

FORESTS AND LAND USE

Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming at the Green Climate Fund

“Where there is conflict, land and natural resources issues are often found among the root causes or as major contributing factors.”*

Summary: Land has historically been a focal point of conflict, especially in fragile and conflict-affected settings (FCS), where disputes over forests and land use often intersect with broader socio-political dynamics, including unfair resource allocation, marginalization, and governance challenges. Factors such as climate change, population growth, and urbanization are expected to intensify these conflicts in the coming decades. While forest and land use projects aim to address these challenges, they can inadvertently exacerbate tensions, especially if they limit resource access, have weak governance, or marginalize local stakeholders. However, with a conflict-sensitive approach, such projects can promote peace by ensuring equitable land access, fostering sustainable resource management, solidifying land rights, and building trust through community engagement and knowledge-sharing.

1. How Fragility, Conflict and Violence Relate to Forest and Land

Throughout history, people have fought over land and over the control of, and access to, valuable resources. Besides being an

economic asset and source of livelihoods, land holds significant social, cultural, and historical importance for individuals and communities.¹ In FCS, forests and land use are often identified as being either the root cause of conflict or exacerbating an existing conflict.

* UNEP. “Toolkit and guidance for preventing and managing land and natural resources conflict: Land and conflict.” (2012). p. 13.

¹ Ibid.

While forests and land use are rarely the sole driver of conflict, they often tie into other political, economic, social, environmental and security factors — including unequal property rights, unfair land distribution, and issues related to marginalization and weak governance.² Moreover, due to the highly dynamic nature of FCS, the relationship between forests and land use and conflict changes over time and can deteriorate rapidly depending on the conflict context.³

Combined with the increasing pressures from climate change, population growth, worsening food security, forced migration and rapid urbanization, violent conflicts related to forests and land use are likely to intensify over the course of the coming decades.⁴ As highlighted by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), land is fundamental for peace and security, human rights, and development, and “essential during the whole conflict cycle including for overall recovery from conflict, economic recovery and for ending displacement.”⁵ Since disputes over forest and land use can be a root cause of conflict, the issue has the potential to be not only a driver of conflict and violence but also a force for peace and stability.

Forest and land use interventions include efforts to develop or strengthen: forest protection, restoration and sustainable forest management; natural protected areas systems; REDD-plus; timber and non-timber forest products; deforestation-free supply chains (including timber, beef, palm oil, soy, cocoa, and coffee); agroforestry; land tenure security; land use planning; and forest-based watershed management.⁶

The following subsections provide an overview on the operational risks that can arise for climate projects in FCS, including how projects in these contexts might exacerbate ongoing

conflict dynamics, and what peacebuilding opportunities exist. We then provide guidance on how to incorporate conflict sensitivity and peace responsiveness in the project. The overview and guidance are based on a literature review of publicly available material and includes a list of guidance notes and case studies for further reading.

Key Terms

Integrated climate-security programming is the holistic approach of embedding both climate and security considerations into the entire lifecycle of projects—from design and implementation to evaluation. This strategy aims to guarantee that climate finance initiatives are not only environmentally sustainable but also conflict-sensitive.

Conflict sensitivity is an organizational process where knowledge of the peace and conflict dynamics in the operational context is gathered through a locally informed perspective and applied to avoid unintended negative consequences and maximize positive effects on peace. Conflict-sensitive practices exist on a spectrum between ‘do-no-harm’ (e.g., conflict assessment, safeguards, redress mechanisms, etc.) and ‘do-good’ (e.g., peace responsiveness, peace co-benefits, peacebuilding, etc.).

2. Risks and Opportunities for GCF Projects on Forest and Land Use

2.1. Security Risks Impacting Projects

Given that forests and land play a central role in many FCS, there are diverse conflict dynamics that may negatively impact projects related to forests and land use. Some of the risks related to forests and land are highlighted below:

Competition over access to land and resources:

In FCS, competition over access to land and natural resources ties into the broader conflict

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ UN. “The United Nations and Land and Conflict.” Note to the Secretary General. (2019). p. 2.

⁵ Ibid., p. 4.

