

## INFRASTRUCTURE AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

# Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming at the Green Climate Fund

“In light of increasingly unpredictable and extreme climate-change induced weather patterns, infrastructure has a large potential to help defuse or protect communities from economic, environmental and societal crises that can lead to instability.”\*

**Summary:** Infrastructure projects in fragile and conflict-affected settings (FCS) are susceptible to many operational challenges, which might inadvertently escalate existing socio-economic and political tensions. Infrastructure, being intricately connected to the daily lives and societal needs of communities, often becomes a flashpoint in conflicts. Essential systems like water, energy, and transportation are not just physical assets; they represent broader social, economic, and political structures that can be either symbols of progress or points of contention. When these vital infrastructures are disrupted or commandeered, it can magnify existing societal disparities, restrict access to essential services, and further entrench divisions. However, with thoughtful planning and sensitivity to the local context, these projects can promote peace, address inequalities, and enhance social cohesion. Success in such endeavors often hinges on navigating uncertain political landscapes, adapting to evolving regulatory frameworks, and understanding regional complexities.

### 1. How Fragility, Conflict and Violence Relate to Infrastructure and Built Environment

In FCS, the infrastructure and built environment can play a critical role in both the eruption, escalation, and resolution of

conflicts. In conflict contexts, vital infrastructure and the built environment for human activities can be destroyed or damaged, impacting important environments specifically made to meet human necessities in the vast sectors of education, health, telecommunications, water, energy, and

agriculture. Infrastructure and the built environment represent a link of physical spaces to their social implications; disruptions to critical infrastructure such as public services and community buildings can significantly impact socioeconomic factors, perpetuating, reinforcing, or reproducing inequality by limiting access to important resources and impeding development opportunities.<sup>1</sup>

Conflict parties, especially non-state armed groups (NSAGs), often seek significant influence over critical elements of infrastructure and built environment and can intensify tensions and perpetuate inequalities and conflict dynamics. Scarce urban resources, such as essential goods and services like housing, water, and security represent incentives for NSAGs to explore both material gain and political influence.<sup>2</sup> Conflict parties may occupy public buildings such as schools and hospitals to assert their authority and restrict access to key facilities. Communication networks can be targeted to manipulate information flow. Vital utilities, such as water treatment plants and power stations, may be manipulated to control essential resources. The control of vital water resources and power supply infrastructure, for example, was a well-documented tactic used by ISIS to control populations in Northern Iraq during their campaign in 2014.<sup>3</sup> NSAGs can also seek control of economic activities by imposing taxes on businesses and individuals in certain areas, influencing urban or rural development.<sup>4</sup>

Infrastructure and the built environment play a crucial role in shaping societies. They are

capable of both cementing community cleavages and favoring intergroup interactions and social cohesion. They hold the potential to significantly enhance peace by establishing vital infrastructure systems, such as housing, education, and health facilities, addressing structural socioeconomic disparities by providing universal access, minimizing the likelihood of uprising and violence, and by promoting sustainable development.<sup>5</sup>

## Key Terms

**Integrated climate-security programming** is the holistic approach of embedding both climate and security considerations into the entire lifecycle of projects—from design and implementation to evaluation. This strategy aims to guarantee that climate finance initiatives are not only environmentally sustainable but also conflict-sensitive.

**Conflict sensitivity** is an organizational process where knowledge of the peace and conflict dynamics in the operational context is gathered through a locally informed perspective and applied to avoid unintended negative consequences and maximize positive effects on peace. Conflict-sensitive practices exist on a spectrum between 'do-no-harm' (e.g., conflict assessment, safeguards, redress mechanisms, etc.) and 'do-good' (e.g., peace responsiveness, peace co-benefits, peacebuilding, etc.).

The following subsections provide an overview of risks to projects in FCS, how projects in these contexts might exacerbate ongoing conflict dynamics, and what peacebuilding opportunities exist. We then provide guidance on how to incorporate conflict sensitivity into projects. The overview and guidance are based on a literature review of publicly available

---

\* UNOPS, 'Infrastructure and Peacebuilding: The role of infrastructure in building and sustaining peace, January 2020, p. 11.

<sup>1</sup> International Committee of the Red Cross section 'Allies, Partners and Proxies: Support Relationships in Armed Conflict. Essential services'

<sup>2</sup> Sampaio, Antonio, 'Urban Resources and Their Linkage to Political Agendas for Armed Groups in Cities' Global Initiative against Transnational Organized Crime

<sup>3</sup> Strategic foresight group, 'Water and violence: Crisis of survival in the Middle East,' 2014, p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> Jones, Stephen and Simon Howarth. 'Supporting infrastructure development in fragile and conflict-affected states: learning from experience.' *Oxford Policy Management*. August 2012.

