



UNITED NATIONS
SYSTEM
STAFF COLLEGE

Climate, Peace and Security Programming Training

11-15 December 2023

Training Report

Prepared for:

Peacebuilding Support Office, Climate Security Mechanism,
adelphi, United Nations System Staff College

Prepared by:

United Nations System Staff College - Peace
and Security Hub

Date:

19th January 2024



PEACEBUILDING
FUND



CLIMATE SECURITY MECHANISM

Introduction

The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) Thematic Review on Climate Security and Peacebuilding highlighted the need to strengthen project design and enhance support to communities of practice and workshops on climate-security programming. In response to those recommendations, the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), in partnership with the UN System Staff College (UNSSC) and the UN Climate Security Mechanism (CSM), organized the second edition of the Climate, Peace and Security Programming Training for the Peacebuilding Fund aimed at PBF Secretariats, Peace and Development Advisors, and Resident Coordinators Offices' staff. This training comprised an online webinar and a week-long training in Turin, Italy in December 2023. The training was divided into three parts: Part 1 on climate, peace and security (CPS) peacebuilding programming, Part 2 on basic facilitation skills, and Part 3 on internal PBF planning and way forward.

The training aimed to strengthen participants' capacity to:

- **Understand** PBF programmatic responses to climate-security risks;
- **Integrate** climate-related security risks in the design and implementation of PBF-funded climate, peace and security and environmental peacebuilding projects;
- **Apply** gender and youth inclusion in climate-security programming;
- **Leverage** synergies between climate change mitigation and adaptation and peacebuilding programming;
- **Use** basic facilitation skills to further disseminate knowledge to relevant actors and stakeholders.

This report captures the main takeaways from the training as well as action areas identified by participants.

Part 1: Climate, Peace and Security Peacebuilding Programming

The first two and a half days of training focused on CPS in the context of PBF programming. Key concepts and existing UN CPS frameworks were introduced, before going into group discussions and group work on identifying climate-related security risks, integrating climate into conflict analysis, and developing programmatic responses to such risks, including impact indicators and M&E frameworks, using Haiti as a case study.

Climate peace and security programming is a new area of peacebuilding programming where innovation, joint programming and integrated approaches offer opportunities to pilot new approaches to address intertwined challenges.

Criticality of the conflict analysis

Any PBF funded project needs a detailed conflict analysis to identify the root causes of instability / violence the project aims to address. When looking at climate, peace and security programming, the conceptual approach developed by the CSM to identify climate-related security risks provides a useful starting point. Participants had the opportunity to put it into practice using a case study from Haiti.

Reflecting on their own experiences with conflict analysis (CA) and conflict analysis training, participants remarked, there are not as many tools and approaches targeted towards CA for CPS programming as opposed to e.g. Women, Peace and Security (WPS) programming and gender-sensitive CA. The challenge is therefore to leverage existing tools to ensure a CA that informs CPS programming to be climate-, gender-, and youth-sensitive. Similarly, there might be a need for streamlining the various tools and approaches for CA available, and practises within the UN system for a more coherent approach, which ensures quality, as well as practicality of the CA for further programming. Participants also discussed how beyond project cycle, the CSM climate-related security risks toolbox can be useful as part of the PBF country eligibility requests, and should be integrated more systematically.

Developing programmatic responses for CPS

To ensure common understanding among participants when discussing CPS programming, a distinction was made between Climate Peace and Security and Environmental Peacebuilding, recognizing that CPS covers 1) Changing climatic conditions appear to have already contributed to resource scarcity or changes in socioeconomic patterns or livelihood activities that – together with other factors – appear to increase the risk or incidence of conflict or violence; 2) Changing climatic conditions appear to have contributed to or exacerbated the vulnerability of individuals or groups as measured by a human security paradigm, including risks in terms of physical integrity rights or ability to pursue basic needs and livelihoods; 3) Expected climate change presents an existential threat, or appears likely to contribute to sources of conflict in the future (i.e. a more preventive climate-security conception).

