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What is CDD?

- **Community Driven Development**— “as broadly defined— is an approach that gives control over planning decisions and investment resources to community groups and local governments.”
- Estimated $12.7 Billion in WB support (2009)
- ~10 percent of WB lending
- Used in all regions of world; used for all sectors of support
- Widely used in post-conflict settings
CDD and conflict-affected areas

- **CDD in theory**
  - More efficient use of resources + stronger local institutions + enhanced state legitimacy = **Better Development**

- **CDD and conflict in theory**
  - Extra development barriers (poverty, social cohesion, eroded institutions) = **Cycle of Deprivation and Insecurity**
  - CDD can help to break this cycle

- **Wide-spread use in fragile/conflict-affected env.**
  - Afghanistan, Angola, Burundi, DRC, E. Timor, Liberia, Nepal, Rwanda, S. Leone, N. Uganda, Aceh, Mindanao
The theory: A framework for assessing impacts
CDD in Conflict; Theoretical Model

CHALLENGES IN CONFLICT SETTINGS

PROJECT AIMS

- Improved public infrastructure, services and more private assets
  - Better matching resources with needs
  - Improved efficiency
  - Better maintenance
  - Ability to work in high conflict areas

MECHANISMS

- Improved social relations and cohesion
  - Greater participation in civic life and improved relations
  - More accepted resource distributions
  - Mechanisms for defusing problems

- More effective and responsive institutions
  - Demand for more responsive institutions
  - Improve citizen-state relations
  - Common platform for programming
Economic deprivation

- **Challenges**
  - Greater needs; human capital deficits; weak institutions; low investment and growth

- **CDD aims**
  - Impact on micro-level determinants of growth and poverty reduction
    - Repairing and supplementing local infrastructure
    - Improving services
    - Replacing private assets or credit
Instability

- Challenges
  - Weak social cohesion and social capital
  - Risks of violence

- CDD aims
  - Improved social relations and cohesion
  - Targeting conflict-affected groups
  - Ensuring development ‘does no harm’
Institutional weaknesses

- Challenges
  - Weak state capacity and legitimacy
  - Weak civil society institutions

- CDD aims
  - Improve capacity of institutions
  - Make institutions more responsive/democratic
  - Build trust in the state
The evidence: The impacts of CDD
Dealing with economic deprivation

- Projects can be effective at addressing sources of deprivation that lie within communities (services and assets)
- Impacts across range of different contexts (inc. where large-scale violence occurring, where social divisions large)
- Limits of evidence
  - Some evaluations for national programs (Phil and Indo) that don’t disaggregate impacts by area
  - No proper impact evaluation for many (E. Tim, S. Leone, Nepal, etc.) or too soon (Afghan)
Economic deprivation mechanisms

1. Matching with local needs
   - Strong evidence of pro-poor/pro-vulnerable targeting & smaller leakages
   - Where evidence, high levels of satisfaction
   - Limitations of CDD in promoting growth

2. Unit costs
   - Strong evidence of lower unit costs (Indo & Phil)

3. Maintenance and sustainability
   - Little evidence that infrastructure is better maintained

4. Working in conflict-affected areas
   - Little formal evidence but most programs managed to operate
Promoting stability

- CDD projects tend not to affect likelihood of violent conflict
  - Indo, Aceh, Phil/ARMM, Afghan
  - Phil/Mindanao – increases in violence?
  - Fits with global evidence

- Sources of violence often exogenous to communities

- CDD no silver bullet, but potential for impact on some local factors
Stability mechanisms

1. Participation, trust and social relations
   - Indo: big impacts on social relations across range of cleavages; impacts increase over time
   - Phil: Intra-village trust increased, but impacts vary between areas
   - Aceh: No impact on social tensions and lower acceptance of ex-combs; Afghan: little change in trust
   - Mixed evidence on willingness for collective action

2. Limits on project-related conflict
   - Very limited evidence except for Indonesia (strong positive impacts)
   - Grievance and complains systems important, but often weak
Strengthening institutions

- Mixed evidence of local institutional impacts
  - Positive: Indo, Phil, Afghan
  - Little impact in (most) high conflict areas

- Large variation within projects in impacts
  - Time; facilitation; project design

- Little evidence of higher level impacts
Institutional mechanisms

1. **Improved trust/confidence between state officials and communities**
   - Some supporting evidence; (Afghan, SL, Phil, Aceh)

2. **Bolstering demand for good governance**
   - Increased participation in non-project meetings (Indo, Phil)
   - However, mostly appears in “project bubble”; few channels to link preferences to higher levels

3. **Common platform for programming/coord.**
   - Project mentalities work against this in practice
   - Donor squabbling and fragmentation
Conclusions

- CDD able to work in difficult places and generally with positive welfare impacts
- CDD does not lower risk of violence
- Some impacts on social cohesion (generally intra-community) but large variance
- Programs can affect local institutional structures, but rarely impact on broader state-citizen relations
- Large variance within and across projects
  - State factors as important as community or local institutional factors
- But evidence base is still shallow
Conclusions (in relation to DDR)

- Allocation efficiencies
- Shown can work in parallel w/ DDR (Aceh)
- Can help to reduce intra-community tensions around project $
- But...
  - Not a silver bullet— expectations need to be tempered
  - Is not a “quick-win”… takes time to set up the “software” before brick/mortar investments
  - Not a short-term solution either… more is better for recovery and for norms to take hold
  - Requires sound socio-political analysis to understand local dynamics
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