

DDR AND PEACEBUILDING

**NO ARMS
ALLOWED**



**REDEMPTION
HOSPITAL**

**WEEKLY
VISITING HOURS
2:00PM - 3:00PM
5:00PM - 6:00PM**



United Nations

THEMATIC REVIEW OF
DDR CONTRIBUTIONS TO PEACEBUILDING
AND THE ROLE OF THE PEACEBUILDING FUND

NOVEMBER 2011

DDR AND PEACEBUILDING:

THEMATIC REVIEW OF DDR CONTRIBUTIONS TO PEACEBUILDING AND THE ROLE OF THE PEACEBUILDING FUND

United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office
Copyright © 2012

Permission is granted to quote from this publication

Any material quoted from this publication must include a complete reference citation including the organization and the title of this publication.

For more information, please contact:
United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office
United Nations, 30th floor
New York, NY. 10017, USA
Tel: (+1 212) 963 0936
Email: khadivi@un.org and rognvik@un.org
Facebook: Peacebuilding Partnerships

Cover photo:

A mural informs visitors that no arms are allowed at the UNICEF-supported Redemption Public Hospital in Monrovia, the capital, in Montserrado County.

© UNICEF/NYHQ2011-1756/Pirozzi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms	01
Executive summary.....	03
1. Introduction	09
2. Setting the scene: understanding Peacebuilding and DDR	10
2.1 Peacebuilding	10
2.2 DDR.....	12
2.3 General overview of DDR contributions to peacebuilding	13
2.3.1 DDR implementation challenges and its effect on peacebuilding	13
3. PBF Support to DDR	17
3.1 Trends in PBF support for DDR.....	18
3.2 PBF contributions in Case Study countries.....	20
3.2.1 Central African Republic	20
3.2.2 Democratic Republic of Congo	21
3.2.3 Nepal.....	22
4. Contributions of PBF-DDR support towards peacebuilding (CAR, DRC and Nepal)	25
4.1 Supporting implementation of peace processes	25
4.2 Security	25
4.3 Peace dividends	26
4.3.1 Socio-economic revitalization.....	26
4.4 Value-added of PBF funding in overcoming DDR challenges.....	28
4.5 Gaps and challenges in PBF-supported projects	29
4.5.1 Funding gaps	29
4.3.2 Multi-agency coordination	29

4.5.3 Sustainability	30
4.5.4 Gap between DD and R and alternative sequencing.....	30
4.5.5 Local capacity.....	31
5. Conclusion	32
5.1 Findings	32
5.2 Recommendations.....	34
Annex 1 – Methodology of DDR Thematic Review	37
Annex 2 – Practical linkages between DDR and peacebuilding	38
Annex 3 – Funding criteria for the Peacebuilding Fund	41
Annex 4 – IDDRS Financing options and opportunities of DDR	43
Annex 5 – Case Studies (1.CAR; 2.DRC; 3.Nepal)	45
List of boxes	
Box 1: DDR contributions to peacebuilding	14
Box 2: PBF funding criteria (terminology)	17
Box 3: Selected promising practices	33
List of tables	
Table 1: PBF-funded DDR activities 2006-present.....	18
Table 2: PBF contributions to DDR projects CAR 2009 - present	20
Table 3: PBF contributions to DDR in DRC 2010-2011.....	22
Table 4: DDR activities in Nepal 2007-2011.....	23

ACRONYMS

- AMAA - Agreement on Monitoring of the Management of Arms and Armies
- APRD - Armée populaire pour la restauration de la République et de la démocratie
- BCPR - Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Recovery
- CAAFAG - Children Associated with Armed Forces and Armed Groups
- CAR - Central African Republic
- CONADER - DRC's National Commission for DDR
- CPA - Comprehensive Peace Agreement
- CPN-M - Communist Party of Nepal - Maoist
- CRRP - Community Recovery and Reintegration Programme
- DDR - Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration
- DRC - Democratic Republic of the Congo
- FDPC - Front démocratique du peuple centrafricain
- HIV/AIDS - Human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome
- IAWG - Inter-Agency Working Group on DDR
- ICRC - International Committee of the Red Cross
- IDDRS - Integrated DDR Standards
- ILO - International Labour Organization
- IRF - Immediate Response Facility
- ISSSS - International Security and Stabilization Support Strategy
- MDRP - Multi-Country Demobilization and Reintegration Programme
- MLCJ - Mouvement des libérateurs centrafricains pour la justice
- MONUC - United Nations Mission in the Congo
- MONUSCO - UN Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo
- NPTF - Nepal Peace Trust Fund
- OHCHR - Office of the High Commission for Human Rights
- PBC - Peacebuilding Commission
- PBF - Peacebuilding Fund
- PBSO - Peacebuilding Support Office
- PRF - Peacebuilding and Recovery Facility
- RECOPEs - Réseaux communautaires de protection de l'enfant/Community Child Protection Networks

SSR - Security Sector Reform

STAREC - Stabilization and Reconstruction Plan for War-Affected Areas

UE-PNDDR - National DDR programme in the DRC

UE-PNDDR- Implementation Unit of the PNDDR

UFDR - Union des forces démocratiques pour le rassemblement

UFR - Union des forces républicaines

UFVN - Union des forces vives de la nation

UNDP - United Nations Development Programme

UNFPA - United Nations Population Fund

UNICEF - United Nations Children's Fund

UNIRP - Interagency Rehabilitation Programme

UNMIN - United Nations Mission in Nepal

USAID United States Agency for International Development

VMLR - Verified Minors and Late Recruits

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) and the Inter-Agency Working Group on DDR (IAWG), of which PBSO is also a member, jointly undertook a review of the contributions of Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) programmes to peacebuilding (DDR Thematic Review). The review draws on the experiences of three case studies: Central African Republic (CAR), Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Nepal and focuses specifically on the projects supported by the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF). The recommendations of the review aim to help the DDR and peacebuilding communities, and the PBF in particular, strategically and programmatically position their support to DDR (-related) initiatives for more lasting and promising peacebuilding results.

Following a brief introduction, section II of the DDR Thematic Review explores the policy relationship and interlinkages of DDR programmes and peacebuilding and the practical implications of this interrelationship on the ground. The section establishes the framework principles for analysing peacebuilding, namely the provision of basic security and peace dividends, building confidence in political processes and building national capacity for conflict management and economic revitalization, which make up the core elements of peacebuilding. The section introduces the main tenets of DDR, which are grounded in the Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS). Prepared by the IAWG, the IDDRS represent the agreed lessons and practices of UN entities involved in DDR and provide a set of guidelines for the planning, design, implementation and monitoring of DDR programmes.

Section III provides an introduction to the funding structure of the PBF and provides a brief summary of each of the three case studies: CAR, DRC and Nepal (the case studies are annexed in full at the end of the report).

	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET (US\$)	TIMELINE (MM/YY)	UN AGENCIES
CAR	Support for the start-up of the DDR process of Armed Groups (PBF/CAF/B-3)	3,955,710	04/09 - 9/10	UNDP
	Prevention of Recruitment, Demobilization and Socio-Economic Reintegration of CAAFAG and Other Children and Women (Child DDR - PHASE I; PBF/CAF/B-2)	2,000,000	11/08 - 10/11	UNICEF
	Prevention of Recruitment, Demobilization and Socio-Economic Reintegration of CAAFAG and Other Children and Women (Child DDR - PHASE 2; PBF/CAF/K-12)	1,500,000	09/10 - 2/12	UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP
	TOTAL	7,455,710		
DRC	Community Reintegration and Recovery Programme in eastern DRC (PBF/COD/B-1)	4,405,342	02/10 - 9/11	UNDP
	Support to War Wounded (PBF/COD/B-2)	228,962	04/10 - 6/11	UNDP
	DD of former Armed Groups residual (PBF-COD-B.4)	636,650	01/11 - 12/11	UNDP
	TOTAL	5,270,954		
Nepal	Programme support for Children and Adolescents Formerly Associated with the Maoist Army in Nepal (PBF/NPL/B-2)	622,969	03/09 - 3/10	UNICEF
	Support to Female Members of the Maoist Army (PBF/NPL/B-2)	224,614	03/09 - 12/10	UNFPA
	Monitoring, reporting and response to conflict related child rights violations (PBF/NPL/E-2)	2,332,421	04/10 - 12/11	OHCHR & UNICEF
	TOTAL	3,180,004		
PBF total contribution to case study countries		15,906,668		

Each case study outlines how DDR was approached in the peace process; the nature of the DDR process undertaken; summary of PBF DDR funding; the project's fulfillment of PBF funding goals for being catalytic, relevant and sustainable for peacebuilding; and challenges encountered in implementing the project for DDR and PBF.

Case Studies

- CAR is the only case study country on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission. The PBF contributions enabled a stronger preparatory phase of DDR, ensuring that DDR planning reflected the content of the IDDRS and supporting the initial launching of the process. PBF support was also catalytic in initiating and implementing two phases of support for child DDR.
- In DRC, PBF supported three projects that targeted ex-combatants posing security risks and led to increased stability and basic security. One project adopted a community-matching approach that saw the socio-economic reintegration of both combatants and other vulnerable community members. A second project, which focused on war-wounded combatants, directly supported the implementation of the lhusi Accord (2009). A third project targets the Disarmament and Demobilization of 4000 residual elements of former armed groups, still responsible for “insecurity pockets” in the forest, in order to provide means for DD gaps, contributing to Government Stabilization plans;
- In Nepal, the three PBF projects promoted the safety and security of women and children involved in the Maoist armed group and promoted the rights of the children involved in the group. The nature and set up of the PBF-support projects further helped the UN best prepare the systems and structures to support the process once the combatants were discharged. The programme preparations proved to be essential to providing as smooth, sustainable and consistent of a process as possible in the complex environment.

The fourth section explores the results of the three case studies horizontally, highlighting overall trends, contextual differences, lessons and challenges across the cases, focusing specifically on the peacebuilding goals of implementation support for peace process, basic security, and peace dividends—economic recovery and the peacebuilding outcomes of social cohesion, reconciliation and community resilience. The results of the case studies cast little doubt of the relevance and value of the PBF projects in meeting both DDR and peacebuilding objectives.

Meeting peacebuilding objectives

At some level, all of the PBF-supported projects reported dividends in the areas of security, economic recovery and seeing a change in the attitudes and behaviours of not only ex-combatants but also within hosting communities. Certain practices undertaken in the case studies further demonstrate how the economic and social benefits of DDR can be felt more widely across communities, such as, among many others:

- Reintegration benefits matched with other vulnerable community members;
- Micro-enterprises developed that improve the basic provision of nutritional or hygienic needs of a community (e.g., grain mills, soap);
- Professional training to build national capacity in the delivery of health services;
- Capacity-building and the provision of equipment (e.g., military hospital in DRC) strengthened overall national capacities and services that will be useful beyond the closing of DDR projects; and
- Community networks such as the solidarity groups, CAAFAG Network and RECOPEs established or supported ex-combatants and other vulnerable community members and provided opportunities for promoting positive interaction among ex-combatants, other vulnerable groups and communities in community, sporting and reconciliatory events/forums.

Section four also focuses on the value added and comparative advantage of the PBF in supporting DDR. In particular, the case studies demonstrate the value of the PBF in filling gaps in DDR programming, such as:

- Financial gaps: funding critical parts of the programme that require additional funds (e.g., reintegration), or to ‘jump start’ critical activities.
- DD and R gap/stop-gap measures: funding reinsertion projects, labour-intensive projects, community/dual targeting projects that aim to minimize the gap or serve as a temporary stop-gap measure between DD and R.
- Caseload gap: supporting marginal caseloads in the DDR programme that would be otherwise left out, for example women associated with armed forces or groups, children associated with armed forces or groups, wounded fighters and groups that entered the DDR process late or were left out of national DDR processes.

The final section of the report summarizes the main findings and puts forward five overarching recommendations that contain specific action points aimed towards PBF efforts to strategically and programmatically position its DDR support as well as action points for UN entities and DDR practitioners as they plan and prepare conflict sensitive DDR and implement DDR that contributes concretely towards achieving sustainable peacebuilding results.

Recommendations:

1. Establish concrete actions for ensuring DDR ‘process’, planning and preparations are aligned with peacebuilding priorities

The DDR process ranges from dealing with DDR in the negotiation of peace agreements, through programme planning and design, implementation and closure. Each component requires human and financial investment; the lack of which can have a serious impact on the subsequent or parallel aspects of the programme and of its concrete contributions to peacebuilding. The planning and preparation of DDR must be conflict sensitive, cognizant of conflict drivers and consider how to achieve key peacebuilding results from design to programme closing.

- The PBF should consider funding inclusive DDR dialogues that both serve as entry points for reconciliation and as vehicles for developing multi-year, inter-agency, country-specific frameworks for reintegration, as recommended by the Secretary-General’s Policy Committee. Such PBF support would encourage the creation of catalytic “One UN” approaches to resource mobilization, as well as multi-sectoral reintegration frameworks that provide viable transition options for the final stages of DDR processes.
- DDR practitioners should factor in conflict analysis prepared in the framework of peacebuilding and be aligned with country PBF Priority Plans, involve key actors from other peacebuilding sectors in the planning and preparation of DDR, plan reinsertion and reintegration activities that are conducive to achieving peacebuilding results and agree in the planning phase of how peacebuilding is included in DDR M&E.
- Peacebuilding and DDR practitioners should consider in conflict and risk analysis and needs assessments potential new threats that emerge and become conflict drivers as a result of challenges in/obstacles to the DDR process.

2. Address obstacles that hinder timing and sequencing of DDR

The sequencing of DDR interventions is difficult, particularly for reintegration to begin immediately after DD or, as in other cases, if aspects of DDR must be undertaken simultaneously or prior to DD being undertaken. Sequencing difficulties are compounded by gaps in funding; dependence on significant voluntary funding within a tight time frame; and political, security and institutional delays in the process. Obstacles to the timing and sequencing of DDR can have serious implications for peacebuilding, including leading to potential new destabilizing threats for not only the DDR but also the country itself.

- PBF support for DDR may require rapid investment, especially to undertake reinsertion as a temporary stopgap before reintegration or to compensate for delays in the DDR.
- PBF is a flexible fund, and this flexibility for DDR should be safeguarded so that DDR can be adapted and tailored according to changes in context, overcoming unforeseen challenges and obstacles and adjusting for alternate sequencing.
- UN should promote the development of trust funds, such as the UNFPN, with a view to promoting multi-agency programmes and that allow the flexibility demonstrated in PBF funding.
- UN should strengthen their mechanisms, with PBF support when possible, for fostering integrated multi-agency approaches to DDR. It should be recognized that PBF funding could also generate increased multi-agency coordination.

3. Strengthen capacities that can promote peacebuilding results in DDR programming

It is often difficult for DDR practitioners to have the full/sufficient profile of the beneficiaries, and the contexts and capacities to where the beneficiaries are returning, etc. DDR interventions must be flexible to quickly tailor or adjust programmes according to needs and evolving conditions on the ground.

- PBF support is already flexible and this flexibility should be systematically maintained, however, the UN should seek to find alternative means for pooling resources that can be used in a flexible manner, such as in a trust fund.
- DDR practitioners should strengthen their partnerships and relationships with other sectors on the ground so as to minimize duplication of efforts in such areas as conflict and needs assessments and market analysis, etc., and to undertake peacebuilding activities that promote social cohesion with other vulnerable groups and communities at large.

There is often a lack of local capacity on the ground, particularly in rural areas, to be able to meet the particular challenges associated with dealing with ex-combatants.

- PBF should encourage projects that build up the capacity of local networks and mechanisms that could be used to support/include ex-combatants in their scope.
- DDR local implementing partners should systematically receive training in conflict-sensitive programming, reconciliation, trainer-training on conflict mediation and reporting on peacebuilding results.
- DDR practitioners should promote stronger and broader partnerships to promote and build the capacity of existing networks, working groups and mechanisms such as the CAAFAG Working Group in Nepal, that promote their sustainability and transition beyond DDR.
- UN should invest, with PBF support as appropriate, in local-level capacity-building that serves to strengthen the linkages between DDR and other sectoral programmes at the grassroots level, with a particular emphasis on rural capacities.

4. Promote the sustainability of peacebuilding results in DDR

Even though it can be difficult to determine when an ex-combatant has been adequately reintegrated, DDR has a defined beginning and end. The symbolism of a successfully completed DDR programme is critical towards preventing a relapse into conflict and for moving a state further along the peace process spectrum. However, the limited time frame of reintegration is often too short for the beneficiaries of reintegration programmes to make a stable transition from DDR to broader national development and economic recovery or, in the case of children, to complete their formal education. The benefits of DDR should be evident even after the DDR process has ended and should promote longer-term dividends for peacebuilding.

- DDR practitioners should plan DDR in a manner that promotes transitional linkages between reintegration from medium to longer-term, non-DDR development and assistance, such as economic recovery and livelihoods initiatives.
- DDR practitioners should re-evaluate conflict analysis and drivers including the peacebuilding and other relevant sectors, upon changes in DDR context.
- PBF should consider funding tracking or M&E initiatives, led by national institutions, which would be able to track the impacts of an entire DDR process, including peacebuilding impacts, rather than individual projects or programme components.
- PBF should support the sustainability of some of the local structural mechanisms or networks built during the programme that can have a lasting effect within a community.
- DDR practitioners should increase the level of attention their programmes give to peacebuilding in the planning and implementation of DDR, including investing more purposefully in community reconciliation and peacebuilding events and activities that bring ex-combatants and communities together in cultural, music and sporting events and supporting the presence of psychosocial support services at such events.
- DDR planners should seek to increase their planning towards the exit strategies of reintegration programmes, allowing for beneficiaries with special needs to incrementally phase out of the reintegration assistance (e.g., to allow children to complete their education, childcare to allow mothers to work or search for work, etc.). PBF could consider supporting the special needs of these groups to support the closing of reintegration programmes.
- UN should strengthen their partnerships and relationships and PBF should aim to support projects and programmes that promote programmatic linkages between DDR and related issues such as SSR, Transitional Justice, Rule of Law, small arms and light weapons, and armed violence reduction, peacebuilding and development.

5. Strengthen the mutual relationship between DDR and wider entities involved in peacebuilding

- The mutual relationship between DDR and peacebuilding is evident, however, there lacks practical guidance on the subject that would allow DDR and peacebuilding practitioners to tighten and improve the programmatic linkages between the two areas.
- The IAWG should provide strategic guidance on peacebuilding and DDR, particularly with respect to strengthening programmatic planning, identifying potential entry points for interventions that directly promote DDR-peacebuilding priorities, monitoring and evaluating the impact of DDR on peacebuilding, and ensuring that programming is informed by conflict needs assessments that include peacebuilding priorities (or prepared by the peacebuilding sector).
- The PBF should aim to be more proactive in identifying gaps and opportunities to promote peacebuilding in DDR activities and to reach out and inform DDR practitioners of useful opportunities to add concrete peacebuilding elements to their activities.
- UN should conduct periodic inter-agency reviews of DDR similar to the inter-agency review conducted in Nepal (February 2011) and/or multi-sectoral reviews of DDR. This would promote joint programme implementation and review programme coherency and UN delivery as one for DDR.

DDR deals with a specific target group; however, there is often not enough crossover in programming between DDR and other national development, recovery, reconciliation and peacebuilding activities and cross-cutting issues

- UN should aim to plan community-matching approaches in the design and planning of reinsertion and reintegration and link DDR more with community recovery and development. Similarly, PBF support should help to fill funding gaps that will enable community-matching initiatives or that ensure cross-cutting issues are adequately addressed in the programmes.
- DDR practitioners should increase, and PBF should support, their gender programming to include opportunities for addressing masculinity and male-centered prevention programmes of sexual and gender-based violence, ensure that the needs of women associated with armed forces and groups, HIV/AIDS and other potentially marginalized groups are included in DDR programmes.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report reviews the contributions of Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) to peacebuilding, with a particular focus on the DDR and DDR-related projects supported by the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF).¹ DDR aims to help build security, reconstruct social fabrics and develop human capacity for ex-combatants and associated members who otherwise pose a significant risk to the stability and security of post-conflict environments. PBF recognizes the value of DDR in building a sustainable, long-term peacebuilding capacity thus places DDR high within its agenda.

The review forms part of a broader series of thematic reviews on peacebuilding led by the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO),² which set out to identify promising practices and identify factors that contribute towards making sectoral interventions relevant, catalytic and sustainable for peacebuilding.

The PBSO and the Inter-Agency Working Group on DDR (IAWG), of which PBSO is also a member, have prepared this review jointly. The review's Terms of Reference called for field research in the Central African Republic and Democratic Republic of the Congo, and desk-based research in Nepal³ in order to identify lessons that contribute to a greater understanding on:

1. Effectiveness and strategic relevance of DDR programmes to peacebuilding.
2. Added-value and comparative advantage of PBF's funding arrangements.
3. Promising practices that can be used to shape future programming.

The review approaches the interlinkages of peacebuilding and DDR through the latter's role in promoting the peace process, provision of basic security, peace dividends (including economic revitalization, restoring social fabrics and civic responsibility) as well as addressing the root causes and drivers of conflict. Other specific elements of peacebuilding considered are conflict analysis and assessment of peacebuilding priorities, impact on social cohesion, national ownership, sustainability, comparative advantage, and institutional coordination (see box 1).