⁶ GCF. “Forest and Land Use Sectoral Guide.” Sectoral Guide Series, Yeonsu: Green Climate Fund. (2022). p. 6.

dynamics, with control over land not only creating economic and political incentives, but also providing important cultural and social values.⁷ Violent competition tends to be the result of a variety of interlinked conflict dynamics, such as the exploitation of natural resources by conflict parties to fund their military operations.⁸ Increased scarcity of fertile land also increases the competition for control over the remaining 'good' land, which in return reinforces a destructive competitive cycle.⁹ In some contexts, increased competition has increased tensions between farmers and herders, whose mobility has decreased significantly due to insecurity and the dwindling availability of resources.¹⁰

The opposite can also be the case in some contexts where there is an abundance of natural resources. This can in turn create slow growth, rent-seeking, corrupt governance, and rebel looting, all of which can generate internal or external violent conflict. This narrative is sometimes called the "resource curse," referring to cases where resource abundance is connected to a higher likelihood of conflict, and paradoxically to economic underperformance. Examples of countries experiencing the resource curse include the Democratic Republic of Congo, Nigeria, Iraq, Libya, and Angola, who all have been impacted by violent internal conflicts between different groups over the access to and the use of natural resources to finance their fighting.¹¹

Increased deforestation in FCS: While deforestation in FCS can also relate to general

cultural practices, there are several drivers of conflict directly or indirectly linked to deforestation. For example: a lack of access to energy can result in widespread fuelwood collection for heating and cooking;¹² military units may clear forests to prevent non-state armed groups (NSAGs) from hiding under tree cover; and, illegal logging activities and charcoal production in relation to the conflict economy.¹³ In other cases, deforestation-related conflict relates more to cultural practices and differences across ethnic groups which affect the natural environment. Recent data provided by the Conflict and Environment Observatory (CEOBS) suggests that the sharp increase in deforestation in many conflict-affected countries in 2020 had a strong relationship with conflict.¹⁴ Since reducing deforestation is the main focus in many forest and land use projects,¹⁵ conflict related deforestation in FCS can prove a major risk to GCF projects.

Forced displacement: Violent conflict is one of the primary drivers of forced population displacement, especially in protracted conflict contexts, which often feature in multiple waves of displacement.¹⁶ This can cause communities to engage in unsustainable forestry since research suggests that reliance on wood fuel in displacement settings can be a main driver of forest degradation and deforestation.¹⁷ In areas hosting displaced populations there often is a lack of available resources, which increases the use of wood fuel dramatically. Furthermore, the prolonged

⁷ USAID. "Land and Conflict: A Toolkit for Intervention 2.0." Land Links. (2022). p. 7.

⁸ UNEP. "Toolkit and guidance for preventing and managing land and natural resources conflict: Land and conflict." (2012). p. 9.

⁹ USAID. "Land and Conflict: A Toolkit for Intervention 2.0." Land Links. (2022). p. 14.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 8.

¹¹ NRG. "The Resource Curse The Political and Economic Challenges of Natural Resource Wealth." The NRG Reader. (2015). p. 2.

¹² Najim, Tara, Zwijsenburg, Wim, Nahas, Noor, and Jaramillo Vasquez, Roberto. "Axed & Burned: How Conflict-caused

Deforestation Impacts Environmental, Socio-economic and Climate Resilience in Syria." Pax for Peace. (2023). p. 42.

¹³ Ibid., p. 6.

¹⁴ CEOBS. "Deforestation in conflict areas in 2020." (2021).

¹⁵ GCF. "Forest and Land Use Sectoral Guide." Sectoral Guide Series, Yeonsu: Green Climate Fund. (2022). p. 6.

¹⁶ UNEP. "Toolkit and guidance for preventing and managing land and natural resources conflict: Land and conflict." (2012). p. 13.

¹⁷ UNHCR. "FAO and UNHCR launch new tool to save forests in displacement-affected areas." (2018).

presence of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in natural resource-poor areas can drive conflict between host communities and IDPs.¹⁸ There is also a risk that NSAGs in these contexts exploit these tensions to create further instability and gain influence in IDP areas, which they can target for recruitment.

1) Lessons from GCF Projects

In the project **Community-based Landscape Management for Enhanced Climate Resilience and Reduction of Deforestation in Critical Watersheds** by the Japan International Cooperation Agency, a strategic implementation of the Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) approach showcases the power of localized incentives in promoting behavioral change. By combining the traditional mutual support system with training courses, the project encourages the replication of sustainable and climate-resilient livelihood options. Moreover, the CBNRM mechanism is used, especially at the village level, to act as a stabilizing force, maintaining public order and preempting social conflict. Finally, members of a Central and Municipal Project Monitoring Team are trained to supervise, provide technical guidance, and most importantly, resolve any conflicts arising from the introduction of the CBNRM mechanism, ensuring a holistic approach to community-based conflict management.

