How to Cite
Charles, K. A. (2026). The 2026 Us/Isreal – Iran conflict and its implications for the construction industry in the Middle East and Africa. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, *9*(3), 32-53.
https://doi.org/10.21744/ijss.v9n3.2483

The 2026 Us/Isreal – Iran Conflict and its Implications for the Construction Industry in the Middle East and Africa

K. A. Charles, Ph.D.
Independent Researcher, Lota Nash, South Africa
Corresponding author email: kencharles@hotmail.com

Abstract---*Purpose: This article offers a detailed analysis of the 2026 military escalation between the United States, Israel, and Iran, focusing on its devastating impact on the construction industry across the Middle East and Africa (MEA). It draws lessons from five earlier conflicts: the 1991 Gulf War, the 2003 Iraq War, the Syrian civil war, the Russia-Ukraine war and the 12-day US/Israeli Iran war of June 2025 (IISS, 2025), to contextualise the current destruction and outline possible reconstruction pathways. The study examines damage to critical infrastructure: airports, desalination plants, power grids, transport corridors and nuclear facilities, as well as the knock-on effects on supply chains, labour markets, investment confidence and project pipelines. Methodology: Using a qualitative, multi-case comparative approach, the research draws on open-source intelligence, government reports, industry databases, academic literature and expert analyses from think tanks and multilateral organisations. Historical parallels are systematically compared to estimate reconstruction needs and to identify lasting success factors for post-conflict rebuilding. Findings: The 2026 conflict has caused unprecedented damage to strategic assets in Iran and, through spillover attacks, to Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) states, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Oman and Qatar as well as Jordan (Reuters, 2026; Wikipedia, 2026). Key infrastructure destroyed or severely damaged includes major airports, desalination plants, power stations and, for the first time, the Bushehr nuclear power plant (IAEA, 2026). The destruction of energy infrastructure (refineries, storage facilities and tankers) has further reduced the revenue available for reconstruction while simultaneously driving up costs (Energy Intelligence, 2026). Based on a sector-by-sector damage assessment and reconstruction unit cost analysis from historical precedents, total reconstruction costs are projected to exceed $600 billion over the next 15 years (Charles, 2026). This is consistent with the IMF's assessment that the conflict has caused a systemic shock to energy markets, trade routes and regional growth (IMF, 2026). Lessons from earlier wars show that successful rebuilding requires stable security, integrated planning, innovative financing and a firm commitment to sustainable, resilient infrastructure. Practical implications: Construction firms and policymakers must adopt multi-scenario risk management, diversify supply chains, invest in local workforce development and embed sustainability into all rebuilding efforts. International cooperation will be crucial to mobilise finance and technical expertise. Originality/value: This is the first scholarly work to systematically link the 2026 US/Israel–Iran conflict with prior regional wars and to outline a comprehensive reconstruction agenda for the construction industry, offering actionable insights for industry, government and international development partners.*
Keywords---*Geopolitical risk, construction industry, Middle East, infrastructure destruction, reconstruction, Iran conflict, Gulf Cooperation Council, war damage, supply chain resilience, desalination, nuclear infrastructure.*

Introduction

A New Chapter in Regional Conflict

The Middle East has endured decades of conflict, but the events of early 2026 have ushered in a new and alarming phase. Following a prolonged period of shadow warfare, the confrontation between the United States, Israel and Iran erupted into open hostilities in June 2025. That 12-day campaign known as the "12-Day War" involved extensive

ISSN 2632-9409
Submitted: 27 May 2026 |Revised: 18 June 2026 | Accepted: 04 July 2026

airstrikes on Iranian nuclear and military sites and retaliatory missile attacks on Gulf oil facilities (IISS, 2025). The conflict ended in a fragile ceasefire, but unresolved tensions reignited in early 2026, leading to a broader war that has now directly targeted critical civilian infrastructure across Iran and the GCC states (Reuters, 2026).

For the first time, airports, desalination plants, power stations and even nuclear facilities have become primary targets. Satellite imagery and official statements confirm that Dubai International Airport, Abu Dhabi International Airport, Kuwait International Airport and Bahrain International Airport have all sustained damage (MEED, 2026; Maxar, 2026). Iranian missile and drone attacks have also hit Oman and Qatar, as well as Jordan. In Oman, the strategic ports of Duqm and Salalah were struck; in Qatar, the Al Udeid Air Base and the critical Ras Laffan Industrial City were targeted; and Jordan faced a barrage of 240 missiles and drones, some of which struck its territory (Wikipedia, 2026). Desalination plants across the region: including those in Qatar, Bahrain and Kuwait, which supply up to 90% of their fresh water, have been damaged or threatened (Energy Intelligence, 2026). Most alarmingly, the Bushehr nuclear power plant in Iran was struck, raising the spectre of radiological contamination (IAEA, 2026).

The construction industry, already reeling from the economic aftershocks of COVID-19 and the Russia-Ukraine war, now faces an unprecedented crisis. Before these events, the MEA region was a global construction powerhouse, driven by Saudi Vision 2030, UAE Centennial 2071, and massive infrastructure investments. Now billions of dollars' worth of projects are on hold, supply chains are shattered, and the industry must prepare for what will likely be the largest post-war reconstruction effort since the 2003 invasion of Iraq.

Scope and Objectives

This article aims to provide a comprehensive, historically informed analysis of the 2026 conflict's impact on the construction industry in the MEA region. Specifically, it:

- Documents the direct destruction of critical infrastructure (airports, desalination plants, power stations, nuclear facilities and transport corridors) across Iran and the GCC countries, drawing on open-source intelligence and verified reports,
- Analyses the indirect effects on supply chains, labour markets, insurance and project pipelines across the region,
- Compares the current crisis with previous regional conflicts; the 1991 Gulf War, the 2003 Iraq War, the Syrian civil war, the Russia-Ukraine war and the June 2025 12-day war - and extracts lessons on reconstruction, funding and sustainability,
- Projects reconstruction scenarios, including cost estimates, financing mechanisms, security constraints and the role of international contractors, and
- Offers strategic recommendations for construction firms, policymakers and international financial institutions.

The analysis is grounded in a qualitative comparative case-study methodology, drawing on official statements, industry reports (MEED, 2026; Fitch Solutions, 2026; GlobalData, 2026), academic literature and real-time open-source intelligence up to March 2026.

Literature Review: Geopolitical Risk, Conflict, and Reconstruction

Theoretical Foundations: Geopolitical Risk in Construction

Geopolitical risk is defined as the uncertainty arising from political decisions, conflicts, and international tensions that affect the predictability of business environments (Caldara & Iacoviello, 2022). For the construction sector, which operates with long project lifecycles, high capital intensity, and cross-border supply chains, such risk manifests in multiple forms: contract cancellations, material price volatility, labour shortages, security threats, and currency fluctuations (Deng & Low, 2013; Osei-Kyei & Chan, 2015).

The MEA region has long been a high-risk area. Assaf & Al-Hejji (2006) identified political instability as a primary cause of construction project delays in Saudi Arabia. Al-Sanad (2015) documented how the Arab Spring (2011) led to abrupt project suspensions and capital flight. More recently, the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated the vulnerability of global construction supply chains, while the Russia-Ukraine war (2022–present) exposed the sector's dependence on steel, energy, and logistics routes (Hammad et al., 2021; OECD, 2024).

Comparative Conflict Reconstruction Cases

The 1991 Gulf War
The 1990-1991 Gulf War resulted in the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the subsequent US-led coalition campaign. The retreating Iraqi army set fire to more than 600 oil wells and systematically destroyed Kuwait's power plants, desalination facilities and telecommunications networks. Reconstruction costs exceeded $50 billion (Kuwait Ministry of Planning, 1993). Key lessons include the critical role of international coalition support, the rapid mobilisation of private contractors and the importance of prioritising water and energy infrastructure. Kuwait's success was also attributed to its sovereign wealth fund, which provided immediate liquidity.

The 2003 Iraq War and Its Aftermath
The 2003 invasion of Iraq led to widespread destruction of infrastructure, exacerbated by a decade of sanctions. Post-conflict reconstruction overseen by the Coalition Provisional Authority and later the Iraqi government was plagued by security instability, corruption and fragmentation. A 2008 audit by the US Government Accountability Office (GAO) estimated that more than $20 billion in reconstruction funds were wasted or mismanaged. The Iraq experience highlighted the need for integrated security-development planning, robust oversight mechanisms and the importance of engaging local contractors to build ownership (GAO, 2008).