Environmental peacebuilding is generally considered to include areas of climate change mitigation and adaptation or climate related risks, but also many other environmentally-related activities and areas, such as natural resource exploitation, minerals and extractive industries, areas of natural resource management and degradation not explicitly linked to climate change, nature conservation, and other practices related to agriculture, farming, and land management, among others.

CPS therefore refers to the exacerbation of peace and security risks due to climate change, as well as to how climate action can offer entry points for peace, while Environmental Peacebuilding employs environmental factors as an entry point for

peace, not explicitly linked to climate change and encompassing broader issues such as pollution and natural resource extraction.

It was also highlighted that the link between climate change and security/conflict is non-linear, multidimensional, and differs depending on the context. This offers opportunities to develop multiple relevant programmatic responses. To ensure such responses are fit for PBF funding, three key questions ought to be discussed:

- What are the priority CPS dynamics and challenges within the concerned context?
- In this context, what are the opportunities and constraints for a relevant and realistic response?
- What is the value added of the PBF, and which actors are best placed to support the different aspects of this project (in terms of comparative advantage)?

To make programmatic responses more sustainable and relevant, more efforts and considerations should be given to linking PBF projects to existing strategies and policies on climate change, peace and security at the national/regional as well as international level. Integrated and inclusive approaches that bring together different actors and consider all possible entry points (climate mitigation/adaptation, conflict prevention/resolution) are needed in this regard.

CPS programming should also rest on robust integrated theories of change which reflect specific goals, outcomes, and the level of change intended for all entry points. Related interventions should span policy, institutional, and community levels, with corresponding indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). Particular attention should also be paid to the sequencing of activities, especially when multiple implementing partners are involved, to ease implementation. The PBSO Thematic review offered an overview of such existing pathways.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

The need for more robust M&E frameworks for CPS was brought up in discussions throughout this part of the training. Given the limited CPS projects that have fully gone through the project cycle, participants discussed the importance of deepening M&E, sharing indicators and lessons learned from on-going evaluations. Participants further suggested that lessons learnt on the methodologies of impact-measuring and M&E from WPS or Youth, Peace and Security (YPS) projects could be of relevancy.

Despite working on the shared CPS agenda, contexts and required responses might vary across regions. Therefore, the programmatic responses and indicators to measure impact and success also ought to reflect these differences. There thus ought to be a framework for PBF-wide M&E that acknowledges and is built on this idea of flexibility.

PBSO noted that M&E should be planned and budgeted for from the initiation of a project, and a baseline study should be conducted within three months of project inception for an evidence-based approach.

Tools and methodologies to mainstream climate, peace and security

adelphi presented the Weathering Risk Methodology which focuses on unpacking the linkages between climate change, peace and security in a given context and identifying entry points for programming and policies to address them. Climate, peace and security risks assessments are therefore helpful to increase understanding of climate impacts and related security risks on the ground and inform policy development, programming and action.

CGIAR presented two of their most recent tools, the Climate Security Observatory and the Climate Security Sensitivity Tool. The Climate Security Observatory is a decision support tool designed to help stakeholders understand and respond to climate-related security risks. The Climate Security Sensitivity Tool is a programming assessment tool for conflict-sensitive and peace-responsive climate action in agriculture.

In a broader discussion on mainstreaming CPS in PBF programming, participants mentioned that WPS and YPS projects, while they might differ in their core themes and approaches, may experience similar challenges in terms of implementation and reporting. Hence, a broader exchange between groups working on different PS Nexus could be beneficial to record common lessons learnt and find solutions for shared difficulties.

Catalytic approaches and partnerships

The short-term nature of PBF projects (2-3 years) was mentioned several times during the training, with a recognition that not all interventions are suitable for PBF funding and in some cases, other actors may be better placed to intervene or address long-term development needs. Participants also stressed that addressing slow-onset events requires long-term climate action, which is not possible with short-term funding. Hence PBF ought to think through exit strategies that can also ensure the sustainability of results achieved through its interventions. Collaborating with other donors and partners, as well as national and local governments, to secure funding for later stages of a project, or continuation of activities after PBF funding elapses, should be considered early on.

