

A Review of the World Bank's Experiences Using Conflict Filters and Peace Lenses

Suh Yoon Kang

Patrick Barron*

17 July 2019

The purpose of this short paper is (i) to provide an overview of the different types of experiences developing and applying conflict filters/peace lenses that exist within the World Bank, and (ii) to present lessons emerging from these experiences that could potentially inform others that may be interested in utilizing similar types of filters/lenses in the future.

Conflict filters and peace lenses are matrices and questionnaires developed for the portfolio and/or individual projects to identify and address conflict risks and identify opportunities for projects to contribute to peacebuilding. These filters and lenses aim to identify key project risks—related to the choice of geographic areas, how benefits are divided, how the consultation process is undertaken, et cetera—and potential mitigating measures. In some cases, these filters/lenses are developed for specific sectors, aiming to better identify sources of risk and resilience.

The tools have a potentially useful role to play as part of the World Bank's effort to design conflict and fragility sensitive programs. In recent years, the Bank has scaled up its work in fragile and conflict-affected situations. At the strategy level, tools such as Risk and Resilience Assessments (RRAs) have been developed to assess patterns and drivers of conflict, violence and fragility. These feed into Systematic Country Diagnostics (SCDs), which provide the analytical underpinnings of Country Partnership Frameworks (CPFs), the Bank's main country-level strategy document. However, conflict sensitive programming requires going beyond this. It requires not only working out *what* to do but also *how* to do it. It requires more micro and sectoral specific analyses than are typically contained in RRAs. Conflict filters or lenses are strategically important as they hold promise in helping to design and implement projects in ways that do no harm while contributing to peacebuilding opportunities, enhancing the Bank's effectiveness in operating in fragile and conflict affected situations.

The paper draws on a desk review of relevant documents along with interviews with task teams who have developed and applied these filters/lenses in different country contexts. In total, twelve experiences are reviewed: Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kyrgyz Republic, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Liberia, Macedonia, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, and a sectoral-specific filter for livestock projects. Nine interviews with task teams were also conducted.¹ The paper does not comprehensively cover all experiences the World Bank has had with conflict lenses and filters, in part because no centralized records exist of these experiences.

* Many thanks to Catalina Quintero, Sean Bradley, Holly Benner, Marcelo Fabre, Museme Munira Issa, Natacha Lemasle, Saeeda Sabah Rashid, and Michelle Rebosio for their inputs. Francois Nankobogo, Marcelo Fabre, and Stephan Massing provided helpful peer review comments and Alexandre Marc comments on an earlier draft.

¹ Interviews focused on lenses/filters for Colombia, DRC, Liberia, Myanmar, Macedonia, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, and the sectoral-specific filter for livestock projects.

Further, the review was built on a rapid assessment rather than an in-depth evaluation of each lens or filter. However, the paper is able to identify some key lessons which can positively shape the development of future lenses and a strategy for expanding this work in the future.²

I. Description of Country Experiences

The review of the experiences developing and applying filters and lenses highlights that while the overarching objective of the instruments are similar (i.e. to design and implement conflict and fragility sensitive programming by identifying key risks and mitigating measures), the specific goals and scope of these filters/lenses differ from one experience to another. This section provides an overview of how the filters and lenses in different countries have been initiated, their contents, as well as their application and impacts.

(i) Initiation of the conflict filter/peace lens

- How did conflict filters/peace lenses come about?

There are two different processes driving the adoption of a conflict filter/peace lens in a given country. The first category is those filters/lenses initiated by an external request to the World Bank by the client government or another development partner. This tends to be most likely in places where peace processes have begun or are ongoing (e.g. Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Colombia). The second category is those cases where the World Bank internally recognized a need to minimize the risk that its activities could inadvertently fuel existing conflict dynamics, or to manage reputational risks to the Bank operating in complex conflict settings (e.g. DRC, Kyrgyz Republic, Macedonia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Philippines, and the livestock filter).