<sup>5</sup> Galster, George and Patrick Sharkey. 'Spatial Foundations of Inequality: A Conceptual Model and Empirical Overview' *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 3, No. 2, *Spatial Foundations of Inequality*. February 2017.

material and include additional resources for further reading.

## 2. Risks and Opportunities for GCF Projects in Infrastructure and Built Environment

### 2.1. Security Risks Impacting Projects

Several conflict risks may negatively impact projects related to infrastructure and the built environment. Some of the risks are highlighted below:

**Destruction of infrastructure and the built environment:** In FCS, there is a higher risk of damage or destruction to infrastructure, both existing and built by a project,<sup>6</sup> including critical public services and community buildings that are intended to be “climate-proofed”.<sup>7</sup> Such damage may disrupt normal activities and operations and require additional resources and efforts to restore or rebuild critical damaged infrastructure.

**Occupation by conflict parties:** Infrastructure often becomes closely linked to military access and usage. Due to power struggles in FCS, infrastructure becomes vulnerable to violence from all parties involved in conflict, making it a channel for or target of increased aggression and exploitation.<sup>8</sup> NSAGs may seek to modify the built environment in the interest of military operations, reinforcing territorial control and strengthening presence in FCS. Project activities may be suspended or delayed due to insecurity and instability, affecting the timely completion of the project. For many NSAGs, establishing governance mechanisms and, in some cases, providing service functions is not merely a means of extorting economic gains from populations in FCS, but also a strategy to

enhance their legitimacy in the eyes of the population as part of an eventual state-building process.<sup>9</sup>

**Political instability:** FCS are frequently subject to volatile political environments with changes in government or alterations in power dynamics, which can ultimately lead to unpredicted policy changes, delays in project approvals or permits, or cancellations of infrastructure projects. The lack of administrative efficiency, such as non-transparent decision-making processes, political instability and inconsistent policies may ultimately affect administrative decisions and can significantly impact projects in their success and implementation.<sup>10</sup>

### 1) Lessons from GCF Projects

The African Development Bank’s **Programme for Integrated Development and Adaptation to Climate Change in the Niger Basin** highlights conflict-sensitive programming in addressing climate challenges related to infrastructure and built environment projects. As climate change disrupts pastoralist migration routes, competition intensifies between farmers and pastoralists over land and water. To mitigate these tensions, the project introduces small multi-purpose dams, the development of 19,000 ha of irrigated land, and transhumance corridors. Integrated landscape management ensures shared resource usage, with agreements between farmers and herders safeguarding both crops and grazing areas. By emphasizing cooperative resource management and strategic infrastructure development, the project aims to reduce potential conflicts and promote community harmony.

**Uncertain legal and regulatory frameworks:** FCS are often characterized by weak legal and regulatory systems around infrastructure-related projects, which may lead to uncertainty

<sup>6</sup> UNOPS ‘Infrastructure and Peacebuilding: The role of infrastructure in building and sustaining peace,’ January 2020.

<sup>7</sup> As per the GCF’s projects related to climate resilient infrastructure.

<sup>8</sup> UNOPS ‘Infrastructure and Peacebuilding: The role of infrastructure in building and sustaining peace’ January 2020

<sup>9</sup> Danish Institute for International Studies, ‘From the power of guns to civilian acceptance - When armed groups provide public services’ October 2017

<sup>10</sup> OECD ‘Getting Infrastructure Right: The Ten Key Governance Challenges and Policy Options’ The OECD Framework for the governance of Infrastructure.

and challenges in obtaining the necessary permits and approvals for such projects to go ahead. Risks related to political and/or regulatory frameworks can arise since infrastructure projects can interfere with the political economy of conflict, with political elites potentially interrupting project approvals that might challenge their political power<sup>11</sup> or business interests.

**Cross-border and regional implications:**

Projects near borders or regions prone to conflict may be exposed to additional risks because of past struggles or owing to tensions with neighboring countries.<sup>12</sup> Risks can arise due to the involvement of several countries with a complex, and often divergent, regulatory environment of infrastructure development. Important geopolitical and diplomatic factors may lead to cost increases and slower development stages. These problems may result from a lack of political will and support from the two or more governmental parties involved, from complex relations or agreements between various stakeholders in certain project regions, or from difficult regional economic cooperation.<sup>13</sup>

## 2.2. Security Risks Generated by Projects

When operating in FCS, infrastructure and built-environment projects are not only subject to conflict risks and political instability. The projects themselves may also exacerbate existing conflict dynamics, creating new tensions. The following set of risks are some of the most common:

**Competition over natural resources:**

Infrastructure projects can involve the allocation of scarce resources such as water, land, or energy. In FCS, where natural resources may already be scarce, projects can intensify competition and disputes involving different actors. These tensions can lead to conflicts over natural resource access and distribution, which have a vital role in sustaining communities' economic stability and livelihoods. Any threat related to the access to natural resources can lead to the aggravation of tensions and even conflict.<sup>14</sup>

**Displacement and land tenure issues:**

Community resettlement may often form part of infrastructure-related projects requiring the compulsory expropriation of land and the relocation of communities to alternative locations.<sup>15</sup> For example, an estimated 80 million people have been displaced by dam projects worldwide.<sup>16</sup> When infrastructure projects require the displacement of communities, particularly in regions with indigenous populations without legally secure land rights, forced evictions and land disputes can arise, hampering social cohesion and stability in conflict-prone regions.<sup>17</sup>

**Interference with local livelihoods:**

Infrastructure implementation in FCS poses several risks. The vulnerability of FCS to environmental, climatic, and health hazards highlights the need to assess potential negative socio-environmental impacts. Infrastructure development can affect traditional livelihoods reliant on natural resources. These subsistence livelihoods may also reflect a community's religious or cultural heritage. Conflicting views on resource

<sup>11</sup> DeGood, Kevin, 'Infrastructure Investment Decisions Are Political, Not Technical,' *CAP*, 14 April 2020. URL

<sup>12</sup> The European investment Bank 'Cross-border infrastructure projects: The European Investment Bank's role in cross-border infrastructure projects,' 2023.

<sup>13</sup> Fujimura, Manabu and Ramesh Adhikari, 'Critical Evaluation of Cross-Border Infrastructure Projects in Asia,' *ADBI Working Paper Series*, July 2010.

<sup>14</sup> Watkins, George, et al., 'Lessons from four decades of infrastructure project-related conflicts in Latin America and the Caribbean' *Inter-American Development Bank* 2017.

<sup>15</sup> Lindsay, Jonathan Mills, 'Compulsory Acquisition of Land and Compensation in Infrastructure Projects' *World Bank*, 2012.

<sup>16</sup> Walicki, Nadine, et al., 'Dams and Internal Displacement,' *IDMC, Applied Social Analysis, and Oregon State University*, 11 April 2017.

<sup>17</sup> G. Watkins, et al (2017).

allocation and its potential socioeconomic effects can lead to resistance or can escalate into conflict.<sup>18</sup> Prioritizing short-term outcomes over building comprehensive infrastructure capacity may hamper long-term sustainable and climate-resilient development.<sup>19</sup>

**“infrastructure projects can be instrumentalized as a powerful tool by a country’s economic and political elite to enable or cement patterns of segregation, sectarianism, gentrification”**

**Lack of community engagement and consultation:** Insufficient consultation and engagement with local communities in project design, planning and decision-making processes — especially in adaptation processes that introduce nature-based solutions<sup>20</sup> — can lead to community mistrust and resistance, hampering the success and sustainability of the project. Ignoring community engagement and local partnerships can negatively impact local communities, exacerbating tensions.<sup>21</sup> Affected communities are also setting up ‘Not In My Back Yard’ (NIMBY) movements against large development

projects.<sup>22</sup> As the green energy transition intensifies globally, these movements will likely grow in size, creating even more opposition to green development, whether projects are trying to engage with communities or not.

**Cementing or exacerbating conflict dynamics:** Especially in urban landscapes, a country’s economic and political elite can implement infrastructure projects as a powerful tool to enable or cement patterns of segregation, sectarianism, gentrification, or other forms of social separation and exclusion. Overlooking such dynamics may result in infrastructure projects which favor or strengthen existing patterns of separation or exclusion to the detriment of equity and social cohesion.<sup>23</sup>

### 2.3. Peace Responsiveness Entry Points

By applying key best practices and standards of peacebuilding investment,<sup>24</sup> climate mitigation efforts focused on infrastructure and the built environment can and should contribute to peace and stability by addressing the challenges faced by communities in FCS. Examples of such pathways include:

**A holistic approach for resilient infrastructure development:** When considering the impact of critical infrastructure in society, it is crucial to highlight interconnections between different sectors. Power, water, and transportation infrastructure function as interconnected systems, with specific vulnerabilities and exposure to specific risks.<sup>25</sup> Adopting a holistic approach to infrastructure development through systems connectivity can foster greater resilience, facilitating the movement of

<sup>18</sup> Ramos Suárez, Eduardo and Gabriel Pérez. ‘Development and conflicts linked to infrastructure. construction’ *Bulleting FAL, Issue 361, No. 1*, 2018.