The target audiences of the review are policymakers and practitioners of both DDR and peacebuilding, particularly stakeholders of the PBF. The review is expected to contribute to the UN's collective knowledge and capacity to better design and implement DDR-related programmes within a broader peacebuilding framework. The recommendations of the review aim to help the DDR and peacebuilding communities, and the PBF in particular, strategically and programmatically position their DDR activities for more lasting and promising peacebuilding results.

The review is not an evaluation or impact assessment of DDR, peacebuilding or PBF activities. It applies existing knowledge and research to look generally across operational programming of DDR and peacebuilding and to draw out the general lessons and promising practices emanating from support provided by the PBF.

¹ Kerry Maze and Sylvie More undertook the field and desk research for this review. Kerry Maze led the preparation of the written report in collaboration with Sylvie More, which was peer-reviewed by Mariska Van Beijnum, Clingendael Institute (CRU). The report and thematic review process was overseen by Erin McCandless, lead consultant for the PBSO thematic reviews as well as Cornelis Steenken, Coordinator of the IAWG. Mario Nascimiento and Beth Prosnitz additionally contributed background material and administrative support for the review. The lead author takes responsibility for any misrepresentations and errors found in the review. The review reflects the only views and opinions of the lead author and do not reflect the views of any specific organization or UN entity.

² In 2011, the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), in collaboration with United Nations partners, agreed to undertake a Sectoral Review of six different thematic areas of peacebuilding: Security Sector Reform; Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration; Social Service Provision, Peace Dividends and Peacebuilding; Economic Revitalization and Youth; Women's Participation in Peacebuilding; and Elections.

³ Annex 1 "methodology" provides the grounds for the selection of cases.

2. SETTING THE SCENE: UNDERSTANDING PEACEBUILDING AND DDR

*Successful implementation of DDR processes is exceedingly vital for ensuring sustainable peace.*⁴

Kofi Annan (2001)

2.1 Peacebuilding

The term peacebuilding covers a vast concept that lacks a precise definition largely because of the political, institutional and programmatic implications packed into the term.⁵ Further, policymakers and practitioners tend to either assign excessively narrow, time-driven or action-based definitions of the term or assign overly encompassing ones, adding to the disagreements of a precise definition.⁶

Nevertheless, the UN, policymakers, practitioners and researchers have continued to evolve the parameters, actions and expected outcomes of peacebuilding.⁷ Relevant for the purposes of this review, in 2007, the United Nations Secretary-General's Policy Committee put forward that peacebuilding "involves a range of measures targeted to reduce the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict by strengthening national capacities at all levels for conflict management and to lay the foundations for sustainable peace and development."⁸

The Report of the Secretary-General on "Peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict" (2009)⁹ recognized that the formal end of conflict does not assume the arrival of sustainable peace. The report warned of potential risks such as a lack of political consensus, persistent root causes of conflict, increased tensions as people return to destroyed or occupied homes, perceived or real impunity of crimes committed during and after the conflict, overly high expectations of concrete, political, social and economic dividends and failure to restore state authority, that can characterize post-conflict environments.¹⁰

Emphasizing that peacebuilding is a national challenge and responsibility, the 2009 report outlines core areas that would increase a post-conflict country's window for achieving sustainable peace and reducing the risk of it relapsing into conflict. These are the provision of: Basic security; delivery of peace dividends;¹¹ shoring up and building

⁴ Report of the Secretary-General on Prevention of armed conflict, United Nations, [A/55/985-S/2001/574], New York, 7 June 2001.

⁵ Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, United Nations, S/2010/393-A/64/868, New York: 21 July 2010.

⁶ Henning Haugerudbraaten, Peacebuilding: Six dimensions and two concepts, African Security Review, Vol. 7 No 6, 1998.

⁷ The term of peacebuilding was first introduced in literature in 1975. The UN first took up the subject of peacebuilding in 1992, with then Secretary-General defining 'peacebuilding' in his report Agenda for Peace as "an action to identify and support structures, which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict" An Agenda for Peace, Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping, Report of the Secretary-General, United Nations, A/47/277-S/24111 17, New York: June 1992, p.11.

⁸ United Nations Secretary-General's Policy Committee, 22 May 2007.

⁹ Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict, United Nations, A/63/881-S/2009/304, New York: 11 June 2009.

¹⁰ Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict, United Nations, A/63/881-S/2009/304, New York: 11 June 2009. p. 3-4.

¹¹ The United Nations and other international actors use the concept of peace dividends to describe timely and tangible deliverables, which in particular contexts can facilitate social cohesion and stability, build trust in the peace process and support the state in earning its legitimacy under challenging conditions.

confidence in the political process; strengthening core national capacity for conflict management¹². The report thus calls on the international community to be “capable of responding coherently, rapidly and effectively to these core objectives through:”¹³

- Support to basic safety and security, including mine action, protection of civilians, DDR, strengthening the rule of law and initiation of security sector reform (SSR);
- Support to political processes, including electoral processes, promoting inclusive dialogue and reconciliation, and developing conflict management capacity at national and subnational levels;
- Support to the provision of basic services, such as water and sanitation, health and primary education, and support to the safe and sustainable return and reintegration of internally displaced persons and refugees;
- Support to restoring core government functions, in particular basic public administration and public finance, at the national and subnational levels;
- Support to economic revitalization, including employment generation and livelihoods (in agriculture and public works), particularly for youth and demobilized former combatants, as well as rehabilitation of basic infrastructure.

The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) is concerned with ensuring that “key actors involved in the peacebuilding process at national and local level are politically and institutionally able to mitigate risks of lapse or relapse into conflict”.¹⁴ Different programmatic approaches to peacebuilding focus on strengthening social cohesion and community resilience; state legitimacy, capacity and accountability and state-society relations; policies, structures and processes that address the drivers of violent conflict and set the conditions for addressing the root causes of conflict.¹⁵ The outcomes of these programmatic approaches are seen to build citizen, community and national capacity to prevent relapses into conflict and to carry the state out of post-conflict recovery to national development.

Addressing gender, from masculinity and the perpetration of violence to advancing the role of women within peace processes, also sit squarely in the peacebuilding agenda. In particular, the 2010 Secretary-General’s report on Women’s participation in peacebuilding emphasizes that women “are crucial partners in shoring up three pillars of lasting peace: economic recovery, social cohesion and political legitimacy”.¹⁶ Studies have shown that women may tend to focus more on broader, community-oriented peacebuilding while men tend to focus on larger infrastructural type priorities¹⁷ and women will, according to Duflo and Udry, spend a greater proportion of their income on areas that benefit their children and extended family networks.¹⁸

¹² Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict, United Nations, A/63/881-S/2009/304, New York: 11 June 2009. p.3 para 3.

¹³ Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict, United Nations, A/63/881-S/2009/304, New York: 11 June 2009. p.6, para 17.

¹⁴ PBF Business Plan, p.2.

¹⁵ See Annex 1 of this review for the broader methodology/definitions used in the sectoral review

¹⁶ Report of the Secretary-General on women’s participation in peacebuilding, United Nations, A/65/354-S/2010/466, New York: 7 September 2010, paragraph 7.

¹⁷ Muggah, Robert. Listening for a Change! Participatory Evaluations of DDR and Arms Reduction in Albania, Cambodia and Mali, United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, United Nations, New York: 2005, p.16.

¹⁸ Duflo, Esther, and Udry, Christopher R, Intrahousehold Resource Allocation in Côte d’Ivoire: Social Norms, Separate Accounts and Consumption Choices, National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper No. W 10498, 2004. The authors note “Given the specialization by gender in the cultivation of crops and the variance in rainfall shocks, women and men will present a significant different behaviour regarding their levels of expenditure. Whereas men will tend to spend more on luxury goods, women will increase expenditure on education and food”. p. 32-33.

2.2 DDR

There is no one blueprint for DDR and related activities since country contexts differ greatly, according to the nature of the conflict, its duration, and causes and the programme must adapt according to the political, physical and cultural environments where the DDR is taking place.¹⁹ Nevertheless, the IAWG Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS) defines DDR as “a process that contributes to security and stability in a post-conflict recovery context by removing weapons from the hands of combatants, taking the combatants out of military structures and helping them to integrate socially and economically into society by finding civilian livelihoods”.²⁰

As initially defined by the Secretary-General in 2005 and affirmed in the IDDRS,²¹ disarmament is the collection, documentation, control and disposal of small arms, ammunition, explosives and light and heavy weapons of combatants and often also of the civilian population. Disarmament also includes the development of responsible arms management programmes.

Demobilization is the formal and controlled discharge of active combatants from armed forces or other armed groups. The first stage of demobilization may extend from the processing of individual combatants in temporary centres to the massing of troops in camps designated for this purpose (cantonment sites, encampments, assembly areas or barracks). The second stage of demobilization encompasses the support package provided to the demobilized, which is called reinsertion.²²

Reinsertion may be used, if necessary, as a stopgap between demobilization and reintegration and can last up to one year. It is defined as the assistance offered to ex-combatants²³ during demobilization but prior to the longer-term process of reintegration. Reinsertion is a form of transitional assistance to help cover the basic needs of ex-combatants and their families and can include transitional safety allowances, food, clothes, shelter, medical services, short-term education, training, employment and tools.²⁴

Reintegration is the process by which ex-combatants acquire civilian status and gain sustainable employment and income. Reintegration is essentially a social and economic process with an open time frame, primarily taking place in communities at the local level. It is part of the general development of a country and a national responsibility, and often necessitates long-term external assistance.²⁵ It is important to highlight that for the purposes of this review, unless otherwise stated, the term ex-combatants covers ex-combatants, members associated with armed forces and groups and dependents of ex-combatants.

Different aspects of reintegration aim to provide ex-combatants with the tools, means and direction to return to civilian life economically, socially, and politically:

- Economic reintegration involves the provision of vocational or professional training, grants, apprenticeships or micro-financing to capacitate individuals in the areas of agriculture, animal husbandry, micro-business or entry into public or private service.
- Social reintegration thus provides the necessary complement to socio-economic reintegration by focusing on interventions that seek to disarm and demobilize minds and behaviours through such areas as psychosocial and mental health counselling, medical treatment and activities that promote reconciliation and social cohesion.

¹⁹ A Framework for Lasting Disarmament, and Reintegration of Former Combatants in Crisis Situations, Workshop Report, International Peace Academy, New York: December 2002, p.8.

²⁰ United Nations - Integrated Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration Standards (IDDRS), Module 1.20 p. 6.

²¹ United Nations - IDDRS Module 1.20 p. 6. Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations, Note by the Secretary-General, United Nations A/C.5/59/31, New York: 24 May 2005.

²² United Nations - IDDRS, Module 1.20 p. 6.

²³ In this review, the term ex-combatant includes associated groups and dependents.

²⁴ United Nations - IDDRS, Module 1.20 p. 6.

²⁵ United Nations - IDDRS, Module 1.20 p. 6.

- Political reintegration supports interventions such as civic education and providing ex-combatants with valid identification documents that support the ex-combatant “in claiming rights and fulfilling duties, including those related to participation in political processes, such as elections and community-based decision-making processes.”²⁶ Political reintegration promotes confidence and investment in the peace process and transitional state structure.

2.3 General overview of DDR contributions to peacebuilding

DDR is unique from other peacebuilding sectors, such as health, social and administrative services, education, and the security sector, etc., as these sectors are continuous and inherent to the daily and sustainable functioning of a state. In contrast, DDR is a programme with a determined beginning and end, in spite of the fact that the implications of DDR, from its negotiations through its implementation and conclusion, penetrate a wide range of longer-term processes and programmes. The closing of a DDR programme is highly symbolic of a state’s return to stability and signals another milestone in the state’s transition out of post-conflict recovery. Once the DDR is completed, the sustainability of its results depends upon the ability of other peacebuilding sectors to incorporate individuals who were once formerly known as ex-combatants as regular citizens in longer-term peace, recovery and development programmes.

Similarly, national ownership, buy-in and support to national institutions implementing DDR are guiding principles of DDR and are seen as essential for the success and sustainability of the DDR programmes themselves.²⁷ However, lack of political will is often a challenge for implementing DDR and while its absence may impinge upon the success of the programme, many DDR programmes and related activities can still proceed. Unlike the other sectoral peacebuilding themes, the national government is not expected to take up DDR sectorally or departmentally once DDR is complete. Instead, it is the linkages between DDR to other issues such as SSR, Transitional Justice, Rule of Law, National Reconciliation, Development and Armed Violence Reduction that carry aspects of DDR thematically and sustainably forward at the national level.

Despite the finite nature of DDR as a programme, the contributions of DDR to peacebuilding are many, raising the more speculative question of what aspects of DDR do not contribute directly to peacebuilding? DDR directly supports implementation of peace agreements, supports the provision of basic security, promotes socio-economic revitalization and other such peace dividends as social cohesion and enhanced community resilience and helps to build confidence in the peace process and statebuilding.

2.3.1 DDR implementation challenges and its effect on peacebuilding

Successful DDR helps set enabling conditions for peacebuilding;²⁸ however, disruptions or setbacks in the DDR can negatively affect security and on the overall peace process,²⁹ even becoming a source of new or renewed tension within the country or neighbouring areas.³⁰ Delayed or incomplete disarmament can fuel the proliferation of arms within and outside the country.³¹ Ex-combatants may opt out of a delayed or ill-timed DDR or be drawn across

²⁶ The State of Reintegration 2010, Inter-Agency Working Group on DDR, forthcoming, p.31.

²⁷ United Nations—IDDRS module 3.30, 2006.

²⁸ Report of the Secretary-General on Prevention of armed conflict, United Nations, A/55/985-S/2001/574, New York: 7 June 2001; Background paper, Children at War: Impact, Protection Rehabilitation, Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre, Accra: 2006 p.9; Second Generation Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) practices in peace operations; Department of Peacekeeping Operations, New York: 2010, p. 9; Knight, M & Ozerdem, A. Guns, Camps and Cash: disarmament demobilization and Reinsertion of former combatants in transition from war to peace. *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 41, n° 4, July 2004, pp. 499-500.

²⁹ Independent External Review of the United Nations Peace Fund for Nepal (UNPFN), Organisation Development Centre, Kathmandu: June 2011.

³⁰ Twenty-second progress report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in the Liberia [S/2011/72], 14 February 2011, paras. 15-17; W. Andy Knight. Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and Post-Conflict Peacebuilding in Africa: An Overview. *African Security*, Routledge. June 2011, p. 33-34. Multi-country Demobilization and Reintegration Program: End of Program Evaluation (Final Report), Oslo: June 2010.

³¹ Swarbrick, Peter. Avoiding Disarmament Failure: The Critical Link in the DDR: An Operational Manual for Donors, Managers, and Practitioners. *Small Arms Survey, Working Paper n° 5*, Geneva: February 2007 p. 20-21; W. Andy Knight. Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and Post-Conflict Peacebuilding in Africa: An Overview, *African Security*, Routledge, June 2011, pp.28, 42.

or outside the country looking for better reintegration options.³² Unmanaged expectations of ex-combatants' regarding DDR benefits can breed frustration, while care must be given to prevent and manage the perceptions of non-combatants and other vulnerable groups that ex-combatants are being rewarded or receiving preferential treatment. Supporting the implementation of DDR thus has an important role on improving the conditions and circumstances for peacebuilding.

Box 1: DDR CONTRIBUTIONS TO PEACEBUILDING

Promoting the Peace Process

- The majority of recent peace agreements include at least some reference to DDR in the negotiations of and content of peace agreements, as encouraged by the IDDRS.

Provision of basic security

- DDR contributes to security and stability on an individual and community level in post-conflict environments by reducing the risk of opportunistic violence and general lawlessness of released combatants so that recovery and development can begin.
- When disarmament is pursued in a proportional manner between different groups, it builds confidence between the parties and addresses the 'security dilemmas' that often dominate political agendas in post-conflict situations.
- The demobilization of armed units dissolves military chains of command and therefore decreases the likelihood and capacity for rapid escalation of hostilities.

Peace dividends

- In protracted conflicts in particular, ex-combatants will have lost or missed out on education and livelihood opportunities. Supporting ex-combatants to overcome such obstacles and become productive political and economic actors helps stimulate peacebuilding opportunities in the communities where ex-combatants return; contributes to the revitalization of economies that benefit both ex-combatants and communities; and helps foster community resilience against conflict.
- DDR primarily targets combatants and associated groups, but it can also have indirect beneficial effects for civilian communities as increased security and stability allows the resumption of many peacetime economic and social activities that would otherwise not be possible.

Addressing root causes and drivers of conflict

- DDR is guided by the principle of "Do no harm" and DDR operations must be based on an analysis and awareness of the root causes and nature of the conflict and post-conflict environment.
- DDR is a highly political and sensitive activity and getting too involved in the root causes of conflict could put DDR practitioners in a difficult position of being perceived as taking sides or favouring specific groups or outcomes. DDR programmes can seek to implement programmes in such a way that root causes of conflict are addressed through improved economic opportunities and more equitable access to natural resources, depending on the context.

³² Swarbrick, Peter. Avoiding Disarmament Failure: The Critical Link in the DDR: An Operational Manual for Donors, Managers, and Practitioners. Small Arms Survey. Working Paper n° 5. February 2007 pp. 20-21.

Several circumstances affect the implementation of DDR. First, as the report, “Second Generation DDR” prepared by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations states the UN is increasingly tasked with undertaking DDR before or in the absence of the necessary preconditions for undertaking DDR.³³ For instance, peace agreements provide the legal framework for DDR, however they often lack detailed provisions for DDR that are in line with the IDDRS.³⁴ There may also be ongoing conflicts in other areas of the country or in neighbouring countries that may threaten to spillover where the DDR interventions are taking place.

Second, the DDR process may lack political will from the government. As the Nepal case study explores in the annex, the Government imposed restrictions that limited the UN’s access to cantonment sites or other areas that would facilitate needs profiling; imposed funding ceilings on the amount of assistance that ex-combatants could receive; and issued negative propaganda against the programme. National programmes themselves, as explored in the annexed case study of CAR, may be undermined by capacity limitations or elements of corruption or mis-managed funding, which can affect the overall public perception of DDR and create obstacles for DDR activities implemented by other agencies.

Third, another recurring challenge for DDR is the fact that DDR, particularly reintegration, relies primarily upon voluntary funding. Only DD may be covered by the UN Mission ‘assessed budgets’ when it takes place within a peacekeeping operation. The typical immediate launch of DD leads to gaps in programming when compounded by the need to secure funding and prepare reintegration programmes, which by their nature is a much longer and resource-intensive process than DD. Moreover, as the fiscal year of the assessed budget begins and ends annually in June, it is difficult to effectively coordinate the timing and sequencing of funding of DDR activities. As a result, there can be gaps between the implementation of DD and R that can have serious security implications.

Lack of funding can also mean that reintegration programmes must be scaled down in time and scope, undermining the success and sustainability of the DDR process. Scaled down reintegration thus provides little more advantage than the short-term reinsertion. Reinsertion bridges demobilization and reintegration in order to foster stability, maintain the momentum of the DDR and to minimize the negative effects that delays to the DDR programme can have on the process overall. However, reinsertion cannot be used as a substitute for longer-term reintegration support.

Fourth, the “Second Generation DDR” report highlights the challenges regarding the difficulties of obtaining and verifying real numbers of weapons and the continued circulation of weapons within a community, compounded by a lack of legal framework governing weapons ownership.³⁵ Initial commitment to disarming may be low or, alternatively, the number of individuals presenting themselves for DDR may be more than anticipated or artificially inflated, making it difficult to define who is a militia member. Regarding demobilization, there is often a poor understanding of the types of, specific needs and agendas of the groups and organizations (militias, clans, ethnic groups) that are being demobilized.³⁶

Fifth, ex-combatants are reintegrated into areas characterized by the reduced productive capacities, destroyed infrastructure and social services and collapsed markets typical of post-conflict environment. The abrupt release of thousands of ex-combatants into the labour market can breed tension and competition among other conflict-affected populations,³⁷ and there can be competition over natural resources, particularly in areas where groups are returning. In addition, the condition of natural resources that underpin livelihoods in such areas may be degraded due to effects from the conflict or coping activities of displaced populations, such as deforestation, contamination of water sources or destruction of crops. While DDR helps beneficiaries rid themselves of their ex-combatant

³³ For a more in depth discussion of the preconditions, see Second Generation Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR): Practices in Peace Operations, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations, NY: 18 January 2010, pp.8, 10, 12.

³⁴ United Nations—IDDRS module 2.10.

³⁵ Second Generation Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR): Practices in Peace Operations, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations, NY: 18 January 2010, p.13.

³⁶ Second Generation Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR): Practices in Peace Operations, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations, NY: 18 January 2010, p.13.

³⁷ The State of Reintegration 2010, Inter-Agency Working Group on DDR, forthcoming, p.30.

status and to become recognized as regular citizens that can engage—anonymous of their past—in longer-term development and recovery activities, DDR thus also depends in many ways upon the ability of other UN-wide initiatives to address the root causes of conflict, promote recovery, and to pave the way for broader and longer-term peacebuilding and development.

