



EN

THIS ACTION IS FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

ANNEX V

of the Commission Implementing Decision on the 2021 annual action plan for the global threats part of the thematic programme on peace, stability and conflict prevention

Action Document for Climate Change, Environmental Degradation and Security (CC)

ANNUAL PLAN

This document constitutes the annual work programme in the sense of Article 110(2) of the Financial Regulation, and action plans in the sense of Article 23 of Regulation (EU) 2021/947 establishing the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe

1. SYNOPSIS

1.1. Action Summary Table

1. Title CRIS/OPSYS business reference Basic Act	Climate Change, Environmental Degradation and Security (CC) OPSYS/CRIS ¹ number: NDICI THREATS FPI/2021/43399 Financed under the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI-Global Europe)			
2. Team Europe Initiative	No			
3. Zone benefiting from the action	The action shall be carried out in the Horn of Africa, the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), and West Africa and the Sahel.			
4. Programming document	Peace, Stability and Conflict Prevention Thematic Programme 2021 - 2027			
5. Link with relevant MIP(s) objectives/expected results	Priority 8 - Addressing global and trans-regional effects of climate change and environmental factors having a potentially destabilising impact on peace and security Specific Objective 1: Strengthen capacities, institutions and policies, and support relevant initiatives at national, regional and multinational levels to understand and address climate/environment security risks and provide support to international dialogue and cooperation in this area, including for the sharing of information and best practices.			
PRIORITY AREAS AND SECTOR INFORMATION				
6. Priority Area(s), sectors	Addressing global and trans-regional effects of climate change and related environmental factors having a potentially destabilising impact on peace and security			
7. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	Main SDG: 13 (Climate Action) Other significant SDGs: 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions) and 17 (Partnership for the Goals)			
8 a) DAC code(s)	15210 - Security system management and reform 41010 - Environmental policy and administrative management			
8 b) Main Delivery Channel	10000 public sector institutions			
9. Targets	<input type="checkbox"/> Migration <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate <input type="checkbox"/> Social inclusion and Human Development <input type="checkbox"/> Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Human Rights, Democracy and Governance			
10. Markers (from DAC form)	General policy objective	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective

¹ Depending on the availability of OPSYS at the time of encoding, a provisional CRIS number may need to be provided.

	Participation development/good governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Aid to environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Gender equality and women's and girl's empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Trade development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reproductive, maternal, new-born and child health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Disaster Risk Reduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Inclusion of persons with disabilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Nutrition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	RIO Convention markers	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Biological diversity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Combat desertification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change adaptation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Internal markers and Tags:	Policy objectives	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Digitalisation Tags: digital connectivity digital governance digital entrepreneurship job creation digital skills/literacy digital services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Connectivity Tags: transport people2people energy digital connectivity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Migration (methodology for tagging under development)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reduction of Inequalities (methodology for marker and tagging under development)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Covid-19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BUDGET INFORMATION				
12. Amounts concerned	Budget line(s) (article, item): BGUE-B2021-14.020230 – STABILITY AND PEACE - GLOBAL AND TRANSREGIONAL THREATS Total estimated cost: EUR 6 000 000 Total amount of EU budget contribution EUR 6 000 000			
MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION				
13. Type of financing	Project Modality Indirect management through delegation agreement to United Nations Environment Programme			

1.2. Summary of the Action

This action builds on an established EU-UNEP partnership that has sought, in its first phase (2017-22), to develop integrated approaches to conflict analysis and to deliver actions on the ground to address compound climate-conflict risks, with a particular focus on two countries (Sudan and Nepal). This partnership has, to date, delivered global, national and local analysis and risk management strategies, and strengthened institutional and policy frameworks for addressing climate-related security risks.

The proposed second phase of this partnership will build on the conceptual frameworks and practical experience developed during phase 1, within a much-strengthened policy framework. From 2022-26, UNEP and EU partners will deploy tools and capacities developed since 2017 to enhance environment and climate-security analysis and preventive action to address conflict and fragility risks. The next phase will have a global thematic dimension, delivering science and environmental analysis to inform EU and UN conflict prevention and peacebuilding initiatives.

The partnership will work to address emerging environment-related risks, with a focus on transboundary dimensions, in a broad region encompassing the Horn of Africa, the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), and West Africa and the Sahel. This choice is due to the vulnerability of these regions to both environmental and conflict risks, and the deep, complex interconnections between environment, climate change and security that characterise them. Both UNEP and the EU have many active scientific and cooperative relationships and ongoing initiatives in these regions, which will provide an important basis for the proposed cross-cutting and inter-disciplinary work.

