

THE DAC NETWORK ON CONFLICT, PEACE, AND DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION (CPDC)

ROOM DOCUMENT 9

ARMED VIOLENCE AND POVERTY REDUCTION

A WORK PROGRAMME FOR THE OECD DAC'S
CONFLICT, PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION NETWORK

CONCEPT NOTE

22 SEPTEMBER 2006

**10TH MEETING OF THE DAC NETWORK ON
CONFLICT, PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION
WORLD BANK HEADQUARTERS, PARIS
17-18 OCTOBER, 2006**

A. Introduction

1. Armed violence prevention and reduction have been under discussion in the OECD since 2003. The issue is closely linked to the Development Assistance Committee's (DAC) work on both preventing violent conflict and security system reform (SSR), but focuses on armed violence associated with conflict and crime. The concept of armed violence prevention and reduction addresses environmental and behavioural factors that drive armed violence, as well as arms availability and misuse as a vector that shapes its lethality. Thus, small arms and light weapons control occupies a central role in preventing and reducing violence. It is most effective, however, where it takes account of environmental and behavioural factors, is part of wider development programming and is based on a firm evidence base.

2. Armed violence has a negative impact on development at a number of levels. In 2003, the UK commissioned a study by Bradford University to investigate the impact of armed violence and arms availability on development and poverty reduction. The Armed Violence and Poverty Initiative (AVPI) produced a body of research that established a link between high levels of high armed violence and certain macro and micro indicators of poverty.¹ It also identified positive impacts of small arms control and violence prevention programmes on development indicators, provided they were focused and took a developmental approach to the issue. The study also demonstrated that most programmes aimed at reducing armed violence and arms availability were more effective where they were integrated with broader security and development initiatives. If states are to create the conditions in which they can escape from a downward spiral of insecurity, criminalisation and under-development, socio-economic and security dimensions must be tackled together.

3. There is growing awareness of the relationships between armed violence prevention, arms reduction and development, although efforts could be greatly enhanced through improved coherence. In 2005, for example, the DAC agreed that efforts to address small arms and light weapons could be classified as Official Development Assistance (ODA).² Ultimately, a common developmental approach to armed violence prevention programmes could significantly increase the effectiveness of ODA spent on small arms and light weapons control, while contributing to increased overall aid effectiveness.

4. Important steps are now being taken to improve co-ordination and coherence in armed violence prevention and reduction programmes. In 2006, the UK and UNDP, supported by Canada, the European Commission, the Netherlands and France, circulated a concept note explaining the rationale for guidance on armed violence prevention and the potential role the Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation Network (CPDC) of the OECD's DAC could play in this process.³ CPDC members agreed to develop such guidance under the overall rubric of its ongoing

¹ Armed Violence and Poverty Initiative research (Centre for International Co-operation, Bradford University, 2005) <<http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/cics/projects/arms/AVPI/>>. See Annex 3.

² OECD Statistical Reporting Directives: Addendum; Annex 5: ODA Coverage of Certain Peacebuilding, Conflict and Security Expenditures, DCD/DAC(2000)10/ADD1/REV1; 7 April 2005.

³ "Integrating the prevention of arms availability and armed violence into development programming", Room Document 9, 9th Meeting of the CPDC, 6-8 February 2006.

work on Security System Reform (SSR). It was later decided to include armed violence in the forthcoming biennium and to include mine action as an additional subject to be covered in the guidance. This concept note builds provides more detail about how this process will be taken forward.

6. Specifically, this note outlines:
 - The aims of the work programme;
 - The background to this initiative;
 - Recent developments since the last CPDC meeting;
 - A definition of the concept of armed violence;
 - The scope and approach of the proposed programme on armed violence;
 - Outputs and additional research areas;
 - The methodology to be used and the consultation process with practitioners and partner governments;
 - Proposals for piloting the guidance;
 - A timeline and budget for the 2007-2008 (excluding pilots).

B. Aims of the work programme

1. The work programme on armed violence will build on existing DAC tools to help donors and practitioners address conflict and security related issues as part of their development assistance. It is aimed at increasing programme efficiency as well as effectiveness by capitalising on opportunities for synergy. These tools touch on the issue of armed violence and arms availability but do not give detailed guidance on how it should be addressed as within conflict prevention and SSR, or as part of wider development programming. It will also be important to ensure that these approaches address underlying developmental factors driving armed violence so that programmes are sustainable.

