

## CHAPTER V: DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE

---

### 1. Introduction to Decentralized Governance in Post-Conflict Situations<sup>25</sup>

Under peacetime conditions, decentralized governance, carefully planned, effectively implemented and appropriately managed, can lead to significant improvement in the welfare of people at the local level, the cumulative effect of which can lead to enhanced human development. The key to human development-friendly decentralized governance is to ensure that the voices and concerns of the poor, especially women, help guide its design, implementation and monitoring. For development and governance to be fully responsive and representational, people and institutions must be empowered at every level of society – national, provincial, district, city, town and village. Decentralised governance entails the empowering of sub-national levels of society to ensure that local people participate in, and benefit from, their own governance institutions and development services. Institutions of decentralization, local governance and, by extension, urban/rural development, must bring policy formulation, service delivery and resource management within the purview of the people. These institutions should enable people, especially the poor and the marginalized, to exercise their choices for human development.

In post-conflict situations, societies are institutionally weak: they are socially fragmented, psychologically fractured and physically devastated, requiring efforts to simultaneously restore people's confidence and satisfy their basic need for water, waste disposal, food, jobs, health services, education, income and security. Post-conflict situations usually entail weak central government, if any at all. Service provision to the citizenry is minimal at best. A decentralized network of local institutions and individuals, often linked to humanitarian operations, can often be an opportunity to re-establish government services, mobilize communities, further democratic processes and demonstrate the responsiveness of public institutions.

### 2. Main Issues for Decentralized Governance in Post-Conflict Situations

2.1 In post-conflict settings, as in others, decentralized governance initiatives are not a panacea. On the one hand, the implicit reallocation of power and resources that decentralization implies can generate, reignite or intensify power struggles, thus leading to further chaos or conflict. On the other hand, without appropriate accountability mechanisms, abuse of power, corruption, and capture by elites are a risk. Conflicts may also arise when reforms fail to address issues of social inclusion, particularly vis-à-vis ethnic and religious minorities, and respect for local customs and traditions. These challenges are added to those facing all decentralized governance initiatives: poor capacities, poor culture of participation, and lack of economic viability to secure mobilization of resources, among others. These and other risks can be minimized if decentralized initiatives and capacity development efforts fit within the overall national post-conflict peace-building and reconstruction strategies.

---

<sup>25</sup> UNDP BDP's practice area is formally called Decentralisation, Local Governance and Urban/Rural Development (DLGUD).

2.2 Renewed or enhanced service delivery is one of the main demands of communities in the aftermath of conflict, and decentralized governance initiatives can go far in achieving this. World Bank case studies from Uganda and the Philippines have demonstrated that local officials at the county or municipal level tend to engage in less pronounced corruption and are more aware of local needs and preferences than those in higher-tier governments; however, often local officials do not have the authority, financial resources or capacity to adjust or manage service provision accordingly.<sup>27</sup> Where there is a functioning central authority, the potential for improving service delivery is increased through decentralized governance when certain institutional arrangements are in place, e.g., meaningful delegation of authority and fiscal transfer.

2.3 Examples from varied contexts such as Cambodia, Mozambique, Kosovo and Congo highlight the interdependence between the centre and the periphery, i.e., national versus localized governance structures and initiatives. Localized initiatives in post-conflict settings with a functioning centre, whether in the form of a coalition government or an external transitional authority such as the UN, tend to be more successful than in situations where there are weak national state institutions.<sup>28</sup> Whereas a functioning centre is important for development of local governance, the politics of central-local relations is key in determining local outcomes. This condition is even more pronounced in a post conflict setting; the nature of the peace settlement and power-sharing agreements, and the rivalry and search for political to control the state will greatly influence the extent to which local structures of conflict mediation and interest balancing.<sup>29</sup>

2.4 Well-designed, multi-faceted responses at the local level, operating in tandem with other administrative tiers, and targeted to engage individuals, institutions and societies in participatory local development and reconstruction, can serve as building blocks in bottom-up development of normalcy in post-conflict situations.

