In 2003, after two decades of fighting for independence, the conflict in the Casamance, an area in Senegal south of the Gambia, finally came to an end. Tens of thousands of people who had been driven from their villages by the fighting between the army and separatist rebels, returned home.

In an effort to support the restoration of normal social and economic activities and prepare for future development programs in these newly-accessible areas, a $2 million grant was given to the Republic of Senegal under the Japan Social Development Fund (JSDF). The purpose of the grant was to extend basic social infrastructure and economic support services to poor communities in the conflict zone, an area that had been both geographically and politically isolated from the rest of the country.

**Challenge and Approach**

The project built on the base of the successful community-driven development approaches pioneered by the Social Development Fund Agency (SDFA) elsewhere in Senegal, while testing and adapting these approaches for use in a post-conflict setting.

The project was framed within Senegal’s poverty reduction strategy, which aims to reduce poverty by 50% by the year 2015, eradicating exclusion, increasing income and equity in improved livelihoods, and establishing gender equity, particular in primary and secondary education. The project strengthened community capacity, social cohesion and trust by vesting control over resources and decisions to the community/village level, aligned with the Bank’s Community-Driven Development (CDD) strategy.

The grant supported activities in two main areas:

1. **Basic social development and income generation activities, identified and prepared by the communities themselves.** Funds were channeled to village management committees, later renamed Social Mobilization Cells, which were responsible for all aspects of implementation, thus increasing the sense of ownership and transparency at the local level. Eligible villages were targeted based on poverty, location in ex-conflict areas, and security of access. Sub-projects were identified in the context of participatory local investment planning and were small-scale, low-cost, and utilized appropriate technology.

2. **Community facilitation and grass roots management training to build the capacity of village management committees in targeted communities.**
NGOs with experience in post-conflict situations facilitated the participatory sub-project identification and preparation and the subsequent implementation of activities. For income generating activities, beneficiaries received support targeted at the development of business plans, access to funds, management of revolving funds, and micro-business.

**Fragile Communities Define Their Needs**

**Peace-Building Workshops:** To sensitize villagers returning to community participation after a 20-year conflict, three-day workshops focused on peace-building techniques and alternatives to conflict. Specialized training modules adapted to Casamance included, “Confidence Building” and “Construction of a Vision for the Future”. Prompted by local facilitators, everyone was invited to contribute, to share and reflect on their experiences. Break-out groups facilitated interaction among participants, including role playing, the use of local proverbs, anecdotes, and singing. The use of a range of tailored adult learning approaches was essential for the fragile post-conflict target audience.

**Staircase to Peace:** This exercise helped communities to see peace on the horizon through a series of steps that emphasized their central role in the peace process, and the importance of vigilance to prevent a resurgence of violence. Step 1 describes the post-conflict situation where there is little communication, and where community needs are unknown. Step 2 - signs of communication appear and a village project is born. Step 3 - peace-building efforts become a reality with implementation of the village project and real hope for the people. Step 4 - a dream comes true with community building in place and a shared promise not to return to times of conflict.

**Drawing Area Village Maps:** Schematic maps were prepared by each community group, showing key features such as topography, travel routes, abandoned or mined villages, vulnerable groups, project sites, remaining conflict zones, location of resources, security forces, refugee camps, rebel areas, organizations that promoted peace, etc. The maps were used to discuss proposed local alert systems, among other aspects.

**Moving Forward in Partnership**

**Project Agreements:** The designation of accountability to community beneficiaries for ownership, financial administration and execution of projects was carried out through written agreements, signed by the local community representative and the Social Development Fund Agency. This placed the community at the heart of their development and decision making and facilitated the decentralization of the funds.

**Strengthened Project Management Competencies for Villagers.** To develop the capacity of communities to assume responsibility within a relatively short time period and to plan, execute, and sustain their subprojects and micro-businesses, a specialized training toolkit was delivered and adapted to Casamance. About 1000 people participated in this Grassroots Management Training (GMT), of whom 712 were members of the Village-based Sub-project Management Committees. The training package included: (i) Village Governance; (ii) Participatory Poverty Assessment; (iii) Participatory Needs Assessment; (iv) Participatory Sub-Project Planning and Management; (v) Participatory Micro-Business Planning and Management (vi) Community-based Procurement Contracting and Financial Management; and (vii) Decentralized Funds Management for Grassroots Communities.

