



**Global Legislators Organisation for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE-EU)
and
Institute for Environmental Security (IES)**

Symposium on Sustainable Development and Security: Challenges and Opportunities

31 May 2006 ħ European Parliament ħ Brussels

Coordinators: Quentin Huxham, GLOBE-EU and Ronald A. Kingham, IES

**Summary Report by
Johannah Bernstein**

Introduction

On 31 May 2006, Global Legislators Organisation for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE-EU) and the Institute for Environmental Security (IES) hosted a symposium at the European Parliament entitled "Sustainable Development and Security: Challenges and Opportunities". The symposium's main objective was to stimulate debate on the environmental security challenge and to help initiate a political process related to the IES's new programme on Greening European Security and prepare for a full conference on these and related issues in December 2006 at the Peace Palace in The Hague.

Tom Spencer, Vice-Chairman of IES opened the symposium with a brief introduction on the relationships between environment, development and security and Anders Wijkman, MEP and President of GLOBE-EU spoke on the need for a greening of European security policy.

The symposium was organised around two separate panels of experts from diverse backgrounds, who addressed the challenges and opportunities for advancing the environmental security imperative. The first panel addressed the substantive environmental security challenges and the second panel addressed the opportunities for improving the way in which Member States, the EU and the international community responds to environmental conflict.

Panel 1: Challenges

The panel on challenges was moderated by Karl von Wogau, MEP, Chairman of the EP Defence Sub-Committee and included the following panellists: Robert Cooper (Director-General, DGE-External and Politico Military Affairs, Council of the European Union) addressed the topic of threat assessment in the 21st century and the EU's response; Worldwatch President Chris Flavin addressed the challenge of redefining global security; Frits Schlingemann, Director and Regional Representative, Regional Office for Europe, UNEP, addressed the challenges of solving environmental problems which pose security risks in Europe. And finally, Michel Rocard, MEP and Member of the EP Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence Sub-Committee, Former

French Prime Minister (1988-1991), addressed the challenges of ensuring more conflict – sensitive development cooperation policy in the European Union.

Threat assessment in the 21st century

Dr. Robert Cooper's presentation addressed the scope of the European Security Strategy (ESS), the EU's response to conflict around the world, and the challenges in improving the EU's capacity to deal effectively with the new global threat scenario.

When the ESS was first drafted, the intention was actually to restrict its ambit to those threats caused by humans in order to create a manageable and viable regime. The main types of threats addressed by the ESS include: terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, state failure.

Despite its rather restricted ambit, Dr. Cooper stressed that the ESS approach has not been entirely conventional. He acknowledged that threats are changing as a result of increased interdependence, with one very big difference emerging from the globalisation phenomenon that "other peoples' wars and conflicts matter". As well, there are increasingly clear environmental dimensions to these security threats, which have important implications for the development of peace and security policy. For example, weapons of mass destruction, if used, could have dramatic environmental consequences and regional conflict and state failure are intimately connected to poverty and environmental degradation. Another interesting point raised was that state failure is "a rather peculiar case of underdevelopment", especially when seen against the broader backdrop of development policy aims, namely "to develop the state, democratic institutions and the rule of law".

Dr. Cooper then outlined the EU's response in a number of conflict zones, where it is endeavouring to advance security and stability on the ground. For example, in the occupied territories, where the environmental security issue is very much related to scarce water resources, the EU has been working towards the creation of a two-state solution. In Aceh, where EU officials are monitoring the implementation of the peace agreement that was negotiated by former Finnish President Maati Ahtissaari, the environmental issue has of course been the continuing illegal logging that has provided the revenue engine to finance ongoing conflict in the region.

By contrast, in the Congo, where the illegal trade in gold and diamonds has paid for and has indeed ensured the profitability of the conflict, the EU has addressed its efforts to improve the functioning of the Defence Ministry apparatus, especially to ensure that the army is properly remunerated. This is an important priority since experience has revealed the destabilising role played by an unpaid army or indeed an army paid for by local commanders, a scenario, Dr. Cooper emphasised, facilitates "power grabs" by war-lords. Thus, the EU will continue to assist the UN in establishing multi-party elections as part of a long-term political process of building democratic institutions. Darfur on the other hand, was referred to rather starkly as the "first war of climate change".