DDR is thus only one, narrow, aspect of broader peacebuilding objectives. It contributes to peacebuilding for one specific target group and, by extension can help to reinforce elements of peacebuilding within communities. DDR should thus be seen as one among other targeted post-conflict interventions. Successful peacebuilding requires other recovery and development initiatives that go beyond the means and scope of DDR.

The success of DDR, however, also depends on the positive results of other recovery and peacebuilding programmes. The chances for an ex-combatants successful and effective reintegration are improved when there are peace dividends, root causes of conflict are addressed, and the resilience of communities is built and government is better capacitated to manage conflict.

Given the challenges to DDR implementation, an important question for the PBSO is how PBF support can help to overcome some of these challenges to DDR in order to simultaneously strengthen DDR's chances for success and reinforce DDR's contributions to peacebuilding. The remaining sections thus look practically at PBF's contributions to DDR, and how the PBF-funded activities met PBF goals.

3. PBF SUPPORT TO DDR

Generally, DDR is financed from five funding sources: the UN Peacekeeping assessed budget; rapid response (emergency) funds; voluntary contributions from donors; government grants, government loans and credits; agency cost-sharing. The Peacekeeping assessed budget covers military, personnel and operational costs of DD (and occasionally reinsertion) within a UN peacekeeping context.³⁸ However, voluntary donations and implementing organizations are the main sources of DDR programme financing, particularly for reintegration activities and when DDR is not part of a peacekeeping operation.³⁹ (See Annex 4 for the breakdown of DDR financing sources and opportunities). DDR thus relies heavily on voluntary contributions.

Support from the PBF sets out to be fast, flexible and risk tolerant. Projects receiving PBF funding are expected to be relevant for peacebuilding, and PRF funds in particular are expected to be catalytic and contribute towards sustainable peacebuilding. Requests for PBF funding must demonstrate that the support addresses an unforeseen or imminent threat to peacebuilding, fills a funding gap where peacebuilding support is needed, or will help to overcome a bottleneck or stalled process.⁴⁰ See Annex 3 for the modalities of PBF funding.

BOX 2: PBF funding criteria (terminology)*

Relevant:

Addresses peacebuilding priorities, responds to conflict analysis, and considers transitional and cross-cutting issues.

Catalytic:

Enables, provokes, facilitates or accelerates shifts in the peace process as a whole, or with respect to different key elements of the peace process. It kick-starts a new longer-term peacebuilding effort, or accelerates an existing blocked peacebuilding effort; ensures that the necessary ownership, capacity and willingness exist to increase the likelihood of catalyzing larger, or longer-term peacebuilding change; provides an immediate response to factors that are urgent and relevant to peacebuilding; fills a gap not covered by other donors.

Fast:

Efficiently to respond to an immediate need, sometimes before other donors are able to mobilize funds.

Risk-Tolerant:

Neglected by other donors/deemed to risky by other donors.

**Drawn from the UN Thematic Review 'Peace Dividends and Beyond: Contributions of Administrative and Social Services', PBSO - 2011*

³⁸ According to the IDDRS, assessed budgets cover Personnel costs (international and local staff members, consultants, etc.); equipment for the disarmament and demobilization sites; infrastructure and logistics; operational costs for DD; transportation (air/ground); rations (food supply); civilian clothing and other non-food items; small arms control projects; DDR training; Quick-Impact projects; Public information activities in support of the DDR programme; Reinsertion support for the demobilization of combatants for up to one year after disarmament. "Financing and Budgeting", IDDRS, Module 3.4.1, United Nations, New York: 2006 p. 7.

³⁹ "Financing and Budgeting", IDDRS, Module 3.4.1, United Nations, New York: 2006 pp. 5-6.

⁴⁰ UN Peacebuilding Fund, "PBF Brochure: Everything you need to know to access the PBF" UN PBF brochure, Peacebuilding Support Office, New York: December 2009; information equally available on the overview section of the PBF website <www.unpbf.org/index.shtml>.

3.1 Trends in PBF support for DDR

Since 2006, the PBF has provided US\$ 36 million towards twenty DDR-related activities in ten different countries: Burundi, CAR, Comoros, Côte D'Ivoire, DRC, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Nepal and Sudan. Of these, Burundi, Central African Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau and Liberia are on the agenda of the PBC. The majority of PBF-supported DDR projects (14/20) fell under the PRF, while six projects implemented in four countries came under the IRF.⁴¹

Table 1 lists the PBF-funded DDR activities implemented between 2006-present as well as the implementing UN body.

Table 1: PBF-funded DDR activities 2006-present

DDR-RELATED ACTIVITY		TIMELINE	APPROVED BUDGET (US\$)	UN AGENCIES
Burundi	Support to the Dialogue between the Burundi Government and Palipehutu-FNL	Mar 08 - Dec 10	1,000,000	UNDP
	Support to DDR Process - Phase 1	May 09 - Dec 10	1,000,000	BINUB UNDP
CAR	Support for the start-up of the DDR process of Armed Groups	Apr 09 - ongoing	3,955,710	UNDP
	Prevention of Recruitment, Demobilization, and Socio-Economic Reintegration of CAAFAG, and Other Children and Women (Phase 1)	Feb 09 - Aug-10	2,000,000	UNICEF
	Prevention of recruitment, demobilization and socio-economic reintegration of CAAFAG and other vulnerable children and women in conflict zones (Phase 2)	Oct 10 - April 12	1,500,000	UNFPA UNICEF WFP
Comoros	National Plan of DDR	Mar 10 - Feb 12	500,000	UNDP
	DDR Support for the Socio-Economic Integration of Women and Girls Associated with the Conflict	Mar 10 - Apr 12	750,000	UNFPA
Côte d'Ivoire	Micro-Projects for Socio-Economic Reintegration of Ex-Combatants and Youth at Risk in Côte d'Ivoire	Dec 08 - Dec 09	4,000,000	UNDP UNOCI
	Support to Direct Dialogue in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso	Aug 07 - 2008	2,000,000	UNDP UNOCI
DRC	Community Reintegration and Recovery Programme in eastern DRC	Feb 10 - Jun 11	4,405,342	MONUSCO UNDP
	Support to War Wounded	Apr 10 - Jun 11	228,962	MONUSCO UNDP
	DD of former Armed Groups residual (PBF-COD-B.4)	Jan 11 - Dec 11	636 650	MONUSCO UNDP

⁴¹ Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, and Sudan, Note Projects under the Emergency window 3 meet the criteria of IRF funding, prior to the creation of the IRF tier.

Guinea	Socio Economic Reintegration of Children Recruited into the Guinea Armed Forces	Dec 10 - Aug 11	2,995,045	UNICEF WFP
Guinea-Bissau	Feasibility Study in Guinea-Bissau: Pretraining for Military and Police Personnel Baseline Assessment, Pre-Reintegration Baseline Assessment	Jul 10 - Dec 10	49,755	UNDP
Liberia	Tumutu Agricultural Training Programme	Dec 08 - Mar 10	1,123,500	UNDP
	Supporting Peaceful Reintegration of High-Risk Youths into Their Communities through Facilitating Rural Transport Livelihood Opportunities	May 09 - Nov 10	250,000	UNDP UNMIL
Nepal	Programme Support for Children and Adolescents Formerly Associated with the Maoist Army in Nepal	Mar 09 - Mar 10	622,969	UNICEF
	Support to Female Members of the Maoist Army	Mar 09 - Dec 10	224,614	UNFPA
	Monitoring, Reporting and Response to Conflict-Related Child Rights Violations Promote Coexistence and Peaceful Conflict Resolution	Apr 10 - Dec 11	1,379,004	OHCHR UNICEF
Sudan	Consolidating Peace through DDR in Sudan: Abyei	Mar 10 - Feb 11	6,680,010	UNDP
	Consolidating Peace through DDR in Sudan: Eastern Sudan	Mar 10 - May 11	1,728,050	UNDP
	TOTAL	2006 - present	36,650,575	

PBF has supported various phases of the DDR process:

- Dialogue, planning or launching of DDR: Burundi, CAR, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea-Bissau
- DD: Comoros, CAR
- Reinsertion: Côte d'Ivoire
- Reintegration: Comoros, DRC, Guinea, Nepal, Sudan
- Wrap-up, follow-on reintegration: Burundi, Liberia

While women may have benefited from any and all of DDR projects, four projects (20 per cent of projects; sharing in 12.5 per cent of budget) particularly targeted women. Six projects (30 per cent of projects; 25 per cent of budget) targeted children.

Not all of PBF funded projects focused only on DDR target groups. For instance, in Liberia, the project "Supporting Peace Reintegration of High-Risk Youths into their Communities" included ex-combatants within a broader target group. Community approaches to DDR, whereby a percentage of community members receive the same reintegration-type benefits as the ex-combatant, are slowly becoming introduced into DDR programmes, most frequently in programmes addressing children, and will be explored in further detail in the case studies.

3.2 PBF contributions in Case Study countries

The case studies for CAR, DRC and Nepal are annexed to this review. Each case study outlines how DDR was approached in the peace process; the nature of the DDR undertaken; summary of PBF funding for the DDR; an exploration of the projects in relation to PBF funding goals; and the challenges encountered in implementing the project. To facilitate the reading of this review, which is meant to place particular emphasis on PBF contributions to DDR, only the PBF aspects of the case studies, and the general context in which they take place, are summarized here.

3.2.1 Central African Republic

The government and three politico-military groups, operating in the north-eastern (UFDR), North-central (FDPC) and north-western (APRD)⁴² signed the Libreville Global Peace Agreement⁴³ in June 2008. The Agreement included a specific provision on DDR. However, it was more than two years after the launching of the DDR Steering Committee (2009) before the disarmament and demobilization (DD) operations began in June 2011. Several reasons are attributed to the delays in launching the DD, including continued outbreaks of violence; political disagreements resulting from the absence of a power-sharing agreement between the government and politico-military groups; and political tactics to delay the process until after the elections (which took place in January and March 2011).⁴⁴ The government began DD in June 2011 and UNDP joined the operations three weeks later in July 2011.⁴⁵

Neither the Libreville Peace Agreement nor any other agreement included provisions on children associated with armed forces or armed groups (CAAFAG). UNICEF used the International Conventions on the Rights of the Child and the fact that children were not covered under the national agreements to justify the need to commence the DDR of CAAFAG immediately. UNICEF thus initiated the process of removing CAAFAG from armed opposition groups in 2008, independently of the formal, adult DDR process.

Under the SSR component of CAR's Peacebuilding Priority Plan, the PBF contributed funding to three DDR projects.

Table 2: PBF contributions to DDR projects CAR 2009 to present

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET (US\$)	TIMELINE	UN AGENCIES
Support for the start-up of the DDR process for Armed Groups (PBF/CAF/B-3)	3,955,710	Apr 09-Sep 10	UNDP
Prevention of Recruitment, Demobilization and Socio-Economic Reintegration of CAAFAG and Other Children and Women' (Child DDR - PHASE 1; PBF/CAF/B-2)	2,000,000	Nov 08 - Oct 11	UNICEF
Prevention of Recruitment, Demobilization and Socio-Economic Reintegration of CAAFAG and Other Children and Women' (Child DDR - PHASE 2; PBF/CAF/K-12)	1,500,000	Sep 10 - Feb 12	UNFPA UNICEF WFP
TOTAL	7,455,710		

⁴² The Armée Populaire pour la Restauration de la République et la Démocratie (APRD), the Union des Forces Démocratiques pour le Rassemblement (UFDR) in May 2008. The remaining rebel groups (Forces démocratiques pour le peuple centrafricain (FDPC), Mouvement des jeunes libérateurs centrafricains (MJLC) and Union des forces vives de la nation (UFVN) added their signatures in December 2008.

⁴³ In French Accord de Paix Global de Libreville.

⁴⁴ Interviews of diplomats and donor representatives in Bangui, July 2011.

⁴⁵ UNDP used a new methodology for data-gathering whereby the information went directly into a database, which could be transferred directly to the capital of Bangui. The tool was based on Android phones and open-source software. UNDP notes that it is easy to train people in this technology.

Managed through UNDP, the first project ‘Support for the start-up of the DDR process for Armed Groups’ received US\$ 4 million from the PBF. This amount covered the full costs of the preparatory phase of the DDR, which included staff costs,⁴⁶ support for Steering Committee meetings and sensitization activities and building the institutional capacity necessary for designing, planning, steering and implementing the national DDR programme. The project also supported the development and building the capacity of the different units and committees, including the functions of the DDR Steering Committee, put in place to oversee and implement DDR. It also implemented the sensitization and public information campaigns for the process.

The PBF-funded UNICEF project (Child DDR Phase 1), implemented by several international NGOs, involved removing CAAFAG from armed groups, putting them through a transitional phase for three weeks and supporting them for a period of 12 months in their chosen reintegration option: either returning to school or learning a trade. The project also established Community Networks for the protection of children (RECOPEs⁴⁷), which promote child protection through community-level sensitization on such issues such as rights of the child, protection, domestic violence and its impact on children and sexual violence, etc.

The second phase of the child DDR involves a multi-agency approach between UNICEF, UNFPA and WFP. The activities continue to engage certain RECOPEs and focus on children in transit centers, their demobilization and reintegration, prevention of their recruitment as well addressing other vulnerable children and documenting, reporting and monitoring violations of child rights.

3.2.2 Democratic Republic of Congo

The government of the DRC led the main national DDR programme (PNDDR), with operational support from MONUSCO (initially as MONUC)⁴⁸ for the DD. The World Bank supported the government financially for the programme, including a six-month civic reinsertion programme.⁴⁹ The PNDDR, however, only targeted combatants that presented themselves with a weapon in hand and who could prove they belonged to a known armed group between October 1996-May 2003. This left an immediate caseload of 4,031 ex-combatants who were not included in the national programme.

Under priority two of the PBF Priority Plan for the DRC “Demobilization and community-based reintegration of combatants and high-risk groups”,⁵⁰ the PBF allocated funds for three DDR-related activities: the CRRP, and the project supporting the war wounded and demobilization of residual ex-combatants.⁵¹

Given the high caseload of ex-combatants who were not included in the national DDR programme, the government requested UNDP, in collaboration with UNICEF and MONUSCO, to lead the reintegration of ex-combatants in the 18-month Community Recovery and Reintegration Programme (CRRP).

The CRRP and DD Residual projects, are designed to support disarmament and demobilization and reintegrate the ex-combatants. The project also adopted a community-matching approach, meaning it provided equivalent assistance for 1,713 other vulnerable members of the community, such as high-risk youths and returnees (total caseload thus 5,744). Projects activities included:

⁴⁶ The December 2009 Project Document budgets for 10 international staff and 27 national staff for a period of 12 months plus some additional consultants.

⁴⁷ RECOPE is the French acronym for Réseaux communautaires de protection de l'enfant.

⁴⁸ In accordance with the UN Security resolution 1925 of 28 May 2010, the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the DRC (MONUSCO) replaced the former United Nations Organization in Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUC). The change reflected the new phase reached by the country aiming at consolidating peace. This change also stressed the gradual withdrawal of peacekeepers and, at the same time, increasing the protection of civilians.

⁴⁹ MONUC/MONUSCO further undertook DRRR of the foreign nationals, seeing to their disarmament, demobilization, repatriation and resettlement back to their own country. MONUSCO highlights that DRRR in combination with military operations has “managed to seriously reduce” threats posed by the FDLR and consequently the related pillaging.

⁵⁰ The PBF Priority Plan covers the period September 2009-December 2011. The total envelop for the funding is US\$ 20 million, which is divided along the four priority outcome areas: 1. Improving security and civilian protection 2. Demobilization and reintegration of combatants and high-risk groups, 3. Extension of State authority; 4. Local peacebuilding and recovery. UN PBF Priority Plan for the Democratic Republic of Congo, PBF, pp.5-6 <www.unpbf.org/docs/DRC-Priority-Plan.pdf>.

⁵¹ PBF-funded Projects: “Community Reintegration and Recovery Programme in eastern DRC (PBF/COD/B-1) of 2 February 2010 and “Support to War Wounded” (PBF/COD/B-2) of 6 April 2010.

- Sensitization to prepare armed groups to disarm;
- Building Disarmament and demobilization centre;
- National Partners logistic aspect support;
- Ex-combatants transport and food support;
- Sensitization activities to prepare communities for the return of the ex-combatants;
- Identification and preparation of the beneficiaries for their reinsertion/reintegration programmes, including placing the beneficiaries into community-based solidarity groups;
- Market and employment studies; and
- Training for the beneficiaries on i) technical aspects of their chosen vocation, ii) management (iii) civic education and peaceful co-existence; provided beneficiaries with kits to help them start up their micro-enterprise.

Table 3: PBF contributions to DDR in DRC 2010-2011

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET (US\$)	TIMELINE	UN AGENCIES
Community Reintegration and Recovery Programme in eastern DRC (PBF/COD/B-1)	4,405,342	Feb 10 - Jun 11	UNDP
Support to War Wounded (PBF/COD/B-2)	228,962	Apr 10 - Jun 11	UNDP
DD of former Armed Groups residual (PBF-COD-B.4)	636 650	Jan 11 - Feb 11	UNDP

The 2009 Ituri Peace Accord called for the support of the war wounded for 265 members of the armed group CNDP. The ‘war wounded’ project, undertaken by UNDP, ICRC, MONUC and the provincial government in North Kivu was designed with the intention of it serving as a pilot project. Over a 10 month period, the project provided equipment to strengthen the capacity of Goma’s military hospital, transport of the beneficiaries to the hospital, food for the beneficiaries and their families, and treatment for 265 war wounded, thus facilitating their integration into the FARDC or their respective demobilization and socio-economic reintegration over a 10-month period.

As of September 2011, the “war wounded” project has been fully implemented and closed, while the “CRRP” project is nearly completed (70 per cent delivery rate). As to the demobilization of residual ex-combatant project, funds have been allocated but the project is not being implemented yet, due to ongoing discussions about the appropriate strategy.

3.2.3 Nepal

The Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) and the Agreement on Monitoring of the Management of Arms and Armies (AMMAA) were both signed in 2006. One of the immediate goals of the CPA was listed to be the management and integration/rehabilitation of the Maoist army personnel. The documents established that the members of the Maoist Army who did not meet the relevant eligible criteria for the army—minors and those entering the armed group after May 2006—are “disqualified” from the army and to be discharged. This group, known as Verified Minors and Late Recruits (VMLR), became the target recipients of the DDR-related rehabilitation activities. It is important to note, however, that the Maoists did not approve of the terminology of disarmament and demobilization, preferring instead to consider their activities as SSR and to approve rehabilitation activities. In this review, any reference to DDR in Nepal thus actually only refers to the rehabilitation.

The registration and verification of Maoist combatants took place in 2007. In the process, 4,008 VMLR were identified (2,973 verified minors and 1036 late recruits). Although the discharge was supposed to be immediate, it took

another three years, until January 2010, of additional negotiations and high-level advocacy before the Maoist army would allow for the discharge and reintegration of VMLR to take place. The UN deployed an inter-agency team⁵² to support the month-long discharge process.

In June 2010, the UN established a 24-month Interagency Rehabilitation Programme (UNIRP). UNIRP, composed of UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and ILO, was tasked with the transitional rehabilitation of the 2,973 verified minors and 1036 late recruits. UNIRP's main activities included public sensitization and information campaigns and psychosocial counselling. Rehabilitation packages further provided VMLR's with 4 socio-economic reintegration options: vocational skills training, micro-enterprises, education and health training. UNICEF oversaw the tracing, formal education, psychosocial support and community based peacebuilding activities to support the social-reintegration of VMLRs. For the late recruits, UNDP provided vocational skills training, micro-enterprises and non-formal education; UNFPA covered the planning and delivery of Health Related Vocational Training and Education packages and also took a lead role in identifying and addressing gender specific issues. ILO focused on enhancing the capacity of UNDP's implementing partners to provide the vocational training and to improve their skills for conducting labour market assessments

Falling under "conflict prevention and reconciliation" under the PBF's Priority Plan for Nepal,⁵³ the PBF-supported three DDR-related programmes for the rehabilitation of VMLR in Nepal.

Table 4: DDR activities in Nepal 2007-2011

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET (US\$)	TIMELINE	UN AGENCIES
Programme Support for Children and Adolescents Formerly Associated with the Maoist Army in Nepal (PBF/NPL/B-2)	622,969	Mar 09 - Mar 10	UNICEF
Support to Female Members of the Maoist Army (PBF/NPL/B-2)	224,614	Mar 09 - Dec 10	UNFPA
Monitoring, reporting and response to conflict related child rights violations (PBF/NPL/E-2)	2,332,421	Apr 10 - Dec 11	OHCHR UNICEF
TOTAL	3,180,004		

PBF contributions in Nepal focused specifically on children and women. Indeed, seventy four per cent (74 per cent) of the VMLR in the cantonment sites were children below the age of 18 at the time of their initial verification, of which 30 per cent were girls or young women. Therefore, the DDR of VMLR required that particular attention be given to child- and gender-specific needs. As highlighted in table 5, PBF projects focused on the discharge of children, support to females in the Maoist Cantonments, including VMLR, for health and reproductive services and support for the monitoring of CAAFAG.

