



*Managing Natural Resources in Post-Conflict Societies:
Lessons in Making the Transition to Peace*

Geneva, 17-18 September 2007



Meeting Report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The sustainable management of natural resources in post-conflict countries has recently become a peacebuilding priority for the international community. In June 2007, the UN Security Council hosted a historic debate on this issue and concluded that poor management of high-value resources constitutes a threat to peace. In addition, the Support Office of the newly established UN Peacebuilding Commission has stated that “where resource exploitation has driven war, or served to impede peace, improving governance capacity to control natural resources is a critical element of peacebuilding.” The European Commission and the OECD Donor Assistance Committee have also emphasized the importance of natural resource management in fragile states.

In this context, the United Nations Environment Programme and the IUCN Commission on Environmental Law Specialist Group on Armed Conflict and the Environment held a joint workshop in Geneva on 17-18 September 2007 to exchange experiences and perspectives on “Managing Natural Resources in Post-Conflict Societies: Lessons in Making the Transition to Peace”. As part of a broader initiative with the Environmental Law Institute in Washington, DC and the University of Tokyo, the workshop aimed to take stock of experiences to date and identify issues for further research and analysis. It also discussed potential next steps and specific measures to ensure a higher profile for natural resource management in ongoing and future peacebuilding efforts.

To lay the ground for the analysis, participants started by identifying illustrative examples of post-conflict natural resource management. Among the 34 cases identified, experiences in Liberia, Jordan and Israel, Rwanda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan/Darfur, Somalia, Afghanistan, and Guatemala were selected for in-depth discussion. These cases were generally found to be complex and nuanced, with natural resources frequently playing a role in peacebuilding while at the same time contributing a measure of instability.

The discussion highlighted a number of issues that cut across the various experiences in post-conflict natural resource management. Foremost, there was strong consensus among the practitioners regarding a significant disconnect between institutional policies at the headquarters level and implementation on the ground. Further technical support is needed in translating generic guidance on natural resource management into practical action, policies, and operations at the field level. The critical need to approach natural resources management from a regional perspective was also identified. The examination of lessons learned also covered the processes for successful legal and institutional reform, monitoring and third-party oversight, as well as the value of incremental and adaptive approaches.

In light of this stock-taking exercise, the group considered what concrete measures could be taken to achieve a more consistent framework for mainstreaming natural resource management into post-conflict recovery and peacebuilding efforts. To respond to a clear

need for documented examples of the linkages between natural resource management and peacebuilding, participants strongly endorsed the proposal by UNEP and IUCN together with the Environmental Law Institute, and the University of Tokyo to gather best practices and lessons learned in an edited volume comprising both case studies and analysis of cross-cutting issues, to be published by 2009 (subject to funding). The volume would be provided to the Peacebuilding Commission and other international partners, and would serve as the basis for advocacy, training and policy development. Moreover, the analysis of these examples could be undertaken through a high-profile process that fosters dialogue and awareness of the role of natural resource management in post-conflict recovery.

Other concrete steps discussed during the meeting include the development of new analytical tools and technical guidelines, capacity-building and technical assistance, as well as the necessity of a formal political mandate to raise the profile of natural resource management in peacebuilding efforts.

In concluding, several entry points into ongoing institutional processes were identified, including: (i) the newly formed UN Peacebuilding Commission; (ii) various UN development strategies and tools, such as the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment of the UN Development Group, the UN Common Country Assessment (CCA), the UN Development and Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS); and (iii) the Cluster Working Group on Early Recovery (CWGER) of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee. Initiatives such as the International Mine Action Standards group and the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) were also highlighted. Finally, the development process of the “Capstone Doctrine” – the new operational policy being developed by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) – was seen as a critical entry point to advocate the need to address the role of peacekeepers in natural resource management.

These entry points emphasize the timeliness and relevance of this meeting and its follow-up. There is significant interest in improving post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery, and growing recognition that natural resource management can and should play a more consistent and important role.

DISCLAIMER: The views expressed in this document do not necessarily represent the official position of UNEP, IUCN, ELI, or any other participating institution.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
I INTRODUCTION	5
II IDENTIFYING CASE STUDIES	5
A. Introduction	5
B. Cases of successful post-conflict natural resource management.....	6
C. Cases where ineffective post-conflict natural resource management led to instability	9
D. Mixed or unclear cases.....	10
III SYNTHESIZING CROSS-CUTTING THEMES AND LESSONS LEARNED	12
A. Policy disconnects	12
C. Monitoring and third party oversight	13
D. Community engagement	13
E. Incremental and adaptive approaches.....	13
F. Financing	14
G. Terminology	14
IV. PRIORITIES FOR ACTION	15
A. Identifying best practice and lessons learned	15
B. Analytical tools.....	16
C. Technical guidelines	16
D. Capacity-building and technical assistance.....	17
E. Political mandate	17
F. Funding.....	18
G. Networking and further collaboration	18
V. RECOMMENDED ENTRY POINTS IN ONGOING PROCESSES.....	18
ANNEX 1. Meeting Agenda	21
ANNEX 2. Participant List	24
ANNEX 3. Message from Carolyn McAskie, ASG for Peacebuilding Support	29

I INTRODUCTION

On 17-18 September 2007, UNEP's Post-Conflict and Disaster Management Branch, together with the IUCN Commission on Environmental Law's Specialist Group on Armed Conflict and the Environment, co-hosted an international consultative meeting in Geneva on *Managing Natural Resources in Post-Conflict Societies: Lessons in Making the Transition to Peace* (see Annex 1 for the meeting agenda).

The meeting brought together thirty-five participants from a wide range of backgrounds, including practitioners from UN agencies, NGOs, humanitarian and peace organizations, and scholars from leading universities and think-thanks (see Annex 2 for the participant list).

Organized as part of a broader initiative in cooperation with the Environmental Law Institute and the University of Tokyo to identify and analyse ways in which natural resource management could facilitate the post-conflict transition to peace, this consultation had two general objectives: (i) to take stock of experiences to date and identify issues for further research and analysis, and (ii) to discuss potential next steps and specific measures to ensure a higher profile for natural resource management in ongoing or future peacebuilding efforts.

