

# Climate Change and Fragile States: Resilient Development and the Struggle for Security

## Workshop Report

Climate Change and Fragile States Workshop  
September 28-29, 2011



## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Day 1: Overview of Workshop Proceedings .....	3
Opening Remarks .....	3
Setting the Scene: Fragile States ‘101’ .....	3
Setting the Scene: Climate Change and Fragile States .....	4
Impacts and Implications on the Ground: Regional Focus .....	5
Impacts and Implications on the Ground: Issue Focus .....	6
Policies and Programming in the Fragile State Context: Moving Towards Resilient Development .....	7
Morning Wrap-Up .....	9
Discussion Sessions .....	9
Day 2: Overview and Synthesis of Day One’s Discussions .....	11
Open Discussion .....	11
Concluding Remarks .....	12
Conclusions and Key Messages .....	13
Appendices .....	14
Appendix 1: Suggested Reading .....	14
Appendix 2: Workshop Agenda .....	16
Appendix 3: Speaker Biographies .....	18
Appendix 4: List of Participants .....	21

## Executive Summary

The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) held a workshop entitled ***Climate Change and Fragile States: Resilient Development and the Struggle for Security*** on September 28 and 29, 2011. The workshop brought together practitioners from a number of “communities of practice”, with the aim of exploring and achieving a better understanding of the dynamics of climate change in fragile states. The workshop focused on the current and potential future impacts of climate change in fragile states, the relationship of these impacts to other factors of state fragility, and the challenges and opportunities associated with international responses and programming carried out within this context. IISD is grateful to the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada (DFAIT) for their support of the workshop.

The workshop included a series of scene-setting presentations by a panel of experts, who spoke on the background of the fragile states issue; the relationship between climate change and fragile states; the impacts and implications on the ground, from both a regional and an issue-focused perspective; and policymaking and programming in the fragile state context. Following the morning’s presentations on Day 1, workshop attendees participated in a breakout discussion session. On Day 2, the workshop concluded with an open discussion among panelists and participants.

A number of key messages emerged from the debate and discussion at the workshop, and various salient issues were identified by the workshop presenters and participants. They included the following:

- **The relationship between climate change and state fragility is inherently complex.** Climate change is deeply interconnected with development, resource use, health, livelihoods and economies. In addition it can act as a ‘threat multiplier’ and a stressor on state capacities, on communities and on existing conflict dynamics.
- **Perfect knowledge is not available, especially in contexts of fragility.** Expectations must be measured and managed, and practitioners must be realistic about when and where benefits and opportunities will actually come into play. Effective programming requires that a degree of flexibility remain, such that as dynamics change, so should the entry points for policymakers.
- **It is essential to step back from our understandings and assumptions and think openly and holistically.** Some existing tools and approaches can be used to help explore and address the relationship between climate change and state fragility. However, to use these tools effectively, better coordination and dialogue is required between the communities of practice involved in both climate change and fragile states. There is a need to “speak each other’s languages” in order to effectively bridge gaps between science and policy, and to disseminate learning across aid, defence and development communities.
- **The reality on the ground rarely fits neatly into existing policy silos.** Practitioners must work with actors of all sorts, by drawing on their local, expert knowledge, and seeking to develop actions that are suited to the specific context. Also, there must be sufficient critical mass so that the value of an approach is demonstrable.

- **In many cases, a number of useful approaches exist in the policy toolbox.** Despite capacity and knowledge gaps, there *are* tools and approaches that can be used. Although identifying vulnerabilities and consequent priorities for action is a difficult challenge, it is possible. It is a matter of being aware of what the tools are, when they can be applied, and how they can be effectively deployed and subsequently strengthened.
- **There are a number of areas that could be explored through further research and where new, innovative programming could be developed.** Such areas include the relationship between climate change and peacebuilding, especially with regard to climate-proofing peace-building efforts, or conflict-sensitizing adaptation. It is important to take advantage of low-hanging fruits moving forward such as building partnerships and working with like-minded allies across disciplines.
- **Increasing resilience should be the long-term goal of defence, aid and development programming.** While responding to immediate humanitarian crises are often the priority, it is essential to find ways of intervening in crisis situations that promote long-term resilience, as is pursuing cross-cutting themes and goals. In this way, resilience and adaptation to climate change is closely connected to broader societal resilience to conflict.

## Day 1: Overview of Workshop Proceedings

### Opening Remarks

The workshop was opened by Keith Christie, Assistant Deputy Minister, Global Issues (DFAIT) and Richard Matthew, Associate (IISD). Mr. Matthew welcomed participants and introduced the overall aim of the workshop; namely to achieve a better understanding of the real and potential impacts of climate change and fragile states, and the ways in which these dynamics impact international policy programming from the development, humanitarian and military perspectives. He stressed that the workshop would be held using 'Chatham House Rules' and that constructive debate on the issues was encouraged. Mr. Christie encouraged participants to go beyond existing understandings of the role that climate change can play as a contributing factor to conflict, and to explore the ways that policies can also have positive impacts in addressing adaptation and longer-term conflict prevention in fragile states. Mr. Christie also spoke to Canada's commitment to providing climate change financing and referenced the initial investment by Canada of \$400 million for Fast Start funding as committed to under the Copenhagen Accord.

Introductions were followed by a series of scene-setting presentations by a panel of experts, who spoke on the background of the fragile states issue; the relationship between climate change and fragile states; the impacts and implications on the ground, from both a regional and an issue-focused perspective; and policymaking and programming in the fragile state context.

### Setting the Scene: Fragile States '101'

Marie-Joëlle Zahar (Université de Montréal) provided participants with a 'Fragile States 101', addressing the questions: What is a 'fragile state', and what are the key challenges faced in these countries? Zahar stressed that there is no standard agreed-upon definition for a 'fragile state', and the label is seen by some as a denigration of the efforts of states that are in conditions of duress, or as a justification for intervention. There has been a shift towards using the term 'state fragility' over 'fragile state' to better reflect the complexity of fragility. She highlighted a number of the key elements of fragility as related to 1) Security/Authority – Losing the monopoly over violence; 2) Democracy/Governance – Representation and legitimacy; and 3) Development/Services – The pressure of unmet expectations.

