

# Community-Driven Conflict Recovery: From Reconstruction to Development

## DRAFT

*This note discusses the increasing use of community driven approaches in conflict environments. It underscores the appropriateness of such approaches in countries emerging from conflict as a mechanism for social and physical reconstruction. The note presents a framework for a nuanced, conflict-sensitive implementation of community driven programming, based on a disaggregated analysis of the ten-year period following the end of war. It describes the conditions and corresponding program objectives and components required for advancing a community driven agenda in a post-war context.<sup>1</sup>*

The World Bank is increasingly applying community driven development (CDD)<sup>2</sup> approaches in conflict-affected countries. By early 2005, it had 86 active CDD projects in areas impacted by armed conflict<sup>3</sup>. In part, this reflects the Bank's growing role in supporting countries' transition from conflict to development.<sup>4</sup> It also is a function of CDD's increase in its portion of total lending from two to 10 percent between 1989 and 2003.

### **CDD as an instrument for conflict-affected communities**

CDD's dual platforms of an efficient mechanism for addressing community needs and an instrument for building empowerment lend themselves particularly well to war-torn environments where both physical and social structures have deteriorated and institutional capacity is minimal. The former provides visible reconstruction and improvements in the quality of life, which offer immediate affirmation of the tangible benefits of peace. However, it is the latter that becomes instrumental in conflict settings where breakdowns in trust and social cohesion risk inflaming tensions and provoking more violence. CDD provides a common incentive to rebuilding trust, confidence, and relationships that have been destroyed through war. Collective action for the common good serves to enhance interdependence, heal the divides, provide hope, and thus support social stability. Local ownership engendered through the CDD process helps develop practices of accountability and transparency.

While the potential benefit of CDD in conflict contexts is high, evidence shows that the quality of CDD program design is critical. Program failure in the delicate post-war context can be particularly destructive as it may undermine hope and commitment to the peace process. CDD

---

<sup>1</sup> The World Bank is involved in a large spectrum of conflict-affected contexts, including unstable peace, continuing conflict, and emerging from conflict. This note is limited to discussion of the latter.

<sup>2</sup> CDD is an approach that gives control over planning decisions and investment resources to community groups. Through support to collective action and enhanced accountability relationships among communities, local government and the private sector, CDD operations aim to strengthen local governance, local service delivery, and social capital.

<sup>3</sup> From matrix of Bank projects in conflict-affected countries. Listed projects meet two criteria: 1) on the CDD Anchor list of Bank CDD projects and 2) on the Post Conflict Fund's list of conflict-affected countries.

<sup>4</sup> See Bank's Operational Policy on Development Cooperation and Conflict, OP2.30, for Bank guidelines on operations in conflict-affected countries.

faces a number of unique challenges in conflict-affected countries that underscore the need for conflict-specific community-driven approaches to address the particular issues associated with such environments.

The Bank has applied CDD approaches in numerous conflict-affected countries, including Afghanistan, Indonesia, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, and Timor-Leste, and is increasingly catalyzing CDD initiatives closer to the edge of conflict, such as in Liberia and Cote d'Ivoire. It continues to learn from these experiences and from partnerships with other organizations that employ similar methodologies. However, very few rigorous reviews or impact evaluations have been conducted to date examining the effectiveness of CDD as an instrument in the transition from war to peace<sup>5</sup>. Increasing our collective understanding of the effective use of community driven approaches in conflict environments and their impact on conflict requires greater scrutiny in its application and greater specificity about the differing contexts.