In terms of the overarching challenges, Dr. Cooper first highlighted the fact that the EU foreign and security budget is very small compared to the development budget. This is obviously a factor that will constrain the EU's ability to act effectively in responding to new peace and security threats. As a matter of priority, the Council and the Commission must develop integrated approaches in their conflict prevention and peace-building work in conflict zones. Moreover, everything that the EU currently does on the ground is of course done in partnership, most importantly with governments and local populations, as well as other international organisations. These partnerships must be strengthened and properly resourced. In the realm of institutional

reform, there is more for the EU to do in terms of bringing together the key institutions in environment, development and security spheres.

But even more concretely, what is particularly essential is the creation of deployable police forces. These must be equipped with the resources and legitimate authority to enforce peace agreements. Despite the relative ease in deploying military units abroad, the EU experience has revealed much greater difficulty in mobilising and deploying the necessary police forces which, in the eyes of the general public, represent the rule of law in ways that the military has not always been associated.

Dr. Cooper emphasised that the EU must consider the ever-broadening array of threats to peace and security and develop new tools and institutions that can respond accordingly. Clearly, an EU Constitution will be essential for providing the legal framework for the new approaches that must be developed. Among these is the proposal for a European Human Security Force. As well, the EU must continue to support the deployment of civilian resources to monitor peace agreements. However, monitoring efforts are not enough and resources must be mobilised to not only promote effective peace-building, but as well, to ensure the creation of the democratic institutions, which will be essential in the maintenance of peace and security in the years to come.

Redefining global security

The presentation of Chris Flavin, President of the Worldwatch Institute focused on the importance of redefining global security in light of the emerging demographic, resource and environmental trends. As the 2005 State of the World report concludes, all of these disturbing trends point to a new era of global insecurity. Mr. Flavin first highlighted the stark reality that the international community has waited far too long before actually recognising the crucial role that these elements play. Referring to the 2005 report, Mr. Flavin noted that “if we continue in allowing these underlying forces to destabilise societies around the globe, no amount of investment in the international peace and security apparatus will be sufficient to deal with the consequences”.

The 2006 State of the World extends this analysis to the emergence of China and India. Indeed, the rapid increase in the pace and volume of their resource use, if unchecked, will have dramatic consequences for the entire globe. Mr. Flavin stated that the 2006 report concludes that “if these two countries were to just reach the EU’s level of resource use per capita over the next five decades, we would effectively need another planet just to sustain the resource needs of China and India”.

Of course, Europe and North America have long since been overusing their bio-capacity, with resource burdens in both regions contributing to the overall global trends that have seen the Earth’s absorptive capacity exceeded by 20%. Clearly, the European and North American economic models are not viable and most certainly must not be replicated on the global scale. Priority efforts must instead be directed towards assisting India and China in realising their economic development objectives but without undermining their natural resource base. The challenge has never been greater, or more pressing, since, as Mr. Flavin noted, there are far too many examples where countries have faced economic collapse as well as state failure as a result of collapsing ecosystems.

Another key issue raised in Mr. Flavin’s presentation was the human security dimension of environmental degradation. He stressed that “one of the principal ways that unsustainability is likely to manifest will be in terms of security, because when basic human needs are not met, state failure unfolds alongside”.

Mr. Flavin underscored that meeting basic human needs is not just about ensuring access to food, sanitation, education and health care. Human survival is also dependent on healthy ecosystems and the ecological services that make life possible. However, worsening climate change is now creating undue stress on ecosystems around the world with many countries facing what were originally perceived as the long-term consequences of climate change in the immediate short-term. Resulting impacts such as increased storm intensity, sea level rise, decreased food production are indeed known consequences, which are already threatening livelihoods around the globe.

But as Mr. Flavin stressed, “what we do not know about climate change is far more worrisome than what we do know, in terms of very sudden and dramatic changes like the flipping of a switch than the cranking of a dial and this will be catastrophic, especially in light of population projections with increasing resource requirements”.