2. The need for guidance was clearly identified by the Bradford University research, but it also became apparent through discussion and consultation with key stakeholders conducted through the AVPI. The armed violence guidance will fill an immediate information gap identified by such stakeholders, particularly policy makers and practitioners in bilateral development agencies, multilateral agencies and international financial institutions. It is primarily intended for their use. Although it is not specifically aimed at partner governments, it will be developed in a participatory way that seeks the views of affected countries on their experiences, needs and capacities. Emphasis will be placed on regional consultation and on bilateral contacts with key governments. Guidance is aimed at:

- i. Capturing lessons learned and best practice in armed violence prevention and reduction;
- ii. Harmonising donor approaches to armed violence programming;
- iii. Developing and delivering effective and relevant armed violence prevention and reduction programmes that will improve safety and security and contribute to an enabling environment for sustainable development;
- iv. Ensuring that armed violence prevention and reduction is country owned and aligned with national development planning processes.

C. Background

1. The research conducted through the AVPI found that arms availability and armed violence have negative, but complex, impacts on prospects for development, undermining all the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).⁴ It also found that it was difficult to separate the impacts of arms availability from the factors that drive the proliferation and misuse of weapons, including insecurity, inequality, conflict and criminal activity. Successful programmes tended to be those that addressed armed violence holistically. They were often linked with wider efforts to reform the security and justice sector or prevent and reduce underlying causes of conflict in society. However, these programmes are relatively few and far between; most projects to reduce arms availability are conducted as stand-alone initiatives and have limited long-term impact. Few are integrated into development programming.⁵

2. As noted above, existing work by DAC on conflict and security includes references to the availability of small arms. First and foremost among these are the DAC Guidelines on Preventing Violent Conflict, which recognised the link between conflict and small arms availability and misuse. The Guidelines also highlighted the value of weapons collection programmes and landmine removal, as well as other initiatives to reduce arms availability.⁶ The armed violence guidance will also take as its starting point the considerable body of information already produced by the DAC on SSR, including the DAC Guidelines on SSR and Governance, and the forthcoming Implementation Framework on SSR (IF-SSR).

D. Recent developments

1. At the ninth meeting of the CPDC on 6-8 February 2006 it was agreed that these tools should be augmented, and that armed violence prevention should be addressed systematically under the SSR workstream in the 2007-2008 biennium. A task team was established following the meeting, under the chairmanship of the UK and UNDP.⁷ Since then, the AVPI Advisory Board (which includes the task team) met in the UK from 10-12 April 2006 to consider how to take the process forward.⁸

2. At Wilton Park it was agreed that opportunities should be created to input into existing documentation, particularly the IF-SSR. The task team has therefore taken forward the process of identifying linkages between SSR and armed violence prevention within the context of the IF-SSR. This will help ensure that armed violence is systematically addressed when designing and implementing SSR programmes. The IF-SSR will be completed by the end of 2006.

⁴ See Annex 3 for a summary of the development impacts of armed violence.

⁵ More information can be found in "Integrating the reduction of arms availability".

⁶ "The DAC Guidelines: Helping Prevent Violent Conflict" (OECD, 2001)
<<http://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict/preventionguidelines>>.

⁷ This taskteam will merge with the current SSR taskteam in January 2007. The new taskteam for 'Security and Development' will be responsible for the work on i) Armed Violence, ii) the outreach phase of the IF-SSR and iii) the work on Community Focused Reintegration.

⁸ Chairs' Summary: Key conclusions from Wilton Park workshop on Securing development: Reducing arms availability and armed violence, 10-12 April 2006. See Annex 2 for Advisory Board members.

4. Additionally, the task team agreed to include mine action as a topic to be covered by the armed violence guidance. There is increasing formal and anecdotal evidence of the constraints imposed by landmines and other explosive remnants of war (ERW) on development at all levels.⁹ This evidence also shows that failure to link mine action with development deprives affected communities of early recovery and improved livelihoods, and can further destabilise fragile post-conflict societies. The relationship between successful mine action and poverty reduction was recognised at the First Review Conference of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Treaty in Nairobi in 2004, at which it was agreed to set up a special Contact Group on Linking Mine Action and Development.¹⁰ This group will hold its inaugural meeting at the 7th Meeting of States Parties in September 2006, and will develop practical tools and guidelines for integrating mine action in development. In order to inform this process, a scoping study on the linkages between mine action and armed violence was commissioned to consider how these concerns could be addressed as part of the armed violence guidance in the CPDC.