By leveraging joint analysis, institutional and systems capacity, and established partnerships at the headquarters and field level, the EU-UNEP partnership will play a key role in:

- Ensuring that national, EU and UN policymakers covering development, peace and security issues in these crisis-affected regions base decisions and investments on clearly presented science-based assessments of emerging environment- and climate-related risks;
- Designing policies, plans and consensus-building dialogue processes that address emerging environment-related risks to peace and security and resolve crises, including those relating to natural resource management, environmental governance, and climate adaptation;
- Supporting programmatic innovation and increasing capacity to address risks, building on the programming experience developed during the first five years of the EU-UNEP partnership.

In addressing the interdependence between security and climate change, the action directly responds to one objective of the Thematic Programme for Peace, Stability and Conflict prevention which aims to strengthen capacities, institutions and policies, and support relevant initiatives at local national, regional and multinational levels to understand and address climate security risks.

It also directly addresses Sustainable Development Goal 13 ‘Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts’ and all of its associated targets, as well as indirectly addressing SDG 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities; SDG 17: Partnership for the Goals.

2. RATIONALE

2.1. Context

Climate change and environmental degradation are interdependent challenges that are widely recognized as risks to international security and stability and threat multipliers. Climate change in particular exacerbates existing social, economic and environmental risks, which can further contribute to tensions and conflict. Security concerns linked to climate change and environmental degradation include impacts on food, water and energy supply, increased competition over natural resources, loss of livelihoods, climate-related disasters, and forced migration or displacement. In conflict-affected countries, climate change can exacerbate existing security risks and vulnerabilities. At the same time, state fragility hinders climate-change adaptation efforts, particularly among the most vulnerable communities.

Sustained analysis and monitoring of the interaction between physical environmental changes and related socio-economic, demographic and governance variables can help decision-makers to identify emerging environment-and climate-related risks to peace. Such detailed analysis can ensure that governments and international partners have sufficient time to design science-based, context-specific, inclusive policies and plans to address such risks. Plans then need to be translated into actions – which may include development initiatives and political/diplomatic processes – in order to address risks before they degenerate into crises.

The Horn of Africa, Middle East and North Africa, and West Africa/Sahel are some of the regions in Europe’s proximity or immediate neighbourhood facing numerous, interconnected challenges relating to climate change, environmental degradation, peace and security. They are affected by longstanding political fault-lines, including conflicts in the Levant, escalating tensions in the Horn, and high levels of violence in the parts of the Sahel. Deep historical relationships nonetheless bind the people of these regions – including ties that have developed via the shared use of major natural features and resources. These include the Mediterranean and Red Seas, which have facilitated trading and cultural relationships over thousands of years; shared transboundary water resources including the Nile, Jordan, Euphrates and Tigris rivers; and socio-cultural ties and trading patterns that transcend national boundaries in the Sahel.

Analysis and action are required at the regional level (in addition to country-specific level work) to address environment-conflict risks, because climatic, environmental and governance changes transcend national boundaries. The combination of changed precipitation patterns, infrastructure, and land use upstream, for example, can have

profound impacts on water availability, quality and agricultural productivity among communities downstream. In such contexts, understanding the sources of emerging problems – and identifying solutions that account for and accommodate inter-state relationships and natural resource-sharing arrangements, or lack thereof – requires detailed understanding of current and projected environmental change, and of existing investment patterns, institutional and traditional governance arrangements, and other factors.

Climate change and environmental degradation are already exerting a complex range of stresses on these regions, impacting water, food and energy supplies, and exacerbating strains associated with population growth and urbanization. In both the Horn of Africa and Sahel regions, changed precipitation patterns contribute to more intense floods and droughts, impacting key livelihoods such as pastoralism and agriculture while water stress is already evident as a result of unsustainable water management. In the Horn of Africa, a combination of conflict, displacement, desert locusts and flooding contributed to a situation in which 20 million people were already facing acute food insecurity before the arrival of COVID-19. Adverse weather conditions, conflicts and the pandemic have further increased food insecurity in this region, with much of the Horn now forecast to be facing food crises by July 2021 (see WFP-FAO report March-July 2021). Movement across national boundaries has historically been an important strategy for people whose livelihoods depend on natural resources; however, both security issues and climate change are already dramatically changing these traditional migration patterns. Moreover, sea level rise is already impacting many regional states in West Africa, East Africa, the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, and forcing both internal and international migration.