Interestingly, two of the three ‘externally driven’ lenses/filters never fully took off (Nepal and Sri Lanka) and the third (Colombia) lapsed after the task team leader managing the work left the country and was not replaced. This does not suggest that external pressure to initiate lenses or filters is not helpful. But it does suggest that this must be matched by commitment within the Bank to follow through, including by devoting resources and personnel to the work.

A number of the filters/lenses followed on from research conducted by the Bank such as RRAs. The lenses in the Kyrgyz Republic, Liberia, Macedonia, Myanmar, DRC, Philippines, Ukraine, along with the livestock filter, each grew out of such analytic work. The studies helped provide a foundation for the lenses by (a) highlighting the real risks of doing development in such contexts and (b) highlighting the key issues that should be considered in the lenses.

In each case, it took dedicated individuals to make the case for the filter/lens, including doing internal advocacy and sometimes fundraising to get them going. In addition, a prerequisite for successful filters/lenses was strong commitment by the Country Management Unit. In a number of cases, Country Assistance Strategies (CASs)/Country Partnership Frameworks (CPFs) formalized this commitment.

(ii) Contents

- What are the contents of the conflict filters/peace lenses?

The filters/lenses generally consist of an overview of conflict dynamics, and a list of questions to guide task teams to think through the implication of such dynamics on specific projects or the portfolio. In many cases,

² The level of information available for each country differs based on the resources available as well as the current stage of implementation as some of the lenses/filters are just being initiated.

these two components are presented as part of a conflict filter/peace lens guidance note together with background, rationale, and methodology for application that provides step-by-step guidance for task teams.

In terms of the specific content of the filters/lenses, inclusion and targeting (of geographic areas and social and identity groups) are the most common themes included. All of the filters/lenses, to varying degrees, prompt project teams to examine power relations between different social and identity group, including males/females, youth, the displaced and ethnic groups and how these dynamics may be affected by, and shape, beneficiary selection. Project teams are asked to think through the implication of the project intervention on existing power structures, in order to ensure projects do not exacerbate existing exclusion and inequality, but rather contribute to building social cohesion, reconciliation, or reduced inter-group inequalities. Another common set of questions relates to targeting of geographic areas. These questions focus on whether the project design has taken into account conflict history and dynamics in target locations, as well as security concerns related to reaching communities where movement is restricted. The filters/lenses typically pose questions on whether project designs need to be modified where they target areas with security risks.

In addition, most of the filters/lenses place emphasis on stakeholder consultation and engagement given the need for a transparent consultation process and allocation of project resources, in particular in conflict areas. Project teams are asked to consider whether consultations have engaged excluded groups, whether local languages were used, and whether there are mechanisms for grievance redressal. Another common set of issues addressed relate to capacity and partnership. In around half of the filters/lenses examined, there are questions centering around understanding capacity gaps, and whether proposed interventions are helping to strengthen the government’s capacity to deliver. While questions pertaining to partnerships are less common, the Liberia and Ukraine filters specifically ask questions on whether the project team has considered partnership in addressing security risks and whether the project activities complement and are coordinated with other partners’ activities. Table 1 summarizes the main substance of each of the country specific conflict filters/peace lenses.³

Table 1: Summary of peace filters/lenses

Country	Contents
Nepal (2009)	<p><i>Peace Filter (TTL/Key contact: Sean Bradley)</i>. The filter analyzes the operating environment including the policy-making environment, the security situation, local political context, and accountability. The filter also looks at potential program impacts in terms of location, who the most likely beneficiaries are, and the nature and scale of impact.</p> <p>The filter is accompanied by a Social Inclusion Index that provides detailed measures of exclusion and inequalities by population groups (ethnic, socio-economic, rural/urban) and by geographic location.</p>
Sri Lanka (2010)	<p><i>Conflict & Reconciliation Filter (TTL/Key contact: Edward Bell – no longer at WB)</i>. The filter consists of separate list of questions for: (i) the concept stage; and (ii) design, appraisal, and ongoing operations. The questions guide the task teams to look at how conflict risks and opportunities influence key project features, stakeholder dynamics, proposed implementation arrangements, and considerations for results monitoring/impact assessment.</p>

³ The actual questionnaires or matrices are available from the authors on request.

