19 March)**
- **"Natural Resource, Security and Development in the Niger Delta" in Yenagoa, Nigeria (8-11 March)**
- **"Conference on Integrated River Basin Management under the Water Framework Directive" in Lille, France (26-28 April)**
- **"Conference on Gender, Environment and Development" in Iloilo City, Philippines (7-9 April)**

IN BRIEF

- **Nothing Learned from Dealing with Resource Conflicts, the Crux of Land Conflicts, Regional Climate Scenarios and the Green Planet Blues**

IMPRINT/CONTACT

Editorial

Much has happened since the ECC-Platform was launched in 2005: environmental aspects are increasingly recognized as important elements of sustainable peace; the UN and EU have initiated processes on the potential impacts of climate change on the security and stability of states; and environmental security has also become a central issue in foreign and security strategy planning.

We have thus moved a great step forward in achieving our objective: to increase information exchange by creating networks among stakeholder from the development, economic, environment, foreign, and security communities worldwide. In January, we organized the first ECC annual conference on climate and energy security issues in collaboration with Germanwatch and the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (see conference reports). In addition, the ECC website appears in a new guise: a "Quick Access Button" leads you directly towards information on current developments, such as on climate change and international security. We established a new section dealing with environment and migration and another one listing publications with regional case studies. The next step includes the development of country profiles on environment and security policies and the introduction of a German-speaking blog. We thereby want to further promote a vivid discussion on issues of environment and natural resources.

The website is a living and dynamic platform, thus never fully complete. The editorial team welcomes your opinion, comments and news on political initiatives, documents, or institutions relevant to this topic as it would help us to further improve the newsletter and the website.

The Editorial Team

FORUM

Copenhagen—the Munich of Our Times?

by Malini Mehra, founder and chief executive of the Centre for Social Markets

Climate negotiations will never be the same after Copenhagen and the Accord reached there may prove to be the 1938 Munich Agreement of modern times: an appeasement to major polluters that condemns the world to runaway climate change and declares war on our children.

One of the Copenhagen climate conference's key outcomes in December was an 'Accord' of no legal status and dubious value. A political agreement, the Accord was simply 'noted' by governments, not adopted by them. Its very existence, however, could now risk the architecture established by the UNFCCC to combat global climate change.

A Powerful Non-Agreement

There is much that is wrong with the agreement. It is not legally binding, contains no mid-term or long-term targets for emissions reductions, and critically does not refer to a

'peaking' year for global emissions in order to keep within the 'safe' limit of 2 °C warming (since pre-industrial times).

Neither has it followed the guidance of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that indicates three benchmarks for avoiding dangerous climate change: (1) developed countries must reduce emissions by 25–40% by 2020 from 1990 levels, (2) global emissions must peak and then begin to decline by 2020, and (3) global emissions must decline by 50% by 2050.

The Copenhagen Accord contains a reference to 2 °C but does not endorse it. Given that there are no targets, no peaking years, no trajectories for emissions reductions, only vague rhetoric, this is effectively an agreement for business-as-usual. The Potsdam Institute on Climate Research estimates that the Accord will actually set the world on course for a 3–4 °C world.

As this is a global average, the actual temperature rise in many parts of the world—especially in the Poles and higher latitudes—will be much higher. The small island states have feared this for some time, hence their plea that warming not exceed 1.5 °C to ensure "island survival".

An Accord Too Far...

The 'Copenhagen Accord' is a cruel blow, a setback for millions around the world who had put their faith in their leaders to deliver on climate protection. Never before had such a constellation of groups and institutions come together. Civil society, faith groups, business and industry, the investment community, scientists, engineers and professional organisations—even the UN itself, which ran an unprecedented 'Seal the Deal' campaign—all came forward for urgent action on climate change. Leaders responded to the call and came to Copenhagen—but they did not deliver. This is a failure of historic proportions because an 'encore' will be very difficult.

Instead, we have the modern equivalent of the Munich Agreement. In 1938 European powers sacrificed Czechoslovakia to Hitler's aggression, thinking this would appease his territorial hunger. The consequences of this gigantic miscalculation became evident with the unfolding horrors of World War II.

