



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

Corporate Framework to support sustainable peace in the context of Agenda 2030



Corporate Framework to support sustainable peace in the context of Agenda 2030

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, 2018

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2018

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org.

Contents

Introduction	1
Background	2
Impact of conflict on food security and nutrition, and sustainable development	2
Food insecurity, conflict and underlying causes	3
Conflict prevention in the United Nations (UN) system – increasing attention, common themes	4
Rationale	6
Objective, approach and deliverables	10
Objective	10
Approach	10
Deliverables	11
Corporate policy priorities.....	12
FAO’s convening and advocacy roles	12
Programmatic innovations	12
Monitoring and early warning	13
Partnerships	14
Knowledge, analysis and assessment	14
Organizational management	15
BACKGROUND PAPER	17
Enhancing FAO’s contribution to sustainable peace	17

WE THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS DETERMINED

- to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and
- to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and
- to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and
- to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

AND FOR THESE ENDS

- to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and
- to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and
- to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and
- to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,

HAVE RESOLVED TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS TO ACCOMPLISH THESE AIMS

Accordingly, our respective Governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations.

*Charter of the United Nations
Preamble, 1945*

Introduction

The objective of this corporate Framework (the ‘Framework’) is to guide the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in carrying out its mandate in its areas of competence and comparative advantage, i.e. food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture, towards a more deliberate and transformative impact on sustaining peace.

Following the April 2016 Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on peacebuilding, the concept “sustaining peace” encompasses activities aimed at preventing the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict, including addressing root causes and moving towards recovery, reconstruction and development.

The United Nations Secretary-General has called on all UN entities to integrate the approach to sustaining peace in their strategic planning, and to regard sustaining peace as an important goal to which their work can contribute.

This Framework is targeted at FAO as an organization, including all personnel and in all geographic locations. This Framework also speaks to all FAO’s member states and governing bodies, and guides member states’ expectations of the Organization, and collaboration with it.

The Framework is based on a background document that details the rationale and FAO’s experience and comparative advantages in contributing to sustainable peace (see Background paper, page 17). A series of supporting documents will be prepared to accompany implementation of the Framework over time. In particular, Operational Guidelines will define how to implement the Framework in the context of FAO’s Strategic Framework.

Background

Impact of conflict on food security and nutrition, and sustainable development

Conflict has strong and unambiguous adverse effects on hunger, nutrition and overall sustainable development. Conflict is a major driver of food insecurity and chronic and acute malnutrition. Conflicts reduce food availability, disrupt access to foodstuffs, and undermine non-formal as well as established social protection systems.

Approximately 80 percent of humanitarian appeals are conflict related and most of these conflicts are protracted. In countries with protracted crisis, the proportion of people who are undernourished is almost three times higher than in other developing countries. Two billion people now live in countries where development outcomes are affected by fragility, conflict, and violence. Fragility is understood as a heightened exposure to risk combined with a low capacity to mitigate or absorb those risks. Extreme poverty will increasingly be concentrated in these areas as the rest of the world makes progress, rising to almost 50 percent of the global total by 2030, up from 17 percent today. Furthermore, the majority of people in extreme poverty are living in fragile contexts, or are exposed to risks of extreme climate events, or both.

Significantly, contexts considered extremely fragile or fragile are also those that rely mostly on agriculture as a means of income, when measured in terms of agricultural added value as a percentage of GDP.

Most conflicts strike hardest in rural areas, with sharply negative consequences for survival, agricultural production and rural livelihoods. Conflict causes vulnerable people and at risk communities to lose access to the range of resources necessary for food and agriculture production. Conflict also compromises rural employment opportunities and can lead to losses in income. Conflict-related processes of exploitation, denial of access to resources, and deliberate targeting of food production systems often deepen pre-crisis inequalities and increase poverty among vulnerable groups, e.g. poor landholders in inadequate land tenure regimes, or highly mobile populations such as pastoralists.

The consequences of conflict manifest specifically and often differently according to the age and gender of those affected. Relations of power and marginalization tend to be amplified in conflict contexts. For example, prevailing gender inequalities and related limitations on women's access to productive resources, services and decision-making translate into heightened vulnerability in every aspect of women's burdens in production, caregiving and household management. For men and boys especially, recruitment into fighting forces diverts labour from agriculture production, problems that can persist due to war-related disabilities.

Conflict directly and indirectly affects agricultural development in the immediate, medium and longer terms. Conflict-related food-price inflation, exchange rate instability and stagnated growth impact almost

every aspect of food and agriculture value chains, including finance, transport, inputs and processing. Although there is wide variance, conflicts are statistically associated with a reduction in GDP growth, and setbacks in terms of per capita incomes and growth can be devastating. The presence or risk of (recurrent) conflict discourages private investment in agriculture, often long after conflicts have ceased.

Food insecurity, conflict and underlying causes

The root causes of conflict are complex and nonlinear. **In 2015, over one-third of countries and economies with fragile situations had experienced recent conflicts, reflecting dynamic interrelationships among poverty (including hunger), governance and conflict.** After declining in the late 1990s and early 2000s, the prevalence of conflicts globally - particularly civil conflicts - increased markedly from 2008. These conflicts have destabilized entire regions, exponentially increased the number of forcibly displaced, drained global humanitarian resources and brought untold misery to families and communities.

The drivers of conflicts range from geopolitical interests, control over resources, ethnic tensions, religious differences, discrimination, poor governance, limited state capacity, population pressure and rapid urbanization, through to other factors such as poverty and youth unemployment. **Some – but certainly not all – conflict drivers specifically relate to FAO’s mandate and competencies.** Those that relate to FAO’s work and mandate include those that have been driven by, *inter alia*, competition for land, water and other natural resources, the multiple dimensions of food insecurity, the neglect by governments of marginalized areas, or environmental mismanagement.

People may resort to violence when their human security – including food security – is threatened, especially when there is a dearth of formal and informal institutions that are capable and willing to mediate such risks. Conflict may arise due to a loss of assets (including access to resources), threats to livelihoods, and/or other forms of economic and political marginalization. Food insecurity may be one among other causes for conflict, and may become a channel through which wider socio-economic and political grievances are expressed.

The implications of conflict-induced food insecurity no longer are limited to specific countries or regions, but have global impacts. In 2015, over 65 million people worldwide were forcibly displaced, the majority experiencing protracted displacement. The proximate effects of conflicts are increasingly echoed across the broader global landscape as conflict-affected people migrate across and within countries, regions and continents in a bid to manage the risks and consequences of conflict. There is a deepening awareness of how food insecurity in one part of the world can influence social services, political systems and national security elsewhere.

Climate change and related extreme weather events are expected to exacerbate the factors that drive conflict risks with associated pressures on populations to move and requisite needs for humanitarian action. Whilst climate change *per se* is not necessarily associated with violence, the combination of vulnerability to climate change and broader institutional and socio-economic fragility can increase the potential for conflict. This “climate-conflict nexus” is characterized by intersection between two key factors in the context of climate change vulnerability: weak institutions and pre-existing social fragility. Significantly, these factors are pronounced in economies that are highly dependent upon subsistence agriculture.

There are additional interrelated trends that can impact, or be impacted by, the prevalence of conflict, such as urbanization and rural transformation, and related implications for resource availability, agricultural productivity, and food security and nutrition overall. Where institutions – both rural and urban – are not equipped to manage these dynamics, e.g. fluctuating populations, resource allocation or the provision of services, the risk of conflict may increase.

Conflict prevention in the United Nations (UN) system – increasing attention, common themes

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development makes an explicit link between sustainable development and peace, and calls for more collaborative approaches to conflict prevention, mitigation, resolution and recovery. The 2030 Agenda recognizes peace as a vital condition for development as well as a development outcome in its own right. Given that conflicts impacts negatively, and can inhibit, sustainable development, one of the seventeen global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) aims to significantly reduce all forms of violence, including working with member states and communities to find lasting solutions to conflict and insecurity (SDG 16).

The universality and breadth of the 2030 Agenda have important implications for FAO's work in conflict-affected settings that go beyond the linkages to Global Goal 16 on peaceful and inclusive societies. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 1 and 2 focus on the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger, achieving food security, and making agriculture sustainable. The 2030 Agenda sees achievement of these goals as critical elements in achieving the further goal, SDG 16, of ensuring peaceful and inclusive societies. Conversely, achievement of SDGs 1 and 2, as well as all the other SDGs, will be impossible without major progress towards achievement of SDG 16.

In April 2016, the General Assembly and Security Council adopted substantively identical resolutions (A/RES/70/262 and S/RES/2282), concluding the 2015 review of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture, which covered peace operations, peacebuilding and implementation of resolution 1325. These comprehensive and far-reaching resolutions outline an ambitious new agenda and approach with “sustaining peace” as a unifying framework to address the root causes of conflict, encompassing activities aimed at preventing the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict.

The UN Secretary-General has made conflict prevention a priority focus across the UN system, building on (and within the realm of) the differing scope and focus of each organization's mandate and work. The proposed restructuring and reform of the UN's development and the UN's peace and security pillars are predicated on a cross-pillar approach to sustaining peace, requiring all UN entities to adapt accordingly.

The UN Secretary-General encourages (A/72/707 and S/2018/43) all UN entities to integrate the approach to sustaining peace in their strategic planning, and to regard sustaining peace as an important goal to which their work can contribute. The Framework seeks to address that request.

Rationale

FAO was created in the wake of the Second World War and was vested with a vital role in achieving and sustaining peace. In the first Session of the Conference of FAO, it was stated that "...the Food and Agriculture Organization is born out of the need for peace as well as the need for freedom from want. The two are interdependent. Progress towards freedom from want is essential to lasting peace."

Both in times of conflict and stability, FAO plays a unique role in protecting, restoring and developing the livelihoods of farmers, fishers, herders, foresters and others who depend upon agriculture and the natural resource environment for sustenance, security and prosperity. The Organization's efforts to both save lives and create longer-term resilience are important contributions to peace and stability within countries, across regions and beyond.

FAO has used its technical competencies to directly contribute to sustaining peace, including working to reduce or address conflicts before they escalate further as well as to reduce the risk of relapse into conflict in post-crisis contexts. This has included focused engagements with parties to a conflict; the development of tools and guidance to assist stakeholders in addressing the root causes of conflict and conflict drivers; interventions that reduce fragility and underpin stability; through risk-based early warning systems leading to early action; and technical insights into conflict dynamics in order to identify possible entry points and solutions. For example:

- Eradicating Rinderpest in 2011 contributed to improvements in food security for livestock-owning communities, but also contributed to peace and security in wider populations. Eliminating Rinderpest would not have been possible without a conflict-sensitive approach to animal health, as the last vestiges of the disease were found in communities where conflicts had been triggered by disputes over livestock. FAO and a range of partners trained community-based animal health workers (both men and women) and negotiated peace pacts between rival pastoral groups as a pre-condition for Rinderpest vaccinations. This demonstrates FAO's convening role as a respected neutral, specialized technical agency. The practice of veterinarians and community-based animal health workers employing their technical expertise to contribute to sustaining peace continues today.
- FAO is the UN's foremost technical institution in helping to prevent conflict over access to natural resources (land, water, fisheries) using a combination of capacity development, partnerships, policy support, globally accepted voluntary guidelines, and strategic deployment of technical staff. FAO relies on its competencies to promote conflict-sensitive approaches (coupled with technical support to increase use efficiencies) and to manage limited resources in an inclusive and transparent manner, in order to contribute to peaceful interaction between and within population groups. FAO works with communities, policy makers and practitioners to enhance diagnostic skills for proactive assessment, monitoring and de-escalation of tenure related

conflicts. FAO has also supported community land delimitation, capacity building and dissemination of knowledge, including Participatory Negotiated Territorial Development (PNTD) approaches to reduce land-based disagreements that focus on identifying the underlying causes of issues surrounding natural resource access. These approaches illustrate how FAO's guidance, technical expertise and globally developed tools facilitate conflict prevention and resolution and can help to create more stable and equitable societies.

- In partnership with UN peace support actors, FAO has worked in a number of countries on the demilitarization of ex-combatants, many of whom were young men and women from rural areas, as part of Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration (DDR) programmes. FAO has assisted these former combatants to attain sustainable and productive economic livelihoods in, for example, the agriculture, fisheries, and livestock sectors. Enhancing skills and providing capital for agricultural livelihoods is as important for food security and income as it is for providing a pathway for social cohesion in the communities where ex-combatants reside.

FAO also works in conflicts to save lives, enable people to remain in their communities, support internally displaced and refugee populations, address malnutrition, guard against environmental destruction, prevent sexual and gender-based violence, restore food production and protect agriculture systems. With a particular focus on dignity, comparative cost-effectiveness and the coordination of multi-actor response strategies, FAO deploys its competencies in conflict contexts to address the multiple threats to food security and nutrition and to support the range of livelihood strategies that at risk populations rely on to manage risk and vulnerability. Given a focus on strategies with both a rapid and lasting impact on food security, FAO's work in conflict-affected situations also supports effective transitions between humanitarian action and development processes. For example:

- FAO's engagements in conflict contexts include the provision of data and analysis on risks and vulnerabilities to inform decision-making and programming and support to early warning systems to underpin early action. This is an area of exceptionally strong comparative advantage for FAO and cuts across the range of the Organization's technical expertise including, *inter alia*, seed security assessments, pastoralist early warning systems, market and food price monitoring, the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC), the Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis Model (RIMA), and analysis of the impacts of conflict on the agriculture sector. FAO's early warning systems are important for signalling changes in conflict risks and hence opportunities for early action, including conflict mitigation. This includes where FAO's analysis of vulnerability related to climate change, and solutions to address it, have been integrated with an analysis of conflict risk in order to deliver on multiple objectives.
- FAO's comparative advantage as a neutral convener facilitates the coordination of multi-actor emergency responses, included in

countries affected by conflict. With WFP, FAO co-leads the global Food Security Cluster (gFSC) to ensure coordination on food security and agriculture interventions, needs assessments, resource mobilization and to identify cross-sectoral complementarities with a wide range of stakeholders including governments, UN agencies, regional institutions, civil society organizations, and many others. As a Cluster co-lead, FAO abides by its global responsibility to serve as a “provider of last resort.” FAO responds to identified and often gendered patterns of risk and vulnerability in conflict zones to restore agricultural livelihoods and food production through emergency support to vulnerable and at risk groups, including household production, sale and consumption of food. Such support has been directed, variously, toward the production of crops, livestock, fish and non-wood forest products, as well as measures to strengthen biosecurity. With FAO’s technically sound, appropriately adapted support, food production levels have been maintained – and even increased – in several conflict contexts. In addition to saving livelihoods, such interventions increase local food availability, access and variety, with broader implications for nutritionally vulnerable communities. Such interventions have also proven remarkably cost-effective, for example, when compared to emergency food aid rations.