2.2. Security Risks Generated by Projects

Forest and land use projects are not only subject to the increased risk of land-related competition when operating in FCS, but they also risk exacerbating pre-existing conflict dynamics. For example, they can create legal disputes over forest management, conservation, and restoration, including disagreements over forest zoning, protected

areas, and forest tenure reform, which can involve multiple actors. The following risks includes some of the most common related to forests and land:

Lack of access to forest resources: Projects aiming at reducing deforestation can create disputes over access and control of forest resources. Implementation and monitoring for forest restoration and sustainable forest management projects can also interfere with cultural norms and social dynamics. Evaluations of REDD+ projects in Tanzania, Uganda, Indonesia, and Panama provide some evidence on how new restrictive rules and regulations on forest-related livelihood options led to a decline in forest-based income and reduced yields, leading to food insecurity and poor nutrition.¹⁹ In most cases, community reactions to these restrictive measures led to conflict, with the level of violence depending on land tenure security. The less secure communities felt, the more violent their reaction to restrictions.²⁰

Weak land governance: Deforestation or sustainable management projects become complicated when communities lack proper land tenure mechanisms, rule of law, strong institutions, and timely and transparent land-related information.²¹ In these cases, there is an increased risk of projects related to land worsening the situation. They may not sufficiently engage with all relevant land right-holders and users, including indigenous communities, who may have relocated due to insecurity and conflict risks, thus causing further grievances and undermining their claims to their native land.

Land grabbing: Whether foreign interventions result in conflict depends not only on the intervention, but also on the perceived

¹⁸ Fomekong, Steve Tiwa. "Why communities hosting internally displaced persons in the Sahel need stronger and more effective legal protection," *International Review of the Red Cross*. (2022).

¹⁹ Alusiola, Rowan Alumasa, Schilling, Jan Peter and Klär, Paul. "REDD+ Conflict: Understanding the Pathways between Forest

Projects and Social Conflict." *Forests* 12, no. 6: 748. (2021). p. 13.

²⁰ Ibid., p.12.

²¹ UNEP. "Toolkit and guidance for preventing and managing land and natural resources conflict: Land and conflict." (2012). p. 27-30.

legitimacy and effectiveness of existing land and resource governance systems.²² Often, however, large land acquisitions in FCS have been associated with human rights violations and violence.²³

Cultural disruption and differing cultural values:

Different groups may have different cultural values and perceptions related to forests and land. For instance, indigenous communities may view forests as sacred or as integral parts of their identity, while others may view them primarily as economic resources.²⁴ Projects risk increasing tensions related to these dynamics if not they do not consider how a given forest is perceived by its users.

Marginalization of local stakeholders: Some forest-related projects are tied to climate change mitigation strategies like REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation).²⁵ These strategies often involve complex issues related to carbon credit trading and can lead to conflict due to perceived inequities or lack of transparency. For example, in REDD+ carbon forestry in Nigeria and Kenya, representation was given lower priority compared to implementation of other forestry project goals, despite the intervening agents requiring the representation of local people in decision-making.²⁶ The Location Carbon Committee's (LLCs) created by the implementing agents neglected the local elected government in both cases, specifically for the purpose of circumventing their authority.²⁷ This caused grievances and further marginalized local elected government, whose influence and perceived legitimacy with the local communities diminished as a result.

Maladaptation practices in watersheds:

Watersheds are dynamic systems characterized by diverse interactions and spatial relations between humans and the environment with their own socioeconomic, cultural and environmental relationships, flows and conflicts that manifest as 'mosaics' of different land-use systems.²⁸ Disrupting the upstream-downstream linkages can increase tensions among communities and lead to violent conflict if access to water becomes more restricted.

2) Lessons from GCF Projects

In the UNDP project **Enhancing Climate Resilience of India's Coastal Communities**, key lessons emphasize the power of community involvement and clear communication. The project designed early engagement and education aiming at reducing potential conflicts between restoration goals and community livelihoods. The project also underscores the necessity of a participatory, inclusive process in identifying beneficiaries, particularly focusing on the most vulnerable groups like women, youth, and Scheduled Castes and Tribes. The project has also established a framework for a Grievance Redress Mechanism so that conflict can be resolved to ensure an equitable distribution of project benefits.