The project on discharge of minors had as its primary objective "to support the overall peace process in Nepal through the promotion of the rights of children and youth who have been affected by the conflict". Its activities led to the successful discharge and socio-economic reintegration of the 2,973 verified minors through for formal education and psychosocial support. In partnership with the CAAFAG Working Group—a network UNICEF estab-

⁵² Office of the High Commission for Human Rights (OHCHR), UN Population Fund (UNFPA), UNDP, UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) and United Nations Mission in Nepal (UNMIN).

⁵³ The PBF Priority Plan for Nepal covered the 12-month period of 2008 to a total of US\$ 10 million. The Priority Plan outlines the following priorities for PBF support: 1. Strengthen state capacity to sustain peace for accelerated recovery in areas where there is a serious risk of future conflict; 2. Foster the accelerated recovery of groups, or areas, where the risk of conflict is heightened specifically addressing women and member of traditionally marginalised groups; 3. Support local communities, including through women's groups, to mitigate the risk of increasing armed violence including the proliferation of small arms, and diffuse tensions over specific issues that could result in conflict; 4. Leverage UN's comparative advantage vis-à-vis other actors. PBF thus supported "DDR" related activities by supporting rehabilitation under the heading of "Conflict prevention and Reconciliation" and focused on women and children. PBF Priority Plan for Nepal, pp.5-6 <www.unpbf.org/docs/Nepal_PBF_Priority_Plan.pdf>.

lished in 2006 comprising UN, international and national NGOs⁵⁴—the project activities additionally encouraged and promoted community engagement in the social-reintegration of VMLRs.

Given the high number of women VMLR and the lack of reproductive services available to them, the PBF funded project “support to female members of the Maoist army” enabled UNFPA to recruit and place gynaecologists in the cantonment sites and to undertake measures to improve the conditions of reproductive health services in the sites. During the discharge process, the support enabled social workers to be made available to accompany female VMLRs, to counsel family members, if needed, and to provide women with referrals for their reproductive health needs.

OHCHR and UNICEF undertook the project “Monitoring, reporting and response to conflict related child rights violations”, as mandated by Security Council resolutions 1612 and 1882 on rights of the child. The project strengthened the national capacity to monitor and report on the discharge and rehabilitation process of minors and ongoing violations of children’s rights. The project extended support for informally or self-released CAAFAG and other children affected by armed conflict. UNICEF, with the help of the CAAFAG Working Group, also sought to locate the 1,130 verified minors who were absent during the discharge process.

⁵⁴ CAAFAG (Children Associated with Armed Forces and Armed Groups) Working Group comprises of UN agencies: UNFPA, WFP; INGOs (Save the Children, IRC, ICRC, Search for Common Ground, PLAN, CARE, and TPO); and national NGOs. The National Human Rights Commission, UNMIN and OHCHR are observers.

4. CONTRIBUTIONS OF PBF-DDR SUPPORT TOWARDS PEACEBUILDING (CAR, DRC AND NEPAL)

4.1 Supporting implementation of peace processes

All of the projects helped to fulfill the peace agreements and contribute to the peace process itself. DDR was well grounded in the peace agreements of CAR. Even though the DDR process in CAR faced several critical delays, spates of renewed violence and where several pending challenges remain, especially with respect to reintegration, PBF contributions: enabled a stronger preparatory phase of DDR, were catalytic in initiating child DDR, and helped the DDR planning reflect the content of the IDDRS into DDR planning.

In Nepal, the VMLR were identified for rehabilitation in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the Agreement on Monitoring of the Management of Arms and Armies. The PBF-supported projects did not directly unblock the delays to the discharge of the VMLR; however, they helped enable the UN to best prepare the systems and structures to support the process once the discharge was granted. Notice of the discharge was sudden and came with a 40-day window for the UN to complete the discharge process and commencing rehabilitation of the VMLR was to follow suit. The programme preparations thus proved to be essential to providing as smooth, sustainable and consistent of a process as possible in the complex environment.

In the DRC, the Ihusi Accord established for the treatment of CNDP's war wounded. The government was slow in delivering assistance to the war wounded and frustrations among them were rising. The PBF funding allowed for this project to take form and fulfill the commitment of the Ihusi Accord. The ex-combatants were not included in the Lusaka Peace Agreement, instead the Community Recovery and Reintegration Programme (CRRP) was undertaken at the request of the government and thus the project still played a critical complementary role to the national DDR process.

Despite the support for DDR as part of the peace process implementation, as noted earlier in this review and evident in the case studies, the inclusion of DDR in the peace agreements is often insufficient and the minimal requirements, according to the IDDRS, for DDR are in place.

4.2 Security

Each of the PBF-supported projects has helped to promote security in the respective case study countries, particularly in the DRC and CAR. The caseload of ex-combatants in the DRC posed a high security risk. Prior to the DRC's Community Recovery and Reintegration Programme (CRRP), the ex-combatants were known for committing armed robbery and extortion. The level of this type of crime has reportedly decreased since the programme began.⁵⁵ The community-matching approach of the CRRP targeted other vulnerable community members, including high-risk youths, and helping at least in principle (given the lack of data for substantive evidence) to prevent them from turning to armed groups or resorting to crime.

Also in the DRC, wounded members of the CNDP had no other means for income or food and becoming notorious for stealing, committing other forms of violence and banditry. In the Masisi Territory, their frustration led to their barricading routes. Immediately after the project began and the wounded combatants were removed, the barricades in Masisi lifted. The Minister of Interior in eastern DRC noted that only a year ago there was no animal husbandry in Masisi, and "one would not pass there after daylight, and you certainly wouldn't spend the night. You can now, it's safer".⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Group interview with CRRP implementing partners (IOM, CARITAS, CARE, CARE International, ETN), Goma, 20 July 2011.

⁵⁶ Minister of Interior for eastern DRC, Goma, 19 July 2011 (Quotation translated from French)

The same effect was evident throughout the region.⁵⁷ The project addressing the war wounded was thus catalytic in removing the barricades around Masisi and bringing greater stability to the areas where the wounded CNDP were based. The doctors participating in the project noted that it had a positive impact on the morale of the military and their families and helped in building their confidence in the government and state more broadly.

Unfortunately, the fact that only the war wounded from CNDP benefited from that project created frustration among other armed groups. These groups have responded with volatility, setting up barricades. The important lesson being to discourage projects that favour one group over another and to ensure that adequate communication and outreach is extended informing other combatants of when and how they might receive similar support.

In CAR, armed groups were becoming impatient; having already begun assembling under the promise of DDR in the peace agreement. The rapid investment in the preparatory phase of the DDR had an early positive impact on security. Seeing the creation of the DDR Steering Committee and the sensitization and verification activities that followed raised hopes among ex-combatants that the DDR process would begin in earnest, which led to a reduction of violence in conflict areas,⁵⁸ though spates of insecurity continued through to the lead up to the elections and until the DD component of the operations itself began.⁵⁹ The fact that the ex-combatants had already begun assembling even before the DDR strategy was agreed added urgency to beginning the DDR. However, as is often the case with DDR processes, the gap between launching the process and commencing the DD also bred frustration. Labour-intensive reinsertion projects could thus have proven useful in maintaining stability in the interim period.

The three projects in Nepal, promoted the safety and security of women and children. UNFPA ensured that the basic needs of women were met in the cantonment sites and that special arrangements were made during the rehabilitation phase to ensure the safety of minors and women who would have to commute long distances for their education and training. The third project oversaw the protection of children and monitored child-rights violations. In CAR, the two PBF-supported projects removed children from the armed groups and focused on preventing their (re-) recruitment into armed groups. Also, the early stability that accompanied the launch of the DDR process in CAR, helped to provide an increased sense of security among women. Several women's testimonies in Bocaranga in CAR highlight that they feel safer traveling to market or working in their fields without the fear of being extorted or raped by the APRD armed group.⁶⁰

4.3 Peace dividends

4.3.1 Socio-economic revitalization

DDR and related activities promotes economic revitalization most evidently by promoting socio-economic reintegration of ex-combatants. In the case studies, ex-combatants benefited from vocational training and start-up kits for micro-enterprise and trades such as mechanics and tailors, in agriculture, animal husbandry and health services, etc The community-matching approach adopted in the CRRP, in the education option for minors in Nepal and for the reintegration options of minors in CAR provided a wider footprint of economic revitalization and benefit for the communities.

In addition to helping ex-combatants engage in markets and services, reintegration provided economic dividends to communities at large. For instance, in DRC, the purchase of a mill in one initiative benefited the whole community, as there became an increased production of grain. Likewise the soap-making activity of a solidarity group in Uvira, DRC, led to the availability of more affordable soap for the community. Similarly, under the UNIRP programme in Nepal, the health service training reintegration option, which aimed to give especially women government-accredited professional training as an Auxiliary Nurse Midwife and Community Health Worker, heeded Nepal's high demand for health workers, both within the public and private sectors.

⁵⁷ UNDP, Minister of Interior for eastern DRC, also noted in Vlassenroot, K. Hoebeke, H. & Risch, L. Multipart: Country Study Paper. EGMONT - Royal Institute for International Relations. December 03 2009. P.24-26.

⁵⁸ Interviews with diplomats and donor representatives in Bangui, July 2011.

⁵⁹ Interviews with diplomats and donor representatives in Bangui, July 2011.

⁶⁰ Interview with IRC Protection staff, Bocaranga, July 2011.

The increased security situation, which DDR promoted particularly in DRC and CAR also contributed to the freedom of movement and thus return of economic activity in certain areas. Following the removal of wounded CNDP, the increased security situation in the region and subsequent opening of the barricaded routes facilitated the redeployment of the administrative authorities and security forces in the areas.

In Bocaranga, CAR, the early stability that accompanied the launch of the DDR process led to the lifting of barriers held by the armed group APRD; and an increase in the number of people attending weekly markets in Bocaranga (some travelling up to 10km) as well as an increase in commercial exchange with traders travelling through from Chad and northern CAR; and the re-building of agriculture and animal husbandry activities. Children who were inserted into existing collectives with other adults (as part of the agriculture and animal husbandry option) shared in the profits of collectives and thus generally fared better than the children who had to compete alone in more competitive markets such as for tailoring.

The community-matching approach to the projects also produced several social dividends. By engaging the communities in the process, and having the ex-combatants and other vulnerable groups work side by side, the CRRP (DRC), UNIRP's education option of the VMLR (Nepal) and the child DDR (CAR) managed to help reduce some of the stigma associated with being an ex-combatant. It also mitigated the typical frustration of non-combatants that the ex-combatants are being rewarded for their part in the conflict as community members also benefited.

Implementing partners and beneficiaries of the CRRP and the CAR's child DDR provided testimonies that there is a notable difference in the attitudes and behaviours of the ex-combatants. For instance, solidarity groups were established under the CRRP, which consisted of both ex-combatants and other vulnerable group beneficiaries. Working closely together, ex-combatants learned how to better engage with others in a non-military fashion, how to live differently and to appreciate a normal civilian life.⁶¹ By the end of the CRRP a significant percentage of ex-combatants and the other community beneficiaries were providing mutual assistance, had formed alliances and pooled their money and set up a credit system.

In Nepal, the CAAFAG Working Group, which UNICEF had previously established in 2006 and was a beneficiary of the PBF support, established mechanisms that brought VMLR and communities together (such as youth clubs, trained psychosocial workers, education and peacebuilding activities). Many of the CAAFAG Network's activities have also benefited broader peacebuilding programmes and communities alike. For instance, VMLRs have engaged in peace building activities that did not specifically target them such as cultural events sports/games, reconciliation meetings, including various types of social activities with local youth clubs and community members. Several VMLR informed the UNIRP implementers that these events were the first time they had been able to positively interact with the communities. The peacebuilding activities creatively acted as an entry point to approach some VMLR who were not enrolled in any of the packages.⁶² Overall, the events contributed to:

- Setting VMLR free from the chain of command;
- Changing communities' negative perceptions against those who are "disqualified", especially women, because such interventions are conducted in a way to ensure mutual respect for all;
- Making VMLR feel that they are accepted;
- Promoting mutual understanding between VMLR and community members through repeated interactions;
- Harmonizing highly politicized communities;
- Facilitating interpersonal skills of participants; and
- Employment of VMLR in some cases by promoting interaction between VMLR and community members.⁶³

⁶¹ Group interview with CRRP implementing partners (IOM, CARITAS, CARE, CARE International, ETN), Goma 20 July 2011.

⁶² Interagency Programming Mission Report, UN Interagency Rehabilitation Programme, February 2011, pp. 15-16.

⁶³ Interagency Programming Mission Report, UN Interagency Rehabilitation Programme, February 2011, pp. 15-16.

In CAR, the PBF-supported child DDR saw the creation of RECOPEs, which promote community resilience. The networks are typically composed of a village chief, religious leader, woman leader, teacher, representative of the parent-teacher association, and a child elected by his/her peers. Having received training from the programme, RECOPEs aim to promote child protection through community-level sensitization on such issues such as rights of the child, protection, domestic violence and its impact on children and sexual violence, etc. They were also tasked with looking after vulnerable and orphaned children. An implementing partner notes that the CAAFAG have found their place in their villages again and that there is now a feeling of equality between the ex-CAAFAG and other children.

Also in CAR, the information and sensitization campaigns conducted by the Government as part of the preparatory phase of DDR helped engage and build the confidence of the population living in conflict-affected areas in the political process. Apart from the symbolic impact of the visit and the information provided on the upcoming DDR process, the sensitization campaigns provided a key forum for representatives of the government, politico-military groups and the population at large to discuss their perceptions of the peace process and the Inclusive Political Dialogue.

4.4. Value-added of PBF funding in overcoming DDR challenges.

PBF aims to support projects that are financially and process catalytic. Certainly, the case studies provide some examples as to where this is the case. However, the PBF support has proved most valuable in filling funding gaps. CAR and Nepal in particular faced significant funding challenges due to donors' lack of confidence in the DDR process and the inability of other donors to take risks on helping to move DDR processes along. Donors typically do not fund preparatory activities, training and 'process' as these items are not associated with tangible outputs despite the necessity of this type of work to lay the foundation for other activities.⁶⁴ The flexibility of the PBF (and in this case the UN Fund for Peacebuilding in Nepal (UNFPN) enabled the UN to support preparatory work of DDR. In Nepal, this led to a more coordinated UN delivery-as-one approach to the DDR activities. For UNICEF in Nepal, the PBF support allowed them to participate on a level footing in the early planning of the activities, when typically UNICEF is often only involved after much of the overall DDR planning has taken place.

UN partners, particularly in DRC and Nepal, positively cited how the PBF's flexibility enabled them to better tailor their projects and programmes according to the needs on the ground compared to other funding mechanisms. In DDR, it is often difficult to anticipate the actual numbers of individuals who will present themselves for DDR, with numbers of weapons or ex-combatants presenting themselves being higher or lower than anticipated. The circumstances or context surrounding the DDR may also change, affecting the resources available or required for the project/programme. For many donors, the details of the project and how the spending will be done is fixed in specific deliverables and outputs. In DRC, UNICEF noted that they did not have accurate early figures of the number of children in the armed forces and thus had to adjust their interventions accordingly. The leeway in PBF project proposals allowed for greater flexibility, thus allowing them to best meet the evolving needs on the ground.

Likewise, in Nepal, the rehabilitation interventions were devised often on an ad hoc basis as the government and Maoist Party imposed several restrictions on the rehabilitation of VMLR. Such restrictions, including: imposing a funding ceiling on rehabilitation costs per combatant; restricting the amount of public awareness and sensitization that could be undertaken; and limiting access to sites where needs profiling could take place, hindered the UN's ability to plan and tailor interventions according to needs. UN partners in Nepal thus noted that the flexibility of the PBF (and UNFPN) was essential in allowing for the interventions to meet the needs on the ground.

Given that PBF financial contributions are relatively low compared to some of the larger DDR donors, the PBF has demonstrated itself to be particularly suited to filling gaps within or falling outside of DDR interventions, particularly with respect to supporting high-risk, vulnerable or excluded ex-combatants. In DRC, the PBF-supported projects that addressed high-risk individuals who were left out of the national DDR programmes, both as ex-combatants or because they were wounded in the conflict and unable to participate in the DDR. In Nepal, the PBF focused specifically on children and women, which made up a large percentage of the VMLR and who had specific needs that were not otherwise accounted for. In CAR, the PBF funding enabled support to child ex-combatants within a broader approach to addressing vulnerable children and women.

⁶⁴ Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict [A/63/881-S/2009/304], 11 June 2009. pp.14&25.

4.5 Gaps and challenges in PBF-supported projects

4.5.1 Funding gaps

While the PBF helped fill a gap for implementing the CRRP project in the DRC, the project still faced a significant funding shortfall to the detriment of the project's full implementation. The shortfall prevented the project from equally matching ex-combatants and other vulnerable groups as planned thus having a smaller ratio of community beneficiaries. The fact that other vulnerable groups were included in the project and the project's overall contribution to community development, it should have enabled funds from other sectors, including from within the PBF, to come on board in a cross-sectoral approach.

Indeed, DDR often faces criticism for not sufficiently linking up substantively and programmatically with national and/or UN programmes on the ground in such areas as SSR, transitional justice, rule of law, armed violence reduction and economic. It would be, therefore, useful to see how both the DDR community and the PBF could help bridge the financial and programmatic linkages and build coherence between DDR and other sectors.

Similar criticisms are made regarding DDR engagement on national programmes that address cross-cutting issues in the areas of health, education, disability, youth and children, HIV, gender, natural resource management and reconciliation.⁶⁵ As pointed out in the annexed DRC case study, there is a marked absence of funding for gender-based programmes that target masculinity. PBF has funded several interventions focusing on women, however, targeting masculinity in DDR programmes, including campaigns for male ex-combatants on the prevention of sexual and gender-based violence, is particularly essential as male dynamics towards women in armed groups can be typically aggressive and domineering. Women have often reported that they do not see a change in the male attitudes towards women after the males have been reintegrated.⁶⁶

Overall, the speed and flexibility of the PBF's IRF is well positioned to promote stronger and more detailed representation of DDR in the dialogue of peace agreements, to fund urgent reinsertion programmes and fill other systematic gaps between the DD and R. As the sequencing of DD is generally much faster than R, the planning and design of DDR consequently may be out of synch. This is especially the case for organizations that otherwise only engage later in the DDR processes, after much of the broader planning has taken place. Therefore, the speed of the IRF in dispensing funds could be of particular value in supporting process-oriented mechanisms that promote multi-agency coordination early in the DDR planning process. Furthermore, occasion and circumstance may see the need to undertake immediate reinsertion or reintegration programmes, which may or may not link directly to DD.

The PRF, on the other hand could find additional niches in: promoting the sustainability of the DDR process; filling financial gaps that inhibit or force reintegration programmes to scale down the scope of the project, particularly if it prevents or hinders a community-matching component or draws resources away from optimally addressing cross-cutting issues. It also would usefully promote transitional linkages to economic recovery and livelihood programmes. Another niche area for the PRF could be to focus directly on local level capacity-building of civil society networks and mechanisms in the early stages of DDR. As many local partners focus on several different beneficiaries from different programmes, such local level capacity-building could thus serve to strengthen the linkages between DDR and other sectoral programmes at the grassroots level. The PBF could also be used to complementarily inject additional peacebuilding related activities throughout the DDR process to facilitate the strengthening of linkages between the two sectors.

4.5.2 Multi-agency coordination

Another aim of the PBF is to support coordinated UN approaches and multi-agency engagement. The cases of CAR and Nepal have polar opposite experiences in this regard. In Nepal, the delays in the programme and the investment in planning the rehabilitation during the delays led to a very well coordinated, UN delivery-as-one approach to the activities, which is widely perceived as being one of the most positive results coming from the funding arrangements for the activities. In contrast, although the DDR in CAR faced a similar duration of delays and the PBF funding was used to support the preparation of the DDR in a number of ways, the UN has received criticism related

⁶⁵ The State of Reintegration 2010, Inter-Agency Working Group on DDR, forthcoming, p.31.

⁶⁶ Interview with the Congo Men's Network, Goma, 20 July 2011.

to integration and mission-UN Country Team relations in preparing the Adult DDR, which reportedly only recently improved as a result of a recent (2011) SSR/DDR Assessment and renewed inter-agency commitments. Further, the phase II of the Child DDR project is intended to be multi-agency, however, observers on the ground highlight that the agencies have been working independently of one another. It may thus be useful for the PBSO and DDR community to review in greater depth the challenges of multi-agency coordination and how the PBF could be used more concertedly as an instrument for fostering inter-agency coordination.

4.5.3 Sustainability

Achieving sustainability of peacebuilding results poses a unique challenge for DDR, given the precise parameters of DDR interventions and the important symbolism of ending DDR as countries move further along the peace process.⁶⁷ However, implementing partners in all of the cases expressed concern over the short-duration of the support coming from the programmes. In DRC and Nepal, for instance, many of the micro-enterprises will have just been getting off the ground by the end of the support, while on the agricultural side, support may end before the beneficiaries reach the harvest season.

In Nepal, some of the minors require more support than is provided through the 2-year duration of the programme. The UNIRP review warned that there could be a high number of drop-outs from the education programmes from those who will not be finished their studies within the 2-year duration of the programme and especially for those who live outside of the home to get their education.