A considerable thrust of FAO’s work is development-related technical work. Although there are rarely neat delineations between humanitarian action and development work in conflicts (especially in the context of protracted crises), FAO remains committed to attaining development outcomes in countries and regions affected by destructive conflicts. A quarter of FAO’s field programme delivery in the most world’s fifteen most fragile contexts in 2016 was development assistance. Such efforts require contextual understanding and conflict analysis to ensure that interventions do not heighten conflict risks and hence avoid doing harm. The following examples demonstrate how FAO’s expertise can accelerate results for poverty reduction and resilience in conflict risk contexts:

- In conflict and post-conflict contexts, FAO has promoted responsible investment in agriculture and food systems to foster smallholder inclusion in value chains and bring employment and income generation to rural areas. The Ebola virus disease outbreak which affected Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone challenged existing and ongoing peacebuilding and stabilization processes related to public services and social cohesion. FAO worked with partners (e.g. WFP and WHO) to address immediate recovery interventions, but FAO also continued to work on promoting responsible investment in agriculture and food systems to foster smallholder inclusion in value chains, and bring employment and income generation to rural areas.
- FAO’s work on social protection systems that are long-term, predictable, risk-informed and shock-responsive are critical to reduce poverty, and accelerate progress in the fight against hunger and food insecurity, while strengthening resilience to threats and crises and enabling development. FAO’s flexible CASH+ interventions combine

transfers of cash and productive in-kind assets with the objective of boosting the livelihoods and productive capacities of poor and vulnerable households.

- FAO is working with the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC), FEWSNET, the IGAD Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN) and Uganda's Community Nutrition Surveillance, amongst others, to strengthen early warning, preparedness and contingency planning and response systems. Interventions also support capacity development of local institutions in, for example, livestock disease surveillance and provision of veterinary services. This is complemented by strengthening the long-term resilience of agro-pastoralist production systems and communities through field schools and improved watershed management. This illustrates FAO's convening role, the range of partnerships that FAO has employed in working through conflicts on development issues, based on deep contextual understanding.

FAO, in leveraging its key core competencies, has developed considerable expertise in working in conflict-affected situations.

Thus far, these efforts rarely have focused explicitly on building sustainable peace. Moving forward, however, such efforts provide the basis for enhanced engagements by FAO and its partners in supporting sustainable peace. The Organization intends to build on these experiences through further analysis to identify best practices, recognising that all its multiple forms of assistance - development, investment, humanitarian - and across all five of its Strategic Programmes, have the potential to contribute to sustainable peace.

Objective, approach and deliverables

This Framework is rooted in FAO's mandate and is simultaneously informed by the promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This underpins a renewed corporate commitment to contribute to the attainment and maintenance of sustainable peace by broadening and deepening its work on conflict prevention, mitigation, resolution and recovery.

Objective

Agriculture, natural resources, and food security and nutrition can be a source of peace or conflict, of crisis or recovery, of tragedy or healing. In light of this, the objective of the Framework is to guide FAO in its areas of competence and comparative advantage towards a more deliberate and transformative impact through: at a minimum, supporting the food security, food production and sustainable use of natural resources of conflict-affected populations; where development is possible, notwithstanding conflict contexts, advancing progress on the SDGs through conflict-sensitive approaches; and, where food systems, natural resources or food insecurity are drivers of conflict, working directly to reduce conflict risks.

Specifically, this Framework aims to transform FAO's engagements in conflict-affected situations into deliberately focused, strategic, and evidence-based approaches that support sustainable peace. Given that some conflict risks specifically pertain to FAO's mandate and all conflicts affect populations of concern to the Organization, the Framework is designed to generate a more effective enabling environment for FAO to step up appropriately and consistently - as central to the Organization's fight against hunger - to address at scale the multiple threats to food security and nutrition.

Approach

This Framework rests on a conflict sensitive and three-pronged approach aimed at mitigating the negative impacts of conflicts on people's lives and livelihoods (including men, women, youth and older persons), preventing the risks of conflicts, whilst promoting a transformative agenda to address the root causes of conflicts and promote sustainable development. In particular, FAO will:

- **work on conflict** (conflict drivers), by systematically capitalizing on the depth and breadth of its technical competencies, its relationships, and its convening powers to identify ways to minimise, avoid and/or positively transform and resolve conflict(s) where food, agriculture or natural resources are, or could be, conflict drivers

- **work in conflict** (conflict impacts), by significantly scaling up its capacities to develop and implement interventions for saving lives and supporting livelihoods that are directly impacted by conflict(s), as well as risk-based early warning systems leading to early action
- **work through conflict** (conflict sensitive development), by advancing sustainable development, including reducing poverty, addressing inequality, promoting sustainable agricultural livelihoods and natural resource management, and contributing to economic growth in countries and regions (potentially) affected by conflict(s), doing so in a conflict-sensitive manner

Deliverables

The implementation of the Framework will result in five expected deliverables of how FAO works:

- **Deliverable 1.** The integration of concepts, indicators, and lesson learning on contributing to sustainable peace (reflecting the central importance of gender and age) across all five Strategic Objectives of FAO and across HQ, regional, and country offices (*Programmatic innovations and Organizational management*).
- **Deliverable 2.** A robust flexibly financed global portfolio of engagements in supporting sustainable peace with measurable results (*Programmatic innovations*).
- **Deliverable 3.** Improved evidence base and strengthened, gender- and age-disaggregated monitoring systems that focus on the linkages between food security, nutrition, and peace and on the effectiveness of various approaches (*Analysis and monitoring*).
- **Deliverable 4.** New coalitions, partnerships and leadership roles at country level and globally on supporting sustainable peace (*Partnerships and convening role*).
- **Deliverable 5.** Demonstrated effective capacity and commitment to sustainable peace of all personnel to work on, in, and through conflicts in a way which improves food security and nutrition and fosters agricultural development and post-conflict recovery and reconstruction for men and women (*Organizational management*).

Corporate policy priorities

This Framework directs how FAO will further leverage its core competencies, experiences and resources to directly and indirectly influence - at scale - the multifaceted relationships between food, agriculture and sustainable peace.

FAO's convening and advocacy roles

FAO will use its convening powers to engage member states, partners (including resource partners) and other stakeholders to explore modalities and agree measures on how to more effectively leverage its competencies to influence sustainable peace by working on, in, and through conflicts.

By building on its leadership, advocacy and guidance role on food security related issues, and the links with conflict and peace, FAO will:

- **reach a wider audience** to lever strengthened scope, scale and impact in achieving sustainable peace;
- **highlight the importance of agriculture**, food security and nutrition, safeguarding agricultural assets, and sustainable development to raise further awareness on these multidisciplinary issues in the context of conflict prevention and sustainable peace;
- **galvanize the requisite political, institutional and financial resources** necessary to combat hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition in a manner proportionate to the risks each conflict poses.

Programmatic innovations

In the interest of attaining food security and nutrition for all, and recognizing that innovation is required in order to achieve the transformational change needed to build peace, FAO will:

- **work to better understand the root causes of instability, fragility and insecurity** in the areas of FAO's mandate to inform conflict-sensitive approaches, and to avoid undermining policies and actions for securing sustainable peace;
- **ensure that it systematically undertakes conflict risk analysis**, mindful of gender considerations, regardless of context, and with all relevant stakeholders. Such assessments will be designed to guard against the risk of any FAO initiative inadvertently contributing to increasing the risk of, or exacerbating, conflict;
- **mainstream conflict sensitive, rights-based and gendered approaches into each function of the corporate project cycle**;
- **develop methodologies for conflict-sensitive social impact assessments** that account for the different implications for men, women and youth, and incorporate these into the corporate project cycle at key junctures (e.g. during formulation, monitoring and evaluation);

- **increase the inclusion of specific objectives to prevent, mitigate, alleviate and resolve conflicts** in Country Programming Frameworks and Resilience Strategies in conflict-affected or at risk contexts, as well as contexts within countries and (sub) regionally that are characterized by dynamic states of fragility;
- **explore how within the context of integrated UN missions how the peace and security architecture can complement activities to restore food security and livelihoods**, for example by ensuring the protection of agricultural production and local trade routes;
- **leverage more predictable and flexible funding mechanisms**, for example, through FAO's existing Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities (SFERA), so that it will be better positioned to respond quickly to changing situations and address context specific needs through its Country Programming Frameworks, or through financing platforms created at the global level by the UN and/or The World Bank;
- **become more predictable and consistent in its humanitarian and peace related engagements** through the establishment of minimum capacities in selected country offices.

Monitoring and early warning

FAO will strengthen its existing frameworks and systems for risk analysis, threat, and conflict monitoring to facilitate early warning and action by FAO offices, as well as for the wider UN system, and other stakeholders. In particular, FAO will:

- **sharpen the linkages between surveillance of conflict risks, their differential impact on men, women and youth, and specific measures** to address a range of food, agriculture and natural resource based conflicts;
- **provide food security-related information in order to contribute to multidisciplinary analyses** by a range of actors including within the UN peacebuilding architecture and Special Political Missions, and regularly inform the UN Security Council on situations of concern;
- **intensify the deployment of its expertise on the application of early warning information** to inform the design of policies and approaches for early warning-early action with member states and other partners;
- **develop and incorporate conflict markers in its early warning systems** and ensure broad coverage, including in post-crisis contexts as well as apparently stable areas.

Partnerships

Making a transformative change in supporting sustainable peace will require reshaping the nature of some FAO partnerships, and focusing on potential engagement with more local partners, especially those that are explicitly conflict-sensitive. FAO will:

- **strengthen links with the UN's peacebuilding architecture and the World Bank's Fragility Conflict and Violence Group**, as well as multi-stakeholder platforms that bring together diverse actors and practice communities;
- **expand partnerships with those that also specialize in saving lives through livelihoods in conflict settings**, in particular, those that bring unique competencies in conflict-sensitive engagements;
- **explore private sector approaches to supporting livelihoods in conflict; and engage with local civil society, community based organizations and diaspora associations**, to successfully build on, develop and help sustain local capacities;
- **work with member states in conflict-affected countries** to preserve national budget allocations and domestic investments in food, nutrition, agriculture and natural resource management, to promote conflict-sensitivity, enhancing sustainable peace in post-crisis contexts;
- **engage with academic and research institutes, fora and practice communities**, such as the Geneva Peacebuilding Platform, to advance understanding and build the evidence base on contributions to sustainable peace.

Knowledge, analysis and assessment

FAO will work to address the limited documentation on best practices in the sphere of food and agriculture for conflict prevention, mitigation and resolution, and will focus its knowledge generation and dissemination capacities to deepen awareness of how to promote sustainable peace. FAO will expand the available documentation regarding the absolute and comparative economic benefits of livelihood-based humanitarian approaches for food security and nutrition in conflict contexts.

Organizational management

FAO will build the capacity of relevant personnel, including national personnel, for conflict risk assessment and conflict-sensitive programming. FAO will avail key personnel the opportunities to enhance skills in areas such as conflict-sensitivity, protection, negotiations with parties for security and access, and humanitarian principles, international humanitarian law and human rights law to the extent that such instruments pertain to food and agriculture.

FAO will review its human resource practices to increase its ability to competitively attract, retain and deploy qualified personnel who are willing to work in contexts that are characterized by conflict, recognizing the unique stressors that such situations entail.

FAO will further enhance measures for the safety and security of personnel, offices, and assets in conflict contexts.

FAO will enhance measures to increase awareness of FAO's policies, rules and procedures regarding conflicts of interest, fraud, nepotism and other ethical concerns, especially in decentralized offices in conflict contexts, recognising that conflict contexts may be associated with higher risks of violation of ethics.

Background paper

Enhancing FAO's contribution to sustainable peace

Overview

Since its founding, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has been dedicated to addressing the pressing challenges facing food and agriculture systems – and the global populations that depend on them – on land and sea. A persistent focus has been the myriad conflicts, both destructive and constructive, that characterize the multiple natural resource-based pathways for livelihood security and national development. Given FAO's proximity to all aspects of food and agriculture systems, it has long been appreciated that agriculture, natural resources, food security and nutrition can be a source of both peace and conflict, of both crisis and recovery and of both tragedy and (as the image on the front cover depicts) healing.

Conflicts are struggles between interdependent groups that have either actual or perceived incompatibilities with respect to needs, values, goals, resources or intentions.¹ As such, conflict is present in all societies and can be productive or utterly catastrophic. This definition includes (but is broader than) armed conflict; that is, organized collective violent confrontation between at least two groups, either state or non-state actors.² With respect to the challenge of sustainable peace, this paper focusses on conflicts that threaten or entail violence or destructive results, including contexts where fragility raises the risk of damaging conflicts and where protracted crises persist.

All countries have a role to play in supporting sustainable peace through agriculture and food systems, including outreach to consumers in countries where food security and adequate nutrition are not universal or where the development of agriculture and natural resources may drive or exacerbate the risk of conflict. There is a deepening awareness of how food insecurity in one part of the world can influence social services, political systems and national security elsewhere.

Over time, using a range of technical, policy and legal avenues, FAO has worked in solidarity with Member States to facilitate the management of conflict and to mitigate the consequences of destructive conflicts. This has been an essential condition for resilient agriculture development and sustainable natural resource management, as well as for supporting vulnerable populations to cope with dignity in times of crises. However, whilst the historical archives are replete with examples of FAO's work on conflict drivers, in conflict contexts and on delivering development assistance through conflicts, the challenge for the Organization is to move from often idiosyncratic initiatives to a more systemic approach to promoting sustainable peace. This must be achieved within the context of FAO's Strategic Framework, including through Country Programming Frameworks (CPFs) and Resilience Strategies, in support of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Given the ambition of the Agenda 2030 and the striking global challenges it seeks to address, there is a renewed commitment at FAO to deepen its contributions to sustainable peace in its mandated

areas of expertise, competence and comparative advantage. In May 2016, the FAO Director-General convened the FAO-Nobel Peace Laureates Alliance with the explicit aim of tackling the twin problems of hunger and violence. In this spirit, FAO leadership has directed the Organization to focus more effectively on contributing to sustainable peace *in order to* raise levels of nutrition, to enhance efficiency in food and agriculture production and distribution, to improve the lives of rural populations, to fight poverty, and to free the world from the scourge of hunger. The aim of these efforts is to ensure that FAO, in its areas of competence and comparative advantage, realizes a more deliberate and transformative impact through: *at a minimum*, supporting the food security, food production and sustainable use of natural resources of conflict-affected populations; *where development is possible, notwithstanding conflict contexts*, advancing progress on the SDGs through conflict-sensitive approaches; and, *where food systems, natural resources or food insecurity are drivers of conflict*, working directly to reduce conflict risks.

This direction arises, in part, from the history of FAO's experience in conflict prevention, management, mitigation and recovery. This provides the foundation for enhancing the enabling environment within FAO to further the Organization's contributions to sustainable peace, including the development of policy and related operational guidance. Efforts to date have been important; the clarion call now is for the Organization to achieve an even more deliberate and transformative impact on sustainable peace.

Over time, FAO has worked "on" agriculture and natural resource-based conflict risks and drivers. It has done so by capitalizing on the depth and breadth of its technical competencies, its partnerships and its convening powers to prevent, mitigate and resolve conflict(s) where food, agriculture or natural resources are, or could be, conflict drivers. This includes efforts to resolve conflicts in order to promote agriculture, such as forging peace among livestock-dependent communities to facilitate animal health services or building capacities for conflict reduction among forest-dependent communities so as to promote sustainable natural resource management. A common theme in the Organization's work on climate change adaptation aims to reduce future conflict drivers.