4. Two recent events have underscored the importance of our work on armed violence. On 7 June 2006, the Government of Switzerland and UNDP hosted a ministerial summit on armed violence and development that raised global awareness of the negative impact of armed violence on sustainable development. At the summit, the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development was endorsed by 42 governments (including 17 member states of the OECD). The declaration contains a number of practical commitments aimed at measurable reductions in the global burden of armed violence. There is a specific commitment to advancing the issue within the OECD. States agreed to meet again no later than 2008 to assess progress, and a core group will develop an action plan to implement the commitments made.

4. The UN Review Conference on Small Arms and Light Weapons (RevCon) took place from 26 June to 7 July 2006. In the margins of the conference, the task team met to discuss this concept note and the way forward in the CPDC. Disappointingly, the RevCon ended without agreement on an outcome text. In spite of this, there was considerable support for the need to integrate measures to control small arms into national development planning frameworks, which underlines the value of the DAC's work in this field.

E. Concept of armed violence

1. As already noted, the armed violence guidance will take a broad approach to the issue. In the past, programmes focused on narrow technical solutions to arms availability (the "vector") without adequately taking into account the environmental and behavioural factors that drive people to acquire and misuse weapons. The new guidance will adopt a broader perspective that includes these additional factors. Although the precise parameters of the concept will be further elaborated in the guidance, a working definition of armed violence is proposed below:

⁹ Reclaiming the Fields of War: Mainstreaming Mine Action in Development, PRIO and Chr. Michelson Institute for UNDP, <<http://www.prio.no/page/preview/preview/9429/45781.html>>.

¹⁰ Nairobi Action Plan, action #19, #21. Outcome document of the 1st Review Conference of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Treaty.

Armed violence is the intentional use of physical force, threatened or actual, with arms, landmines and explosives, against another person or a group/community, which is likely to result in mental or physical injury, death, deprivation or loss of livelihood.

2. Thus, armed violence encompasses situations of violent conflict, violent crime and political violence in both urban and rural settings, and in pre-crisis, crisis and post-crisis contexts. The central focus is on what drives and restrains the availability and misuse of the tools of violence – small arms and light weapons, as well as landmines and other ERW – in these contexts, but it also addresses the behavioural and environmental preconditions in which those tools are used. Working to prevent and reduce armed violence therefore requires looking at broader issues including social cohesion and resilience; governance; security and justice sector reform, and transitional justice; conflict prevention and peacebuilding; and the provision of education and alternative livelihoods, particularly for youth.

3. Armed violence is manifest in multiple contexts, such as:

- i) Urban and rural crime (e.g. predatory crime in northern Kenya and organised crime in Nairobi);
- ii) Sexual and gender-based armed violence (e.g. Papua New Guinea);
- iii) Political violence (e.g. electoral violence in Bangladesh)
- iv) Armed conflict; (e.g. Sudan, Northern Uganda);
- v) Post-conflict contexts (e.g. Sierra Leone).

Often, the boundaries between these different categories are of course blurred (e.g. Colombia). Multiple sub-categories exist and are influenced by local conditions and realities. Moreover, there are often causal relationships between categories, such as when armed conflict may drive criminal or gang violence, or vice versa (e.g. South Africa, El Salvador, Haiti). The manifestations of armed violence often occur where violence, crime and conflict intersect.

4. Many factors drive high levels of armed violence. These could include underlying structural issues, such as competition over resources or the exploitation of ethnic differences.¹¹ Even where conflict does not take the form of violent conflict, exclusion can exacerbate and prolong armed violence. Although there is a little evidence that absolute poverty is a causal factor of armed violence, widening disparities between rich and poor can create tensions which risk becoming violent. Where the state does not have the ability or will to provide security for its citizens, levels of armed violence can escalate. In such situations, societies can become caught in a vicious circle in which high levels of armed violence generate widespread fear and perceptions of insecurity, which in turn fuels a culture of violence.

5. A key driver of armed violence is the unregulated availability and misuse of small arms and light weapons. In many societies plagued by unusually high levels of weapons availability and misuse, weapons become the vectors of violence. Where weapons remain in circulation after violent conflicts end, they are often used for criminal or political violence that can undermine peacebuilding and reconciliation. An influx of weapons into an already tense situation is a key factor that can tip non-violent conflict into armed violence.