Mr. Flavin also highlighted the growing problem of energy insecurity, which is rapidly complicating all aspects of US foreign policy around the globe. The world is entering a new energy era, where the \$70 per barrel prices will not be a temporary phenomenon. The fundamental problem today is that the world is consuming two barrels of oil for every barrel being discovered. We are not finding sufficient quantities of oil and gas to account for the rapidly growing increase in oil and gas demand around the world. This will most definitely be the most critical security issue that will dominate the politics of the big geo-strategic powers over the coming years.

The Northern addiction to oil is not good for either buyer or seller in the global energy market. Rather, it is causing rapid increases in tensions between those countries which search for it, and undermining instability in those countries producing it. As Mr. Flavin noted, “the biggest buyers are jockeying dangerously for power and control of strategic transport routes”, while oil producing developing countries continue to be tangled in the so-called “natural resource curse”, with most state-owned oil production now taking place under dubious circumstances. The latter point was emphasised by an important conclusion in a recent article by Thomas Friedman entitled “The First Law of Petro-Politics” in which he correlates increased oil prices with correspondingly decreasing levels of freedom, democratic rights and abilities to meet basic human needs.

In closing, Mr. Flavin emphasised that security threats from oil dependence will grow exponentially. The world must react to the urgency with a comprehensive sustainable energy security strategy, one that must underlie and become the primary focus of international peace and security efforts.

Solving environmental security risks in Europe

Frits Schlingemann, UNEP Regional Director, described the role and impact of the Environment and Security Initiative, a collaborative arrangement between UNEP, UNDP, OSCE, NATO and more recently the REC and UNECE.

The Environment and Security (ENVSEC) Initiative was launched simultaneously at the Environment for Europe Conference in Kyiv and the OSCE Economic Forum in Prague, in May 2003. ENVSEC seeks to facilitate a process whereby key public decision-makers in South Eastern and Eastern Europe, Central Asia and the Caucasus are able to motivate action to advance and protect peace and the environment at the same time.

Together with governments and key stakeholders, ENVSEC has carried out assessments and published reports illustrated by maps, for understanding the linkages between environment and security in the political and socio-economic reality of South Eastern Europe, the Southern

Caucasus and Central Asia. Based on the assessments, the Initiative develops and implements work programmes aimed at reducing tensions and solving the problems identified.

Working in close collaboration with national Ministries of the Environment and Foreign Affairs as well as with many other local partners, ENVSEC today operates in 20 countries, from the Balkans to Central Asia. With a project portfolio of well over 50 projects for an overall budget close to \$ 20 million provided by a large variety of donors, including the EC and the GEF.

In describing the strengths and achievements of the Initiative, Mr. Schlingemann first highlighted the unique composition of ENVSEC, a collaborative effort of several organisational partners, which are supported by the field presence of OSCE, UNDP and the REC. This not only enhances the effectiveness of the ENVSEC's policy work, it also ensures greater cost effectiveness of its field operations.

Also, in terms of its clients and donors, the Initiative has a broad base of interest and support from ministries of environment, development and foreign affairs. Given the extensive network of national and international alliances that each of the partners brings into the exercise, ENVSEC programmes and activities link to, build upon and integrate almost all the related work in the areas of focus in the countries concerned.

Mr. Schlingemann also emphasised that, as a result of ENVSEC's work, a growing number of countries in the region have started to address environmental concerns in foreign and security policy. He concluded by describing how the Initiative has become an important catalysing and coordinating force in the regions/countries where it is operational. Not only has it raised awareness regarding the links between environmental degradation and conflict, it has brought key actors together to establish partnerships to address potential threats before they result in conflict.

Advancing conflict-sensitive development

MEP Michel Rocard addressed the challenges faced by the EU in ensuring that its development cooperation efforts address the new generation of threats and security challenges. He stressed that reorienting development cooperation in this way requires a stronger prevention component in order to respond to conflict more effectively and with greater speed. This necessarily requires strengthening decision-making processes within the EU, but also strengthening the ability of governing authorities on the ground. Mr. Rocard emphasised that any form of decision-making process requiring unanimity is paralyzing and will constrain EU's ability to respond swiftly enough to initial signs of conflict.