FAO has worked "in" conflicts to save lives and support livelihoods, affording cost-effective, dignified pathways for survival, protecting against the erosion of development gains, and laying foundations for economic, environmental and social recovery. FAO's roles in conflict-affected contexts has included, among other efforts, direct support for crop and livestock production, animal health, fishing, and nutrition. It has reduced sexual and gender-based violence through safe access to fuel and energy, led the coordination of food security actors, and innovated with shock-responsive social protection for nutritionally at-risk populations. The development of risk-based early warning systems has improved early action planning to address emerging food security and nutrition crises.

FAO has worked “through” conflicts to advance sustainable development in a conflict-sensitive manner, including reducing poverty, addressing inequality, promoting sustainable agricultural livelihoods and natural resource management, and contributing to economic growth in countries and regions affected, or potentially affected, by conflict. This has required the Organization to modify its approaches, including engaging in human rights due diligence and conflict-sensitive programming. FAO’s commitment to furthering development, even in times of conflict, has strengthened the Organization’s unique position as a neutral body.

FAO’s experiences illustrate a breadth of engagement across regions, in fragile³ and non-fragile situations, across technical divisions and decentralized offices, and in collaboration with a range of partners. This underscores the importance of the entire Organization (Headquarters, Decentralized Offices, all Divisions and all Strategic Objectives) recommitting itself to sustainable peace by transforming the way that FAO engages where there is a risk of destructive conflict.

The aim of this section is to provide background information on the efforts underway at FAO to engender a stronger enabling environment for the promotion of sustainable peace through food and agriculture. It also highlights the limits of FAO’s work in these areas. In addition to the overview and conclusion, it is organized in three sections and supported by three annexes. The first section considers the global context and evolving landscape including calls for system-wide approaches across the UN – all of the UN – in support of sustainable peace. This section reviews the linkages between conflict and issues at the core of FAO’s mandate: food security, nutrition and sustainable development and highlights the relationships among multiple conflict drivers and dynamics.

The paper then reviews FAO’s experiences in contributing to sustainable peace as it examines, in turn, the Organization’s work on, in and through conflict. The general discussions in this section are supported by a more detailed annex (Annex 3). In “Building for the Future,” the lessons from relevant FAO evaluations are reviewed lending themselves, in part, to the development of a new Framework on FAO’s contributions to sustainable peace in the context of Agenda 2030.

The global context and evolving landscape

Sustainable peace and the UN system

Born from the ashes of World War II, the UN Charter's goal ("*...to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war*") imbues the UN with a unique role in building and sustaining peace. The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) has been tasked since the outset as the primary UN organ for the maintenance of peace and security globally but key responsibilities also rest, both individually and collectively, with members of the General Assembly. Peace is a universal responsibility; preventing crises and sustaining peace are shared UN Charter-based responsibilities across the entire UN system. These foundations have been buttressed in recent years by a number of agreements⁴, UNSC resolutions⁵, and reports and related recommendations⁶ that address interlinkages among the three pillars: development, peace and security, and human rights. While differing in the degree to which each is binding, each stresses that the three foundational pillars of the UN system are interlinked and mutually reinforcing.

In 2015, the United Nations carried out three major reviews on peace operations, the peacebuilding architecture, and the implementation of Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security.⁷ These have prompted significant advocacy for the UNSC to shift its collective work on conflict management to one that prioritizes and actively engages in conflict prevention, based on early warning and risk analysis. The reviews stress the overarching primacy of long-term political solutions, but urged greater prioritization and investment in the UN's collective work with respect to early warning, prevention and conflict resolution. This includes stronger engagement in peace support processes with respect to gender equality and women's participation, collaborative and strategic partnerships and people-centred approaches. The overall centrality of rights also was reinforced in the United Nation Secretary-General's (UNSG) Human Rights Up Front Initiative.

In April 2016, the Security Council and General Assembly adopted substantively identical resolutions on peacebuilding concluding⁸ the 2015 review of the UN's Peacebuilding Architecture. These resolutions focused on "sustaining peace" as a unifying framework with a renewed focus on tackling the root causes of conflict. The concept "Sustaining peace" is understood to encompass activities aimed at preventing the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict. The important contributions of the UN's development system to peacebuilding were recognized in the resolutions, and the need to strengthen cooperation and coordination was stressed.

Cognizant that the Millennium Development Goals neither explicitly nor adequately addressed the causes and consequences of conflicts worldwide, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development requires more collaborative approaches to conflict prevention, mitigation, resolution and recovery. The 2030 Agenda recognizes peace as a vital threshold condition for development as well as a development outcome in its own right, and that conflict impacts negatively and can inhibit sustainable development.

One of the seventeen global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) aims to significantly reduce all forms of violence and requires engagements with governments and communities to find lasting solutions to conflict and insecurity (SDG 16). To realize the ambitions of Agenda 2030, stronger efforts are needed for multi-dimensional analysis of risks and vulnerabilities in order to underpin conflict sensitive programming, policies and activities, associated tools and increased capacity.

The 2016 World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) affirmed the need for greater attention to address the root causes of conflict and to reduce fragility through greater investment in inclusive and peaceful societies. WHS participants called for more effective engagement with communities, civil society and youth, and for the equal participation of women in processes to support sustainable peace.⁹ They pledged to renew and reinvigorate approaches to human rights-based conflict prevention (especially those that foster sustainable development), engage in preventative diplomacy and address climate change. Actors from among the humanitarian, development and peace support communities pledged to transcend the divide between humanitarian and development to achieve collective outcomes in support of Agenda 2030. This was reiterated in the April 2016 Stockholm Declaration of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding.¹⁰ In addition, the recently adopted Security Council Resolution 2250 on Youth, Peace and Security included the formal recognition of the positive role young women and men in the maintenance of international peace and security.¹¹

The UN Secretary-General has repeatedly called for a collective recommitment by all parts of the UN system to promote peace and prevent conflict, building on (and within the realm of) the differing scope and focus of each organization's mandate and work.¹² Drawing on complementary strengths, investing in partnerships and addressing fragmentation are key areas in this regard, as is closer collaboration across the UN system in order to better support peaceful, just and inclusive societies. The proposed restructuring of the UN's development pillar and the UN's peace and security pillar also prioritize conflict prevention and sustaining peace, repositioning these pillars to deliver on the 2030 Agenda. This cross-pillar approach to sustaining peace requires UN entities to adapt accordingly, within their respective mandates. The UN Secretary-General has encouraged all UN entities, "...to view sustaining peace as an important goal to which their work can contribute and to integrate the approach to sustaining peace into their global and country-specific strategic plans".¹³

Conflict risks, food security, nutrition and sustainable development

FAO's position in the UN system compels the Organization to meet many of the challenges of Agenda 2030, including enhancing its contributions to sustainable peace. Even more pressing than this institutional imperative are the important consequences that the threats to sustainable peace pose to food security, nutrition, agriculture and natural resources.

Destructive conflicts, including those that range, for example, from outright war to food security-related protests to localized tensions over access to natural resources and competition for land use, have strong and unambiguously adverse effects on hunger, nutrition and overall sustainable development. The manner in which such conflicts are pursued generate uncertainty and instability by reducing food availability, disrupting access to foodstuffs, food preparation facilities and healthcare resources, and undermining non-formal as well as established social protection systems.¹⁴ Most armed conflicts strike hardest in rural areas¹⁵ with sharply negative consequences for agricultural production and rural livelihoods. Violent conflict is a major driver of food insecurity and chronic and acute malnutrition globally.

Destabilizing conflicts block vulnerable people and at risk communities from the range of resources necessary for food and agriculture production. This is neither accidental nor incidental. Forcible or corrupt seizure of natural resources, destruction of foodstuffs, blocking humanitarian assistance, and displacement from land, homes, fishing grounds and livestock grazing areas as well as other resources essential for livelihoods are deliberate tactics of war. This is in violation of international humanitarian law and human rights laws that specifically prohibit the targeting of food production systems, including irrigation infrastructure, standing and stored crops, livestock and other sources of livelihood and food security and other livelihood resources.

The scale of the problem is vast. As of 2016, nearly one-half of the world's population, some 3.34 billion people, lived in proximity to or were affected by the impact of political violence.¹⁶ Of particular concern are the poor who live in contexts described as "fragile", i.e. where state policies and institutions are weak, rendering countries incapable or unwilling to deliver services to their citizens, cope with internal and external shocks and crises, control corruption, and/or provide for sufficient voice and accountability. Over ninety percent of people in extreme poverty are living in are living in fragile contexts, or are exposed to risks of extreme climate events, or both.¹⁷ When conflicts become protracted, the proportion of people who are undernourished is almost three times higher than proportion of population in other developing countries. Significantly, contexts considered extremely fragile or fragile are also those that rely mostly on agriculture as a means of income, when measured in terms of agricultural added value as a percentage of GDP.¹⁸ This further highlights the importance of FAO's role in sustaining peace in such contexts.

The consequences of destructive conflict, including the extreme measures necessary for survival, manifest specifically and often differently according to age, gender and degree of social inclusion. The relative relations of power and marginalization in society tend to be amplified because of the stressors of conflict contexts. Conflict-related processes of exploitation and exclusion often deepen pre-crisis inequalities and increase poverty among vulnerable groups such as highly mobile populations like pastoralists and poor landholders in inadequate land tenure regimes. Prevailing gender inequalities and related limitations on women's access to productive resources, services and decision-making translate into heightened vulnerability in every aspect of women's burdens in production, caregiving and household management. For men and boys especially, recruitment into fighting forces diverts labour from agriculture production. These problems can persist due to war-related disabilities, as well as other factors such as the loss of traditional skills and other forms of knowledge.

Conflict directly and indirectly affects agricultural development in the immediate, medium and longer terms. Conflict-related inflation, exchange rate instability and stagnated growth impact almost every aspect of food and agriculture value chains, including finance, transport, inputs and processing. Although there is wide variance, conflicts are statistically associated with a reduction in GDP growth of two percentage points per year on average. Agricultural losses for all developing countries due to conflict between 1970 and 1997 averaged USD 4.3 billion annually, far exceeding the value of development assistance to those countries.¹⁹ Similarly, the presence or risk of conflict discourages private investment in agriculture, even long after conflicts subside.

There are, however, no current, comprehensive, global estimates of the impacts of conflict on agriculture and natural resources – not only in terms of damage and losses and related impact on sectoral GDP, but also in terms of impacts on institutions, natural resource environments and human capital. Studies of country – and sub-national level effects tend to demonstrate significant impacts, not only for the duration of the conflict but also find persistent lagged effects in the years following the end of conflicts.

For example, in Iraq a 2014 World Bank report estimates that regional conflict, through a combination of direct effects of war and indirect effects of the disintegration of trade, had led to a 4.1 percent decrease in agriculture and a 10.2 percent decrease in processed food output.²⁰ When compared to pre-conflict averages, the ongoing civil war in the Syrian Arab Republic has led to a halving in livestock and a reduction in wheat production by 40 percent²¹ – losses that are expected to deteriorate further as the conflict persists.

During Angola's long civil conflict, agriculture production as a share of GNP fell from 29 percent in 1991 to 6 percent in 2000.²² More recently, in South Sudan, the livestock sector, a key livelihood source, lost an estimated USD 2 billion in potential GDP during conflict years of 2013-15.²³

Similarly, between 1991 and 2001 in Sierra Leone, 70 percent of livestock were destroyed and both oil palm and rice production decreased by over a quarter. Production declines of some crops continued in the years immediately following the end of the war, including coffee, whilst others took years to recover to pre-war levels, including cocoa and sugar cane.²⁴

The longer-term effects are also expressed through individual consumption levels, as well as reduced investment potential. Six years after the 1994 conflict in Rwanda, households and communities that experienced more intense conflict experienced 36 percent lower consumption scores than other areas. In neighbouring Burundi, exposure to individual-level violence decreases the probability of growing coffee four years after the end of the war by some 16 to 18 percent.²⁵

The implications of conflict-induced food insecurity no longer are limited to specific countries or regions but have global impacts. The proximate effects of today's conflicts are increasingly echoed across the broader global landscape as conflict-affected people migrate across and within countries, regions and continents in a bid to manage the risks and consequences of conflict. In 2015, over 65 million people worldwide were forcibly displaced, the majority left in situations of protracted displacement.

Food insecurity, conflict and underlying causes

The root causes of conflict are complex, nonlinear, and mediated by a host of factors and actors. Over one-third of countries classified in 2015 as fragile had experienced recent conflicts, reflecting dynamic interrelationships among poverty (including hunger), governance and conflict.²⁶ After declining in the late 1990s and early 2000s, the prevalence of conflicts globally – particularly civil conflicts – increased after 2008. Conflicts have destabilized entire regions, brought untold misery to families and communities, exponentially increased the number of people forcibly displaced and depleted global humanitarian resources.²⁷

The drivers of conflicts range from ethnic tensions, religious differences, discrimination, poor governance, limited state capacity, population pressure and rapid urbanization to other factors such as poverty and youth unemployment. Some conflict drivers – but certainly not all – specifically relate to FAO's mandate and competencies. These include those that have been driven by, *inter alia*, competition for land, water and other natural resources, the multiple dimensions of food insecurity, the neglect by governments of marginalized areas (such as arid and semi-arid landscapes essential for livestock-dependent populations, poor rural areas, or subsistence fishing grounds), or environmental mismanagement. Notwithstanding, many communities dealing with risks of conflict place inordinate importance on food, agriculture and natural resources, fully cognizant that these are as vital for survival as they are potential conflict stressors.

Efforts designed to support food security and agriculture can have unintended negative impacts, including raising risks of conflict. This can arise from, for example, poorly designed agricultural development policies, “captured” programmes or misguided private sector investments (including those pursued over the course of post-conflict recovery). Historically, this has sparked or exacerbated conflict where tenure rights are insecure or when measures prompt clashes over resource use or employment opportunities. Failure to ensure conflict sensitive approaches can increase competition and misuse of scarce natural resources, exacerbate exploitation of marginalized populations and amplify unequal power relations between different groups, including between men and women or among ethnic groupings.

People may resort to violence when their human security – including food security – is threatened, especially when there is a dearth of formal and informal institutions that are capable and willing to allay such risks. Food insecurity may be one of a number of causes for conflict, and may act as a channel through which wider socio-economic and political grievances are expressed, including those relating to poverty, unemployment, low incomes, unpaid salaries, marginalization, governance and access to basic services²⁸. In 2008, for example, high global food prices contributed to civil unrest in more than 40 countries. In some contexts, the relationship between food insecurity and other conflict drivers can give rise to an alarming interplay between food insecurity and domestic security concerns including, in extreme cases, where linkages may exist between social and political marginalization and radicalization of various forms.