Despite a great deal of ongoing research and analysis, the linkages between fragility, instability and violence are rather poorly understood. She explained that dimensions of fragility are not straightforward; there can often be interconnected causes, and that state capacity (effectiveness) and state-society relations (legitimacy) often play an important role as well. It is also necessary to consider whether the root causes of fragility are internal, external, or both. For example, the scope and root causes of climate change are well beyond the national level (particularly in fragile states); yet national governments are often looked to and depended on to respond.

Zahar also highlighted the importance of identifying programming challenges and obstacles at all stages, from the development of policy and the identification of partners through to implementation on the ground. Numerous 'measures of fragility' have been developed by international organizations, governments and academic institutions, though it is very difficult to fully capture the inherent complexity of state fragility in these measures. There is a notable absence of environmental, natural resource use and/or climate change measures

from most of the commonly used indices. Fragility should be understood in the context of not only state weakness, but also of societal resilience and adaptation. Elements of fragility should also be taken in the broader context of human rights, development and global climate change.

### Setting the Scene: Climate Change and Fragile States

Geoff Dabelko (Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars) provided a second scene-setting presentation, overlaying climate change onto the context of state fragility. Dabelko explained that it is necessary to ‘abandon stereotypes’ and appreciate that environmental issues and climate change are about much more than international negotiations; they are deeply interconnected with development, with resource use (such as water) and with health. Addressing these issues is critical to livelihoods and national economies as well as to resolving conflict and promoting stability. Many within the security and humanitarian communities now see climate change and natural resource management as legitimate elements of their work and recognize the need to consider longer-range concerns in policymaking.

He outlined the reasons why the climate change/energy relationship has increasingly resonated with policymakers in recent years, and surveyed both direct and indirect climate change impacts. Dabelko stated that climate change can act as a ‘threat multiplier’ and a stressor on state capacities, on communities and on existing conflict dynamics. Depending on how well the state responds to impacts, these additional stresses can be a threat to state legitimacy and this can play out differently both within and between states. While climate change alone is highly unlikely to cause conflict, it can play a contributing role. As such, vulnerability needs to be understood on a social *and* environmental basis.

Dabelko went on to highlight the cyclical relationship between peacemaking, peacebuilding and preventative action. As climate change impacts have very different manifestations in different places, it is important to understand the unique scenarios that climate change may factor into, during various stages of programming (ie. intervention through to preventative action). As such, climate change programming can be an integral part of conflict prevention and development programming, for example, though the use of shared natural resource management structures as a trust (re)building exercise amongst former adversaries.

However, Dabelko also stressed that it is important to consider the flip side: that conflict could be caused by responses to climate change. He provided examples of large-scale hydro and solar projects that displaced local populations and degraded productive farmland. He also pointed out the potential for conflict in areas of increasing demand for rare earths and other important minerals necessary to build a green economy. Thus, responses to climate change could create conflict and undercut stability if done poorly, *or* lower vulnerability and build resilience that would benefit peacebuilding if done well.

According to Dabelko, the challenge is to first ‘do no harm’ by aiming to conflict-proof climate responses. In addition, adaptation should be viewed as an integral part of a larger peacebuilding or fragility strategy in order to capture the triple bottom line of environmental, social and economic benefits. It is important to note that in building the legitimacy of a new-found peace, natural resources are not a luxury item or second tier priority in fragile states. In many cases, economic recovery is largely dependent on natural resource sectors, and the restoration of livelihoods and services is dependent on the availability and effective management of water, bioenergy sources, agriculture and so forth.

Dabelko outlined a number of principles for conflict-sensitive programming in fragile state contexts, and concluded that: country context should be taken as the starting point; climate policies, programs and resource transfers should seek to ‘do no harm’; conflict prevention and resiliency should be prioritized; the links between political, security and development objectives should be recognized; and programming should align with local priorities. Furthermore, programming should aim to strengthen local social and institutional capacity to understand and manage climate and conflict risks, including support for effective adaptive capacities and conflict management mechanisms. He stressed the need to bring climate down from global to local, and work to integrate impact analysis and responses by harmonizing the climate, natural resource, development, conflict, and peacebuilding considerations of diverse stakeholder communities.

### Impacts and Implications on the Ground: Regional Focus

Todd G. Smith (Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, The University of Texas at Austin) provided a case study of the climate change/state fragility nexus through the lens of the Climate Change and African Political Stability (CCAPS) initiative. The CCAPS program focuses on a number of key areas related to climate change and fragility, including: 1) Vulnerability Assessments and Causal Connections; 2) Constitutional Design and Conflict Management; 3) Foreign Assistance and Adaptation; and 4) Government Capacity and Response to Complex Emergencies. Smith explained that having a broad but common understanding of vulnerability is important, and that to CCAPS vulnerability includes both exposure to physical hazards *and the* socio-economic and political factors that can magnify the effects of physical/environmental hazards.

CCAPS has conducted a geographic information system (GIS)-based assessment of climate change, vulnerability and security in East Africa. Their approach includes four equally-weighted ‘baskets’ or processes, namely: 1) physical exposure; 2) population density; 3) community/household vulnerability; and 4) governance and political violence. Each basket includes a series of indicators (with various weightings) that combine to create a measure of vulnerability. For example, the physical exposure basket includes measures of the frequency of past disasters (droughts, aridity, floods, cyclone winds, wildfires) and the expected future exposure (low elevation coastal zones in particular).

Individual maps have been created for each of the baskets, as has a composite vulnerability map combining all baskets. According to CCAPS’s composite analysis, the Southern region of Somalia and East/South DRC are among the most vulnerable regions in Africa. Smith explained that by layering on the potential impacts of climate change, it becomes apparent that some of the most vulnerable regions in Africa are at a higher risk to significant impacts of climate change. It is particularly important to gain a better understanding of the dynamics at the sub-national level, since impacts can vary not only from country to country, but within countries and regions as well.