In 2009, we are making a similar miscalculation by allowing the major greenhouse gas emitters to knowingly sacrifice the poor and vulnerable parts of the world for their 'right to pollute'. The consequences of their actions at a time when the implications of rising carbon emissions are well-known are unconscionable.

The Copenhagen Accord is little more than 'greenwash' by a group of countries who have put the world on a highway to 4 °C and 550ppm. They will spin that information saying this is only the first step, but the reality is that countries as disparate as the USA, Canada, Saudi Arabia, China, and India have no intention of committing to a legally-binding global climate regime now or in the future. Instead we now have an anaemic 'Pledge and Review' system, which provides little guarantee that emissions will decline as rapidly as they must.

A New World Order Emerges

What Copenhagen made blindingly clear is that the world has changed. We are in a new geopolitical era. Gone are the days of outdated divisions of the world as 'developed' and

'developing'. Nations such as China and India showed they are new power players that will act as nakedly in their self-interest as western powers. It was their double-act with the U.S. that gave us this agreement—backed by a pliant if somewhat discomfited Brazil and South Africa, and bounced on to the rest of the world.

A key lesson from Copenhagen is that the new world order simply does not map onto the archaic systems and processes of the United Nations. The issue is not the UN as such but its antiquated processes and 'political capture'. Bloc politics at the UN are now at least a decade out of date and have not permitted the creative emergence of hybrid coalitions from North and South.

Copenhagen made depressingly clear that 'political realism' has trumped 'climate realism' and that the G2 powers are incapable of providing global leadership. We will have to look elsewhere for solutions. The U.S. and China, aided by others, have acted in their short-term political interest, thinking they will be able to 'manage' their way out of climate change.

But the climate system is oblivious to the vaunted ambitions of temporal nations and a kicking is around the corner. Those who have acted in their 'national self-interest' will now find that their actions do not serve their long-term interests in a climate- and resource-constrained world. The collateral damage of their decisions, however, will be tragic for those less able to cope.

The good news is that nothing is stopping the emergence of new players. What we need is leadership. Instead of dysfunctional and anachronistic groupings such as the G77/China, we need new groupings of nations that recognise the perils of climate change and increasingly see their interests as interdependent and intertwined.

Many of the nations who are putting their faith in strong de-carbonisation and green growth national plans—such as the Maldives, Costa Rica, Mexico, South Korea, Brazil, and the European Union—now need to unite under a common cause. They need to cross failed 'North/ South' lines and devise a new politics of common climate security and collective economic prosperity.

In Europe eighty years ago, the key lesson of Munich was that appeasement is not an option. Today our hope rests in multilateralism to prevent a cabal of powerful nations making climate triage decisions over the rest of the world. With the next climate conference slated to take place in Cancun in November 2010, there is everything to play for. It may well be that Cancun can, what Copenhagen could not.

Malini Mehra is the founder and chief executive of the Centre for Social Markets (CSM). The mission of CSM is to change the culture of markets and other social institutions to advance social justice, human rights and sustainable development. For more information, please see <http://www.csmworld.org/>

This article was first published in the BBC and is available at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8490935.stm>.

▲Top

POLICY & RESEARCH

Forests: From 'Hinterland' to CO2-Market

Local forest communities often lack tenure rights, which results in their marginalisation and the destruction of forests. This is the key message of the recent publication "The End of the Hinterland", compiled by the Rights and Resources Initiative. The paper discusses the significance of indigenous and local forest rights, in the context of climate change and REDD (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation).

Governments own about 75 percent of forests worldwide, while only nine percent officially belong to indigenous communities. The authors emphasise the role of unrecognised collective property rights as being responsible for poverty, human rights abuse, inequality, and political exclusion. Yet the struggle of forest communities to gain official recognition of their tenure rights has been partly successful: New Zealand assigned forests to the Maori and India passed a progressive Forest Rights Act. However, the mere existence of legislation does not guarantee its implementation, as a case of irregularly approved logging concessions in Liberia shows.