	<p>Upon going through the questions, task teams are asked to summarize in a matrix their analysis of how the project is likely to interact with its operating environment. The main components in the matrix are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification: Key socio-political risks and opportunities; • Manifestations: Possible manifestation of those issues in the operating environment; • Risk; • Action: Project design measures to mitigate risk or strengthen opportunity; • Residual risk; • Monitoring Indicators (where applicable) – to be included in the Management Information System.
Liberia (2012)	<p><i>Fragility Lens (TTLs/Key contacts: Inguna Dobraja, Michelle Rebosio)</i>. This fragility lens is an annex to the Liberia CPS (2013). The lens first analyzes the sources of fragility and resilience in Liberia and their potential impacts on development. Second, it provides a 'Country Level Conflict and Fragility Filter', a set of questions aimed at identifying risks for the country portfolio that are related to conflict and fragility. Finally, it outlines a process for applying the conflict lens to projects, as well as sample questions on conflict and fragility for specific sectors.</p>
Kyrgyz Republic (2012–2015)	<p><i>Conflict Filter (TTLs/Key contacts: Aly Rahim, Asli Gurkan)</i>. The filter consists of a matrix with five sections: (i) inclusion/equity/participation; (ii) geography/project targeting; (iii) impacts from project-related activities; (iv) accountability and transparency; and (v) political economy. The questions in these sections are related to conflict stressors; responses about the project's attention to stressors; risk appraisal; and proposed or ongoing project level conflict sensitivity measures. Upon going through the questions, task teams are asked to summarize the analysis under the five sections into a matrix. The main components in the matrix are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions; • Identified conflict risks and impacts; • Mitigation measures; • Responsible parties to implement mitigating measures; • Timeline for implementing mitigating measures. <p>In addition to the project-level conflict filter matrix, task teams are also provided with a country- and region-level assessment of conflict risks/tensions as well as a sector- or project-specific conflict assessment by the conflict filter team, with hands on support provided by a consultant conflict specialist.</p>
Nigeria (ongoing since 2013)	<p><i>Governance, Gender and Conflict filter (TTLs/Key contacts: Saeeda Sabah Rashid, Rosa Maria Martinez)</i>. The filter was developed following analytical work, and emerged from a pilot phase which began in FY12. The filter helps the country team identify and address governance, gender, and conflict challenges in project designs.</p> <p>At project preparation stage, the filter team provides comments and provides recommendations on the following dimensions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framing the problem; • Tailoring the solution to the context in order to maximize development effectiveness; • Choice of instrument, incentives, and implementation arrangements to facilitate results; • Risk management (including conflict-related);