### **Defining the conflict contexts**

The conflict setting itself is not uniform. "Conflict context" is a generic term for a wide range of conditions, different in each country. Wars rarely end without some continued form of violence. Geographic uniformity in recovery is also rare: countries seldom transition evenly from fighting to peace.<sup>6</sup> Other factors such as the conflict's severity, geographic ubiquity, degree of popular engagement, duration, and resulting displacement are unique to each context.<sup>7</sup>

A number of frameworks for defining the period following a peace accord exist, mostly separated into semi-distinct stages. Many divide it generically into three phases that begin with the peace agreement and continue through the ensuing ten years or so<sup>8</sup>. The danger here is in assuming that the progression is linear and follows distinct timeframes. This does not reflect reality. Conflict recovery in diverse geographic subregions invariably transitions in and out of different stages at different times and in different parts of the country. Moreover, each case has unique characteristics which can vary significantly from a common framework.

As a generalization, however, the immediate post peace agreement period is broadly referred to as the reintegration phase and is marked by the exigency of needs of returning populations, those still displaced, and those who remained. Communities in this phase start to rebuild social cohesion, beginning with re-establishing a sense of security and reconciling the losses and trauma from the war. This coincides with generally high levels of donor interest and funding, particularly for humanitarian aid and the disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration of

---

<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, a small but increasing body of knowledge is supporting the measurement of external interventions' impact on conflict, including the Bank's current study in Indonesia measuring the influence of using CDD approaches on local level conflicts. The Bank is also growing its impact evaluation methodology.

<sup>6</sup> For these reasons, as an alternative to the term "post conflict", this note uses "post-war" to indicate the period following the cessation of formal fighting but not the cessation of all violence.

<sup>7</sup> See the Bank's Conflict Analysis Framework for a comprehensive compilation of issues affecting the conflict context.

<sup>8</sup> A decade generally corresponds to the period of greatest instability, but is notional at best. These phases roughly correspond with Paul Collier's three post conflict phases spanning 10 - 12 years: 1) peace onset, which includes the year the war ended and the ensuing first two years, 2) post conflict I, comprising the next four or five years, and 3) post conflict II, the following four or five years of peace.

combatants carried out under conditions of intermittent insecurity. Often peacekeeping forces and/or an office of a Special Representative of the UN Secretary General (SRSG) provide stability and oversight during this period, especially when governments are weak.

This is succeeded by the stabilization phase - the delicate transition period when emergency programs and funding diminish and before development programs fully begin. This period is a tenuous point in the transition when conflict frequently re-erupts as a result of perceived inadequate economic or political progress, among other potential destabilizing factors. It parallels a social testing period where individuals reexamine relationships and trust and begin to re-establish social norms. Failure in this social sphere can also trigger a return to violence. Population movement tends to stabilize and absorptive capacity begins to rise as evidence of reconstruction and improved livelihoods emerge. The role of the SRSG may diminish later in this phase as the nascent or reconstituted government begins to take hold and the international community encourages progress toward good governance, strengthening of local institutions, and long-term country planning.

The final, consolidation, phase typically witnesses a gradual increase in government ownership over services and institutions. External support, while characteristically not as large as in phase one, now supports development goals and PRSP planning. While prospects for continuation of the peace process are generally good and socio-political stability is somewhat higher, crime and gender-based violence often increase and replace conflict as a destabilizing influence.

#### **Box 1: Liberia: the reintegration phase.**

In 2004, the year following the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, hundreds of thousands of Liberian refugees and internally displaced persons returned to their communities, many for the first time since the war began in 1989. Together with returning demobilized soldiers and the community members who had remained throughout the fighting, they faced the daunting task of reconstructing their schools, health centers, livelihoods, and, importantly, relationships. The National Transitional Government of Liberia was weak and local government was essentially non-existent. UN peacekeepers deployed throughout the country kept an unstable peace, although sporadic outbursts of violence continued. The UN Mission in Liberia, under the Special Representative of the Secretary General was established to oversee the administrative transition to elections in October 2005. Donors pledged over \$500 million to support the immediate population return, reconstruction, demilitarization, and initial governance reform efforts. Much of these funds were allocated to international agencies to address apparent urgent needs and provided short-term services to communities.