2.5 Post-conflict situations are not characterized by smooth transition into democratic approaches and often there could be efforts by local elites and leaders to capture power and exercise ruthless authority over marginalized groups. Post-conflict efforts need to promote effective participatory mechanisms and mobilize people around common needs such as water, sanitation, waste disposal, jobs, shelter, land tenure and so forth. The control of local institutions exerted by various ruling factions,

---

<sup>26</sup> *The Role of Participation and Partnership in Decentralised Governance: A Brief Synthesis of Policy Lessons and Recommendations of Nine Country Case Studies on Service Delivery for the Poor*, Robertson Work, UNDP BDP (2002).

<sup>27</sup> *Decentralization and Governance: Does Decentralization Improve Public Service Delivery?* Satu Kahkonen and Anthony Lanyi, World Bank (2001).

<sup>28</sup> UNDP's Area Development Approach (ADA) has achieved success in strengthening local governance by providing for an umbrella framework that allows multiple interventions to take place at various administrative levels and tiers (e.g. CAREERE in Cambodia and PRODERE in Central America, as well as in Sudan and Afghanistan).

<sup>29</sup> See e.g. *Local Governance Approach to Social reintegration and Economic Recovery in Post-Conflict Countries*, Susan L. Woodward, New York, 2002 and *Strengthening Democratic Governance in Conflict Torn Societies: Civic Organisations, Democratic Effectiveness and Political Conflict*, Richard C. Crook, Brighton, 2001.

and the political relationships between tiers of the administration will determine not only the pattern of participation emerging but in many cases it may lead to important limitations of local authorities to reach out with services in areas within their jurisdiction. Whereas, the specific obstacles will to a large extent depend on the type of post-conflict situation (see below), there is in many cases a risk that the rural areas most heavily affected by the conflict may not be reached.

2.6 Often, local administrative structures cease to function in areas most directly affected by conflict. The extent to which sub-national democratic institutions – the organizations of local government as well as the democratic systems and procedures – are functioning during and after the conflict will be a key determinant for the post-conflict strategies and the type of assistance required for recovery. Often, the lowest tiers of local government will be in the front line of fighting between warring factions and will cease to function. In Nepal, for example, the majority of the 3,913 Village Development Committees have been destroyed or been abandoned. In such situations, the local governments will in the immediate post-conflict period not be in a position to resume activities.

2.7 In such situations with limited capacity of local governments, various types of local institutions and individuals, including traditional leaders, could serve as logical partners for localized initiatives. Engaging leaders from differing factions in localized initiatives can serve to promote multi-partisanship and contribute to peace-building. Investing in capacity development and institutional strengthening of local institutions and individuals is critical to building and strengthening local governance processes.

2.8 Fostering decentralized governance requires thorough analysis of local contexts; such analysis should be sensitive to local traditions and customs and at the same time should take into account efforts to enhance national governance. A three-pronged approach is a useful way of formulating a baseline assessment: (i) a comprehensive analysis of the post-conflict setting; (ii) specific analysis of local governance structures and customs; and (iii) opportunities for interventions in the immediate post-conflict stage and in the longer-term. A baseline assessment of local governance specific needs (disaggregated for urban and rural areas) should study issues such as:

- Existing policy and legislative frameworks for decentralization and local governance;
- The number and type of administrative tiers in the country and their precise functions; the administrative and political nature of existing local authorities; the presence of other existing local institutions such as CSOs, traditional community-based structures (e.g., *Shura*, *Sanduqs*, etc.), special interest groups (e.g., women's groups, youth groups, etc.), NGOs, trade associations, and so forth; identification of local leaders and their roles in the communities concerned;
- The relationship between existing localized governance structures and other levels of administration;
- The institutional and human resources capacities of local authorities and other local institutions, actors and leaders;
- Mechanisms for people's participation (including traditional forms of community participation); and

- Existing planning and service delivery mechanisms for various segments of the population.