To maximize participant input, the meeting was structured as a facilitated dialogue under the Chatham House rule. This report does not attempt to provide a detailed record of all the points raised during the rich debate that took place over the two-day meeting, but rather to summarize the key points of discussion and to highlight next steps.

II IDENTIFYING CASE STUDIES

A. Introduction

To take stock of experiences and lay the ground for analysis, participants started by considering the universe of examples and identified 34 cases that were illustrative of post-conflict natural resource management (see Table 1). The participants *initially* categorized the experiences as (1) successful cases in which best practices in effective management of natural resources in post-conflict countries could be identified, (2) problematic cases in which the failure to manage natural resources had contributed to post-conflict instability, or (3) mixed or unclear cases. In some of the cases, the cycle of violence and instability complicated the analysis, as a particular country or countries may have relapsed or evolved from post-conflict to conflict, or somewhere along the spectrum (as in Iraq, Sudan/Darfur, DR Congo, and Nigeria).

Table 1. Examples of Post-Conflict Management of Natural Resources

Cases of best practice	Problematic cases	Mixed/Unclear cases
Israel/Jordan Lebanon Liberia Mozambique Rwanda Somalia Thailand	Cambodia Côte d'Ivoire Darfur (Sudan) DR Congo El Salvador Haiti Nigeria Somalia	Aceh, Indonesia Afghanistan Angola Bosnia Kosovo Myanmar Colombia East Timor Ethiopia Guatemala Iraq Japan Middle East/Palestine Nepal Niger Peru/Ecuador Sierra Leone Southern Sudan Turkana-Karamoja Cluster of Kenya/Uganda

Participants then selected three examples from each category for more in-depth discussion, attempting to draw out some of the lessons learned and cross-cutting issues for further analysis. This discussion made clear that the experiences were generally complex and nuanced, with natural resources frequently playing a role in peacebuilding while at the same time causing some measure of instability. Indeed, many of the experiences that were initially considered successful had multiple caveats, whereas problematic experiences often provided some useful lessons learned.

B. Cases of successful post-conflict natural resource management

Liberia

The role of timber revenues and the trade's infrastructure in bankrolling the Charles Taylor regime is well studied. Groundbreaking reports by Global Witness and by the United Nations expert panels resulted in UN-imposed sanctions on Liberia's timber trade in 2003. Since the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2003, reform of the forestry and mining sectors has been a key peacebuilding and economic priority.

Participants discussed the ongoing and so far successful reform of the forestry sector at the legal and policy levels, and noted the apparent knock-on effect of these efforts on reforms in other contentious sectors, such as land tenure. The decisive issue remains the translation of governance reforms into practice, particularly the sharing of concession benefits at the community level.

Reform in the forestry sector in Liberia was linked to international trade interests in the country's high-value timber resources. The international spotlight on these assets drew expertise and drove the reform process in a high-capacity way. In this context, international sanctions were useful for motivating reform and facilitating transition.

However, observers cautioned that these successes should still be considered fragile, given the Liberian government's fledgling capacity and dependence upon a strong UN presence. While there are examples of courageous government initiatives (such as taking on the rice cartels), many of the more entrenched interests in Liberia – the rubber concessions, for example – have yet to be addressed. Moreover, many of the reforms are still ongoing and, while promising, their long-term impact and success remain to be seen.

It was also noted that the UN peacekeeping mission in Liberia (UNMIL) was the first such mission to institute an “environmental and natural resources unit” with a specific mandate to provide technical assistance on natural resources management (as well as monitor its own environmental footprint). This was welcomed as a positive example. It was noted that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) needs to consider the role of peacekeepers in natural resources monitoring and management on a more systematic basis, within the ongoing policy process known as the Capstone Doctrine.

Jordan and Israel

The sharing of water resources was an element in the 1994 peace agreement between Jordan and Israel, and some progress has been achieved on water management issues, for example, through regional cooperation between technical experts. This is a positive example whereby the transboundary management of natural resources was used as a platform for technical cooperation and as an element of the regional peacebuilding process.

However, success in water resources management has failed to influence other sectors or contribute to wider peacebuilding efforts in the region. This is in part due to the fact that the peace agreement does not adequately address broader natural resource issues (including resolving disputes over land) and that its implementation has lacked follow-through in that respect. Moreover, the highly negative political context has impeded attempts by national experts to work together and move forward with other environmental projects, such as the creation of a transboundary “peace park” in the Jordan River Valley.

Natural resources, participants remarked, are but one element of the complex regional conflict, and inseparable from political and religious ties to the land. While the sound management of such resources could underpin a political peace, they need to be managed in ways that visibly contribute to livelihoods and economic development in the short term.

Rwanda

Rwanda provides an interesting combination of lessons learned at the community, national, and transboundary levels. The successful reform and rehabilitation of the national parks management authority coupled with the development of high-value mountain gorilla tourism is often cited as an example of best practice. Today, tourists pay US\$ 500 for a single gorilla permit plus a similar amount per day on luxury accommodation, meals, and transport. The funds generated from the sale of the permits are used for the management of the national parks and a percentage is shared with local communities to contribute to their development and improve natural resource management in the region. At the regional level, the signature of the “Declaration of Goma” by ministers from DR Congo, Rwanda, and Uganda was a major achievement toward the transboundary management of the gorilla population. The agreement includes joint patrols between the three countries, information exchange, and the sharing of revenues. The declaration, brokered by the International Gorilla Conservation Programme, could be a model of species-specific transboundary management as well as a good example of using natural resources as a platform for regional peacebuilding.

The Rwandan example, participants noted, illustrates the complexity of situations where the exploitation of natural resources is core to a shadow economy financing structures that governments do not have the budget to support. In this case, natural resources were exploited by the army to finance the maintenance of the forces necessary to respond to security concerns that were arguably legitimate – for example to create a buffer against Interahamwe attacks. The government requested support from the international community to reduce its own forces and thereby the need for illegal activities to finance the military operation. This request was denied. [In a somewhat similar case, the illegal exploitation of timber resources financed the Indonesian armed forces in Aceh, and thus fuelled decades of conflict].