CCAPS is also undertaking a similar geo-spatial analysis with respect to the distribution of aid and adaptation funding. The analysis includes programming by bilateral donors—Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) member countries and emerging donors—and multilaterals such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), World Bank, and African Development Bank. Projects are being coded by sector and purpose (adaptation, mitigation). The intention of the analysis is to get a better sense of the relationship between vulnerability and financing flows to determine whether resources are going where they are most needed. Their preliminary findings have shown that in many cases the most vulnerable areas were not receiving sufficient assistance. The issue is inevitably very complex—there are many reasons why financing and programming may not be going to areas most vulnerable (absorptive capacity, governance concerns, etc.); but



this type of analysis is helpful for policymakers in illustrating that states and borders matter in the context of programming and financing, but that understandings of vulnerability must also go beyond understanding of the nation state.

Referring back to Marie-Joëlle Zahar's presentation, it was noted that there are two sides of the equation: states may be unwilling to support programming, are or simply unable. As such, the capacity to absorb funding is often a major determinant in programming decisions by donors. Donor perceptions of absorptive capacity may assume at least a baseline of recipient state's ability to support the delivery of programming, even if they are 'unwilling'. There may be indirect ways to ensure that benefits reach those most in need: through the positive spillover impacts of targeted programming in other states. Therefore it is important to consider a regional approach to aid policymaking, as there is likely little hope of achieving sustainable success on a state-by-state basis without a broader understanding of the regional context.

Mapping tools such as those being developed by CCAPS are a helpful starting point for this discussion, but cannot be used to make conclusive statements. They can assist policymakers in identifying areas of persistent fragility and provide a basis for analysis in setting programming priorities at various levels (i.e. national, regional). They are a valuable part of a broader set of decision-making tools, but not a replacement for monitoring of emergent vulnerability or other measures of environmental, socio-economic and/or political fragility.

### Impacts and Implications on the Ground: Issue Focus

Glen Hearn (Transboundary Water Initiative, UBC) provided perspectives on the importance of promoting cooperation in the governance of natural resources, with a particular focus on transboundary water governance. Hearn explained that increasing pressure on resources, including as a result of climate change, demands more effective and sustainable use to achieve maximum benefits. Effective and sustainable use will demand *interdependent cooperation* among actors, and as such, promoting this cooperation should be seen as part of good governance.

Hearn highlighted that many of the regions of the world are most likely to face increasing and severe water scarcity in coming years, including those already facing conflict situations or considered fragile states. At present, humankind uses about 54 percent of all accessible surface freshwater, but that number is expected to rise to 70 percent by 2025. About 20 percent of the global population lacks access to safe drinking water and this is projected to grow to 38 percent by 2025. Effective management of water resources in order to provide secure access to safe, clean water is therefore fundamental to ensuring health, economic growth and development around the world.

It is important to consider what characteristics a given governance system has that makes it stable and resilient to change; with climate change being but one of the 'changes' being faced. How institutions, even informal ones, deal with one another will impact their ability to adapt. Technical, economic and governance capacity, can impact adaptability to change, and result in one of two paths to be taken—cooperation or conflict. The unique context of each situation will determine the emphasis on technical, economic and/or governance issues. In addition, the extent to which governance mechanisms can be designed in a way that promotes cooperation, but *not* interdependence, the less likely it is that changes will lead to conflict, either within or between states. For example, the Indus Waters Treaty between India and Pakistan is considered an example of successful settlement of a transboundary water basin conflict. Under the treaty, India was granted the three eastern tributaries (Ravi,

Beas, and Sutlej) and Pakistan assumed the flow of the three western rivers (Indus, Jhelum, and Chenab). This arrangement has allowed the two countries to remain cooperative but not interdependent; therefore, it begs the question: might such types of governance arrangements be feasible elsewhere?

Hearns outlined a number of important ways in which this cooperation can be fostered, including: data and information sharing (knowledge exchange), benefit sharing (understanding trade-offs), dispute resolution (both mechanisms and negotiations), institutional architecture (appropriate scale and design), financial mechanisms (*including* private sector involvement), adaptability (flexibility of institutions), and stakeholder engagement. Trade and commodity considerations also need to factor in, particularly when talking about water. It is also necessary to consider the existing mechanisms and governance arrangements and how they may be adapted to foster greater cooperation and resilience to future threats (i.e. working to avoid free-riding or tragedy of the commons issues).

Hearns also stressed the importance of looking at the ‘bigger picture’ and taking a regional approach to water governance. Using the example of the Nile Basin, it is evident that upstream and downstream activities will have differentiated impacts and shape cooperation. For example, a series of dams being constructed in Ethiopia will create new economic opportunities, generate hydro-electricity and enhance capacity to cope with future drought in the country. However, such activities can become a threat multiplier for neighbours (particularly North Sudan) and the region in the absence of international watershed governance mechanisms. From a governance perspective, the Nile Basin Initiative represents the formalization of various aspects of cooperation that have been around for many, many years in some cases. New changes are being experienced and dealt with at an accelerated rate; from infrastructure changes and the development of new dams through to the impacts of climate change. With upwards of 40 million people in 10 countries living in the Nile basin region, there are various political and economic dynamics at play, including increasing foreign ownership of agricultural land in the region (ie. land in Sudan leased to China) and varying levels of development. The private sector role in resource governance (particularly in fragile states) should not be understated, as in many cases private investment outweighs ODA.

### **Policies and Programming in the Fragile State Context: Moving Towards Resilient Development**

Cynthia Brady (USAID) shared her perspectives on conflict analysis and moving towards the implementation of policies that support the development of resilient states. A resilient state is one that has the ability to absorb shocks and respond to unexpected change, without falling back into conflict. And while it is simple to call for greater coordination among different stakeholder communities to help foster this resilience, achieving meaningful coordination is another matter. A major issue in this is selecting the tasks and initiatives that allow diverse organization to work together. It is important that initiatives seek to “speak a common language” across various organizations’ languages and assumptions. This necessitates organizations looking and thinking beyond their own borders. But trying to be engaged in this broader way is difficult, and the tendency is to try to predict and control. Such efforts, due to the ‘Black Swan’ phenomenon (the unknown unknowns) are often doomed to fail. What organizations need to adopt is an openness and an anticipatory awareness; an important but difficult task, especially for those institutions and policy processes that are complex, bureaucratic and slow-moving. Nevertheless, adopting this framework is the only meaningful way forward in developing resilient and flexible policymaking to build resilient and flexible states.