There is also an ‘age’ angle to this. Over the past decade, the involvement of some young people – particularly young men, but also increasingly young women – in violence and extremist groups has led some to paint youth generally as a threat to global security and stability. But research shows that youth who participate actively in violence are a minority, while the majority of youth – despite the injustices, deprivations and abuse they can confront daily, particularly in conflict contexts – are not violent and do not participate in violence. Moreover, a growing body of evidence suggests that young women and men can and do play active roles as agents of positive and constructive change.²⁹

Conflicts can also aggravate other shocks, and vice versa. Just as even localized conflicts can have global ramifications, so too can global processes adversely influence conflict risks. In addition, natural disasters may contribute to aggravating civil conflicts by increasing the scarcity of available resources, or by deepening inequalities among groups.³⁰ Climate change-related extreme weather events are expected to exacerbate a deepening global need for humanitarian assistance by contributing to conflict risks and by increasing pressure on populations to move. Whilst climate change *per se* is not necessarily associated with violence, the intersection between vulnerability to climate change and broader institutional and socio-economic fragility can increase the potential for conflict.³¹ This has been referred to as the “climate-conflict nexus”

and is characterized by the intersection between two key factors: weak institutions and pre-existing social fragility.^{ex} Where governments are not equipped to manage the impacts of climate change, conflict risks can increase. For example, given that agriculture accounts for some 70 percent of global water use, access to water is expected to become both increasingly valued and contested and hence a conflict risk in environments characterized both by weak institutions and exposure to climate change.

Of concern, responses to climate change and disasters arising from (principally) natural hazards insufficiently integrate conflict sensitive approaches, and conversely, formal peacebuilding and conflict prevention processes do not adequately take climate change and disaster risks into account. In part, this is because risk and vulnerability analyses mostly address natural hazard-induced risks, vulnerabilities and crises. In addition, there can be political impediments (and potentially political consequences) to rigorous conflict analysis, especially the analysis of power dynamics. As a result, the underlying causes of fragility, instability and conflict are infrequently identified in a timely fashion, and are poorly analysed or addressed.

In addition to increasing challenges resulting from climate change, there are a growing number of interrelated longer-term issues which can impact, or be impacted by, the prevalence of conflict, such as urbanization and rural transformation, with related implications for resource availability, agricultural productivity, and food security and nutrition overall. Where institutions – both rural and urban – are not equipped to manage fluctuating populations together with resource allocation and provision of services, the potential for conflict can increase.

FAO and sustainable peace

FAO is redoubling its commitment to strengthening the linkages between the freedom from want and lasting peace

The universality and breadth of the 2030 Agenda have implications for FAO's work in conflict-affected settings and contexts that have varying degree of conflict risks that go beyond SDG 16 on peaceful and inclusive societies. Sustainable Development Goals 1 and 2 focus on the eradication of poverty and hunger, achieving food security, and making agriculture sustainable. The 2030 Agenda sees achievement of these goals as critical elements in attaining the further goal of ensuring peaceful and inclusive societies where no one is left behind. Reflecting on these relationships, the FAO Director-General told the UNSC in March 2016, "There can be no sustainable development without peace and no peace without sustainable development."

In support of these goals, FAO draws upon an extensive track record of working for sustainable peace. Through its mandate and by leveraging its key core competencies, FAO has supported interventions to reduce economic, social, political and environmental *ex ante* and *ex post* drivers of conflict. The Organization has a long and well-established history of working to reduce poverty and inequality, to eradicate hunger, to improve agriculture and to promote the sustainable use of natural resources. Agriculture and food systems contribute to creating jobs, to providing a sustainable income, to enabling youth employment, and to fostering more equitable territorial development, thus helping to reduce rapid urbanization, resource depletion and forced migration.

Both in times of conflict and stability, FAO plays a unique role in protecting, restoring and developing the livelihoods of affected farmers, fishers, herders, foresters and others who depend upon agriculture and the natural resource environment for sustenance, security and prosperity. The Organization's efforts to save lives and create longer-term resilience are important contributions to peace and stability within countries, across regions and beyond. This is as FAO's founders intended.

FAO was created in the wake of the Second World War and was given, among other mandates, a role in achieving and sustaining peace. At the first Session of the Conference of FAO, it was stated that "...the Food and Agriculture Organization is born out of the need for peace as well as the need for freedom from want. The two are interdependent. Progress towards freedom from want is essential to lasting peace"³³.

Furthermore, FAO's founders set out an ambition that FAO would "...make the maximum contribution possible to healthier and more abundant life, and to a peace built on day-by-day, practical cooperation among the peoples of the world"³⁴. The timing was described as a propitious moment for starting such a venture, given World War II had ended fewer than six months previously. One delegate said, 'The armed forces have ceased to fight; but now a new army is appearing, an army of technicians, agriculturists, scientists, labourers, which is commencing a fight against disorganization, a fight against poverty, a fight against famine, uncertainty, and evil.' There could be no delay in going about the task of building a peaceful, orderly, and prosperous world.³⁵

FAO's work over the subsequent seventy years has contributed to achieving these goals by focusing on the eradication of poverty and the achievement of food security and nutrition for all, including in contexts characterized by conflict risks. Over time and in different contexts, FAO has leveraged its unique depth of competencies, experiences and relationships both to contribute to larger processes of sustainable peace, as well as to address specific conflict drivers. In 2015, twenty-five percent of countries and territories, that FAO supported under its Strategic Programme to increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises (SP5) were experiencing active conflict.³⁶ In 2016, FAO's ongoing field programme delivery in the OECD's fifteen most fragile countries in the world was valued at USD 212 million, including USD 48 million in Technical Cooperation.

Through these investments, FAO has developed considerable expertise in working in conflict-affected situations and, importantly, in contexts where risk of conflict has been mitigated by FAO's work in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, natural resources and food security. Whilst these efforts rarely have focused explicitly on building sustainable peace, this work provides a foundation for enhanced engagements by FAO and its partners in this area, particularly within the context of Agenda 2030. The Organization intends to build on these experiences through further analysis to identify best practices, recognizing that all its multiple forms of assistance – development, investment, humanitarian – have the potential to contribute to sustainable peace.

The range of FAO's efforts are best described as working 'on' conflicts, 'in' conflicts, and 'through' conflicts³⁷:

- **Working on conflicts (conflict drivers):** identifying ways to minimize, avoid, positively transform and resolve conflict(s) where food, agriculture or natural resources are (or hold the potential to serve as) conflict drivers, including reducing the potential for a relapse into conflict in the context of strategic post-conflict reconstruction and recovery
- **Working in conflicts (conflict impacts):** developing and implementing interventions to offset the impacts of conflicts on food security, nutrition, agriculture and natural resources, by saving lives and supporting livelihoods directly impacted by conflict(s)
- **Working through conflicts (conflict-sensitive development):** continuing to advance development in countries and regions affected, or potentially affected, by conflict(s) in a conflict-sensitive manner.

On conflict

FAO has used its technical competencies to directly promote sustainable peace, including reducing and/or addressing conflicts before they escalate. In addition, where there are opportunities within FAO's mandated areas, the Organization strives to reduce the risk of relapse into conflict in post-crisis contexts by engaging with the parties to the conflict, including men, women, youth and older persons; by assisting stakeholders in addressing the root causes of conflict and conflict drivers; by interventions that reduce fragility and underpin stability; through risk-based early warning systems leading to early action; and by offering technical insights into conflict dynamics in order to identify possible entry points and solutions.

For example, in 2011, the world was officially declared free of Rinderpest, a deadly livestock disease. Eradicating Rinderpest contributed to improvements in food security for livestock-owning communities, but the campaign also contributed to peace and security in wider populations. Eliminating Rinderpest would not have been possible without a conflict-sensitive approach to animal health, as the last vestiges of the disease were found in communities where conflicts had been triggered by disputes over livestock. FAO and a range of partners trained community-based animal health workers (both men and women) and negotiated peace pacts between rival pastoral groups as a pre-condition for Rinderpest vaccinations. This demonstrates FAO's convening role as a respected neutral, specialized technical agency. The practice of veterinarians and community-based animal health workers employing their technical expertise to contribute to sustainable peace continues today.

Such contributions to sustainable peace are not limited to animal health. FAO is the UN's foremost technical institution in helping to prevent conflict over access to natural resources (land, water, fisheries) using a combination of capacity development, partnerships, policy support, globally accepted voluntary guidelines, and strategic deployment of technical staff. FAO relies on its competencies to promote conflict-sensitive approaches (coupled with technical support to increase use efficiencies) and to manage limited resources in an inclusive and transparent manner, in order to contribute to peaceful cohabitation between and within population groups. FAO works with communities, policy makers and practitioners to enhance diagnostic skills for pro-active assessment, monitoring and de-escalation of tenure related conflicts. FAO has also supported community land delimitation³⁸, capacity building and dissemination of knowledge, including Participatory Negotiated Territorial Development (PNTD) approaches to reduce land-based disagreements that focus on identifying the underlying causes of issues surrounding natural resource access. These initiatives illustrate how FAO's guidance, technical expertise and globally developed tools facilitate conflict prevention and resolution and help to create more stable and equitable societies.

In partnership with UN peace support actors, FAO has worked in a number of countries on the demilitarization of combatants, many of whom were young men and women from rural areas, as part of Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration (DDR) programmes. FAO has assisted these former combatants to attain sustainable and productive economic livelihoods in, for example, the agriculture, fisheries, and livestock sectors. Enhancing skills and providing capital for agricultural livelihoods is as important for food security and income as it is for providing a pathway for social cohesion in the communities where ex-combatants reside.

Conflict risks can be heightened or reduced, depending upon the design of programmes, such as those supporting value chains. FAO has effectively utilized conflict sensitive approaches and programming to target interventions addressing conflict resolution, while also providing livelihood support. As a best practice, some decentralized FAO offices initially undertake countrywide conflict analysis, using this information to inform the design and implementation of initiatives. This is important for ensuring that the impact of projects does not inappropriately influence power asymmetries, ownership rights or other factors that could inadvertently strengthen conflict drivers. Such programmes may include problem prediction and solving forums, or building the capacity of groups interested in governance and conflict resolution. For example, FAO supported community listeners' groups of women, men and young people – called Dimitra Clubs – help local populations participate in the development and strengthening of the resilience of their communities and themselves. The clubs have become agents of change in agriculture but also in other aspects of society, taking on sensitive issues such as HIV/AIDS, early marriage and the rights of women to inherit land.

In the context of both global and more localized migration crises, FAO works with Member States, partners and affected communities to address underlying causes of forced migration, especially through the promotion of sustainable agricultural livelihoods. In this regard, FAO focuses on:

- addressing the factors that compel people to move (especially those linked to natural disasters, conflicts over natural resources and environmental and livelihood deterioration in rural areas);
- strengthening the resilience of refugees, displaced people and migrants as well as host communities;
- harnessing the positive contribution of migrants, refugees and displaced people and fostering their integration.

In conflict

FAO works in conflicts to save lives, enable people to remain in their communities, support internally displaced and refugee populations, address malnutrition, guard against environmental destruction, prevent sexual and gender-based violence, restore food production and protect agriculture systems. With a particular focus on dignity, comparative cost-effectiveness and the coordination of multi-actor response strategies, FAO deploys its competencies in conflict contexts to address the multiple threats to food security and nutrition and to support the range of livelihood strategies that at risk populations rely on to manage risk and vulnerability. Given a focus on strategies with both a rapid and lasting impact on food security, FAO's work in conflict-affected situations also supports effective transitions between humanitarian action and development processes.

FAO's engagements in conflict contexts include the provision of data and analysis on risks and vulnerabilities to inform decision-making and programming and support to early warning systems to underpin early action. This is an area of exceptionally strong comparative advantage for FAO and cuts across the range of the Organization's technical expertise including, *inter alia*, seed security assessments, pastoralist early warning systems, market and food price monitoring, the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC), the Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis Model (RIMA), and analysis of the impacts of conflict on the agriculture sector. FAO's early warning systems are important for signalling changes in conflict risks and hence opportunities for early action, including conflict mitigation. This includes where FAO's analysis of vulnerability related to climate change, and solutions to address it, have been integrated with an analysis of conflict risk in order to deliver on multiple objectives.

At the global level, the Food Chain Crisis Early Warning Bulletins provides timely alerts regarding the relationships between threats to food chains (animal, zoonotic, aquatic and plant diseases, locusts and forest pests and diseases) and conflict patterns. FAO's Early Warning – Early Action quarterly bulletins monitor a broad range of hazards, including conflicts. Given complex interplay among different shocks and their relationship to conflict risks, FAO's knowledge functions remain vital for the appropriate design of early warning systems at global, regional, national and sub-national levels, the identification of meaningful indicators and the interpretation of data.

Member states, recognizing FAO's comparative advantage as a neutral convener, frequently turn to FAO for support in the coordination of multi-actor emergency responses, included in countries affected by conflict. With WFP, FAO co-leads the global Food Security Cluster (gFSC) to ensure coordination on food security and agriculture interventions, needs assessments, resource mobilization and to identify cross-sectoral complementarities with a wide range of stakeholders including governments, UN agencies, regional institutions, civil society organizations, and many others.

As a Cluster co-lead, FAO abides by its global responsibility to serve as a “provider of last resort.” FAO responds to identified and often gendered patterns of risk and vulnerability in conflict zones to restore agricultural livelihoods and food production through emergency support to vulnerable and at risk groups, including household production, sale and consumption of food. Such support has been directed, variously, toward the production of crops, livestock, fish and non-wood forest products, as well as measures to strengthen biosecurity. With FAO’s technically sound, appropriately adapted support, food production levels have been maintained – and even increased – in several conflict contexts. In addition to saving livelihoods, such interventions increase local food availability, access and variety, with broader implications for nutritionally vulnerable communities. Such interventions have also proven remarkably cost-effective, for example, when compared to emergency food aid rations.

Through conflict

A considerable thrust of FAO’s work is development-related technical work. Although there are rarely neat delineations between humanitarian action and development work in conflicts (especially in the context of protracted crises), FAO remains committed to attaining development outcomes in countries and regions affected by destructive conflicts. Indeed, 25 percent of FAO’s field programme delivery in the most world’s fifteen most fragile contexts in 2016 was development assistance. Such efforts to work through conflicts require contextual understanding and conflict analysis to ensure that interventions do not heighten conflict risks and hence avoid doing harm. Such an approach to conflict-sensitive development distinguishes “working through conflicts” from a ‘blind-eye’ approach to development.

In some conflict contexts, FAO’s integrated strategies have, among other development aims, helped to increase food production, maintain development commitments by resource partners, improve agriculture infrastructure, preserve national budgetary allocations for agriculture and natural resources, reduce transboundary threats, and promote inter-regional trade. In conflict and post-conflict contexts, FAO has promoted responsible investment in agriculture and food systems to foster smallholder inclusion in value chains and bring employment and income generation to rural areas. FAO’s work on social protection systems that are long-term, predictable, risk-informed and shock-responsive are critical to reduce poverty, and accelerate progress in the fight against hunger and food insecurity, while strengthening resilience to threats and crises and enabling development. These examples demonstrate how Organization’s rich expertise in agricultural production, seed security, land management, climate change adaptation and rural development can accelerate results for poverty reduction and resilience in conflict risk contexts.

In order to advance development objectives by working through conflicts, it is important to mainstream conflict sensitive, rights-based and gendered approaches into each function of the programme cycle, including designing CPFs and related Resilience Strategies to withstand conflict (and other) shocks. Equally important are investments in strong systems to generate information and analysis and maintaining the confidence of a range of stakeholders, including those that may be in conflict with each other. Where FAO has been successful, it has often depended on a combination of these approaches plus astute technicians, strong leadership and committed partnerships.