Other climate-related changes are less direct, but equally profound. The global energy transition is already impacting highly exposed, low-resilience oil producing states such as Libya and Iraq, while growing demand for minerals critical to clean energy transition will impact other states. Climate change is also contributing to global food price shocks, affecting countries such as Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon that combine high food imports with high household spending on food. Furthermore, climate change, water stress and land degradation are shifting land use and ownership, with major implications for regional food and water resources. Gulf countries have invested heavily in land in the Horn of Africa during the past two decades, which may lead to further natural resource changes as purchased land becomes operational for commercial agriculture and industries.

Addressing escalating climate- and natural resource-related challenges will require coordinated policy and practical interventions, including agreements on transboundary resource-sharing, investments in ecosystem restoration, and technological innovations to address scarcity and foster sustainable resource use and productivity. Interventions need to be guided by solid environmental data and monitoring; by an understanding of regional governance and security trends; and by knowledge of best-practice environmental solutions, including the sustainable resource-sharing and peacebuilding opportunities that such solutions may offer.

The geographical scope of this action is broad and as such, it covers many countries in which persistent and significant challenges to governance and rule of law are further amplified by the convergence of climate change, conflict and insecurity. The action aims to increase the sensitivity of actions and interventions to these challenges in order to ensure a more tailored response to such fragile contexts.

The proposed emphasis on data-driven analyses backed up by qualitative assessments will permit a much more nuanced understanding of these contexts and the multiple interlinked challenges which they present. Such an approach will also add a further dimension to early warning systems and thus aims to ensure that responses to climate- and environment-related aggravations of latent tensions and emerging conflicts will be more adapted to the drivers of instability and the effects of different groups.

A more thorough understanding of how climate change and environmental challenges can affect conflict dynamics and the rights of communities in fragile countries and the governance in such regions can inform and result in greater protection of their rights and provide them with tools to anticipate and adapt to threats to their livelihoods and security.

2.2. Problem Analysis

Priority Area and sectors:

This action is proposed under Priority 8 of the Thematic MIP: Addressing global and trans-regional effects of climate change and related environmental factors having a potentially destabilising impact on peace and security

Key cross-cutting issues: The action directly addresses climate-change, environmental degradation and conflict sensitivity and prioritises the integration of gender considerations in the analysis of climate-related security risks, as well as the design of inclusive policy solutions and programmatic responses to build resilience to these risks. As such, its principal objective is to ensure that these cross-cutting issues are better integrated into peacebuilding actions.

Identification of main stakeholders and corresponding institutional and/or organisational issues (mandates, potential roles, and capacities) to be covered by the action:

The principal implementing partner will be UNEP, which will act in close coordination with fellow members of the UN Climate Security Mechanism (UNDP and DPPA), special political missions and peacekeeping missions, regional representatives and resident coordinator offices, and in liaison with local partners with region- or country-specific expertise. The action seeks to leverage and build upon the multiple initiatives carried out under the auspices of the UN Climate Security Mechanism in the focus regions, as well as those of other partnerships between the UN family and the EU.

The impact of the action depends on close collaboration at different levels with EU actors within the focus regions, including EU Delegations, EU Special Representatives, ECHO offices and HQ, Common Security and Defence Policy missions; regional and thematic programmers at HQ level. Synergies between the proposed activity and EU tools and in-house expertise, such as Copernicus, the EU's Earth Observation Programme or JRC climate data initiatives will also be actively prioritised.

Further assessment of stakeholders and regional/national partners pending the following stages of definition of geographical scope of the action.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

3.1. Objectives and Expected Outputs

The Overall Objective (Impact) of this action is to support fragile and crisis-affected regions, countries and communities to achieve resilience and sustain peace by addressing the climate and environmental risks that drive conflict and instability.

The Specific Objectives (Outcomes) of this action focus on three priorities:

- 1 European Union and United Nations peacebuilding and conflict transformation efforts are informed by science-based, integrated risk assessments, in order to simultaneously reduce conflict risks, build peace and security, and strengthen partners' capacity in relation to climate change adaptation and resilience to environmental degradation.
- 2 Effective policy responses and measures at national, regional and global level address security threats related to climate change and ensure fluid articulation between these levels.
- 3 Communities have an enhanced capacity to build resilience to climate change- and environment-related risks and security threats at local level.