¹¹ See “The DAC Guidelines: Helping Prevent Violent Conflict”.

6. In addition, landmines and other ERW left after conflicts pose a real or perceived threat to civilian populations, constraining their ability to return to normality and exacerbating competition over land and other scarce resources. This in turn increases the level of tension and possibility for armed violence.

F. Scope and approach

1. Much work has already been done on violent conflict and insecurity, both within the DAC and elsewhere. Guidance on armed violence will not duplicate these tools. Instead, it will provide donors and practitioners with practical help on how to address armed violence within security, conflict, governance and development programming as a first priority. It will also provide advice on stand-alone armed violence programmes, which will continue to have their place, although the emphasis will be on integration. The armed violence guidance will provide a multi-sectoral framework for analysing armed violence, and will identify entry points and programming approaches from this perspective.

2. Task team members have recommended that the guidance be operationally focused. All agreed that there was already a wealth of policy in this area and that guidance should be as practical as possible.

G. Outputs

1. The task team proposes the following four outputs during 2007-8:

- a) A scoping study on the synergies between mine action and armed violence reduction and prevention.
- b) An armed violence prevention and reduction manual covering:
 - Identifying and capitalising on entry points into armed violence programming;
 - Diagnosing levels of armed violence and driving forces behind it (particularly the role played by arms availability), including through the use of existing analytical tools on conflict and security;
 - Using diagnosis and assessment to inform programming;
 - Programming approaches, including;
 - o Strengthening capacity to control and manage weapons, including landmines and ERW;
 - o Community-based violence prevention;
 - o Support for alternative livelihood strategies;
 - o Sequencing and integration with security and justice sector reform, and post-conflict recovery and reconciliation;
 - o Sequencing and integration with sector wide approaches to governance, education, health, rural agriculture, gender equality, etc.
 - The integration of armed violence prevention and reduction programming into national planning frameworks on poverty reduction;

- Working with partners in government, civil society, multilateral organisations and the private sector, and fostering whole-of-government approaches;
- Donor harmonisation and alignment;
- Monitoring and evaluation, and identification and application of lessons learned.

c) A short update and operational note for agreement at the Senior Level Meeting (SLM) in March 2008.

d) A training package on armed violence prevention for donors and practitioners. Ideally, this should be integrated into existing DAC packages on conflict prevention and SSR, as well as training on DDR and mine action.

2. A timeline of outputs and a budget can be found in Annex 1.

H. Additional research

1. Although a considerable body of evidence has been collected on armed violence prevention, a few questions remain unanswered. Additional research could be commissioned on a handful of topics to be agreed by the task team. These topics should be directly relevant to the armed violence guidance.

2. Broadly speaking, additional research could focus on aspects of the phenomenon that are still not well understood, such as the influence of identity on armed violence, linkages with trafficking and corruption, or the differing characteristics of rural and urban violence. Research could also address programme management issues, such as improved impact assessment, the integration of armed violence prevention and reduction into national development frameworks, and the financing of armed violence programmes. Finally, research could also be commissioned on nascent programming approaches such as building social cohesion and resilience to armed violence, or the engagement of non-state groups as security providers.

I. Methodology and consultation process

1. The task team will be responsible for the production of the outputs outlined above, assisted by the OECD DAC Secretariat. Where necessary, consultants will be engaged to support this process. The outputs will be informed by existing research, particularly the AVPI research of Bradford University. They will also draw on existing guidance in this area, particularly that developed by CPDC members,¹² as well as on the work of the Mine Ban Treaty Contact Group on Linking Mine Action and Development (LMADCG).

2. So far, the AVPI has not engaged in significant consultation with partner governments. However, if guidance is to be useful and relevant, it is essential that it is informed by partner government needs, priorities and capacities. Their views will

¹² Examples include the UNDP Practice Note on Small Arms and Light Weapons Control and Mine Action (forthcoming) and the DFID Practice Paper on Reducing Arms Availability and Armed Violence (forthcoming).

be sought through a formal consultation process based around regional workshops, as well as less formal contacts with key individuals with experience in this area.