The Syrian Civil War (2011–Present)
The Syrian civil war has destroyed more than 30% of the country's housing stock and caused massive damage to water, electricity and transport infrastructure. Reconstruction needs are estimated at $400-600 billion (World Bank, 2021). However, political divisions, sanctions and fragmented control have delayed any comprehensive rebuilding. The Syrian case shows that reconstruction cannot succeed without a stable political settlement and inclusive governance. It also illustrates the role of external powers (Russia, Iran) in shaping reconstruction contracts.

The Russia-Ukraine War (2022-Present)
Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 has caused extensive damage to urban areas, energy grids and industrial facilities. By early 2026, reconstruction costs were estimated at more than $500 billion (World Bank, 2026). Key lessons for the construction industry include:

- **Supply chain resilience:** The war triggered global shortages of steel, neon gas and grain, demonstrating the need for diversified sourcing (OECD, 2024).
- **Energy security:** Attacks on Ukraine's power grid accelerated the shift toward decentralised renewable energy systems (Hammad et al., 2021).
- **Digital reconstruction:** The use of drones, satellite imagery and BIM for damage assessment and planning became standard practice (Kyiv School of Economics, 2025).
- **Innovative funding:** The use of frozen Russian assets as a reconstruction financing tool is being debated, while multilateral development banks have created new rapid disbursement mechanisms (World Bank, 2026).
- **Protection of critical infrastructure:** The targeting of Ukraine's Zaporizhzhia nuclear power plant highlighted the need for international norms protecting nuclear sites (IAEA, 2025).

The June 2025 US/Israeli-Iran 12-Day War

In June 2025, a sudden escalation known as the "12-Day War" saw extensive air and missile exchanges between the US, Israel, and Iran. Although brief, it caused considerable damage to Iranian nuclear and missile sites, as well as to several Gulf oil facilities. The International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS, 2025) noted that the conflict demonstrated Iran's ability to strike deep into GCC territory using drones and cruise missiles, with damage to airports in Saudi Arabia's Eastern Province and the UAE. The ceasefire brokered in late June 2025 was fragile, and the underlying tensions remained unresolved, setting the stage for the more extensive 2026 conflict. The 12-day war also revealed the vulnerability of desalination plants: a missile strike near the Fujairah plant in the UAE caused a temporary shutdown, prompting GCC states to begin hardening water infrastructure (Energy Intelligence, 2025).

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative comparative case-study design, integrating primary and secondary data sources to analyse the impact of the 2026 conflict and to project reconstruction pathways. The methodology comprises four main components.

Case Selection and Historical Comparison

The research selects five historical conflicts for systematic comparison:

- 1991 Gulf War (Kuwait),
- 2003 Iraq War and subsequent reconstruction,
- Syrian civil war (2011-present),
- Russia-Ukraine war (2022-present), and
- June 2025 12-day US/Israeli-Iran war.

These cases represent a spectrum of conflict types (interstate war, civil war, hybrid warfare) and reconstruction contexts (international coalition-led, fragmented, under sanctions). By comparing factors such as security stability, funding mechanisms and reconstruction governance, the study derives lessons applicable to the current crisis.

Data Sources

Data were collected from:

- **Official government publications:** Damage assessments, reconstruction plans and financial statements from Iran, Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Kuwait, Bahrain and international coalition partners.
- **Industry and financial intelligence**: MEED, Fitch Solutions, GlobalData, Drewry, Aon, and company annual reports.
- **Academic literature**: Peer-reviewed journals in construction management, political risk, and conflict studies (2015-2026).
- **Multilateral organisations**: World Bank, IMF, OECD, UN Habitat, IISS, IAEA reports.
- **Media and open-source intelligence**: Verified reports from Reuters, BBC, Al-Jazeera, Associated Press, and satellite imagery analysis (Maxar, Planet Labs).

Analytical Framework

The analysis is organised around three interconnected pillars: Direct Impacts, Indirect Impacts and Reconstruction Pathways. Each pillar is further disaggregated into sub-components, allowing for systematic data collection, coding and synthesis. This structure ensures that the findings are comprehensive and comparable across the different conflict cases and infrastructure sectors.

Pillar 1: Direct Impacts

This pillar captures the immediate physical and operational consequences of the conflict on infrastructure and construction activity. It is divided into four sub-components:

Sub-Component	Description	Data Sources	Application in Findings
1.1 Infrastructure Damage	Quantification of destroyed or damaged assets, including airports	Satellite imagery (Maxar, Planet Labs); government damage assessments	Presented in Tables 2 and 5, with
	desalination plants, power stations, nuclear facilities, ports, and energy infrastructure.	MEED reports; IAEA and IISS assessments.	Geographical and sectoral breakdowns.
1.2 Project Delays and Cancellations	Identification of major construction projects (public and private) that have been halted, paused, or indefinitely postponed due to the conflict.	Industry reports (MEED, Fitch Solutions); company announcements; government statements.	Discussed in Section 5.4 (Mega-Project Slowdowns).
1.3 Operational	Assessment of immediate	Contractor reports; news	Integrated into Section

Sub-Component	Description	Data Sources	Application in Findings
Disruptions	disruptions to construction operations, including site closures, evacuation of workers, and suspension of logistics.	media; Aon insurance updates.	5.2 (Labour Market Disruptions) and Section 5.3 (Insurance and Investment Climate).
1.4 Cost Escalation	Analysis of price increases for key construction materials (steel, cement, fuel) and logistics due to supply chain shocks.	GlobalData; Drewry; World Bank commodity price data.	Presented in Section 5.1 (Supply Chain Disruption) and Section 5.5 (Energy Prices).

Pillar 2: Indirect Impacts
This pillar examines the ripple effects of the conflict across the wider economic and operational environment, extending beyond immediate physical damage. It is organised into four sub-components:

Sub-Component	Description	Data Sources	Application in Findings
2.1 Supply Chain Disruption	Analysis of upstream and downstream disruptions, including shortages of materials, increased lead times, and rerouting of logistics.	GlobalData; Drewry; OECD supply chain reports; company supply chain disclosures.	Detailed in Section 5.1, with specific quantification of price increases and shortages.
2.2 Labour Market Effects	Assessment of expatriate labour availability, evacuation patterns, and impacts on construction workforce capacity.	Contractor reports; government labour statistics; ILO data; news media.	Covered in Section 5.2, including evacuation numbers and recruitment challenges.
2.3 Investment and Insurance Climate	Evaluation of changes in foreign direct investment, sovereign risk ratings, insurance premiums, and investor sentiment.	FDI Intelligence; Moody's/S&P reports; Aon insurance updates; IMF investor surveys.	Discussed in Section 5.3, with quantification of premium increases and FDI decline.
2.4 Macroeconomic Spillovers	Analysis of how energy price shocks, reduced oil revenues, and fiscal pressures affect government budgets for infrastructure.	IMF Regional Economic Outlook; national budget statements; World Bank data.	Integrated into Section 7.2 (Energy Infrastructure and Funding Implications).

Pillar 3: Reconstruction Pathways
This pillar develops forward-looking scenarios for post-conflict reconstruction, integrating the lessons from historical precedents with the specific characteristics of the 2026 conflict. It is structured around four sub-components:

Sub-Component	Description	Data Sources	Application in Findings
3.1 Security Assumptions	Definition of three security scenarios (stable ceasefire, fragile peace, renewed conflict) that underpin reconstruction feasibility.	IISS; International Crisis Group; UN reports; geopolitical risk analysis.	Formulated as Scenario 1, 2, and 3 in Section 7.3, with probability assessments.
3.2 Funding Availability	Assessment of potential financing sources (sovereign wealth funds,	IMF; World Bank; OECD; MIGA; national SWF annual	Presented in Table 6 (Funding Availability by Scenario) and expanded in Section 7.5

Sub-Component	Description	Data Sources	Application in Findings
	multilateral banks, private capital) under each security scenario.	reports.	(Financing Mechanisms).
3.3 Technological and Sustainability Choices	Evaluation of reconstruction technologies (digital tools, modular construction, renewable energy, green materials) and their suitability for different sectors.	Kyiv School of Economics; World Bank; academic literature; industry technology reports.	Discussed in Section 6 (Reconstruction Lessons) and Section 8 (Strategic Recommendations).
3.4 Sectoral Prioritisation and Timelines	Estimation of reconstruction timelines for key sectors based on funding availability and technical complexity, drawing on historical benchmarks.	Historical reconstruction data (Kuwait 1991, Iraq 2003–2010, Ukraine 2022–2026); expert interviews.	Presented in Table 7 (Timelines by Scenario) and Table 4 (Cost Estimates by Sector).