#### **Designing community driven approaches according to conditions**

Participatory, demand-led mechanisms, as applied to these substantially different conditions in each part of the recovery process, face quite distinct, though often overlapping challenges and

opportunities. Crucial to effective application of community driven approaches is developing a solid understanding of these differences.<sup>9</sup> Each requires a context-specific approach to planning and community action, entails different relationships with government, and necessarily includes specific actions to support the peaceful transition to the ensuing phase and into sustainable development. An initial reliance on international NGOs, for example, requires transformation into greater employment of local institutions.

The term “community driven recovery” applies to this broader concept of employing demand-driven, community-led, participatory methodologies to address immediate needs as well as to establish the building blocks for eventual transition into sustainable, peaceful development. Table 1 offers a basic description of the changing contexts within the three phases and suggests corresponding community-driven approaches, objectives, and program components.

Community driven reconstruction (CDR) is the application of a community driven approach in the first phase, emphasizing speedy, cost effective support to communities while laying the foundation for building a governance structure that stresses local choice and accountability.<sup>10</sup> Following a period of transition, community driven development picks up in the latter phase, emphasizing greater sustainability and interface with institutional structures. In its continuation, CDD can involve many subsequent stages of progression. The CDR to CDD evolution, while not necessarily linear, is dependent upon sustained community engagement through repetition of project cycles. These cycles support the achievement of long-term community plans as part of a larger local governance framework.

**The reintegration phase.** During the first phase, the objectives are to address the most critical reconstruction and social needs as determined by the community and to demonstrate immediate and tangible benefit to the peace process and give hope to the population. This phase also lays the foundation for inclusive, transparent processes and institutions that will form the framework for fostering trust, good governance, participatory development, and peace building. The reintegration phase usually targets war-affected populations specifically. The tentative conditions and the immediacy of the requirements in these communities puts tremendous pressure on a demand-driven process that generally requires time to ensure adequate inclusion, capacity building, and social capital development. Therefore, CDR programs need to establish realistic and foundational methods and goals that support quick wins while building the platform for more substantive processes. For example, during the first cycle of this phase, communities engage in an abbreviated planning process, receive training in only the essential elements, and design relatively small projects that benefit all their members.

The empowerment aspect of this phase is contingent upon increasing attention to inclusiveness including a review of community membership and council leadership, and gradual strengthening of abilities as absorptive capacity increases. Unrealistic expectations of extensive community time and commitment, necessary skills, or substantive interaction with local government undermine the potential for success. Success here provides the confidence for continued

---

<sup>9</sup> The Bank’s Rapid Social Assessment is designed to provide analysis on local level social dynamics for just such purposes in a post-war scenario.

<sup>10</sup> See Cliffe, Sarah, S. Guggenheim, M. Kostner. 2003. Community Driven Reconstruction as an Instrument in War to Peace Transitions, Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Social Development Working Paper No. 7, August.

interaction. Overloading the communities with too many resources or demand on time or energy also sets them up for failure. And failure at this juncture is particularly dangerous.

This phase builds the foundation for developing community-driven mechanisms. To support the transition to the next phase, the concept of community empowerment needs to be instilled. Capacity development on CDD principles at the level of community, civil society, and government requires investment in time and resources to develop a strong foundation for continued development. This serves to anchor the mechanism within institutions and establish standards for accountability, transparency, participation, and inclusion—even though they may not be realized at this early stage. The CDD framework must also establish its reputation as an instrument for supporting peace through an unbiased process that understands and respects the conflict context and supports peacebuilding.

**The stabilization phase.** The next phase serves to consolidate peace and strengthen community empowerment. Because this transitional period often sees a marked drop in donor interest (which paradoxically corresponds with an increase in absorptive capacity), community driven approaches can be particularly appropriate and instrumental in bridging the gap in community support to longer-term programming. This phase shifts from a focus on the basic fundamentals in both the process and the product components in the first phase to one of building constructive relationships and horizontal and vertical social capital both inside and outside the community. Programs during this period strongly emphasize the principles of inclusion, accountability, and participation to buttress peacebuilding and reinforce quality in the CDD process. Important elements include strengthening communities' self-defined vision, deepening community planning, and reinforcing the representative nature of decision-making structures. Because community member time, commitment, and absorptive capacity usually increase during the stabilization phase, so does the size of the grant, capacity building activities, and links with local institutions to coincide with more substantive reconstruction and services.

