



## World Development Report 2011 – Terms of Reference

### Thematic Papers and Case Studies

#### I. Timetable and Outputs

1. From October 2009 through January 2010, Lead Authors will be tasked with the following:
  - **Production of a short initiating paper** to frame the key issues and identify major actors and stakeholders; initiating paper length: 10 pages/4,000 words. In addition, Lead Authors should prepare a critical literature review of 4-5 pages, identifying the essential thinking on the subject, fully referenced, with short accounts in each case of the various writers' positions.
  - **Consultations.** For the Case Studies involving country visits Lead Authors should convene roundtables or workshops in the November-January period, where possible with WDR team participation (and in all cases, with WDR team organizational assistance)<sup>1</sup>. The Lead Author would be responsible for developing the exact format and approach of these consultations, in discussion with the WDR team, avoiding formalism and red tape wherever possible. Case Studies relying on secondary sources and Thematic Papers may benefit from small workshops to compare perspectives or discuss findings, but for budget reasons these should be tied in with existing events or be conducted by videoconference. Lead Authors would be reimbursed for any necessary travel taken; this should be discussed with the WDR team, and would be undertaken in accordance with applicable World Bank regulations.
  - **Preparation of a final paper**, including revision of the initiating paper to reflect inputs from reviewers and the findings of the fieldwork/roundtables/workshops; final paper length: 15 pages/6,000 words maximum except when otherwise directed by the WDR team.
  - In some cases Lead Authors will be invited to a **Comparisons Workshop** in February 2010 to compare findings and help the WDR team derive more general lessons.
  - For the Case Studies, apart from WDR team member inputs and advice, an internal World Bank Peer Review Group will be asked to comment on the initiating draft paper and final draft paper. The WDR team will consider the possibility of preparing some case studies for subsequent standalone publication.

#### II. Structure of Papers

2. Papers should have two parts, the first answering a common set questions which explore the key working hypotheses of the WDR (supplemented by additional questions pertaining to the Theme/Case in question), and the second a more open-ended opportunity to discuss aspects unique to the Case or Theme in question, and to provide recommendations.

<sup>1</sup> At a **local** level, respondents should if possible include traditional leaders, local politicians, government service providers, NGO representatives, police and/or security personnel, shopkeepers and farmers; at the **national** level, politicians, senior civil servants, police/security officers, NGO representatives, aid representatives, diplomats, press and media, domestic and foreign investors.



## **Part I**

3. The paper should explore questions relating to the WDR's key hypotheses. It should relate the particular Case/Theme to each of the questions below to ensure comparability with other papers and facilitate integration of the paper into the overall WDR. If a particular question is **not** applicable to a Case/Theme, the Lead Author should explain why. He/she should also draw on the tables on precipitators and remedies.

### ***A. Causes and Dynamics of Violent Conflict***

#### **For the Case Studies:**

- An appreciation of the historical context is essential to the Case Studies. What factors have predisposed the country/region to conflict? What events precipitated/ sustained conflict? What were key factors contributing to the resolution of conflict (where applicable)? Has the form of conflict evolved over time (e.g. from civil war to more fragmented, forms of violence after political settlement; criminalization of conflict)?

#### **For the Thematic Papers:**

- Do the conclusions you draw apply both to situations of (a) civil war (where your conclusions should cover situations of prevention as well as post-conflict stabilization, sub-national/cross-border violence following a political settlement and conflict exit), and (b) state-threatening organized crime and violence?

### ***B. Short-Term Confidence and Peace-building***

#### **For the Case Studies:**

- What factors are of greatest importance for the creation of short-term confidence in peace-building in this particular case?<sup>2</sup>
- To what extent have these factors been addressed? Where missing, were they (i) unimportant; (ii) important, but not planned; (iii) planned, but not delivered? What impact have these deficits had on outcomes? If possible, give good and bad examples of each of the factors alluded to above. Did the pursuit of short-term confidence-building measures undermine subsequent efforts to create functioning, legitimate institutions?