Integration and Cross-Pillar Analysis

The three pillars are not treated in isolation. The analytical framework explicitly traces linkages across them:

- **From Direct to Indirect Impacts**: The destruction of energy infrastructure (Pillar 1) leads to reduced sovereign revenue (Pillar 2, sub-component 2.4), which in turn constrains funding for reconstruction (Pillar 3, sub-component 3.2).
- **From Historical Lessons to Current Scenarios**: The reconstruction lessons distilled from past conflicts (Section 2.2) inform the definition of security assumptions and the selection of appropriate financing mechanisms in Pillar 3.
- **From Impacts to Recommendations**: The direct and indirect impacts identified in Pillars 1 and 2 directly inform the strategic recommendations for construction firms (Section 8), ensuring that advice is grounded in empirical evidence rather than generic principles.

Table 3.1 summarises the analytical framework, showing the relationship between pillars, sub-components, and the corresponding sections of the article where findings are presented.

Table 3.1: Analytical Framework Summary

Pillar	Sub-Component	Corresponding Section(s)	Key Outputs
1. Direct Impacts	1.1 Infrastructure Damage	Section 4.1; Tables 2, 5	Damage inventories; sectoral breakdown
	1.2 Project Delays and Cancellations	Section 5.4	List of affected mega-projects
	1.3 Operational Disruptions	Sections 5.2, 5.3	Labour and insurance impacts
	1.4 Cost Escalation	Sections 5.1, 5.5	Price increase data
2. Indirect Impacts	2.1 Supply Chain Disruption	Section 5.1	Material shortages; logistics costs
	2.2 Labour Market Effects	Section 5.2	Evacuation data; workforce trends
	2.3 Investment and Insurance Climate	Section 5.3	Premium increases; FDI decline
	2.4 Macroeconomic Spillovers	Section 7.2; Table 6	Revenue loss; funding constraints
3. Reconstruction Pathways	3.1 Security Assumptions	Section 7.3	Three scenarios with probabilities

Pillar	Sub-Component	Corresponding Section(s)	Key Outputs
	3.2 Funding Availability	Section 7.4; Tables 6, 8, 9	Financing mechanism typology
	3.3 Technological and Sustainability Choices	Section 6; Section 8	Technology recommendations
	3.4 Sectoral Prioritisation and Timelines	Section 7.1; Table 4, 7	Cost and timeline estimates

Methodological Rigour and Triangulation

To ensure the validity and reliability of the findings, the analytical framework employs triangulation across multiple data sources for each sub-component. For example:

- Infrastructure damage (Pillar 1.1) is verified through cross-referencing satellite imagery with government damage assessments and industry reports,
- Supply chain disruptions (Pillar 2.1), are triangulated using GlobalData price indices, Drewry freight rates, and company supply chain disclosures. and
- Funding availability (Pillar 3.2) is assessed by comparing IMF fiscal projections, World Bank lending data, and sovereign wealth fund annual reports.

This triangulation approach mitigates the limitations of relying on any single data source, particularly in a conflict environment where information may be contested or incomplete.

Limitations and Assumptions

The analytical framework explicitly acknowledges its limitations:

- **Data temporality**: Damage assessments are based on information available up to March 2026; ongoing conflict may cause further destruction not captured.
- **Scenario uncertainty**: The three reconstruction scenarios (Section 7.3) are based on current political dynamics, which may shift unexpectedly.
- **Cost estimation**: Reconstruction cost figures are derived from historical unit costs and may not fully capture post-conflict inflation or supply-side constraints.

These limitations are addressed by presenting ranges rather than point estimates, by clearly stating the assumptions underpinning each scenario, and by emphasising the illustrative rather than predictive nature of the timeline estimates.

Limitations

Given the ongoing nature of the conflict, damage assessments are preliminary. The study relies on open-source data, which may underestimate actual damage or be subject to propaganda. Reconstruction cost estimates are based on historical unit costs and may vary with market volatility. Nonetheless, the comparative approach provides a robust framework for understanding likely trajectories.

Findings: Direct Infrastructure Damage in the 2026 Conflict

Overview of Targeted Infrastructure

The 2026 conflict has marked a significant expansion of targets beyond purely military installations. Based on open-source intelligence and satellite imagery (up to March 2026), the following infrastructure has been heavily damaged or destroyed.

Table 1 provides a comparative overview of five major conflicts since 1990, highlighting duration, main infrastructure damage, estimated reconstruction costs and principal challenges. This comparison shows that the 2026 conflict already ranks among the most destructive, both in the diversity of targeted infrastructure (including nuclear facilities) and in the projected reconstruction bill.

Table 1: Comparative Overview of Recent Conflicts and Reconstruction Challenges

Conflict	Duration	Main Infrastructure Damage	Estimated Reconstruction Cost	Key Challenges
1991 Gulf War	7 months	Oil wells, power, desalination, airports (Kuwait)	$50–60 billion	Rapid coalition support, sovereign wealth funds
2003 Iraq War	Ongoing insurgency	Urban destruction, power grid, water, oil	$100+ billion (Iraq)	Security, corruption, fragmentation
Syrian civil war	2011-present	Housing, water, electricity, transport	$400-600 billion	Political stalemate, sanctions, fragmentation
Russia-Ukraine war	2022–present	Energy grid, housing, industrial, transport	$500+ billion	Continuous conflict, frozen assets debate
12-Day War (2025)	12 days	Nuclear sites (Iran), oil facilities (GCC)	$10-15 billion	Fragile ceasefire, no comprehensive reconstruction yet
2026 US/Israeli Iran conflict	Ongoing (2026)	Airports, desalination, power, nuclear (Bushehr), ports, LNG (Qatar), oil storage (Oman), radar (Jordan)	$600+ billion (projected)	Nuclear dimension, regional escalation, financing, multi-country damage

Sources: Kuwait Ministry of Planning (1993); GAO (2008); World Bank (2021); World Bank (2026); IISS (2025); MEED (2026); IMF (2026); Energy Intelligence (2026); Wikipedia (2026); Reuters (2026).

As Table 1 shows, the 2026 conflict is unprecedented in its combination of advanced infrastructure damage, the involvement of a nuclear facility, the targeting of LNG and logistics hubs (Ras Laffan, Duqm, Salalah), and the spill-over effects on multiple Gulf states as well as Jordan. While the 12-Day War of June 2025 served as a warning, the current conflict has inflicted far more extensive and permanent damage.

Table 2 gives a country-by-country, asset-by-asset breakdown of confirmed damage up to March 2026. This table is critical for understanding the geographical spread and sectoral concentration of destruction, which directly influences reconstruction priorities. Airports, desalination plants, power stations, ports, nuclear facilities, LNG terminals and military assets have been hit across eight countries/territories, underscoring the regional nature of the conflict.

Table 2: Infrastructure Damage Assessment by Key Assets Affected (by country)

Country	Asset Type	Name/Location	Extent of Damage	Operational Status (March 2026)
Iran	Airport	Tehran Imam Khomeini	Runway craters, terminal damaged	Closed
Iran	Airport	Isfahan International	Runway disabled	Closed
Iran	Airport	Shiraz International	Terminal damage, ATC destroyed	Closed
Iran	Airport	Mashhad International	Runway damage	Limited
Saudi Arabia	Airport	Abha International	Runway closed after missile strike	Reopened with restrictions
Saudi Arabia	Airport	King Fahd (Dammam)	Peripheral damage	Operational
UAE	Airport	Dubai International	Runway damage, cargo facilities hit	Partial operation
UAE	Airport	Abu Dhabi International	Runway damage, terminal glazing shattered	Partial operation
Kuwait	Airport	Kuwait International	Terminal roof damage, cargo facility	Operational with delays
Bahrain	Airport	Bahrain International	Runway edge damage, terminal	Operational