On the question of institutional reform, Mr. Rocard responded to the point made earlier by Dr. Cooper regarding the need to bring the EU institutions closer together. He was adamant that such an objective was neither possible nor desirable. The separation of powers between the institutions was designed to maintain stability and to ensure a system of checks and balances. Since each institution was designed with specialized functions to ensure maximum efficiency, combining them would create even more confusion and duplication than currently exists.

On the issue of the EU's capabilities to respond to conflict, Mr. Rocard insisted that it must be empowered to exercise the use of force, either through the establishment of a permanent military force or through providing the EU with the resources to ensure the timely deployment of police forces to enforce peace agreements. Mr. Rocard stated that for example if the EU had a permanent military force or the capability to deploy police forces, these could be used to support Africa in its efforts to build greater stability in the region.

As a necessary complement, permanent regional structures must be established to support the regions in their own peace and stability efforts. Despite the positive presence of the EU in the Middle East, that has not necessarily been the case for most of Africa. Strengthening regional organisations such as the African Union will enable them to take responsibility for their own security.

At the same time, the EU must also be more responsive to the challenges faced by failed states and their limited or total lack of capacity to replace their governance structure. Past practice usually deferred the state-rebuilding mandate to another country, but this is no longer acceptable. Here, reviving the UN Trusteeship Council to support this process could be an interesting avenue to explore. But as Mr. Rocard pointed out, it is impossible to realise peace when the war makers do not want it. Where this is the case, the international community must have the courage to say that conditions are not adequate for peace building. Otherwise, pseudo nation-building that creates false hopes - which will ultimately be deceived - will in the end undermine the confidence of key parties in the peace building process and ultimately destroy incentives for them to end conflict.

Mr. Rocard also emphasised that conflict prevention presupposes the ability to see and understand roots of conflict, and here the EU must develop new approaches to look at the different forces that interplay in the early stages before conflict breaks out.

His final points addressed the challenges faced by the EU in supporting democracy building in its partner countries. Mr. Rocard stressed that the EU must be sensitive to the evolution of democracy especially since no country follows a uniform path. Over-emphasis on multi-party elections can have the effect of disregarding other important democracy criteria, such as free press, independent judiciary, checks and balances on different branches of government. Multi-party elections are certainly not the only indicator of a country's transition to democracy. Indeed, in some cases pluralistic elections may often hide real democracy deficits and human rights abuses.

In conclusion, Mr. Rocard insisted that where there is no history of liberal democracy, the EU must not force pluralistic elections until the other key democracy indicators are fulfilled. Instead, the EU must allow the country to develop its own form of democracy without insisting that pluralistic elections are the sole criteria for establishing democratic regimes.

Panel 2: Opportunities

The panel on opportunities was moderated by Tom Spencer, Vice-Chairman of the Institute for Environmental Security. The panellists included the following: Nick Mabey, Founder Director, E3G – Third Generation Environmentalism addressed the topic of sources of potential conflict; Nick Grono, Vice President (Advocacy and Operations) of the International Crisis Group, addressed conflict prevention policies and practices; Pekka Haavisto, EU Special Representative for Sudan / Former Chairman, Post Conflict Assessment Unit, UNEP / Former Finnish Minister for Environment and Development (1995-1999) addressed conflict resolution and post-conflict rehabilitation and reconstruction policies; and Satu Hassi, MEP, Member, GLOBE-EU / Board Member, Worldwatch Institute / Former Finnish Minister for Environment (1999-2002) addressed the challenges for the forthcoming Finnish EU Presidency.

Sources of potential conflict

Sources of Potential Conflict – The pressures on natural resources from Climate Change and their human impact

by Nick MABEY, Founder Director, E3G - Third Generation Environmentalism

[Summary not yet available]

Conflict prevention policies and practices

Nick Grono of the International Crisis Group provided an overview of recent conflict trends and response strategies. He first noted that in recent years, conflicts throughout the world have decreased in number. This is in part due to the creation of a record number of democratic states, which tend to engage less in conflict and cooperate more readily. As well, the Human Security Report confirms an upswing in effective interventions in part due to the increasing involvement in civil society in conflict prevention.

However, conflicts continue to be fought over scarce natural resources, especially non-renewable resources such as oil, diamonds, gas, and coal. A study by Paul Collier indicates that in any five-year period, the chance of civil war in African countries ranges from less than 1% in countries with resource wealth to 25% in countries without resource wealth.