2.3. Peace Responsiveness Entry Points

Forest and land use-related climate mitigation efforts can promote peace and stability by addressing the challenges faced by communities in FCS; examples of pathways include:

²² USAID. "Land and Conflict: A Toolkit for Intervention 2.0." Land Links. (2022). p. 7.

²³ Ibid. p. 10.

²⁴ OECD. "The importance of land for Indigenous economic development." OECD Library. (2020).

²⁵ Alusiola, Rowan Alumasa, Schilling, Jan Peter and Klär, Paul. "REDD+ Conflict: Understanding the Pathways between Forest Projects and Social Conflict." Forests 12, no. 6: 748. (2021).

²⁶ Ece, Melis, Ribot, Jesse, and Murombedzi, James. "Disempowering Democracy: Local Representation in Community and Carbon Forestry in Africa." Conservation and Society, 15(4). (2017). p. 365.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ FAO. "Watershed management." Forestry module. (2017). p. 2.

Increase access to forests and land: For many communities living in FCS, land and the benefits it provides are the most important source of livelihoods and income. Developing and implementing rules for equitable access to land is, therefore, critical for sustainable development and for tackling related challenges, such as malnutrition and unemployment.²⁹

Create economic opportunities: Sustainable forestry practices can create employment and economic opportunities across a wide range of sectors, if implemented in an inclusive and conflict-sensitive way. This will not only create livelihoods for vulnerable and marginalized groups, especially women, youth, and displaced communities, but also grow the forestry sector and promote more sustainable supply chains.³⁰

Sustainable resource management: Building better relationships between different communities can support more balanced management of finite land and forest resources, which are highly susceptible to overuse and even destruction in conflict contexts. Facilitating more efficient, transparent, and inclusive natural resource governance structures can also provide more sustainable livelihoods for communities.³¹

Securing land rights: Securing land tenure arrangements can improve the capacities of communities to adapt to the impact of climate change on livelihoods.³² Moreover, it can increase access to land for women, ethnic minorities, displaced populations, and vulnerable groups. Clear land tenure rules, transparent and inclusive land management, and equal access to land for all user groups can decrease the risk of conflict.³³ For

example, establishing boundaries between croplands and grazing lands can help reduce conflict between farmers and herders.³⁴

Trust-building and knowledge-sharing: Strengthening the linkages between governments and traditional authorities and building accountability and legitimacy between the individual and the state can foster better relationships and can enable the transfer of climate mitigation knowledge between the local groups and the government. For example, building trust between government and community groups makes it easier for the government to introduce new, climate-

“Sustainable forestry practices can create employment and economic opportunities across a wide range of sectors, if implemented in an inclusive and conflict-sensitive way.”

resilient crops. These improved crops will more likely address the needs of communities because project authorities, from the beginning, engaged with local people who have better knowledge of the environment.³⁵ The effectiveness of such an approach was highlighted in a joint UN Habitat-UNDP-FAO project in Democratic Republic of Congo. By using FAO's Participatory Negotiated Territorial Development (PNTD) approach, the project helped to reduce land-based disagreements by engaging land administrators, farmers, customary authorities, private actors, and armed groups in a participatory territorial analysis to help

²⁹ Adelphi, UNEP, and the EU. “Addressing climate-related security risks: Conflict sensitivity for climate change adaptation and sustainable livelihoods.” Guidance note. (2022). p. 33.

³⁰ Ecotree. “What is sustainable forestry and what are the benefits?” 5 May 2023. ([url](#))

³¹ Adelphi, UNEP, and the EU. “Addressing climate-related security risks: Conflict sensitivity for climate change adaptation and sustainable livelihoods.” Guidance note. (2022).

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

identify the underlying causes of issues surrounding natural resource access.³⁶

Strengthen community resilience: Conflict dynamics are often linked to a history of exclusion, marginalization, and inequality (real and perceived) between different groups. Focusing on equal participation and inclusion of local stakeholders in the design, planning and implementation of the project will ensure that marginalized people are able to voice their needs and concerns, which can contribute to community resilience. Their strong relationship and knowledge of the local environment can also foster shared meaning between conflicting parties.