Children in CAR also face the same challenge. The Child DDR programme supported the education of the children for one year, but the majority of families are too poor to continue the schooling beyond this. Some RECOPEs managed to provide additional help for primary school children (which were in the village), however they could not extend support for the students to attend the secondary schools further away. The justification for the second phase of the PBF project Child-DDR project was to address the fragile socio-economic environment into which ex-CAAFAG were reintegrated during the first phase, however the activities of the second-phase reportedly are not specifically addressing some of the key sustainability challenges.

Further on the issue of sustainability, RECOPEs had received support for a one-year period and many now struggle with raising funds to sustain their support services. While RECOPEs are expected to carve out their own means for sustainability, the short-term support of the programmes may not be enough to give the beneficiaries sufficient opportunities to make the best of the support they received. RECOPEs that are not included in the phase II of the Child DDR project will not be able to continue to provide the same level of community support as when they were first created and risk disappearing.

These challenges emphasize the broader value and need for ensuring there is an adequate and sustainable exit strategy in place to link the reintegration programmes into more sustainable recovery and development programmes.

4.5.4 Gap between DD and R and alternative sequencing

As highlighted above, DDR often faces gaps between the immediate implementation of DD and reintegration for a range of reasons from financial to political to also the time needed for planning and preparation of multi-year reintegration programmes. DDR in CAR faced significant delays between the launching of the DDR process and implementation of the DD. It is also likely to face serious delays between the completion of DD and the commencement of R. This disconnect can pose grave problems for the fluidity and complementarity of the DDR process. Local civil society groups in CAR warn that, given the current atmosphere among the ex-combatants and their continued ties to their armed group's chain of command, the ex-combatants could return to the armed groups if there are significant delays in the process or if the reintegration packages are not adequate.

Given the PBF's capacity to rapidly disperse funds through the IRF, PBF could consider funding labour-intensive and other reinsertion projects that have proven beneficial as stop gap measures in such DDR contexts as Côte

⁶⁷ The Government of DRC's objections to reintegrating newly identified residual combatants is based on its wish to demonstrate to the country that DDR is complete and that there are no more ex-combatants that could potentially pose a risk to the country. While seen as premature in DRC, the symbolism of ending DDR is significant for moving a state further along the peace process.

d'Ivoire, DRC and Liberia as a bridge to longer-term reintegration. Such measures could have proven useful during the delays that occurred such as in CAR between the launch of the DDR process and the commencement of DD and between the DD and R.

The DPKO report, *Second Generation*, further highlights that occasion and circumstance may mean that not all the components of DDR may be necessary, or that certain components could be implemented earlier, such as reinsertion or reintegration as a way to encourage DDR. In CAR, the long delays between the launch and commencement of DD could have been a useful opportunity to undertake certain reinsertion projects as a way to stabilize/maintain security leading up through the elections.⁶⁸

4.5.5 Local capacity

The PBF requires that its supported projects provide capacity-building for the local or national governments and local civil society. All of the projects reviewed in this case study provide at least some degree of training on substantive thematic issues, project and financial management, monitoring and evaluation, information technology, etc.

In certain instances, local partners require less capacity-building under the PBF-supported project as they have previously worked with the UN partner and received the same or similar capacity-building as before. In other instances, however, such as for dealing with the adult VMLR in Nepal, the capacity did not exist in advance. UNIRP was given less than two months to train counselors and to develop orientation tools and the implementing partners had difficulty managing the particular needs and sensitivities of the caseloads.⁶⁹ The existence and capacity of the CAAFAG Working Group, established prior to the UNIRP programme, gave UNICEF an edge over the other agencies and mechanisms in Nepal for dealing with these challenges. It could thus be useful for PBF to support DDR practitioners in mapping out partners and their respective capacities in the early planning or preparatory stages of DDR and to build up their respective capacities, networks and mechanisms before or even outside of the reintegration programmes. Even if there were delays or suspensions in the DDR programme, support for the local level civil society would benefit all sectors and services.

⁶⁸ *Second Generation Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) practices in peace operations*; Department of Peacekeeping Operations, New York: 2010, p. 23

⁶⁹ *Interagency Programming Mission Report, UN Interagency Rehabilitation Programme*, February 2011, p.7.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Findings

Financially, the contributions of the PBF are relatively small in comparison to the costs of DDR and PBF's overall allocations to a country. It is difficult to judge what the state of the DDR process would have been had the PBF assistance not been made available, however, the results of the case studies cast little doubt of the relevance and value of the PBF projects in meeting both DDR and peacebuilding objectives.

At some level, all of the PBF-supported projects reported dividends in the areas of security, economic revitalization and seeing a change in the attitudes and behaviours of not only ex-combatants but also within hosting communities towards ex-combatants. Peacebuilding activities have helped the DDR community identify ex-combatants who are not enrolled in a programme and are a useful platform for positively promoting and providing outreach for DDR. Peacebuilding activities create opportunities where ex-combatants and community members positively interact together, promoting social cohesion and reconciliation.

Even in CAR, where several delays have undermined the programme, spates of violence surfaced and funding for reintegration remains uncertain, the PBF support for the preparatory phase ensured that the strategies developed and process as a whole reflected the content of IDDRS and that the DDR process remained present despite the delays. In Nepal, despite several government and Maoists restrictions, the PBF support ensured that special needs of women were accommodated and the CAAFAG Working Group undertook several peacebuilding activities for the VMLR and receiving communities. It is thus important not to measure the success and effectiveness of the individual PBF interventions based on the success of DDR process itself.⁷⁰

The DDR activities in the case studies also produced benefits that extended beyond the immediate beneficiaries of ex-combatants, with communities benefiting from the economic and social dividends of DDR, such as:

- Reintegration benefits were matched with other beneficiaries deemed as vulnerable community members;
- Micro-enterprises developed that improve the basic provision of nutritional or hygienic needs of a community (e.g., grain mills, soap);
- Professional training provided to build national capacity in the delivery of health services;
- Capacity-building and the provision of equipment (e.g., military hospital in DRC) that strengthened overall national capacities and services that will be useful beyond the closing of DDR projects;
- Community networks such as the solidarity groups, CAAFAG Network and RECOPEs established or supported, which helped to promote social cohesion and reconciliation.

This review finds that the PBF has a particular value in filling gaps in DDR programming, particularly:

- Financial gaps: funding critical parts of the programme that require additional funds (e.g., reintegration), or to 'jump start' critical activities.
- DD and R gap/stop-gap measures: funding reinsertion projects, labour-intensive projects, community/dual targeting projects that aim to minimize the gap or serve as a temporary stop-gap measure between DD and R.

⁷⁰ In Côte d'Ivoire, the PBF also funded the 1000 micro-projects reinsertion project. Conflict resumed in the country following the elections in early 2011. It is difficult to say if the micro-projects had an impact on controlling in some way the levels of violence that ensued or in paving the way for a quicker return to stability as the conflict was resolving. Nevertheless, the project itself is widely seen to have been successful and the implementers believe it may have had an impact on reigning in the violence and restoring the peace as quickly as it did.

- Caseload gap: supporting marginal caseloads in the DDR programme that would be otherwise left out, for example women associated with armed forces or groups, children associated with armed forces or groups, wounded fighters and groups that entered the DDR process late or were left out of national DDR processes.

BOX 3: Selected promising practices

Central African Republic

- The DDR Steering Committee and the local DDR committees brought the government and armed groups together in a consensus-based forum, which helped build confidence in the DDR process.
- International agreements on children usefully helped move Child-DDR along, which also opened a point of entry for building the capacity of local networks on child protection and for donors to build up contacts and relationships with the armed groups, beneficial for adult DDR.
- Establishing inclusive Community Networks for Child Protection raised awareness on child protection issues across the communities and created a supportive and esteemed local mechanism for children.
- Children inserted into existing collectives with other adults (agriculture and animal husbandry option) generally fared better than children who were left to compete in more competitive already established markets e.g., tailoring.
- Approach used for the DD is considered to be light and mobile. The technology and methodology adopted, particularly for data-gathering, was suitable for such a large country with poor infrastructure, and is easily replicable.

Democratic Republic of the Congo

- Solidarity groups and community/village councils created a community support network for the beneficiaries and helped promote social cohesion.
- Projects such as the building of a mill and soap-making enterprise directly benefited the communities as a whole.
- The flexibility in allowing ex-combatants to adjust their socio-economic reintegration and invest in other side projects, gave them a chance to be innovative and entrepreneurial.

Nepal

- The funding arrangement was conducive to promoting a coordinated delivery-as-one approach to the VMLR.
- Other projects, for instance the late recruits, were able to benefit from the mechanisms and structures set up under CAAFAG and UNICEF.
- Peacebuilding activities (sporting events, concerts, etc.) attracted ex-combatants who had left or not engaged in any of the programmes, and could now be identified and receive outreach on the DDR.
- Flexibility to tailor programmes and designate resources to the specific needs of women and girls, including additional benefits and flexibility within packages to accommodate pregnant women and mothers (such as being able to board near their programme instead of having to commute, childcare and nutritional support, and allowing for greater flexibility of absences for mothers of young children) is necessary in order to give the women and girls the opportunity to stay committed to the programme.
- The health service training reintegration option, which aimed to give especially women government-accredited professional training as an Auxiliary Nurse Midwife and Community Health Worker, heeded Nepal's high demand for health workers, both within the public and private sectors.

Based on the findings of this review, the following recommendations are presented below.

5.2 Recommendations

1. Establish concrete actions for ensuring DDR ‘process’, planning and preparations are aligned with peacebuilding priorities

The DDR process ranges from dealing with DDR in the negotiation of peace agreements, through programme planning and design, implementation and closure. Each component requires human and financial investment; the lack of which can have a serious impact on the subsequent or parallel aspects of the programme and of its concrete contributions to peacebuilding. The planning and preparation of DDR must be conflict sensitive, cognizant of conflict drivers and consider how to achieve key peacebuilding results from design to programme closing.

- The PBF should consider funding inclusive DDR dialogues that both serve as entry points for reconciliation and as vehicles for developing multi-year, inter-agency, country-specific frameworks for reintegration, as recommended by the Secretary-General’s Policy Committee. Such PBF support would encourage the creation of catalytic “One UN” approaches to resource mobilization, as well as multi-sectoral reintegration frameworks that provide viable transition options for the final stages of DDR processes.
- DDR practitioners should factor in conflict analysis prepared in the framework of peacebuilding and be aligned with country PBF Priority Plans; involve key actors from other peacebuilding sectors in the planning and preparation of DDR; plan reinsertion and reintegration activities that are conducive to achieving peacebuilding results and agree in the planning phase of how peacebuilding is included in DDR M&E.
- Peacebuilding and DDR practitioners should consider in conflict and risk analysis and needs assessments potential new threats that emerge and become conflict drivers as a result of challenges in/obstacles to the DDR process.

2. Address obstacles that hinder timing and sequencing of DDR

The sequencing of DDR interventions is difficult, particularly for reintegration to begin immediately after DD or, as in other cases, if aspects of DDR must be undertaken simultaneously or prior to DD being undertaken. Sequencing difficulties are compounded by gaps in funding; dependence on significant voluntary funding within a tight time frame; and political, security and institutional delays in the process. Obstacles to the timing and sequencing of DDR can have serious implications for peacebuilding, including leading to potential new destabilizing threats for not only the DDR but also the country itself.

- PBF support for DDR may require rapid investment, especially to undertake reinsertion as a temporary stopgap before reintegration or to compensate for delays in the DDR.
- PBF is a flexible fund, and this flexibility for DDR should be safeguarded so that DDR can be adapted and tailored according to changes in context, overcoming unforeseen challenges and obstacles and adjusting for alternate sequencing.
- UN should promote the development of trust funds, such as the UNFPN, with a view to promoting multi-agency programmes and that allow the flexibility demonstrated in PBF funding.
- UN should strengthen their mechanisms, with PBF support when possible, for fostering integrated multi-agency approaches to DDR. It should be recognized that PBF funding could also generate increased multi-agency coordination.

3. Strengthen capacities that can promote peacebuilding results in DDR programming

It is often difficult for DDR practitioners to have the full/sufficient profile of the beneficiaries and the contexts and capacities to where the beneficiaries are returning, etc. DDR interventions must be flexible to quickly tailor or adjust programmes according to needs and evolving conditions on the ground.

- PBF support is already flexible and this flexibility should be systematically maintained, however, the UN should seek to find alternative means for pooling resources that can be used in a flexible manner, such as in a trust fund.
- DDR practitioners should strengthen their partnerships and relationships with other sectors on the ground so as to minimize duplication of efforts in such areas as conflict and needs assessments and market analysis, etc., and to undertake peacebuilding activities that promote social cohesion with other vulnerable groups and communities at large.

There is often a lack of local capacity on the ground, particularly in rural areas, to be able to meet the particular challenges associated with dealing with ex-combatants.

- PBF should encourage projects that build up the capacity of local networks and mechanisms that could be used to support/include ex-combatants in their scope.
- DDR local implementing partners should systematically receive training in conflict sensitive programming, reconciliation, trainer-training on conflict mediation and reporting on peacebuilding results.
- DDR practitioners should promote stronger and broader partnerships to promote and build the capacity of existing networks, working groups and mechanisms such as the CAAFAG Working Group in Nepal, that promote their sustainability and transition beyond DDR.
- UN should invest, and PBF support as appropriate, in local level capacity-building that serves to strengthen the linkages between DDR and other sectoral programmes at the grass-roots level, with a particular emphasis on rural capacities.

4. Promote the sustainability of peacebuilding results in DDR

Even though it can be difficult to determine when an ex-combatant has been adequately reintegrated, DDR has a defined beginning and end. The symbolism of a successfully completed DDR programme is critical towards preventing a relapse into conflict and for moving a state further along the peace process spectrum. However, the limited time frame of reintegration is often too short for the beneficiaries of reintegration programmes to make a stable transition from DDR to broader national development and economic recovery or, in the case of children, to complete their formal education. The benefits of DDR should be evident even after the DDR process has ended and should promote longer-term dividends for peacebuilding.

- DDR practitioners should plan DDR in a manner that promotes transitional linkages between reintegration to longer-term, non-DDR development and assistance.
- DDR practitioners should re-evaluate conflict analysis and drivers including the peacebuilding and other relevant sectors, upon changes in DDR context.
- PBF should consider funding tracking or M&E initiatives, led by national institutions, that would be able to track the impacts of an entire DDR process, including peacebuilding impacts, rather than individual projects or programme components.
- PBF should support the sustainability of some of the local structural mechanisms or networks built during the programme that can have a lasting effect within a community.
- The PBF and DDR practitioners should avoid projects that favour one group over another and, if one group receives treatment or benefits before another, there should be adequate investment in extensive communication and outreach in order to inform other combatants of when and how they might receive similar support.
- DDR practitioners should increase the level of attention their programmes give to peacebuilding in the planning and implementation of DDR, including investing more purposefully in community reconciliation

and peacebuilding events and activities that bring ex-combatants and communities together in cultural, music and sporting events and supporting the presence of psychosocial support services at such events.

- DDR planners should seek to increase their planning towards the exit strategies of reintegration programmes, allowing for beneficiaries with special needs to incrementally phase out of the reintegration assistance (e.g., to allow children to complete their education, child-care to allow mothers to work or search for work, etc.). PBF could consider supporting the special needs of these groups to support the closing of reintegration programmes.
- UN should strengthen their partnerships and relationships and PBF should aim to support projects and programmes that promote programmatic linkages between DDR and related issues such as SSR, Transitional Justice, Rule of Law, small arms and light weapons and armed violence reduction, peacebuilding and development.

5. Strengthen the mutual relationship between DDR and wider entities involved in peacebuilding

The mutual relationship between DDR and peacebuilding is evident, however there lacks practical guidance on the subject that would allow DDR and peacebuilding practitioners to tighten and improve the programmatic linkages between the two areas.

- The IAWG should provide strategic guidance on peacebuilding and DDR, particularly with respect to strengthening programmatic planning, identifying potential entry points for interventions that directly promote DDR-peacebuilding priorities, monitoring and evaluating the impact of DDR on peacebuilding, and ensuring that programming is informed by conflict needs assessments that include peacebuilding priorities (or prepared by the peacebuilding sector).
- The PBF should aim to be more proactive in identifying gaps and opportunities to promote peacebuilding in DDR activities and to reach out and inform DDR practitioners of useful opportunities to add concrete peacebuilding elements to their activities.
- UN should conduct periodic inter-agency reviews of DDR similar to the inter-agency review conducted in Nepal (February 2011) and/or multi-sectoral reviews of DDR. This would promote joint programme implementation and review programme coherency and UN delivery as one for DDR.

DDR deals with a specific target group; however, there is often not enough crossover in programming between DDR and other national development, recovery, reconciliation and peacebuilding activities and cross-cutting issues

- UN should aim to plan community-matching approaches in the design and planning of reinsertion and reintegration and link DDR more with community recovery and development. Similarly, PBF support should help to fill funding gaps that will enable community-matching initiatives or that ensure cross-cutting issues are adequately addressed in the programmes.
- DDR practitioners should increase, and PBF should support, their gender programming to include opportunities for addressing masculinity and male-centered prevention programmes of sexual and gender-based violence, ensure that the needs of women associated with armed forces and groups, HIV/AIDS and other potentially marginalized groups are included in DDR programmes.

ANNEX 1

Methodology of DDR Thematic Review

The review was conducted over the three-month period of June, July and August in 2011. The review team's main goal was to focus on three case studies in particular: Central African Republic (CAR), Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Nepal. Two specific countries were selected for conducting field research: DRC and CAR. Given limitations in time and budget, and the fact that practitioners had only recently undertaken separate reviews of DDR and peacebuilding in Nepal prior to instigating this thematic review,⁷¹ it was agreed that the research for Nepal would consist of desk research and telephone interviews. Case study selection was based on the diversity of the DDR context of the cases:

- DRC has an active peacekeeping mission while the peacekeeping mission in CAR had drawn down by the time DDR commenced and the rehabilitation activities in Nepal were conducted in a non-peacekeeping environment.
- The country selection of Nepal allowed for a degree of geographic diversity given the other two cases take place in Africa.
- The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) activities in DRC focused on a typical reintegration caseload while Nepal the PBF activities focused on vulnerable groups and the PBF activities in CAR focused on the preparatory process for DDR and on implementation of DDR for children.

The PBSO senior consultant, in consultation with the IAWG and consultants hired for the review, prepared the methodological basis for the DDR Thematic Review in accordance with the methods applied throughout the broader Sectoral Review. This included establishing the framework principles for analysing peacebuilding, namely the provision of basic security and peace dividends, building confidence in political processes and building national capacity for conflict management (described in section two). Other specific elements of peacebuilding considered were conflict analysis and assessment of peacebuilding priorities; design and implementation of DDR projects; impact on social cohesion; national ownership; sustainability; comparative advantage; and institutional coordination. It is important to highlight that, for the purposes of this report, the terminology of ex-combatant includes associated groups and dependents.

IAWG members were consulted on the project documents for the DDR Thematic Review, including the specific Terms of Reference for the study, the selection of consultants and where the field case studies would take place. The IAWG also provided comments to the preliminary draft of the review.

⁷¹ Interagency Programming Mission Report, UN Interagency Rehabilitation Programme, February 2011, Independent External Review of the United Nations Peace Fund for Nepal (UNPFN), Organisation Development Centre, Kathmandu: June 2011.

ANNEX 2

Practical linkages between DDR and peacebuilding

Promoting the peace process

DDR-type programmes are very political and are a highly sensitive and visible part of the political process of consolidating peace. The majority of recent peace agreements includes at least some reference to DDR in the negotiations of and content of peace agreements, as encouraged by the IDDRS.⁷² The basic implementation of DDR is thus itself part of fulfilling the commitments of the peace agreements.

In certain instances, such as in Sierra Leone and Liberia, the peace agreements set out the establishment of national DDR commissions. In Mozambique, the general peace agreement established a dedicated commission to address reintegration. Other agreements only partially refer to components of DDR such as disarming and cantonments or the integration of combatants into national armed forces, the latter being closer to SSR than DDR. In the DRC, the peace agreements prioritized integration of the armed groups into the national forces, national reintegration being only for those individuals who were unable to be included for reasons of health, fitness or age. In Nepal, DDR was not specifically included in the peace agreements, however the rehabilitation and reintegration of “disqualified” combatants only (minors and those recruited after the signing of peace agreements) was.

Peace agreements provide the legal framework for DDR, however, important details regarding the terms of DDR, which would help clarify funding, divisions of labour, government control and responsibilities, eligibility criteria, timelines, and sequencing of the programmes, etc, is still generally lacking from the agreements.⁷³ In particular, a comparative study of DDR in peace agreements, the results of which were outlined in a memorandum prepared for the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, observed that the majority of peace agreements and UN peacekeeping mandates failed to address the crucial issue of reintegration.⁷⁴ This omission can have serious programmatic implications, as it could have an impact on delaying the funding and timing of the implementation of reintegration.

DDR and related activities takes place even when it is not included in peace agreements. For instance, the national DDR process in DRC imposed a strict definition of combatant, which left out a large group of individuals who did not qualify for the national programme. It was thus necessary to conduct DDR-related activities for the individuals that had been excluded from the national DDR, as defined in the peace agreements.