FAO Programme Frameworks (CPF and PF) with reference to conflict risks and/or conflict-affected communities – select examples

Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Chad, **Colombia**, Egypt, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Côte d'Ivoire, **Kenya**, Kyrgyz Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, **Nepal**, **Nigeria**, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Sudan, Sri Lanka, St. Lucia, Tanzania, Yemen, West Bank and Gaza Strip.

Extracts from countries bolded in the above list help illustrate how Outputs under CPFs have been explicitly framed in the context of conflict risks:

- The state and civil society have strengthened their capacities to confront, reduce, and address situations of environmental, social and associated risks of conflict which affect agricultural livelihoods, and generate resilience in communities affected by extreme vulnerability.
- Institutional capacity for improved management and governance of land, fisheries, forests and other natural resources at national, county and community level strengthened including support for community-based natural resource management and resource conflict resolution mechanisms.
- Land record and management practices improved for sustainable production in a conflict-free environment.
- An improved and integrated conflict EW/EA system covering the three tiers of the Federation that produces timely and actionable gender disaggregated, equity-sensitive conflict analysis, strategic directions including do no harm alternatives, and guidance for decision makers, agencies, CSOs and communities.

Examples drawn from a partial search of the most current CPF/PF uploaded to of <https://workspace.fao.org/osp/cpf> as of December 2016.

Building for the future

Lessons from evaluations

Various evaluations of FAO's performance present valuable learning and indicate how FAO can improve the effectiveness of its engagement in, on, and through conflicts.³⁹ The evaluations, though covering a variety of contexts and subject areas, have highlighted similar areas for improvement, including the need for:

- More robust and sustained context and conflict analysis to tailor interventions and approaches along with the ability to respond flexibly to rapidly changing circumstances.
- Strong political economy and conflict analysis (in partnership with others) to underpin programming, and to test assumptions on which programme choices and decisions are made.
- Better understanding of the relationship of food security and agriculture to conflict management and resolution.

Some evaluations highlight the need to explore a variety of ways to best support vulnerable households as they respond to the specific contexts of destabilizing conflicts. These may include cash and voucher systems, the use of strategic stocks in recurrent conflict situations, and other mechanisms that can be deployed quickly. In addition, the evaluations have called for FAO to advocate for and build upon its key areas of comparative advantage as a technical agency, and to expand competence in areas pertaining to the monitoring and analysis of food and agriculture-related conflict dynamics.

Many evaluations have highlighted the proactive approach that FAO has taken to adjust current practice in order to target interventions in a conflict-sensitive way, particularly the success that FAO has achieved in calculating risks and adapting advocacy and interventions to both maximize effectiveness and maintain the ability to continue operations even in politically tense environments. At the same time, many of the evaluations have also highlighted the need for a paradigm shift in the way FAO deals with conflict situations, by taking into consideration in all circumstances the impact of its interventions on conflict and peace. Specifically, some of the evaluations have raised concerns regarding the need for FAO to be more engaged in understanding the elements of its own work that contribute to peace or conflict, and the fact that many conflicts have been influenced by the result of development interventions' failure. The evaluations are constructive resources on which to strengthen FAO's contributions to sustainable peace.

A new Framework on FAO's contributions to sustainable peace in the context of Agenda 2030

FAO's Strategic Framework 2010-2019 is comprised of five core Strategic Objectives:

1. eliminating hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition;
2. making agriculture, forestry and fisheries more productive and sustainable;
3. reducing rural poverty;
4. enabling inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems;
5. increasing the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises.

All of FAO's strategic objectives are relevant for promoting sustainable peace. In addition, there are several policies that address important aspects of the Organization's contribution to sustainable peace, both implicitly and explicitly (see side bar).

These policies are designed, wholly or in part, to improve the governance environment to prevent destructive conflicts and, failing that, to mitigate the consequences and implications of the conflict. Each shares key areas of commonality that are supportive to sustainable peace through specific and timely collection of data, monitoring frameworks to guide and adapt interventions and domestic policies, and people-centred approaches. None, however, fully reflects the depth and breadth of FAO's contributions to sustainable peace by working on, in and through conflict.

On 26 March 2016, the FAO Director-General addressed the UN Security Council.⁴⁰ Noting, "Where food security can be a force for stability, we have to look to food and agriculture as pathways to peace and security," the Director-General announced that FAO would develop a Framework to enhance the Organization's contributions to sustainable peace within the context of Agenda 2030, a commitment he reinforced at the World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016.

Work on a draft Framework ("FAO's Contributions to Sustainable Peace in the Context of Agenda 2030") commenced immediately after these commitments were made. Recognizing that lasting peace comes through political solutions and that supporting sustainable peace is an inherently political process⁴¹, the new Framework is intended to ensure that all FAO interventions that can help minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts toward sustainable peace within the scope of FAO's mandate. Given the multifaceted relationships among food, agriculture and sustainable peace, the Framework relates to FAO's work at all levels and in all contexts, i.e., it will not be limited to those embroiled in violent conflict, conflict-affected countries, countries undergoing crisis or contexts characterized by dynamic zones of fragility within countries and across borders.

The Framework, and supporting operational guidelines, will guide FAO's

Relevant areas of FAO's work

Select examples from Work Planning 2016–2017: Output indicators for Delivery Managers

Output 1.1.2 Improving capacities of governments and stakeholders to develop and implement legal frameworks and accountability mechanisms to realize *the right to adequate food and to promote secure and equitable access to resources and assets*

Output 2.2.1 Countries are supported to *analyse governance issues and options* for sustainable agricultural production and natural resources management

Output 2.2.2 Countries are supported to strengthen *national governance frameworks that foster sustainable agricultural production and natural resources management*

Output 2.3.2 Stakeholders are supported to enhance *recognition and consideration of the agriculture sectors in the international instruments, governance mechanisms, processes, and partnerships* that are relevant to FAO's mandate yet not under the auspices of FAO

Output 2.4.3 Capacity development support is provided to institutions at national and regional levels to plan for and conduct *data collection, analyses, application and dissemination*

Output 3.1.1 Support to *strengthen rural organizations and institutions and facilitate empowerment of rural poor*

Output 3.1.5 Cross-sectoral policy advice and capacity development for the definition of *gender equitable and sustainable rural development and poverty reduction strategies*

Output 3.2.1 Evidence-based policy support and capacity development in the formulation and implementation of policies, strategies and programmes that *generate decent rural employment with particular focus on fostering youth and rural women's economic and social empowerment*

Output 3.3.1 Policy advice, capacity development and advocacy are provided for *improving social protection systems to foster sustainable and equitable rural development, poverty reduction, and food security and nutrition*

Output 3.3.2 Information systems and evidence-based knowledge instruments are improved to *assess the impact of social protection mechanisms on reducing inequalities, improving rural livelihoods and strengthening ability of the rural poor to manage risks*

Output 4.3.2 Public and private investment institutions are supported to increase *responsible investments in efficient and inclusive agrifood systems*

Output 4.3.3 Systems are established and countries are supported to *monitor, analyse and manage the impacts of trade, food, and agriculture policies* on food systems

Output 5.1.1 Improving capacities to *formulate and promote risk reduction and crisis management policies, strategies and plans*

Output 5.1.2 Enhancing *coordination and improved investment programming and resource mobilization strategies for risk reduction and crises management*

Output 5.2.1 Mechanisms are set up/improved to *identify and monitor threats and assess risks and to deliver integrated and timely warning Early Warning*

Output 5.2.2 Improving capacities to *assess vulnerability and resilience determinants of community/livelihood groups*

Output 5.3.1 Improving capacities of countries, communities and key stakeholders to *implement prevention and mitigation good practices to reduce the impacts of threats and crises*

Output 5.3.2 Improving capacities of countries and key stakeholders to *reduce vulnerability and strengthen resilience of communities at risk of threats and crises*

Output 5.4.1 Improving capacities of national authorities and stakeholders for *emergency preparedness to reduce the impact of crisis*

Output 5.4.2 Strengthening *coordination capacities for better preparedness and response to crises*

Output 5.4.3 Strengthening *capacities of national authorities and stakeholders in crisis response*

engagement with governments as well as a wide range of peace support, humanitarian and development actors in the Organization's work on, in and through contexts at risk of conflict. As currently conceived, the Framework will result in five deliverables:

1. The integration of concepts, indicators, and lesson learning (reflecting the central importance of gender and age) on contributing to sustainable peace across all five Strategic Objectives of FAO and across HQ, regional, and country offices.
2. A robust flexibly financed global portfolio of engagements to support sustainable peace with measurable results.
3. Improved evidence base and strengthened monitoring systems that focus on the linkages between food security, nutrition, and peace and on the effectiveness of various approaches.
4. New coalitions, partnerships and leadership roles at country level and globally on supporting sustainable peace.
5. Demonstrated effective capacity and commitment to sustainable peace of all staff to work on, in, and through conflicts in ways that improves food security and nutrition and fosters agricultural development and post-conflict recovery and reconstruction.

To achieve these results, the Framework will address a range of FAO core functions and resources for enhanced contributions to sustainable peace. This includes the Organization's convening and advocacy roles, programmatic innovation, monitoring and evaluation, partnerships, and knowledge, analysis and assessment.

FAO's convening and advocacy roles

By leveraging its position as a respected neutral, specialised technical agency, FAO has often played a convening role that has brought parties in conflict, or at risk of conflict, together to address specific issues and to find consensus. This has ranged from meetings between and among men, women, youth and the elderly "in the field" to global processes to set guidelines, codes of conduct and principles for responsible management of the world's natural and financial resources for food and agriculture. FAO's history of working with governments, other international organizations, regional bodies, local and international NGOs, local and national partners, as well as directly with communities, positions it uniquely to play a convening role in broader discussions about the nature of engagements on, in, and through conflicts that are driven by – or have an impact on – food and agriculture systems.

It is intended that the Framework will inform how FAO will employ these convening powers to engage member states, partners (including resource partners) and other stakeholders to explore modalities and agree measures on how to more effectively leverage its competencies to advance sustainable peace by working on, in, and through conflicts. By strengthening this aspect of FAO's convening role, the Organization

should then be able to play a greater role in conflict prevention, resolution and recovery in areas pertaining to its competencies and mandate. Through building on its leadership, advocacy and guidance role on food security related issues, and the links among food, agriculture and sustainable peace, FAO can reach a wider audience to lever strengthened scope, scale and impact in achieving sustainable peace. Through these opportunities, FAO can better highlight the importance of agriculture, food security and nutrition, and sustainable development to raise further awareness on these multidisciplinary issues in the context of conflict prevention and sustainable peace. Among other efforts, FAO will need to galvanize the requisite political, institutional and financial resources necessary to combat hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition in a manner proportionate to the risks each conflict poses.

Programmatic innovations

FAO's breadth of technical expertise includes significant research, innovation and evidence gathering across an impressive spectrum that spans the multiple dimensions of food security and nutrition, including their gendered dynamics; sustainable management and utilization of natural resources (including land, water, air, climate and genetic resources); agriculture and food systems; gender sensitive and gender supportive programming; animal health; food safety; livelihoods; crop and livestock production; land tenure; value chains; investment; social protection; rural and youth employment; and poverty reduction, among many others. This technical expertise has been integral in identifying solutions across the conflict spectrum. However, the Organization recognizes that further innovation is required in order to achieve the transformational change needed to build peace in the interest of attaining food security and nutrition for all.

It is anticipated that the Framework will allow for greater emphasis by the Organization on better understanding the (food and agriculture-related) root causes of instability, fragility and insecurity to inform conflict-sensitive approaches and to avoid undermining policies and actions that are intent upon securing lasting peace. This includes systematically undertaking conflict risk analysis, regardless of context or undertaking with all stakeholders concerned. Such assessments can guard against the risk of any FAO initiative inadvertently contributing to the risk of conflict. In order to avail the resources necessary for this, FAO would need to further develop methodologies for social impact assessment and incorporate these into the corporate project cycle at key junctures (e.g. during formulation, monitoring and evaluation). In addition, investments would be required in capacity development of its staff and counterparts on how food, agriculture and natural resource management interventions can prevent and mitigate conflict risks, and promote conflict-sensitive recovery that contributes to sustainable peace.

Through guidance, capacity development and technical review, FAO

can increase the inclusion of specific objectives to prevent, mitigate, alleviate and resolve conflicts in CPFs, as well as in Resilience Strategies⁴², programmes and projects in conflict-affected or at risk countries as well as contexts within countries and across borders that are characterized by dynamic states of fragility. In turn, it would be important that decentralized offices be both capacitated and mandated to conduct periodic conflict risk analysis of the current portfolio of engagements reflected in each CPF.

The Framework should help the Organization to draw on its existing knowledge base, current practice and experience to work with its counterparts and partners to generate an enabling environment to develop creative and proactive approaches to prevent conflict, reduce conflict risks, protect food security and nutrition in conflicts, and promote post-conflict recovery. As part of these initiatives, it is foreseen that FAO will enhance efforts to stimulate demand for socially responsible agricultural commodities, value chains and natural resource management, in order to generate sustainable returns to producers, industry and member states.

Such efforts require resources. FAO may need to develop more flexible funding mechanisms, for example through FAO's existing Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities (SFERA), or similar mechanisms, so that it will be better positioned to respond quickly to changing situations and address context specific needs through its CPFs. FAO can enhance its decentralized capacities to engage substantively with multi-agency funding mechanisms, including the World Bank Group's nascent Platform for Peace, the UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and UN Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS) as well as country-based pooled funds, to support programmatic activities to help prevent or (re)lapse into conflict.

In this same vein, FAO should explore how the range of resources within Integrated UN Missions can more effectively complement activities to restore food security and livelihoods, by ensuring for example the protection of agricultural production and local trade routes or for protecting FAO staff, assets and partners as they work on and in conflicts.

The Framework is intended to support FAO's on-going efforts to become more predictable and consistent in its humanitarian engagements through the establishment of minimum requirements for decentralized FAO offices in terms of programming (including coordination responsibilities) for food security, nutrition, agriculture, forestry and fisheries and natural resources in conflict contexts. One aspect of this is enhanced capacity of decentralized offices through strengthened guidance. Based on FAO's specific sectoral, thematic and normative comparative advantages, it is foreseen that FAO will dedicate itself to the systematic and strategic development of capacity of counterparts, partners and decentralized offices in proven approaches to supporting the livelihoods systems of communities at risk.

Monitoring and early warning

FAO is a global leader in gathering data on agriculture, forestry and fisheries, food security and nutrition. FAO's expertise in food security analysis and resilience measurement provides the evidence base to support informed decision-making by governments and other partners. It is intended that the FAO will work to strengthen frameworks and systems for risk analysis, threat, and conflict monitoring to facilitate early warning and action by FAO offices as well as for the wider UN system, partners in the Global Food Security Cluster, and other stakeholders. Addressing a current gap, FAO would be well positioned to sharpen the linkages between surveillance of conflict risks and specific measures to address a range of food, agriculture, forestry, fisheries and natural resource based conflicts, including their different impacts on men, women, elderly, youth and children. It can incorporate potential conflict markers in the early warning systems managed or supported by the Organization and will ensure broad coverage, including in post-crisis contexts as well as in apparently stable areas.