Country	Asset Type	Name/Location	Extent of Damage	Operational Status (March 2026)
			windows	
Iran	Desalination	Bandar Abbas	Plant destroyed	0% output
Iran	Desalination	Bushehr	Plant heavily damaged	0% output
UAE	Desalination	Jebel Ali (Dubai)	Intake pipes damaged, electrical systems	50% output
UAE	Desalination	Taweelah (Abu Dhabi)	Major structural damage	40% output
Saudi Arabia	Desalination	Jubail	Pipeline damage	70% output
Saudi Arabia	Desalination	Khobar	Electrical substation destroyed	50% output
Kuwait	Desalination	Doha East	Missile impact, boiler damage	30% output
Bahrain	Desalination	Al-Hidd	Intake structure damaged	60% output
Iran	Nuclear	Bushehr	Reactor building struck (non-critical)	Shutdown, IAEA monitoring
Iran	Power	Isfahan Thermal	Multiple units destroyed	Offline
Iran	Power	Karaj Power Plant	Generator hall damaged	Offline
Saudi Arabia	Power	Qurayyah (Eastern Province)	Turbine hall damaged	40% capacity
UAE	Power	Jebel Ali Power Station	Grid connection hit	60% capacity
Kuwait	Power	Sabiya Power Plant	Transmission tower destroyed	50% capacity
Bahrain	Power	Al-Hidd Power Plant	Switching station damaged	70% capacity
Iran	Port	Bandar Abbas	Cranes destroyed, warehouses bombed	Closed
UAE	Port	Jebel Ali Port	Minor damage to berths	Operational
Jordan	Port & Pipeline	Aqaba Port & Iraq Petroleum Pipeline	Pipeline rupture at terminal (sabotage/missile debris); port crane damage	Pipeline offline (30 days); port at 60% capacity
Jordan	Transport	Aqaba Highway (to Saudi border)	Bridge damaged by airstrike on convoy	Reduced to single lane
Oman	Port	Duqm Port	Warehousing & fuel storage tanks hit (drone attack); military logistics centre damaged	Commercial ops suspended; military ops limited
Oman	Energy	Muscat–Sohar Product Pipeline	Sabotage attack on pumping station	40% capacity reduction; repairs ongoing
Oman	Desalination	Ghubrah (Muscat)	Electrical substation damaged by blast wave	70% output
Qatar	Air Base	Al Udeid Air Base	Runway craters (2); hangar destroyed; barracks damaged	Runway repaired (48hrs); base at 85% capacity
Qatar	Energy (LNG)	Ras Laffan LNG Complex	Storage tank damaged (drone strike); control room shattered	Production reduced 25%
Qatar	Energy (GTL)	Pearl GTL (Shell)	Flare stack & pipeline damage	Output reduced 30%; non-essential ops suspended
Qatar	Desalination	Ras Laffan Desalination Plant	Intake structure damaged	60% output
Qatar	Power	Ras Laffan Power Station	Transformer destroyed	70% capacity
Qatar	Energy Storage	Halul Island (Crude)	Tank fire (missile strike)	50% of storage offline

Sources: MEED (2026); IISS (2026); Reuters (2026); Maxar satellite imagery (2026); IAEA (2026); national government statements; Wikipedia (2026); Energy Intelligence (2026).

The data in Table 2 reveal several patterns. First, the targeting of airports in all six countries has paralysed regional air connectivity, affecting both passenger travel and the air freight of high-value construction components. Second, the simultaneous damage to desalination plants across the Gulf has created a water security crisis that will require urgent investment. Third, the inclusion of the Bushehr nuclear facility marks a dangerous escalation that could have long-term implications for reconstruction governance and international oversight. Fourth, the attacks on Oman's Duqm and Salalah ports aim to cripple alternative logistics routes designed to bypass the Strait of Hormuz. Fifth, the strike on Qatar's Ras Laffan Industrial City has directly impacted global energy markets, destroying 17% of LNG export capacity and causing an estimated $20 billion annual revenue loss. Sixth, the destruction of a $485 million US radar system in Jordan demonstrates that even non-GCC countries with US military assets are not immune.

Indirect Impacts on the Construction Industry

Supply Chain Disruption and Material Shortages

The construction sector in the MEA region relies heavily on imported steel, cement, aggregates and specialised equipment. The conflict has created a cascade of supply shocks (GlobalData, 2026; Drewry, 2026):

- **Steel**: Iran was a significant exporter of steel to the GCC, Turkey, and Iraq. Sanctions and port closures removed up to 15% of regional supply. Global steel prices rose by 35% in February-March 2026 (GlobalData, 2026).
- **Cement**: Clinker production in Iran and eastern Turkey was disrupted, leading to price increases of 20%.
- **Logistics**: Freight costs from Asia and Europe to the Gulf increased by 300% due to longer routes (via Cape of Good Hope) and higher war-risk insurance premiums (Drewry, 2026).
- **Equipment**: Heavy machinery (excavators, cranes) already in short supply was further constrained by shipping delays and safety restrictions.

Labour Market Disruptions

The MEA construction workforce is predominantly expatriate (from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Egypt, Philippines). The conflict has caused:

- **Evacuations**: Major contractors (e.g., Saudi Binladin Group, Besix, ACCIONA) evacuated expatriate workers from high-risk zones (Eastern Saudi Arabia, coastal Iran).
- **Travel bans**: Several GCC states temporarily suspended flights to/from Iran and conflict zones, stranding workers.
- **Worker reluctance**: The perception of increased risk has made it difficult to recruit new foreign labour, exacerbating the existing skilled labour shortage (Assaf & Al-Hejji, 2006).

Insurance and Investment Climate

War risk insurance premiums for construction projects in the region increased five-fold (Aon, 2026). Some insurers withdrew coverage entirely. Sovereign risk ratings for Iran, Saudi Arabia and the UAE were downgraded by Moody's and S&P, citing elevated geopolitical risk. Foreign direct investment (FDI) into regional infrastructure projects dropped by 60% in the first quarter of 2026 compared to the previous year (FDI Intelligence, 2026).

Mega-Project Slowdowns and Cancellations

- **Saudi Arabia**: NEOM's The Line and Oxagon projects were paused for security reviews. The Red Sea Project halted work at sites near the Yemen border. ROSHN housing developments slowed due to labour shortages.
- **UAE**: The Dubai Creek Tower project was indefinitely postponed; Emaar and other developers delayed new launches.
- **Kuwait**: The Silk City project (Madinat al-Hareer) was scaled back as the government diverted funds to defence and emergency water supplies.
- **Egypt**: The New Administrative Capital continued work but faced financing delays as Gulf investors redirected funds.

Energy Prices and Construction Costs
Oil prices briefly surged to $120 per barrel (Brent), benefiting GCC government revenues but also increasing the cost of construction materials, especially asphalt, plastics and energy-intensive products. Higher energy costs also raised operational expenses for construction firms.

Reconstruction Lessons from Past Conflicts

To inform the reconstruction strategy for the 2026 conflict, it is essential to synthesise the experiences of previous wars. Table 3 summarises five key factors that influenced reconstruction outcomes in the conflicts discussed earlier: security stability, funding source, governance, role of local contractors, technology and sustainability focus (Kuwait Ministry of Planning, 1993; GAO, 2008; World Bank, 2021; Kyiv School of Economics, 2025; IISS, 2025; MEED, 2026).

Table 3: Summary of Reconstruction Lessons from Past Conflicts

Factor	1991 Gulf War	2003 Iraq War	Syrian Civil War	Russia-Ukraine War	12-Day War (2025)
Security stability	Rapid coalition victory; peace enforced	Insurgency, no peace	Fragmented, ongoing conflict	Ongoing war	Ceasefire but no peace
Funding source	Kuwaiti sovereign wealth, coalition contributions	US appropriations, Iraqi oil revenues	Minimal; external patrons	Donor conferences, frozen assets	Emergency GCC funds
Governance	Centralised, US-led reconstruction authority	Chaotic, corruption	No unified government	Ukrainian government, international coordination	Fragile; GCC states intact
Role of local contractors	Limited; international firms dominant	Mixed, often bypassed	Local actors with external support	Strong local involvement	Emerging
Technology	Conventional	Conventional; early IT	Low-tech	Drones, BIM, satellite mapping	Digital assessment tools
Sustainability focus	Minimal	Minimal	None	Strong push for green rebuilding	Emerging, with climate lens

Sources: Kuwait Ministry of Planning (1993); GAO (2008); World Bank (2021); Kyiv School of Economics (2025); IISS (2025); MEED (2026).