<sup>19</sup> UNOPS ‘Infrastructure and Peacebuilding: The role of infrastructure in building and sustaining peace’ January 2020

<sup>20</sup> The World Bank report ‘Nature-based Solutions for Climate: Resilience and Adaptation’

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Hager, Carol, ‘Grassroots Protest and Innovation: A New Look at NIMBY,’ *Items: Insights from the Social Sciences*, 17 October 2017. (url)

<sup>23</sup> Bollens, Scott A., ‘Urban planning and peace building,’ *Progress in Planning*, 66(2), 67-139, 2006.

<sup>24</sup> See for example Peace Bond Standard (2023), Version: 2.0 June, Finance for Peace, Geneva, Switzerland. / Peace Equity Standard (2023), Version: 2.0 June, Finance for Peace, Geneva, Switzerland.

<sup>25</sup> Almaleh, Abdulaziz, ‘Measuring Resilience in Smart Infrastructures: A Comprehensive Review of Metrics and Methods’ *Applied Sciences* 2023



vital goods, such as medicines and food, as well as access to vital services, such as health and education.<sup>26</sup>

**Human-centered approach to resilient infrastructure projects:** Adopting conflict-sensitive efforts to ensure infrastructure projects are adaptable and resilient to drivers of conflict is key when working with a human-centered approach to development infrastructure.<sup>27</sup> By ensuring inclusion for marginalized groups — such as youth and women, or ethnic, cultural, and religious minorities — projects can contribute to the mitigation of hidden and overt conflicts. Addressing inequitable access to essential public infrastructure service projects may enable divided communities to develop or rebuild critical spaces in the interest of community development and regional growth.<sup>28</sup>

**Project adaptability and sustainability:** Infrastructure projects can enhance sustainable outcomes for the well-being of future generations. They can implement a comprehensive and strategic assessment of life cycle sustainability to ensure resilient long-term infrastructure projects, adaptable to the different needs of ecosystems they operate in and to the beneficiary communities.<sup>29</sup> By addressing challenges proactively, projects can ensure environmentally and socially responsible project development. They can prevent the need for future financing to fix or rebuild essential structures, meeting higher infrastructure performance and sustainability standards.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Okkonen, Lasse and Olli Lehtonen. 'Socio-Economic Impacts of Community Wind Power Projects in Northern Scotland,' *Renewable Energy*, Vol. 85. 2018.

<sup>27</sup> Mitoulis, Stergios-Aristoteles, et al. 'Conflict-resilience framework for critical infrastructure peacebuilding,' *Sustainable Cities and Society*, Vol. 91, April 2023

<sup>28</sup> Lim, Susan and Alessandra Heinemann, 'Human-Centered Design: Putting People at the Heart of Urban Transport Infrastructure Planning' the Asian Development Bank, 15 January 2019. URL

## 2) Lessons from GCF Projects

The **Simiyu Climate Resilient Project** by *Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau* integrates a conflict-sensitive approach to combat water scarcity, emphasizing benefits for vulnerable communities. The project promotes inclusion by adopting block tariffs, prioritizing public taps in impoverished areas, and ensuring representation of women and vulnerable groups in decision-making bodies. This approach aligns with SDG 16's vision of peaceful, inclusive societies, fostering transparent governance, community-based planning, and reducing potential conflicts between farming and pastoralism. The holistic involvement of all users in decision-making not only strengthens community bonds but also enhances local revenue stability.

### **Enhancing sustainability through infrastructure compliance and development:**

When ensuring public-level sustainability standards, it is crucial for projects to comply with infrastructure requirements. This entails aligning the assessment of public needs with broader community development objectives.<sup>31</sup> Infrastructure projects can contribute to creating fair and efficient legal systems that support economic growth, community well-being and responsible use of natural resources. Projects should encourage proper public record-keeping practices, support infrastructure development investment policies, and build trust at national and regional levels.<sup>32</sup>

**Promoting secure ownership:** In infrastructure and built-environment projects, safeguarding the land ownership rights of smallholders becomes crucial. Special attention should be

<sup>29</sup> UNEP. 'Future-proofing Infrastructure to address the climate, biodiversity, and pollution crises' UNEP, Nairobi. 2021.

<sup>30</sup> Hussain, Shahid, et al. 'Assessing the Socio-Economic Impacts of Rural Infrastructure Projects on Community Development Buildings.' *Buildings* 2022, 12(7), 947. December 2022.

<sup>31</sup> Pavlovskaja, Evgania. 'Using Sustainability Criteria in Law.' International Journal Environmental Protection Policy. 2013.