Changing this culture of exploitation can be difficult, as it requires transparency (about illegal activities and shadow budgets, for example) that is often not possible or desired on a political level. Yet, this aspect cannot be overlooked in the search for long-term solutions to conflict.

Rwanda’s 2006 policy decision to ban charcoal production also provides an important lesson on the need for a regional approach to natural resources management. While the policy may have been effectively implemented in Rwanda, charcoal production and supply

was simply shifted to neighbouring DR Congo thereby further increasing extractive pressures, including on the Virunga National Park and World Heritage Site.

C. Cases where ineffective post-conflict natural resource management led to instability

Democratic Republic of the Congo

The conflict in DR Congo also has many lessons learned, as it involves a wide range of high-value natural resources coupled with ineffective governance and regional dynamics. It highlights the different economic and security roles that resources can play both during armed conflict as well as in the post-conflict period.

It has been well-documented by a number of high-level reports, including from Global Witness and the United Nations Expert Panel on Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and other Forms of Wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, that natural resources have fuelled conflict in DR Congo. All sides have exploited natural resources to fund military activities and control over high-value areas remains a strategic priority. It is believed that both government forces (FARDC) as well as rebel armed groups continue to benefit from illegal resource exploitation from national parks, in particular charcoal, bushmeat, minerals, and ivory. Some of the parks are also being used as bases to launch attacks against both government forces and local communities. Effective governance structures for natural resources are a critical peace building priority, yet slow progress is being made on building strong national and sub-national management capacity.

Another concern in DR Congo – as in many other cases – is that the process for reintegrating refugees, IDPs and former combatants can trigger a new set of natural resource-related problems in vulnerable environments. Attacks on gorillas in DR Congo, for example, have increased significantly since the end of the conflict, particularly when compared to gorilla casualties during the conflict. With the broader Virunga landscape, there is a need to facilitate dialogue between humanitarian, security, development, and environmental stakeholders for the development of sustainable livelihoods around Virunga National Park. Integrated programmes are needed to re-settle people and rebel groups currently living in the park or relying on park resources for livelihoods and income. At the same time, conflicts between communities over resource access must be avoided.

The group noted that there had been little follow-up of these issues in DR Congo so far, perhaps due to the fact that the UN Expert Panel report on the illegal exploitation of natural resources was weaker than similar studies in other countries. The participants noted that UNEP's recent commitment to conduct a post-conflict environmental assessment for DR Congo was a positive development which could further highlight the issues and identify points of entry for intervention.

Darfur, Sudan

For Darfur, the group noted the particular complexity of a multi-layered conflict, with resource scarcity a factor at the tribal level, political and economic factors at the national level, and ethnic tensions complicating the situation at the regional level.

The conflict over resources is best understood with reference to competing livelihood systems in a context of increasing water and land scarcity coupled with diminishing authority of the traditional administration. Indeed, this conflict affects numerous tribes that have migrated and changed livelihood strategies in response to droughts and increasing water scarcity since the early 1970s. Moreover, the violence has diminished the social capital necessary for effective resource management, and this has occurred in the context of significant impacts on resources from climate change and population growth.

The chronic tribal conflict has been manipulated as a counter-insurgency measure to quell the political uprising in Darfur against the government in 2003. This is not the first time this approach has been used in Sudan or even in Darfur, but the scale of the fighting in this case has been greater than previous uprisings. The current conflict has been accompanied by considerable environmental degradation, which further undermines traditional livelihoods and exacerbates the triggers for conflict at the tribal level.

The focus of peacebuilding initiatives has until now been the political rather than the tribal conflict, although natural resource management issues have been key to much of the ongoing violence – particularly against women – on the ground in Darfur.

D. Mixed or unclear cases

Somalia

Somalia represents an interesting case in that the situation differs dramatically from one part of the country to the other. Somaliland, for example, declared independence, led its own reconciliation process, and has now largely recovered from conflict with minimal international intervention. This has not been the case for other parts of the country, such as Puntland, where the situation is still problematic.

Natural resource issues linked to conflict in Somalia include land and grazing rights, but also fisheries and crops, such as bananas. The internal consumption as well as export of charcoal remains a key management issue. In this context, participants emphasized the need to take into account the role of importing countries in funding conflict through trade, and consider whether permutations of initiatives like the Kimberley Process could be applied to a variety of resource-based conflicts. It was also noted that given that relatively few international companies do business (e.g. purchase bananas) in a specific post-conflict context, it may be easier to address trade issues through informal means as well.

Afghanistan

The case of Afghanistan is a mixed scenario, but participants felt that it should nevertheless be considered an opportunity. On the positive side, in April 2005, Afghan President Hamid Karzai established the National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA), the country's first such entity. Eight months later on 18 December 2005, the Afghan cabinet approved an environmental framework law that for the first time gives Afghanistan the legal power it needs for environmental management. In a major EC- and Finnish-funded programme, UNEP is currently working with NEPA to strengthening its technical and professional capacity to implement the new law and its associated regulations.

Moreover, recent environmental diplomacy initiatives between Afghanistan and Iran on shared water issues in the Sistan Basin have also met with some success. Dialogue between the countries has been reinitiated and prospects exist for further technical cooperation and regional development, including a transboundary GEF project on the Sistan Basin.

Other positive elements include a successful reintegration programme which, participants noted, hinged upon the fact that local customary structures of authority remained in place in Afghanistan (this was also the case in Angola, for example).

The Afghan economy's dependence on the drug trade, however, represents a challenge for post-war stability, as it undermines governance and the rule of law at the local, national, and regional levels. Large areas are excluded from reform because of drugs-related banditry. Yet, one participant noted that opium acts as a "lubricant to peace" throughout Central Asia, as regional economies would collapse without it, leading to more conflict. Another major challenge faced by Afghanistan is the need to rehabilitate the severely degraded and deforested landscape in ways that contribute to livelihoods as well as to the restoration of ecological functions and services.