The Outputs to be delivered by this action contributing to the corresponding Specific Objectives (Outcomes) are:

- 1.1 Environmental analysis for integrated risk identification is delivered including interactive geospatial tools, written risk assessments and direct data feeds into early warning systems;
- 1.2 Complementarity of EU-UN data and analysis tools for environmental and climate-related risks to peace and security is enhanced
- 2.1 Policy measures and planning support to address cross-cutting environmental risks to peace and security are proposed in close collaboration with partners;
- 2.2 Spaces and frameworks for dialogue are optimised to facilitate horizontal and vertical collaboration, information-sharing, and co-development of solutions;
- 3.1 Communities have access to strategies and tools to enhance their resilience to climate change; and their capacity to anticipate and address environmental risks to peace and security is enhanced.

3.2. Indicative Activities

Activities related to Output 1.1 and 1.2

- i. UNEP will deliver **state-of-the-art analyses** of earth observation data, consolidated in simplified thematic indicators and visualisations over space and time;
- i. **Written assessments of climate and environment-related risks to peace and security** will identify sub-regional areas at risk by integrating data-driven insights with political economy analysis and qualitative information;

- i. **Direct data feeds from the STRATA platform into EU-based systems** will support the socio-political assessments and could be channelled through the EU's Destination Earth Digital Twin platform, **further enhancing interoperability** with EU data sets and systems.

Activities related to Output 2.1 and 2.2:

- i. UNEP will work with regional, UN and EU partners to design **politically informed and inclusive environmental policy solutions** that can be implemented in complex or insecure contexts;
- ii. UNEP will work in **close partnership with UN and EU actors and national experts and networks**, to ensure that international, national and sub-national policies and plans address drivers of environmental degradation, support transboundary dialogue on environmental management and natural resource-sharing, and are based on a solid understanding of security and policy constraints.

Activities related to Output 3:

- i. UNEP will work with local experts and networks to **translate climate and environment-related plans into action**, and scale solutions for conflict prevention and resilience-building at the transboundary, national and sub-national levels.
- ii. UNEP will build on its expertise on environmental governance, climate adaptation planning, integrated programming solutions in crisis-affected contexts to address climate-related security risks at community level.

3.3. Mainstreaming

Environmental Protection & Climate Change: As stated, the overall objective of this action is to support fragile and crisis-affected regions, countries and communities to achieve resilience and sustain peace by addressing the climate and environmental risks that drive conflict and instability through enhanced capacity to provide data and analysis leading to sound policy response and community-level action.

As such, environmental and climate risk assessment is the core component of the action itself and no further assessment is deemed necessary. It is also evident that environmental protection and climate change are the essence of the action and thus do not require further mainstreaming.

Gender Equality and empowerment of women and girls: As per OECD Gender DAC codes identified in section 1.1, this action is labelled as G1. This implies that gender equality will be mainstreaming through every output, starting with the inclusion of gender-disaggregated data, which can help inform policy that takes into account the specific effects of climate change on the security of women and girls, minorities and other vulnerable groups.

Human Rights: This action aims to ensure a rights-based approach which takes into account the fact that climate change acts as a threat multiplier and its effects on vulnerable populations.

Democracy: The action will ensure that actions particularly at the policy formulation and community level are inclusive, participatory and emerge from partners themselves enhancing ownership by institutions and civil society alike.

Conflict sensitivity, peace and resilience: This action aims to further improve conflict sensitivity in recognising the need to integrate an evidence-based understanding of the impacts of climate change and environmental degradation into analysis and policy to ultimately ensure more responsive action in peacebuilding and conflict resolution at all levels of engagement.

Disaster Risk Reduction: DRR is a core tenet of the adaptation/mitigation aspect of this action. Policy proposals and responses will be formulated with a view to strengthening the capacity of partner regions, countries and communities to anticipate and adapt to the effects of climate change and environmental degradation.

3.4. Risks and Lessons Learnt

Category	Risks	Likelihood (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Mitigating measures
1.	Lack of political support on the part of governments/regional or local authorities for analytical/policy processes	M	H	Staff working on this action will be expected to work hand in hand with UN/EU political missions and representations to manage risks and incentivise collaboration.

3.	Guidance adopted to assess climate and security risks is not robust enough to detect empirical links and generalize findings	L	M	Peer review guidance and have an iterative process in conducting field studies. Use other empirical sources and case studies to supplement field findings.
2,3.	Data needed to perform analysis using climate change and security risk analysis is not available at national level	H	M	Work with regional and/or sub-national datasets, including geospatial data.
1.	Lack of entry points for capacity building with the Government	M	M	Identify potential entry points in other ministries or at different levels or through other existing projects, train focal points outside the selected country, access focal points through trans-boundary fora and other international agencies
1, 3.	Safety and security conditions in selected countries or regions do not allow activities to take place as planned	H	M	Select community action locations based on feasibility analysis (political, security, logistical factors) and in consultation with local actors Prioritise locations in which a reasonable level of security expected during action life cycle. Alternatively, online convening of meetings may permit action implementation even if security issues or other access issues prevent in-person presence.
3.	Communities will not implement conflict resilience measures due to a lack of trust	L	H	Identify projects and partners that already have a track record and a good level of community trust. Engage with field-based partners from the outset to understand how different proposals might be interpreted and understood.