Advance Non-Timber Forest Product Supply Chains: Supporting deforestation-free production can help grow the value of non-timber forest products (NTFPs), which can then increase sustainable forestry and provide alternative and better income opportunities for local producers. Realizing this potential, however, will require investing in other areas as well, such as micro-finance schemes, transportation, and training.³⁷

3. Recommendations

3.1. Conflict-sensitive Programming in the GCF

There is a wealth of guidance and tools available on how to deliver conflict-sensitive forest and land use projects and how to adequately address challenges as they arise:

Planning the project: The GCF's Initial Investment Framework may benefit by applying conflict sensitivity to the investment criteria, in particular 'needs of the recipient community', 'sustainable development

potential' and 'country ownership'. A robust application can then proceed, based on a strong understanding of the targeted area, including land ownership, geographic characteristics, land grabbing and other conflict dynamics. The framework addresses conflict impacts on land governance, on existing land reform initiatives, and on infrastructures for peace.³⁸ To do this, baseline analysis and stakeholder mapping can reveal issues and problems, as well as whom they affect and how.³⁹ Documenting these different realities experienced by different groups can improve the inclusivity of programming and help identify potential solutions, even among already-existing efforts. This stage can further ensure that the next steps are conflict-sensitive by defining a co-benefit indicator and acquiring free, prior, and informed consent from stakeholders.

Implementing the project: During activities' rollout, operational risks can be mitigated by robust early-warning systems for land conflict and insecurity, engagement with security officials, and contingency funding for security-related delays. Some planning tools can help mitigate the risks of contributing to insecurity and operational risks by extension. For example, stakeholder mapping can clearly define the beneficiaries, staff, and partners,⁴⁰ helping the project start with the least controversial issues to build confidence between stakeholders.⁴¹ At this stage, negative impacts can be further prevented by regularly engaging stakeholders and addressing their concerns, in particular through adequate grievance and compensation mechanisms. Activities promote increased security when implementing staff and partners display

³⁶ FAO. "Peace and Food Security: Investing in resilience to sustain rural livelihoods amid conflict." Technical note. (2016). p. 11.

³⁷ CIFOR. "Forests and Non-timber forests products." blog post

³⁸ CDA. "Conflict Sensitivity in Land Governance: The Do No Harm Framework and Other Tools for Practitioners of Land

Activities." Cambridge, MA: CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. (2022). p. 18-19.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 52-53.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 56.

⁴¹ UNEP. "Toolkit and guidance for preventing and managing land and natural resources conflict: Land and conflict." (2012).

positive behavior patterns to beneficiaries.⁴² How project resources are distributed should consider potential negative impacts.⁴³ Regular and open communication can bring stakeholders closer, revealing opportunities for peace dividends and raising awareness for durable dispute resolution mechanisms. Finally, a well-designed exit strategy can ensure that land conflict does not reignite and that resilience to compounded climate-related risks is increased.⁴⁴

Monitoring and evaluating the project: During and after activities, it is key to monitor both operational risks and the project's impacts on the security context. Data on the evolution and emergence of sources of tension and cohesion, on land issues, and on the implementation of conflict sensitivity measures is particularly relevant. It may also be helpful to assess perceptions of the project and potential negative effects of resource allocation (whether real or perceived), and the perception of RAFT (Respect, Accountability, Fairness and Transparency) on the part of beneficiaries.⁴⁵

Throughout the project: The project can be more conflict-sensitive across planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation activities through conflict resolution training for staff, a designated conflict and peace focal point, consistent inclusion of beneficiaries, and information transparency.⁴⁶

3.2. Peacebuilding Actions Related to Forests and Land Use

Promoting benefit sharing and conflict resolution governance structures: Promoting equitable

access and usage of natural resources, for example by implementing transparent and inclusive governance systems that ensure fair distribution of benefits, can also reduce competition and increase the trust and legitimacy of institutions.

Using existing GCF policies: GCF has a network of policies available for Accredited Entities (AEs), including issue-specific policies. For example, the Indigenous People Policy (IPP) aims to prevent harm and bring positive changes to vulnerable communities.⁴⁷ From a conflict governance point of view, the policy appears to be particularly advanced about land tenure conflicts and redress mechanisms.