2.9 One model of intervention applied by UNDP in countries with weak central institutions with low ownership of equitable, sound policies, has traditionally been that of the “Area Development Schemes” which were first designed and implemented in Sudan in 1986-87 and have subsequently evolved through a process of corporate learning as they been implemented in other countries such as Central America (PRODERE) and Cambodia (CARERE). Important design modifications have respond to local conditions<sup>30</sup>. The Local Governance Model draws on the lessons learned from UNDP’s Areas Based Development experience and provides an umbrella planning and management framework and delivery mechanism under which a number of different interventions can take place supported by a variety of different organizations. There are a number of areas in which UNDP can assist:

2.9.1 *Creation of capacity:* A key first step is to focus on developing capacity among official government institutions or traditional institutions of government at the village or district level with a view to creating an effective planning and delivery mechanism. The objective is to establish the capacity at this level to plan and manage development activities that are identified, planned, resourced and managed in a participatory manner. Where traditional cultural practices exclude particular groups from decision-making, UNDP assistance has been used to leverage broader participation in decision-making bodies including economically disadvantaged groups or displaced groups living in the community. For example, in the case of Sudan, the programmes focused at the outset on the development of community-based decision-making systems expanding on traditional village committees and other traditional institutions such as village “*sanduqs*”<sup>31</sup>, thereby creating capacity to manage local development. In order to ensure that any entrenched traditional power structures were not further reinforced, these committees were expanded to incorporate other members, including women and minority tribal groups<sup>32</sup>. National and international UN Volunteers were mobilized to help develop capacity for effective planning and management. NGOs and CBOs constitute an important component of this effort. In the case of CARERE in Cambodia, UNDP, in partnership with ILO, created a network of national NGOs (ACLEDA) to manage small credit schemes and the development of micro-enterprises at the local level in the absence of any formal lending institutions with outreach capacity. These national NGOs were composed of individuals drawn from the local community as well as returning refugees with a view to facilitating resettlement and reintegration objectives.

<sup>30</sup> In addition to Cambodia, Central America and Sudan, area development programmes have since been implemented in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Angola, Myanmar, Mozambique and Somalia.

<sup>31</sup> Literally translated as village “chests” or treasuries, these systems of managing communal finances were built upon to enable the management of small credit schemes that were administered along the Grameen Bank model.

<sup>32</sup> Recent evaluations show that women have actively participated in decision-making in most of the Area Development Schemes in Sudan. Participation across tribal and communal lines, however, has been more difficult to achieve.

- 2.9.2 *Ownership*: An emphasis on community ownership of development activities is critical. In addition to ensuring participatory planning, many activities can include local contributions of resources either in cash or in kind. Labour-based Public Works in partnership between the UNDP and the ILO has been a good example of this. Under such projects, local communities are organized and participate in labor-intensive rehabilitation and reconstruction of essential infrastructure (feeder roads, irrigation schemes, schools, etc.)
- 2.9.3 *Resourcing development activities*: Providing adequate resources for local level development activities is another critical area. Resources come in the form of expertise, technology and funds. Local development funds, in the form of block grants that are more directly managed by community organizations for credit, small infrastructure projects and other development activities, have been used successfully in Cambodia for example.
- 2.9.4 *Links to the central administration*: In Sudan the original design for the project entirely excluded the central and provincial government authorities. This placed considerable financial stress on the *Sandouqs* that were forced to subsidize the cost of essential all essential services as the government withdrew its support to the area development scheme areas. Local governance schemes, while retaining management control in the hands of local communities as much as possible, must link to official government structures as they exist or emerge.

### 3. Entry Points for Decentralized Governance in Post-Conflict Situations

In *self-enforcing cases*<sup>33</sup>, decentralization and local government development can take place with minimal risk of renewed conflict. The government and its development partners, once agreement is reached on the nature of decentralized governance, can introduce reforms with minimal threats to the newfound stability. The main challenges in such cases, as seen in situations such as Timor-Leste and Eritrea, tend to revolve around the lack of capacity of both national/local civil servants and the CSOs/CBOs that need to represent communities' interests. By and large, however, the departure of the former regime and society's support for the government in such settings permits relatively far-reaching reforms to take place with minimal disruptions.