Lessons Learnt:

This action builds on an established EU-UNEP partnership that has sought, in its first phase (2017-22), to develop integrated approaches to conflict analysis and to deliver actions on the ground to address compound climate-conflict risks. Where Early evidence from the implementation of the pilot project suggests that interventions are being delivered in Sudan and Nepal, there is evidence of the project's contributions to conflict prevention and peacebuilding in target communities, while at the national level, early indications point to improvements in planning for and responding to climate-related security risks. Globally, the project has contributed to shaping the emerging policy agenda on climate-security through strategic engagement with key entities and enhanced system-wide capacity for understanding, identifying and addressing climate-related security risks.

Within this action, lessons and good practices from the pilot phase will be adapted and scaled in different contexts. The following preliminary lessons for programme design and implementation are emerging from the project's interventions in Nepal and Sudan:

- i. Climate adaptation and resilience building interventions can contribute to peacebuilding at local levels, when delivered in a conflict-sensitive way.

In both pilot countries, the project used interventions around environmental governance and livelihoods as a platform for bringing conflicting groups together for a common purpose, facilitating more meaningful and regular exchanges between different groups and laying the foundation for building more inclusive and equitable natural resource governance mechanisms. In this light, the project helped to reframe climate and environmental challenges in conflict-affected contexts as an opportunity for collaboration rather than a source of potential conflict, an approach that serves as a replicable and scalable example for conflict-sensitive resilience building programme design.

- ii. In conflict-affected and climate-vulnerable contexts, such interventions offer opportunities for strengthening the leadership and political and economic inclusion of vulnerable or marginalised groups.

The meaningful inclusion of marginalised or vulnerable groups in all levels of decision-making is essential for building durable peace, yet in many contexts deep-seated power dynamics as well as social or gender norms exclude particular groups from engaging governance mechanisms or leadership roles. The pilot interventions in Sudan and Nepal demonstrated that specifically targeting vulnerable or marginalised groups through activities such as sustainable livelihoods and natural resource management can serve as an entry point to building more inclusive governance mechanisms, thus transforming underlying social, economic and political drivers of insecurity and conflict. This has led to measurable improvements in community-government relationships and has also influenced how different groups are

perceived in their communities.

- iii. Influencing national planning and policy practices on climate-related security risks requires sustained technical engagement with government stakeholders.

While the pilot projects have already resulted in initial uptake of approaches to address climate-related security risks at local levels, achieving consensus and coordinated action at the national level remains challenging, not least because of the sensitive political nature of national security. Although lower levels of uptake of findings and recommendations from climate-security analysis in national policy and planning processes are multifactorial, the overt emphasis on peace and security aspects may have ultimately politicised the analysis and undermined the adoption of an actionable strategy within the national governments involved. Meaningful influence at the national level requires regular and sustained technical engagement with key actors, especially in the context of a government transition. Standing capacity to provide policy advice and support – whether directly to national governments or through partnerships with UN and field-based actors – is essential to ensuring environmental and climate-related considerations are both mainstreamed across national planning processes and recognised as areas of opportunity for building and sustaining peace.

3.5. The Intervention Logic

The underlying intervention logic for this action is that

IF EU and UN teams in crisis-affected regions and countries recognize and monitor key environmental changes and how they interact over time with socio-economic, political and security factors, including through using accessible, up-to-date geospatial monitoring systems;

AND IF EU and UN leaders in crisis-affected regions and countries have access to clearly communicated environmental analysis, advisory services, and the knowledge necessary to engage their national government counterparts regularly around environmental challenges (including transboundary dimensions) with implications for regional or national stability;

AND IF EU and UN leaders, in their engagements with Heads of Government and other stakeholders, systematically raise science-based concerns about environmental change and its consequences and propose viable, politically-informed, best practice solutions to address key environmental challenges relating to climate change—including environmental governance solutions;

THEN the EU and the UN system will provide strong, sustained support to governments in identifying emerging environmental challenges with potential consequences for peace, security and stability, and in offering best practice solutions to address challenges and seize opportunities for positive transformation.