Guatemala

In Guatemala, natural resource and land tenure issues were taken into account in the 1996 peace accord, and parliament has continued to pass good legislation. However, it was noted that the current levels of violence and criminality (there are more murders today than at the height of the civil war) undermine efforts of implementation and enforcement, as gangs and warlords frequently wield more power than government.

III SYNTHESIZING CROSS-CUTTING THEMES AND LESSONS LEARNED

The discussion highlighted a number of issues that cut across the various experiences in post-conflict natural resource management. The participants examined common factors that could influence the effectiveness of different approaches.

A. Policy disconnects

Foremost, there was strong consensus among the practitioners regarding a significant disconnect between institutional policies at the headquarters level and implementation on the ground. In some cases, participants said, poorly defined or implemented policies do more harm than good and can compound poor resource management situations. Best and worst practices are still not being effectively incorporated at the policy level or implemented at the field level. Three cases were highlighted.

First, participants noted that while the employment of ex-combatants as wildlife guards (which has been proposed as an option for Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) programmes in DR Congo, Sudan, and Afghanistan, for example) can be an important step (as in Mozambique), it has in certain cases met with significant resistance from international organizations. Indeed, without payment of staff salaries and strong institutional capacity to support such a measure, guards often turn to using the resources under their protection for income generation. Practitioners thus emphasized the need for such DDR or short-term employment policies to be based on solid operational experience, while continuing to be forward-thinking.

Second, participants noted that there continues to be a disconnect between the humanitarian and development communities at both the policy and field levels. Humanitarian operations focus on life-saving measures that are immediately necessary, but seldom consider the environmental implications of the unsustainable use of natural resources. Extensive deforestation for shelter and energy increases soil erosion, as well as the risk of landslides and flooding, while over-pumping groundwater aquifers can lead to exhaustion and conflicts with local communities. Short-term operations have medium- and long-term impacts that can actually increase vulnerability and lead to the onset of new crises. Participants noted a lack of contextual analysis feeding into work programmes at the field level; they advocated focusing on linkages between the environment and livelihoods as a way to address this gap.

Finally, issues related to management of IDP and refugee camps were cited as examples to illustrate the disconnect between policy and implementation. While UNHCR guidelines for the environmental siting and management of camps do exist, the current situation in Darfur and other places demonstrates that the guidelines frequently are not effectively implemented. Some participants did nevertheless note progress in mainstreaming environmental issues into humanitarian practices, and recognized that better inter-agency

coordination was visible since the implementation of the new IASC cluster approach for humanitarian response.

B. Processes for legal and institutional reform

Participants repeatedly returned to the process for the successful legal reform and policy development in post-conflict settings, contrasting bottom-up and top-down approaches. It was noted that the post-conflict transition phase is an opportunity to introduce such approaches into policy design. The new land tenure legislation in Angola – which was drafted by foreign law-makers without any consultation – is widely seen as problematic and may lead to significant animosity over high-value agricultural lands.

C. Monitoring and third party oversight

Another issue cutting across a number of experiences is that of monitoring and third-party oversight, a crucial requirement for successful natural resource management that is often lacking as governments in transition rarely have the capacity to undertake this task. The importance of effective monitoring systems was also emphasized in a brief group discussion on the role of private companies and corporate initiatives. The Kimberley Process for diamond certification, for example, imposes extensive requirements on participant states but is essentially self-enforced. Any monitoring has so far been undertaken on a voluntary basis by NGOs or other such entities. An even more problematic gap is the international corporate sector's lack of oversight regarding the equitable distribution of the revenue generated by the commercial exploitation of natural resources, a key condition for stability and sustainable development.

D. Community engagement

The importance of engaging communities was emphasized as essential for ensuring that the environmental policies are appropriate to the local context and that there is political and popular support for reforms and initiatives. Promoting this dialogue on environmental issues is especially important given the role that natural resources play in the vast majority of post-conflict communities. Moreover, environmental issues can introduce an important element of commonality for communities to build on in a post-conflict or transition setting. For example, formerly warring interests in post-conflict Kosovo were able to come to the table to discuss demining and water management.

E. Incremental and adaptive approaches

Another lesson learned from past experiences in natural resource management is that success can often be built through small, incremental steps. In Sierra Leone, for example, rather than initially tackling the full set of issues around land tenure reform – which would have taken years – a more modest measure addressing the right of reversion was introduced, enabling returnees to farm while the broader land reform process was

undertaken. Another example of progressive land reform was noted in post-conflict Cambodia.

F. Financing

Acknowledging the particular constraint that environmental administrations often are regulatory and do not generate funds for their activities (even if they generate revenues for the nation's treasury), the group also examined the issue of financing and the use of economic instruments for natural resource management. Given the difficulty of mobilizing domestic budgets, participants welcomed the increasing trend of reinvesting funds generated by natural resources into the sustainable management of those same resources. The proposed reinvestment of timber funds in Liberia – introduced by post-conflict reforms – was cited as a positive example in this respect.

G. Terminology

Participants debated the challenges associated with “post-conflict” terminology, and discussed the alternatives offered by the “transition” model used by humanitarian actors and the “early recovery/recovery” model adopted in the development community. Most agreed that the discussion was essentially donor-driven, with various labels designed to fit different sets of donor guidelines rather than to reflect the realities of such situations at field level. Ultimately, though, it was noted that it is necessary to discuss the issues within a conceptual framework that is consistent with how people in the field view, construct, and undertake post-conflict interventions.

Participants then worked to reach a common understanding of peacebuilding. A conceptual framework comprising three core components – improving governance, restoring security, and supporting economic recovery – was proposed and discussed.

In relation to governance, the debates highlighted tension between two conflicting aspirations: on the one hand, a strong shared sense that institutional development should build upon existing institutions and traditional structures rather than import western models (*facilitate rather than dictate*); and the deep-seated notion that the post-conflict period can and often should somehow be transformative, for example to address grievances that initially led to conflict. In this context, several participants cautioned against the use of the term “democratic governance” as a goal for peacebuilding, proposing “improved governance” or an equivalent instead.