From Table 3, several cross-cutting lessons emerge. Security stability is the single most important determinant: without it, reconstruction stalls (Iraq, Syria). Funding must be sufficient and predictable; the Kuwait model of using sovereign wealth and coalition contributions worked well, whereas the fragmented donor approach in Ukraine has faced coordination challenges. Governance and anti-corruption mechanisms are critical to ensure funds reach intended beneficiaries; Iraq's experience demonstrates the cost of weak oversight. Finally, the role of technology and sustainability has evolved: the Ukraine war has shown that digital tools can accelerate damage assessment and that reconstruction can align with climate goals if planned from the outset.

Reconstruction Scenarios and Cost Estimates

Estimated Scale of Damage

Based on preliminary damage assessments, the total direct physical damage to infrastructure across Iran and the GCC is estimated at 180-220 billion, with Iran accounting for the majority. Including economic losses (business interruption and supply chain ripple effects), total costs could exceed180-220 billion, with Iran accounting for the majority. Including economic losses (business interruption and supply chain ripple effects), total costs could exceed400 billion in the short term. Using a sector-by-sector reconstruction unit cost methodology drawn from historical precedents (Kuwait 1991, Iraq 2003-2010, Ukraine 2022-2026), the author estimates that full reconstruction will require 10-15 years and total investment exceeding $ 600 billion (Charles, 2026). The IMF's April 2026 *Regional Economic Outlook* (IMF, 2026) provides the macroeconomic backdrop – severe disruption to energy markets, trade routes and confidence, which is fully consistent with a multi-hundred-billion-dollar rebuilding effort.

Table 4 gives a sector-by-sector breakdown of projected reconstruction costs (author's calculations based on damage inventories (Charles, 2026; IMF, 2026 macroeconomic context; MEED, 2026; World Bank, 2026 estimates). This disaggregation helps prioritise investments and identifies the sectors that will dominate the rebuilding effort.

Table 4: Projected Reconstruction Costs by Sector (Iran and GCC, 2026–2040)

Sector	Estimated Cost (USD billion)	Notes
Airports	40-50	Full reconstruction of Iranian airports; GCC repairs
Desalination plants	30-40	Replacement of destroyed plants; capacity upgrades
Power generation & grid	50-70	Rebuilding power stations; hardening of grid
Nuclear facilities (Iran)	10-15	Repair of Bushehr; potential new safety systems
Ports & maritime	20-30	Reconstruction of Bandar Abbas; GCC port upgrades
Housing & urban (Iran)	150-200	Extensive damage in cities near military targets
Industrial & commercial	80-100	Factories, warehouses, logistics centres
Transport networks	40-60	Roads, bridges, railways
Water & wastewater	20-30	Pipelines, treatment plants
Total	**440-595**	Excludes economic losses and inflation

Sources: IMF (2026); MEED (2026); World Bank (2026 estimates).

The figures in Table 4 highlight that housing and urban reconstruction in Iran will be the highest single cost, followed by power and industrial sectors. Notably, the repair of desalination plants and water infrastructure is a relatively smaller portion of the total but is of immense strategic importance for human survival and industrial activity. The inclusion of nuclear facility repair reflects the unique challenge posed by the attack on Bushehr, which may require specialised international expertise and oversight.

The Destruction of Energy Infrastructure and Its Implications for Funding

A critical dimension of the 2026 conflict is the systematic targeting of energy infrastructure in both Iran and the GCC states. Refineries, fuel storage depots, pipelines, and tankers have been attacked, crippling the region's ability to generate revenue from oil and gas exports and simultaneously disrupting the supply of fuel needed for construction equipment and logistics. This dual impact fundamentally alters the financial landscape for reconstruction. Table 5 summarises key energy assets damaged or destroyed, based on open-source intelligence and satellite imagery up to March 2026 (MEED, 2026; IISS, 2026; Reuters, 2026; Energy Intelligence, 2026; Wikipedia, 2026).

Table 5: Damage to Energy Infrastructure (Iran and GCC)

Country	Asset type	Location	Extent of Damage	Significance
Iran	Refinery	Abadan	Multiple units destroyed, fires	Largest refinery in Iran; output halved
Iran	Refinery	Isfahan	Cracking units damaged	Major supplier of domestic fuel
Iran	Storage facility	Bandar Abbas	Tanks destroyed	Key export terminal
Iran	Pipeline	Kharg Island–Bandar Abbas	Ruptured in several places	Main crude export line
Saudi Arabia	Refinery	Ras Tanura	Partial damage to distillation units	World's largest refinery complex
Saudi Arabia	Storage	Juaymah	Tanks hit; fires	Critical storage for Eastern Province
UAE	Refinery	Ruwais	Minor damage to utilities	Largest refinery in UAE; operational at reduced capacity
Kuwait	Refinery	Mina Al-Ahmadi	Cracking unit damaged	Major refinery; 40% output loss
Bahrain	Refinery	Sitra	Storage tanks damaged	Only refinery in Bahrain; output reduced 30%
Oman	Port / Storage	Duqm Port	Fuel tanks and workers' accommodation hit; worker injured	Strategic hub to bypass Strait of Hormuz
Oman	Port / Storage	Salalah Port	1.6M barrels of oil storage capacity damaged; fires	Critical logistics bypass with 6M-ton annual throughput
Qatar	LNG / GTL	Ras Laffan Industrial City	17% of LNG export capacity destroyed; Pearl GTL facility damaged; $20bn/year revenue loss	World's largest LNG export hub; supplies ~20% of global market
Qatar	Water	Desalination plants	Part of a pattern of targeting; potential for future damage	Provides ~90% of Qatar's freshwater
Iran	Oil tankers	Several (Persian Gulf)	12 tankers hit by missiles/drones	Disruption of maritime exports
GCC	Fuel tankers	Gulf waters	8 tankers damaged	Disruption of regional fuel supply

Sources: MEED (2026); IISS (2026); Reuters (2026); Energy Intelligence (2026); Wikipedia (2026).

The destruction summarised in Table 5 has three immediate financial consequences:

- **Loss of sovereign revenue**: Oil and gas exports account for 80-90% of government revenues in Iran and 50-80% in GCC states (IMF, 2026). With refineries and export terminals damaged, export volumes have dropped by an estimated 40% in Iran and 15% in the GCC during the first quarter of 2026. This directly reduces the fiscal space available for reconstruction budgets.
- **Increased cost of reconstruction materials**: Fuel prices have soared, raising the cost of operating construction equipment and transporting materials. Moreover, the need to repair energy infrastructure itself will consume a large share of available funding, competing with other sectors such as housing, water, and transport.
- **Diversion of sovereign wealth funds**: GCC sovereign wealth funds (e.g., PIF, ADIA, KIA) have historically been invested in global markets. In the wake of the conflict, governments are under pressure to draw down these funds to cover immediate budget deficits and to finance emergency repairs. This reduces the pool of capital available for long-term reconstruction projects unless replenished by future oil revenues.

Table 6 outlines the main sources of reconstruction funding and their likely availability under different political scenarios (IMF, 2026; World Bank, 2026; OECD, 2026; author analysis). As Table 6 indicates, the most favourable scenario for reconstruction financing is one that combines a political settlement (lifting sanctions on Iran) with continued stability in the GCC, allowing multilateral and private capital to flow. In the more likely prolonged fragmentation scenario, funding will be uneven: GCC states will rely on their sovereign wealth funds and some multilateral support, while Iran will struggle with limited resources and sanctions.

Table 6: Potential Sources of Reconstruction Funding – Availability by Scenario

Funding Source	Scenario 1: Rapid International Settlement	Scenario 2: Prolonged Fragmentation	Scenario 3: Renewed Conflict
Sovereign wealth funds (GCC)	High (direct allocations)	Moderate (competing priorities)	Low (diverted to defence)
Sovereign wealth funds (Iran)	N/A (no significant SWF)	N/A	N/A
Multilateral development banks	High (Iran sanctions lifted)	Low–Moderate (Iran excluded; GCC only)	Very low
Bilateral aid (US, EU, etc.)	High (conditioned on political reforms)	Low	None
Export credit agencies (China, Turkey)	Moderate (tied to their contractors)	Moderate (fragmented)	Very low
Private investment (PPPs)	Moderate (with risk guarantees)	Very low	None
Blended finance (public-private)	Moderate	Low	None
Capital markets (bonds)	Moderate (sovereign bonds for GCC)	Low (higher risk premiums)	None

Sources: IMF (2026); World Bank (2026); OECD (2026); author analysis.

Table 7 provides estimated project timelines for critical sectors under different funding scenarios, based on historical precedents and current capacity assessments (historical reconstruction data from Kuwait 1991, Iraq 2003-2010, Ukraine 2022-2026 estimates, and expert interviews).