<sup>2</sup> Factors might include: (A) government action to deliver (i) security and the absence of predatory behavior (violence, human rights abuses, corruption); (ii) speedy and equitable access to justice; (iii) a voice in decision-making; (iv) merit-based appointments; (v) competent economic management and the provision of jobs, livelihoods and services; (vi) specific responses to other key grievances and concerns; (B) political agreements that offer the prospect of conflict reduction/elimination; (C) constructive diplomatic and security relations with external parties. How do these factors differ at local and national levels?



- What are the main interests of elites in this case? Have they been properly understood? How have relationships between elites affected conflict (and, where applicable, its resolution)? Has local/national leadership created or undermined confidence in the legitimacy of government peace-building efforts? What might have been done to influence leadership or elite behavior?

**For the Thematic Papers:**

- Please identify (i) examples of actions which have supported short-term confidence in the legitimacy of a peace-building; (ii) examples of actions which have undermined such confidence; and (iii) whether and how these actions relate to the elements of confidence-building identified in “Addressing Conflict and Organized Crime’ table.

**C. Medium-Term Legitimacy and State-building**

**For both Case Studies and Thematic Papers:**

- Have national leaders or outside parties promoted appropriate institutional models in building state capacity? Where they have not, in what ways were the models inappropriate (for example, was too much asked of embryonic institutions: give specific examples: e.g. legislation, economic policy, service delivery strategies, administrative structures)? What might have been preferable? Have national actors embraced or resisted inappropriate institutional models promoted by outsiders? Have such mistakes had a significant bearing on government legitimacy, and/or on outcomes?
- Where possible, give examples of the successful adaptation of imported institutional models, and/or of innovative domestic approaches, indicating how these have contributed to state-building.

**For the Case Studies:**

- Have the actions of security, political and economic/social development actors (national and international) been well-sequenced and adequately coordinated (for example, disarmament and demobilization; elections; security sector reform; transitions from non-state to state service delivery)? How important has this issue been? To what extent has performance in these areas affected perceptions of government legitimacy?

**D. Regional and Global Dimensions**

**For both Case Studies and Thematic Papers:**

- Were natural resource management and illegal trafficking (of drugs, arms, commodities) relevant in this instance? If so, how?
- How did the policies and actions of regional and global parties<sup>3</sup> influence events in the country/region? What regional initiatives were taken, and to what extent did they seize or miss opportunities in the

<sup>3</sup> Although the WDR is not focused on the actions of International Financial Institutions, where examples of good and bad IFI interventions are apparent, they should be mentioned.



World Development Report 2011 Conflict, Security and Development

political, security and development spheres? Were the goals of external parties consistent with those of national leaders, and how did this affect outcomes? Did regional and global players behave in accordance with international/their own stated standards?

- Were externally-supported initiatives (political, security, humanitarian and/or developmental) sufficiently well-resourced? Timely? Skilful? Innovative? Coordinated? Were outside parties prepared to support high risk, high reward approaches? If not, to what extent was this due to external priorities (e.g. audit/anti-corruption requirements; taxpayer constituency expectations)? On balance, were regional or global support efforts more useful to the country's/region's state-building and peace-building efforts?

### ***E. Measuring Results and Outcomes***

**For both Case Studies and Thematic Papers:**

- To what extent have outcomes reflected the intentions of (i) national leadership; (ii) global or regional leadership? Were expectations realistic? Is there a clear framework to measure progress?

### **Part II**

**For both Case Studies and Thematic Papers:**

4. The questions in Part I may well miss important elements relevant to your enquiry. What other factors do you consider important in explaining the genesis of conflict in this case, and/or its persistence? What factors are (or, where applicable, were) important to ending/resolving violent conflict?
5. What do you believe could have been done better? Why was it not done? What would you now recommend to national, regional and global actors?
6. What lessons does your enquiry reveal that have significance beyond your particular Case/Thematic enquiry?