Issues highlighted in relation to restoring security included how to mainstream information on the location and management risks of natural resources into peacekeeping operations at the early planning stages, and how to distinguish between natural resources that cause conflict and those that fuel it. Also of note was the potential value of community security programmes, such as the pilot project implemented by UNDP in Southern Sudan, to identify security risks – including environmental threats – at the local level.

Regarding economic recovery, participants observed that post-conflict economic systems are extremely complex and fragmented in nature, as they involve remnants of the formal economy as well as parallel aid, illegal, and livelihood economies. In the aftermath of war, fragmentation also affects social structures, shrinking the circle of potential trusted economic partners, while the lack of security shortens perspectives. In terms of natural resource exploitation, this combination of factors typically leads to more extractive practices for short-term gain and undermines efforts of longer-term sustainable management.

IV. PRIORITIES FOR ACTION

In light of the stock-taking exercise summarized above, the group considered whether natural resource management deserved a higher profile in peacebuilding and post-conflict recovery, and if so, what concrete measures could be taken to achieve a more consistent framework for this approach.

Recognizing that natural resources cause, fuel, and prolong conflicts worldwide, immediate consensus was achieved on the need to raise the profile of environmental and natural resource management in peacebuilding efforts conducted in conflict-affected countries. Participants also agreed that environmental considerations should be integrated into the peace process as early as possible. Indeed, the experience to date in addressing natural resources during the negotiation and adoption of peace agreements illustrates that more effective and careful consideration of these issues could mitigate certain conflicts.

In the final part of the meeting, the group examined seven concrete activities and measures that could enhance the role of natural resource management in supporting the transition to peace in post-conflict societies. These are described below.

A. Identifying best practice and lessons learned

To respond to a clear need for documented examples of the linkages between natural resource management and peacebuilding, a consortium of organizations (including the meeting organizers, the Environmental Law Institute, and the University of Tokyo) propose to gather best practices and lessons learned in an edited volume comprising both case studies and analysis of cross-cutting issues, to be published by 2009 (subject to funding).

Meeting participants showed keen interest in the project, and raised two specific methodological issues to take into consideration. First, some cautioned against case studies focusing exclusively on the country level, noting that not only had significant work already been done in this respect, but also that successes were often better observed at the regional or sub-national levels. Another risk of using countries as the unit of analysis is

that of overlooking the importance of global processes that influence post-conflict situations, such as international trade.

Second, to ensure that the findings have an impact and are translated into policy, it is essential that the analysis align with the common language and frameworks used to model and discuss conflict in the wider community of people working on conflict-related issues. Workshops could be held to “socialize” authors into these frameworks and share work in progress. These workshops could be part of a broader effort to foster dialogue and consideration of the role of natural resource management in post-conflict recovery and reconstruction.

Meeting participants interested in collaborating in the proposed publication were invited to come forward, and several approached the organizers after the close of the meeting.

B. Analytical tools

Participants noted that while several conflict analysis tools already exist, few can be considered to effectively integrate natural resource management issues. To address this gap, participants reported that UNEP and the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) have formed a partnership to develop a methodology for mainstreaming environmental issues into conflict analysis. Initial documents can be expected by the end of 2007.

Other potentially useful tools include sustainable livelihoods frameworks and rapid rural appraisals, which can be modified to be appropriate for the post-conflict setting.

C. Technical guidelines

The group discussed a number of areas in which post-conflict natural resource management could benefit from further technical guidance.

Specific guidelines, several participants thought, are needed for the management of conflict-fuelling natural resources (e.g., timber, rubber, oil, diamonds, bananas, etc).

The group also called for guidance on how to engage civil society, as this sector is too often ignored by the international community, with sometimes highly negative results. The three universities in Darfur, for instance, represent a crucial knowledge base, yet they have not been effectively engaged by the humanitarian community. Community-based approaches are also necessary to ensure that guidance is delivered at the ground level.

Adaptation to climate change and its integration into conflict analysis and capacity-building was another area where guidance was considered necessary. Linkages to disaster management and the need for systematic analysis of environmental issues affecting humanitarian planning were also stressed in this context.

In addition, while many international organizations have guidelines addressing different aspects of post-conflict assistance, these are generally silent on natural resources or other environmental matters. It may be possible to add new modules or provisions to such guidelines, and a number of international organizations are exploring such opportunities.

D. Capacity-building and technical assistance

Capacity-building for environmental management, participants agreed, should focus on maintaining capacity during conflict in addition to rebuilding it in its aftermath. In Eastern Congo, for instance, a joint WWF/GTZ project has supported the maintenance of park staff for 15 years. Other capacity-maintaining initiatives include the funding of visiting/training positions given to civil servants from Mozambique within the Tanzanian administration during Mozambique's civil war. Similar cases can be found elsewhere in East Africa.

In terms of technical assistance, some participants called for consolidated rosters of experts in areas such as conflict-fuelling natural resources, while stressing the need to involve local institutions that have both knowledge and capacity but are not necessarily actively engaged in international circles of expertise. Yet, it was noted, the sustainability and ultimate effectiveness of capacity-building initiatives hinges upon engagement with and transfer of knowledge to local communities and institutions. The group also generally pushed for greater cooperation between UN and NGO communities, emphasizing the latter's high level of expertise and access in situations where the former may be constrained by political or security concerns.

In the field of natural resource monitoring, many positive examples of training and capacity-building were noted for the tracking of timber, but capacity was considered to be lacking for other natural resources.

Other entry points for technical assistance to post-conflict countries can be found in the international commitments (such as environmental conventions) made by those countries. These commitments can be used to leverage funds, mobilize staff, and initiate activities.

Generally speaking, the group agreed on the need to hear more from those working on the ground, to make sure that the issues that they face on a day-to-day basis are being addressed.

E. Political mandate

There was strong consensus that a formal political mandate would be critically important in raising the profile of natural resource management in peacebuilding efforts. As a first step, a series of high-level meetings with various agency/organization directors would be useful to gauge interest and awareness levels. More generally, it is necessary to identify

opportunities and entry points for generating political momentum to initiate change and influence action at the ground level.