<sup>32</sup> Hussain, Shahid, et al. 'Assessing the Socio-Economic Impacts of Rural Infrastructure Projects on Community Development Buildings.' *Buildings* 2022, 12(7), 947. December 2022.

paid to protecting land areas where the project activities take place. Projects should consult land tenure arrangements, adopting a comprehensive approach to acknowledging formal and traditional land ownership and use. They should recognize property rights and the significance of sacred indigenous land in compliance with customary law, local traditions, and land tenure systems. By promoting secure ownership of land, projects can proactively prevent future land-related tensions or conflicts and ensure a more secure and equitable ownership and use of the built environment.<sup>33</sup>

**Promoting community-based and economy-boosting infrastructure:** Community-based infrastructure projects have the most significant positive effects on promoting and sustaining peace.<sup>34</sup>

**“infrastructure projects have the potential of being peace-promoting in terms of implementing more transparent and inclusive governance systems that ensure better accessibility”**

Construction phases are the most likely stages for conflicts to arise. During construction, concerned communities and different social groups consider how to coexist and collaborate effectively.<sup>35</sup> Infrastructure projects that focus on community livelihoods may stimulate local economies by connecting people, reducing stereotypes and sponsoring dialogue, as well as generating local employment and incomes,

and addressing economic grievances. In addition, communally accessible infrastructures, such as water wells or

processing facilities, can encourage dialogue between groups, create shared values, and promote intracommunal cooperation.<sup>36</sup>

### 3. Recommendations

#### 3.1. Conflict-sensitive Programming in the GCF

There is a wealth of guidance and tools on delivering conflict-sensitive projects related to infrastructure and the built environment, and on how to adequately address challenges as they arise:

**Planning the project:** The GCF Initial Investment Framework may benefit by applying conflict sensitivity to the investment criteria, in particular ‘needs of the recipient community’, ‘sustainable development potential’ and ‘country ownership’. A robust application can then proceed, based on a strong understanding of the targeted area, including the current state of infrastructure systems with a particular focus on critical infrastructure related to energy, healthcare, transportation and water.<sup>37</sup> To do this, baseline analysis and stakeholder mapping can illuminate understanding of the problem, as well as whom it affects and how.<sup>38</sup> Documenting these different realities experienced by different groups can improve the inclusivity of programming and help identify potential solutions or contribute to already existing efforts. This stage can further ensure that the next steps are conflict-sensitive by defining a co-benefit indicator and acquiring free, prior, and informed consent from stakeholders.

<sup>33</sup> Oxfam Tanzania report ‘Balancing Infrastructure Development and Community Livelihoods’

<sup>34</sup> Bachmann, Jan and Peer Schouten, ‘Concrete approaches to peace: infrastructure as peacebuilding,’ *International Affairs*, Vol. 94, Issue 2, March 2018.

<sup>35</sup> Wang, Wanting and John W. van de Lindt ‘Quantifying the effect of improved school and residential building codes for tornadoes in community resilience’ 2022.

<sup>36</sup> Dresse, Anaïs, et al., ‘Environmental peacebuilding: Towards a theoretical framework’. *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 54, is. 1, 2019

<sup>37</sup> CDA. ‘Conflict Sensitivity in Land Governance: The Do No Harm Framework and Other Tools for Practitioners of Land Activities.’ *Cambridge, MA: CDA Collaborative Learning Projects*, March 2022. p. 18-19.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52-53.

**Implementing the project:** During activities' rollout, operational risks can be mitigated by robust early-warning systems for insecurity, engagement with stakeholders, and contingency funding for security-related delays. Some planning tools can help mitigate the risks of contributing to insecurity and operational risks by extension. For example, projects should clearly define the beneficiaries, staff, and partners,<sup>39</sup> starting with the least controversial issues to build confidence between stakeholders.<sup>40</sup> At this stage, negative impacts can be further prevented by regularly engaging stakeholders and addressing their concerns, in particular through adequate grievance and compensation mechanisms. Activities avoid worsening security when implementing staff and partners display positive behavior patterns to beneficiaries,<sup>41</sup> and when distribution of project resources accounts for potential negative impacts.<sup>42</sup> Co-benefits can be further leveraged by activities through regular and open communication, which can bring stakeholders closer, reveal opportunities for peace dividends and raise awareness for durable dispute resolution mechanisms. Finally, a well-designed exit strategy can ensure that conflict in cities and urban areas does not reignite and that resilience to compounded climate-related risks is increased.<sup>43</sup>

**Monitoring and evaluating the project:** During and after activities, project staff should monitor both operational risks and the project's impacts on the security context. Data on the evolution and emergence of sources of tension and cohesion, on changing dynamics

that can impact infrastructure, and on the implementation of conflict sensitivity measures is particularly relevant. It may also be helpful to assess perceptions of the project and potential negative effects of resource allocation (whether verified or perceived), and the perception of RAFT (Respect, Accountability, Fairness and Transparency) on the part of beneficiaries.<sup>44</sup>