The timelines in Table 7 illustrate that without adequate and timely funding, reconstruction in Iran could stretch beyond two decades, prolonging human suffering and delaying economic recovery. For the GCC, even under a fragmented scenario, the presence of sovereign wealth funds allows faster repairs of critical infrastructure, though major new projects may be postponed.

Table 7: Estimated Reconstruction Timelines by Sector and Funding Scenario (years from start of reconstruction)

Sector	Scenario 1 (Rapid, well-funded)	Scenario 2 (Moderate, fragmented)	Scenario 3 (Delayed, underfunded)
Airports	3–5	6–10	10+
Desalination plants	2–4	5–8	8–12
Power generation & grid	4–6	8–12	12–15
Nuclear facilities	5–8	10–15 (with international oversight)	Indefinite
Ports	2–3	5–7	8–10
Housing & urban (Iran)	8–10	15–20	20+
Industrial & commercial	6–8	10–15	15+
Transport networks	5–7	10–12	12–15

Refineries & fuel infrastructure	4–6	8–12	12–15

Sources: Based on historical reconstruction data (Kuwait 1991, Iraq 2003–2010, Ukraine 2022–2026 estimates) and expert interviews.

Reconstruction Scenarios

Three broad scenarios are possible, depending on political and security developments:

Scenario 1: Rapid International Settlement (Optimistic)

- A comprehensive nuclear agreement is reached, sanctions on Iran are lifted, and frozen assets are released,
- International donors and multilateral banks provide substantial grants and loans,
- GCC states coordinate a unified reconstruction fund,
- Reconstruction proceeds quickly (10 years), with strong technology transfer and sustainability focus, and
- Probability: Low (requires major political shift).

Scenario 2: Prolonged Fragmentation (Middle-of-the-road)

- A ceasefire holds, but no comprehensive political settlement,
- Iran rebuilds slowly using domestic resources and limited Chinese or Russian investment,
- GCC states independently repair their infrastructure, focusing on hardening,
- International reconstruction efforts are fragmented; corruption and delays are common, and
- Probability: High (most likely outcome in the near term).

Scenario 3: Renewed Conflict (Pessimistic)

- Ceasefire collapses, fighting resumes,
- Further destruction of infrastructure; reconstruction delayed indefinitely,
- Regional investment evaporates; humanitarian crisis deepens, and
- Probability: Moderate (risk of escalation remains high).

Implications for Project Funding and Financing

The destruction of energy assets shifts the financing landscape in several ways:

- **Public funding constraints**: Governments in Iran (under sanctions) and the GCC (despite wealth) face competing priorities: defence, social welfare, and rebuilding destroyed infrastructure. Public budgets will be stretched, leading to project delays and the need for prioritisation.
- **Reduced appetite for private investment**: The conflict has heightened perceived risk, making private investors and commercial lenders reluctant to commit capital to long-term infrastructure projects without significant risk guarantees. Political risk insurance premiums have increased fivefold (Aon, 2026), and some insurers have withdrawn coverage entirely.
- **Shift toward multilateral and development finance**: With commercial capital retreating, multilateral development banks (World Bank, Islamic Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development) and bilateral development agencies will play a larger role. However, their lending to Iran is currently blocked by sanctions; any reconstruction there will require a political settlement that unlocks such financing.
- **Increased reliance on sovereign wealth funds**: GCC states can tap their sovereign wealth funds to finance domestic reconstruction. However, these funds have suffered investment losses due to global market volatility exacerbated by the conflict. Drawing down too quickly could weaken long-term fiscal stability.

Recommendations for Financing Reconstruction

A **layered approach** is typically adopted:

- **Base layer:** Sovereign wealth funds and multilateral loans for critical public infrastructure (airports, power, water) that may not be commercially viable without public support.
- **Middle layer:** PPPs and ECA-backed finance for projects with stable revenue streams (toll roads, ports, power plants) where private sector efficiency can be harnessed.

- **Top layer:** Blended finance and microfinance for social infrastructure (housing, community facilities) and local businesses, often leveraging philanthropic or development agency resources.
- **Risk mitigation:** Political risk insurance layered over private investment to make projects bankable in a high-risk environment.

For the 2026 reconstruction, a pragmatic financing mix would likely be:

- **GCC:** SWF direct investment + PPPs + green bonds for major infrastructure; ECA financing for imported equipment; microfinance for housing repair in affected areas.
- **Iran**: Any reconstruction will depend on a political settlement that unlocks multilateral loans, frozen assets (if sanctions are lifted) and potentially Chinese ECA financing under the Belt and Road Initiative. Blended finance with a focus on water and energy efficiency could attract early support.

Table 8 draws on World Bank (2023, 2026); OECD (2024); MIGA (2025); IMF (2026); Climate Bonds Initiative (2025); and author synthesis.

Table 8: Financing Mechanisms for Reconstruction – Detailed Typology

Mechanism	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages	Suitable Sectors	Real-World Examples
Sovereign Wealth Fund (SWF) Direct Investment	Government allocates capital from national wealth funds (e.g., PIF, ADIA, KIA) to infrastructure projects.	Speed; no interest; aligns with national priorities; can be deployed. Without external conditions	Draws down long-term savings; may be subject to political pressures; reduces. liquidity for other investment	Strategic assets: airports, ports, power plants, refineries.	Kuwait used SWF to rebuild after 1991; PIF funding for NEOM.
Multilateral Development Bank (MDB) Loans	Concessional or market-rate loans from World Bank, Islamic Development Bank, EBRD, Etc., often with technical assistance.	Low interest rates (for concessional long tenors; policy advice; can catalyst private investment.	Slow disbursement policy conditionality limited to countries with acceptable governance.	Transport, water, energy, urban infrastructure	World Bank funding for Iraq reconstruction (2004–2008); Ukraine Rapid Damage Assessment.
Export Credit Agency (ECA) Financing	Government-backed loans or guarantees to support exports of goods and services from the ECA's home country.	Supports domestic contractors; often lower cost than commercial debt; political risk coverage.	Tied to procurement from the ECA's country; may not be competitive.	Large infrastructure industrial plants, heavy equipment.	US EXIM, UKEF, China Exim Bank financing for power plants and railways.
Public-Private Partnership (PPP)	Long-term contract where private partner finances, builds, and operates infrastructure, recovering	Mobilizes private capital; transfers risk; efficiency gains; can	Complex contract negotiation; requires stable regulatory framework;	Airports, ports, water treatment, toll roads, power.	Dubai International Airport PPP; Istanbul New Airport; UK water PPPs.

Mechanism	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages	Suitable Sectors	Real-World Examples
	investment through user fees or government payments.	accelerate delivery.	political risk may deter investors.		
Green / Sustainability Bonds	Debt instruments where proceeds are used exclusively for environmentally sustainable projects; often certified by Climate Bonds Initiative.	Attracts ESG-focused investors; can lower cost of capital; enhances reputational value.	Requires robust reporting and verification; may not be suitable for all sectors.	Renewable energy, water efficiency, green buildings, sustainable transport.	UAE Green Bond (2023); Saudi Green Bond Framework; Ukraine Green Reconstruction bonds (proposed).
Blended Finance	Combination of concessional public or philanthropic funds with commercial capital to de-risk projects and attract private investment.	Leverages limited public resources; expands investable projects; can target social or Environment-tal goals.	Complex structuring; higher transaction costs; requires alignment of multiple stakeholders.	Housing, urban Regeneration, SMEs, climate adaptation.	Global Infrastructure Facility; European Fund for Sustainable Development; Ukraine Energy Security Fund.
Political Risk Insurance (PRI)	Insurance provided by MIGA, ECAs, or private insurers covering risks of expropriation, war, currency inconvertibility, etc.	Enables private investment in high-risk Environment s can be a precondition For commercial lenders	Premiums can be high; coverage limits; may not cover all risks.	All sectors, especially where private capital is sought.	MIGA guarantees for power projects in Iraq; private PRI for oil and gas.
Sovereign Bonds (Eurobonds, Green Bonds)	Government issues debt on international capital markets, often in large denominations.	Access to deep pools of capital; can fund large programs; fixed interest rate.	Requires strong credit rating; currency risk; repayment burden on future budgets.	General government budget support; large infrastructure programs .	Egypt Eurobonds; Saudi sovereign debt issuance.
Microfinance & Community-Based Finance	Small loans, grants, or savings groups to support individual housing repair, small businesses, and local infrastructure.	Reaches grassroots; empowers communities; fast disbursement ; creates local	Limited scale; high administrative cost per unit; requires established microfinance	Housing repair, small-scale water and sanitation, local roads.	Syrian housing microfinance (via NGOs); post-earthquake Nepal. Yemen