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge, adaptation, and learning. <p>Each of the dimensions are accompanied by a list of questions for governance, conflict, and gender considerations.</p>
Macedonia (2014–2015)	<p><i>Macedonia Social Filter (TTLs/Key contacts: Bekim Yemeri, Michelle Rebosio)</i>. The filter focuses on improving the inclusion aspects of the WB projects and portfolio. The filter consists of: (i) a country social analysis; (ii) a basic set of questions to help task teams identify how their projects can address key social issues and identify opportunities to enhance them; and (iii) support to project teams in the application of the social filter.</p>
DRC (2015–2016)	<p><i>‘Conflict proofing’ support (TTLs/Key contacts: Hugo De Vries, Catalina Quintero)</i>. The ‘conflict proofing’ support was provided as part of the Great Lakes Initiative, a broader set of interventions that the World Bank is supporting to promote peace and security in the region.</p> <p>Rather than developing specific guidance note/tools, the ‘conflict proofing’ work was more hands-on support with an on-the-ground conflict specialist working directly with project teams to reflect conflict sensitive considerations in project designs. This support emerged after the completion of the RRA for Eastern DRC.</p>
Ukraine (2015–2016)	<p><i>Governance, Anti-Corruption and Conflict (GAC/C) filter (TTL/Key contact: Holly Brenner)</i>. The GAC/C filter was originally initiated as the GAC filter which examined national and local institutions, stakeholders, and political economy aspects that influence reform options in specific sectors. However, recognizing overlapping governance and conflict challenges in Ukraine, and to reduce duplication and burden on task teams, the existing GAC filter was expanded to include questions related to sensitivity to conflict, displacement, and recovery issues in the design of World Bank Group activities. For conflict risks, the conflict analysis and the Ukraine Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment have informed the development of the filter instrument and critical questions posed to project teams.</p> <p>The filter matrix comprises seven focus areas: (i) sectoral issues; (ii) government issues; (iii) beneficiary targeting and inclusion; (iv) accountability, transparency, and citizen engagement; (v) conflict stressors and resilience; (vi) partner issues; and (vii) risk. Task teams are asked to summarize the analysis under the seven sections into a matrix. The main components in the matrix are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key questions; • Considerations; • Potential activity level mitigation measures. <p>In addition, task teams are asked to fill out a table that summarizes the main challenges/risks identified in the matrix that relate to the activity’s design, planned designed modifications, and how the project design modification will be reflected in key project documents.</p>
Colombia (2015–2017)	<p><i>Peace lens (TTL/Key contact: Marcelo Fabre)</i>. The peace lens consists of: (i) a detailed analysis and key factors for consideration under seven key dimensions when applying the peace lens for individual projects; and (ii) a matrix with a list of questions that guides project teams to evaluate the application of the peace lens and to ensure that it has covered the necessary elements in the project designs. The seven dimensions are:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A territorial focus representing the different regions of the country; • The effects of armed conflicts in these regions; • The presence of illegal armed groups in the territory; • The impact of illegal economies in the regions; • The presence of the state and civil society; • The commitments for peacebuilding in each territory; • The risks for renewed violence in each region. <p>This is followed by a verification tool (<i>instrumento de verificacion</i>) with a list of questions that guides project teams to evaluate the application of the peace lens and ensure that it has covered the necessary elements in the design of projects. There is a clear emphasis on the importance of World Bank projects not only ‘doing no harm’ but also ‘doing good’ by contributing to the construction of positive peace through project interventions.</p>
Myanmar (ongoing since 2018)	<p><i>Inclusion and Peace Lens (IPL) (TTLs/Key contacts: Natacha Lemasle, Patrick Barron, Sean Bradley).</i> The IPL builds on previous and directly relevant work in Myanmar around poverty, social exclusion, and conflict such as the <i>Contested Areas of Myanmar</i> study, published in late 2017. It also incorporates elements of the recent social inclusion portfolio review undertaken by the Social Development team, and a previous ‘Conflict Filter’ that was developed by the Myanmar country team based on early experiences when the Bank reengaged in the country in 2012.</p> <p>The IPL guidance note consists of: (i) an analytical overview of key exclusion and conflict dynamics in Myanmar that task teams should be aware of; and (ii) a list of questions that are divided between inclusion and peace sections that examine exclusion dynamics, targeting, access to benefits, mitigation of risks, etc. There is separate list of questions for the concept and project appraisal stages.</p>
Philippines (ongoing since 2018)	<p><i>Peace lens (TTL/Key contact: Marcelo Fabre).</i> Under development and will take a similar approach to that of Colombia’s. This will be initiated following the completion of the RRA in the Philippines.</p>

In addition to country specific filters/lenses, sector specific filters have also been developed. Box 1 provides an overview of the livestock filter:

Box 1: Livestock filter

Conflict Sensitivity and Prevention (CSP) Checklist for Sub-Saharan Pastoral Livestock Sector (2015–2017; TTLs – Stephan Forman, Catalina Quintero). CSP was developed as part of the Pastoralism and Stability in the Sahel and Horn of Africa (PASSHA) project to enhance monitoring and evaluation systems and knowledge on the link between pastoralism development and stability for regional organizations and programs.