3. The task team proposes the following process of consultation:
 - i. **An initial meeting with key partner governments**, and including NGOs and researchers, to provide input on process and output outlines. It is anticipated that these governments (and individuals) would act as focal points for regional discussion. Many partner governments with an interest in this process may be involved in the follow-up to the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence.
 - ii. **Three regional consultation meetings** in Africa, Latin America and Asia-Pacific, bringing together donors, partner governments and practitioners. These consultation meetings will take place within twelve to fourteen months programme. Ideally, these will be linked with existing events or activities of relevant regional organisations in order to maximise participation and minimise costs. The seminars are expected to draw out best practice and lessons learned from each region. They will address common issues across regions as well as one specific issue of regional concern. Where possible, the draft guidance will be made available in advance for comment and discussion. Where this is not possible, background papers will be prepared for the meetings, and a number of recommendations will be agreed.
 - iii. **Continued consultation with the AVPI Advisory Board**, which is made up of task team members, some additional governments and international organisations, NGOs and researchers. The Advisory Board membership will be reviewed to include more expertise from affected countries.

J. Proposals for piloting

A key stage in this process is the piloting of guidance in a limited number of diverse settings. Pilots will be identified and launched later in the process. All pilot programmes will be identified on the basis of existing work on armed violence prevention, and will seek to build on this work and integrate programming into wider development frameworks. It may be possible to link up with the follow-up to the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence. Further details on piloting will be discussed and agreed in 2007.

Annex 1: Timeline

Year	Month	Activity/Output	Objectives	Inputs	Lead CPDC member	Budget (EUR)
2006	Oct	Agreement on armed violence work programmes at CPDC meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capture lessons learned and best practice in armed violence prevention; - Harmonise donor approaches to armed violence programming; - Develop and deliver armed violence prevention programmes aimed at improving safety and security and creating space for development; - Ensure that armed violence prevention is country owned and aligned with national development planning processes. 	Concept note	UK, UNDP	-
		Agreement on IF-SSR, including small arms components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure that small arms control and armed violence prevention is taken into account in SSR programming 	Consultancy (20 days)	UK, UNDP, Switzerland	In kind
	Dec	Regional meeting in Latin America, tied to an existing UNDP meeting in Panama and possible Geneva Declaration follow-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify and quantify the nature of the problem in Latin America - Identify lessons learned and best practice in programming - Agree on recommendations for guidance manual - Identify partner government focal points 	Travel, accommodation and venue costs Consultancy to develop background note on Latin American best practice	UK, UNDP, others?	In kind 20,000
		Development of terms of reference for guidance manual (output b)		Task team drafting and comments	UK, UNDP	-
2007	Jan -	Research conducted on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inform the guidance manual 	Consultancies for three		48,000

June	topics to be agreed by task team	- Increase understandings and linkages with wider development programming	experts (60 days)		
March-May	First draft of guidance manual drafted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capture lessons learned and best practice in armed violence prevention; - Harmonise donor approaches to armed violence programming; - Develop and deliver effective and relevant armed violence reduction programmes that are aimed at improving safety and security and creating an enabling environment for development; - Ensure that armed violence prevention is country owned and aligned with national development planning processes. 	Consultancies for editor and two other authors (80 days)		64,000
April-May	Regional meeting in Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify and quantify the nature of the problem in Africa - Identify lessons learned and best practice in programming - Agree on recommendations for guidance manual 	Travel, accommodation and venue costs		50,000
May	First draft of the guidance manual distributed		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultancies for 4 person reference group (40 days) Drafting and comments from CPDC members 		32,000
July	Meeting of the AVPI Advisory Board/task team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review the first draft of the guidance manual - Review new research - Decide on next steps - Agree on piloting of guidance 	Travel, accommodation and venue costs for non-CPDC members		In kind
Sept	Regional meeting Asia	- Clarify and quantify the nature of the	Travel, accommodation		50,000

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> problem in Asia - Identify lessons learned and best practice in programming - Agree on recommendations for guidance manual 	and venue costs		
	Nov	Second draft of guidance manual distributed		Consultancies as above Drafting and comments from CPDC members		-
2008	Jan	Final draft of guidance manual published		Consultancies as above Drafting and comments from CPDC members Publication costs		15,000
	Feb	Agreement on communications and dissemination strategy, including training package	- Ensure that the manual is widely used and changes policy and practice	Communications and dissemination		6,000
	March	DAC and SLM agreement on armed violence prevention guidance and on operational note	- Raise awareness of the issue among policy makers	Engagement of CPDC members in capitals		-
	May-Sept	Design of a training package on armed violence prevention	- Ensure that the manual is widely used and changes policy and practice	Consultancy for one thematic and one functional expert (25 days)		35,000
Total						320,000¹³

¹³ It may not be possible to cover all the costs for the Armed Violence workstream from the CPDC budget, in which case some outputs will have to be dropped unless CPDC members are able to make contributions in kind.