Conflict dynamics describe the interplay between latent grievances and resiliencies and the key actors active in mobilizing them, and these dynamics occur within a specific context. In the context of conflict dynamics and climate change, Brady explained that the evidence base for the climate change-conflict relationship in developing countries is actually quite small. The argument that countries most vulnerable to climate change are also most prone to conflict is not necessarily true; though it is true that many fragile states will face additional stresses because of climate change. Many aid and development agencies are only just beginning to get a handle on what this means, and how programming can be designed and implemented in a way that supports existing coping capacities in countries while strengthening resilience. Nevertheless, it was also noted that resilience is not normatively 'good', as it can be characteristic of systematic failures. Resilience in the context of climate change and conflict however, refers to the ability to absorb shocks while simultaneously adapting to impacts and working to decrease vulnerability in the longer term. One must be careful in making assumptions about where the greatest need for it is, as expectations about the relationship between conflict and climate change that may not be necessarily accurate.

USAID takes a three-pronged approach to climate change and security: through analysis, programming and policy/advocacy. Through working to increase the body of literature and analysis on the issues, USAID has produced a discussion paper on *Climate Change, Adaptation and Conflict* (2009), three field-based case studies (2010-2011) in Uganda, Ethiopia, Peru, and as of 2010 began using climate change as an indicator in their Instability and Conflict Risk Country Rankings (2010 and 2011 USAID *Alert Lists*). From a programming perspective, the agency will be producing a Climate Change and Conflict Guidance, and undertaking additional case studies with USAID missions.

Brady highlighted a number of challenges and barriers that can often hinder effective policies, particularly in the fragile state context. Actionable information may not be available, or may be incomplete. It can also be difficult to connect early warning systems with response mechanisms and to integrate conflict sensitivity into larger security initiatives (such as climate change, food, or water). Nevertheless, it is important to work towards establishing baselines in order to measure if progress has actually been made in better integrating climate change and conflict considerations into fragile state programming. USAID is working to integrate conflict sensitivity into all climate change programming across the agency, as well as implementing frameworks and tools for collaboration within the US government (development, defence and diplomacy agencies) and with its partners.

Brady identified a number of areas where practitioners need help moving forward. There is a need to gather coherent actionable information and identify trends, particularly at the sub-regional and local level. Comparative global trend information can help to "narrow the set of questions (practitioners) need to ask" but context is critically important. Cross-sectoral analytical tools and program designs (along with lessons learned from the field) can help to bridge the gap between various policymaking communities and bring about more holistic and integrated approaches to climate change and conflict.

## Morning Wrap-Up

Following the day's presentations, Facilitator Richard Matthew provided a brief synthesis of the morning's proceedings. He highlighted the need to think about whether or not using 'fragile state' as the unit of analysis is a useful approach, or if it is necessary to broaden our understanding of fragility in various contexts, and take a more nuanced approach. In addition, Matthew identified a number of key themes that he viewed as having emerged during the presentations (and requiring further discussion) including:

- Identifying vulnerabilities and setting priorities for action: it is challenging to work across sectors, disciplines and policy communities, but is possible (and often necessary) in the context of state fragility.
- Entry points for climate change and fragile state policy: are they at the local, national or regional level? In the private sector or civil society? In all or none of the above?
- The principle of "do no harm": it is an important guiding principle, but what does it actually mean and how do policymakers and practitioners actually achieve it?
- Resilient programs and policies: what do flexible and resilient approaches, policies and institutions actually look like?

## Discussion Sessions

Following the morning's presentations, workshop attendees participated in a breakout discussion session. Participants were asked to consider the following discussion questions:

1. Climate change has impacts on a variety of spheres (natural resource management, economic development, food security, disaster preparedness and response, etc.) and across different policy approaches (diplomacy, defence and development). What are the linkages and how might we best work towards a common approach?
2. In considering the relationship between climate change impacts and state fragility, which states/regions are at greatest risk? Why and in what ways are these states/regions at risk, and how do we prioritize?
3. What is the best way to go about developing a conflict sensitive approach to climate change in fragile states, and which actors are important in taking this thinking forward?

During the report-back session, Group 1 addressed question 1. The group identified several challenges to strengthening linkages between sectors, including the need to sensitize the various communities of practice to the issues, and the difficulties associated with establishing a common understanding among policymakers. It is difficult for various key actors to learn how to "speak each other's languages". The group believed it is possible to identify the barriers and necessary enabling conditions for better coordination and cooperation between climate change and fragile state policy/practitioner communities. A number of approaches were identified as

important in strengthening the linkages, including the use of bottom-up approaches. It was also highlighted that policies may not need to be put into 'climate change' terms in order to have positive impacts on adaptation or resilience; the end goal of climate change programming is really sustainable development more broadly, and a framing and language matter. The value of building on local initiatives and pilot projects was highlighted, as there may be opportunities for scaling up effective approaches or using them in different contexts. Similarly, lessons learned from ongoing programming need to be disseminated to a broader audience to support policy learning across communities. It was also noted that opportunities to add climate and conflict lenses to existing approaches need to be identified.

Group 2 considered questions 1 and 2 in their discussions. In the report-back session, the group highlighted the importance of defining what is meant by 'risk', understanding that it is often contextual and will likely be perceived differently by different groups (for example, those setting priorities in donor countries vs. those on the ground implementing). The group outlined a number of steps that needed to define risk, including the need to identify vulnerability and determine a measure of fragility; together with elements such as social resilience and governance measures. In considering aid effectiveness, the group stressed it is important to ensure delivery of humanitarian and emergency aid to those most in need or vulnerable while simultaneously developing programming that considers longer-term absorptive capacity. It was explained that it is always essential to assess the sustainability of programming in a broader context of education, healthcare, good governance, and societal resilience.

The group also highlighted the importance of coordinating and cooperating to translate knowledge across disciplines. One way in which this could be done is through the establishment of cross-disciplinary teams to guide the policymaking process, including those with sensitivity to broader global trends, alongside an appreciation for local knowledge and realities. The group also emphasized the significance of framing and language in setting priorities; climate change does not have traction with everyone; and it is a matter of finding the right 'hooks' for particular policy approaches. According to the group, all policy sectors are complex and have challenges, but those challenges should not preclude the need to find and build on linkages. The group also identified a number of approaches that should be utilized in building such linkages; including building on best practices and institutional memory, constant capacity building, and providing adequate funding for innovation and new thinking. As a relatively new policy area, there is a great deal of room to explore the relationship between research, policy and practice with respect to climate change and conflict, particularly within the broader context of peacebuilding.