3.6. Logical Framework Matrix

Results	Results chain (e): Main expected results (maximum 10)	Indicators (e):	Baselines (values and years) TBD	Targets (values and years) TBD	Sources of data	Assumptions
Impact	Fragile and crisis-affected regions, countries and communities achieve resilience and sustain peace by addressing the climate and environmental risks that drive conflict and instability.	1 Number of specific climate change and environment-related security risks reduced through improved resilience from interventions.			Assessments and progress reviews carried out under the project	<i>Not applicable</i>
Outcome 1	European Union and United Nations peacebuilding and conflict transformation efforts were informed by science-based, integrated risk assessments to simultaneously: i. reduce conflict risks, build peace and security; ii. strengthen partners' capacity in relation to resilience to climate change and environmental degradation	1.1 Number of EU and UN programmes, policy measures and plans in crisis-affected regions incorporating science-based environment and climate-related analysis into their design 1.2 Number of interventions in crisis-affected countries utilising science-based analytical outputs of action.			EU/UN internal reporting	Assessments are fully utilised by EU and UN staff to enhance impact of interventions
Outcome 2	Effective policy responses and measures at national, regional and global level addressed security threats related to climate change and environmental degradation and ensured fluid articulation between these levels.	2.1 Number of climate change adaptation or peacebuilding policies, institutional structures and response plans that draw on policy and planning advice provided through the action to address climate change and environment-related security risks at the aforementioned levels			Assessments and progress reviews carried out under the project	Policy measures are implemented with a coordinated institutional approach
Outcome 3	Communities had an enhanced capacity to build resilience to climate and environment-related risks at local level	3.1 Number of communities using new skills/knowledge or practices to improve resilience to climate and environment-related security risks.			Assessments and progress reviews carried out under the project	Communities are in a position to address challenges at a local level
Output 1 related to Outcome 1	1.1 Environmental analysis for integrated risk identification delivered, including through interactive geospatial tools, written risk assessments and direct data feeds into early warning systems	1.1.1 Number of analyses on environmental issues with peace and security dimensions completed through full complement of mixed research methods.			Draft strategies or amendments are subsequently adopted.	Analysis is exploitable and produced in a timely fashion
Output 2 related to Outcome 1	1.2 Complementarity of EU-UN data and analysis tools in the domain of climate change, environment and security enhanced	1.2.1 Strengthened complementarity of EU and UN datasets and indicators.			JRC/UNEP reports	Complementarity and cross-fertilisation of data

						is prioritised by EU and UN actors
Output 1 related to Outcome 2	2.1 Policy measures and plans proposed to address cross-cutting environmental risks to peace and security, in close collaboration with national partners	2.1.1 Number of instances/processes in which UNEP and the EU collaborate with national and field-based partners to deliver policy recommendations to address climate-related risks to peace and security			Assessments and progress reviews carried out under the project	Draft strategies or policy measures are subsequently adopted.
Output 2 related to Outcome 2	2.3 Spaces and frameworks for dialogue among stakeholders optimised to facilitate horizontal and vertical collaboration, information-sharing and co-development of solutions	2.2.2 Number of stakeholder dialogue processes initiated/utilised by UNEP and the EU, sustained with UN/EU and partners on climate, environment, peace and security linkages and issues..			Assessments and progress reviews carried out under the project	Coordination frameworks are sustainable and inclusive
Output 1 related to Outcome 3	3.1 Communities had access to strategies and tools to enhance their resilience to climate change and their capacity to anticipate and address environmental risks to peace and security was enhanced	3.1.1 Number of local-level dispute resolution, dialogue, mediation and peacebuilding mechanisms that are equipped to understand climate-related security risks 3.1.2 Number of communities that build resilience to climate-related security risks using sustainable nature-based solutions			Assessments and progress reviews carried out under the project	Communities are willing to collaborate with implementing partner

4. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

4.1. Financing Agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not envisaged to conclude a financing agreement with the partner countries.

4.2. Indicative Implementation Period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 3 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 48 months from the date of entry into force of the financing agreement.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission's responsible authorising officer by amending this Financing Decision and the relevant contracts and agreements.

4.3. Implementation Modalities

The Commission will ensure that the EU appropriate rules and procedures for providing financing to third parties are respected, including review procedures, where appropriate, and compliance of the action with EU restrictive measures².