**Throughout the project:** The project can be more conflict-sensitive — during planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation — through conflict resolution training for staff, a designated conflict and peace focal point, consistent stakeholder inclusion, and information transparency.<sup>45</sup>

### 3.2. Peacebuilding Actions Related to Infrastructure and Built Environment

**Promoting benefit sharing and conflict resolution governance structures:** Improved infrastructure typically enhances access to services and provides better transportation for people and communities. However, these benefits do not necessarily promote peace.<sup>46</sup> Infrastructure projects have the potential to build peace in terms of implementing more transparent and inclusive governance systems. They can ensure improved accessibility, reducing competition and increasing trust and legitimacy in institutions.

**Supporting capacity building and employment:** While infrastructure can decrease isolation of rural areas and increase access to markets for people and communities, it doesn't necessarily improve security.<sup>47</sup> Projects need to incorporate training and capacity-building

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 56.

<sup>40</sup> UNEP. 'Toolkit and guidance for preventing and managing land and natural resources conflict: Land and conflict.' 2012.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 39-41.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 37-38.

<sup>43</sup> European Commission. Guidance notes on conflict sensitivity in development cooperation – An update and supplement to the EU staff handbook on 'Operating in

situations of conflict and fragility.' Publications Office of the European Union. 2021.

<sup>44</sup> CDA, 2022, p. 39-41.

<sup>45</sup> USAID. 'Operational Guidelines for Responsible Land-based Investment.' March 2015. (url)

<sup>46</sup> Schouten, Peer and Jan Bachmann, 'Roads to peace? The Role of Infrastructure in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States,' *DIIS and UNOPS*, January 2017, p. 10.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 16.



programs to develop skills related to entrepreneurship and infrastructure in the workforce, focusing in particular on youth and marginalized communities.

**Securing land rights:** There is no 'one size fits all' approach when it comes to securing land tenure rights; it will depend on the legal, cultural, and environmental conditions in the specific context.<sup>48</sup> Projects can help in recognizing communities' rights to land by developing tailor-made, context-specific and participatory land use planning strategies. This approach ensures that local stakeholders — especially women, youth, marginalized communities, indigenous peoples, displaced populations, tribes and other groups — have legal recognition and ownership of land. This is especially relevant in the context of infrastructure projects expanding into remote land areas in FCS.

**Addressing the gender gap:** Projects can promote equal rights and address the gender gap in infrastructure development by empowering women and women's groups. Women can claim spaces in decision-making around infrastructure. They can raise their voices. Projects should inform and support strong institutions, including customary

institutions, to be more inclusive and to invite more women's participation.<sup>49</sup> This could start, for example, by working to achieve a better gender balance in community decision-making bodies for infrastructure planning. Also, where discriminatory customary practices are deeply embedded, a strategy could be to work with the least discriminatory institutions to at least try to change the status quo. Initial work can generate evidence and experience, raising voices and confidence, and then address other institutions.

**Fostering partnerships with Civil Society:** Due to the lack of agreement and clarity on infrastructure in many FCS, it is important to foster partnerships with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). They can help to resolve conflicts related to infrastructure through peacebuilding actions, for example, by promoting regulatory frameworks and strong rule of law. Using participatory approaches to infrastructure design, development, and implementation can help tailor the project and its objectives to the intended beneficiaries.

## 5. Recommended Reading:

Adelphi, UNEP, and the EU. 'Addressing climate-related security risks: Conflict sensitivity for climate change adaptation and sustainable livelihoods.' *Guidance note, toolbox, and monitoring and evaluation note*. 2022.

Danish Institute for International Studies, 'From the power of guns to civilian acceptance - When armed groups provide public services. October 2017.

Büscher, Karen. 'African cities and violent conflict: the urban dimension of conflict and post-conflict dynamics in Central and Eastern Africa,' *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 2, 193-210. 2018

Notices from European Union Institutions, Bodies, Offices and Agencies. The European Commission notice 'Technical guidance on the climate proofing of infrastructure in the period 2021-2027' *Official Journal of the European Union*. 2021.

---

<sup>48</sup> Wehrmann, Babette and Andrea Lange, 'Secure Land Tenure Rights for All: A key condition for sustainable development,' *GIZ*, July 2019.

<sup>49</sup> SDC, 'Gender and Land Governance,' *Guidance note*. 2017. p. 5.