---

<sup>33</sup> This paper utilizes a three-pronged typology identified by CMI to analyze different post-conflict settings and proposing governance interventions, as follows:

(i) *Self-Enforcing Cases*, in which one side is overwhelmingly victorious, usually with the defeated party territorially displaced (e.g. post-colonial or separation situations); there is typically substantial consensus in society about political developments in the aftermath of the cessation of hostilities (e.g. Timor-Leste and Eritrea).

(ii) *Mediated Cases*, in which two or more previously warring factions agree to a peace settlement, which typically includes agreement on subsequent political development; however, mistrust usually remains, and, moreover, other elements of society are unable to voice their concerns, given the dominance of the previously warring factions (e.g. Cambodia and Mozambique).

(iii) *Conflictual Cases*, in which one side achieves a military victory *per se*, but there is no comprehensive peace settlement to resolve the very issues that led to and exacerbated the conflict. The risk of renewed hostilities is high (e.g. Rwanda and Afghanistan).

*Mediated cases*, like *conflictual cases*, are significantly more challenging. Decentralised governance initiatives involve alterations in the allocation of powers and resources, which, in a fragile peace, can bring about the renewal of conflict. In some cases, undertaking extensive decentralization and local public administration reform runs the risk of entrenching the existing incumbents (including former combatants) and administrative power structures. However, focusing on local service delivery mechanisms can lay the ground for formal reforms once normalcy has been achieved and a return to conflict unlikely.

Similarly, in *conflictual cases*, the obstacles to effective decentralized governance are daunting: coherent implementation is usually politically and practically difficult to achieve, either because the reach of central government is still tenuous in many areas, or because it would upset the political peace. However, improvements in the performance of local authorities could help weaken support for the conflict; additionally, strengthened governance in local communities can form the basis for building a peacetime administration. Here, again, the cautions of the *mediated cases* should be heeded.

### **3.1 Immediate Post-Conflict Assistance**

In the initial stages of a post-conflict situation, it is useful to focus on service delivery that can help meet basic humanitarian needs as well as lay the foundation for legitimate participatory processes and institution building at all levels, in particular at the local and community levels. The following short-term measures are examples:

- 3.1.1 Enabling local authorities to proactively lead localized recovery and social reintegration.
- 3.1.2 Promote fiscal transfer to local authorities for localized recovery and social reintegration activities.
- 3.1.3 Instituting participatory local planning and budgeting procedures in the local authority and building capacity for demand-driven, socio-economic local development and social integration activities.
- 3.1.4 Developing the capacity of local NGOs, CBOs and other local institutions for participatory development in post-conflict situations.
- 3.1.5 Establishing grant facilities to fund local NGOs and CBOs, including traditional organizations and interest groups (such as women's groups, youth groups, etc.), to promote dialogue and participatory local initiatives in the areas of water supply and sanitation, rural road building, small irrigation schemes and the like, as well as activities to foster reconciliation and social reintegration.
- 3.1.6 Establishing micro-credit schemes to promote income-generating activities among poor and marginalized groups such as women and youth.

- 3.1.7 Strengthening the capacity of sectoral state administrative units to provide technical assistance, legal control and local performance appraisal.

### **3.2 Medium-Term Post-Conflict Support**

There are three major strategic entry points for longer-term support and assistance, namely: (i) creating an enabling framework at the national level in support of decentralized governance; (ii) promoting participation and community-led development; and (iii) developing local capacity at individual, institutional and systemic levels for local development and social reintegration.

- 3.2.1 Creating an enabling framework at the national level in support of decentralized governance:

- Constitutional recognition and autonomy for local authorities;
- Legislative and legal frameworks for decentralization, including mechanisms for fiscal transfer and devolution of financial powers;
- National decentralization strategy sensitive to rural and urban contexts;
- Local Governance Act;
- Enabling legislation for administrative reforms, regulations and procedures;
- Law empowering NGOs, CBOs and traditional forms of participatory mechanism; and promoting micro-macro linkages to inform national policies; and
- Laws regulating public-private partnerships.