4.3.1. Indirect Management with an international organisation

This action may be implemented in indirect management with the United Nations Environment Programme. The implementation by this entity entails the carrying out of activities as described in chapter 3 aiming to strengthen the resilience of crisis-affected countries by developing integrated approaches to conflict risk analysis, as well as actions on the ground. In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select a replacement entity using the same criteria. The envisaged entity was selected by the Commission's services using in particular the following criteria: mandate and operational capacity, experience and added value of the organisation. In case the envisaged entity would need to be replaced, the Commission's services may select a replacement entity using the same criteria.

4.3.2. Changes from indirect to direct management mode (and vice versa) due to exceptional circumstances

In the interest of the programme, or if the negotiations with the selected entities fail, this action may be implemented in direct management.

4.4. Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

4.5. Indicative Budget

Indicative Budget components ³	EU contribution (amount in EUR)
Indirect management with UNEP cf section 4.3.1	6 000 000
Evaluation – cf. section 5.2, Audit – cf. section 5.3	will be covered by another Decision ⁴

² www.sanctionsmap.eu. Please note that the sanctions map is an IT tool for identifying the sanctions regimes. The source of the sanctions stems from legal acts published in the Official Journal (OJ). In case of discrepancy between the published legal acts and the updates on the website it is the OJ version that prevails.

³ N.B: The final text on audit/verification depends on the outcome of ongoing discussions on pooling of funding in (one or a limited number of) Decision(s) and the subsequent financial management, i.e. for the conclusion of audit contracts and payments.

⁴ Where the action is not covered by a financing agreement (see section 4.1), but 'will be covered by another Decision' as it is unlikely that evaluation and audit contracts on this action would be concluded within N+1. These contracts have to be authorised by another Financing Decision.

Communication and visibility – cf. section 6	n/a
Contingencies ⁵	n/a
Totals	6 000 000

4.6. Organisational Set-up and Responsibilities

As part of its prerogative of budget implementation and to safeguard the financial interests of the Union, the Commission may participate in the above governance structures set up for governing the implementation of the action. Throughout its implementation, the EU-UNEP Partnership on Environment, Climate Change and Security will be steered, guided and monitored by a multi-layered governance mechanism designed to foster dialogue and collaboration at all levels. In addition, fluid and ongoing communication between EU-UN partners, particularly between the members of the Climate Security Mechanism, and with EU Delegations shall be prioritised to ensure coherence with other initiatives.

The first tier of this mechanism will be the partnership's Steering Committee, comprised of designated representatives of the European Commission's Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI) and the EEAS, and of UNEP's Environmental Security Unit. EU Delegations may also be invited to participate. The Steering Committee will meet at minimum quarterly during the partnership's inception and throughout its implementation to:

- i) consider how to respond to requests for support from EU and UN field-based entities;
- ii) discuss strategic matters, such as the selection, prioritisation and sequencing of initiatives in different focus regions;
- iii) share updates on other initiatives and key political developments in focus regions; and
- iv) review implementation progress based on the agreed workplan, results framework and budget.

The Steering Committee will also be responsible for decision-making and adaptive management of the partnership when implementation challenges or new opportunities arise. Finally, members of the Steering Committee will take the lead on upstream and downstream dissemination of good practices and lessons learned across their respective institutions, proactively identifying opportunities for collaboration and cross-fertilization.

The second tier of the governance mechanism will be comprised of Regional Advisory Committees established for each of the partnership's focus regions (MENA, Horn of Africa, West Africa/Sahel). Regional Advisory Committees will bring the Steering Committee together with relevant entities at the regional and country levels, including representatives of EU Delegations, offices of EU/UN Special Representatives/Envoys (where relevant), UN political missions, regional bodies and RCOs. Regional Committees will convene at least semi-annually to:

- (i) exchange on key initiatives linked to climate change and security, as well as political and development priorities for the region;
- (ii) guide decisions on prioritisation of partnership activities and implementation strategies for the region; and
- (iii) foster synergies with other EU and UN initiatives at regional and country level. Regional consultations will play a critical role in ensuring that partnership interventions are aligned to ongoing efforts, while encouraging regional dialogue and collaboration to address climate-related risks to peace and security.

The final tier will be a Global Advisory Committee, composed of the partnership's Steering Committee and EU and UN stakeholders at HQ level, including services of the European Commission (incl. NEAR, INTPA, CLIMA, RESEARCH/JRC, ECHO), EEAS and others, as well as the UN's Climate Security Mechanism (DPPA, UNDP, UNEP). The Global Advisory Committee will meet annually to:

- (i) hear key updates on the implementation of the partnership;
- (ii) exchange on EU and UN policy developments related to climate change and security; and
- (iii) discuss dissemination of results, good practices and lessons learned across the different institutions.