Annex 2: Membership of the AVPI Advisory Board

Governments

Canada*
France*
Germany
Japan
Netherlands*
Norway
Sweden*
Switzerland*
UK*
US

International organisations, institutions and agencies

European Commission (EC)*
UNDP*
UN Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR)
World Bank
World Health Organisation (WHO)

NGOs and academic institutions

Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, Switzerland
Centre for International Co-operation, Bradford University, UK
Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
Institute for Security Studies, South Africa
Oxfam GB, UK
Saferworld, UK
Small Arms Survey, Switzerland
Viva Rio, Brazil

** Member of the CPDC Armed Violence Prevention Task Team.*

Annex 3: Development impacts of armed violence

- Direct casualties – A thousand people die every day from armed violence. About 100,000 per year die directly in armed conflict, most of which are caused by small arms.ⁱ And 200,000 people per year are killed by small arms violence in countries supposedly at peaceⁱⁱ. Millions more are seriously injured in war or crime contexts. In Algeria, 5% of the population are disabled as a result of the conflict.ⁱⁱⁱ The cost of caring for victims puts a serious strain on health services. In El Salvador, treatment of gunshot wounds uses up more than 7% of the public hospital system's budget.^{iv}
- Gender – In each of the AVPI case studies, men (particularly young men) were the main perpetrators and victims of armed violence. This has significant poverty implications including reducing labour power and skills, as well as increasing the number of female-headed households. In Southern Somalia, 40% of households are headed by women, and among IDPs this figure rises to 75%.^v Small arms have been used to facilitate the systematic use of sexual violence as a weapon of war in, among others, Algeria, Chechnya, DRC, North-East India, Sierra Leone and Southern Sudan.^{vi}
- Children and youth – young people are disproportionately affected by armed violence. The breakdown in family and community ties, the lack of education and employment opportunities and the availability of lightweight small arms mean that children and youth are increasingly involved in violent conflict and armed criminality. There are currently at least 30,000 child soldiers in the DRC, 20,000 in Uganda and 17,000 fighting in Colombia.^{vii} It is estimated that around half of the 10,000 armed drug faction members in Rio de Janeiro are children.^{viii}
- Displacement – After casualties, the biggest direct impact of armed conflict (but not of violent criminality) is the creation of refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs). At the end of 2004, UNHCR estimates that there were 19.2 million refugees and IDPs, mostly as a result of war.^{ix} Insecurity facilitated by the spread of small arms is a significant factor influencing individual and household decisions on whether to flee or migrate.^x It is also fundamental to return and resettlement. Surveys conducted in Darfur, Sudan in mid-2005 have suggested that of approximately 1.8 million IDPs, 30% would return spontaneously to 600 villages within the first year following signature of a peace agreement if security improves on the ground.^{xi}
- Macro-economic costs – Armed violence slowed economic growth, deterred investment, disrupted socio-economic activity and was an overall drain on the economy in every AVPI case study. For example, the World Bank estimates the overall cost of the conflict in Nepal at \$300 million.^{xii} In 2002, Brazil spent 10% of its GDP combating criminal violence.^{xiii} Estimates suggest that in El Salvador and Colombia in the late 1990s the costs of insecurity may have been as high as 25% of GDP, once the full range of indirect costs associated with insecurity were included.^{xiv} A survey of 69 companies by the World Bank in 2001 found that armed insecurity was the greatest risk facing investors.^{xv}