- 3.2.2 Promoting participation and community-led development:

- Citizen participation (including returnees and other residents) in setting priorities and budget allocation for local service provision and development;
- Legislative frameworks enabling communities to organize themselves for collective action;
- Leadership training for human development.
- Establishing facilities to fund NGOs, CBOs and other groups for participatory infrastructure reconstruction such as schools, health centers, rural roads, irrigation channels and the like, as well as social reintegration activities; and
- Access to information, public records and meetings.

- 3.2.3 Developing local capacity at individual, institutional and systemic levels for local development and social reintegration:

- Developing the capacity of local authorities for participatory and transparent governance and in analyzing, planning and monitoring localized demand-driven, socio-economic development;
- Developing local authorities' capacity to expand local revenue base;
- Enhancing capacity to undertake measures for community security and social reintegration;
- Strengthening skills to promote partnership among local actors;
- Strengthening local officials' management and coordination skills;

- Promoting measures to build public confidence and social reintegration through non-violent conflict resolution mechanisms and physiological healing; and
- Developing the capacity of relevant agencies at the regional and national levels to provide financial and technical support to local authorities.

**Annex I: Illustrative Entry Points and Sequencing for Decentralized Governance in Post-Conflict Situations**

<b>SELF-ENFORCING<sup>34</sup> POST-CONFLICT SITUATIONS</b>		
<b>Strategic Entry Point</b>	<b>Immediate Post-Conflict</b>	<b>Medium-Term</b>
<i>Resources, Financing and Investment Mechanisms</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rapid financing facilities (e.g. UNDP Area Based Programme, UNCDF's LDF, LIFE, etc.) to promote service delivery, etc.</li> <li>- Promote fiscal transfer from central to local authorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Funding facilities to fund NGOs, CBOs and other groups for participatory service delivery, infrastructure reconstruction and social reintegration</li> <li>- Developing local authorities' capacity to expand local revenue base</li> <li>- Develop framework for sharing of revenues between central government and tiers of local government</li> </ul>
<i>Planning and Budgeting Structures and Processes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Instituting participatory local planning and budgeting procedures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Citizen participation in setting priorities and budget allocation for local service provision</li> <li>- Developing the capacity of local authorities for participatory and transparent governance and in analyzing, planning and monitoring localized reconstruction and development</li> </ul>
<i>Institutional Strengthening</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing capacity of local authorities to engage in priority service provision and participatory development</li> <li>- Strengthening the capacity of sectoral state administrative units to provide financial and technical support, etc. to local administrative structures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthening local officials' management and coordination skills</li> <li>- Developing the capacity of relevant agencies at the regional and national levels to provide financial and technical support to local authorities</li> <li>- Enabling legislative and legal frameworks for political, administrative and financial decentralization and devolution sensitive to urban and rural contexts</li> </ul>
<i>Community Participation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing capacity of local authorities, NGOs, CBOs and other local institutions for participatory development</li> <li>- Legal framework enabling communities to organize and to empower CBOs, NGOs and traditional forms of participatory mechanisms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing leadership capacity for community-led participatory local development</li> <li>- Enhancing local capacity to undertake measures for community security and social reintegration</li> <li>- Strengthening capacity to promote partnerships among local actors</li> </ul>

<sup>34</sup> A *Self-Enforcing Case* is one in which one side is overwhelmingly victorious, usually with the defeated party territorially displaced (e.g. post-colonial or separation situations); there is typically substantial consensus in society about political developments in the aftermath of the cessation of hostilities (e.g. Timor-Leste and Eritrea).