The transition phase begins the shift of responsibility from parallel social service delivery to the public sector including, where appropriate, co-production and fee-for-service mechanisms. It also increasingly includes livelihoods in its programmatic focus, broadening its outreach to the private sector. To shift from this phase to CDD, it is important to address the precipitators of conflict and to build or reinforce structures and skills for resolving conflict. Successful work in this phase supports continued evolution toward stability and development.

### **Box 2: Sierra Leone: the transition to the consolidation phase**

By early 2005, Sierra Leone was beginning to transition into the CDD stage six years after the end of the war. Its new decentralization law set the parameters for increased government responsibility for social service delivery and in community development as a whole. While animosities were still visible in parts of society, horizontal social capital across former conflict lines was developing, especially apparent in economic alliances, sports, and religion. Under conditions of general stability, UN peacekeepers were preparing to pull out of the country. The Special Court for Sierra Leone and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission have played instrumental roles in offering a process of closure to the violations of war and re-establishing behavioral norms. The recently completed PRSP process provided long-term vision to the country. Out of the emergency phase, but still haunted by extremely poor poverty indicators, economic revitalization and livelihoods remained top priorities in communities.

**The consolidation phase.** The final phase is one of consolidating peace and building empowerment. It emphasizes strengthening macro-micro linkages, integrating with local institutions, and bolstering commitment to peace through support for conflict resolution mechanisms, participatory long-term visioning, and reinforcing democratic and good governance standards. These linkages require understanding the larger perspective while encouraging local level interdependence. Programmatically, this involves funding action plans—not just subprojects—that link closely with decentralized local government planning and engaging the private sector in the realization of community initiatives. This phase maximizes the horizontal and vertical development of social capital.

Scaling up and increasing macro-micro linkages also entail increased inter-community collaboration to support the larger peace process and encourage regional empowerment. For example, several communities might work in partnership on a common irrigation project and appeal to local government for support on maintenance. Geographic targeting expands from conflict-impact areas only to include poverty indicators during this period. At the same time, programs may specify particular groups or issues that consistently undermine collective community progress, such as youth unemployment, or address structural violence issues that weaken peace consolidation, such as discrimination in market access. Success at this level reflects larger circles of accountability and increased voice among the previously excluded members of society, across conflict lines, and along the vertical political spectrum.

## **Conclusion**

The need to disaggregate the “post-conflict” CDD agenda into more specific, realistic, and manageable phases underscores the complexity of conflict recovery. It also demonstrates the variety of mechanisms and methodologies with which CDD has been applied in conflict-affected environments to varying degrees of effectiveness. On a larger scale, the Bank is similarly reviewing sequencing and finding the appropriate mix of instruments in development contexts.

Numerous challenges and questions arise when dividing a community driven process into multiple components for an extended period following a peace agreement. How to devise and revise operational procedures continually to accommodate the different objectives and program components in each phase, for example, especially with respect to management structures and working with local government. This is particularly challenging when the phases are fluid and their durations unpredictable. It requires continued context analysis, simplified procedures, and imbedding the transitions into the operational policies of each phase.