**Partnership at the Village Level:** The project implementing agency developed a partnership with the community by placing facilitators side-by-side with the beneficiaries and their projects from concept through completion.

**Village Project Coordinators -- “Barefoot Experts” (Expert aux pieds nus):** The project trained one or two Village Project Coordinators per community to continue to sensitize and mobilize community members to implement the micro-businesses and sub-projects. The Village Coordinators were chosen by the local community members based on their credibility as representatives or leaders, communication skills, availability, and occupation. Their specific responsibilities included promoting communications between the project and community beneficiaries, knowledge dissemination.

---

**Promoting Peace Through Community Theatre:** An effective communication method used to deliver project messages was community theatre using local groups and sketches that promoted peace in the local context and in local dialects.

---

**Project Data**

**Implementing Agency:** Social Development Fund Agency
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related to peace-building tools, support and monitoring of security alert systems to protect infrastructure, and advice on income-generating activities.

**Harmonization with National Priorities:** Regional representatives of line sector ministries advising on community projects played a policy review role to ensure that the sub-projects were consistent with sector objectives and standards. Local ministerial authorities were also involved in information campaigns, and acted as members of technical review panels approving sub-projects and micro-businesses. This also prevented overlap with other programs and ensured harmonization.

**Information and Communications Strategies:** The emphasis on strengthening conditions for peace through information, communication and social mobilization paid off. The demobilization sites, were turned into social mobilization cells where young staff worked on early warning, prevention of conflict, peace management, and information sharing. Staff provided advice and assistance to people returning to their places of origin on work opportunities and community reinsertion. Settlers visited the cells to discuss and seek help in resolving disputes over ownership of dwellings or land. The cells also became a space where communities could address different development priorities, such as which road to build, or which school or clinic to rehabilitate. Media messages were also disseminated through radio, TV, or pamphlets informing settlers about the value of peace and prospective long-term development plans for the region.

**Peace and Social Mobilization.** Activities were designed to promote community conditions amenable to the acceptance and reintegration of returning refugees and combatants. These conditions were independent of progress with the high level government peace talks. The community-based conflict prevention and early warning system developed with the assistance of the staff of the social mobilization cells proved to be effective in preventing the resurgence of conflict.

**Improved Basic Infrastructure:** A total of 91 sub-projects were completed, of which 74 supported investments in communities and 17 supported individual revenue-generating projects. Activities included school classrooms (38% of projects), health (21%), adult occupational training (12%), water supply (10%), micro-business (8%), reducing women's workload (2%), and others (housing, agriculture, fish farming, women and youth cooperatives (7%)).

**RESULTS**

The most important outcome was the contribution of the Project to peace-building. The preparation and implementation of subprojects proved to be an effective mechanism to rebuild intra- and inter-community cohesion. The project was implemented in villages that had been greatly affected by the conflict, including villages abandoned due to the war. To encourage people to come back to their villages, the project provided essential infrastructure, such as schools and health huts, which had been deliberately destroyed during the conflict. Assistance was also given to the disabled, in particular the handicapped, and victims of land mines.

In terms of human capital, a sustainable cadre of effective barefoot experts was developed at the local community level. These experts were low-cost permanent residents who were trained and developed skills in various subjects during project implementation, from peace-building and technical subjects, to local governance and financial management. These local residents have continued to play a key role in the development of their communities following project completion, ensuring sustainability and greater development impact.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

- **Community Trust and Empowerment:** A participatory CDD approach maximized local ownership of the project and facilitated rapid implementation. Communities were able to decide on priorities, the selection of subprojects, and to manage the associated funding. This devolution of authority from the central government to the local community helped build trust, an important feature when working in a post-conflict environment with former combatants who rebelled against government.

- **Strengthening Community Capacity for Conflict Resolution:** Linking peace-building training to grassroots management training helped stabilize villages and build confidence. Use of the Peace Staircase and Village Maps enabled the communities to become aware of the importance of their role in the peace-building process.