Consultations with the Global Advisory Committee will play a similar role at the global thematic level to regional consultations in ensuring that the partnership's interventions are informed by the latest policy developments within

⁵ Consider that contracts where no financing agreement is concluded, contingencies have to be covered by individual and legal commitments by 31 December of N+1.

the EU and the UN. The Global Advisory Committee will also serve as a connector bringing together different entities for a regular dialogue on climate change and security.

4.7. Pre-conditions

NA

5. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

5.1. Monitoring and Reporting

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process, and part of the implementing partner's responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (Outputs and direct Outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the logframe matrix (for project modality) and the partner's strategy, policy or reform action plan list (for budget support).

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

Roles and responsibilities for data collection, analysis and monitoring will be carried out according to section 4.6.

5.2. Evaluation

Having regard to the nature of the action, evaluations of single components/projects are carried out via an implementing partner.

The Commission may, during implementation, decide to undertake mid-term or final evaluations for duly justified reasons either on its own decision or on the initiative of the partner.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders following the best practice of evaluation dissemination. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the action.

5.3. Audit and Verifications

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audit or verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

6. COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY

Communication and visibility is a contractual obligation for all entities implementing EU-funded external actions to advertise the European Union's support for their work to the relevant audiences.

To that end they must comply with the instructions given in the [Communication and Visibility Requirements of 2018](#) (or any successor document), notably with regard to the use of the EU emblem and the elaboration of a dedicated communication and visibility plan, to be completed for every action at the start of implementation.

These obligations apply equally, regardless of whether the actions concerned are implemented by the Commission, the partner country (for instance, concerning the reforms supported through budget support), contractors, grant beneficiaries or entrusted entities. In each case, a reference to the relevant contractual obligations must be included in the respective financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

Communication and visibility measures may be funded from the amounts allocated to the action. For the purpose of enhancing the visibility of the EU and its contribution to this action, the Commission may sign or enter into joint declarations or statements, as part of its prerogative of budget implementation and to safeguard the financial interests

of the Union. Visibility and communication measures should also promote transparency and accountability on the use of funds.

Effectiveness of communication activities on awareness about the action and its objectives as well as on EU funding of the action should be measured.

Implementing partners shall keep the Commission and concerned EU Delegation/Office fully informed of the planning and implementation of specific visibility and communication activities before work starts. Implementing partners will ensure adequate visibility of EU financing and will report on visibility and communication actions as well as the results of the overall action to the relevant monitoring committees.

APPENDIX 1 REPORTING IN OPSYS

An Intervention⁶ (also generally called project/programme) is the operational entity associated to a coherent set of activities and results structured in a logical framework aiming at delivering development change or progress. Interventions are the most effective (hence optimal) entities for the operational follow-up by the Commission of its external development operations. As such, Interventions constitute the base unit for managing operational implementations, assessing performance, monitoring, evaluation, internal and external communication, reporting and aggregation.

Primary Interventions are those contracts or groups of contracts bearing reportable results and respecting the following business rule: ‘a given contract can only contribute to one primary intervention and not more than one’. An individual contract that does not produce direct reportable results and cannot be logically grouped with other result reportable contracts is considered a ‘support entities’. The addition of all primary interventions and support entities is equivalent to the full development portfolio of the Institution.

Primary Interventions are identified during the design of each action by the responsible service (Delegation or Headquarters operational Unit).

The level of the Primary Intervention is defined in the related Action Document and it is revisable; it can be a(n) (group of) action(s) or a (group of) contract(s).

Tick in the left side column one of the three possible options for the level of definition of the Primary Intervention(s) identified in this action.

In the case of ‘Group of actions’ level, add references to the present action and other action concerning the same Primary Intervention.

In the case of ‘Contract level’, add the reference to the corresponding budgetary items in point 4.6, Indicative Budget.

Option 1: Action level		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Single action	Present action: all contracts in the present action
Option 2: Group of actions level		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Group of actions	Actions reference (CRIS#/OPSYS#):
Option 3: Contract level		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Single Contract 1	Contract with UNEP
<input type="checkbox"/>	Group of contracts 1	NA

⁶ [ARES \(2021\)4204912](#) - For the purpose of consistency between terms in OPSYS, DG INTPA, DG NEAR and FPI have harmonised 5 key terms, including ‘action’ and ‘Intervention’ where an ‘action’ is the content (or part of the content) of a Commission Financing Decision and ‘Intervention’ is a coherent set of activities and results which constitutes an effective level for the operational follow-up by the EC of its operations on the ground. See more on the [concept of intervention](#).