Addressing question 3, Group 3 highlighted a number of 'best ways' to go about developing a conflict sensitive approach to climate change in fragile states. They emphasized the value in identifying tools that can help policymakers draw on existing guidance (such as the OECD or IISD). They stated that it is important to build on lesson learned and start with what is known to work, rather than starting at square one or looking to "reinvent the wheel". Also, it was explained that in identifying useful tools, it is best to look for one that can be translated at multiple levels, and scaled up and down as appropriate, as well as those that support the transaction of knowledge between policymakers and practitioners (such as gender screening or disaster management tools). Nonetheless, priorities, interventions and policies need to be context-specific, and there is no one-size-fits-all

solution. As such, communities receiving support can play an important role in setting priorities and informing decisions around the approaches to be used.

In terms of key actors that are important in taking this thinking forward, the group discussed the role that legitimacy plays in determining which actors need to be a part of the equation. In fragile states, the legitimacy of actors is often not straightforward, particularly in situations where governments are unable or unwilling to meet their responsibilities. Donors must sometimes “hold their noses” for the sake of delivering aid. In these situations, the engagement of local stakeholders becomes even more important in ensuring programming is delivered effectively in the absence of a legitimate government at the national level.

## Day 2: Overview and Synthesis of Day One’s Discussions

To begin the second and final day of the workshop, Robert McLeman (IISD/University of Ottawa) summarized key messages and themes that had come out of the previous day’s presentations and discussions. McLeman noted that in many cases the reality on the ground doesn’t fit into our ‘policy silos’ and requires that we work with both government and non-government actors in often ‘messy’ situations. At the same time, those policy silos and differentiated approaches exist for a reason; it is a matter of striking a balance and working in a way that allows each approach to flow coherently into the broader goal of resilient development and lasting peace. Understanding the influence of climate on state stability will only become more important as the increasingly severe impacts of climate change unfold around the world. Perfect information is not, and never will be, available, but more and more is known each day. There are also useful tools from a variety of policy areas (including from disaster risk reduction and sustainable natural resource management, for example) that can help inform policy approaches in fragile states. There are existing points of entry within the defence, development and aid communities that can be built upon and strengthened if the will exists.

### Open Discussion

The workshop concluded with an open discussion among panelists and participants. Some of the salient points and lessons that emerged from this discussion are provided below.

On understanding the issues:

- The goal is not necessarily to change the trajectory of climate change trends, but to change the context in which it happens (i.e. adaptation over mitigation in the fragile states context);
- You cannot ‘bracket’ reality, and the facts on-the-ground are what is important;
- A major part of resilience is “helping people help themselves”;
- It is essential to step back from understandings and assumptions and think openly and holistically, but this is easier said than done. For example, vulnerable groups may not be who practitioners think they are at first glance;
- Many facets of the issues exist in legal vacuums (i.e. climate refugees), so guiding principles are not always as clear as policymakers might otherwise like them to be, and;
- Black swan events (unknown unknowns) are inevitable, and one must accept that failures will happen and think about how to build knowledge of this into future planning (more flexibility and resilience).

#### On coordinating efforts:

- Effective coordination and dialogue between organizations requires that they learn to speak in languages other than their own (i.e. bridging gaps between science and policy);
- Top-down and bottom-up need to meet somewhere; local realities need to be connected with global frameworks;
- It is important to engage policymakers at all stages of the process – “Policymakers have to be in the plane for take-off if you want them there for the landing”, and;
- Allocate funding in such a way that organizations and people have to cooperate in order to access it.

#### On policymaking:

- The need to find evidence also carries with it the need to find creative ways to apply it;
- It is essential to craft opportunities for the people living in fragile states to be involved in the policymaking processes;
- Dynamics change, as do points of entry. There must be sufficient critical mass so that the value of an approach is demonstrable;
- It is important to take advantage of low-hanging fruits moving forward such as building partnerships and working with like-minded allies;
- Generic templates will not work everywhere, and this understanding needs to manifest in the ways climate change funds are developed;
- Expectations must be measured and managed, and practitioners must be realistic about when and where benefits and opportunities will actually come into play, and;
- While long-term resilience is the goal, a lot of aid is channelled to address humanitarian crises. Finding ways of intervening in crisis situations that promote long-term resilience is essential, as is pursue cross-cutting themes and goals.

### Concluding Remarks

Marie Gervais-Vidricaire, Director General, Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force, (DFAIT) provided concluding remarks for the two-day workshop. She emphasized that coordination and cooperation must be central objectives in the climate change and fragile states nexus and that further work was required to establish best practices in establishing how lessons learned from programming in fragile states can be applied to climate change programming and vice-versa. She also echoed many of the participants in stressing that climate change is not just about the environmental context, it is a much broader issue, especially in the context of state fragility. Finally, she closed by remarking upon the need to continue working to ensure that these issues are integrated into the policy thinking and planning at all types of aid and development organizations.

## Conclusions and Key Messages

A number of key messages were identified by the workshop presenters and participants. They included the following:

- The influence of climate on state stability is an emerging issue that is not about to go away;
- Identifying vulnerabilities and consequent priorities for action is a difficult challenge, but it is possible;
- Outcomes will be better when research and actions are coordinated;
- In many cases, there are a lot of useful tools that exist in the policy toolbox; it is simply a matter of correctly deploying them;
- Perfect knowledge is not available, so decisions will often need to be made with the information at hand; however, the base of available knowledge is growing every day;
- The reality on the ground rarely fits neatly into existing policy silos. Practitioners must work with actors of all sorts, drawing on their local, expert knowledge, and seeking to develop actions that are suited to the specific context;
- The reality at headquarters is one of a desire to streamline, to centralize decision-making and to work state-to-state, often under conditions of competing priorities and shrinking resources; however, effective programming requires that these tendencies be tempered to a degree in order to leave room for more flexible policymaking, and;
- The shifts in organizational focus and methods that are necessary to deliver more effective policy won't start without initiative on the part of individuals.