The IPP prescribes AEs to work with indigenous people to prepare project-specific plans that ensure the recognition of property rights in accordance with applicable laws and with "customs, traditions and land tenure systems."⁴⁸

Supporting livelihood diversification: Projects can support livelihood diversification and provide economic opportunities for displaced populations. They can also help address youth unemployment and recruitment into armed groups. This can involve training and capacity-building programs to develop skills related to sustainable agriculture, agroforestry, eco-tourism, or renewable energy, and other nature-based enterprises. By providing viable economic alternatives, peacebuilding initiatives can reduce the pressure on forests for subsistence and income, thus contributing to forest conservation efforts.

⁴² Ibid., p. 39-41.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 37-38.

⁴⁴ European Commission. Guidance notes on conflict sensitivity in development cooperation – An update and supplement to the EU staff handbook on 'Operating in situations of conflict and fragility.' Publications Office of the European Union. 2021.

⁴⁵ CDA. "Conflict Sensitivity in Land Governance: The Do No Harm Framework and Other Tools for Practitioners of Land

Activities." Cambridge, MA: CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. (2022). p. 39-41.

⁴⁶ USAID. "Operational Guidelines for Responsible Land-based Investment." (2015).

⁴⁷ GCF. "Indigenous People Policy." (2018).

⁴⁸ GCF. "FP160: Monrovia Metropolitan Climate Resilience Project." (2021). p. 15.

Securing land rights: There is no 'one size fits all' approach when it comes to securing land tenure and rights; it will depend on the legal, cultural and environmental conditions in the specific context.⁴⁹ Projects can help recognize communities' rights to land by developing tailor-made, context-specific, and participatory land use planning strategies. The approach must ensure that local stakeholders — especially women, youth, marginalized communities, indigenous peoples, displaced populations, chiefdoms authorities, tribes and other groups — have legal recognition and ownership of land.

Addressing the gender gap: Projects can promote equal rights to land and address the gender gap in land tenure by empowering women and women's groups to actively participate in land governance decision-making. They can inform and support land governance institutions, including customary institutions, to be more inclusive and to invite more women's participation.⁵⁰ This could start, for example, from working to achieve a better gender balance in community decision-making bodies for land use planning and natural resource management. Also, where

discriminatory customary practices are deeply embedded, a strategy could be to work with the least discriminatory institutions to try to change the status quo. Then — with generated evidence, experience, raised voices, and confidence — the project can address other institutions more resistant to change.

Fostering partnerships with civil society: Due to the lack of agreement and clarity on land ownership in many FCS, it is important to foster partnerships with civil society organizations (CSOs). The partnerships can attempt to resolve conflicts related to land rights through peacebuilding actions, such as those promoting benefit sharing and resource governance. Using participatory approaches to sustainable land use in the development of project design and/or implementation can help tailor the project and its objectives to the target country. For example, the FAO used a participatory analysis, including a rapid landscape analysis, to engage with different stakeholders. They promoted more sustainable food systems and healthy diets through a deeper understanding of the importance of territorial approaches.⁵¹

4. Recommended Reading:

Adelphi, UNEP, and the EU. "Addressing climate-related security risks: Conflict sensitivity for climate change adaptation and sustainable livelihoods." Guidance note, toolbox, and monitoring and evaluation note. (2022). [URL](#)

CDA. "Conflict Sensitivity in Land Governance: The Do No Harm Framework and Other Tools for Practitioners of Land Activities." Cambridge, MA: CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. (2022). [URL](#)

International alert. "Practice note 7: Conflict-sensitive land policy and land governance in Africa." Strengthening the Economic Dimensions of Peacebuilding. (2011). [URL](#)

Läderach, Peter, Julian Ramirez-Villegas, Giulia Caroli, Claudia Sadoff, and Grazia Pacillo. "Climate Finance and Peace—Tackling the Climate and Humanitarian Crisis." *The Lancet Planetary Health* 5, no. 12 (December 2021): e856–58. [URL](#)

⁴⁹ Wehrmann, Babette and Lange, Andrea, "Secure Land Tenure Rights for All: A key condition for sustainable development." GIZ. (2019).

⁵⁰ SDC. "Gender and Land Governance." Guidance note. (2017). p. 5.

⁵¹ FAO. "Using a participatory analysis to strengthen multi-level territorial governance for sustainable food systems and healthy diets." FAO. (2023). p. 5.