<b>MEDIATED<sup>35</sup> POST-CONFLICT SITUATIONS</b>		
<b>Strategic Entry Point</b>	<b>Immediate Post-Conflict</b>	<b>Medium-Term</b>
<i>Resources, Financing and Investment Mechanisms</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rapid financing facilities (e.g. UNDP ABD Programme, UNCDF's LDF, LIFE, etc.) to promote service delivery, etc.</li> <li>- Promote fiscal transfer from central to local authorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Funding facilities to fund NGOs, CBOs and other groups for participatory service delivery, infrastructure reconstruction and social reintegration</li> <li>- Developing local authorities' capacity to expand local revenue base</li> <li>- Develop framework for sharing of revenues between central government and tiers of local government</li> </ul>
<i>Planning and Budgeting Structures and Processes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pilot participatory local planning and budgeting procedures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Citizen participation in setting priorities and budget allocation for local service provision</li> <li>- Developing the capacity of local authorities for participatory and transparent governance and in analyzing, planning and monitoring localized reconstruction and development</li> </ul>
<i>Institutional Strengthening</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing capacity of local authorities to engage in priority service provision and participatory development</li> <li>- Strengthening the capacity of sectoral state administrative units to provide financial and technical support, etc. to local administrative structures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthening local officials' management and coordination skills</li> <li>- Developing the capacity of relevant agencies at the regional and national levels to provide financial and technical support to local authorities- Enabling legislative and legal frameworks for political, administrative and fiscal decentralization sensitive to urban and rural contexts</li> </ul>
<i>Community Participation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing capacity of local authorities, NGOs, CBOs and other local institutions for participatory development</li> <li>- Legal framework enabling communities to organize and to empower CBOs, NGOs and traditional forms of participatory mechanisms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing leadership capacity for community-led participatory local development</li> <li>- Enhancing local capacity to undertake measures for community security and social reintegration</li> <li>- Strengthening capacity to promote partnerships among local actors</li> </ul>

<sup>35</sup> A *Mediated Case* is one in which two or more previously warring factions agree to a peace settlement, which typically includes agreement on subsequent political development; however, mistrust usually remains, and, moreover, other elements of society are unable to voice their concerns, given the dominance of the previously warring factions (e.g. Cambodia and Mozambique).

<b>CONFLICTUAL<sup>36</sup> POST-CONFLICT SITUATIONS</b>		
<b>Strategic Entry Point</b>	<b>Immediate Post-Conflict</b>	<b>Medium-Term</b>
<i>Resources, Financing and Investment Mechanisms</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rapid financing facilities (e.g. UNDP's ABD Programme, UNCDF's LDF, LIFE, etc.)</li> <li>- Funding facilities to fund NGOs, CBOs and other groups for participatory service delivery, infrastructure reconstruction and social reintegration.</li> </ul>
<i>Planning and Budgeting Structures and Processes</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Piloting citizen participation in setting priorities and budget allocation for local service provision</li> <li>- Developing the capacity of local authorities for participatory and transparent governance and in analyzing, planning and monitoring localized reconstruction and development</li> </ul>
<i>Institutional Strengthening</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing capacity of local authorities to engage in priority service provision and participatory development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthening local officials' management and coordination skills</li> <li>- Strengthening the framework for tiers/units of governance and the mandate/coordination</li> <li>- Developing the capacity of relevant agencies at the regional and national levels to provide financial and technical support to local authorities</li> <li>- Enabling legislative and legal frameworks for political, administrative and fiscal decentralization sensitive to urban and rural contexts</li> </ul>
<i>Community Participation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing capacity of local authorities, NGOs, CBOs and other local institutions for participatory development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing leadership capacity for community-led local development</li> <li>- Legal framework enabling communities to organize and to empower CBOs, NGOs and traditional forms of participatory mechanisms</li> <li>- Enhancing local capacity to undertake measures for community security and social reintegration</li> <li>- Strengthening capacity to promote partnerships among local actors</li> </ul>

<sup>36</sup> A *Conflictual Case* is one in which one side achieves a military victory per se, but there is no comprehensive peace settlement to resolve the very issues that led to and exacerbated the conflict. The risk of renewed hostilities is high (e.g. Rwanda and Afghanistan).