Potentially valuable initiatives and research themes were also identified:

- The relationship between climate change and peacebuilding, especially with regard to climate-proofing peace-building efforts, could be further explored through research and through new, innovative programming that draw on lessons learned;
- Adaptation to climate change needs to be conflict-sensitive; developing best practices in how to accomplish this could be of great value for practitioners;
- Low-carbon shifts must be supportive of development and peacebuilding; develop programming and research that explores how to harmonize these objectives could offer a way forward in realizing triple bottom lines;
- Local knowledge and abilities are integral, so processes that can be shown to develop or strengthen local adaptive capacity could offer valuable lessons learned for other contexts, and;
- Events, like this workshop, that promote coordination and cooperation among practitioners could greatly assist in advancing many of these aims.



## Appendices

### *Appendix 1: Suggested Reading*

Barnett, J. R.A. Matthew and K. O'Brien. (2008), "Global Environmental Change and Human Security: An Introduction" in *Global Environmental Change and Human Security*, R.A Matthew, J. Barnett, B. McDonald and K. O'Brien, Eds. MIT Press, Massachusetts. pp 3-27.

Brown, O. and A. Crawford (2008) "Assessing the security implications of climate change for West Africa: Country case studies of Ghana and Burkina Faso" in *African Security Review*, Vol 17, No 3. Institute for Security Studies, pp 39-51. Available online at: [http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2008/asr\\_vol17\\_no3\\_climate\\_west\\_africa.pdf](http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2008/asr_vol17_no3_climate_west_africa.pdf)

Brown, O. and A. Crawford (2009), "Climate Change and Security in Africa: A Study for the Nordic-African Foreign Ministers Meeting", IISD, Winnipeg. Available online at: [http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2009/climate\\_change\\_security\\_africa.pdf](http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2009/climate_change_security_africa.pdf)

Collier, Paul. (2007) "The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What can be Done About it", Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hammill A., A. Crawford, R. Craig, R. Malpas and R. Matthew (2009) "Conflict-Sensitive Conservation: Practitioners' Handbook". IISD, Winnipeg. Available online at: [http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2009/csc\\_manual.pdf](http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2009/csc_manual.pdf)

IPCC (2007)b. "Summary for Policymakers" In *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Parry, M.L, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. Online at: [http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\\_and\\_data/ar4/wg2/en/spm.html](http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg2/en/spm.html)

Matthew, R.A, M. Brklacich and B. MacDonald (2004) "Analyzing Environment, Conflict and Cooperation", in *Understanding Environment, Conflict and Cooperation*, UNEP, Nairobi. Available online at: <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/topics/pubs/unepchap1.pdf>

McGray, H, A. Hammil and R. Bradley (2007). " Weathering the Storm: Options for Framing Adaptation and Development" WRI, Washington, D.C. Available online at: <http://www.wri.org/publication/weathering-the-storm>

McLeman, R. and B. Smit. (2004) "Commentary No. 86: Climate Change, Migration and Security. Canadian Security Intelligence Service", Ottawa. Available online at: <http://www.csis-scrs.gc.ca/pblctns/cmmntr/cm86-eng.asp>

OECD (2006). DAC Guidelines on Whole of Government Approaches to Fragile States, available online at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/15/24/37826256.pdf>

WBGU. (2007). *Climate change as a security risk*, German Advisory Council on Global Change (WBGU), Earthscan, London.

Smith, D. and J. Vivekananda (2009) "Climate Change, Conflict and Fragility", International Alert, London.  
Available online at: [http://www.international-alert.org/press/Climate\\_change\\_conflict\\_and\\_fragility\\_Nov09.pdf](http://www.international-alert.org/press/Climate_change_conflict_and_fragility_Nov09.pdf)

UNEP (2009) *From Conflict to Peacebuilding: The role of natural resources and the environment*, UNEP, Nairobi.  
Available online at: [http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2009/conflict\\_peacebuilding.pdf](http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2009/conflict_peacebuilding.pdf)

UN General Assembly (2009) "Climate change and its possible security implications: Report of the Secretary General", Sixty-fourth session, UN , New York. Available online at:  
[http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=A/64/350](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/64/350)

## Appendix 2: Workshop Agenda

### September 28, 2011—Workshop and Discussions

Time	Session	Details
9:00-9:15am	Welcome and Introduction	<b>Richard Matthew</b> , IISD and the Center for Unconventional Security Affairs, University of California at Irvine and <b>Keith Christie</b> , Assistant Deputy Minister, Global Issues, DFAIT
9:15-9:55	<b>Setting the Scene: Fragile States '101'</b>	<b>Marie-Joëlle Zahar</b> , Université de Montréal <i>What is a fragile state? What are the key challenges faced in these countries?</i>
10:00-10:40	<b>Setting the Scene: Climate Change and Fragile States</b>	<b>Geoff Dabelko</b> , Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars <i>How does climate change impact dynamics within fragile states? What are the foreign policy issues we face as a result?</i>
10:40-11:00	<i>Networking Break and Refreshments</i>	
11:00-11:40	<b>Impacts and Implications on the Ground: Regional Focus</b>	<b>Todd Smith</b> , Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, University of Texas <i>Climate Change and African Political Stability (CCAPS) case study of the Horn of Africa, analysing the political/social/conflict context and the role of climate change therein.</i>
11:40-12:20pm	<b>Impacts and Implications on the Ground: Issue Focus</b>	<b>Glen Hearn</b> , Transboundary International Waters Initiative, University of British Columbia <i>Case study on global transboundary water and conflict, impact of climate change on water and food security therein. Particular focus on the Nile region.</i>
12:20-12:30	Morning Wrap-Up	Richard Matthew, IISD
12:30-1:30	<i>Lunch</i>	
1:30-2:10	<b>Policies and Programming in the Fragile State Context: Moving Towards Resilient Development</b>	<b>Cynthia Brady</b> , USAID <i>Considerations for enhancing the effectiveness of programming in fragile states. Broader implications within the context of capacity building, governance and conflict prevention.</i>
2:10-2:20	Introduction to Discussion	Participants to move to breakout discussion groups
2:20-3:00	<b>Breakout Discussion Session</b>	Participants will be involved in smaller group discussions; discussion questions to be provided