While climate finance was mentioned, participants discussed challenges of accessing resources from the main climate funds, especially for special political missions and peacekeeping operations. Fragile and conflict-affected contexts face particular difficulties related to prioritizing adaptation in securitized areas, and receiving investments from risk averse climate funds. The importance of liaising with accredited agencies to the main climate funds to discuss priorities and opportunities was raised. In Somalia, the Climate Security Advisor is working with partners to implement a 5 million USD project financed by the Adaptation Fund. While focusing on nature-based solutions, the project provides opportunities for the climate and peacebuilding communities to work together and tackle CPS

issues. Synergies between the climate adaptation work and the UNSDCF pillar on the rule of law are also being sought as a way to address CPS issues in Somalia.

When it comes to partnerships, participants expressed a need to work more closely with government partners to implement CPS projects on a national level. A majority of such projects is targeted towards smaller-scale local initiatives, and do not explore national institutionalization of CPS within national policies, strategies, budgets. To that end, participants have highlighted that it would be helpful to research and capture lessons on how communities cope with climate change and the CPS nexus on a local level to better identify pathways towards said institutionalisation process.

Part 2: Basic facilitation skills training

The basic facilitation skills training took place over one and a half day. Participants explored key concepts and techniques for transformational learning, that is, learning as a two-way process that also originates from the learner him/herself. Transformational learning is particularly important for CPS as:

- This is a new topic that we are still exploring and building together;
- We do not have all the answers yet;
- The topic is complex and requires the environmental, peace and security, and programmatic communities to reflect together;
- The context-specificity of climate-related risks to peace and security calls for the identification of solutions tailored to each specific context and needs.

Part 3: PBF Day

The last day of training was dedicated to discussions on donor outreach, communication and planning the way forward for the PBF.

Evaluation

[HERE](#) you can find results from the training evaluation.

Recommendations and Next Steps for the training team

Based on the discussions throughout the training and the evaluation results, these are the recommendations following this intensive 5-day training.

To replicate in future trainings

- Use of Haiti case study throughout the CPS training ensured a certain consistency and basis for some of the subsequent exercises, even in the basic facilitation skills training.

- Sequencing of the three parts of the training (although it would have been good to have more time on each of these individual parts).
- Have participants facilitate a learning activity on CPS during the basic facilitation skills training, which allowed application and testing of concepts and knowledge acquired previously.
- French speaking group & bilingual material (confirm ahead of time whether all material should be translated).
- Subtitles in PowerPoint.
- Have a 'parking lot' board to note ideas as we go without needing a specific session on the topic (in this case, the CoP).
- Have coffee breaks in the room, 20 min break & 1hr 15 min lunch break (gives us flexibility to go over time and still have 1hr for lunch).

To improve in future trainings

- Need to do the learning needs assessment (LNA) for a better understanding of the audience, their capacities and needs (also for consistency in our approach, if we are going to combine with a training on basic facilitation skills where we emphasize the importance of the LNA).
- Reduce duration of presentations to allow more time for discussions and questions.
- Need to make it more context specific – case study was good, but maybe we should allow time for clinics at the end of the training, like we did for the 1st edition.
- Time dedicated to CPS too short. Overall program too packed – need to allow more time for interactive discussions and exercises in addition to delivery of substantive presentation.
- Keep English speakers engaged when French speakers are talking/facilitating (maybe change the translation setting from FR to EN).