Provision of basic security

The objective of DDR processes is to contribute to security and stability in post-conflict environments so that recovery and development can begin.⁷⁵ Thus the effect of DDR in improving security is a key contribution to broader peacebuilding. This effect takes place, firstly, on the politico-military level, where DDR is often a component of peace processes, as noted above. When disarmament is pursued in a proportional manner between different groups, it builds confidence between the parties and addresses the ‘security dilemmas’ that often dominate political agendas in post-conflict situations. On an organizational level the demobilization of armed units dissolves military chains of command and therefore decreases the likelihood and capacity for rapid escalation of hostilities.

⁷² Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) in Peace Agreements and UN Peacekeeping Mandates, Report prepared as a memorandum for the Government Offices of Sweden available on the Government Offices website <www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/06/54/02/24e58930.pdf>.

⁷³ A Framework for Lasting Disarmament, and Reintegration of Former Combatants in Crisis Situations, Workshop Report, International Peace Academy, New York: December 2002, pp.3-4.

⁷⁴ Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) in Peace Agreements and UN Peacekeeping Mandates, Report prepared as a memorandum for the Government Offices of Sweden available on the Government Offices website <www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/06/54/02/24e58930.pdf>.

⁷⁵ United Nations - IDDRS 2.10.

Secondly, DDR contributes to security on a community and individual level by reducing the risk of opportunistic violence and general lawlessness. Ex-combatants⁷⁶ are considered to have a high-risk potential of becoming spoilers of the peace process or committing banditry and other crimes.⁷⁷ Removing weapons from these groups and preventing their aimless return to cities and communities directly contributes to the provision of basic security and stabilization of a country. Further, assistance to reintegrate ex-combatants into civilian life and helping them establish an alternative livelihood helps to minimize the likelihood that the individuals will return to armed groups or participate in criminal activities.

Security, both on the strategic and communal levels, is a basic precondition for peacebuilding. While DDR alone cannot ensure security, one of its main contributions to peacebuilding is found in the provision of basic security, which enables other activities to take place.

Peace dividends

The United Nations and other international actors use the concept of peace dividends to describe timely and tangible deliverables, which in particular contexts can facilitate social cohesion and stability, build trust in the peace process and support the state in earning its legitimacy under challenging conditions.⁷⁸ In protracted conflicts in particular, such as in Burundi, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Sudan, ex-combatants will have lost or missed out on education and livelihood opportunities that would have enabled them to more readily enter into civilian life. After decades of adhering to strict military or rebel structures, often hiding out in harsh conditions and perpetrating and enduring high levels of violence, ex-combatants will lack life skills, such as how to manage their finances and their inter-personal relations with others, including male attitudes towards women. They may be prone to violence and/or have anti-social mindsets and behaviours and/or are dealing with substance abuse and HIV/AIDS or have dependents facing such challenges.

Supporting ex-combatants to overcome such obstacles to become productive political and economic actors helps stimulate peacebuilding opportunities in communities to where ex-combatants return, contributes to the revitalization of economies by supporting economic opportunities for both the ex-combatant and communities, and can foster community resilience against conflict. Linking reintegration in with community-oriented and community security approaches, and preparing communities for the reception of ex-combatants, further promotes social cohesion and reconciliation by fostering economic, social and political equality among ex-combatants and the communities to where they return.

Also, as noted above, DDR contributes to increased security and stability, which allows the resumption of many peacetime economic and social activities that would otherwise not be possible. For example, demobilization of armed groups can reduce the threat of banditry and other predatory practices, which in turn allows the safe movement of people and goods and therefore stimulates commerce. Although DDR is primarily targeted at combatants and associated groups, it can also have indirect beneficial effects for civilian communities.

Root causes of conflict and conflict drivers

Root causes and drivers of conflict widely differ from country to country and can evolve over the course of protracted conflicts. Most typically, the root causes stem from a variation of several factors such as political, economic and social inequalities, poor government services, extreme poverty, economic stagnation, high unemployment, environmental degradation and personal and economic incentives to fight.⁷⁹ While several countries may face similar challenges and do not end up in conflict, it is often the resilience of individuals and communities and the government's capacity to mitigate conflict that prevents these factors from escalating into conflict.

⁷⁶ In this review, the term ex-combatant includes associated groups and dependents.

⁷⁷ Knight, M & Ozerdem, A. Guns, Camps and Cash: disarmament demobilization and Reinsertion of former combatants in transition from war to peace, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 41, n° 4, July 2004, p. 502; Spear, Joanna, From Political Economies of War to Political Economies of Peace: The Contribution of DDR After Wars of Predation, *Contemporary Security Policy* 27, No.1, 2006, p.172-177; de Vries, H. & Wiegink, N. Breaking up and Going Home? Contesting Two Assumptions in the Demobilization and Reintegration of Former Combatants. *International Peacekeeping*, 18(1), 2011, p.40-41.

⁷⁸ Drawn from the UN Thematic Review 'Peace Dividends and Beyond: Contributions of Administrative and Social Services', PBSO - 2011.

⁷⁹ Stewart, Frances. Root Causes of Conflict in developing countries, *British Medical Journal BMJ* Volume 324, p.342-345, 9 February 2002.

The primary guiding principle of the IDDRS is for DDR to “do no harm”. The IDDRS emphasizes that DDR operations must be based on an analysis and awareness of the root causes and nature of the conflict and post-conflict environment.⁸⁰ Specifically, the return of ex-combatants to communities must not aggravate tensions that may surround such issues as land reform, competition over natural resources and cultural and ethnic sensitivities. DDR also has to be careful not to give rise to new tensions by fuelling community perceptions that the ex-combatants are rewarded for their participation in the conflict or that they have impunity against grave violations they may have committed.

The IDDRS also establish that DDR will, within its capacity, help to address the root causes of conflict. DDR programmes can seek to implement programmes in such a way so that root causes of conflict are addressed through improved economic opportunities and more equitable access to natural resources, depending on the context. On a general level, done well, the DDR activities may inevitably tackle some of the root causes of conflict: economic reintegration activities help address unemployment issues; psycho-social counseling can help ex-combatants work through some of their personal or social motivations for entering the conflict and reconciliation; while social cohesion activities can help bridge social and ethnic divides.

More difficult, however, is understanding how DDR can contribute practically or more purposefully with the root causes of conflict. ***DDR is a highly political and sensitive activity and getting too involved in the root causes of conflict could put DDR practitioners in a difficult position of being perceived as taking sides or favouring specific groups or outcomes.*** Further, the time-bound nature of DDR, and the often urgency of getting the programme underway as soon as possible, make it less conducive to establishing a longer-term commitment to address the root causes. Ex-combatants are also only one target group. Even when programmes aim to match ex-combatant assistance with assistance to other vulnerable groups, it is still only a fraction—albeit a critical fraction—of the larger population that was involved in the conflict and may have played a role in the conflict in one form or another. Meaning, DDR is limited in how far it can engage in dealing with the root causes of conflict directly beyond the “do no harm” principle.

The guidance of the IDDRS for field practitioners in finding ways for DDR to deal with the root causes of conflict within their programmes is not yet fully developed but it is an area DDR policymakers are keen to address. Building programmatic linkages between DDR and other sectors is currently the most direct way for DDR to support broader efforts to address the root causes of conflict.

⁸⁰ United Nations—IDDRS, module 4.

ANNEX 3

Funding Criteria for the Peacebuilding Fund⁸¹

The United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) is designed to inject fast, relevant and catalytic funding into key projects and programmes that help prevent a country from relapsing into violence. It was launched on 11 October 2006, through General Assembly Resolution A/60/180 and Security Council Resolution S/RES/1645/ (2005). With initial funding target set at US\$ 250 million, the PBF has raised US\$ 360 million,⁸² from which it is supporting more than 150 projects in 18 countries. It is managed by the PBSO and administered by the UNDP Multi-Donor Trust Fund Office (MDTF Office). The PBF relies upon voluntary contributions from Member States, organizations and individuals.

The PBF's Guidelines were revised in 2009 to enhance its effectiveness.⁸³ The PBF now allocates funding through two facilities:

1. Immediate Relief Fund (IRF) is the **project-based** (single project with a 12 month maximum duration) component of the PBF to address critical peacebuilding needs in the immediate aftermath of conflict or as a result of a dramatic change in the country situation. IRF funding is typically part of a larger package of UN support in such situations, and is based on a strategic framework plan that serves as the basis for the broader UN intervention. Allocations from the fund are needs based, relying on existing strategic frameworks, underpinned by a conflict analysis, that explicitly address peacebuilding goals.⁸⁴
2. Peacebuilding and Recovery Facility (PRF) is the **programme-based** (multiple activities/programming objectives, with an 18 month maximum duration) component of the PBF. Programming addresses a significant risk of relapsing into conflict, and is compatible with the country Priority Plan, which is developed at the country level and draws from existing national plans to identify critical and catalytic interventions in support of peacebuilding.⁸⁵

Both facilities fund initiatives that respond to one or more of the following Priority Areas (PA):

- **PA1:** Respond to imminent threats to the peace process and initiatives that support peace agreements and political dialogue;
- **PA2:** Build or strengthen national capacities to promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflict;
- **PA3:** Stimulate economic revitalization to general peace dividends for the population at large;
- **PA4:** Re-establish essential administrative services and related human and technical capacities.⁸⁶

Countries on the agenda of the PBC may receive funding, and those not on the agenda may also receive funding following a declaration of eligibility by the Secretary-General. The Fund's work in countries on the agenda is informed by the PBC's work in these countries.

⁸¹ This annex is taken from the UN Thematic Review 'Peace Dividends and Beyond: Contributions of Administrative and Social Services', PBSO - 2011.

⁸² As of 31 August 2010. PBSO (2010a).

⁸³ This came in response to two evaluations, one by the UN Office for Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) and one initiated by donor governments of Canada, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

⁸⁴ PBF Application Guidelines (2009), p. 6.

⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 10.

⁸⁶ PBF website, available at www.unpbf.org.

PBF's Standard Criteria:

- **Relevant** (Programming addresses peacebuilding priorities, responds to conflict analysis, considers transitional and cross cutting issues).
- **Catalytic** (gaps; accelerate larger peacebuilding effort, especially promoting sustainability / government involvement)(Programming initiates, accelerates, and/or sustains advances in the peacebuilding process. It can also lay the foundation for tackling root causes of violent conflict).
- **Fast** (Programming is implemented efficiently to respond to an immediate need, sometimes before other donors are able to mobilize funds).
- **Risk tolerant** (PBF funds programmes/areas that are neglected by other donors/deemed to risky by other donors).

The need for programming to be catalytic is particularly important in the PBF's determination of where and how it can make a difference. For the PBF, catalytic programming should enable, provoke, facilitate or accelerate shifts in the peace process as a whole, or with respect to different key elements of the peace process. To be catalytic four criteria should be met:

- Kick-start a new longer-term peacebuilding effort, or accelerate an existing blocked peacebuilding effort;
- Ensure that the necessary ownership, capacity and willingness exist to increase the likelihood of catalyzing larger, or longer-term peacebuilding change;
- Provide an immediate response to factors that are urgent and relevant to peacebuilding;
- Fill a critical gap not covered by other donors.

This conceptualization suggests that catalytic programming will help to lay the conditions for a significant change rather than the change itself; it does not transform a conflict root cause or defuse a trigger, but rather it sets up the conditions for the root-cause to be transformed or the trigger resolved.⁸⁷

⁸⁷ These intermediate conditions (or enabling factors) still represent changes in the context but they are not the ultimate peacebuilding changes desired. This creates challenges for evaluation, which is based it on clearly articulated changes: PeaceNexus Foundation Annual Report, (2010) available at http://www.peacenexus.org/sites/default/files/peacenexus_foundation_-_annual_report_2010.pdf.

ANNEX 4

DDR financing (IDDRS)

The following table is drawn from module 3.4.1 of the IDDRS, Financing and Budgeting". It provides a break down of DDR financing sources and opportunities

PHASE	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	POSSIBLE SOURCE
Peace negotiations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DDR technical advice • Assessments and surveys • Country visits • DDR training/capacity development 	Bilateral support, agency preparatory funding, voluntary contributions to trust funds
Pre-mission planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish coordination and planning mechanisms for international community in-country • Establish contacts with network of local partners (civil society groups, private sector, non-governmental organizations [NGOs]) • Increase personnel and logistics to support DDR planning • Capacity-building of national Institutions 	Bilateral support, agency preparatory funding, voluntary contributions to trust funds
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post-conflict needs analysis • Technical assessment mission (before mandate from Security Council) 	Pre-mandate commitment authority from peacekeeping assessed budget
Disarmament	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arms and ammunition data collection plan and programme • Weapons collection, registration, transportation, secure storage and destruction • Stockpile management plan and programme • Legal framework for arms, ammunition and explosives • Community arms collection programmes (from planning to implementation) 	Peacekeeping assessed budget

Demobilization: Processing phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-bound transportation; • Registration; • Socio-economic profiling; • Health screening; • Civic education; • Discharge orientation; • Out-bound transportation (repatriation and resettlement); 	Peacekeeping assessed budget, voluntary contributions, agency in-kind contributions
Demobilization: Reinsertion phase (up to one year for each combatant)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitional safety allowances • Food • Non-food item support • Clothes • Short-term education and training • Short-term employment • Tools • Medical services 	
Reintegration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional/vocational training; • Long-term education, accelerated learning; • Employment counselling and referral; • Job placement; • Financing of microenterprises; • Induction into uniformed services; • Family tracing and reunification, interim care services for CAAFAG; • Community support for reintegration of women associated with armed forces and groups; • Reconciliation activities; 	Voluntary contributions, bilateral programmes
Awareness-raising and sensitization, and advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radio • Print • Local theatre groups • Advocacy, publication information and social mobilization to raise awareness about children and women associated with armed forces and groups 	Peacekeeping assessed budget, voluntary contributions, bilateral programmes

ANNEX 5 — Case studies – CAR, DRC, NEPAL

1. Central African Republic

1.1 DDR in the peace process

The government and five politico-military groups, operating in the north-east (UFDR and MLCJ), center-north (FDPC and UFR) and north-west (APRD), signed the Libreville Global Peace Agreement (APGL⁸⁸) in 2008⁸⁹. The Agreement included a specific provision on DDR⁹⁰. Later in November 2008, the government, the political opposition⁹¹ and armed groups in collaboration with UNDP and the regional organizations of EU, CEMAC, CEN-SAD and OIF,⁹² agreed to a DDR Framework, which included the conditions for the DDR process to begin and various components of DDR.⁹³

As part of the Inclusive Political Dialogue held in December 2008 between the government, political opposition, politico-military groups and civil society groups, the Working Group on Security and Armed Groups further reiterated the need for the DDR programme to begin as a matter of priority.

CAR is the only country of the three case studies reviewed in this report to be on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).⁹⁴ In 2009, DDR, alongside SSR, was identified as one of the three top priorities in the PBC's Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding in CAR.⁹⁵ DDR in CAR is also unique as it was run within the framework of a Special Political Mission (SPM), while designating UNDP as the executing agency to implement and coordinate the DDR process⁹⁶.

1.2 Current DDR process in CAR⁹⁷

The third DDR programme to take place in CAR, the DDR of armed groups covered by the Libreville Peace Agreement began in early 2009 with the formation of the DDR Steering Committee. The DDR Steering Committee is chaired by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in CAR and Head of BINUCA, and composed of the government, representatives of five politico-military groups, and donors.⁹⁸ However, it was more than two years after the launch of the DDR Steering Committee before the disarmament and demobilization (DD) operations began in July 2011. Several reasons can be attributed to the delays in launching the DD operations, including continued outbreaks of violence,

⁸⁸ In French *Accord de Paix Global de Paix de Libreville*.

⁸⁹ The APRD, UFDR, and FDPC in June 2008. The remaining rebel groups MJLC and UFR added their signatures in December 2008.

⁹⁰ P.3 Art. 4, APGL.

⁹¹ Represented by the *Union des Forces Vives de la Nation* (UFVN).

⁹² European Union (EU), *Communauté économique et monétaire de l'Afrique centrale* (CEMAC), *Communauté économique des états sahélo-sahéliens* (CEN-SAD) and *Organisation internationale de la francophonie* (OIF).

⁹³ The *Document Cadre sur le lancement du processus DDR en République centrafricaine* was signed on November 20, 2008.

⁹⁴ It has been on the agenda of the PBC since June 2008.

⁹⁵ *Strategic framework for peacebuilding in the Central African Republic 2009-2011*, Peacebuilding Commission, Central African Republic Configuration, PBC /3/CAF/7 June 2009.

⁹⁶ The DDR Framework Document calls for UNDP to "support the implementation of the DDR programme" (p.3) and specifies the agency as a "neutral organ with profound knowledge in this matter" (p.4).

⁹⁷ DDR first took place in CAR in the central and southern areas of the country between 2004-2007. Known as PRAC, it was a nationally led programme funded by the World Bank Multi-Donor Trust Fund (US\$ 9.7 million) and implemented by UNDP. The programme provided reintegration support to 7,565 ex-combatants in addition to small-infrastructure rehabilitation to communities of return. However, the programme faced several difficulties. This review focuses, however, only on the DDR undertaken within the Libreville Peace Agreement, which expressly excluded any individual who participated in PRAC.

⁹⁸ In French *Comité de Pilotage DDR*.

particularly in the north-east, and the political battles resulting from the absence of a power-sharing agreement between the government and politico-military groups. The start of DD was further affected by disagreements between Government and politico-military groups on the “pre-conditions”⁹⁹ to DDR as well as the political nature of the DDR Steering Committee. Also, it is widely believed that each side was employing tactics in order to delay the process until after the elections (which eventually took place in January and March 2011).¹⁰⁰

The DDR programme was initially planned in two phases: (1) a preparatory phase to set up the necessary structures and operational procedures, and (2) an operational phase including the Disarmament, Demobilization, Reinsertion, and Reintegration of combatants. The preparatory phase began in April 2009 and included as primary activities: Establishment of a UNDP Management Unit; ongoing meetings of the DDR Steering Committee; opening of field offices and support to local DDR committees;¹⁰¹ elaboration of a detailed project document outlining the entire DDR process; a socio-economic study of the areas affected by armed violence; and sensitization of ex-combatants and their verification against the official criteria qualifying them for participation in the DDR process. Although UNDP’s Management Unit was operational by August 2009, the preparatory phase had to be extended to 28 months to accommodate the first part of the operational phase being launched in July 2011. In the north and northwest, the preparatory phase was successfully concluded following the verification of combatants in August and September 2010. However, the activities in the north-east were limited to a sensitization and information campaign conducted in May 2010, and thus the preparatory phase for this region is still ongoing (as of December 2011).

The government began the operational phase of the DDR with a symbolic disarmament in June 2011, and UNDP joined three weeks later in July 2011.¹⁰² Despite the long delay period, the DD had to be launched without a reintegration component firmly in place. A reintegration strategy was only adopted on July 8, 2011. The strategy, developed with technical assistance from UNDP and in line with the IDDRS, adopts an individual approach. It puts forward three main options for reintegration, to: return to civilian life; become part of the national defence and security forces; participate in a six month National Youth Pioneer Programme (Jeunesse Pionnière Nationale – JPN), which provides civic education and professional and vocational training to youths between the ages of 17-24 years old. However, as detailed in the section on challenges below, there will likely be a significant gap between the completion of the DD and commencement of the R. While stopgap reinsertion activities are under consideration, there is no funding to support the activities. A request for partial funding from PBF is under consideration (as of December 2011).

Neither the Libreville Peace Agreement nor any other agreement included provisions on children associated with armed forces or armed groups (CAAFAG). UNICEF used the International Conventions on the Rights of the Child and the fact that children were not covered under the national agreements to justify the need to commence the DDR of CAAFAG immediately. UNICEF thus initiated the process of removing CAAFAG from armed opposition groups in 2008, independently of the formal, adult DDR process.

The DDR project document (adopted on 4 December 2009) included a budget for Reinsertion and Reintegration activities, for which about US\$ 19.5 million were previously pledged by the Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa (CEMAC) and the European Commission.¹⁰³ The funding from the European Union was limited to

⁹⁹ The ‘préalables’ were clearly stipulated in the recommendations of the December 2008 Inclusive Political Dialogue.

¹⁰⁰ Interviews of diplomats and donor representatives in Bangui, July 2011.

¹⁰¹ Comités Locaux de DDR (CLDDR) were set up by the regional UNDP offices of the project. The Government and politico-military groups requested that they be composed along the same lines as the DDR Steering Committee. They are presided by the Sous-Prefét, the vice-president is a member of a politico-military group, other members involve civil society, representatives of religious groups, etc. The CLDDR were intended to be the voice of the DDR Steering Committee on the ground, to pass on DDR information and messages to ex-combatants and communities.

¹⁰² The technology and methodology adopted for data collection and information management was suitable for such a large country with poor infrastructure, and is easily replicable. UNDP used a new methodology for handheld mobile data-gathering whereby the information went directly into a database which could be transferred directly to the capital Bangui. The tool was based on Android phones and open-source software. UNDP notes that it is easy to train people in this technology.

