COMMUNITY DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT – A DONOR’S PERSPECTIVE

- What it is / What it isn’t
- Where/ When we engage
- Why donors like it
- What it does well
- Where it has further to go
WHAT IT IS

• A pro-poor way to deliver public goods such as infrastructure, which puts the decision making, accountability and finances in the hands of communities.

• Generally three key features:
  o **Grants** delivered directly from governments to villages
  o **Participatory planning** process focused on inclusiveness, transparency & accountability
  o **Trained facilitators** to support communities with participatory planning, project & budget management, construction

• CDD operates on the principles of transparency, local community participation and accountability.
SMALL SCALE, LABOUR INTENSIVE INFRASTRUCTURE
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CLINICS AND SCHOOLS
WHAT IT IS NOT

• A program aimed at improving governance, or capacity building of the community as a whole.
  ○ CDD is not the silver bullet for all development issues.

• Social funds

• A small scale NGO type model of participatory community development.
WHERE/WHEN WE ENGAGE - DFAT SUPPORT TO CDD

• An important poverty reduction strategy for many of Australia’s partner governments – including (Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Afghanistan and the Philippines).

• DFAT usually focuses on policy support, M&E and program improvement, rather than funding community grants. **South-South learning** is also a focus.

• Supported **when** current government systems are not delivering appropriate small scale infrastructure to communities.
WHY DONORS LIKE IT

- CDD is an effective person/community centric instrument for delivering services and infrastructure.
  - Poor people are treated as partners in the development process.
- Attractive as a low-resource intensity investment, using partner systems with reach at the community level. Achieves scale!
- It can reduce corruption through transparent mechanisms of decision-making and budget management.
- CDD can bypass ineffective government systems – hence why it is a useful ‘tool’ in emergencies, humanitarian settings and in fragile and conflict affected states.
WHAT IT DOES WELL

• Delivers cost effective economic infrastructure. Generally cheaper than contracting through local agencies.

• Allows poor people to set their own direction.

• Has built in safeguards - reduces corruption through transparent mechanisms of decision-making, accountability and budget management.

• Can be used as a state and peace building tool in some contexts. For example - Afghanistan Citizens Charter program.
WHAT IT DOES WELL
EXAMPLE: AFGHANISTAN- CITIZENS’ CHARTER

The CCP aims to deliver a minimum package of basic services to every Afghan over ten years (2017-2027); including universal access to clean drinking water; improved access to rural infrastructure; health and education services.

NSP:
• 33,000 communities were mobilised with Community Development Councils (CDC) elected from 2003 to 2015

81,000 rural infrastructure subprojects from 2003 to 2015 (WB data):
• Increased school attendance and quality of education for girls
• 15% increase in the use of protected water sources,
• 5% reduction in the time households spend collecting water
• 26% increase in electrification

Citizens’ Charter:
• 49% of community development council (CDC) members; &
• 50% of CDC office bearers are female.
• 5,000 water, irrigation, electricity, transport, school and other projects underway.
• The CCP has so far benefitted almost 8 million Afghan citizens, across all 34 provinces.

Afghanistan
CCP 1st phase (2017-2021)

Total program value of CCP
$10bn
(Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund - World Bank, bilateral donors, and the Government of Afghanistan)
WHAT IT DOES WELL

EXAMPLE: TIMOR-LESTE - PNDS

- Roads, bridges, irrigation and clean water systems all exceeded the benchmark 25% rate of return for sound public investments.

- Nearly 60% of community members said they have expanded economic activities since completion of the infrastructure investment.

Clean water systems account for 35% of all projects under PNDS:

- 24% of respondents claimed that they now save more than 2 hours per day not carrying water.

- 64% report improved health as one of the benefits.
WHAT IT DOES WELL

RESULTS ACROSS WB PORTFOLIO

Poverty Reduction
11% increase in consumption among poor households (Indonesia)
19% increase in consumption, 19% decline in incidence of food insecurity (Nepal)
26% increase in household assets (India)
65% increase in household expenditures (Senegal)

Service Delivery
15% increase in the use of protected water sources (Afghanistan)
11% improvement in access to healthcare (Indonesia)
Bottom 40% have improved access to protected water sources, education facilities, and access to local roads (Laos)

Cost Effectiveness
13-39% lower infrastructure costs compared to central government-funded projects (Indonesia, Nepal, and the Philippines)
CDD spending total 8% of total World Bank lending (199 projects in 78 countries)
CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

• The spill over effects on governance
• Quality of participation – voices of the marginalised
• Can do little about the supply side
• Building a stronger evidence base of what works and what doesn’t work
  o Improving M&E to better understand strengths, limitations and sustainability
• Linking with social protection
CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS
CDD AND SP

Scope for greater collaboration:
- Community targeting
- Filling the inevitable gaps in social protection programs
- Sharing lessons with PWPs
CONCLUSION

- Valuable vehicle for donors – gets funds into the hands of those who know what would most improve their welfare.
  - does so at scale
  - can bypass inefficient government systems (esp in fragile contexts)
  - produces cheaper, more corruption resistant, assets
- Focus needs to be on viewing CDD as part of a broader development strategy.
  - CDD will never be the sole approach and should have realistic expectations placed on it.
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