Locke, Anna and Henley, Giles. "Topic Guide: Land." ODI. (2014). [URL](#)

Najim, Tara, Zwijnenburg, Wim, Nahas, Noor, and Jaramillo Vasquez, Roberto. "Axed & Burned: How Conflict-caused Deforestation Impacts Environmental, Socio-economic and Climate Resilience in Syria." Pax for Peace. (2023). [URL](#)

OECD. "Forests and Violent Conflict." OECD DAC Issues Brief. (2005).

OECD. 'Land and Violent Conflict.' *OECD DAC Issues Brief*. 2005.

Scartozzi, Cesare M. "Conflict Sensitive Climate Finance: Lessons from the Green Climate Fund." Climate Policy. (2023). [URL](#)

Umwelt Bundesamt. "Guidelines for conflict-sensitive adaptation to climate change." Final Report. (2022). [URL](#)

UNEP. "Toolkit and guidance for preventing and managing land and natural resources conflict: Land and conflict." (2012). [URL](#)

UN-Habitat. "Land and Conflict: Lessons from The Field on Conflict Sensitive Land Governance and Peacebuilding." (2018). [URL](#)

USAID. "Land and Conflict: A Toolkit for Intervention 2.0." Land Links. (2022). [URL](#)

5. Bibliography

Adelphi, UNEP, and the EU. "Addressing climate-related security risks: Conflict sensitivity for climate change adaptation and sustainable livelihoods." Guidance note, toolbox, and monitoring and evaluation note. (2022). [URL](#)

Alusiola, Rowan Alumasa, Schilling, Jan Peter and Klär, Paul. "REDD+ Conflict: Understanding the Pathways between Forest Projects and Social Conflict." *Forests* 12, no. 6: 748. (2021). [URL](#)

CDA. "Conflict Sensitivity in Land Governance: The Do No Harm Framework and Other Tools for Practitioners of Land Activities." Cambridge, MA: CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. (2022). [URL](#)

CEOBS. "Deforestation in conflict areas in 2020." (2021). [URL](#)

CIFOR. "Forests and Non-timber forests products." blog post. [URL](#)

DRC. "Conflict Analysis Guidelines." Guidance note. (2020). [URL](#)

Ece, Melis, Ribot, Jesse, and Murombedzi, James. "Disempowering Democracy: Local Representation in Community and Carbon Forestry in Africa." *Conservation and Society*, 15(4). (2017). [URL](#)

Ecotree. "What is sustainable forestry and what are the benefits?" (2023). [URL](#)

European Commission. "Guidance notes on conflict sensitivity in development cooperation – An update and supplement to the EU staff handbook on 'Operating in situations of conflict and fragility.'" Publications Office of the European Union. (2021). [URL](#)

FAO. "Peace and Food Security: Investing in resilience to sustain rural livelihoods amid conflict." Technical note. (2016). [URL](#)

FAO. "Watershed management." Forestry module. (2017). [URL](#)

FAO. "Using a participatory analysis to strengthen multi-level territorial governance for sustainable food systems and healthy diets." FAO. (2023). [URL](#)

Fomekong, Steve Tiwa. "Why communities hosting internally displaced persons in the Sahel need stronger and more effective legal protection," *International Review of the Red Cross*. (2022). [URL](#)

GCF. "Forest and Land Use Sectoral Guide." Sectoral Guide Series, Yeonsu: Green Climate Fund. (2022).

GCF. 'Thematic Briefs: Forests and Land Use.'

GCF. "Indigenous People Policy." (2018). [URL](#)

GCF. "FP160: Monrovia Metropolitan Climate Resilience Project." (2021). [URL](#)

Goldwyn, R., and Chigas, D. "Monitoring and evaluating conflict sensitivity - methodological challenges and practical solutions." CARE and CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. (2013). [URL](#)

Hammill, Anne with Alec Crawford, Robert Craig, Robert Malpas and Richard Matthew. "Conflict-Sensitive Conservation Practitioners' Manual." International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). (2009). [URL](#)

Najim, Tara, Zwijnenburg, Wim, Nahas, Noor, and Jaramillo Vasquez, Roberto. "Axed & Burned: How Conflict-caused Deforestation Impacts Environmental, Socio-economic and Climate Resilience in Syria." Pax for Peace. (2023). [URL](#)

NRGI. "The Resource Curse The Political and Economic Challenges of Natural Resource Wealth." The NRG Reader. (2015). [URL](#)

OECD. "The importance of land for Indigenous economic development." OECD Library. (2020). [URL](#)

Peaceful Change initiative. 'The conflict sensitivity operational toolkit: a practical approach.' 2022.