The hope of industrialised countries for a cheap method of climate protection has moved tropical forests in the focus of international interests. The authors rightly criticise the narrow focus of the REDD debate on the price, which is necessary to render forest conservation attractive. This underestimates the role of governments and governance. The widespread lack of legal clarity and enforcement as well as the rising value of the forests increase the risk of fraud, corruption, violent conflict and the further exploitation of unequal power relations. However, the study also states that indigenous groups today are well organised and the new funding and attention associated with REDD can also bring opportunities: to raise income, and increase real political power and the recognition of their rights. Seizing these opportunities will require a shift from an externally-controlled hinterland to an era of locally-led and democratic forest governance and development. Whether REDD can contribute to that, and actually reduce greenhouse gas emissions and save forests will depend on its potential to reform forest tenure and to respect and reflect local rights. (*Felix Ries*)

The publication "The End of the Hinterland: Forests, Conflict and Climate Change" can be downloaded at http://www.rightsandresources.org/documents/files/doc_1400.pdf

▲Top

Cash for Leaving Oil Underground?

The start of the International Year of Biodiversity has also brought to a head the three-year-long debate on Ecuador's Yasuni ITT initiative. The initiative centres around the Yasuni national park, one of the most biodiverse regions on the planet. It is home to indigenous peoples who have so far been isolated from the outside world—and also to an estimated 800 million barrels of oil. Ecuador is proposing that it will refrain from extracting this oil if the international community pays for half the foregone economic benefits (about 350 million dollars a year). The advantages of the unprecedented initiative are obvious. For one, Ecuador will be able to avoid massive environmental damages and social tensions that have so far resulted from oil exploitation and the

unequal distribution of its revenues. And for another, climate-unfriendly oil would remain underground and the forest and its rich biodiversity would be preserved, thereby avoiding about 410 million tons of CO₂ emissions. The reasoning behind this idea is that saving the region from economic exploitation is also in the global interest and should correspondingly be compensated for by the international community.

So far Germany, Spain, Sweden, and Belgium have declared that they would be prepared to contribute about half of the stipulated amount. The negotiations on the payment conditions, however, proved to be difficult: disputes include the time frame and the application of the funds. At the beginning of the year President Rafael Correa lost his patience: "We will not submit. Let them know that this country is nobody's colony. We won't accept shameful conditions. Keep your money." As a consequence, his chief negotiator, Foreign Minister Fander Falconi, resigned from office. Correa has now set a deadline for June 2010. If no deal is reached by then, the oil fields will be made available for drilling. Were this to happen, a significant opportunity for greater shared global responsibility and environmental justice would have been frittered away. (*Christiane Roettger*)

For more information on this topic, please see <http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/N12209446.htm> and [here](#).

An interview with Ivonne Yanez of Acción Ecológica, an Ecuadorian environmental organization and co-founder of the initiative, is available at http://www.democracynow.org/2009/12/11/ecuadorian_activist_heads_to_cop15_with

▲[Top](#)

Green Reconstruction: UNIFIL Plants Trees in Southern Lebanon

The 2006 Lebanon War caused massive ecological damages, especially in the country's Southern region: more than one thousand hectare of forests and olive groves have been destroyed by bomb explosions and bush fires—according to a study published in May 2007 by the Association for Forests, Development and Conservation (AFDC). The economic losses of this destruction hit especially farmers and the rural population in South Lebanon.

In January 2010, the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) started an extensive reforestation project in the region around the village Sh'huur. Within about three months, the international troops want to plant 2 300 trees. The project is headed by the "Green Sh'huur" Committee, a local initiative consisting of community residents and their mayor. About 4 000 trees have already been planted by the initiative. At the end of the project the number is supposed to reach a total of 10 452 trees—a symbolic number that represents the total surface area of Lebanon (10 452 km²). UNIFIL also maintains two other reforestation projects in the Southern Lebanese towns of Khiam and Rachaya al-Foukhar.

The projects have several objectives: they prevent further loss of biodiversity in the region, provide natural spaces for recreation and leisure, and foster the economic development in the region by increasing its attractiveness for tourists. Another central

objective of the initiative is to strengthen local people's awareness for environmental issues.

UNIFIL has been based in Lebanon since 1978. It guarantees that there are no illegal weapons between the Litani River and the Blue Line, a zone that separates Lebanese and Israeli armed forces. Engaging Blue Helmets in reforestation projects is nothing unusual: they have already planted more than 30 000 saplings around the world, among others in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Georgia, and Timor-Leste. (*Kerstin Fritzsche*)

For more information, please visit:

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=33498&Cr=leban&Cr1>

▲Top

Defence Takes on 'Climate Change and Security'

In September 2009 Rear Admiral Neil Morisetti has taken a new cross government post as Climate and Energy Security Envoy for the Ministry of Defence and Foreign and Commonwealth Office. The editors of the ECC-platform took the chance to talk with him about his new position.