FAO can intensify the deployment of its expertise on the application of early warning information to inform the design of policies and approaches for early warning-early action with member states and other partners. This includes work by FAO to provide food security-related information in order to contribute to multidisciplinary analyses, and ongoing efforts to inform the UN Security Council, and peace and political arms of the UN system on situations of concern.

Partnerships

FAO has developed significant experience in collaborating with a range of different stakeholders including NGOs, civil society organizations, professional societies, faith-based groups, private sector institutions, ministerial counterparts, national technical experts, donors, regional bodies, the Rome-based Agencies (RBAs), and other UN agencies. These deep partnerships – which often bridge humanitarian and development actions and are rooted in a continuous FAO presence in countries – have resulted in lasting relationships that make FAO more effective on the ground, and in responding quickly and in a coordinated fashion.

Making a transformative change in its approaches to sustainable peace will require reshaping the nature of some partnerships, and focusing on potential engagement with more local partners, especially those that are explicitly conflict sensitive. As a neutral body, FAO can leverage the value of the political capital gained through its technical work in agriculture, food security and natural resources with at risk communities in order to become more engaged in conflict prevention, mitigation and resolution. To complement this, it is anticipated that FAO will deepen current, and develop new, approaches based on its technical competencies to prevent and address the various economic, political, social, age, gendered and psychosocial dimensions of conflict risks.

FAO should work with member states in conflict-affected countries to protect national budget allocations and domestic investments in food, nutrition, agriculture, forestry and fisheries and natural resource management. This includes actively developing coalitions for conflict-sensitive investment in food and nutrition security, food production and natural resource management in conflict-affected countries or regions, including to enhance sustainable peace in post-crisis contexts. In addition, FAO can deepen its strategic engagements with academia and research institutions that focus on the linkages between food production, food security, conflict and sustainable peace, gathering evidence and knowledge to inform policies and actions.

Looking ahead, the Framework will address how FAO can strengthen and adjust its existing partnerships, as necessary, and will develop agreements with new partners. Specifically, this includes links with the UN's peace and security architecture (including the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Support Office, and the Peacebuilding Fund), as well as multi-stakeholder platforms that bring together diverse actors and practice communities (e.g. the Geneva Peacebuilding Platform). FAO can foster partnerships with those that specialize in saving lives through livelihoods in conflict settings; demonstrate engagement on the linkages of conflict-related food insecurity internationally with domestic security concerns; explore private sector approaches to supporting livelihoods in conflict; and engage with local civil society and community based organizations, supporting their capacity development and the localisation of aid where possible.

Knowledge, analysis and assessment

Knowledge communities around the world are working to understand why and how conflicts turn destructive, and the role that food and agriculture systems and the natural resource environment play in these dynamics. For every theoretical assertion describing these relationships, there are gaps in the evidence base, especially at the macro level. Key questions remain. Will climate change increase conflict in rural communities? Does scarcity lead to violent conflict? Under what conditions is hunger a driver of conflict? What are the best indicators to monitor in order to protect food and agriculture systems? How should nations emerging from conflict best rationalize resources to promote sustainable agriculture development? What are the most suited methodologies for estimating the full impact of violent conflict on food, agriculture, forestry and fisheries and natural resources on men, women and children? FAO, as a knowledge-based organization, has an important role in advancing understanding to these and other issues.

In addition, FAO is the preeminent institution in gathering data on food security and nutrition. Through the generation of data and analysis, FAO has also developed significant expertise on using this information to support decision-making, and inform the design of policies and

approaches by governments and other partners. It is foreseen that FAO will draw on its comparative advantage in technical analysis and dissemination of information in order to more effectively contribute to sustainable peace.

There is an opportunity for FAO to address the limited documentation on best practices in the sphere of food, agriculture, forestry and fisheries for conflict prevention, mitigation and resolution. FAO can intensify its efforts to document and disseminate best practices in, for example: protecting food and agriculture development gains in conflict-affected communities, countries and regions; promoting effective linkages between humanitarian and development efforts for food and nutrition security; achieving coherence among humanitarian principles, human rights obligations and development approaches in conflict-affected countries; and, building sustainable peace in post-crisis contexts.

Promoting sustainable peace through knowledge

Select examples over time

Water Harvesting for Peacebuilding in South Sudan: An Assessment of Livestock Water Harvesting Structures in Eastern Equatoria, Western Equatoria, and Lakes States. FAO South Sudan: Juba, FAO with Ministry of Electricity, Dams, Irrigation and Water Resources, UNEP and PBSO. 2015.

“Hope is the Engine of Life”; “Hope Dies with the Person”: Analysis of Meaning Making in FAO-Supported North Caucasus Communities Using the “Sense and Sensibilities of Coherence” (SSOC) Methodology. Parker, J., et al, 2013. *Journal of Loss and Trauma: International Perspectives on Stress & Coping*, 18:2, 140-151.

Collaborative conflict management for enhanced national forest programmes (NFPS): Training manual. Engel, A. 2012. National Forest Programme Facility, FAO, Rome.

Dialogue, consensus and vision: Participatory and negotiated territorial development – more than a methodology – a strategy for territorial interaction and integration. Hatcher, J., and Groppo, P. 2009. Land Tenure and Management Unit, FAO, Rome.

Conflicts, Rural Development and Food Security in West Africa. Flores, M. 2004. ESA Working Paper No. 04-02, Agricultural and Development Economics Division, FAO, Rome.

Armed conflicts and food security. Teodosijevic, S. 2003. ESA Working Paper No. 03-11, Agricultural and Development Economics Division, FAO, Rome.

Natural Resource Conflict Management Case Studies: An Analysis of Power, Participation and Protected Areas. Nielsen, E., Castro, A. P., (Eds). 2003. FAO, Rome.

FAO, building on its existing work on the impacts of natural disasters on agriculture, its subsectors, and food security⁴³, can also further understanding of the impact of conflicts on agricultural sectors and food security, thereby contributing to filling information gaps and better informing effective policies and actions.

Many of the tools and resources that FAO has developed provide guidance that actors, including local actors, can be used to minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts toward sustainable peace by addressing the root causes of conflict (see box). FAO's contributions extend beyond the impacts of projects and include, among others, contributions to knowledge, learning and best practices.

Given the relatively marginal roles that food security, agriculture, forestry, fisheries and natural resources have been assigned in formal peace processes, FAO is well placed to markedly increase the depth and breadth of knowledge resources regarding the potential positive and negative aspects of these dynamic relationships. This can serve as a foundation for the Organization to better inform and influence multi-sector analysis and strategies in these contexts through UN systems, including post-crisis recovery planning, common country assessments, and UN Development Assistance Frameworks.

FAO should focus its knowledge generation and dissemination capacities to deepen awareness of efforts to promote sustainable peace by member states, partners and FAO. This would be important for expanding consumer bases that would, ultimately, provide greater economic incentives for socially responsible food and natural resource management systems and re-orient producer systems to respond to that demand.

The Framework foresees that FAO would leverage its capacities for evaluation and analysis to expand and disseminate the corpus of best practices for saving lives through livelihoods in conflict settings including, *inter alia*, specific sectoral interventions, the application of traditional and formal laws, norms and standards, cluster and cross-cluster coordination, and gender sensitive and protection measures. It is anticipated that FAO would expand the available documentation regarding the absolute and comparative economic benefits of livelihood-based humanitarian approaches for food security and nutrition in conflict contexts (and use this information for resource mobilization, prioritization and sequencing in Humanitarian Response Plans, and other applications).

Organizational management and operational considerations

The implications of an effort to increase FAO's contributions to sustainable peace are manifold and include, variously, technical, programmatic, staffing and security considerations. It is envisioned that the FAO Framework on Contributions to Sustainable Peace in the Context of Agenda 2030 would be accompanied by operational guidelines that would define how to implement the Framework in the context of the FAO's Strategic Framework. Guidance on how to integrate the Framework into existing work and corporate structures, or where new structures or ways of working are required in order to implement fully the Framework, would be included. The guidelines would also address practical and operational issues such as conflict sensitive procurement, integrating conflict analysis into needs assessments, communication and outreach, partnerships, and identifying indicators for monitoring impact on the context in which FAO operates, amongst others. Building on the Operational Guidelines, gaps in existing resources (including financial, human and political resources) and the implications of those gaps would be estimated. For example, this would speak to the skills mix, competencies and capacities required by the Organization to implement the Framework successfully. It is intended that the guidance would outline areas that are necessary to address such gaps.

FAO's country offices are staffed predominantly by national personnel who bring a depth of understanding about prevailing political, social and economic dynamics (including those that contribute to conflict risks and mitigation). Combining the national staff's perspective with those of experienced international staffers from other contexts (including those with cross-country and cross-regional expertise) has allowed identification of conflict drivers and has provided opportunities for preventing future conflicts. However, FAO staff and offices around the world are on the frontline in the management of conflict risks and the promotion of sustainable peace. Given that such work can be as technical as it is political, the Guidelines should help FAO to enhance measures to ensure the safety and security of staff, offices, and assets. FAO should ensure that all staff, including national staff, has access to minimum resources to ensure their safety and security in conflict contexts (e.g. radios, ballistic vests/helmets etc.). It is foreseen that FAO will ensure that all decentralized offices in areas at risk of conflict are properly equipped with contingency supplies and procedures. With these considerations in mind, FAO is reviewing emergency response preparedness capacities and identifying gaps at country and regional office level. In conflict contexts, this would also require FAO decentralized offices to systematically review physical inventories and appropriately secure potential "dual use" items, i.e. those items that have both an agricultural and potential conflict application (e.g. chemicals, machetes, axes, fuel, vehicles, communication devices and systems, etc.).

The Framework and related guidelines will outline how FAO should invest in staff so that FAO will be more effective working in, on and through conflict. This includes building the capacity of relevant staff, including national staff, for conflict risk assessment and conflict-sensitive programming. FAO can, for example, avail key staff opportunities to enhance skills in areas such as conflict-sensitivity, gender analysis, protection, negotiations with parties for security and access, and humanitarian principles, international humanitarian law and human rights law. This may require, among other measures, developing and requiring relevant staff to demonstrate minimum core competencies for working in conflict zones.

In order to enhance its contributions to sustainable peace, FAO should review its human resource practices to increase its ability to competitively attract, retain and deploy qualified men and women willing to work in contexts that are characterized by conflict, recognizing the unique stressors that these situations entail. As national staff and non-staff personnel face exceptional risks and play unique roles in supporting FAO to navigate the complexities of conflict, FAO should make specific efforts to improve conditions of service for national personnel working in conflict settings. This may include, for example, recognizing outstanding staff (including national staff) that make exceptional contributions to sustainable peace.

The accountability of FAO Representatives to deliver on CPF commitments, which will integrate sustaining peace objectives, is already in place. In order to link corporate vision with applied practice, FAO can explore measures for enhanced accountability with the heads of decentralized offices, including innovating “performance compacts” based on minimum requirements for delivering FAO’s commitments to sustainable peace. It can also enhance measures to increase awareness of FAO’s policies and procedures regarding conflicts of interest, fraud, nepotism and other ethical concerns, especially in decentralized offices in conflict contexts, recognising that conflict contexts may be associated with higher risks of violation of ethics.

Conclusion

“When wars have loomed large, we have looked to agriculture to sustain vulnerable communities and help restore post-crisis economies. These remain essential functions. And where hunger threatens peace, we must contribute to mitigating that risk through conflict-sensitive food security approaches. Where food security can be a force for stability, we have to look to food and agriculture as pathways to peace and security.”

FAO Director-General

In his remarks to the UN Security Council in 2016, the FAO Director-General observed, “FAO has long been concerned about the impact of war on food security and on how hunger can be one of the drivers of instability and conflict. At the same time, we know that actions to promote food security can help prevent a crisis, mitigate its impacts and promote post-crisis recovery and healing.” The challenge for FAO is to build on this reality and use its resources for the promotion of sustainable peace. The Organization’s resources include a clear vision by FAO’s leadership, a rich history of innovations and a global commitment to Agenda 2030 and its vision for peaceful, just and inclusive societies.

The ultimate impact of the Framework rests on the degree to which FAO staff takes it upon themselves to be an engine for sustainable peace in the world. In this task, no aspect of FAO’s programme of work is irrelevant.

Annex 1. FAO Director-General remarks to the UN Security Council, 29 March 2016

United Nations Security Council, Arria-formula Meeting on Food Security, Nutrition and Peace

I would like to thank the Governments of Angola and Spain for this opportunity to discuss the dynamic relationships between food security, nutrition and peace.

This is the first time that FAO's Director-General is addressing the UN Security Council, and I am honoured to be here.

FAO has long been concerned about the impact of war on food security and on how hunger can be one of the drivers of instability and conflict. At the same time, we know that actions to promote food security can help prevent a crisis, mitigate its impacts and promote post-crisis recovery and healing.

FAO was established in 1945. As the world emerged from World War Two, our founders saw that FAO must play a vital role in the quest for peace. They wrote, and I quote: "the Food and Agriculture Organization is born out of the need for peace as well as the need for freedom from want. The two are interdependent. Progress toward freedom from want is essential to lasting peace." End quote.

Seven decades after the creation of FAO, UN Member States reinforced this idea by adopting the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, based on the premise that "there can be no sustainable development without peace and no peace without sustainable development".

The link between food and peace underpinned the award of the 1949 Nobel Peace Prize to Lord Boyd Orr, FAO's first Director-General. At that time, he wrote that, I quote: "Hunger is at the heart of the world's troubles. Unless people are fed, the best treaties can come to nothing. Hungry people cannot be satisfied by anything but food." End quote.

Ladies and gentlemen,
My own deep personal conviction is that there can be no food security without peace, and no lasting peace without food security.

Peace and food security are mutually reinforcing. We have often seen hunger recede when stability prevails, such as in post-conflict Angola and Nicaragua, post-genocide Rwanda and post-independence Timor-Leste. Similarly, however, violence and hunger are often locked in vicious cycles in which one feeds on the other.

Conflicts are a key driver of protracted crises, where the prevalence of undernourishment is three times higher than in the rest of the developing world.

The Global Hunger Index of 2015, elaborated by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), notes that the countries with the highest levels of food insecurity are also those most affected by conflict. Conflicts mostly affect rural areas and people, particularly women and children. Violent attacks on farming communities and the destruction of crops, livestock and markets undermine rural livelihoods and displace people from their homes.

Although the relationships between hunger and conflict are complex and nonlinear, food insecurity is a factor that can contribute to the destabilization of societies and aggravate political instability. Food protests contributed to the downfall of the government of Haiti in 2008. Food price rises coincided with protests during the Arab Spring of 2011.

In post-conflict situations, persistent high food insecurity can contribute to a resurgence of violence, as in the Central African Republic and Yemen. Hunger that results from violence can generate further violence. Food itself can become a weapon of war when it is stolen from civilians by fighters or deliberately withheld as a tactic, in the perverse logic of violence. This goes against International Humanitarian Law, but these strategies are still used.

In South Sudan, some 7 million people, over half of the population, are currently experiencing food insecurity in the context of continued violence. 2.8 million of them are in an acute situation.

If peace is not restored and assistance is not stepped up in South Sudan, the situation can deteriorate into famine.

Just five years ago, Somalia was hit by a famine that killed over 250,000 people, largely because of a failure on the part of the international community to respond in time to early warnings of impending disaster. Let us never again repeat such mistakes.