The CSP consists of ten thematic areas with specific guiding questions, which build on the findings and recommendations of the Bank’s study on *Pastoralism Development in the Sahel: A road to Stability?*, which explores the connections between pastoralism and (in)stability. The checklist allows task teams to pay attention to the main risks (threats) identified, and give recommendations on mitigation measures to be pursued before proceeding with project implementation. Depending on responses checked (either YES or NO answer), one may identify a need for further analysis, or for a technical meeting to process issues further,

or a problem-solving meeting with beneficiaries aimed at breaking a deadlock. This tool is targeted primarily at project appraisal stage, and accompanies a capacity building training for project implementation units (PIUs) on the use of the checklist.

(iii) Application and Impact

- When have the conflict filters/peace lenses been applied?

The conflict filters/peace lenses are applicable at both portfolio and individual project levels. At the portfolio level, the filters/lenses may serve as an input to country-wide and portfolio-wide discussion of strategy, approach, geographic distribution of new and planned projects, and financing priorities (e.g. as part of Program Learning Reviews, Systematic Country Diagnostics, Country Partnership Framework processes). At the individual project level, the filters/lenses may serve as guidance to task teams to think through and adjust projects' designs through conflict and fragility sensitive considerations, especially during the key phases of the project cycle. It was also noted that these tools can also be used by task teams undertaking supervision missions, mid-term reviews, project re-structuring, or project evaluations to assess whether conflict considerations have been addressed and to inform mid-course corrections or address implementation challenges (e.g. to inform Implementation Status and Completion Reports, aid memoires, mid-term reviews, re-structuring papers).

In practice, the scope of the application of the filter or lens varies. In some countries, the application is targeted at both investment projects as well as for advisory services and analytic products at all stages of project cycle. In other countries, the focus is solely on operations. In most of the countries, however, the applications of the conflict filter/peace lens was focused largely on investment projects during preparation stage. For instance, in Kyrgyz Republic, when the filter was first applied to projects (2012-2013), the conflict filter team applied it to all of the projects in the portfolio in a comprehensive manner. However, building on lessons learned, the conflict filter team adopted a more selective and practical approach by carrying out more in-depth assessment on projects under preparation and selected analytical activities from 2013 onwards. In Myanmar, the focus of the application is also on projects under preparation as the application with the IPL made mandatory for all projects in preparation.

- How were the tools applied?

One of the crucial elements for the application of the conflict filters/peace lenses is the establishment of a dedicated team or a person to work with the project teams. The conflict filter/peace lens teams work with project teams through a consultative process to help them think through the questions posed in the filters/lenses systematically and to identify relevant responses or adaptations to operations and knowledge products. In most of the cases reviewed, a dedicated team was established to work with task teams to apply the conflict filter/peace lens. In the case of Nepal, the lack of dedicated on the ground expertise to work with the task teams to apply the filter was noted as one of the reasons why the operationalization of the filter was challenging. In Colombia, the lens lapsed after the key staff member leading the work left the country.

It was also found that the modality of engagement of the dedicated conflict filter/peace lens teams with project teams differed from country to country, and also from project to project. In some projects, the conflict team's involvement was quite limited, whereas in other cases, the team was fully incorporated into the project teams. For instance, in Kyrgyz Republic, the conflict filter task team member not only provided support in applying the

conflict filter to a specific project, but also provided broader support to the project team through cross-support arrangements. In the case of DRC, the conflict specialist joined task teams in various project missions, and was directly involved in developing results framework indicators and the project budget. This deeper support led to greater consideration and incorporation of ‘findings’ from the lenses into projects, but this also raises feasibility and selectivity questions as it will not be possible for such conflict specialists to play a role in all projects.

- What does its application look like?

The key desired outcome of the application of the filter/lens is a conflict-informed project design (including results frameworks), as well as supervision and monitoring plans. Such analysis and applications are also summarized in filter/lens questionnaire or matrices. For instance, in Sri Lanka, Myanmar, and Ukraine, task teams are asked to include a brief annex, summarizing how they have thought through and addressed key inclusion and peace questions in their Concept Notes and Project Appraisal Documents.

- What has the impact been?