ECC: *Mr. Morisetti, from the German perspective, this is a quite innovative approach, so could you shortly explain the rationale behind the establishment of this new position and what your principle responsibilities and objectives are, please?*

Neil Morisetti (NM): In the debate on climate change, people looked for a long time only at the environmental consequences. I studied the subject in the 1970s and it was very much an environmental issue. I think that particularly in the past few years we have begun to realise that the consequences of climate change are more than just environmental impacts. There are socio-economic, political and security issues. In 2007, the UN Security Council held a UK-led debate on security implications. About the same time, a number of think tanks started to produce work. One paper, which probably launched the debate in a sense, was produced by the Center for Naval Analysis in Washington on the national security implications of climate change.



About the same time, in 2008, our UK national security strategy mentioned this issue for the first time. So, a document, endorsed by the Prime Minister, recognised climate change as the potentially greatest threat to global stability and security in the future and therefore to national security. And when you start talking about national security then Defence starts to get engaged in the process. In a revision of this strategy last year we talked about climate change as a threat multiplier. And I think this is increasingly how it is seen. That is to say, climate change in itself is unlikely to start a conflict. But it could well be the tipping point or the catalyst for conflict, particularly when you look at where the greatest impact from climate change is likely to be felt and that is coincidental with those regions already suffering from multiple threats. By that I mean resource issues such as shortages of food and water, health issues, and financial challenges. Often they

are also in areas with weak governments or low resilience. We have seen small or various sizes of conflicts in those regions in the past and it may well be that climate change will accelerate or accentuate that problem.

***ECC:** So, conflicts will not be a direct consequence of climatic changes?*

NM: What we are looking at really are not the physical changes of climate change but the implications of the second or third order consequences. Temperature rises, increased salinity in the sea, water shortages etc. lead to failed crops, failed harvests, loss of fish stocks, loss of land. What will people do? They have lost their livelihood, they have lost their home. How do they behave? Do they look towards alternative livelihoods, which may or may not be legal? Do they look to move, either within countries or between countries? This is the element that has a potential bearing on global security. Consequently, the UK established my position in September 2009. The decision was made to use a serving military officer, because much of this involves engagement with the military, internationally. If you have two people of the same profession, it is easier to talk and to engage than if you are used to different thought patterns.

But what we also came to was the run up to Copenhagen. It was important to encourage governments when they were forming their position for Copenhagen, not only to consider the environmental, economic and political perspective, but also to listen to the departments of defence and be aware that there are security implications: unless we can hold it to a less than 2 degree world, the risk to security will increase, and increase considerably, and become slightly unpredictable as well. So since then I have been engaging in the international community, not just with military and defence but also with foreign affairs, environment, the economic side, think tanks. I have been engaging in the UK defence community and also across government departments. Climate change doesn't necessarily recognise departmental boundaries any more. It doesn't recognise national boundaries. So, on the policy side it means broadening and deepening the understanding. What does it mean with regard to potential missions and tasks for defence? In a sense, it could be humanitarian activities in response to extreme weather events, which are not necessarily at the other side of the world but could well be in our own countries. I am thinking of the recent heavy rains in the UK in December, which in one county alone caused damages estimated at more than 100 million pounds. The military were there in a certain rescue role with helicopters, rebuilding bridges so that people could move around, restoring infrastructure.

***ECC:** Does that mean that climate security focuses mainly on disaster management?*

NM: At the other extreme is conflict resolution in cases of conflicts where climate change may be a factor. But perhaps more likely is engagement as one of a number of actors and probably performing quite a small role but nonetheless a key role in conflict prevention, in developing resilience and capacities. Especially in those countries I talked about, where the potential threats and multiple stresses—including climate change—are greatest. At the same time, there is the challenge of adaptation. Climate will continue to change because of what we have done in the past, regardless of what we do today. And we need to be sure that we have the ability to operate and deliver those missions and tasks in the second quarter of the 21st century. It might be a more rugged environment and we might find that we have to change our equipment because the temperatures are hotter.