Potential topics to add/expand in future trainings

- Climate change adaptation and mitigation, climate finance, Rio Conventions.
- Sustaining peace approach in defining the UNSDCF.
- Resource mobilization/financing opportunities to sustain catalytic effect.
- Gender mainstreaming, consideration of cultural and indigenous approaches, HRBA.
- Mainstreaming CPS in the HDP nexus.
- ToC formulation.
- M&E for CPS.
- Case studies and examples of how to include CPS in PBF programming in different regions, building on the experience of different organizations.
- Scenario planning from the CPS angle, CPS evidence and data collection/analytics.
- Pathways analysis & interventions.
- Practical sessions on how to include CPS in PBF programming.

Next steps

- Develop checklist (and potentially a training toolkit after that?).
- Organize an online catch up in 6 months with participants to check on progress, support needs, provide updates, measure impact, etc.
- If possible, provide additional support as requested in the evaluation form.

Action planning for training participants

On the last day of training, participants were invited to share what are the next steps they intend to take as a follow-up to this training.

Bolivia

- Organize specific session on CPS in the UNCT retreat next 29-30 January 2024 (great if PBSO can participate – Gran Chaco).
- Ask CSM to include Bolivia in CoP and get advice from climate security advisors.
- Link CPS-Chaco with the launch of thematic bonds for indigenous people/government (catalytic effect).

Chad

- Share the training material.
- Prepare a training session for the Peacebuilding Team & RCO.
- Organize a training for UN and civil society partners.
- Discuss with the PBF team and government how to integrate CPS in the conflict analysis which is in preparation, and in the entire process of re-eligibility request.

Colombia

- Organize a short training / video cop on CPS for CSOs.
- Review 2023-24 investment plan and see if we can include or make it more specific to CPS.
- Explain CPS to the programme team of the MPTF to ensure we include CPS in the note and project document.

Guatemala

- Training session with UNDP, WFP, FAO and other agencies that are selected for the TRIFINIO cross-border project to review and refine draft concept notes.

Guinea-Bissau

- Be more engaged with RUNO and NUNO to produce catalytic effect.
- Organize a briefing session with PMT.
- Need support to adapt briefing to the specific context.

Haiti

- Plan an introductory session on climate stressors in relation to current risks in Haiti for the RCO, civil society, youth and women, in collaboration with adelphi and the study carried out in Haiti.

Kenya

- Brief PDU on the training and entry points for CPS interventions.
- Plan a training with the PBF team and agency focal points.
- Integrate elements of CPS in project document (MPTF).
- Engage government counterpart on CPS.

Kyrgyzstan

- Distil CPS in the current PBF projects (ex. in strategies reporting).
- Better integrate CPS in the design of new CPS projects.
- Help new GPI project with their inception phase to strengthen the CPS and gender angle.
- Provide CPS mini-training to PBF RUNOs and NUNOs in Kyrgyzstan/Central Asia.
- Connect with adelphi and the OSCE env. Dim. & Fos in Kyrgyzstan/Central Asia and explore synergies.
- Connect with future UNAMA CPS/CSM advisor and UNRCCA water advisors/projects to explore synergies.

Mauritania

- Training/debriefing on CPS for RCO, PMT and UNCT.
- Have specific inputs/analysis on CPS in the next CCA update and PBF eligibility document.
- Needs:
 - o Facilitate dialogue with CPS advisor in the region.
 - o PBSO (and maybe adelphi) to present their work/review on CPS at the next UNCT/PMT retreat.
- Keep RCO/PBF Secretariat informed on latest publications, reports and data on CPS.

Niger

- Training in the country on CPS.
- Possibility to integrate CPS in the SRF.

Somalia

- Design a training for RCO and PBF Secretariat on CPS, with support from PDA.

South Sudan

- Training of partners (UN, INGOs, CSO, government) on CPS framework.
- Integration of CPS in PBF ongoing projects.
- CPS training of trainer toolkit development for government, CSO and community.

- Organize high level country dialogue on CPS.
- Brief PBF Secretariat team in Juba on the training and discuss possible opportunities to enhance CPS interventions in South Sudan.

Sudan

- Share material with RUNOs, NUNOs, RCO, Secretariat Team & give them a training on CPS.
- Would be good to receive additional tools on CPS when available.