Läderach, Peter, Julian Ramirez-Villegas, Giulia Caroli, Claudia Sadoff, and Grazia Pacillo. "Climate Finance and Peace—Tackling the Climate and Humanitarian Crisis." *The Lancet Planetary Health* 5, no. 12 (December 2021): e856–58. [URL](#)

Sampaio, Antônio. 'Urban Resources and Their Linkage to Political Agendas for Armed Groups in Cities' *Journal of Illicit Economies and Development*, 2(2), p.171–187. 2020.

The World Bank 'Nature-based Solutions for Climate: Resilience and Adaptation' World Bank Group Priorities at COP27. [URL](#)

Scartozzi, Cesare M. "Conflict Sensitive Climate Finance: Lessons from the Green Climate Fund." *Climate Policy*, May 21, 2023. [URL](#)

UNOPS 'Infrastructure and Peacebuilding: The role of infrastructure in building and sustaining peace'. January 2020 [URL](#)

## 6. Bibliography

Almaleh, Abdullaziz. 'Measuring Resilience in Smart Infrastructures: A Comprehensive Review of Metrics and Methods' *Applied Sciences*. 2023 [URL](#)

Bachmann, Jan and Peer Schouten. 'Concrete approaches to peace: infrastructure as peacebuilding' *International Affairs*, Volume 94, Issue 2. March 2018 [URL](#)

Bollens, Scott A. 'Urban planning and peace building.' *Progress in Planning*, 66(2), 67-139. 2006.

DeGood, Kevin, 'Infrastructure Investment Decisions Are Political, Not Technical,' *CAP*, 14 April 2020. [URL](#)

Dresse, Anaïs, et al. 'Environmental peacebuilding: Towards a theoretical framework.' *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 54, Is. 1, 2019.

Fujimura, Manabu and Ramesh Adhikari. 'Critical Evaluation of Cross-Border Infrastructure Projects in Asia' ADBI Working Paper Series. July 2010.

Galster, George and Patrick Sharkey. 'Spatial Foundations of Inequality: A Conceptual Model and Empirical Overview' *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 3, No. 2, *Spatial Foundations of Inequality*. February 2017.

Hager, Carol. 'Grassroots Protest and Innovation: A New Look at NIMBY.' *Items: Insights from the Social Sciences*. 17 October 2017. [URL](#)

Hussain, Shahid, et al. 'Assessing the Socio-Economic Impacts of Rural Infrastructure Projects on Community Development Buildings.' *Buildings* 2022, 12(7), 947. December 2022.

Jones, Stephen and Simon Howarth. 'Supporting infrastructure development in fragile and conflict-affected states: learning from experience.' *Oxford Policy Management*. August 2012.

Lim, Susan and Alessandra Heinemann. 'Human-Centered Design: Putting People at the Heart of Urban Transport Infrastructure Planning.' *the Asian Development Bank*. 15 January 2019. [URL](#)

Lindsay, Jonathan Mills. 'Compulsory Acquisition of Land and Compensation in Infrastructure Projects.' *PPP Insight*, Vol. 1, Is. 3. 2012.

Mitoulis, Stergios-Aristoteles, et al. 'Conflict-resilience framework for critical infrastructure peacebuilding.' *Sustainable Cities and Society*, Vol. 91, April 2023.

Notices from European Union Institutions, Bodies, Offices and Agencies. The European Commission notice 'Technical guidance on the climate proofing of infrastructure in the period 2021-2027' Official Journal of the European Union. 2021. [URL](#)

- Okkonen, Lasse and Olli Lehtonen. 'Socio-Economic Impacts of Community Wind Power Projects in Northern Scotland,' *Renewable Energy*, Vol. 85. 2018.
- Oxfam Tanzania report 'Balancing Infrastructure Development and Community Livelihoods' [URL](#)
- Pavlovskaia, Evgania. 'Using Sustainability Criteria in Law.' *International Journal Environmental Protection Policy*. 2013.
- Ramos Suárez, Eduardo and Gabriel Pérez. 'Development and conflicts linked to infrastructure. construction' *Bulleting FAL, Issue 361, No. 1*, 2018.
- Sampaio, Antônio. 'Urban Resources and Their Linkage to Political Agendas for Armed Groups in Cities' *Journal of Illicit Economies and Development*, 2(2), p.171-187. 2020.
- Schouten, Peer and Jan Bachmann. 'Roads to peace? The Role of Infrastructure in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States.' *DIIS and UNOPS*. January 2017.
- The European Investment Bank 'Cross-border infrastructure projects: The European Investment Bank's role in cross-border infrastructure projects.' 2023 [URL](#)
- The World Economic Forum and The Boston Consulting Group 'Industry Agenda Strategic Infrastructure Mitigation of Political & Regulatory Risk in Infrastructure Projects.' February 2015 [URL](#)
- UNEP. 'Future-proofing Infrastructure to address the climate, biodiversity, and pollution crises' *UNEP, Nairobi*. 2021.
- UNOPS Infrastructure for Peacebuilding: The role of infrastructure in tackling the underlying drivers of fragility. September 2020.
- Walicki, Nadine, et al., 'Dams and Internal Displacement,' IDMC, Applied Social Analysis, and Oregon State University, 11 April 2017.
- Wang, Wanting and John W. van de Lindt, 'Quantifying the effect of improved school and residential building codes for tornadoes in community resilience.' *Resilient Cities and Structures, Vol 1, Is. 1*. 2022.
- Watkins, Graham. 'Lessons from four decades of infrastructure project-related conflicts in Latin America and the Caribbean.' *Inter-American Development Bank*. 2017 [URL](#)
- Wehrmann, Babette and Andrea Lange, 'Secure Land Tenure Rights for All: A key condition for sustainable development,' GIZ, July 2019.