<b>3:00-3:20</b>	<i>Networking Break and Refreshments</i>	
<b>3:20-4:00</b>	Report Back	Rapporteur from each discussion group to give brief overview of discussion and main sticking points
<b>4:00-4:30</b>	Day One Wrap-Up	Richard Matthew, IISD

## September 29, 2011—Plenary Session

<b>Time</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>9:00-9:10am</b>	Welcome and Introduction	IISD and <b>Mark Berman</b> , Director, Climate Change and Energy Division, DFAIT
<b>9:10-9:30</b>	<b>Overview and Synthesis of Day One's Discussions</b>	<b>Robert McLeman</b> , IISD/University of Ottawa
<b>9:30-10:20</b>	<b>Panel Discussion</b>	Day one speakers will join in a facilitated panel discussion, input from additional plenary attendees welcomed
<b>10:20-10:40</b>	<i>Networking Break and Refreshments</i>	
<b>10:40-11:30</b>	<b>Open Discussion</b>	Moderated discussion amongst all attendees
<b>11:30-11:50</b>	Moving Forward	Identifying key challenges and opportunities
<b>11:50-12:00</b>	Closing Remarks	IISD and <b>Marie Gervais-Vidricaire</b> , Director General Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force-START, DFAIT
<b>12:00-1:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	

### Appendix 3: Speaker Biographies

#### Marie-Joëlle Zahar

Marie-Joëlle Zahar is associate professor of Political Science and Research Director of the Francophone Research Network on Peace Operations at the Centre for International Research and Studies at the Université de Montréal. Her research interests include conflict resolution, civil wars, peacekeeping and post-conflict reconstruction. She is a specialist of militia politics and war economies; she also researches the dynamics of post-conflict reconstruction.

A graduate of McGill University, she has been visiting professor at the Université Lyon II and the Institut d'études politiques de Lyon, visiting scholar at the Centre d'études pour le monde arabe moderne, Université Saint-Joseph (Beirut, Lebanon), research fellow at Stanford's Center for International Security and cooperation, and SSHRC post-doctoral fellow at the Munk Centre for International Studies (University of Toronto).

Co-editor with Stephen Saideman of *Intra-State Conflict, Government and Security: Dilemmas of Deterrence and Assurance* (Routledge 2008), her work has appeared in academic journals such as *Global Governance*, *Africa Spectrum*, the *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development*, *Südosteuropa*, *Critique internationale*, *International Peacekeeping* and *The International Journal* as well as in multiple edited volumes on conflict resolution and peace implementation.

A former consultant for the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and adjunct faculty member at the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, she served on the board of directors of the Canadian Political Science Association, on the executive committee of the Canadian Consortium on Human Security, and as research director of the Middle East Network at the Centre d'études et de recherches internationales of the Université de Montréal.

#### Geoff Dabelko

Geoffrey D. Dabelko is director of the Environmental Change and Security Program, a nonpartisan policy forum on environment, population, health, and security issues founded in 1994 at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC. He is also an adjunct professor at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. Geoff has held prior positions with the Council on Foreign Relations and *Foreign Policy* and served as a lecturer at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. For over 20 years, he has facilitated dialogue among policymakers, practitioners, journalists, and scholars grappling with links among environment, population, development, conflict, and security. Geoff is co-editor with Ken Conca of *Environmental Peacemaking* (2002) and *Green Planet Blues: Four Decades of Global Environmental Politics* (4th edition).

Geoff is a member of the UN Environment Programme's Expert Advisory Group on Environment, Conflict, and Peacebuilding, contributing editor to *Environment*, member of the editorial board of *Global*

*Environmental Change*, member of the Board, Wilton Park USA Foundation, member of the Board of Experts, Center for Unconventional Security Affairs at the University of California, Irvine. He is a lead author on Working Group II, Chapter 12 “Human Security” on the 5<sup>th</sup> Assessment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

## **Todd Smith**

Todd’s research interests are in urban poverty, informal settlements, food security, and climate change adaptation in sub-Saharan Africa. He has worked for the past two years as a research assistant for the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law on the Climate Change and African Political Stability Project. During that time he has worked to understand what makes populations in Africa vulnerability to the future consequences of climate change and how they can adapt to such consequences and to map relative vulnerabilities on the continent. Todd has traveled extensively in eastern and southern Africa and has worked for Doctors Without Borders in Ethiopia, for Impumelelo Social Innovations Centre in South Africa, and the International Food Policy Research Institute in Uganda.

Todd holds a BA in political science from Lipscomb University in Nashville, TN, a law degree from Emory University in Atlanta, GA, and a Master of Public Affairs from The University of Texas at Austin. He is currently pursuing his PhD in Public Policy at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at The University of Texas at Austin.

## **Glen Hearn**

Glen Hearn is research director of the Transboundary Water Initiative at the University of British Columbia, and an associate with Compass Resource Management with over a decade of experience in resource management and decision making, conflict resolution and strategic planning. He has worked in over 20 countries throughout the globe on a variety of assignments related to resources and health.

His research and work focuses on applying structured approaches to make strategic choices around resource use and policy, and in promoting cooperation over shared resources. He has applied this to various sectors including water use planning, energy, local economic development, biology and conservation. His clients range from local communities, municipalities, regional governments, First Nations, national governments and international organizations. He was a member of the Crucible Group: a multi-disciplinary international think tank on genetic resources.

Glen holds a PhD from the Institute of Resources, Environment and Sustainability of UBC, a Master of Science in Policy Planning from IHE Delft, and a Bachelor of Science in Geophysics from the University of Waterloo.

## **Cynthia Brady**

Cynthia Brady is a Senior Conflict Advisor with USAID's Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance in the Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation (DCHA/CMM). She is the Agency's technical lead on environment/natural resources and conflict. She also serves on CMM's Africa Regional Team. Ms. Brady's primary responsibilities include identifying and analyzing sources of conflict and instability; supporting early responses to address the causes and consequences of fragility and violent conflict; and integrating conflict mitigation and management into USAID's analyses, strategies and programs. She provides technical support to USAID field offices, specifically including conflict analysis and program design.

Previously, Ms. Brady served as a Foreign Affairs Officer with the U.S. Department of State. She has also worked for the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Ms. Brady has worked in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America. She holds a master's degree in international affairs from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University and a bachelor's degree in political science from Denison University.