Mechanism	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages	Suitable Sectors	Real-World Examples
		employment.	institutions.		cash-for-work programs.
Debt-for-Nature / Debt-for-Development Swaps	A portion of a country's foreign debt is forgiven in exchange for the government committing local currency to environmental or social projects.	Reduces debt burden; funds sustainable projects; can involve NGOs as implementers.	Complex negotiation requires willing creditors; limited applicability to sovereign debt.	Protected areas, renewable energy, water conservation n.	US-Brazil debt-for-nature swaps (Amazon fund); proposed for Iraq marshlands restoration.
Frozen Assets / Reparations	Assets of the aggressor state (e.g., Russian assets frozen in Western jurisdictions) are seized or used to fund. reconstruction.	Provides a "polluter pays" mechanism; reduces burden on taxpayers.	Legally complex requires international agreement; may be contested.	General reconstruction funds; housing; infrastructure	EU/UK proposals for Russian frozen assets to fund Ukraine reconstruction

Sources: World Bank (2023, 2026); OECD (2024); MIGA (2025); IMF (2026); Climate Bonds Initiative (2025); author synthesis.

Selecting the Right Mix of Financing Mechanisms

No single mechanism can cover the full cost of reconstruction. A **layered approach** is typically adopted:

- **Base layer**: Sovereign wealth funds and multilateral loans provide the foundation for critical public infrastructure (airports, power, water) that may not be commercially viable without public support.
- **Middle layer**: PPPs and ECA-backed finance are used for projects with stable revenue streams (toll roads, ports, power plants) where private sector efficiency can be harnessed.
- **Top layer**: Blended finance and microfinance address social infrastructure (housing, community facilities) and support local businesses, often leveraging philanthropic or development agency resources.
- **Risk mitigation**: Political risk insurance is layered over private investment to make projects bankable in a high-risk environment.

For the 2026 reconstruction, a pragmatic financing mix would likely be:

- **GCC**: SWF direct investment + PPPs + green bonds for major infrastructure; ECA financing for imported equipment; microfinance for housing repair in affected areas.
- **Iran**: Any reconstruction will depend on a political settlement that unlocks multilateral loans, frozen assets (if sanctions are lifted), and potentially Chinese ECA financing under the Belt and Road Initiative. Blended finance with a focus on water and energy efficiency could attract early support.

Table 9 provides a summary of recommended financing mixes by sector, synthesising the analysis. It is based on author analysis informed by World Bank (2026); IMF (2026); MIGA (2025); and industry practice.

Table 9: Recommended Financing Mix by Reconstruction Sector (Illustrative)

Sector	Primary Mechanism	Secondary Mechanism	Risk Mitigation	Notes
Airports	PPP	SWF	MIGA guarantee	Concession model. Government provides airside infrastructure
Desalination	MDB loan + PPP	Green bond	Multilateral guarantee	Long-term water purchase agreement supports PPP
Power generation	IPP / PPP	ECA loan	PRI	Solar/wind IPPs with government power purchase agreement
Nuclear	Bilateral	IAEA trust	N/A	Only state-to-state;

	government loan	fund		international oversight
Ports	SWF + PPP	MDB loan	None	Strategic; often government-owned with private operations
Housing	Blended finance	Microfinance	None	Mix of grants (for vulnerable) and microfinance (for working families)
Industrial	ECA loan	Private equity	PRI	Target sectors: steel, cement, building materials
Transport networks	MDB loan	SWF	None	Long-term public goods
Refineries	Joint venture	SWF	ECA guarantee	Strategic; likely state-controlled with minority private partner

Sources: Author analysis based on World Bank (2026); IMF (2026); MIGA (2025); and industry practice.

Impact of Funding Availability on Project Timelines

Building on the earlier timeline analysis (Table 7), the choice and availability of financing mechanisms directly affect project pace. For example:

- If PPPs are feasible (Scenario 1 or 2 with risk guarantees), airports and power plants can be delivered in 3–5 years.
- If only SWF and MDB loans are available (Scenario 2), timelines lengthen by 2-3 years due to slower procurement and limited private sector efficiency.
- If funding is largely absent or fragmented (Scenario 3), timelines double or more, as seen in post-2003 Iraq.

The financing mechanisms selected also influence **quality and sustainability**. PPPs and green bonds tend to incorporate higher environmental and social standards, whereas emergency SWF spending may prioritise speed over long-term resilience. Thus, the choice of financing is not merely a financial decision but a strategic one with implications for reconstruction outcomes.

Impact of Funding Availability on Project Timelines

The choice and availability of financing mechanisms directly affect project pace. For example:

- If PPPs are feasible (Scenario 1 or 2 with risk guarantees), airports and power plants can be delivered in 3-5 years.
- If only SWF and MDB loans are available (Scenario 2), timelines lengthen by 2-3 years due to slower procurement and limited private sector efficiency.
- If funding is largely absent or fragmented (Scenario 3), timelines double or more, as seen in post-2003 Iraq.

The financing mechanisms selected also influence **quality and sustainability**. PPPs and green bonds tend to incorporate higher environmental and social standards, whereas emergency SWF spending may prioritise speed over long-term resilience. Thus, the choice of financing is not merely a financial decision but a strategic one with implications for reconstruction outcomes.

Strategic Recommendations for Construction Firms

To assist construction companies in navigating the volatile post-conflict environment and positioning themselves for reconstruction opportunities, Table 10 distils the analysis into actionable recommendations (author analysis based on lessons from past conflicts and the specific characteristics of the 2026 war).

Table 10: Strategic Recommendations for Construction Firms

Area	Recommendation	Rationale
Risk management	Develop multi-scenario risk dashboards; maintain contingency plans for evacuation, supply chain rerouting, and financial hedges.	The conflict is fluid; firms must be able to react rapidly to security and market changes.
Supply chain	Diversify sourcing away from conflict-prone routes; invest in local manufacturing partnerships (steel, cement, prefab).	Reduce vulnerability to port closures and sanctions.
Workforce	Partner with local vocational institutes to train GCC	Mitigate labour shortages and travel

	nationals; use remote design centres; offer retention incentives to key expatriates.	restrictions.
Security	Integrate security assessments into project planning; provide hostile environment awareness training (HEAT).	Protect staff and assets; ensure business continuity.
Reconstruction engagement	Proactively engage with government reconstruction authorities and multilateral banks; develop pre-approved modular designs.	Position for early contract awards when reconstruction begins.
Sustainability	Adopt green building standards; design for resilience (blast-proofing, redundancy); use low-carbon materials.	Differentiate in a competitive market; meet donor and government requirements.
Financing	Explore PPPs with sovereign wealth funds; use blended finance; seek political risk insurance from MIGA or ECAs.	Secure capital in a high-risk environment.

Conclusion

The 2026 US/Israel–Iran conflict has delivered a profound shock to the construction industry in the Middle East and Africa. Critical infrastructure: airports, desalination plants, power grids, and even a nuclear facility have been heavily damaged, while supply chains, labour markets, and investment confidence have been severely disrupted. The destruction of energy infrastructure (refineries, storage, tankers) has further constrained the revenue available for reconstruction while increasing costs.

The conflict has drawn in nations across the region:
In Iran, the Bushehr nuclear power plant was struck for the first time, and major refineries at Abadan and Isfahan were damaged (IAEA, 2026; Energy Intelligence, 2026). In the UAE, Dubai and Abu Dhabi airports were hit, and the Jebel Ali and Taweelah desalination plants suffered significant output losses (MEED, 2026; Maxar, 2026). Saudi Arabia saw damage to the Ras Tanura refinery and Qurayyah power plant. Kuwait experienced refinery and power plant damage. Bahrain's Sitra refinery and Al-Hidd desalination plant were affected. Oman's strategic ports of Duqm and Salalah were attacked, crippling key logistics hubs designed to bypass the Strait of Hormuz (Wikipedia, 2026). Qatar suffered strikes on the Al Udeid Air Base and the Ras Laffan Industrial City, destroying 17% of its LNG export capacity, costing an estimated $20 billion in annual revenue, and requiring 3-5 years to repair (Energy Intelligence, 2026). Jordan was hit by 240 missiles and drones, with a $485 million US radar system destroyed and civilian casualties in Amman (Wikipedia, 2026).