But also, and this is where the energy element comes in, virtually all of our military equipment requires diesel or petrol. As we move further into the 21st century this energy is going to become increasingly rare or scarce, and likely to become much more expensive. And this makes us vulnerable. We need to try to reduce that vulnerability. We need to reduce our energy demands. We have to be more efficient in the way we use our energy. We must look for alternative energy and renewables. That brings advantages actually. All these things pose challenges but also offer opportunities. If we could reduce the amount of fuel we use at our operating base in Afghanistan, for example, we could reduce the number of convoys we need. That reduces the threats to life, it reduces our vulnerability, and brings financial savings as well. [...]

ECC: *Mr. Morisetti, thank you very much for the interview.*

The interview was conducted by Dennis Taenzler and Christiane Roettger

In the second part of the interview Mr. Morisetti talks about regions at risk and the role of climate change and security in national security strategy planning. For the complete interview, please see [here](#).

Further information on the "4-Degree-Map" of the Met Office Hadley Centre is available at <http://www.actoncopenhagen.decc.gov.uk/content/en/embeds/flash/4-degrees-large-map-final>

For the Green Book of Defence and the study of the Defence Concept and Doctrine Centre, please see [here](#).

▲Top

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Global Energy and Climate Policy at a Crossroads?

Does climate determine energy policy or is it the other way round? Where is climate policy headed post Copenhagen, and whose security does this impact and how? These were some of the questions debated by researchers and policymakers participating at the annual conference of the ECC-Platform, which was jointly organised by Adelphi Research, Germanwatch and the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) in Berlin on January 25, 2010. The participants concluded that the Copenhagen failure was a result of the huge ideological differences between key negotiating partners such as the USA and China. The EU and Denmark, who chaired the summit, were not in a position to bridge these extremes. The prospects of a binding agreement were deemed bleak even for 2010. Consequently, the focus needs to be on implementing and strengthening existing agreements and local initiatives.

The pressure to act is immense. Even today climate change is impacting the security and stability of several countries. States that are fragile and have a background of conflict tend to be particularly hard hit by climate change. The participants suggested that development cooperation activities should focus more on such conflict regions to combat threats to security. One of the contentious issues under discussion was the danger that security policy will dictate the agenda for development and climate policies, and favour a

militarisation in these areas. Broad-based approaches focusing on crisis and conflict prevention can, however, counter this trend. Additionally, at the EU level the issue should be integrated as a strategic foreign policy component within the requisite institutional framework rather than being left to informal steering groups.

According to the conference participants, there is no institutional framework that adequately reflects the interaction between energy and climate policies. Emission reduction commitments that result from climate policy will inevitably influence energy policy. In an ideal scenario, sustainable transformation processes would drastically decrease the dependence on fossil fuels. However, the pipelines and coal-based thermal power plants that are built today hardly reflect these climate policy objectives. Yet they will determine the type of energy supplied over decades. The participants concluded that energy security and climate protection must therefore be integrated through a systematic dialogue on energy infrastructure. One option would be to set up an *Enquete Commission*: such a commission is normally established by the German Parliament and comprises members of all parties as well as experts in order to jointly develop recommendations for a specific issue area - an approach that has so far worked well in Germany. But international climate policy cannot afford to wait that long. The EU must recapture its leadership role and undertake confidence building measures. One way of achieving this would be to set ambitious and binding greenhouse gas reduction and energy efficiency targets of 30 percent for the year 2020. Only this would lend the EU credibility and send out the right signals for the future direction of global energy and climate policies. (*Christiane Roettger*)

Further information (in German) on the conference "Are Global Climate and Energy Security Policies at a Crossroads?" is available [here](#).

▲Top

New Resources for Security?

Resource security was a major focus of the 46th Munich Security Conference held in early February. Although the discussions reflected largely traditional perspectives on this challenge, a comprehensive understanding of the nature of future security risks prevailed among most of the keynote speakers: Catherine Ashton, the new EU foreign minister, emphasised that "Wider issues also affect the security of our citizens: energy, climate change and the competition for natural resources, illegal migration and human trafficking." U.S. National Security Advisor, James L. Jones, further added risks like the spread of cyber attacks, economic instability or pandemic diseases to this list. With respect to the challenge of climate change he even considered the Copenhagen summit as a hopeful signal that major economies accepted their responsibility to take action—an opinion not necessarily shared among commentators of the December climate summit.

