Can Citizen Engagement Strengthen Social Cohesion in FCV contexts?
Let’s discuss!
Citizen Engagement in the Fragile, Conflict & Violence contexts
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In FY19, 28% of Investment Project Financings (IPFs) are operationalized in FCV countries.

74 operations (out of 268 IPFs approved by Board) focuses on 24 countries affected by FCV.

Among 74 operations in FCV countries, 93% of FY19 projects included Beneficiary Feedback indicator(s) in the Results Frameworks of Project Appraisal Document, and 100% had a citizen-oriented design.

Overall, Grievance Redressal Mechanisms (GRMs), consultation, and satisfaction surveys are most commonly used CE mechanisms.

Half of the countries (18) of the Bank’s Harmonized List of Fragile Situations are in Africa.
By increasing interaction and dialogue between citizens and state and improving the responsiveness and effectiveness of government, citizen engagement could reduce citizen distrust and fear of the state and increase state legitimacy in the eyes of citizens, thus decreasing fragility.

- Citizen Engagement Can Help Build State Legitimacy
- Citizen Engagement Can Strengthen the Social Contract
- Citizen Engagement Can Strengthen the Social Cohesion
- Beneficiary Feedback compensating for lack of access

Reference: Governance Global Practice *Engaging Citizens in Countries Affected by Fragility, Conflict, and Violence* (2019)
Citizen Engagement Can Help Build State Legitimacy

- Increase in political legitimacy (accountability) and inclusion
- Increase in performance legitimacy (capacity)
- Increase in procedural legitimacy

Reference: Governance Global Practice Engaging Citizens in Countries Affected by Fragility, Conflict, and Violence (2019)
Citizen Engagement Can Strengthen the Social Contract

- A relationship is reinforced in which the state is answerable to citizens for its actions, and citizens can sanction it for not fulfilling its obligations.

- When citizens engage with government officials, the state becomes visible, and citizens gain more knowledge about government processes as well as constraints that affect government performance.

- In doing so, they also gain skills that help them better negotiate and communicate with the government in presenting their demands more coherently.

Reference: Governance Global Practice *Engaging Citizens in Countries Affected by Fragility, Conflict, and Violence* (2019)
Citizen Engagement Can Strengthen the Social Cohesion

- potentially strengthen social cohesion by increasing face-to-face interaction among community members, which can build trust and ultimately improve social cohesion

- provide the opportunity to community members to undertake collective projects, thereby engendering a sense of community and facilitating collective action

Reference: Governance Global Practice Engaging Citizens in Countries Affected by Fragility, Conflict, and Violence (2019)
Beneficiary Feedback Compensating for Lack of Access

• At a more pragmatic level for the World Bank Group, when open violence restricts access to supervision teams, beneficiary feedback can be supported to compensate for lack of access.

• Involving both an international and a local NGO (or consulting company) offers the benefit of having two watchdogs against elite capture to further guard against the possibility that beneficiaries and local governance structures will be intimidated or manipulated.

Reference: Governance Global Practice *Engaging Citizens in Countries Affected by Fragility, Conflict, and Violence* (2019)
Fragmented Accountabilities in Local Communities
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The role of social intermediaries in mediating state-citizen interaction

Social Intermediaries play a critical role in influencing information flows, ability for civic mobilization & access to the citizen-state interface

Adapted from Opening the Black Box: The Contextual Drivers of Social Accountability (World Bank 2015)
Multiple modes of governance create fragmented accountability relations at the community-level

- The ‘Chieftaincy’ mode of local governance – Village Chiefs/ Neighborhood Chiefs/Traditional Chiefs
- The ‘administrative/bureaucratic’ mode of local governance – Prefects/Sub-prefects
- The ‘municipal’ mode of local governance – Communes/Municipalities/Territorial Collectives
- The ‘religious’ mode of local governance – Imams/Marabouts
- The ‘associational’ mode of local governance – CBOs/Women groups/Youth Groups/Development Associations

Source: Photos taken by study team in Mali and Niger, 2019
Local Governance

Fragmented Accountabilities

- The lack of clear links, relations and harmonization between different modes of governance, creates **overlap and cross-purposes in accountabilities**

- The orientation of these governance modes away from the community **weakens their link with the community**

Source: Photos taken by study team in Mali and Niger, 2019
Youth trajectories: Top-down structuring

- **Socialization** = the complex process by which youth acquire the behaviors & beliefs of the social world (culture). Has a conservative bias toward internalization of existing norms and rules.

- **The concept of youth is not strictly tied to age.** Other milestones are used, like community role & contribution to family well-being. Such criteria makes the definition open for interpretation by community elders/members.

- The status passage of youth becomes contingent on the willingness of youth to conform to community norms & to defer to elders. This significantly constraints youth’s agency and voice.

“Community leaders (traditional leaders, local elected officials, marabouts) do not take care of our problems or consult us in solving our problems. Even when they make commitments to us, they do not fulfill these commitments. So, we do not respect them or respect them less and less. Sometimes they only need us during election campaigns”

Youth Focus Group, Maradi
Gender inequalities amplifying stressor

- In rural areas, **women rely on land resources for household needs** (food, water, energy) & are more dependent on natural resources

- **Women are a significant labor force in agriculture** in production, processing & commercialization of commodities. Women are guardians of valuable traditional & indigenous knowledge on land use

- Most landholders are men, **women neither own nor have control over land**, impacting the entire economic & social system, incl. access to credit & individual ventures

- **Disempowerment makes women invisible**: No extension services, agriculture and market information, or inputs to increase productivity.

“If parents do not have a right to look at their children in relation to marriage, there is a problem. Islam gives parents the right to their children, a father does not need permission from someone to give his daughter in marriage. The State of Niger has signed texts on the rights of women and children which are inadmissible in a Muslim country because it has received money from donors.”  
A Marabout in Maradi.
Shifting role of women in households

- Women’s relative importance at household level has grown, due to micro-level and agriculture-based income-generation.