“*The Participatory approach proved to be extremely useful at all levels. The communities were at the heart of the project, which explains why it was so successful*”

- Ousmane Massek Ndiaye, Minister of Decentralization and Local Collectivities

Community members working with facilitators, present their ideas for sub-projects
• **Establishment of Multiple Thematic Local Committees**: Promoting, facilitating and training stakeholders for the establishment of multiple local committees - technical, managerial, environmental, public health and HIV/AIDS, peace-building, coordinating and mobilizing, sensitizing and motivating, and financial – for various functional roles was an important element in the success of the program.

• **Investing in Targeting**: Selection of districts and villages was based on an initial participatory poverty and needs assessments. This led to a project driven by the most vulnerable – youth, women, and victims of the conflict. Adult males played a less important role in implementing project activities than did the vulnerable groups.

• **Alleviating Demand for Urban Migration**: By supporting the development of rural districts and villages, displaced victims of conflict were less inclined to move to cities rather than returning to their homes. This improved the standard of living for villagers and reduced the concentration of poverty in urban areas.

• **Delivering on Community Infrastructure is Essential to Achieve Peace**: Implementation showed that, in post-conflict situations, it is essential to identify the inputs that lead to peace, such as freedom of movement, liberation of prisoners, economic and social recovery benchmarks, and improved road access. Provision of basic infrastructure allows refugees to return to shelter, schools to re-open, access to health services and the resumption of economic activities that restores people’s livelihoods and well-being.

• **Comprehensive Approach to Conflict**: The Casamance experience confirms that while a demobilization and reintegration program is important, it needs to be complemented with broader development and social mobilization efforts that can sustain peace. Building trust, rebuilding social capital, and finding areas of common ground between all stakeholders, in parallel with formal negotiations, are the key to achieving sustainable results in fragile conditions.

• **Social Mobilization Cells – Innovative Conflict Resolution Operating Inside Communities**: The early warning, conflict prevention and peace management system that was put in place with the creation of the large number of social mobilization cells became an effective conflict resolution system at the local and community level. Former conflict drivers such as social and economic isolation, land issues, and ethnic and religious tensions did not go away and, in some instances, intensified. The cells played a key functional role in restoring and maintaining peace while addressing local conflicts, creating innovative ways to communicate, influence behavior, and restore social capital at the community level. After the project closed, the cell structures in rural communities continued to be used as a basis for community-decision making about local development.

• **Negotiating Locations for Infrastructure Investments**: Sub-project selection through a process of negotiation that involved all stakeholders in community meetings was essential to ensure not only that the work could be carried out in peace, but that all concerned had a stake in ensuring that investments responded to the needs of communities rather than narrower interest groups. It also became evident that infrastructure investments contribute to the strengthening of conditions for peace by mobilizing the community to discuss decisions, the need to maintain peace and trust between people and communities, and to facilitate agreement on collective development goals. Most important, while high level national peace negotiations among groups may be at an impasse, communities at the grassroots level moved on to become conflict-free, with communities themselves taking responsibility for mediating and resolving local conflicts.

**FOLLOW-ON PROJECTS**

In January 2005, the Bank was re-engaging Senegal after years of civil strife, through a Poverty Reduction Support Credit (PRSC1), and the Casamance Emergency Reconstruction Project. The JSDF complemented the emergency IDA Credit, and both the grant and credit were implemented in parallel. The direct follow-on project to the JSDF grant was the Participatory Local Development Program (P088656) supported by an additional IDA Credit of US$50 million, implemented by the Ministry of Decentralization and Local Collectivities. This project supports the Government of Senegal in setting up an effective framework for participatory local development, decentralization, resource mobilization and transfers responsibilities for the delivery of services to local governments and communities.

**Suatanbility Grant**

In FY09, Japan approved a supplemental grant for $100,000 to the Government of Senegal, promoting sustainability after completion and to help complete some unfinished community sub-projects.

---

The Japan Social Development Fund -- JSDF Good Practice Notes seek to share achievements, knowledge and lessons learned from the implementation of JSDF projects over the past decade. The JSDF is a partnership between the Government of Japan and the World Bank to support innovative social programs that directly meet the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable groups in developing countries. JSDF projects meet four basic requirements: Innovative, introducing new approaches to development; Responsive to the needy, by directly meeting the needs of vulnerable, marginalized, and disadvantaged groups; Rapid response activities that deliver short-term results and benefits to targeted beneficiaries; and Community capacity building activities that empower local governments, NGOs, and disenfranchised groups, while promoting stakeholders participation and ownership.