From the beginning of the conference a discussion panel with high ranking representative from energy producing countries and energy supply companies tried to get to the core of resource security. Ilham Aliyev, president of Azerbaijan, stressed the importance of his country's stable political relations with investors and energy companies. Due to relations built on trust the wealth of his country has increased significantly: today, the revenues from energy exports account for more than half of the gross national product of Azerbaijan. Potential risks associated with a one-sided focus of the national economy on

one export sector, however, were not part of the debate. Juergen Grossmann, Chief Executive Officer of the energy supply company RWE, also emphasised the relevance of stable relationships between energy producing and consuming countries, from a company perspective. Alternative energy pathways to global energy security, for example through the massive expansion of renewable energies, were not discussed as a viable option during the security talks in Munich. RWE in fact is part of the DESERTEC initiative, which hopes to establish a transmission grid between Europe and North Africa to import energy produced by concentrated solar power plants in Northern Africa deserts. However, in order to discuss such sunny prospects, which also entail some security implications, the group of participants in Munich needs to be further expanded beyond traditional thinkers. (*Dennis Taenzler*)

For further information on the Munich Security conference including speeches by the panellist and summaries of the panels, please see <http://www.securityconference.de/>

For more information on the DESERTEC Initiative, please see <http://www.desertec.org/>

▲Top

Security Perspectives in Climate Change

Climate change can have severe large-scale security consequences, particularly in Africa and Southeast Asia. Meeting this challenge requires close international cooperation, with all actors having a share in swiftly devising preventive action. This was the consensus at the high-level panel debate on climate change and international security held at the international climate conference in Copenhagen on December 15, 2009. The Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Per Stig Moeller, hosted the debate, whose participants included NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen, Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs Carl Bildt, Chairperson of the Commission of the African Union Jean Ping, and the Administrator of UNDP, Helen Clark.

The panellists stressed the direct and discernable impacts of climate change on the general living conditions in Africa, pertaining especially to food security and conflicts. Special reference was made to Darfur and to the effects of climate change as both a threat multiplier and threat creator. The panellists expressed their concern about developments in Southeast Asia, in particular the melting of the ice in the Himalayan Mountains and the vulnerability of densely-populated lowlands; they also noted the potential large-scale impacts of melting ice in the Arctic. The discussion also dealt with climate-related migration: while Denmark is ready to recognise and accept climate refugees, the EU has had comprehensive and difficult discussions on the refugee question. Bildt stated that a definition of climate refugees would not be straightforward. He preferred using the term climate migrants and stressed the need to focus on regional cooperation and regional solutions. Clark and Moeller highlighted the need for preventive measures in order to secure people from being severely affected by climate changes and to strengthen their ability to stay in their local community.

Everyone on the panel underlined the importance of the UN as the institution where international discussions on climate change and security were anchored. Rasmussen described the role of NATO as a forum for coordination and consultation. The panellists agreed on the need for regional and international cooperation in order to respond to the

negative security consequences. Just as climate change is a global problem, so are climate-induced security challenges. (*Achim Maas and Stephan Wolters*)

For a comprehensive overview on this event, please see the report by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which can be accessed at: <http://ecc-platform.org/images/CCIS/ccis%20panel%20debate%20151209.pdf>

▲Top

UPCOMING EVENTS

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

"Negotiation and Mediation for Water Conflict Management II" in Delft and The Hague (1-19 March)

The short, advanced course "Alternative Dispute Resolution Techniques" addresses water issues and is jointly offered by the UNESCO programme 'From Potential Conflict to Cooperation Potential (PCCP)' and the UNESCO-IHE Institute for Water Education. It offers a recap of basic concepts in, and introduces advanced processes related to, conflict resolution and cooperation building. Cases of transboundary water conflicts are discussed with invited speakers from the field of water governance and conflict resolution.