## About the Series:

The “Guidance Notes for Peace-Informed Programming at the Green Climate Fund” is a thematic series published by CGIAR in partnership with Interpeace, with the support of TrustWorks Global. The series consists of eight briefs that provide sectoral risk analyses and guidance tailored to the Green Climate Fund's Result Areas. Recognizing the complex nexus between climate change and peace, the series aims to provide actionable strategies to assist both Accredited Entities and Direct Entities to understand and manage project risks as well as to maximize opportunities to promote peace. The series is published as part of the Climate Security Programming Dashboard for Climate Finance (**CSPDxCF**). The dashboard is an all-in-one solution for preliminary conflict sensitive assessments and tailored guidance, targeting projects funded by international financial institutions and climate funds.

## CGIAR-Interpeace Partnership:

CGIAR Focus Climate Security and Interpeace collaborate at the intersection of climate finance, conflict, and peace. Drawing from CGIAR's expertise in climate science and Interpeace's experience accompanying peacebuilding processes, they aim to enhance conflict sensitive climate finance and improve the delivery of funds towards communities most at risk.

## Related Briefs and Toolkits:

- Climate Security Programming Dashboard for Climate Finance (**CSPDxCF**).
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Health, Food, and Water Security.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Livelihoods of People and Communities.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Infrastructure and Built Environment.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Ecosystems and Ecosystem Services.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Energy Generation and Access.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Buildings, Cities, Industries, and Appliances.
- Guidance Note for Peace-Informed Programming: Forest and Land Use.

Discover all the related guidance notes and the **CSPDxCF** dashboard at:

<http://cspd.cso.cgiar.org/>.

**Authors:** Cesare M. Scartozzi<sup>+</sup>, Giulia Caroli<sup>+</sup>, Carolina Sarzana<sup>+</sup>, Peter Läderach<sup>+</sup>, Grazia Pacillo<sup>+</sup>, Daniel Hyslop<sup>°</sup>, Andreas Luis Hahn<sup>°</sup>, Elio Azar<sup>°</sup>, Giorgia Nicatore, Oliver Brown<sup>x</sup>, Komal Hassamal<sup>x</sup>, Simon Ehmsen<sup>x</sup>.

<sup>+</sup> Alliance Bioversity International - CIAT / CGIAR FOCUS Climate Security

<sup>°</sup> Interpeace, International Organization for Peacebuilding

<sup>x</sup> TrustWorks Global

**Publication Date:** 21/11/2023

**Copyright:** 2023 CGIAR System Organization, CC BY 4.0.

**Disclaimer:** This publication has been prepared for information purposes only. No claim or representation is made or warranty given as to the accuracy, completeness or authenticity of the information. CGIAR, the Alliance of Bioversity & CIAT, and Interpeace shall not in any way be held liable for any loss or direct or indirect damage caused by any inaccuracies or errors in the publication. The publication is an independent product and is not affiliated with, endorsed by, or sponsored by the Green Climate Fund.

**Acknowledgements:** This work was carried out with support of the CGIAR Initiative on Climate Resilience (ClimBeR) and the CGIAR Initiative on Fragility, Conflict, and Migration (FCM). We would like to thank all funders who supported this research through their contributions to the [CGIAR Trust Fund](#).

**CGIAR System Organization:**

1000, Avenue Agropolis,  
F-34394 Montpellier, France.  
P: +33 (0)467047800

**Alliance Bioversity - CIAT:**

Via di San Domenico, 1,  
00153 Rome, Italy.  
P: +39 0661181

**Interpeace Head Office:**

Maison de la Paix,  
2E Chemin Eugène-Rigot,  
1202 Geneva, Switzerland.