- Fieldwork indicates shift in women’s roles: As breadwinners, their income is indispensable & empowered them within the household to gain more voice relating to children’s welfare and schooling, etc.

- Led to a tacit negotiated deal: women have access to markets & trade & a voice in the running of household affairs, while men are left with a more or less “nominal” role in public life.
Key Operational Implications

1. Social accountability interventions should be premised on a solid understanding of societal dynamics operating in each targeted community and their evolution over time. This includes an in-depth mapping of governance structures and accountability relations as well as identifying different identity groups and informal structures operating at the community-level.

2. Specialized local NGOs and other implementing entities of social accountability interventions should, to the extent possible, be organically linked to the local community and have a nuanced understanding of community-level societal dynamics and structures.

3. Social accountability interventions should contribute towards harmonizing community-level fragmented accountabilities. This will create a uniform line of accountability in the community, strengthening its ability to adapt to change. Where possible, uniform line of accountability should be centered around local state institutions (communes, etc.), to increase trust in public institutions and strengthen state-society relations.
4. In the context of weak state presence, social intermediaries should continue to be viewed as mandatory for social accountability interventions. They should factor-in inherent biases and prejudices of such structures—traditional structures and community-level associational structures—and introduce checks-and-balances to make them more inclusive.

5. Social accountability interventions should build on existing societal structures without introducing new structures into the community. They should be calibrated carefully to prevent their co-optation by incumbent elites while at the same time recognizing (at least symbolically) the legitimacy of such structures in the community.

6. Social accountability interventions should view the role of social intermediaries to be temporary and transitionary and should avoid creating permanent structures and/or new power centers at the local level. The eventual social accountability relations these interventions should aim to create is between the state and community members and, in that regard, view the role of social intermediaries as one of temporary facilitation.
State-society relations weakened links between social intermediaries and communities, undermining the ability of communities to adapt to rapid social change.

Social intermediaries are critical at the community-level in the context of a weak state presence, yet depth & scope of involvement needs careful calibration.

Additional checks-and-balances & capacity measures should be considered to harmonize and strengthen the role of social intermediaries – to minimize the fragmentation of accountabilities at the community-level.
Key Lessons Learned and some examples

- Understanding the local context dynamics
- Importance of support to access to information
- Strengthening the interface between the state institutions and the communities
- Support the civic space
- Flexibility & realism in operational design implementation
- Use ICT leverage power when possible (e.g. geo-localization, improved database, disruptive tech for information and reporting, mobile reporting etc.)

- Fragmented Accountabilities in Local Communities of Mali and Niger
- Institutionalizing Citizen Engagement in Guinea
Institutionalizing Citizen Engagement in Guinea
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Intensity of Citizen Engagement – tools and mechanisms

- Inform
  - Inform citizens on analysis, alternatives, & decisions

- Consult
  - Obtain feedback on analysis, alternatives & decisions

- Involve
  - Citizens take actions in identifying alternatives & decisions

- Collaborate
  - Citizens are responsible for some decisions

- Empower
  - Citizens hold final decision-making power

Example of tools/mechanisms:

- Information display boards
- Information campaigns
- Budget literacy campaigns
- Citizen’s charters

- Focus group discussions
- Interviews
- Feedback surveys

- Integrity Pacts
- GRM
- Public hearings
- Procurement monitoring
- Participatory monitoring (scorecards, report cards)

- Social Audits
- Public expenditure tracking
- Citizen’s juries
- Participatory budgeting

- Community contracting
- User management committees
- User membership in decision-making bodies
From project-based piloting to institutionalizing Citizen Engagement in fragile context

- Guinea – not “FCV” but fragility and need for strengthen social contract
- Community-driven development (CDD) project accompanying the country’s decentralization since 2000, more than 1500 micro-projects realized with participatory planning/implementation
- Now institutionalized with a national agency and funds transferred annually across 337 rural and urban communes
- Citizen Engagement mechanisms such as Participatory budgeting, M&E, GRM
- Working with local and sub-national authorities for institutionalization
CE Framework throughout the project cycle, with different tools and mechanisms

**Planning**
- Information sharing and Consultations
- Participatory identification and decision making on investments

**Implementation/Finance/Budget**
- Proposal development, budgeting
- Community procurement
- Management of the work

**Evaluation/Satisfaction**
- Beneficiary satisfactory survey
- Maintenance activities
- Data management and sharing of the Investments made

**Communication**
- (Community and National Radios, Project’s website, Information board of the local authorities)

**Grievance Redress mechanism /Early warning and response system**
- Call center (national level) and Complaints Handling Committee (commune level)

**Local development initiatives/micro projects**
- Participatory Budgeting
- Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

**LG Services delivery and budget**
- Information/data sharing
- Local Development Plans through participatory processes
Grievance Redress Mechanisms

- Two-levels: National call center and local community-based entry points
- Illustrated guide and communication strategy
- Gathering data for monitoring the local conflict and risks situations
- Founding a platform for other development programs to build on
- Challenges in monitoring the quality and making sure feedback loop is ALWAYS closed in a timely manner
Early Warning and Response System

- Pilot since late 2019 in 7 communes in a mining region
- Local “monitors” with a cell phone to alert on identified or observed risks of conflicts
- Training and capacity building efforts
- Monitoring based on geo-localization and online mapping
- Efforts to harmonize with other Citizen Engagement mechanisms such as GRM and partners
Participatory budgeting and M&E

- Local committee created with facilitating support from the national and local development agent
- Training provision
- Emphasis on inclusion for the members and activities
- Contributing to local government’s resource mobilization
Open Discussion