## **Richard Matthew (Facilitator)**

Richard A. Matthew (BA McGill; PhD Princeton) is Professor of International and Environmental Politics in the Schools of Social Ecology and Social Science at the University of California at Irvine, and founding Director of the Center for Unconventional Security Affairs.

He studies (a) the environmental dimensions of conflict and peacebuilding; (b) climate change adaptation in conflict and post-conflict societies; and (c) transnational threat systems. He has done extensive field work in conflict zones in South Asia and East, Central and West Africa.

In addition to his positions at UCI, he is also the Senior Fellow for Security at the International Institute for Sustainable Development in Geneva; a senior member of the United Nations Expert Advisory Group on Environment, Conflict and Peacebuilding; and a member of the World Conservation Union's Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy. Dr. Matthew has received Certificates of Recognition for his research and service activities from the U.S. Congress, the California State Legislature and the City of Los Angeles. He has over 130 publications including six books and co-edited volumes.

## Appendix 4: List of Participants

Name	Position/Title	Organization
<b>Day One and Two</b>		
Mike Brklacich	Professor, Geography and Enviro Studies	Carleton University
Graeme Auld	Asst Prof, School of Public Policy and Admin	Carleton University
Alexandra Mallett	Asst Prof, School of Public Policy and Admin	Carleton University
Xiang He	Policy Analyst, Policy Development (YSP) (resp. for Fragile States)	CIDA
Eugenia Zorbas	Policy Analyst, Policy Development (YSP)	CIDA
Laura Smallwood	Senior Policy Analyst, Economic Growth and Environmental Sustainability	CIDA
Laverne Barretto	Advisor, CC and Enviro Integration, Econ Growth and Enviro Sustainability	CIDA
Camille Pomerleau (Mr.)	Team Leader, Environment	CIDA
Ralph Osterwaldt	Senior Environmental Specialist, Strategic Planning and Analysis	CIDA
David Gillies	Senior Policy Advisor, Policy Research Division, Strategic Policy and Performance Branch	CIDA
Pamela O'Donnell	Director Deployment & Coordination (IRC)	DFAIT
Jess Dutton	Director Stabilization and Reconstruction Programs (IRG)	DFAIT
Eric Laporte	Deputy Director, Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Response Group	DFAIT
Jeanette Menzies	Deputy Director, Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Response Group	DFAIT
Lisa Helfand	Director Peace Operations and Fragile State Policy (IRP)	DFAIT
Mark Berman	Director, Climate Change and Energy (MDC)	DFAIT
Andréanne Goyette	Policy Analyst, Policy Research Division	DFAIT
Pierre Guimond	Director, Policy Planning	DFAIT
Tim Hodges	Senior Polic Advisor, Policy Planning	DFAIT
Adam Barbolet	Team Leader, Fragile States, Peace Operations and Fragile State Policy Division (START)	DFAIT
Carmen Sorger	Senior Advisor, Fragile States, Peace Operations and Fragile State Policy Division (START)	DFAIT
Marcia Burdette	Coordinator for Pan-African Affairs, Africa Bureau, DFAIT	DFAIT
Karen MacArthur	Director, Eastern and Southern Africa Relations	DFAIT
Ian Small	Senior Policy Analyst, Climate Change and Energy (MDC)	DFAIT



Jeremy Wallace	Deputy Director, Climate Change (MDC)	DFAIT
Melissa Burke	Senior Desk Officer-Policy, Sudan Task Force	DFAIT
Jordan Zed	Deputy Director, Defence and Security Relations Division	DFAIT
Stephen de Boer	DG, Climate Change International	Environment Canada
Peter Berry	Senior Policy Analyst, Climate Change and Health Office	Health Canada
Emily Bishop	Program Management Officer, Social and Economic Policy	IDRC
Hayley Price	Program Management Officer, Climate Change Adaptation in Africa (CCAA)	IDRC
Dave Sawyer	Director, Climate Change and Energy	IISD
Jessica Boyle	Project Officer, Climate Change and Energy	IISD
Hilary Hove	Project Officer, Climate Change and Energy	IISD
Jason Dion	Research Assistant-Economist	IISD
Richard Matthew	Senior Fellow/Director, Center for Unconventional Security Affairs	IISD/University of California, Irvine
Randy McLeman	Associate/Professor	IISD/University of Ottawa
Kedra Hildebrand	Executive Coordinator, Centre for International Peace and Security	McGill
Jenny Becker	Researcher, Fragile and Conflict-Affected States	North-South Institute
George Betts	Director, Global Division	PCO
Michaël de Verteuil	International Health and Environment Analyst, International Assessment Staff	PCO
Manon Dumas	Senior Privy Council Officer, FDPS	PCO
Judy Watling	DG, Sustainable Devp Research and Analysis	Policy Horizons Canada (formerly PRI)
Peter Padbury	Director, Sustainable Devp Research and Analysis	Policy Horizons Canada (formerly PRI)
Glen Hearn	Global Transboundary Intl Waters Center	UBC
Euan Wallace	Head of Global Issues, formerly First Secretary (Climate Change)	UK - British High Commission
Barry Smit	Canada Research Chair in Global Environmental Change	University of Guelph
Marie Joelle Zahar	Professor	University of Montreal
Stephen Baranyi	Professor	University of Ottawa
Pacifique Manirakiza	Professor, Law	University of Ottawa
Christoph Zuercher	Professor	University of Ottawa
Todd Smith	Senior Researcher, CCAPS	University of Texas at Austin
Cynthia Brady	Senior Conflict Advisor, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation (DCHA/CMM)	USAID

Geoff Dabelko

Director, Environmental Change and Security Program

Woodrow Wilson Center

**Day Two Only**

Philip Baker

Regional DG, Southern and Eastern Africa

CIDA

Sheila Riordon

DG, Environment, Energy and Sustainable Development

DFAIT

David Angell

DG, International Organizations, Human Rights and Democracy

DFAIT

Marie Gervais-Vidricaire

DG, Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force – START

DFAIT

Laurence Blandford

Director, Partnerships Division

Environment Canada

Furio De Angelis

UNHCR Representative in Canada

UN