- Reduced service delivery and increased social needs – Armed violence has severely disrupted the provision of medical services in Nepal, Somalia and South Sudan, leading to an increase in the spread of malaria, HIV and other treatable illnesses and increased adult and infant mortality rates.^{xvi} Of the 3.9 million people estimated to have died in DRC between 1998 and 2004, over 90% have died through easily preventable causes due to lack of clean water and basic healthcare^{xvii}. Studies in a number of countries have shown how school enrolment declines during periods of intense armed conflict, only to increase as the level of violence reduces.^{xviii} Armed violence also affects education in urban contexts where the growth of gangs is a factor in the high drop out rate from schools. Sixty three per cent of *favela* residents in the Municipality of Rio have not achieved a primary certificate of education.^{xix}
- Disruption of trade – Violent conflict severely disrupts supplies and transportation. In Sierra Leone, for example, a tactic of the RUF was to surround key towns and enforce a siege, making normal patterns of trade impossible. In the majority of the AVPI case studies, loss of trade and access to markets negatively impacted on people's livelihoods.^{xx}
- Loss and depletion of livelihoods – There was a decline in the livelihoods of the majority of households, especially in rural areas, in each of the AVPI case studies. The Director-General of the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation has estimated that the net loss of agricultural production attributable to armed violence in Africa from 1970 to 1997 was \$25 Billion – equivalent to 75% of aid in that period.^{xxi} In Somalia, there is a direct correlation between poverty and persistent armed violence: of its 18 regions, the eight with incomes lower than the national average are all in insecure areas of the centre-south of the country.^{xxii}
- Weakening social capital – Armed violence erodes trust within and between communities, and undermines the networks and norms that provide cohesion and mutual cooperation in society. Traditional governance and conflict resolution mechanisms have been damaged in Northern Kenya and Sierra Leone.^{xxiii} In Nepal, the readiness of people to help others in trouble has dropped because of the fear of armed reprisals by the Maoists or state forces.^{xxiv} The availability of weapons and increase in armed violence also frequently undermines the social control of elders' traditional authority over young men – a loss that is difficult to reverse.
- Emergence of exploitative alternative political economies – Armed violence transformed economic activities and linkages in all of the AVPI case studies, normally leading to increased criminal activity (e.g. trafficking in guns, drugs, people and natural resources) that impoverishes or bypasses the many while benefiting the few. These were normally dependent on the use, or threat of use, of arms. In many of the case studies there was a substantial criminalisation of politics.
- Disruption of development and humanitarian aid – Armed violence can lead to a 'culture of withdrawal' where development agencies are unable to deliver

services in insecure areas. In a recent survey, 21% of aid workers said that over a quarter of their beneficiary target groups were inaccessible due to the threat of armed violence in the previous six months.^{xxv} Aid workers are increasingly targets of violence and the costs of logistics and security have significantly increased, diverting resources from their intended recipients.

-
- i Small Arms Survey (2005).
- ii Primarily through homicides but also suicides. Small Arms Survey (2004).
- iii *The Impact of Armed Violence on Poverty and Development*, University of Bradford (2005A), p15
- iv *Gun Violence and Poverty*, International Action Network on Small Arms (2006).
- v University of Bradford (2005A), p24.
- vi *Ibid*, p21.
- vii *Gun violence: A global epidemic*, International Action Network on Small Arms (2006).
- viii Dowdney, *Neither War nor Peace: International comparisons of children and youth in organised armed violence*, Viva Rio (2004), p35.
- ix 2004 Global Refugee Trends: Overview of refugee populations, new arrivals, durable solutions, asylum-seekers, stateless and other persons of concern to UNHCR, UNHCR (2005).
- x As measured by rates of displacement from areas affected by gun violence. Muggah and Batchelor (2002) quoted in *Securing Development*, UNDP (2005).
- xi Concept Note - Darfur Joint Assessment Mission (JAM): Track I.
- xii University of Bradford (2005A), p24.
- xiii *Ibid*, p25.
- xiv Buvinic, Morrison and Shifter, *Violence in Latin America and the Caribbean: a framework for action*. Inter-American Development Bank (1999).
- xv *Gun Violence and Poverty*, IANSA (2006).
- xvi University of Bradford (2005A), op cit, p26.
- xvii Findings of research study by the International Rescue Committee, published in the Lancet. <http://www.theirc.org/resources/DRCMortality0106Study.doc>
- xviii Muggah and Batchelor, *Development Held Hostage: Assessing the Effects of Small Arms on Human Development*, UNDP (2003), p29.
- xix Richardson and Kirsten, *Armed Violence and Poverty in Brazil*, University of Bradford (2005B).
- xx University of Bradford (2005A), p27.
- xxi *Ibid*, p27.
- xxii *Ibid*, p28.
- xxiii *Ibid*, p33.
- xxiv *Ibid*, p33.
- xxv Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (2005), p22.