Further information is available at <http://www.unesco.org/water/news/newsletter/224.shtml>

▲Top

"Natural Resource, Security and Development in the Niger Delta" in Yenagoa, Nigeria (8-11 March)

This conference is organised by the Political Science Department of Niger Delta University in collaboration with Environmental Aid, Nigeria and the Center for Applied Environmental Research (CAER) of the University of Missouri-Kansas City. It aims to shed light on the circumstances of the continued instability in the Niger Delta. The discussions will deal with three main sub-themes: the environment and sustainable development in the Niger Delta; securing the Niger Delta: issues and challenges; and policy options for Niger Delta Development.

Further information is available at <http://www.ndu-polsci.com/news.htm>

▲Top

"Conference on Integrated River Basin Management under the Water Framework Directive" in Lille, France (26-28 April)

This conference is co-organised by the European Commission and invites policy-makers, scientists, consultants and other stakeholders to review and discuss the implementation of EU water policies. Particular attention will be given to the technical challenges of developing the first River Basin Management Plan under the water framework directive.

Discussions will also address aspects of integration, cross-sectoral and multidisciplinary cooperation, as well as climate change.

Further information is available at <http://www.wfdlille2010.org/>

▲Top

"Conference on Gender, Environment and Development" in Iloilo City, Philippines (7-9 April)

This conference, organised by the Women's Studies Association of the Philippines (WSAP), addresses interconnected issues that affect women, including environmental degradation, development, poverty, and gender inequality. The event is directed at scientists, policy-makers and NGO representatives. Presentations will deal with the consequences of climate change for women, the social impacts of mining, the role of gender in migration, as well as best practices in climate change mitigation.

Further information is available at

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/trainings-events/events/v.php?id=12215>

▲Top

IN BRIEF

Nothing Learned from Dealing with Resource Conflicts, the Crux of Land Conflicts, Regional Climate Scenarios, and the Green Planet Blues

In their recent study "[Lessons UNlearned. How the UN and Member States must do more to end natural resource-fuelled conflicts](#)" Global Witness criticises the international community for having neither the will nor the capacity to deal with natural-resource-fuelled conflicts. The report provides several case studies and concrete recommendations for the United Nations and their member countries.

▲Top

The Rights and Resource Initiative has published the new article "[Fodder for War: Getting to the Crux of the Natural Resources Crisis](#)", which analyses the close relationships between land tenure and conflict. The author points to unequal tenure and property rights as the most important source for conflicts over land and natural resources.

▲Top

On behalf of the Directorate-General External Relations of the European Commission, Adelphi Research developed [case studies with regional scenarios on climate change and international security](#). The reports provide an overview of the potential risks and developments for the Indian-Pacific Ocean Island States, Middle America, South East Asia, and South West Asia.

▲Top

The revised and updated fourth Edition of the "[Green Planet Blues. Four Decades of Global Environmental Politics](#)" by Geoffrey Dabelko and Ken Conca examines global

environmental politics from a range of perspectives. The three key paradigms of sustainability, environmental security, and ecological justice frame the debates in the book. Fourteen new readings include discussions on environment-conflict linkages, including the case of Darfur; environmental peacebuilding; and the linkages between climate change and human rights.

▲Top

IMPRINT/CONTACT

The newsletter "Environment, Conflict, and Cooperation" is published every two months.

To subscribe or unsubscribe, please follow this link:

http://ecc-platform.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=144&Itemid=71

Disclaimer:

Adelphi Research recommends visiting the websites linked to this newsletter. Following a judgment by the Hamburg Regional Court (Landgericht), we must, however, dissociate ourselves from the design and content of all linked pages in order to prevent any compensation claims.

Publisher:

Alexander Carius
Adelphi Research gGmbH
Caspar-Theyss-Strasse 14a
D - 14193 Berlin

Phone +49-30-89 000 68 0
Fax +49-30-89 000 68 10
www.adelphi-research.de

Editorial team:

Contact: editor@ecc-platform.org

Alexander Carius, Irina Comardicea, Moira Feil, Kerstin Fritzsche, Annabelle Houdret, Annika Kramer, Monika Kronz, Achim Maas, Felix Ries, Christiane Röttger, Dennis Tänzler, Stephan Wolters
Translation support by Anya Malhotra

This newsletter is financed in part by the German Federal Environmental Agency and the Federal Ministry for Environment, Nature Protection and Nuclear Safety.

© Adelphi Research gGmbH and Germanwatch 2010

▲Top