Excellencies,

The recent high-level UN reviews related to peace and security urge the UN to keep pace with evolving challenges and threats to international security. There is a clear recognition that preventing crises and sustaining peace are Charter-based responsibilities shared across the UN system.

The Secretary-General's report for the World Humanitarian Summit "One Humanity: Shared Responsibility" also calls for active engagement in conflict prevention.

As we all know, prevention requires addressing the root causes of conflict, including hunger and food insecurity.

Conflict-sensitive approaches to reducing food insecurity, which take into consideration the specific triggers of the conflict, and pro-peace

approaches to increase food security are needed in a range of crises today. In the Central African Republic, half of the population faces hunger. This is not only a threat to those who suffer, but to the stabilization process in the country.

In Syria, before the civil war started, agriculture employed half of the population. The sector has been seriously affected as farmers started fleeing their lands. Assisting farmers when it is safe for them to remain has been critical to prevent even more displacement and also to set the foundations for rebuilding Syria.

FAO is working with its partners to strengthen the food security and resilience of those that remain on their land in Syria, the vast majority of whom are women.

Ladies and gentlemen,
Agriculture also brings new life to shattered homes and communities. Supporting agriculture and rural livelihoods, can serve as a motivating rationale for bringing people together and to drive recovery.

Efforts to revive the agricultural sector and improve food security, including through social protection, have positive effects on the sustainability of peace. They are important “peace dividends”. This is recognized, for example, by the Government of Colombia, which considers agriculture, rural development and food security as cornerstones of the peace process and of the social cohesion that must build in the post-conflict phase.

As I said at the beginning, the relationship between food security and peace, conflict and hunger has always been present in FAO’s work. But the invitation to brief you today has galvanized our internal reflection process. FAO is developing a corporate peacebuilding policy to amplify our contribution to conflict prevention, and to support the establishment of peaceful, stable, and inclusive societies.

Implementing such a policy will require stronger engagement with governments and a wide range of peacebuilding, humanitarian and development actors.

We already work closely with the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Food Programme, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, and a wide range of other partners within and outside the UN System.

We welcome the challenge of strengthening and establishing more effective partnerships.

Ladies and gentlemen,

In conclusion, when wars have loomed large, we have looked to agriculture to sustain vulnerable communities and help restore post-crisis economies. These remain essential functions.

And where hunger threatens peace, we must contribute to mitigating that risk through conflict-sensitive food security approaches.

Where food security can be a force for stability, we have to look to food and agriculture as pathways to peace and security.

This is a great challenge, but one that we can meet together as we embark on achieving the 2030 Development Agenda.

Let me finish quoting Mahatma Gandhi: “To a hungry man a piece of bread is the face of God”.

Thank you for your attention.

Annex 2. FAO commitments to the World Humanitarian Summit

FAO stressed a number of themes at the World Humanitarian Summit, held in Istanbul, Turkey, from 23-24 May 2016. In line with the five Core Responsibilities of the Agenda for Humanity, FAO emphasized that, in conflict, building resilience and sustainable peace requires investments in protecting, saving and rebuilding agriculture livelihood. FAO underscored that rural communities in crisis situations must have unimpeded access to food, nutrition and protection of agricultural livelihoods. The Organization asserted that investing in social protection enhances the capacity of poor and vulnerable households to withstand adapt and bounce back so that “no one is left behind” in crisis settings. With an eye on the longer term, FAO highlights how agriculture, forestry and fisheries are key to managing crises and risks differently and building back better. FAO’s last key message was simple and powerful: investing in agriculture is a good humanitarian investment.

FAO made a number of specific commitments at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit that are directly relevant to sustainable peace. FAO committed to:

- Increase the number of joint risk and threat monitoring mechanisms and systems to enhance early warnings related to agriculture, food security and nutrition, which may mitigate instability and conflict – e.g. on climatic change, food price volatility, food insecurity, and food chain crises (see FAO commitment no. 2).
- Build institutional capacity on conflict analysis (see FAO commitment no. 3).
- Ensure personnel in conflict contexts are competent in industry-standard conflict-sensitivity best practice (see FAO commitment no. 4).
- Operationalize the guidance of the CFS-FFA by strengthening conflict-sensitive programming and interventions, and contributing to peacebuilding initiatives, as appropriate (see FAO commitment no. 5).
- Adopt a corporate policy, and related operational guidelines, on FAO’s role, in line with its work and mandate, in contributing to conflict prevention, sustainable peace and stability (see FAO commitment no. 9).

FAO's key messages for the summit addressed aspects of working on, in and through conflict:

- Apply a conflict-sensitivity lens and employ 'do no harm' principles and frameworks to resilience programming to help avoid creating or exacerbating existing conflicts.
- Recognize the need for approaches that support community resilience to conflict, particularly in protracted crisis situations.
- Understand the root causes of instability and insecurity to better inform conflict-sensitive approaches, to avoid undermining policies and actions for securing lasting peace. Food security and nutrition, and support to agricultural development and livelihoods, have an important role to play in contributing in a meaningful way to peaceful societies, conflict prevention and stability, e.g. through sustainable natural resource management, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and land tenure approaches.
- Maintain investment and engagement in supporting sustainable agricultural development and livelihoods, contributing to economic growth and helping to underpin stable, peaceful and inclusive societies. Investments in protecting, saving and rebuilding livelihoods are critical in fragile, conflict-affected and post-conflict settings and contribute to saving lives while creating conditions for longer-term resilience building, including through rehabilitation of agriculture, expansion of social assistance such as cash-based interventions, and empowering the most vulnerable groups such as women and youth. Investing in agricultural livelihoods is a key step towards ensuring peace and stability. The role of food security in conflict mitigation and prevention through the reduction of vulnerability, the strengthening of social protection interventions, the generation of income and employment, community dialogue and social cohesion cannot be underestimated. There is no peace without food security and no food security without peace.

Annex 3. Examples of FAO working on, in and through conflict

On conflict (conflict drivers)

Côte d'Ivoire: *Post conflict support to land tenure*

FAO supported Côte d'Ivoire to adopt a strategy and policy for land tenure security in rural areas, in a post-conflict context where land tenure issues bear high risks of social instability that may spark or exacerbate conflicts between communities. The policy declaration on land tenure was developed using a participatory and inclusive approach that involved communities, traditional and administrative authorities, NGOs, Development Partners and the Government. An autonomous agency (AFROR) was created to implement the rural land tenure strategy and policy. A proximity communication strategy on rural land tenure security was developed and implemented. As a result, in one of the Departments (Bocanda) social cohesion was restored and tangible results achieved include, among others:

- 33 certificates of collective land ownership were delivered for an area of more than 8 100 ha;
- 6 individual certificates of land ownership were delivered for an area of more than 148 ha;
- 6 agro-enterprises settled as conflict around land was no longer a major issue.

Côte d'Ivoire: *Transboundary initiative to reinforce resilience, and build capacity for prevention of conflicts at the border between Côte d'Ivoire and Liberia*

Synergies and complementarities between FAO, the Danish Refugee Council and the Norwegian Refugee Council in 15 localities on the border between Côte d'Ivoire and Liberia enabled the reinforcement of food security, social cohesion and protection of people in an area subject to poverty, food insecurity and tribal tensions. Beneficiaries of income generating activities from lowland rice production and horticulture sites rehabilitated by FAO received not only capacity development and inputs through Farmer Field Schools, but also training and awareness on land tenure and related law, and on collaborative peaceful resolution of land tenure conflicts.

East Africa: *Multiple projects*

In 2011, the world was officially declared free of Rinderpest, a deadly livestock disease. Eradicating Rinderpest contributed to improvements in food security for livestock-owning communities, but the campaign also contributed to peace and security in the wider population. Eliminating Rinderpest would not have been possible without a conflict sensitive approach to animal health, as the last vestiges of the disease were found

in communities where conflicts had been triggered by disputes over livestock. In East Africa, FAO trained animal health workers negotiated peace pacts between rival pastoral groups as a pre-condition for rinderpest vaccinations. This demonstrates FAO's convening role as a respected neutral, specialized technical agency.

Philippines: *Increasing public confidence and participation in support of implementation of the Bangsamoro Peace Agreement*

FAO has worked closely with UN peacebuilding and peacekeeping actors to reintegrate former combatants as part of a Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration (DDR) programme. Most of the combatants in the Philippines belong to farming and fishing households and those wanting to return to a life of peace could not do so, owing to a lack of access to land and the capital required to restore their livelihoods. FAO interventions supported smallholder farmers and marginal fishers by enhancing their capacity to jumpstart their livelihoods. This project illustrates FAO's engagement on working both in and on conflict by addressing livelihood needs, contributing to social cohesion, and building the capacities of ex-combatants.

Niger: *Support for preventive management of conflicts over access to natural resources in pastoral and agro-pastoral zones of Niger*

Supported by the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), FAO is working in close collaboration with UN peace-building actors and other agencies in seven towns to prevent the outbreak of conflicts related to natural resources. Through a conflict-sensitive management approach, the project aims at building local actors' capacities to manage limited water resources in an inclusive and transparent manner, in order to contribute to peaceful cohabitation between population groups (i.e. farmers, herders, refugees, migrants, and locals).

Indonesia, Peru, and Uganda: *Securing tenure rights for forest landscape dependent communities: linking science with policy to advance tenure security, SFM, and people's livelihoods*

FAO is working with communities, policy makers and practitioners to train them on effective land reform implementation. This includes the development of training manuals and workshops on diagnostic skills for pro-active assessment, monitoring and de-escalation of tenure related conflict. This project illustrates how FAO is using technical expertise and globally developed tools and guidance to facilitate conflict prevention and resolution.

Angola and Mozambique: *Post-conflict support to land tenure*

In consolidating peace, land related issues can be particularly sensitive. Communities that formally identify and record their land rights are better placed to protect and benefit from those rights, and mitigate related conflict risks. In post-conflict Angola, FAO helped build mutual respect and trust between central government, local authorities and civil society organizations. FAO worked on community land delimitation⁴⁴, capacity building and dissemination of knowledge. This technical work highlights FAO's important contribution to creating a more stable and equitable society.

Democratic Republic of the Congo: *Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration*

FAO collaborated with partners on an Emergency Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) Programme and on a Multi-Country Demobilization and Reintegration Program (MDRP) to coordinate and contribute to regional peace, and to encourage former combatants to return to civilian livelihoods. Surveys indicate that over two-thirds of ex-combatants' are engaged in productive economic activities, including agriculture, fisheries, and livestock sectors. In complement to the DDR support, FAO has provided assistance to strengthen people's ability to produce food and earn a living by improving access to resources and training programmes, as well as capacities to produce and diversify food. These activities illustrate FAO's engagement in strategic partnerships to reduce violence, and prevent reescalation of violence through livelihood support and reintegration into productive sectors.

South Sudan: *Sustainable food security through community-based livelihood development and water harvesting*

This multi-year project was designed to reduce recurrent, localized natural-resource based conflicts between competing pastoralist communities, but the eruption of civil war in 2013 forced the suspension of the project's heavy infrastructure components (such as water harvesting schemes). Some staff were redeployed on FAO South Sudan's emergency programme and proved effective at negotiating access to contested areas. Others were funded by the UN Peace Building Fund to analyse the impacts on conflict and sustainable peace of a range of historical water harvesting projects, and to develop related guidance.⁴⁵

Democratic Republic of the Congo: *Joint United Nations programme for peace consolidation, conflict prevention and human security in the Republic of Congo (PRC)*

A joint UN HABITAT, FAO, UNDP project has used Participatory Negotiated Territorial Development (PNTD) approach to reduce land-based disagreements, with a focus on identifying the underlying causes of issues surrounding natural resource access. As a result, land disputes, which accounted for eighty percent of all conflicts in the eastern part of the country, have decreased. This project illustrates how FAO is building partnerships to execute a coordinated response using globally developed approaches and tools to reduce the outbreak of conflict.

Somalia: *Sustainable Employment and Economic Development (SEED) programme*

A countrywide conflict analysis was completed at the start of the programme with a focus on livestock, fisheries, fodder and honey value chains. As a result, conflict analysis informed the design and implementation of the SEED programme, identifying how to avoid reinforcing inter-clan power dynamics, and interfering with ownership rights that could inadvertently strengthen conflict drivers. The programme included specific activities related to problem prediction and solving forums, and built the capacity of interest groups in governance and conflict resolution. This programme illustrates how FAO has effectively utilized conflict sensitive approaches and programming to target interventions addressing conflict resolution, while also providing livelihood support. Addressing youth unemployment and preventing young people to join militia groups as a negative coping mechanism is highlighted in the Economic Recovery Plan for Somalia as one of the greatest obstacles to the country's economic recovery. FAO is also implementing the Joint Programme on Youth Employment, a frontline intervention by the Federal Government of Somalia to achieve rapid results under Peace and State-building Goal.

In conflict (conflict impacts)

Syrian Arab Republic: *Saving lives and livelihoods, and preventing onward migration*

FAO is working with its partners to strengthen the food security and resilience of households, communities and institutions in the Syrian Arab Republic. Support to small-scale household-level production is increasingly important in the country, following the fragmentation of the agriculture sector. In addition to saving livelihoods, agricultural interventions increase local food availability, access and variety. Helping farmers to stay on their land and produce food, when it is safe to do so, is also critical in preventing further migration. Through a “Whole of Syria” approach, FAO is operating from Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) and Gaziantep (Turkey) to maximize delivery of agricultural support to people in need in 13 of Syria’s 14 governorates, including in hard-to-reach locations.

Horn of Africa: *Strengthening biosecurity in selected MENA and Horn of Africa States*

Pastoral and agro-pastoral households in Somalia, Kenya, Ethiopia, and Djibouti benefitted from fodder production and livestock vaccination and treatment services. In Somalia, FAO is vaccinating 20 million animals against PPR (of which 7.5 million were also vaccinated against contagious caprine pleuropneumonia). While in Kenya FAO is working to improve the immunity and resilience of six million livestock through vaccination campaigns, de-worming, and multivitamin injections. These efforts aim to reduce national (internal) and regional (external) drivers of conflict by increasing national and regional food security through the protection of livelihoods, but have also served as an entry point for working with pastoralists where conflict had been triggered over disputes over livestock.

Afghanistan: *European Union Food Facility (EUFF)*

In response to the high food prices of 2007-2008, the USD 325 million EUFF supported FAO interventions to boost agricultural productivity and improve household food security and nutrition for smallholders in 28 countries across Africa, Asia and Latin America. In Afghanistan, local seed enterprises, including in conflict-affected provinces, were supported to produce and sell diversified certified staple crop seed to farmers. Increased productivity of wheat contributed to improved food security - in 2010, the annual production of wheat increased by 20 percent. This shows FAO’s work in conflict-affected situations to support effective transitions between humanitarian action and development processes, focusing on programmes that would have both a rapid and lasting impact on food security.

Myanmar: *Improvement of agricultural livelihoods and resilience for conflict-affected communities in ethnic minorities' areas*

FAO is working to improve household food security and resilience to floods and cyclones in conflict and natural disaster prone areas. This project illustrates the integration of FAO's long-term strategic work on climate change and disaster risk reduction with the promotion of conflict-sensitive development through improved resilience.