Mr. Grono then highlighted the unique characteristics of environmental conflict. First, environmental conflicts provide all sorts of incentives for large-scale corruption. Through the exploitation of non-renewable natural resources, parties can gain lasting political and economic power since the benefits of victory involve control of the state's resource base and this power exacerbates corruption at all levels.

Second, the exploitation of natural resources becomes an important source of funding for conflict activities. Conflicting parties who control the resource base assert their monopoly over the resource and this not only provides a funding source for perpetuating conflict, but a real disincentive for finding solutions to actually bring conflict to an end and engage in peace building.

Third, parties who acquire a natural resource as a result of conflict immediately exploit that resource, leading to rapid growth. However, this usually leads to a very unstable form of growth which does not continue indefinitely and is followed by a period of stagnation, and ultimately high inflation, all of which destabilises national economies and undermines economic development efforts.

Fourth, conflicting parties in resource-rich regions tend to oppose any efforts by central governments to manage the resource base. They assert that they should be allowed to manage the natural resource that lies within their domain. This tension often leads to civil unrest.

Mr. Grono outlined the various responses that have been developed to redress and prevent resource-related conflicts. For example, ensuring transparency over natural resource control by placing the revenues and resource concessions into the public domain minimises corruption. Second, good governance and the minimisation of corruption within the public sector lead to the development of sustainable natural resource management regimes. Third, supporting the

strengthening of the judicial system and the relevant institutions will ensure that laws governing the use and management of natural resource will be enforced. Fourth, empowerment of local communities is of course key. But local communities who are directly involved in the management of natural resources must benefit from an appropriate amount of the revenue stream in order to accept centralised regulation and not resort to civil unrest.

Two important innovative initiatives that have been developed in response to growing resource-based conflict include, the Extractable Industries Transparencies Initiative (EITI) and the Kimberly Process. The EITI is a voluntary initiative designed to promote transparency with regard to public sector revenues derived from extractive industries. This involves an independent auditing of resource revenues together with the active involvement of civil society who verify the external audits.

The Kimberley Process is a joint government, international diamond industry and civil society initiative to stem the flow of conflict diamonds - rough diamonds that are used by rebel movements to finance wars against legitimate governments. The trade in these illicit stones has contributed to devastating conflicts in countries such as Angola, Cote d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Sierra Leone. Producer countries agree to track diamonds from mine to export and certify conflict-free diamonds. Buyers agree not to purchase diamonds that have not been duly certified.

Conflict resolution and post-conflict rehabilitation

Pekka Haavisto described the key lessons learned during his tenure as Chair of UNEP's Post-Conflict Assessment Unit from 1999-2005. He led post-conflict assessments and projects in Kosovo, in Serbia-Montenegro, in Bosnia-Herzegovina, in Afghanistan, in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, in Iraq and in Liberia.

First, the environment is not a secondary issue in a post-conflict situation. In many cases, post-conflict rehabilitation tends to be focused on humanitarian consequences and reconstruction with only a secondary emphasis placed on environmental impacts. However, environmental priorities are elevated in importance when the environmental impacts can be explained in terms of their human health linkages.

Second, environmental degradation most immediately affects poor populations. There is a perception in the North that the poor cannot afford to be concerned about environmental concerns since their day-to-day survival is their first priority. Unfortunately, the poor are usually on the front-line of environmental degradation, whether it relates to climate change, the drying of wells, desertification, unsustainable water management or coastal pollution, the income and daily food production of the poor people is most immediately impacted by resource degradation or scarcity. Of course, in a post-conflict situation the poor are more vulnerable. Therefore eradicating poverty depends on a clean and healthy environment, from which sustainable livelihoods can be pursued.

Third, the environment has to be integrated both in the humanitarian and reconstruction phases of post-conflict international efforts. In the humanitarian phase, it is important to ensure that local populations are protected from the health effects resulting from post-conflict environment pollution.

Similarly, environmental concerns must be integrated into the reconstruction phase and this is best achieved through environmental impact assessments of all reconstruction projects and programmes, especially in the development of energy and transport infrastructure.