F. Funding

Participants also discussed the financing of such activities. A number of options were examined, including the aforementioned use of funds generated by sustainable natural resource exploitation (such as the revenue stream derived from forestry concessions in Liberia) and the possibility of tapping into discretionary pools of bilateral funding that often exist for agencies and decision-makers to use at country level.

The need for early collaboration and better coordination of UN agencies – in particular with DPKO and UNDP who spearhead the recovery process – was also emphasized in this context, although progress made thus far through to the “One UN” reform was acknowledged.

G. Networking and further collaboration

Participants saw many opportunities to move forward with the present group of experts and practitioners, although the absence of peacekeeping representatives was noted and regretted. Other organizations such as FAO and UN Habitat should also be included in follow-up activities.

V. RECOMMENDED ENTRY POINTS IN ONGOING PROCESSES

Several ongoing institutional processes were found to offer opportunities to improve natural resource management in peacebuilding. The participants recommended follow-up actions and further engagement in the following processes:

- The UN Inter-agency Working Group on Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (comprising UN agencies and NGOs) developed comprehensive standards, which as yet fail to include best environmental practice (www.unddr.org). UNEP and other meeting participants were encouraged to join the group to help mainstream environmental issues into the group’s work plan.
- Initiatives such as the International Mine Action Standards group, whose approach inspired the Working Group on DDR, are also worth exploring for opportunities to further mainstream environmental concerns, as new modules are regularly added.
- Participants were also invited to join in meetings of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Cluster Working Group on Early Recovery (CWGER). The group has been taking stock of existing tools and working to develop a rapid post-disaster needs assessment for immediate crisis situations. In this context, it has

been working on a roster of experts and would welcome input regarding terms of reference for environmental experts, for example.

- Efforts are also being deployed to mainstream environmental issues into the work of the newly formed Peacebuilding Commission. While environment does not constitute a formal sector of activity for the Commission, this gap should be considered a question of means, rather than one of interest or understanding, as was made clear by the statement given to this meeting by Carolyn McAskie, the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support (see Annex 3). In this context, UNEP noted plans to second a staff member to Peacebuilding Commission to support the mainstreaming these issues in the peacebuilding process. UNEP is also partnering with the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) to develop conflict analysis methods that include environment and natural resources.
- Given the new cluster approach, UN country teams are crucial to integrating natural resource management and other environmental issues in planning at country level.
- UNDP also invited collaboration and exchange – for example on case studies – in the context of a project examining linkages between conflicts and natural disasters and how to improve risk assessments and programming for recovery scenarios in countries subject to both risks.
- The Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) is developing a new operational policy called the Capstone Doctrine. UNEP and other organizations were encouraged to emphasise the need to address the role of peacekeepers in natural resource management in the policy development process.
- Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative supports improved governance in resource-rich countries through the verification and full publication of company payments and government revenues from oil, gas, and mining. The Initiative works to build multi-stakeholder partnerships in developing countries in order to increase the accountability of governments.

The participants noted that these ongoing processes provide a range of fora in which the various activities and measures identified as next steps – including examining best practices, developing analytic tools and technical guidance, and building capacity – can be undertaken, shared, and scaled up. Many of these ongoing processes would be receptive to considering how to further improve peacebuilding, including lessons learned from effective natural resource management in post-conflict societies. Moreover, these processes offer opportunities for developing policy and guidance that will shape future post-conflict recovery efforts.

This meeting emphasized the growing interest among institutions and regions in post-conflict natural resource management. It also highlighted the broadening recognition that effective natural resource management can support and enhance peacebuilding. Building upon the exchange of experiences at the meeting, the next steps will be to document and analyse specific experiences in post-conflict natural resource management, develop appropriate policy and operational frameworks, put in place the reforms, and build capacity.

ANNEX 1. Meeting Agenda

MONDAY	17th SEPTEMBER 2007
09.00 – 10.00 Hrs	<p>OPENING</p> <p>Welcome Remarks, by UNEP and IUCN</p> <p>Meeting Objectives, Carl Bruch, Environmental Law Institute and Co-Chair, IUCN CEL Specialist Group on Armed Conflict and the Environment</p> <p>Participant Introductions</p>
10.00 – 10.30 Hrs	TEA / COFFEE BREAK
<p>Session 1</p> <p>10.30 – 13.00 Hrs</p>	<p>IDENTIFICATION OF EXPERIENCES, facilitated by Carl Bruch and Rosie Sharpe</p> <p><i>This session will identify specific instances where natural resource management has influenced the transition to peace in post-conflict societies.</i></p> <p>Questions for Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which countries successfully prioritized sustainable management of natural resources in the peace building strategy? How was this achieved? - What are the best examples where natural resources have concretely contributed to peace building in conflict-affected countries? - What are specific examples in which the private sector has taken a lead in managing conflict and post-conflict natural resources (e.g., the Kimberley Process)? - What are the worst examples where natural resources contributed to a relapse of conflict or to a temporary destabilization of peace? - Which peace agreements provide best and worst examples of addressing natural resources grievances, access, or revenue sharing?
13.00 – 14.30 Hrs	LUNCH BREAK

<p>Session 2 14.30 – 16.30 Hrs</p>	<p>CROSS-CUTTING THEMES AND LESSONS LEARNED, facilitated by Michael Bothe</p> <p><i>Drawing from Session 1, this session will discuss lessons learned that cut across the various experiences in post-conflict natural resource management. Participants will consider common issues and factors that may affect the effectiveness of approaches. They will also examine how post-conflict natural resource management measures relate to – and may depend on – other measures.</i></p> <p>Questions for Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the key lessons learned in terms of successfully integrating sustainable management of natural resources in peacebuilding processes (including in the domestic policy agenda as well as in donor agendas)? - Who are the most common stakeholders in terms of linking natural resource management to peacebuilding? How best can civil society be involved? - What are the risks involved in using natural resources for peacebuilding? How can these risks be managed? - What is the best way to organize government structures and public participation for NRM in post-conflict countries (centralized vs. decentralized; public participation in decision-making)?
<p>16.30 – 17.00 Hrs</p>	<p>TEA / COFFEE BREAK</p>
<p>Session 3 17.00 – 18.00 Hrs</p>	<p>LOOKING FORWARD, facilitated by Ken Conca</p> <p><i>This session will examine whether and when natural resource management should have a higher profile in peacebuilding efforts in post-conflict countries. If so, how could a more consistent framework be achieved?</i></p> <p>Questions for Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on experience to date, should natural resource management have a more consistent or systematic role in post-conflict peacebuilding efforts? If so, how? - How can a focus on the management of natural resources in post-conflict countries be justified in the initial peace consolidation period (e.g., during the first two years)?
<p>18.00 – 19.00 Hrs</p>	<p>RECEPTION (lobby outside the Rhin Room)</p>

