



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

DFID Department for
International
Development

Ministerie van
Buitenlandse Zaken



Security, Development, and Forest Conflict: A Forum for Action

**Hosted by the International Crisis Group and
Fiona Hall, MEP
Brussels, 8-9 February 2006**

Summary Report

The Forum brought around 60 representatives from the security and defense, diplomatic and development communities together to:

- Raise awareness of the different approaches of these communities to conflict in forest areas, and identify complementarities and synergies;
- Evaluate the implications of conflict in forest areas for security and development;
- Present current work in this area and identify effective responses to local-level conflict, armed conflict, and post-conflict conditions in forest areas; and
- Identify follow-up actions, including collaboration between participants in specific countries and regions, and new approaches to programming guidance and policy development.

The Forum was supported by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), the Netherlands Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in association with ARD Inc., the Center for International Forest Research (CIFOR) and the European Tropical Forest Research Network (ETFRN).

The Forum agreed to proceed with (a) developing an internationally-recognized definition of conflict resources; (b) integrating natural resource conflict within the UN security and peace building systems; and (c) building partnerships with other governments and the OECD DAC [to enhance donor coordination both internationally and at country level].

The meeting included four half-day sessions:

- The first plenary session explored the links between security, development, and forest conflict, with perspectives from security, foreign policy, and conflict prevention specialists, donors, and NGOs.
- In the second session, two parallel thematic working groups discussed:
 - Preventing Forest Conflict: Managing military exploitation of forests and responding to local-level conflict, with a focus on Asia; and
 - Conflict Timber – Lessons for Post-conflict Reconstruction: Defining conflict timber and responding to the needs of demobilized forces without fuelling future conflict and the destruction of the natural resource base, with a focus on West Africa, especially Liberia.
- The third session had two parallel working groups focusing on Central Africa and the Great Lakes Region; and on Asia, especially Nepal and several South-east Asian countries.
- The fourth and final plenary session focused on action points arising from the working group discussions and next steps.

The agenda and list of presentations are attached to this report as Annexes 1 and 2.



Key points

The working groups generated a wealth of lessons and points for action, which will be included in a longer report. The following action points were extracted, and discussed in the final plenary session:

1. Integrate natural resource conflict into the broader security agenda and promote better coordination between diplomacy, development, and security and defence.
2. Support the adoption of a common definition of conflict resources by the UN Security Council. The Forum participants noted that the Commission for Africa, the G8 and UNDP had all called for an internationally accepted definition of conflict resources. It was suggested that Forum participants could ensure that the conflict resource definition developed by Global Witness was used widely. At a different level, it was proposed that tagging the definition onto specific, existing UN Security Council resolutions might shorten the process of adoption.
3. Examine options for incorporating concerns over natural resource conflict in the UN security and peace-building institutions.
4. Engaging other institutional actors and fora such as the G8 Presidency; the EU Presidency; the International Criminal Court, Europol, ASEAN, NEPAD, the Collaborative Partnership on Forests; and others.
5. Address both supply and demand issues related to conflict resources including corporate practice. Specific actions may focus on private security forces and developing good practice in the resource chain of custody.
6. Carry out further research on natural resource conflict, including the impacts of marginalising natural resource-rich regions and communities.
7. Support and document community-based natural resource management as a means for conflict prevention and post-conflict stabilisation and development; favour business models that benefit local people.
8. Promote good governance, including transparency, accountability, and support for marginalised regions to reduce natural resource-related conflict.

Next steps

The Forum participants agreed that it would be useful to establish an interagency group or similar mechanism to continue the work of the Forum. All participants wishing to be part of this group will send an Email to ETFRN expressing their interest. This process should be supported by a well-managed website, multistakeholder dialogue and regular interagency meetings. The Chatham House support to the FLEGT process was cited as a useful model. It was recommended that the group would use a neutral and established institution as convener.

The interagency group will address the following points:

- Steps to take to facilitate the UN Security Council adoption of a common definition of conflict resources.
- Development of proposals for pilot activities in specific countries, paying attention to field- and community-based activities, and business models that benefit local people.
- Reaching out to the OECD DAC, and to other regions and countries; the private sector; export credit agencies.
- The optimal size and inclusiveness of the group, and the possible need to regionalise.

- The links between community and private sector / scaling up; using community outcomes as the "lens" to view conflict resolution.
- Pulling together lessons and best practice.

Finally, it was agreed that the draft findings and lessons from the Forum should be circulated, providing participants with the opportunity to insert ideas for next steps into the document:

- Practical opportunities for action
- Priority research needs
- Other groups of actors