¹⁰³ In the DDR project document, total funding from the European Commission was assessed at US\$ 8,446,006, of which US\$ 7,592,944 (90 per cent) were to finance the FAO ‘reintegration’ project, and US\$ 853,062 to finance the Military Observers. CEMAC funding for the DDR was assessed at US\$ 12,652,000, of which US\$ 11,910,000 (94 per cent) were earmarked for reinsertion and reintegration, and US\$ 670,000 (6 per cent) as a contribution to the preparatory phase.

a project already planned with and executed by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). The CEMAC funds were directly provided to the CAR government under personal supervision from the President.

In a separate initiative complementary to the national DDR process, the World Bank prepared (2010) and commenced (mid-2011) a 'Community Development Project' under its Transitional Demobilization and Reintegration Programme (TDRP). The US\$ 8.6 million project, led by international NGOs,¹⁰⁴ primarily targets conflict-affected communities throughout the northern provinces that have a high concentration of ex-combatant youths, youth associated with militia and banditry and youth-at-risk living among the population. However, the project is not linked to DDR and its inclusion of ex-combatants is widely considered to be a side-benefit as opposed to a purposeful targeted group of the programme.

1.3 PBF funding for DDR in CAR

Under the SSR component of CAR's Peacebuilding Priority Plan, the PBF contributed funding to two DDR projects. Managed through UNDP, the first project 'Support for the start-up of the DDR process for Armed Groups' received US\$ 3.96 million from the PBF. This amount set out to cover the full costs of the preparatory phase of the DDR. However, the delays and extended preparatory phase in the north-west and is still ongoing for the north-east, meant that the funding fell short and project staff had to be reduced in March 2011. In 2009, UNDP provided US\$ 1.9 million in additional funds. In total, the DDR project was thus funded with US\$ 5.94 million, of which PBF funding constituted 67 per cent, a large part of which went to the payment of salaries of international DDR experts.

For the second project, 'Prevention of Recruitment, Demobilization and Socio-Economic Reintegration of CAAFAG and Other Children and Women' (Child DDR), the PBF provided US\$ 2 million to UNICEF. This amount covered the project's full budget. This project has since seen the development of a second phase (US\$ 1.5 million). The second phase is a multi-agency initiative composed of UNICEF, UNFPA and WFP, running from September 2010 through February 2012.

In total, the PBF allocated US\$ 7.46 million towards DDR, which amounts to 19 per cent of its total contributions to CAR (currently US\$ 31 million). In considering the total contributions for both projects, it should be noted that the PBF-funded project on Child DDR included a higher ratio of non-ex-combatants.

Table 1: PBF contributions to DDR projects CAR

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET (US\$)	TIMELINE (MM/YY)	UN AGENCIES
Support for the start-up of the DDR process for Armed Groups (PBF/CAF/B-3)	3,955,710	04/09 - ongoing	UNDP
Prevention of Recruitment, Demobilization and Socio-Economic Reintegration of CAAF-AG and Other Children and Women' (Child DDR - PHASE I; PBF/CAF/B-2)	2,000,000	11/08 - 10/11	UNICEF
Prevention of Recruitment, Demobilization and Socio-Economic Reintegration of CAAF-AG and Other Children and Women' (Child DDR - PHASE 2; PBF/CAF/K-12)	1,500,000	09/10 - 02/12	UNFPA UNICEF WFP
TOTAL	7,455,710		

¹⁰⁴ Predominantly the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and the Danish Refugee Council (DRC).

1.4 Catalytic, relevance and sustainability of PBF funding

1.4.1 Adult DDR

PBF's contribution to the Adult DDR covered about two-thirds of UNDP's engagement and its activities in the preparatory phase of the DDR. The activities centered mainly on (a) building the institutional capacity necessary for designing, planning, steering and implementing the national DDR programme, (b) supporting the DDR Steering Committee put in place to oversee the DDR process, and (c) conducting all preparatory activities required prior to launching the operational DD phase, such as sensitization and public information campaigns.

Relevance

The PBF directly supported the implementation of the Libreville Peace Agreement, specifically at the beginning of the process-oriented preparatory phase of the DDR, when there were no other donors coming forward to fund the planning and preparations of DDR¹⁰⁵.

The meeting, which additionally signalled the launch of the DDR process, came at a time when there was a sense of urgency to get the DDR process underway: armed groups were becoming impatient, having already begun assembling under the early promises of DDR in the lead up to and included in the peace agreement; and there had been early hopes to complete the DDR before the elections. The rapid investment in the preparatory phase of the DDR had an early positive impact on security. Seeing the creation of the DDR Steering Committee and the sensitization and verification activities that followed raised hopes among ex-combatants that the DDR process would begin in earnest, which led to a reduction of violence in conflict areas, though spates of insecurity continued through to the lead up to the elections and until the DD component of the operations itself began.¹⁰⁶

The preparatory phase of the DDR process is also relevant to peacebuilding as the highest authorities of the politico-military groups were involved in the DDR planning, and the government and politico-military groups worked together in the DDR Steering Committee, which contributed to confidence-building between the parties and to the DDR process itself. Decisions of the DDR Steering Committee were met by consensus, meaning the government and politico-military leaders were continuously meeting and negotiating on forward-looking political and security matters. While these were important achievements, they should be understood within the context of the overall criticism of the DDR Steering Committee, which includes a lack of medium-term and long-term approaches, overt focus on operational details without addressing the larger issues, and a perceived disconnect between the representatives of politico-military movements and their military leaders on the ground.¹⁰⁷

Furthermore, the information and sensitization campaigns conducted as part of the PBF contributions helped build the confidence of, and engage the population living in, conflict-affected areas in the political process. Community members reportedly note that, for the first time in many years, they had seen government officials travel to their area. For them, this signalled a change that the government is taking an interest in their communities. Apart from the symbolic impact of the visits and the information provided on the upcoming DDR process, the sensitization campaigns provided a key forum for representatives of the government, politico-military groups and the population at large to discuss their perceptions of the peace process and the Inclusive Political Dialogue process.

Catalytic

This preparatory phase was considered process-catalytic as it enabled the rapid launch (and subsequent development) of a DDR process, a key element of the Libreville Peace Agreement. Further, the effect of announcing the availability of PBF funds was considerable as it enabled UNDP/BCPR to mobilize an additional financial contribution to the programme.

¹⁰⁵ UNDP/BCPR provided internal funds over US\$ 1.99 million later as of 2010, as described earlier.

¹⁰⁶ Interviews with diplomats and donor representatives in Bangui, July 2011.

¹⁰⁷ Interviews with diplomats and donor representatives in Bangui, July 2011.

Sustainability

The sustainability of the reintegration programme is currently questioned. Although the CEMAC funding (managed by the CAR President) was earmarked for reinsertion and reintegration (94 per cent of its total, or US\$ 11.9 million), these funds no longer remain. The lack of coordination between existing donors and the absence of new donors results in significant challenges for implementing the reintegration strategy.

Substantively, however, the PBF-funded project provided capacity-building support, which promotes the sustained input of skills and resources into the DDR process. At various stages of the project, different actors from the DDR Steering Committee, local DDR committees, the UNDP Management Unit, military observers,¹⁰⁸ MICOPAX police forces,¹⁰⁹ and elements of the CAR national army benefited from capacity-building. Different trainings covered such issues as DDR, project management including financial management, IT, public information, sensitization, data gathering and verification. The training provided to the military observers and the UPC was important as the capacity to implement DD is often assumed by a UN peacekeeping mission. Delays in the DDR process meant that the trained regional military observers were rotated out of the country before the DDR began. However, the training meant that the capacity of personnel of regional countries to conduct similar operations in the future was strengthened, which was not a direct benefit for CAR, however regional capacity to address DDR is a gap area identified by the IAWG.

1.4.2 Child DDR

In broad terms, the PBF-funded UNICEF project (Child DDR Phase 1), implemented by several international NGOs,¹¹⁰ involved removing CAAFAG from armed groups, putting them through a transitional phase for three weeks and supporting them for a period of 12 months in their chosen reintegration option: either returning to school or learning a trade. The project also established Community Networks for the protection of children (RECOPEs),¹¹¹ which promote child protection through community-level sensitization on such issues such as rights of the child, protection, domestic violence and its impact on children and sexual violence, etc.

The second phase of the child DDR involves a multi-agency approach between UNFPA, UNICEF and WFP. The activities continue to engage certain RECOPEs and focuses on children in transit centers, their demobilization and reintegration, prevention of their recruitment as well addressing other vulnerable children and documenting, reporting and monitoring violations of child rights.

Relevance

Both phases of the child DDR make relevant contributions towards peacebuilding. Using a community-based approach, for every one CAAFAG, two vulnerable children in the community received parallel support. Similar to other programmes of this nature, this approach promotes social cohesion and has enabled the community to benefit from broader dividends, including sensitization of child rights and recreational clubs. The International Rescue Committee (IRC) notes that the ex-CAAFAG have found their place in their villages again and that there is now a feeling of equality between the ex-CAAFAG and other children. The sensitization and recreational activities are reported to have played an important role in changing the attitudes and behaviours of the ex-CAAFAG children towards other children.

The RECOPEs, which were created under the project, promote community resilience, which is a key aspect of peacebuilding. The networks are typically composed of a village chief, religious leader, woman leader, teacher, representative of the parent-teacher association, and a child elected by his/her peers. Having received training from the programme, RECOPEs aim to promote child protection through community-level sensitization on such issues such as rights of the child, protection, domestic violence and its impact on children and sexual violence, etc. They were also tasked with looking after vulnerable and orphaned children.

¹⁰⁸ The military observers were provided by the Communauté économique des états de l'Afrique centrale (CEEAC) and financed by the European Commission.

¹⁰⁹ The regional peacekeeping force (MICOPAX) provided Unités de Police Constituée that were trained to secure the sites during the DD operations.

¹¹⁰ These include the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and the Danish Refugee Council (DRC).

¹¹¹ RECOPE is the French acronym for Réseaux communautaires de protection de l'enfant.

In particular, the RECOPEs, have reported noticing a change in behaviour of parents as a result of the sensitization activities. For instance, there has been reportedly less domestic child abuse and fewer ‘marriages précoces’ of young girls (parents marrying underage daughters in order to earn the dowry). Furthermore, the RECOPEs, and the child DDR as a whole, are credited with the fact that none of their 108 ex-CAAFAG returned to the armed group APRD. Similarly, BINUCA confirmed the results of a Danish Refugee Council study that revealed that the APRD had not re-recruited children. Also, the RECOPEs also helped ensure that all the children from the IRC caseload in Bocaranga completed the academic year.

RECOPEs collect money from members of the community in order to pay for medical fees or buy school books for the orphaned and vulnerable children under their care. Sustainability of these and their other achievements is, however, a serious challenge that will be further explored below.

Catalytic

The first phase of the child DDR project was only partially financially catalytic. While it did not draw forward additional donors to support child DDR in general, one of the implementing NGOs received additional French funding allowing them to follow half of the caseload from the first phase. Other local implementing partners, however, sought funding from UNICEF and other donors for child DDR, with no success. The second phase of the project has only recently begun, and thus it too early to consider how it may have been catalytic.

Sustainability

Substantively, the PBF-funded Child DDR project promoted sustainable programming to some degree as it led to the development of a second phase. Seeing the continued risk to children in the north, the second phase includes a component on the prevention and recruitment of vulnerable minors in towns where the rebel groups are established. The second phase is also enabling ex-CAAFAG left over from the first-phase caseload to benefit from reintegration activities.

As a result of studies conducted during the first phase of Child DDR, other international NGOs were encouraged to initiate projects using the local NGOs that had been working with UNICEF on phase 1. This allowed for local NGOs to sustain themselves. Further, one of UNICEF’s implementing partners for the project’s first phase, the IRC, highlights that the lessons they learned from the community approach will be used in their implementation of part of the World Bank Community Reintegration Project.

1.5 Challenges and lessons

Although there have been several positive outcomes from the DDR process, in particular, the work funded by the PBF, the challenges to implementing DDR in CAR are serious and numerous.

First, due to a variety of political and financial reasons, observers have noted that it had been in the interest of the Government and the political representatives of the politico-military groups sitting on the DDR Steering Committee to delay and draw out the DDR process.¹¹² The delays between launching the DDR process and actually commencing DD operations caused several problems financially, programmatically and on security. For instance:

- The European Commission’s contribution to the Reintegration process, which was linked to a project with the FAO, had to be executed at the beginning of 2011. The delay in beginning the DD operations meant that the project had to be modified and instead targeted conflict-affected communities more broadly than ex-combatants.¹¹³
- UNDP trained regional military observers on DDR over a period of three months for the purpose of verifying and demobilizing combatants; however, due to the delays they left the country in 2011 after the verification of 67 per cent of all listed combatants and before DD operations began. As a result, UNDP had to

¹¹² Interviews with diplomats and donor representatives in Bangui, July 2011.

¹¹³ The CAR desk officer of the European External Action Service (EU EEAS) at the time highlights that the seeds had already been ordered and the whole operation had been planned for in respect of the CAR agricultural cycle. The EU notes that ex-combatants still indirectly benefited from the programme, i.e. through their families as the APRD zones were covered.

train the elements of the national army in a matter of hours to conduct the tasks of the military observers at the beginning of DD operations.¹¹⁴

- The early implementation of sensitization and verification led to hopes that the DDR would be conducted soon, and the delays produced frustration among ex-combatants and the general population, which in some cases fueled tensions and violence. The APRD, for example, continued to set up barriers to extort money from those transporting goods and stole livestock. During the long run-up to the national elections there were several occasions where the APRD threatened to disrupt the electoral process without progress on the DDR process, which in some cases led to significant challenges and intimidations during the preparation of the election.

Second, the process is criticized for not being sufficiently inclusive. Civil society is not represented on the DDR Steering Committee. Furthermore, the Adult DDR process is criticized by civil society organisations for not being sufficiently gender-sensitive, for instance, civil society raised the concern that the sensitization campaign did not contain specific messages targeting women, and that the government's insistence of not including HIV/AIDS programmes during the preparatory and operational DDR phases was a lost chance to address these issues among ex-combatants and their host communities.

Third, the vast majority of weapons (98 per cent) that have been turned in during the DD operations are artisanal/hand-made weapons, and thus there is concern that a number of weapons are still in circulation in the hands of the ex-combatants and/or armed groups.¹¹⁵ The effectiveness of the demobilization process is also questionable, according to critics, given that the demobilization seems to have had little effect on breaking down the command structures of the armed groups, as ex-combatants remain in the same locations and seem to be following the orders of their commanders in the APRD. Further, it is reported that the ex-combatants are paying their commander US\$ 20 from the reinsertion package they are given by the Government (CEMAC funds).¹¹⁶

A potential new risk could emerge from the fact that civilian disarmament programmes took place in the north-west as the same time as the disarmament of ex-combatants. However, the civilians have not received compensation for turning in their weapons, which could lead to a sense of ex-combatants being rewarded for their role in the conflict.¹¹⁷

Fourth, the fact that planning, funding, and implementation of DD is disconnected from R poses grave problems for the fluidity and complementarity of the DDR process. As referred to above, the planning of reintegration only took place late into the process, having been adopted only in July 2011. Further, as noted, the government has some of the earmarked funds available for reintegration,¹¹⁸ however it is not considered to be enough. UNDP provided some technical assistance to the development of the reintegration strategy, but it could not commit funds and resources to the implementation of the national reintegration programme itself. Although multiple international coordination meetings have taken place between HQ and field level (attended by UNDP, BINUCA, the PBC Chair of CAR, the WB, EU) and as initiated by UNDP, the key donors have so far not been able to successfully align their support to CAR with respect to the DDR process.

Furthermore, delays in implementing the reintegration programme could pose high risks for the 4,792 ex-combatants demobilized since the DD began on 14 July 2011 in the north-west of the country:

¹¹⁴ The EEAS further highlights that ECCAS MILOBS arrived in Bangui in October 2009 and stayed until June 2011. They were funded by the EU under the APF-support to the ECCAS MICOPAX operation in the CAR. The CAR government could have introduced (but did not) a new request to ECCAS for the renewal of the mandate of the MILOBS. Initially, it had not been foreseen to keep the MILOBS for as long as they stayed.

¹¹⁵ During verification in the northwest of 6153 ex-combatants, 4170 artisanal weapons were turned in versus 72 formal weapons. During the DD stage of 4,792 combatants, 3,467 artisanal versus 54 formal weapons were registered.

¹¹⁶ Interviews with communities and civil society, Bocaranga July 2011.

¹¹⁷ Interviews of communities and civil society, Bocaranga July 2011.

¹¹⁸ CEMAC committed US\$ 12 million in grants and US\$ 2 million in loan to the Government of CAR to fund DDR. The President of CAR personally manages these funds. In the December 2009 DDR project document, this money was allocated to reintegration activities. However interviews with donors and diplomats indicate concerns about how much of this money remains for reintegration.

- There are serious doubts concerning the availability of sufficient funds to cover the reintegration of ex-combatants. Civil society groups warn that if the reintegration packages are not adequately generous or if national institutions such as the JPN are not well-enough capacitated,¹¹⁹ given the current atmosphere among the ex-combatants and their continued ties to their armed group's chain of command, the ex-combatants will return to or establish new armed groups.
- At the time of research, the terms for the integration or recruitment of ex-combatants into the national defense or security forces had not been agreed, and senior figures in the Ministry of Defence do not appear keen to take steps to allow the ex-combatants to enter the national forces.¹²⁰

Fifth, sustainability of the benefits of the Child DDR project is a particular concern given the extreme poverty afflicting the families and communities the children returned to. In the first phase, implementing partners paid for the children to be enrolled in school for a year but the majority of families are too poor to continue the schooling beyond this. Some RECOPEs managed to provide additional help for primary school children (which were in the village), however, they could not extend support for the students to attend the secondary schools further away. Similarly, RECOPEs had received support for a one-year period and many now struggle with raising funds to sustain their support services. The justification for the second phase of the project was to address the fragile socio-economic environment into which ex-CAAFAG were reintegrated during the first phase, however the activities of the second phase are not specifically addressing this.

Finally, some members of the international community note that there has been an insufficient level of coordination among the partners of the Child-DDR, and they believe that UN Country Team meetings should focus on improving this. Many of the coordination issues may relate in some way to the new scenario in which DDR was being undertaken – as part of a Special Political Mission. Overall, there is a lack of synergy or harmonization between PBF-funded projects in CAR. A separate Steering Committee is set up for each project. It is reported that the Government (chairing PBF Steering Committee) demonstrates no interest in ensuring coordination between different PBF-funded projects once the funding has been allocated. International NGOs expressed concerns that there doesn't seem to be an awareness of where the gaps in funding are and that there isn't sufficient information shared between each of the clusters dealing with separate thematic areas. As a result, there is a sense that the PBF funding has resulted in a sprinkling of activities that have consequently caused tensions amongst the communities in conflict-affected areas who benefit from projects and those who do not. PBF could thus promote greater synergy and coordination among PBF projects, including indicating potential crossovers of PBF targeted beneficiaries (e.g., when ex-combatants benefit from other, non-DDR PBF programmes).

¹¹⁹ One donor country reported that they believe the structures and facilities, at least for the JPN option, (skills of trainers, infrastructure, etc.) are weak.

¹²⁰ In late July 2011 the Ministry of Defence launched a recruitment process for the army for which ex-combatants were not eligible despite the fact that a significant number of ex-combatants (around 650) had by then been demobilised in the NW.

2. Democratic Republic of the Congo

2.1 DDR in the peace process

DDR in DRC is grounded in several agreements, annexes and resolutions.¹²¹ Notably, the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement (1999), Inter-Congolese Dialogue (2002), and the Global and Inclusive Agreement on Transition (2002) each include provisions on the disarming, cantonment and unification of national Congolese armed groups into a single national defence force (FARDC) and the disarming and withdrawal of foreign troops. None of the agreements comprehensively discussed DDR as a complete process.

Based on Chapter 9.1 of the Lusaka Agreement, the UN first defined its role in DDR, through MONUC, in 2000¹²² and later strengthened its approach to DDR in two UN resolutions: Resolution 1493 (2003), which focused mainly on the voluntary disarmament of Congolese combatants; and resolution 1565 (2004), which strengthened the UN's approach towards DRRR (repatriation and resettlement) of foreign combatants and their dependents.

In 2009 the government and Congrès National pour la Défense du Peuple (CNDP) armed group active in North and South Kivu agreed upon the Ihusi Peace Accord. The Accord established for the integration of the armed groups into the FARDC and further included a provision to support wounded CNDP combatants, and also for their eventual inclusion, if able, into the FARDC.

In addition to the peace agreements, given the fragility of the eastern DRC, a special stabilization, security and peacebuilding framework has been established. The framework consists of the government's Stabilization and Reconstruction Plan for War-Affected Areas (STAREC) developed in 2009; and in the same year its main vehicle of support, the International Security and Stabilization Support Strategy was developed, which was based on the UNSSSS established the year previous. DDR is a priority area identified within this framework and all existing DDR activities in the region were incorporated therein.

2.2 DDR programmes in the DRC

The main national programme for DDR (PNDDR), previously under the direction of the National Commission for DDR (CONADER) and now known as the Implementation Unit of the PNDDR (UE-PNDDR),¹²³ began in 2004 and is set to complete in September 2011. The government is also undertaking DDR in Ituri, which for the most part mirrors the main national programme.

