Examples of conflict risks associated with WASH interventions and proposed mitigation measures

Planning		Implementation		Review and closure	
WASH-Conflict Interactions	**Mitigation**	**WASH-Conflict Interactions**	**Mitigation**	**WASH-Conflict Interactions**	**Mitigation**

Intervention Examples: **Water Trucking distribution**

Water delivered for free is seen as competing with water utilities' fee-based services	*Consult water utilities about water tariff and perhaps pay for the water trucked, and/ or inform beneficiaries that the free provision of water is exceptional*	The water trucking company selected does not come from the area served, and is therefore prevented from working by local authorities.	*Make sure local companies have a chance to participate in the bidding*	Lack of planning and communication on the necessary reduction and closure of water trucking activities created tensions between the benefiting community and the operator	*Identifying the best exit strategy and the realistic period of water trucking should be planed before the implementation, in close consultation with the community and donors, and clearly communicated to the community served.*
The water point identified to fill the trucks is considered by the community connected to it to have already limited capacity for themselves.	*To avoid potential conflict over limited water resources, carefully check the capacity of the water point and the daily quantity of water needed for the water trucking, and communicate with local communities to reach an official agreement on water extraction.*	After few months of implementation, monitoring shows that host communities are coming from other areas to collect the water distributed by water trucking and thus reducing the quantity for IDPs and creating conflict with them.	*Add additional WT distribution sites in poor densely populated host community neighbourhoods or add water point construction/ rehabilitation to your plan to satisfy host community demand.*	After closure of water trucking services, IDPs are obliged to take water from existing wells within host communities, creating tensions over sharing limited water resources	*Evaluate the level of acceptance of IDPs within surrounding communities to anticipate potential tensions, as part of the 'Do No Harm' analysis.* *Design the exit of water trucking accordingly, considering the willingness of host communities to share water resources* *A mechanism for community engagement in sharing resources should be developed in parallel to the water trucking so that there is a sustainable exit plan.*

Planning		**Implementation**		**Review and closure**	
WASH-Conflict Interactions	**Mitigation**	**WASH-Conflict Interactions**	**Mitigation**	**WASH-Conflict Interactions**	**Mitigation**

Intervention Examples: **Water piped network construction**

Investing in water projects in this area is not considered as a priority by national authorities. The layout of the pipeline goes through an community antagonistic to the one served	*Gathering enough data at national level to justify the rationale behind the selection of the area* *Consider providing a longer pipeline if no solid agreement can be reached between the two communities*	Local authorities stop the project, considering that it will encourage the IPDs camp it serves to become sustainable, creating tensions with IDPs The community hosting the water source refuses to share limited resources with the benefiting one	*Ensure that all stakeholders are involved from the planning phase and consider innovative designs to serve IDPs with semi-temporary water points.* *Map all the communities along the project and analyse their interactions. Ensure the inclusion of all communities since the design phase of the project, including creating mixed water committees who will follow up on the project implementation and take over its operation and maintenance*	When the programme is over, a possible conflict risk may be rivalry between IDPs and host communities for priority use (e.g., host communities expect to be able to skip the line).	*Set up a gender-balanced water committee, or a water security mechanism, or involve the local authorities in monitoring use, etc.* *Develop transparent and clear water use guidelines in consultation with prospective water users ensuring the perspectives of different usages are captured (drinking, cattle, irrigation).* *Ensure land titles and agreements with local communities are re-committed to before closure.*

Intervention Examples: **Wastewater piped network construction**

Connecting IPDs to wastewater network is seen by authorities as an encouragement to make the camp sustainable, which is not on the authorities' agenda	*Design temporary connections and/or demonstrate that the increased system capacity will be used to absorb future planned extension of the city (considering demographic growth for instance) after the camp closure.*	Local authorities from neighbouring poor areas complain that there are no plans to connect them to the new pipeline.	*Make sure that the project falls into an overall official master plan to cover the whole district with wastewater services. Communicate before the project starts and during its implementation on its outputs.*	Local water utilities refuse to take over the facility, considering the operation and maintenance costs and lack of income from wastewater fees	*Wastewater services are usually provided free, and are therefore challenging to sustain. Before investing in the project, a very thorough business model should be developed with relevant local stakeholders i.e. water authorities, municipality, the community etc.).* *Ensure policy engagement/clear agreements by decision-makers as part of the programme closure approach to mitigate marginalization.*

WASH for Peace **Conflict Sensitivity and Peacebuilding Programming** Guide & Toolkit

Planning		Implementation		Review and closure	
WASH-Conflict Interactions	**Mitigation**	**WASH-Conflict Interactions**	**Mitigation**	**WASH-Conflict Interactions**	**Mitigation**
Downstream communities consider that the system will not be able to treat additional wastewater, and therefore accuse benefiting community of planning to pollute their environment.	*Undertake a thorough feasibility study of the treatment system to ensure additional wastewater can be absorbed, and communicate on your findings.*	Communities downstream do not benefit from the project, but are impeded by the work implementation.	*Through a participatory process, find innovative ways to ensure all communities impacted by the project benefit from it, for instance through the recruitment of local workers from communities affected.*	Connection costs (inside the premises) are not affordable for the most vulnerable communities, creating inequality and frustration between communities	*Consider specific support for the most vulnerable families or communities through subsidies or social loans.*

Intervention Examples: **Public latrine construction**

WASH-Conflict Interactions	Mitigation	WASH-Conflict Interactions	Mitigation	WASH-Conflict Interactions	Mitigation
Landowners and local authorities have not been consulted on the latrine's location and do not want works to start; tensions between IDPs user and host communities are raised.	*Make sure that landowners and local authorities are consulted and provide official authorization to build the latrine.*	Latrine design does not reach official national standards (which can be higher than SPHERE), thus halting construction of the toilets.	*Make sure that designs are officially approved by relevant authorities prior any implementation.*	Local authorities in charge of the maintenance close the toilette to keep it clean and/or for their own use, thus creating tensions with benefiting communities	*Make sure that the communities are aware of their right to access the toilets. Plan regular monitoring visits after the work has been completed to convince local authorities to keep the toilets open.* *Have a grievance policy – a dispute channel that operates throughout the programme with clear accountability lines and is sustained beyond programme closure*
Temporary latrines are seen as a cause of pollution by the host community, which is used to higher standards.	*Do not forget that surrounding and downstream communities, even if not benefiting from the intervention, should be consulted as they can be impacted by potential pollution*	The contractor is from the host community, and is accused of corruption by IDPs, which exacerbates tensions between the IPDs and host community.	*Bear in mind that any construction work is also an opportunity for local people to get business, and will require people who can do both skilled and unskilled jobs. Therefore make sure that the work implementation benefits all involved communities equally.*	Tension over use of latrines between different sexes (e.g. only men use the latrines and not the women) or between IDPs and host communities after hand over.	*Clear signage; distance between the two blocks (Men/women), localization of the toilet close to the IDPs user, consideration of the needs from host communities.*