Overall, the conflict filters and peace lenses were viewed as having the greatest impact when they were first applied at the earliest stages of project design. Teams found the most substantial conflict sensitivity impact to be adjustments incorporated during the design stage of projects (i.e. DRC, Nigeria, Colombia, and Krygyz Republic). In the case of the conflict filter application in Kyrgyz Republic, the team found projects under supervision to have varying degrees of capacity to incorporate the types of adjustments suggested through a conflict filter process depending on how advanced implementation is and the amount of time remaining in the project. In the case of Ukraine, the impact of the filter had been limited because of the status of the portfolio — the country hit its lending limit around the time when the filter was developed, and there were very few new projects as entry points. For on-going projects, there had been significant risk aversion in project restructurings to take on conflict-affected populations/areas of the country because of huge pressures around disbursement.

Given limited resources, there has been a limited tracking of conflict sensitivity impacts resulting from the application of conflict filters/peace lenses. Also, some of the countries experienced challenges to continue the application of filter/lens with the departure of the dedicated expert from the country. In order to better track the impact of such work, the Myanmar IPL team intends to conduct an assessment at the end of FY19 following the first year of IPL application.

Box 2. Examples of impact

In Krygyz Republic, the Conflict Filter Team completed conflict sensitivity reviews for four projects (Third Village Investment Program, Judicial Development Project, Urban Development Project, and Integrated Forest Ecosystems Project) in FY15. This process led to substantive changes to project designs. For instance, and based on the recommendations of the Conflict Filter Team, the Third Village Investment Program changed its strategy for targeting and selection criteria to make the project more inclusive. Also, by taking on the recommendations from the conflict filter team, the project team included trainings on conflict management and grievance redress measures. Likewise, recommendations from the Conflict Filter Team to the Urban Development Project task team that were implemented included monitoring of perceptions of project beneficiaries as part of its results framework and changing the targeting strategy, and the team

decided to carry out communications activities in order to avoid any misunderstandings over the sharing of project benefits.⁴

The Myanmar Inclusion and Peace Lens (IPL) is relatively new. Implementation has not yet begun on the projects supported through the IPL. However, initial results are encouraging. Support from the Inclusion and Peace Team has led to the development of strategies for systematically engaging with ethnic armed organizations (EAOs) who operate in the areas where projects such as the Maternal Cash Transfer for Nutrition and Additional Financing for Health will work. Support from the Inclusion and Peace Team led to the inclusion of data on violence as part of a metric for deciding which states would potentially receive assistance under a new Subnational Governance program. For some projects, such as planned work on community forestry, the IPL process led to task teams deciding not to initially target conflict areas because the risks of inadvertently doing harm were deemed to high.

II. Lessons Learned

Below are some of the key lessons learned shared by the teams:

- **CMU engagement and support.** All of the teams highlighted the importance of Country Management Unit (CMU) engagement and support as the critical enabling factor for the application of conflict filters/peace lenses at the portfolio and individual project levels. For example, the Colombia and Myanmar teams stated that the CMU's decision to make the application of the filter/lens mandatory for project approval sent a clear signal on the importance of this work, and this was a main factor determining task teams' buy in. In the case of the DRC and livestock sectoral filters, the TTLs noted that more political support from the CMUs would have been helpful.
- **Dedicated financial resources.** The main source of funding for work on the filters and lenses has been CMU budget (e.g. Colombia, Kyrgyz Republic) and trust funds (the State and Peacebuilding Fund and Korean Trust Fund for Economic and Peace-building Transitions, EU Governance TF – e.g. Myanmar, Nigeria, DRC, livestock filter). All of the teams stated the necessity of having dedicated financial resources to carry out the conflict filter/peace lens work. The Kyrgyz Republic highlighted that offering conflict filter support as a 'free resource' helped increase task teams' receptivity and having a separate resource to finance consultant time also allowed conflict filter team members to join some of the project teams' field missions, which would not have been possible otherwise. On a similar note, the Myanmar team noted that having dedicated resources, especially in the early phase of implementation, was critical as it provided an opportunity for the team to demonstrate its value added to the task teams and the CMU.
- **Dedicated expertise on the ground.** In conjunction with having dedicated financial resources available to carry out the work, the importance of having strong on-the-ground expertise was also highlighted. Colombia, Kyrgyz, and DRC highlighted the importance of finding the right people to be able to influence project designs. The teams stated that dedicated expertise on the ground needed to know not only the conflict dynamics and the context, but also needed to have operational credibility (knowing the procurement rules, etc.). The lack of such expertise was noted as one of the reasons why the Nepal conflict filter was not operationalized, nor the Sri Lanka one. Similarly, in DRC, the conflict filter/peace lens work in the country lost momentum with the departure of the expert on the ground. Likewise, in Colombia, the