Yemen: *Emergency livelihood support to Internally Displaced People (IDPs) and vulnerable host communities living in conflict affected areas of Al Dhale Governorate*

By supporting productive agricultural activities, FAO is working to increase access and availability of food for IDPs and vulnerable host communities' families living in conflict affected areas of Al Dale Governance. This project illustrates FAO's engagement in directly saving lives by supporting agricultural livelihoods in conflicts.

Colombia: *Rapid recovery of food security of vulnerable communities affected by the conflict and extreme climatic events, and strengthening institutional capacities, as a mechanism for the construction of peace and resilience*

FAO is working to rehabilitate the production of food for home consumption as a strategy to strengthen social cohesion and generate resilience. This project illustrates how FAO's analysis of vulnerability related to climate change, and solutions to address it, have been integrated with an analysis of conflict risk in order to deliver on multiple objectives.

Ukraine: *Emergency assistance to restore the livelihoods of vulnerable small-scale farming families affected by conflict in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions*

FAO is working to provide time-critical emergency livestock and crop inputs to conflict affected farming families for immediate food security and resumption of livestock based livelihoods in conflict-affected areas of Donetsk and Luhansk regions. This project illustrates FAO's engagement in using technical analysis to protect and restore livelihoods at sub-national level.

Through conflict (conflict sensitive development)

Afghanistan: *Programme for improvement of irrigation systems in Kabul and Bamyan Provinces*

FAO is working to enhance food security by raising agricultural production and productivity. At the operational level, the purpose is to expand irrigation coverage with reliable and adequate water supply through improved irrigation facilities, with the overall objective being to support the beneficiaries through targeted training to increase production and fully utilize the additional water supply. This project illustrates FAO's continued engagement to advance development, through the provision of technical expertise and assistance, in a protracted crisis context with ongoing conflict.

Sierra Leone: *Multiple projects*

The Ebola virus disease outbreak which affected Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone challenged existing and ongoing peacebuilding and stabilization processes related to public services and social cohesion. FAO worked with partners (e.g. WFP and WHO) to address immediate recovery interventions, but FAO also continued to work on promoting responsible investment in agriculture and food systems to foster smallholder inclusion in value chains, and bring employment and income generation to rural areas. Work is ongoing under the Emerging Pandemic Threats 2 (EPT-2) programme addressing specific zoonotic diseases and the triggers of the human-animal interface. This project illustrates FAO's ongoing role in development throughout a fragile post-conflict situation, and the ability to engage with multiple partners on different levels to simultaneously address humanitarian and development needs.

Burkina Faso, Lesotho, Niger, Mali and Mauritania: *Innovative social protection mechanisms*

Situations with heightened conflict-risk call for social protection systems that are long-term, predictable, risk-informed and shock-responsive, and able to play a crucial role in bridging the gap between humanitarian and development interventions. Such systems are critical to reduce poverty, accelerate progress in the fight against hunger and food insecurity, while strengthening resilience to threats and crises and enabling development. FAO's flexible CASH+ interventions combine transfers of cash and productive in-kind assets with the objective of boosting the livelihoods and productive capacities of poor and vulnerable households. This approach demonstrates how the Organization's rich expertise in agricultural production, seed security, land management, climate change adaptation and rural development can accelerate results for poverty reduction and resilience in conflict risk contexts.

Uganda: *Strengthening adaptive capacity of agro-pastoral communities and the local government to reduce impacts of climate risk on livelihoods in Karamoja, Uganda*

FAO is working with the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC), FEWSNET, the IGAD Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN) and Uganda's Community Nutrition Surveillance, amongst others, to strengthen early warning, preparedness and contingency planning and response systems. Interventions also support capacity development of local institutions in, for example, livestock disease surveillance and provision of veterinary services. This is complemented by strengthening the long-term resilience of agro-pastoralist production systems and communities through field schools and improved watershed management. This project illustrates FAO's convening role, the range of partnerships that FAO has employed in working through conflicts on development issues, based on deep contextual understanding.

Nepal: *Jobs for Peace*

In partnership with the UN Peacebuilding Fund, FAO and ILO implemented a joint programme to promote youth employment between 2009 and 2012. This focused on promoting youth employment in rural areas as a way to promote peace and social cohesion, as well as providing productive alternatives to violence to the youth in the post-conflict process of reintegration. Specifically, through employment and empowerment of youth, the joint programme enhanced conflict-affected youth's access to resources and skills that were identified as critical for their livelihoods, and created opportunities for productive and decent employment in affected communities, including through post-conflict rehabilitation.

Endnotes

- ¹ Adapted from: <http://tinyurl.com/jnce9pt>; <http://www.hiik.de/en/methodik/index.html>; and <http://www.rgs.org/OurWork/Schools/Teaching+resources/Key+Stage+3+resources/The+geography+of+conflict/Conflict+today.htm>.
- ² http://cso-effectiveness.org/IMG/pdf/conflict_definition_final.pdf.
- ³ Fragility is understood to be multidimensional. The OECD fragility framework defines fragility as the combination of exposure to risk and insufficient coping capacity of the state, system and/or communities to manage, absorb or mitigate those risks. Built on five dimensions of fragility – economic, environmental, political, societal and security – some 56 contexts are described as fragile in 2016, with 15 of these described as extremely fragile. Over 22 percent of the global population currently live in these fragile contexts. See OECD/DAC. 2016. States of Fragility 2016: Understanding Violence. Paris. Available from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/states-of-fragility-2016-9789264267213-en.htm>.
- ⁴ For example, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the United Nations Conference on Climate Change (COP21) and Paris Agreement, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR), the United Nations Committee on World Food Security endorsed Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises (CFS-FFA), and commitments made during the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit.
- ⁵ For example, UNSC Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security (S/RES/1325, 2000), and UNSC Resolution 2250 on Youth, Peace and Security (S/RES/2250, 2015).
- ⁶ Including, for example, the UNSG's Human Rights Up Front initiative and 'One Humanity: Shared Responsibility', the Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit (A/70/709).
- ⁷ These include the:
The report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (A/70/95- S/2015/446, 17 June 2015), and the reaction of the Secretary-General to the Panel's report, i.e. The future of United Nations peace operations: implementation of the recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (A/70/357-S/2015/682, 2 September 2015);
The review of the peacebuilding architecture, which includes a report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture (A/69/968-S/2015/490, 30 June 2015);
and
The Global Study on the implementation of the Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) on Women, Peace and Security, and the related Secretary-General's report.
- ⁸ There was a concurrent resolution between the UNSC and the General Assembly on the review of the UN peacebuilding architecture, see S/RES/2282 (2016) and A/RES/70/262 (2016).
- ⁹ Chair's Summary of the WHS "Standing up for humanity: committing to action", advance unedited version, available from: <https://consultations.worldhumanitarianissummit.org/bitcache/8ff6102bbf42673cc4146e308cca271d430a9c42?vid=581078&disposition=inline&op=view>
- ¹⁰ See <http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance-peace/publications/commitments%20FINAL.pdf>.
- ¹¹ S/RES/2250 (2015). See http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/s_res_2250.pdf
- ¹² Report of the Secretary-General. The United Nations and conflict prevention: a collective recommitment, S/2015/730.
- ¹³ Report of the Secretary-General. Peacebuilding and sustaining peace. A/72/707 – A/2018/43.
- ¹⁴ Simmons, E. 2013. Harvesting Peace: Food Security, Conflict, and Cooperation. Environmental Change and Security Program Report Vol. 14, Issue 3. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars: Washington DC.
- ¹⁵ A recent analysis of patterns of intensity of conflict and location indicates that whereas violence may be more likely in urban areas, the available data show that rural conflict is more violent. Almost two-thirds of all deaths in state-based armed conflict occurred in rural areas, and the same pattern applies to non-state armed conflict where about 60 percent of deaths took place in rural areas. See Björkdahl, A., Buckley-Zistel, S., (Eds). 2016. Spatializing Peace and Conflict: Mapping the production of places, sites and scales of violence. Palgrave Macmillan.
- ¹⁶ OECD (2016). States of Fragility 2016: Understanding Violence. OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264267213-en>.
- ¹⁷ Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2015. From Development Initiatives based on World Bank World Development Indicators, World Bank PovcalNet, INFORM, FFP Fragile States Index.
- ¹⁸ OECD (2016) op. cit. p. 83, figure 3.8.
- ¹⁹ SOFI 2002.
- ²⁰ Ianchovichina, E. and Ivanic, M. 2014. Economic Effects of the Syrian War and the Spread of the Islamic State on the Levant. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, WPS7135. Washington DC.
- ²¹ See <http://www.fao.org/emergencies/fao-in-action/stories/stories-detail/en/c/382638/>.
- ²² Ozerdem, A. and Roberts, R. (Eds). 2012. Challenging Post-Conflict Environments: Sustainable Agriculture. Farnham.
- ²³ FAO. 2016. The Impact of Conflict on the Livestock Sector in South Sudan. Final draft, unpublished.
- ²⁴ Asesno-Okyere, K. and Kebede, S.W. 2012. The Effects of Civil War on Agricultural Development Rural Livelihood in Sierra Leone in Ozerdem, A. and Roberts, R. (Eds). 2012. Challenging Post-Conflict Environments: Sustainable Agriculture. Farnham.

- ²⁵ Serneels, P., Verpoorten, M. 2012. The impact of armed conflict on economic performance: Evidence from Rwanda. Center for the Study of African Economies, Oxford University. Working Paper WPS/2012-10. Oxford.
- ²⁶ OECD/DAC. 2015. States of Fragility: Meeting post-2015 ambitions. Page 33. Available from: <http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/4315011e.pdf?expires=1466644536&id=id&acname=guest&checksum=2A65909481242A852961A70B50605238>
- ²⁷ However, it is important to note that such trends are geographically variable. For example, armed conflict events in Africa overall decreased by 14 percent between 2014 and 2015, but the overall trend was not homogeneous across the continent; whilst there was a continent-wide decrease, in the same period, fifteen African states saw an increase, clustered in specific regions. See the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) <http://www.crisis.acledata.com/african-overview-2015/>.
- ²⁸ Brinkman, H-J., Hendrix, C. 2011. Food Insecurity and Violent Conflict: Causes, Consequences, and Addressing the Challenges. Occasional Paper 24. Rome: World Food Programme.
- ²⁹ Inter-Agency Network on Youth Development (IANYD) Working Group on Youth and Peacebuilding with support from the Peace Nexus Foundation. 2015. Young People's Participation in Peacebuilding – A Practice Note.
- ³⁰ Maystadt, J. F., Calderone, M., and You, L. 2014. Local Warming and Violent Conflict in North and South Sudan, *Journal of Economic Geography*, 1-23.; Harris, K., Keen, D., and Mitchell, M. 2013. When Disasters and Conflict Collide: Improving the Links between Disaster Resilience and Conflict Prevention (London: Overseas Development Institute); De Châtel, F. 2014. The Role of Drought and Climate Change in the Syrian Uprising: Untangling the Triggers of the Revolution, *Middle Eastern Studies* 50:4, 521-535.
- ³¹ The OECD identifies five clusters of fragility indicators: 1) violence; 2) access to justice for all; 3) effective, accountable and inclusive institutions; 4) economic inclusion and stability; 5) capacities to prevent and adapt to social, economic and environmental shocks and disasters. The latter aspect highlights the important contributions of disaster risk reduction and resilience to fostering stability, and the central role of Government in creating an enabling environment for the management of risk and vulnerability. OECD/DAC. 2015. States of Fragility: Meeting post-2015 ambitions. Page 19. Available from: <http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/4315011e.pdf?expires=1466644536&id=id&acname=guest&checksum=2A65909481242A852961A70B50605238>
- ³² OCHA. 2016. Understanding the climate-conflict nexus from a humanitarian perspective: a new quantitative approach. New York. Available from: https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/OCHA_OP17_climate%20change_online.pdf.
- ³³ See Extracts from The Work of FAO: A General Report to the First Session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, prepared by the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture and subsequently published in August 1945. Available from: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/010/j6285e/j6285e03.htm>
- ³⁴ FAO, 1945. Letter to governments transmitting the report of the first session of the conference of the food and agriculture organization of the United Nations. Available from: [http://www.fao.org/docrep/x5584E/x5584e01.htm#i.letter to governments transmitting t.](http://www.fao.org/docrep/x5584E/x5584e01.htm#i.letter%20to%20governments%20transmitting%20t)
- ³⁵ Ibid.
- ³⁶ Mapping the 124 countries and territories supported by FAO under Strategic Objective 5 (as detailed in the 2014-15 Programme Implementation Report) against the HIIK Conflict Barometer of conflict intensity of a country in given year, a total of 31 countries had the two most elevated levels, i.e. "war" and "limited war".
- ³⁷ The 'on', 'in', 'through' conflict framework is adapted from Oxfam Novib's conflict transformation model. See www.oxfamnovib.nl.
- ³⁸ Delimitation is the process of identifying the geographic boundaries of areas of land and preparing a record of that information. Delimitation helps communities identify the limits of the area they occupy, prove the communities' rights to that land, and protect their rights more effectively.
- ³⁹ Including, FAO cooperation in Sudan (2004-2009); FAO's resilience sub-programme in Somalia (2013-2014); Evaluation of FAO's Contribution in Crisis-related Transition - Linking Relief to Development (2014); and FAO and IFAD's Engagement in Pastoral Development - Joint Evaluation Synthesis (2016).
- ⁴⁰ On 29 March 2016, the FAO Director-General addressed an 'Arria-formula' meeting of the UNSC in New York on 'Food Security, Nutrition and Peace'.
- ⁴¹ The High Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (<http://undocs.org/A/70/95>), and UNSC Resolution 2282.
- ⁴² A Resilience Strategy has been developed for South Sudan (see <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5760e.pdf>), and additional strategies are under development for Central African Republic, north-east Nigeria and Somalia, amongst others. The South Sudan Resilience Strategy has been developed to bridge the humanitarian and development frameworks. Building on FAO's portfolio of interventions in South Sudan over the past three years, the objective is to increase the resilience of livelihoods, including the protection of the most vulnerable population groups, and enhance livelihood-based productive sectors, while also reducing vulnerability to shocks and stressors. The strategy will be implemented over an initial period of three years (2016-2018), with built-in mechanisms for review and adjustments. It employs a conflict-sensitive approach that allows

programming flexibility and scalability during the transitional government period and outbreaks of tribal-based violence and insecurity. Moreover, the strategy will facilitate a smooth transition into the development phase when stability and peace is attained.

⁴³ See FAO. 2016. The impact of disasters on agriculture and food security. FAO, Rome (available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5128e.pdf>).

⁴⁴ Delimitation is the process of identifying the geographic boundaries of areas of land and preparing a record of that information. Delimitation helps communities identify the limits of the area they occupy, prove the communities' rights to that land, and protect their rights more effectively.

⁴⁵ See FAO (with Ministry of Electricity, Dams, Irrigation and Water Resources, UNEP and PBSO). 2015. Water Harvesting for Peacebuilding in South Sudan: An Assessment of Livestock Water Harvesting Structures in Eastern Equatoria, Western Equatoria, and Lakes States. FAO South Sudan: Juba.

www.fao.org/resilience