The reconstruction challenge is historic in scale:
Total direct physical damage across Iran and the GCC is estimated at $180-220 billion, based on the author's sector-by-sector cost modelling (Charles, 2026), with total reconstruction costs (including economic losses) projected to exceed $600 billion over the next 15 years. Housing and urban reconstruction in Iran will be the largest single cost ($150-200 billion), followed by power generation ($50-70 billion), airports ($40-50 billion), and desalination plants ($30-40 billion). The repair of energy infrastructure will itself consume tens of billions, competing with other sectors for scarce funding.

Drawing on lessons from the 1991 Gulf War (Kuwait Ministry of Planning, 1993), the 2003 Iraq War (GAO, 2008), the Syrian civil war (World Bank, 2021), the Russia-Ukraine war (World Bank, 2026; Kyiv School of Economics, 2025) and the June 2025 12-day war (IISS, 2025), this article has identified key success factors for post-conflict rebuilding:

1. **Security stability:** Without a durable ceasefire and robust security guarantees, reconstruction stalls (Iraq, Syria).
2. **Sufficient and predictable funding:** The Kuwait model of using sovereign wealth funds and coalition contributions worked well, whereas fragmented donor approaches in Ukraine have faced coordination challenges.
3. **Strong governance and anti-corruption mechanisms:** Iraq's experience shows that weak oversight leads to waste; transparent procurement and international supervision are essential.
4. **Early adoption of technology and sustainability:** Digital tools (drones, BIM, satellite mapping) accelerate damage assessment, while renewable energy, water-efficient desalination and green building materials reduce long-term costs and enhance resilience (Kyiv School of Economics, 2025; Climate Bonds Initiative, 2025).

5. **International cooperation:** Multilateral development banks, export credit agencies and political risk insurers must work together to de-risk private investment and mobilise capital

Three reconstruction scenarios were developed.

- **Scenario 1 (Rapid International Settlement): R**equires a political breakthrough that lifts sanctions on Iran. Key infrastructure could be restored in 3-8 years.
- **Scenario 2 (Prolonged Fragmentation):** The most likely outcome. The timelines doubles or triples, with Iran struggling to rebuild using domestic resources and limited external support, while GCC states rely on sovereign wealth funds for faster repairs.
- **Scenario 3 (Renewed Conflict)**: A real risk. Reconstruction would be delayed indefinitely, with further destruction and a humanitarian crisis.

The financing of reconstruction will require a layered approach:

1. **Base layer**: Sovereign wealth funds and multilateral development bank loans for critical public infrastructure.
2. **Middle layer**: Public-private partnerships (PPPs) and export credit agency (ECA) financing for projects with stable revenue streams.
3. **Top layer:** Blended finance and microfinance for housing and community facilities.
4. **Risk mitigation**: Political risk insurance from MIGA, ECAs, or private insurers to attract private capital.

For Iran, any meaningful reconstruction depends on a political settlement that unlocks frozen assets, multilateral loans, and Chinese Belt and Road Initiative financing. For the GCC, sovereign wealth funds provide a buffer, but they must be used judiciously to avoid depleting long-term savings.

For construction firms, the current moment demands strategic agility. Those that diversify their supply chains away from conflict-prone routes, invest in local manufacturing partnerships, train local workforces, adopt green building standards, and develop pre-approved modular designs for rapid deployment will be best positioned to navigate the turbulence and capture emerging opportunities. Engaging early with reconstruction authorities and multilateral banks is essential to secure contracts when rebuilding begins.

For governments and international partners, the challenge is to create the conditions, security, financing and governance that enable reconstruction to succeed. This includes establishing a dedicated reconstruction fund, issuing reconstruction bonds, leveraging multilateral development banks, and linking financing to transparent procurement and anti-corruption measures. The protection of civilian infrastructure in future conflicts must also be strengthened through international norms and monitoring mechanisms.

The path ahead is long and uncertain, but history shows that even the most devastating conflicts eventually give way to reconstruction. The decisions made today – whether to invest in resilience, embrace sustainable technologies or prioritise inclusive governance – will shape the region's infrastructure and economy for decades to come. The 2026 conflict is a tragedy, but it also offers a once-in-a-generation opportunity to modernise the built environment, reduce dependence on volatile global supply chains, and embed climate-friendly practices into the very fabric of the Middle East and Africa's construction industry.

References

Al-Sanad, S. (2015). The impact of political instability on construction project performance in the Middle East. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 141*(8), 05015005.

Aon (2026). *Political Risk and War Insurance Market Update – Middle East*. London: Aon.

Assaf, S. A. & Al-Hejji, S. (2006). Causes of delay in large construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management, 24*(4), pp. 349–357.

Caldara, D. & Iacoviello, M. (2022). Measuring geopolitical risk. *American Economic Review, 112*(4), 1194–1225.

Charles, K.A. (2026). The 2026 US-Israel–Iran Conflict and Its Implications for the Construction Industry in the Middle East and Africa. unpublished manuscript / ResearchGate preprint.

Climate Bonds Initiative (2025). *Green Bond Market Report 2025*. London: Climate Bonds Initiative.

Deng, X. & Low, S. P. (2013). Understanding the critical variables affecting the level of political risks in international construction projects. *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering*, *17*(5), 895–907.

Drewry (2026). *Container Freight Rate Insight: Middle East Conflict Impact*. London: Drewry Maritime Research.

Energy Intelligence (2025). *Gulf Desalination Vulnerability Assessment*. New York: Energy Intelligence Group.

Energy Intelligence (2026). *Middle East Energy Infrastructure Damage Assessment*. New York: Energy Intelligence Group.

FDI Intelligence (2026). *The FDI Report 2026: Global Investment Trends*. London: Financial Times.
Fitch Solutions (2026). *Middle East Construction Outlook: March 2026 Update*. London: Fitch Solutions.
GAO (Government Accountability Office) (2008). *Iraq Reconstruction: Lessons Learned in Contracting and Management*. Washington, DC: GAO.
GlobalData (2026). *Steel Market Impact Assessment: Iran-Israel Conflict*. London: GlobalData.
Hammad, A.W., Akbarnezhad, A. & Rey, D. (2021). COVID-19 and the construction industry: a systematic review of impacts and opportunities. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 147*(11), 04021150.
IAEA (2026). *Report on the Incident at Bushehr Nuclear Power Plant*. Vienna: IAEA.
IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) (2025). *Safety of Nuclear Facilities in Armed Conflict*. Vienna: IAEA.
IISS (2026). *The 2026 Iran-Israel Conflict: Damage Assessment*. London: IISS.
IISS (International Institute for Strategic Studies) (2025) *The 12-Day War: A Post-Conflict Assessment*. London: IISS.
IMF (2026). *Regional Economic Outlook: Middle East and Central Asia*. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund, April.
Kuwait Ministry of Planning (1993). *The Reconstruction of Kuwait: A Report on the Damage and Restoration*. Kuwait City: Government of Kuwait.
Kyiv School of Economics (2025). *Digital Reconstruction: Technology in Ukraine's Rebuilding*. Kyiv: KSE.
Maxar Technologies (2026). *Satellite Imagery of Gulf Infrastructure Damage*. Westminster, CO: Maxar.
MEED (2026). *Iran-Israel Conflict: Infrastructure Damage Assessment*. Dubai: MEED.
MIGA (Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency) (2025) *Annual Report 2025*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.
OECD (2024). *Global Supply Chains and Geopolitical Risks*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
Osei-Kyei, R. & Chan, A.P.C. (2015). Review of studies on the critical success factors for public–private partnership (PPP) projects from 1990 to 2013. *International Journal of Project Management*, *33*(6), 1335–1346.
Reuters (2026). Timeline: The 2026 Iran-Israel Conflict, *Reuters*, 15 March. Available at: https://www.reuters.com (Accessed: 1 April 2026).
Wikipedia (2026). '2026 Iran–Israel conflict', *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2026_Iran–Israel_conflict (Accessed: 1 April 2026).
World Bank (2021). *Syria Reconstruction: A Post-Conflict Assessment*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
World Bank (2023). *Blended Finance for Infrastructure: A Practical Guide*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
World Bank (2026). *Ukraine Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment (RDNA4)*. Washington, DC: World Bank.