⁴ Completion Report - Ensuring Conflict Sensitivity in Post-Conflict Contexts: Lessons from the Kyrgyz Republic Portfolio (World Bank, 2015).

departure of the conflict expert on the ground—combined with a shift in the administration’s policy vis-à-vis the commitments made in the peace agreement and a change in the country management team—reduced the momentum gained with the deployment of the peace lens. The overall shortage of World Bank experts, with both conflict and operational expertise who can be dedicated to a specific country for an extended period of time, was noted as a challenge for the potential scale-up and roll out of conflict filters/peace lenses in more countries.

- **Reduce burden to task teams.** All of the experiences reviewed highlighted the importance of not overburdening task teams by adding the conflict filter/peace lens application as another layer/hurdle. To reduce the burden to the teams, Kyrgyz Republic found providing cross-support to the project teams to have been useful. In the case of the livestock filter, the capacity building of the PIUs was found to be useful in reducing the burden on task teams and to facilitate the sustainability of this work.
- **Recommendations and suggestions from conflict filter/peace lens team need to be operationally relevant.** The Nigeria team emphasized the importance of the conflict filter/peace lens team providing recommendations that are directly focused on project’s development objectives and tied to actionable next steps. The team highlighted that for these recommendations to have greater impact and uptake by the project teams, the recommendations cannot be abstract, but need to be specific and actionable.
- **Work closely with safeguards team.** Kyrgyz Republic, DRC, and the livestock filter teams stated the benefits of coordinating and working closely with the safeguards teams as they play a crucial role in project preparation. In the case of Kyrgyz, the ECA Safeguards Adviser alerted the project teams to take into account potential conflict impacts of Kyrgyz projects and reminded TTLs to work with the conflict filter team as part of broader discussions on projects’ social impacts. This approach was useful and enforced the view that conflict sensitivity is an important part of mitigating social risk and enhancing projects’ impacts. Moreover, in the case of the livestock filter, the filter team highlighted the utility of the conflict filter by ensuring that the findings were linked and incorporated into the new environment and social framework by working in close collaboration with the safeguards team.
- **Engage projects at very early stages and focus on the results framework.** In terms of when to engage, all teams stated the importance of engaging from the very early stages of project preparation such as the Project Concept Note reviews or identification/preparation missions in order to have the greatest impact. The teams also noted that it may not be realistic to make conflict filters mandatory for all projects in the portfolio, and highlighted the importance of prioritizing the projects for which the application of conflict filter/peace lens could have the most impact. In addition, the teams agreed that conflict sensitivity considerations resulting from this work need to be reflected in individual projects’ results framework indicators and budget. Without this, the likelihood and the incentives of project TTLs to integrate the conflict filter/peace lens findings into project design decreases.
- **Importance of analytical work.** Strong analytical work that provides an analysis of conflict dynamics in the country has served as a trigger and entry point for conflict filter/peace lens application (i.e. DRC, Myanmar, Kyrgyz Republic, Nigeria, Philippines, Ukraine, livestock). However, the teams also stressed the importance of having the analytical work complemented by strong hands on support to project teams for the actual application of the filter/lens at the project and portfolio level.
- **Working with client governments.** Some of the teams stated that dialogue with the government can encourage the use of the filter or block it, especially in cases where the government did not consider the

situation as conflict (e.g. Kyrgyz Republic). As such, teams need to think about the implications, and how and what to communicate with the client government.