SDC. "Gender and Land Governance." Guidance note. (2017). [URL](#)

UN. "The United Nations and Land and Conflict." Note to the Secretary General. (2019). [URL](#)

UNHCR. "FAO and UNHCR launch new tool to save forests in displacement-affected areas." (2018). [URL](#)

UNEP. "Toolkit and guidance for preventing and managing land and natural resources conflict: Land and conflict." (2012). [URL](#)

USAID. "Land and Conflict: A Toolkit for Intervention 2.0." Land Links. (2022). [URL](#)

USAID. "Operational Guidelines for Responsible Land-based Investment." (2015). [URL](#)

Wehrmann, Babette and Lange, Andrea, "Secure Land Tenure Rights for All: A key condition for sustainable development." GIZ. (2019). [URL](#)

About the Series:

The “Guidance Notes for Peace-Informed Programming at the Green Climate Fund” is a thematic series published by CGIAR in partnership with Interpeace, with the support of TrustWorks Global. The series consists of eight briefs that provide sectoral risk analyses and guidance tailored to the Green Climate Fund's Result Areas. Recognizing the complex nexus between climate change and peace, the series aims to provide actionable strategies to assist both Accredited Entities and Direct Entities to understand and manage project risks as well as to maximize opportunities to promote peace. The series is published as part of the Climate Security Programming Dashboard for Climate Finance (**CSPDxCF**). The dashboard is an all-in-one solution for preliminary conflict sensitive assessments and tailored guidance, targeting projects funded by international financial institutions and climate funds.

CGIAR-Interpeace Partnership:

CGIAR Focus Climate Security and Interpeace collaborate at the intersection of climate finance, conflict, and peace. Drawing from CGIAR's expertise in climate science and Interpeace's experience accompanying peacebuilding processes, they aim to enhance conflict sensitive climate finance and improve the delivery of funds towards communities most at risk.

Related Briefs and Toolkits:

- Climate Security Programming Dashboard for Climate Finance (**CSPDxCF**).
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Health, Food, and Water Security.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Livelihoods of People and Communities.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Infrastructure and Built Environment.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Ecosystems and Ecosystem Services.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Energy Generation and Access.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Buildings, Cities, Industries, and Appliances.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Forest and Land Use.

Discover all the related guidance notes and the **CSPDxCF** dashboard at:

<http://cspd.cso.cgiar.org/>.

Authors: Cesare M. Scartozzi⁺, Giulia Caroli⁺, Carolina Sarzana⁺, Peter Läderach⁺, Grazia Pacillo⁺, Daniel Hyslop[°], Andreas Luis Hahn[°], Elio Azar[°], Giorgia Nicatore, Oliver Brown^x, Komal Hassamal^x, Simon Ehmsen^x.

⁺ Alliance Bioversity International - CIAT / CGIAR FOCUS Climate Security

[°] Interpeace, International Organization for Peacebuilding

^x TrustWorks Global

Publication Date: 21/11/2023

Copyright: 2023 CGIAR System Organization, CC BY 4.0.

Disclaimer: This publication has been prepared for information purposes only. No claim or representation is made or warranty given as to the accuracy, completeness or authenticity of the information. CGIAR, the Alliance of Bioversity & CIAT, and Interpeace shall not in any way be held liable for any loss or direct or indirect damage caused by any inaccuracies or errors in the publication. The publication is an independent product and is not affiliated with, endorsed by, or sponsored by the Green Climate Fund.

Acknowledgements: This work was carried out with support of the CGIAR Initiative on Climate Resilience (ClimBeR) and the CGIAR Initiative on Fragility, Conflict, and Migration (FCM). We would like to thank all funders who supported this research through their contributions to the [CGIAR Trust Fund](#).

CGIAR System Organization:

1000, Avenue Agropolis,
F-34394 Montpellier, France.
P: +33 (0)467047800

Alliance Bioversity & CIAT:

Via di San Domenico, 1,
00153 Rome, Italy.
P: +39 0661181

Interpeace Head Office:

Maison de la Paix,
2E Chemin Eugène-Rigot,
1202 Geneva, Switzerland.