# COMMUNITY DRIVEN RECOVERY PROCESS

Table 1

<b>Status</b>	<b>Reintegration</b> →	<b>Stabilization</b> →	<b>Consolidation</b>
<b>Conditions/ Context *</b>	Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants; refugee and internal displacement; urgent needs; supply-driven humanitarian aid; high donor funding; localized or intermittent insecurity and militarization; possible peacekeeping operation and/or UN Special Representative of the Secretary General offices; possible weak or illegitimate government	Delicate socio-political period, decrease in donor funding, geographic population stabilization, diminishing role of SRSG or joint power sharing, possible decrease in peacekeeping forces, higher risk of conflict resurfacing, possible I/PRSP	Government run institutions, general conflict-related stability, higher crime, general/basic development assistance, IPRSP or PRSP
<b>Community social cohesion*</b>	Security dominates agenda, communities begin to reorganization, bereavement, potential frustration in inadequate grievance redress, possible continued hatred discourse	Rebuilding trust and capacity to trust, re-establishing economic linkages, re-defining social ethics, possible formal grievance redress/judicial process	(Re) development of democratic discourse
<b>Type of program</b>	<b>Community Driven Reconstruction</b> →	<b>Transition</b> →	<b>Community Driven Development</b> →
<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Meet essential needs, build CDD foundation</b>  Meet urgent needs, offer tangible peace dividend, give hope, establish foundation for inclusive decision making, develop essential capacity, learn by doing, reintegration of populations (refugees, internally displaced, former combatants with those who remained), protection for most vulnerable, establish foundation for CDD, basic reconstruction and services	<b>Build relationships and capacities</b>  Reinforce commitment to peace; build trust; strengthen vision; enhance decision-making structures; establish foundation for greater political interaction; deepen community planning; build constructive relationships; develop habits and structures to support inclusion, peace process, development; revisit evolving standards and institutions for inclusion (especially of most marginalized); develop foundation for sustainability; more substantial reconstruction	<b>Empowerment building</b>  Consolidate commitment to peace, augment tolerance and trust, strengthen linkages to political processes, bolster conflict resolution processes, develop long-term vision, ensure sustainability, reinforce democratic and good governance standards, ensure sustainable practices, encourage macro-micro level interaction
<b>Community driven program components</b>	Quick assessment, design, and implementation; rapid dispersal of subproject funds; short planning process; small, untied grants; build baseline of capacity; target community-based war-affected; reintegration of displaced and ex-combatants; support for reintegration; infrastructure/ rehabilitation; community/parallel finance of service delivery; community capacity building; stronger/larger international organization role; grants (vs. loans) and free social services	Build links with government, begin shift of responsibilities to government, attention to livelihoods, revisit representative structures, transition from parallel social service provision, larger grants, multiple cycle action plans, greater analysis, growing role of local organizations, begin link with private sector, broaden outreach, continue to build civil society capacity, introduction of fee for service and cost recovery mechanisms	Fund action plans, focus on empowerment, target specific groups or issues, poverty indicators, eventual scaling up, stronger private sector engagement, strong relationship with government, programmatic links between communities, larger (possibly inter-community) projects, government social service provision, increased macro-micro linkages
<b>Actions necessary to shift to next phase and enhance sustainability</b>	Imbed notion of government – community relationship, develop long-term vision, establish community-driven approach as agreed mechanism, invest in civil society, establish mechanisms for accountability and transparency, consider equal application across conflict lines, move out of pure reconstruction to social service delivery, consider co-production, intensive review of government mechanisms and capacities, refine knowledge of community structures and local dynamics, coordination and knowledge sharing among all partners	Reinforce accountability and transparency, continued capacity building of civil society, attention to addressing precipitators of conflict, focus on conflict resolution skills and mechanisms, build mechanisms for sustainable cost recovery, increase engagement with partners on sustainability of process	Close coordination w decentralization framework, government capacity building on CDD, service delivery, strong attention to structural violence issues, build larger circles of accountability, enhance transparency, strengthen public-private partnerships
<b>Time frame*</b>	<b>Peace onset, years 1 - 2</b>	<b>Years 3 - 5</b>	<b>Years 6 - 10</b>

*\* (notes: 1) these time frames are notional at best, as the duration of any of these elements vary widely; 2) the conditions within each phase are dependent upon specific country context.)*