Fourth, it is important to build strong environmental administrations after the conflict has been resolved so that post-conflict countries will be able to manage their own environmental challenges when the UN and donor community departs. In countries like Afghanistan or Liberia, which were very fragmented after the conflict, it was important that the new post-conflict governments regained control and planning over natural resources to ensure that they were not exploited anew in order to finance new conflict. One of the first steps in a post-conflict reconstruction process is to establish a central environmental authority and empower it with the authority to enforce environmental regulatory frameworks.

Fifth, the environment can be a powerful tool for peace building. In many cases, focusing on environmental challenges can have the effect of uniting conflicting parties in the common cause of conflict prevention, peace building and reconciliation

For example, UNEP's post-conflict work in the Mesopotamian Marshlands brought together Iranian and Iraqi authorities for the first time for 29 years. UNEP's work in assessing common environmental concerns in the occupied territories similarly enhanced confidence and trust-building between Israeli and Palestinian. This was also the case with UNEP's work on the Sistan wetlands, where cross-border water management united Afghani and Iranian actors and created a climate of trust within which other post-conflict issues could be resolved.

Challenges for the Finnish EU Presidency

MEP Mrs. Satu Hasi described the major environmental security-related challenge for the incoming Finnish EU Presidency. As a matter of high priority, the Finnish Presidency will have to increase understanding both inside the EU and globally regarding the emerging environmental security challenges and promote the institutional changes needed to respond more effectively to environmental conflict. Mrs. Hassi stressed in particular, the need for "intelligent institutions". She also noted the irony that "we have more knowledge than ever before, and yet the average citizen or politician does not have enough knowledge to bring about the necessary changes."

The second environmental security priority for the Finnish Presidency is to develop reliable early warning systems to enable the EU to react before there is an actual conflict. Environmental degradation is a good indicator of potential conflict. However, there are other key "soft" issues that must be addressed in the security context.

The 2005 State of the World report referred to a CIA study which analysed countries that had collapsed and compared them to other societies with similar threat scenarios, but which did not collapse. The most striking difference was that the failed states were distinctly characterized by a significant rise in infant mortality, a soft indicator of something very hard. Mrs. Hassi emphasised that if early warning systems examined these soft issues as well, this would contribute to more effective conflict prevention.

Third, the Finnish Presidency must address the worsening global water crisis. Fresh water is a vital natural resource for survival. Mrs. Hassi pointed out that the Himalayan Glaciar sources eight major Asian rivers, which in turn provide water to a heavily populated region. Should there be a decline in the water source, five hundred million people would be directly affected. Thus, the shared impacts of climate change and other major risks to the environment will either lead to new outbreaks of conflict or to new forms of cooperation. Now that China is beginning to recognise its own particular vulnerability to the impacts of climate change, there are new opportunities for the EU to advance new modes of environmental cooperation and global governance. Mrs. Hassi noted that all of the elements of the approach needed for redressing environmental conflict are also what is needed in climate context.

In terms of concrete recommendations, Mrs. Hassi endorsed the establishment of IPCC-like bodies for other environmental sectors, in order to generate the necessary data for policymakers to make informed decisions and to enable them to respond more effectively to global challenges. She asserted that one of the key issues is to ensure that environment and security challenges are properly mainstreamed into other relevant policy spheres and that global governance systems are duly strengthened.

During the discussion that followed the panel presentations, Mr. Harald Neitzel from the German Ministry for the Environment underlined the growing importance of environment and security issues against the background of climate change as well as the growing overuse of scarce natural resources and transboundary pollution. He highlighted the tremendous potential of transboundary environmental cooperation in contributing to confidence building and peace processes in areas of tension, echoing the remarks of Pekka Haavisto in this regard.

Mr. Neitzel referred to several possibilities and options for strengthening the environment and natural resource pillar of the European Security Strategy especially in relation to existing EU programmes, such as the EU Water and Energy initiatives. In response to recent national activities in Germany, he expressed the intention to advance this debate during the German Presidency in close cooperation with the European Commission and some "like-minded countries". Two events in Berlin (1st and 2nd February 2007 in the format of a stakeholder dialogue and mid March in the format of a governmental symposium) are already scheduled. Finally he expressed the hope that the Finnish Presidency will address these priorities as well.