- **Establish linkages between projects.** The DRC, Myanmar, and Kyrgyz Republic teams highlighted keeping an eye on ensuring synergies across projects, and addressing risks at the portfolio level, as one of the key roles that the conflict filter/peace lens teams can play. Given that the teams work across different projects, they are well positioned to establish linkages and highlight the potential complementarities and the sharing of lessons learned between projects.
- **Budgets.** The budget allocated for the conflict filter/peace lens application varied widely across the different experiences. For instance, the budget allocated for the conflict filter in Kyrgyz Republic in FY15 was US\$35,000 whereas in Sri Lanka in FY10 it was US\$405,000. In the case of Kyrgyz Republic, the team was able to carry out this work with modest budget by prioritizing and focusing on a selected number of projects, but an early grant from the State and Peacebuilding Fund also helped with initial groundwork. Keeping costs low was achieved by having the two key staff (conflict filter team) based in Central Asia and by being practical about linking this work to other social development support to task teams. This approach was stated to be not only cost-efficient but also leads to better quality of the work and better receptivity from operational teams.

III. Moving forward

The paper has highlighted how conflict filters and peace lenses can play a useful role in helping the World Bank to work more effectively, and in a conflict sensitive ways, in conflict or fragile contexts. Conflict filters and peace lenses have developed organically in a number of countries, often driven by committed individuals trying to find ways to address problems where they work. While experiences have been mixed there is clear potential for using such lenses and filters to improve the effectiveness of the Bank's work in complex contexts.

This suggests that there may be benefits in applying conflict filters or peace lenses more widely. As the World Bank continues to work more in FCV (fragility, conflict and violence) contexts, and seeks new ways to do development in such places more effectively, filters and lenses have a key role to play – in translating understanding of the context into better designed projects that do no harm and promote positive changes. As IDA19 policy commitments and a new World Bank FCV Strategy are being developed, there may be a role to incentivize the use of such filters and lenses more widely.

However, the analysis also shows that this will require both dedicated resources (financial and in terms of expertise) and strong commitment from Country Management Units. Without this, filters or lenses either do not get designed or are not fully implemented. If the filters and lenses are rolled out to a broader range of contexts, it will be necessary to think through how to finance these and how to ensure that sufficient expertise is in place in each country to allow them to be effective. Finding ways to leverage partnerships—with the UN, development partners, civil society, and academics—may have a role to play here.

The analysis also raises questions about the extent to which each lens or filter should be standardized or follow a common format. On the one hand, each context is different, and lens and filters should vary to reflect this. On the other hand, there are lessons that can be learned from what works, and what is less effective, that could feed into the design of new instruments. There are undoubtedly also lessons to be learned from the use of filters and lenses by other development partners. Finding ways to facilitate such cross-country and institutional learning should be a priority. An operational guidance note, or good practice note for interested

task teams, may be considered going forward to support more systematic and standardized application of these tools and cross-fertilization of existing experiences in applying these tools across the Bank. Moreover, given the need to better document the outcomes associated with the conflict filters and peace lenses, there may be value in conducting a set of country cases studies to better assess the returns on investing in conflict filters and peace lenses.

Annex – Sample Conflict Filters/ Peace Lenses (available on request)

Annex A. Colombia – Peace Lens Guidance note

Annex B. Kyrgyz Republic – Conflict Filter guidance note

Annex C. Liberia – Country Partnership Strategy (2013) – Fragility lens (p.99)

Annex D. Macedonia – Macedonia Social filter

Annex E. Myanmar – Inclusive Peace Lens Summary Note for Task Teams

Annex F. Nigeria – Governance, Gender and Conflict Filter Operations Manual

Annex G. Sri Lanka – Conflict and Reconciliation filter (*draft version*)

Annex H. Ukraine - Governance, Anti-Corruption and Conflict Filter (GAC-C) Guidance note

Annex I. Livestock Filter – Conflict Sensitivity and Prevention (CSP) Checklist