

**Geneva Dialogue on Environment,
Climate, Conflict, and Peace:
Meeting 36**

19 September, Zoom

12 participants

The Geneva Dialogue is an informal group of professionals, practitioners, researchers, policy-makers, largely though not exclusively Geneva-based working on environment, climate, conflict, and peace.

- <https://www.gpplatform.ch/content/environment-climate-conflict-and-peacebuilding>

This group met in July 2022 and decided to reconvene in September to explore updates and possible next collaborative steps. Notes from that meeting are available upon request and include an initial map of organizations operating on this topic.

Discussion notes:

What is conflict sensitivity? What is peace responsiveness? How well-defined must they be to be integrated? Are there other definitional challenges?

- [Climate Security Mechanism's toolbox](#) discusses climate-related security risk assessments integrated into programs - provides one definition.
- Conflict sensitivity and conflict analysis is often short-term and driven by political context. It is also highly local.
 - Climate data, on the other hand, is longer-term. This creates a challenge where data often doesn't match up between the two.
 - One solution to the challenge is using a multi-scalar approach from the global, to regional, to national, to local.
 - [Example from UNU](#)
- Conflict sensitivity has been present in the conversation for a long time - risk that it becomes a box to be checked
 - Because financial actors are highly risk averse, genuine engagement is difficult
 - Where do we start calling something "conflict"? Many seem to be more interested in work on "resilience"
 - Satisfying ESG requirements seem to look like reputational management
- "Peace responsiveness" is a higher degree of engagement than "conflict sensitivity"
 - Moving beyond project-oriented approaches to a longer and more intensive approach on how projects might also contribute to or build peace

What are some of the challenges blocking climate finance and peace?

- When we talk about climate finance, sometimes we mean *distribution of finance* and sometimes mean *implementation of projects "on the ground"*
 - A challenge is defining what we are actually talking about
 - Allocation is a different conversation from implementation, though they need to go hand in hand
- Climate funds are beginning to acknowledge peace and conflict sensitivity with more regularity, though they are not necessarily taking necessary steps to operationalize

- Operationalizing conflict sensitivity into climate finance requires institutional structure changes
 - Political will cannot change reality “on the ground” if the framework for implementing funding priorities does not also change
- Transparency in reporting is necessary to further diagnose
- The field is still largely silo’d into “peace” actors doing “climate work” and “climate” actors doing “peace work”
 - If we try to operate one project at a time, we will not move fast enough.
 - We need larger systemic shifts.
 - [Example from Climate Security Mechanism](#)
 - Without a substantial change in quality and access, certain countries will never get access
 - Most recent IPCC report put challenges of affected populations front and center

Where can we go from here?

- Trying to develop monitoring/measurement in conflict areas
 - What are the indicators we are looking for? What is failure? What is a successful project in a conflict zone?
 - Degree of intentionality of addressing the conflict
 - Calling it “context sensitivity” and building interest among folks to address drivers
 - One example is the Conservation International training manual
 - Primary goal: Conservation, Secondary Goal: Conflict sensitivity indicators
- M&E toolkit
 - We cannot make indicators that work for everyone, but rather walk people through the process of how to think about it
 - Not just contextual for the location, but also contextual for the organization
- Future conversations possible:
 - Methodologies and indicators
 - There’s a possibility to set up action-research possibilities – hooking researchers into programs that are happening, and feeding back their findings
 - We have a need for increasing the evidence base right now
 - There’s not much data from ESG on what kind of impact is possible
 - More data sources
 - Brainstorm on how to mobilize finance - how to increase government investment