TUESDAY	18 th SEPTEMBER 2007
<p><i>Session 4</i></p> <p>9.00 – 11.00 Hrs</p>	<p>NEXT STEPS, facilitated by Hassan Partow and Carl Bruch</p> <p><i>This session will identify measures that could be undertaken to assist the transition to peace in post-conflict societies through natural resource management. These may include – but are not limited to – analysis of experiences to date, development of technical guidelines, institutional reform, capacity building, and policy development. Ongoing processes, such as efforts at the UN Peacebuilding Commission, will also be discussed.</i></p> <p>Questions for Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the specific needs and opportunities for building institutional and technical capacity to strengthen post-conflict peacebuilding, particularly through effective natural resource management? - What analytical tools are available to assess the contribution of natural resources to conflict and to identify opportunities for peacebuilding? - What are the main capacity gaps within the UN in terms of linking natural resources and peacebuilding? What role could UNEP and its partners play in addressing this gap? - How can the experiences and lessons learned from civil society organizations be captured?
<p>11.00 – 11.30 Hrs</p>	<p>TEA / COFFEE BREAK</p>
<p>11.30 – 12.30 Hrs</p>	<p>NEXT STEPS (cont.)</p>
<p>12.30 – 13.00 Hrs</p>	<p>CLOSING REMARKS</p>

ANNEX 2. Participant List

Ms. Al-Sharifeh Nawzat bint Ali
Member, Steering Committee
IUCN CEL Specialist Group on Armed
Conflict & the Environment
P.O. Box 35135
Amman 11180, Jordan
Tel: +962 777 939 506
Fax: +962 6 55 60 288
Email: nawzat@hotmail.com

Rina Alluri
Research Associate
Swisspeace
Sonnenbergstrasse 17
3000 Bern 7, Switzerland
Tel: +41 31 330 1071
Fax: +41 31 330 1213
Email: rina.alluri@swisspeace.ch

Professor Michael Bothe
Co-Chair, IUCN CEL Specialist Group
on Armed Conflict & the Environment
University of Frankfurt
Theodor Heuss Strasse 6
64625 Bensheim, Germany
Tel: +49 6251 4345
Fax: +49 6251 65240
Email: bothe-bensheim@t-online.de

Ms. Glauca Boyer
DDR Policy Specialist
UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention
and Recovery (BCPR)
International Environment House
11-13 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8678
Fax: +41 22 917 8060
Email: glauca.boyer@undp.org

Ms. Robyn Bright
Project Officer
Interpeace
7-9 Chemin de Balxert
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8854
Fax: +41 22 917 8039
Email: bright@interpeace.org

Mr. Brendan Bromwich
Environmental Advisor
UNEP Post-conflict & Disaster
Management Branch
International Environment House
15 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: + 41 22 917 8530
Fax: + 41 22 917 8064
Email: brendan.bromwich@unep.ch

Mr. Oli Brown
Project Manager
International Institute for Sustainable
Development (IISD)
International Environment House 2
9 chemin de Balxert
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8630
Fax: +41 22 917 8054
Email: obrown@iisd.org

Mr. Carl Bruch

Senior Attorney
Co-Director, International Programs
Environmental Law Institute
Co-Chair, IUCN CEL Specialist Group
on Armed Conflict & the Environment
2000 L Street NW, Suite 620
Washington, DC
20036 USA
Tel: +1 202 939 3879
Fax: +1 202 939 8368
Email: bruch@eli.org

Professor Ken Conca

Department of Government and
Politics, University of Maryland
3114-J Tydings Hall
College Park, MD
20742 USA
Tel: +1 301 405 4125
Fax: +1 301 314 9690
Email: kconca@gvpt.umd.edu

Ms. Fenella Frost

UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention
and Recovery (BCPR)
11-13 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8354
Fax: +41 22 917 8060
Email: fenella.frost@undp.org

Ms. Silja Halle

Communications Advisor
UNEP Post-Conflict and Disaster
Management Branch
International Environment House
15 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8441
Fax: +41 22 917 8064
Email: silja.halle @unep.ch

Mrs. Marion Harroff-Tavel

Political Adviser to the Directorate
International Committee of the Red
Cross (ICRC)
19 Avenue de la Paix
1202 Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 730 2683
Fax: +41 22 733 2057
Email: mharrofftavel@icrc.org

Mr. David Jensen

Policy and Planning Coordinator
UNEP Post-Conflict and Disaster
Management Branch
International Environment House
15 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8167
Fax: +41 22 917 8064
Email: david.jensen@unep.ch

Ms. Birgitta Liljedahl

Senior Scientist
Environmental Impact Analysis
FOI Swedish Defence Research
Agency
Cementvägen 20
S-901 82 Umeå , Sweden
Tel: +46 90 106606
Fax: + 46 90 106800
Email: birgitta.liljedahl@foi.se

Dr. Simon Mason

Senior Researcher, Mediation Support
Project
Center for Security Studies
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology,
ETH Zurich
Weinbergstrasse 11
8092 Zurich, Switzerland
Tel: +41 44 632 67 67
Fax: +41 44 632 19 41
Email: mason@sipo.gess.ethz.ch

Professor Marcos Mollar
University of Buenos Aires
Alvarez Jonte 5945
CP 1408
Buenos Aires
Argentina
Tel: + 54 11 46440517
Email: mnmollar@hotmail.com