## Annex II. Resources and Partners

### Resources

UNDP, *Decentralized Governance for Development: A Combined Note on Decentralization, Local Governance and Urban/Rural Development (Draft)*, New York, February 2004

Sam Barnes and Alain Retiere, *Peace-building from the ground up: A case study of UNDP's CAREERE Programme in Cambodia 1991- 2000*, UNDP/Cambodia, Phnom Penh, 2001

Dirk Salomons, *Local Governance Approach to Social Reintegration And Economic Recovery in Post-Conflict Countries: Programme Options for UNDP/UNCDF Assistance*, Paper presented in the Workshop: A Local Governance Approach to Post – Conflict Recovery, New York, 2002

Leonardo Romeo, *Local Governance Approach to Social Reintegration and Economic Recovery in Post Conflict Countries: Towards A Definition And A Rationale*, Paper presented in the Workshop: A Local Governance Approach to Post-Conflict Recovery, New York, 2002

Rajeev Pillay, *Halting the Downward Spiral: Returning Countries with Special Development Needs to Sustainable Growth and Development; A Discussion Paper* prepared for IDG/BDP/UNDP, New York, 2002

Gurr TR, Monty G. Marshall, Deepa Khosla, *Peace and Conflict, 2001: A Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self- Determination Movements and Democracy*, Centre for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM), University of Maryland, College Park, 2001

Marlene Fernandez, *LIFE Programme in Colombia: An Evaluation Report*, UNDP, New York, 2000

UN- DDSMS/UNDP, *Local Governance: Report of the UN Global Forum on Innovative Policies and Practices in Local Governance*, Gothenburg, Sweden, September 1996

### Partners

#### *UN System*

UN DESA and UNDP collaborate in many country programmes as well as in the conduct of capacity development workshops on DGD themes as part of the annual Global Forum on Reinventing Government.

<http://www.unpan.org/globalforums.asp>

UN HABITAT executes most of UNDP's urban programmes including the Urban Management Programme (UMP), one of the global programmes supported by UNDP.

<http://www.unhabitat.org/> and <http://www.unhabitat.org/programmes/ump/>

The World Bank Institute and UNDP has signed an MOU outlining specific areas of collaboration and initiatives, including those related to (i) local governance, fiscal decentralization and access to information, and (ii) community empowerment. [http://www.decentralization.org/Active\\_Pages/index.asp](http://www.decentralization.org/Active_Pages/index.asp)

#### *Local Government Associations*

- International Union of Local Authorities (with access to local government associations around the world) – UNDP has an MOU with IULA: <http://www.iula.org/>
- Council of European Municipalities and Regions <http://www.ccre.org/docs/index.html>
- International City/County Management Association <http://www.icma.org>
- International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives <http://www.iclei.org>
- World Association of the Major Metropolises| <http://www.metropolis.org>
- World Associations of Cities and Local Authorities Coordination <http://www.waclac.org>
- Sister Cities International <http://www.sister-cities.org/>

#### *Resource Centers, Universities and Institutes*

- Asian Resource Center for Decentralization (ARCD) <http://www.decentralization.ws/>
- Barefoot College (India) <http://www.barefootcollege.org/html/about.htm>
- Fiscal Decentralization Initiative <http://lgi.osi.hu/fdi/>
- Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA) [kadarko@yahoo.com](mailto:kadarko@yahoo.com)
- Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies- HIS, Rotterdam, The Netherlands: <http://www.ihs.nl>
- Institute of Public Administration (IPA), USA <http://www.theipa.org/index.html>
- Institute of Regional and Metropolitan Studies (Spain) <http://campus.uab.es/iermb/>
- International Development Department- IDD School of Public Policy, University of Birmingham, UK <http://www.bham.ac.uk/idd>
- Kiev-Mohyla Academy (Ukraine) <http://www.ukma.kiev.ua/>

- Network of Institutes and Schools of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe (NISPAcee)  
<http://www.nispa.sk>
- Open Society Institute/Soros Foundation  
<http://www.soros.org/>
- School of Planning and Architecture (India)  
[jhansari@bol.net.in](mailto:jhansari@bol.net.in)
- Taubman Center for State and Local Government  
Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University  
<http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/taubmancenter/>
- Universidad Privada Antenor Orrego (Perú)  
[vcarrerat@yahoo.com](mailto:vcarrerat@yahoo.com)
- University of the Philippines  
School of Urban & Regional Planning  
<http://www.upd.edu.ph/>
- University of the Philippines  
National College of Public Administration and Governance  
<http://www.upd.edu.ph/~ncpag/>
- Centre for Environmentally Sound Technology Transfer - Sichuan University  
P.R. China  
<http://www.cestt.org.cn/English/>