Ms. Cecilia Morales
Advisor
UNEP Post-Conflict and Disaster
Management Branch
14 rue Montoyer
1000 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 2 213 3055
Fax: +32 2 213 3051
Email: cecilia.morales@unep.ch

Professor Mikiyasu Nakayama
Institute of Environmental Studies
Graduate School of Frontier Sciences
University of Tokyo
Email: nakayama@k.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Mr. Thomas Nydegger
Hydrogeologist, Head of Sector, Water
and Habitat Unit
International Committee of the Red
Cross (ICRC)
19 Avenue de la Paix
1202 Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 730 26 60
Fax: +41 22 733 20 57
Email: tnydegger@icrc.org

Mr. Hassan Partow
Senior Environmental Expert
UNEP Post-Conflict and Disaster
Management Branch
International Environment House
15 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8665
Fax: +41 22 917 8064
Email: hassan.partow@unep.ch

Mr. Sean Peoples
Program Assistant
Woodrow Wilson International Center
for Scholars
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
One Woodrow Wilson Plaza
Washington, DC
20004 USA
Tel: +1 202 691 4186
Fax: +1 202 691 4001
Email: sean.peoples@wilsoncenter.org

Mr. Pierre-Michel Perret
Agronomist, Deputy-Head, Economic
Security Unit
International Committee of the Red
Cross (ICRC)
19 Avenue de la Paix
1202 Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 730 2313
Email: pperret@icrc.org

Mr. Raj Rana
Project Coordinator, International
Geneva – UN Peacebuilding
Commission
Geneva Centre for Security Policy
7 bis avenue de la Paix
Case Postale 1295
1211 Geneva 1
Tel: +41 76 532 6480
Email: r.rana@gcsp.ch

Ms. Gaëla Roudy-Fraser
UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention
and Recovery (BCPR)
International Environment House
11-13 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8238
Email: gaela.roudy@undp.org

Dr. Albrecht Schnabel
Senior Research Fellow, Swisspeace
Lecturer, Bern University
Sonnenbergstrasse 17
3000 Bern 7, Switzerland
Tel: +41 31 330 1071
Fax: +41 31 330 1213
Email:
albrecht.schnabel@swisspeace.ch

Ms. Rosie Sharpe
Senior Campaigner, Conflict
Resources Team
Global Witness
PO Box 6042
Archway, London
N19 5WP, UK
Tel: +44 20 7561 6393
Fax: +44 20 7272 9425
Email: rsharpe@globalwitness.org

Mr. Henrik Slotte
Chief
UNEP Post-Conflict and Disaster
Management Branch
International Environment House
15 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8530
Fax: +41 22 917 8064
Email: henrik.slotte@unep.ch

Mr. Matthias Stiefel
Founder and Vice-Chairman
Interpeace
International Environment House 2
7-9 Chemin de Balxert
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Mobile: +41 79 287 2437
Email: stiefel@interpeace.org

Mr. Surin Suksuwan
Protected Areas Officer
WWF International/WWF-Malaysia
Avenue du Mont-Blanc
1196 Gland, Switzerland
Tel: +41 79 703 1952
Fax: +41 22 364 4892
Email: ssuksuwan@wwf.org.my

Ms. Mara Tignino
University of Geneva
Email: mara.tignino@droit.unige.ch

Professor Jon Unruh
Department of Geography
McGill University
805 Sherbrooke Street W
Montreal, Quebec H3A 2K6
Canada
Tel: +1 514 398 8989
Fax: +1 514 398 7437
Email: jon.unruh@mcgill.ca

Ms. Anne-Cécile Vialle
Operations & Research Assistant
UNEP Post-Conflict and Disaster
Management Branch
International Environment House
15 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8512
Fax: +41 22 917 8064
Email: anne-cecile.vialle@unep.ch

Mr. Scott Weber
Director-General
Interpeace
7-9 Chemin de Balxert
1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8593
Fax: +41 22 917 8039
Email: info@interpeace.org

Mr. Tetsuro Yoshida
Associate Legal Officer
United Nations High Commissioner
for Refugees (UNHCR)
94 Rue Montbrillant
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 739 8755
Fax: +41 22 739 7361
Email: yoshidat@unhcr.org

ANNEX 3. Message from Carolyn McAskie, ASG for Peacebuilding Support

UNITED NATIONS
Peacebuilding Support Office



NATIONS UNIES
Bureau d'appui à la consolidation de la paix

Message from Carolyn McAskie Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support

The Peacebuilding Natural Resource Management Nexus

War-torn countries rich in natural resources face particular challenges in the stabilization and reconstruction of their societies, despite the apparent promise that natural resource wealth holds for peacebuilding and development. Where resource exploitation has driven war, or served to impede peace, improving governance capacity to control natural resources is a critical element of peacebuilding.

Among the recommendations of *The Report of the Secretary-General's High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change* (2004) – which included the call for the establishment of a Peacebuilding Commission – was an invitation for the United Nations to “work with international financial institutions, civil society organizations and the private sector, to develop norms governing the management of natural resources in countries emerging from, or at risk of, conflict.”

Acknowledging the mismanagement of natural resources as among the root causes of conflict, Peacebuilding efforts involve, *inter alia*, measures targeted to strengthen national capacities within security and governance institutions. Control over natural resources is of course fundamental to sovereignty and ultimately, it is governments and people who must put in place the systems that enable resource wealth to support long-term development.

The United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office is eager to explore further the issues of natural resource management. While this issue has not yet been tabled by the PBC as a thematic issue, natural resource management needs to be an integral part of the country-specific discussions of the Commission as part of the PBC's mandate to “bring together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery.” (UNGA Res. 60/180 of 20 Dec. 2005) The PBSO intends to strengthen its own internal capacity to analyze and raise critical natural resource management issues through the possible secondment of a United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) staff in the near future.

“Where resource exploitation has driven war, or served to impede peace, improving governance capacity to control natural resources is a critical element of peacebuilding.”

14 September 2007