The government enforced strict eligibility criteria for its programmes, requiring that every combatant present himself/herself with a weapon in hand and prove their affiliation to a known armed group between October 1996-May 2003. Those who were not eligible to enter FARDC—due to health, age or fitness—were to be demobilized and reintegrated.

The UN Stabilization Mission in the DRC's (MONUSCO, formerly as MONUC)¹²⁴ participation in the PNDDR was limited to disarmament and demobilization and the provision of security and logistical support for the programme.

¹²¹ For a comprehensive overview of the peace process in DRC and a compendium of the Peace Agreements, see: « The Peace Process in the DRC » Workshop report, Institute for Security Studies, December 2002.

¹²² The United Nations Mission in the Congo (MONUC) was established pursuant to UN Security Council Resolution on the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of Congo [S/Res/1291] of 24 February 2000. MONUSCO replaced MONUC in May 2010, pursuant to UN Security Council Resolution 1925 of 28 May 2010. MONUSCO represented a gradual withdrawal of peacekeepers and a greater emphasis on civilian protection.

¹²³ CONADER is the French acronym for Commission nationale de désarmement, démobilisation et réinsertion. UE-PNDDR is the French acronym for the l'Unité d'exécution du programme national de DDR.

¹²⁴ The United Nations Mission in the Congo (MONUC) was established pursuant to UN Security Council Resolution on the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of Congo [S/Res/1291] of 24 February 2000. MONUSCO replaced MONUC in May 2010, pursuant to UN Security Council Resolution 1925 of 28 May 2010. MONUSCO represented a gradual withdrawal of peacekeepers and a greater emphasis on civilian protection.

UNICEF and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) took the immediate charge of minors and organized family reunification. The World Bank, within its Multi-Country Demobilization and Reintegration Programme (MDRP), supported the government financially for the programme, including the reintegration component of the PNDDR or “civic reinsertion” as it was known. The six-month civic reinsertion consisted of a resettlement allowance of US\$ 110 upon leaving the transit center and US\$ 25/month for up to one year as a transition allowance. Additionally, 54,000 of the 102,148 demobilized adults received other forms of socio-economic reintegration benefits such as in the area of micro-enterprises.¹²⁵

MONUSCO (initially as MONUC) further undertook DDRRR of the foreign nationals, seeing to their disarmament, demobilization, repatriation and resettlement back to their own country.

The narrow eligibility excluded a large number of ex-combatants, both foreign nationals and individuals who did not qualify for the national programme.¹²⁶ These individuals¹²⁷ were widely considered to still pose a significant threat to security. In 2010, at the request of the government and in collaboration with UNICEF and MONUSCO, UNDP thus led the reintegration of residual combatants in an 18-month Community Recovery and Reintegration Programme (CRRP). The CRRP adopted a community-based reintegration approach, whereby vulnerable members of the community received comparable support to that received by ex-combatants. The ratio, originally planned to be 50 per cent ex-combatants and 50 per cent other identified vulnerable groups was revised to be 70 per cent - 30 per cent respectively. In total the CRRP processed 4,378 combatants, while 4,031 combatants and 1,713 community members were beneficiaries of the socio-economic reintegration (total 5,744).

As the 2009 Ihusi Peace Accord called for the support of wounded CNDP combatants, UNDP, in collaboration with MONUSCO, ICRC and the government, provided capacity support for the military hospital in Goma, funded the treatment of 265 wounded CNDP combatants and facilitated their integration into the FARDC or their respective demobilization and socio-economic reintegration over a 10-month period.

2.3 PBF support for DDR in the DRC

Under priority two of the PBF Priority Plan for the DRC, “Demobilization and community-based reintegration of combatants and high-risk groups”,¹²⁸ the PBF allocated funds for three DDR-related activities: the CRRP, and the project supporting the war wounded and demobilization of residual ex-combatants.¹²⁹

¹²⁵ CONADER in particular but also the UE-PNDDR has been criticized for the management of DDR funds and for what many have perceived to be a too short and limited reinsertion programme. The UE-PNDDR further admitted the difficulty of implementing the reinsertion programme given the disparity in education and skills of the ex-combatants and the fact that implementing partners did not have the capacity and/or time to better tailor the programmes. Several ex-combatants are reported to have sold their reinsertion kits.

¹²⁶ Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, S/2010/512, 8 October 2010.

¹²⁷ The CRRP covered ex-combatants who were not eligible to the PNDDR programme. The term ‘residual combatants’ was coined after the declaration of the end of the Amani Leo process, which stipulated that the armed groups were all integrated/reintegrated. The estimation made in October 2010 speak of residual elements, but in the CRRP, the target groups was still called ex-combatants.

¹²⁸ The PBF Priority Plan covers the period September 2009-December 2011. The total envelope for the funding is US\$ 20 million, which is divided along the four priority outcome areas: 1. Improving security and civilian protection 2. Demobilization and reintegration of combatants and high-risk groups, 3. Extension of State authority; 4. Local peacebuilding and recovery. UN PBF Priority Plan for the Democratic Republic of Congo, PBF, pp.5-6 <www.unpbf.org/docs/DRC-Priority-Plan.pdf>.

¹²⁹ PBF-funded Projects: “Community Reintegration and Recovery Programme in eastern DRC (PBF/COD/B-1) of 2 February 2010 and “Support to War Wounded” (PBF/COD/B-2) of 6 April 2010.

Table 2 – PBF contribution to DDR in DRC

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET (US\$)	TIMELINE (MM/YY)	UN AGENCIES
Community Reintegration and Recovery Programme in eastern DRC (PBF/COD/B-1)	4,405,342	02/10 – 06/11	UNDP
Support to War Wounded (PBF/COD/B-2)	228,962	04/10 -06/11	UNDP
DD of former Armed Groups residual (PBF-COD-B.4)	636 650	01/11 – 12/11	UNDP
Total	5,270,954		

The projected cost of the 18-month CRRP project was US\$ 18.6 million. PBF contributed US\$ 4.4 million to the project, which amounted to 24 per cent of the total cost for CRRP. UNDP's Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) contributed US\$ 5 million (28 per cent). The project thus faced a shortfall of almost half of the projected budget (US\$ 9 million).

For the project supporting the war wounded, PBF provided US\$ 228,962. The PBF contribution amounted to 48 per cent of the total cost of almost half a million. MONUSCO, the government and the ICRC provided US\$ 18, 000, US\$ 160,000 and US\$ 61,000 respectively.

As of the time of the research, the “war wounded” project has been fully implemented and closed, while the “CRRP” project is nearly completed (70 per cent delivery rate). As to the demobilization of residual ex-combatant project, funds have been allocated but the project is not being implemented yet, due to ongoing discussions about the appropriate strategy.

The total calculation of PBF support provided to DDR in DRC is therefore US\$ 5.2 million, which comprises 26 per cent of PBF's total engagement with the DRC (US\$ 20 million).

2.4 Catalytic, relevance and sustainability of PBF funding

2.4.1 CRRP

As noted above, the CRRP was designed to demobilize and reintegrate the residual combatants. The project also adopted a community-matching approach, meaning it provided equivalent assistance for 1,713 other vulnerable members of the community, such as high-risk youths and returnees (total caseload thus 5,744). Project activities included:

- Sensitization activities to prepare communities for the return of the residual combatants;
- Identification and preparation of the beneficiaries for their reinsertion/reintegration programmes, including placing the beneficiaries into community-based solidarity groups;
- Market and employment studies; and
- Training for the residual combatants on i) technical aspects of their chosen vocation, ii) management (iii) civic education and peaceful co-existence; provided beneficiaries with kits to help them start up their micro-enterprise.

The PBF contribution mainly covered the demobilization and orientation requirements of the ex-combatants and ex-police; however, the project itself set out to bolster five specific aspects of peacebuilding:

- Identification of beneficiaries and socio-economic opportunities;
- Social cohesion and conflict prevention;
- Capacity-building of local authorities and community groups, in order to promote good governance;
- Improved access to Social Services through the reconstruction of certain infrastructure in areas where there is a high level of ex-combatants and vulnerable community members; and
- Sustainable revenue generating activities.

Relevance

The CRRP filled a gap in the DDR process by addressing a significant group of individuals that were left out of the national DDR programme and who were still recognized to pose a risk to the DRC peace process. According to one local implementing partner of the CRRP, prior to the initiative, the ex-combatants were known for committing armed robbery and extortion, and the level of this type of crime has decreased seemingly because the ex-combatants are now occupied.¹³⁰

The CRRP's design also contributed to a wider footprint of economic revitalization for the communities by ensuring that one third of the caseload represented other vulnerable groups, such as returnees and high-risk youths. Further, for instance, the purchase of a mill in one community for the community benefited the whole community, as there became an increased production of grain. Likewise the soap-making activity of one solidarity group in Uvira benefitted the whole community as it led to the availability of more affordable soap for the community. CRRP implementing partners noted that both the short-term labour intensive and the longer-term reintegration helped to prevent vulnerable groups from turning to violence and crime.¹³¹

The broadened scope of the project also produced several social dividends. By engaging the communities in the process, and having the ex-combatants and other vulnerable groups work side by side, the CRRP managed to help reduce some of the stigma associated with being an ex-combatant. It also mitigated the typical frustration of non-combatants that the ex-combatants are being rewarded for their part in the conflict.

According to the local NGO Caritas as well as beneficiaries in Bukavu,¹³² many ex-combatants are now accepted in their communities and there is a notable difference in their behaviour. Working closely with the other community beneficiaries in what are known as solidarity groups, ex-combatants learned how to better engage with others in a non-military fashion, learned how to live differently and even learned to appreciate a normal civilian life.¹³³ In a large number of cases, ex-combatants would provide assistance to the other beneficiaries and vice versa, also helping to build a greater level of confidence and social cohesion between the groups. For instance, in several cases ex-combatants had initially refused to work together with civilians, however by the end of the project had formed alliances and pooled their money, setting up a credit system.

Due to the participation of the community councils¹³⁴ set up by the CRRP, in addition to the civic education provided in the CRRP, ex-combatants learned a greater appreciation for, and felt a sense of support from local authorities. Indeed, one ex-combatant became a representative of the local authority himself.¹³⁵

Results from UNICEF's engagement in the CRRP also yield positive contributions to sustainable and relevant peacebuilding as these results show that some ex-combatants remained engaged after they had completed the

¹³⁰ Group interview with CRRP implementing partners (IOM, CARITAS, CARE, CARE International, ETN), Goma 20 July 2011.

¹³¹ Group interview with CRRP implementing partners (IOM, CARITAS, CARE, CARE International, ETN), Goma 20 July 2011. Interview with members of soap-making Solidarity Group, Uvira, DRC, 22 July 2011; Interview with Solidarité pour la Promotion Sociale (CRRP Implementing Agency Bukavu), Bukavu, DRC, 21 July 2011.

¹³² Group interview with CRRP implementing partners (IOM, CARITAS, CARE, CARE International, ETN), Goma 20 July 2011.

¹³³ Group interview with CRRP implementing partners (IOM, CARITAS, CARE, CARE International, ETN), Goma 20 July 2011.

¹³⁴ The community councils helped select the other vulnerable community members to participate in the project and participated in the overall planning and oversight of the programme.

¹³⁵ Group interview with CRRP implementing partners (IOM, CARITAS, CARE, CARE International, ETN), Goma 20 July 2011.

programme. For instance, former beneficiaries of UNICEF's programmes started establishing and hosting their own workshops for children associated with armed forces and groups (CAAFAG), while others returned to offer apprenticeships to former CAAFAG. UNICEF pointed to the benefits of the flexibility of the PBF support. As it is often difficult to anticipate the actual numbers of individuals who will present themselves for DDR and programmes must be tailored to fit the actual situation. The flexibility of the project proposals accepted by the PBF allowed UNICEF to better accommodate and adjust their programme to best meet the evolving needs on the ground.

Catalytic

The PBF funding was financially catalytic in that following the results of the CRRP, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) committed to funding US\$ 3.9 million to reintegrate another 700 ex-combatants identified as 'residual combatants' throughout the CRRP process. The PBF also agreed to thus fund US\$ 600,000 towards the DD of these ex-combatants.¹³⁶ This new phase of the project, however, is delayed. While the government initially endorsed the project, they have since withdrawn their support. The government's changed stance is widely considered because the government would like to present the perception that DDR is complete and there are no more ex-combatants in the country.

Substantively, the community-based matching approach of the CRRP could also be considered as catalytic given that the UE-PNDDR will adopt a similar community-matching model for piloting farming options of reintegration conducted with the African Development Bank.

Sustainability

Using the CRRP to build the capacity of the government and local implementing partners is also an important contribution towards the sustainability of peacebuilding. UNDP, confirmed by the Minister of Interior, noted that the local government's engagement in the planning and implementation of the CRRP helped capacitate and teach the authorities about project planning, participatory methods, market analyses. They were also trained in how to identify and verify ex-combatants.

National implementing partners of the CRRP were also provided with training on monitoring and evaluation, information technology and financial management. UNICEF highlighted the improved capacity of local NGOs. Previously they would engage with international NGOs and now, given the continuous capacity-building of local NGOs, UNICEF goes directly to the local level. Government also used to only deal with UNICEF on relevant issues, and now they too will go directly to local NGOs.¹³⁷

2.4.2 Support to war wounded

ICRC, MONUC, UNDP and the government jointly undertook the war-wounded project. Designed as a pilot for similar projects to take place elsewhere in the country, the war wounded project provided equipment to strengthen the capacity Goma's military hospital and transported, provided food for the beneficiaries and their families and treated 265 war wounded from the CNDP armed group, as identified in the Ihusi Accord so that they can proceed to the national defence force or be reintegrated into civilian life.

Relevance

The 2009 Ihusi Accord included a provision of support for the wounded CNDP, and thus the project, and PBF's contribution therein, directly supported the implementation of peace agreements.

The project also, however, demonstrates a wider relevance for peacebuilding. Prior to the project, the wounded CNDP could not be integrated into the national forces or into the national DDR programme and became notorious for stealing and committing other forms of violence and banditry. In the Masisi Territory, the combined frustration of having been promised support through the Ihusi Accord and the delay in receiving the support, with the fact that the wounded CNDP combatants had no other means for income or even food, led to their constructing barricades.

¹³⁶ Interview, Mohamed El Mehdi, Programme Manager, UNDP 18 July 2011.

¹³⁷ Interview, UNICEF - Goma, July 20, 2011.

Immediately after the project began and the wounded combatants were moved to the hospital for treatment, the barricades in Masisi lifted. The Minister of Interior for eastern DRC noted that only a year ago there was no animal husbandry in Masisi, and “one would not pass there after daylight, and you certainly wouldn’t spend the night. You can now, it’s safer”.¹³⁸ This same discussion was also used to discuss the region more broadly.¹³⁹ The same effect was evident throughout the region. The increased security situation in the region and the opening of routes facilitated the redeployment of the administrative authorities and security forces in the areas. The doctors participating in the project noted that it had a positive impact on the morale of the military and their families and helped in building their confidence in the government and state more broadly.

Catalytic

The project supporting the war wounded was catalytic in establishing a sustainable approach to dealing with wounded combatants. Initiated as a pilot project and following its successful completion, the government has agreed to replicate the project for at least 2,686 wounded ex-combatants of armed groups as well as members of the FARDC within the STAREC covered zone (eastern DRC).

According to the medical staff involved in the project, due to the capacity support, received from the project, particularly equipment, the military hospital is now considered to be the second best hospital in the area.

Sustainability

As stated, the project was designed as a pilot initiative. The government has stated its commitment to replicate the initiative elsewhere in the country for other armed groups as well as the national FARDC using its own resources and possibly with the assistance of other partnerships. However, as of the writing of the review, there are no funds mobilized to undertake the project elsewhere. Furthermore, if the projects are treating the war wounded of FARDC, it would not count as DDR.

2.4.3 Demobilization of residual ex-combatants

As to the demobilization of residual ex-combatant project, funds have been allocated but the project is not being implemented yet, due to ongoing discussions about the appropriate strategy.

2.5 Challenges and lessons

Several challenges in the implementation of the PBF-funded projects relate to challenges that are typical in DDR programming in general. The fact that only the war wounded from CNDP benefited from that project created frustration among other armed groups, including the FARDC. These groups have responded with volatility and set up barricades. The important lesson is to discourage projects that favour one group over another and to ensure that adequate communication and outreach is extended informing other combatants of when and how they might receive similar support.

Occasionally there were difficulties and rivalries within the solidarity groups created under the CRRP and some people would leave the programme. Therefore the programmes themselves need to be flexible enough to be able to find other alternatives. Also children have been reported to manipulate DDR benefits by reporting to different implementing partners for packages, highlighting the need for better coordination between implementing partners.

While women are included in the DDR programmes, there lacks a broader understanding of gender both within the government and implementing partners. In the DRC, a gender-focus is often understood only to apply to victims of sexual and gender-based violence, not to broader issues facing women, of masculinity and targeting the re-socialization of perpetrators of violence in their treatment of women. Targeting masculinity in DDR programmes is particularly essential as male dynamics towards women in armed groups can be typically aggressive and domi-

¹³⁸ Minister of Interior for eastern DRC, Goma, 19 July 2011 (Quotation translated from French).

¹³⁹ UNDP, Minister of Interior for eastern Congo, also noted in Vlassenroot, K. Hoebeke, H. & Risch, L. Multipart: Country Study Paper. EGMONT – Royal Institute for International Relations. December 03 2009. P.24-26.

neering. Women have often reported that they do not see a change in the male attitudes towards women after the males have been reintegrated.¹⁴⁰ Few actors in the DRC address this issue. One NGO, the Congolese Men's Network, is not associated with any of the DDR projects but uses its meager resources to address gender issues of male ex-combatants.

Another implementing partner of the CRRP also noted that there needs to be better linkages with development. Many of the reintegration programmes provide strong initial support, but there needs to be a stronger linkage to development in order to see it through and provide greater chances of sustainability. Several implementing partners, for both projects referred to the difficulties caused by delays of UNDP in dispensing the funds.

¹⁴⁰ Interview with the Congo Men's Network, Goma, 20 July 2011.

3. Nepal

3.1 DDR in the peace process

The Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in Nepal was signed on 21 November 2006 by Nepal's main political parties, the Seven Party Alliance (SPA) and the Communist Party of Nepal - Maoist (CPN-M) following a decade-long conflict. One of the immediate goals of the CPA was listed to be the management and integration/rehabilitation of the Maoist army personnel. It also included a commitment to "instantaneously rescue children in armed force and provide necessary and suitable assistance for their rehabilitation".¹⁴¹

Also in 2006, the Agreement on Monitoring of the Management of Arms and Armies (AMMAA) set forth provisions for the redeployment and concentration of forces, Maoist army cantonment, and registration of Maoist army combatants at cantonment sites. The AMMAA established that the members of the Maoist Army who did not meet the relevant eligible criteria for the army—minors and those entering the armed group after May 2006—are to be discharged. This group, known as Verified Minors and Late Recruits (VMLR), became the target recipients of DDR-related activities. It is important to note that the Maoists did not approve of the terminology of disarmament and demobilization, preferring instead to consider their activities as SSR and to approve rehabilitation activities. In this review, any reference to DDR in Nepal thus actually only refers to the rehabilitation.

3.2 DDR-related programmes in Nepal

The UN Mission in Nepal (UNMIN)¹⁴² and UN Country Team—specifically UNDP and UNICEF along with other UN Country Team members - conducted the registration and verification of the Maoist combatants, between June and December 2007. The process verified 19,602 regular members of the Maoist army and disqualified 4,008 individuals as VMLR (2,973 verified minors and 1036 late recruits). However, it took another three years of additional negotiations and high-level advocacy before the Maoist army would allow for the discharge and reintegration of VMLR to take place.

In January 2010, the UN deployed an inter-agency team¹⁴³ to support the month-long discharge process. In total, 2,394 (60 per cent) of the 4,008 VMLR were officially discharged. The remaining 1,614 (40 per cent) were discharged in absentia in March 2010.

In June 2010, the UN established a 24-month Interagency Rehabilitation Programme (UNIRP). UNIRP, composed of ILO, UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA, was tasked with the transitional rehabilitation of the 2,973 verified minors and 1036 late recruits. UNIRP's main activities included public sensitization and information campaigns and psychosocial support. Rehabilitation packages further provided VMLR's with four socio-economic reintegration options: vocational skills training, micro-enterprises, education and health training. For the late recruits, UNDP provided vocational skills training, micro-enterprises and non-formal education; and UNFPA covered the planning and delivery of Health Related Vocational Training and Education packages and took a lead role in identifying and addressing gender specific issues. ILO focused on enhancing the capacity of UNDP's implementing partners to provide the vocational training and to improve their skills for conducting labour market assessments. UNICEF oversaw the tracing, formal education and psychosocial support and community peacebuilding activities to support the social-reintegration of VMLRs.

¹⁴¹ Comprehensive Peace Agreement, Section 7.6, 26 November 2006.

¹⁴² The UN Mission in Nepal, UNMIN, established under Security Council resolution 1740, is administered by the Department of Political Affairs.

¹⁴³ Office of the High Commission for Human Rights (OHCHR), UNDP, UN Population Fund (UNFPA), UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), and United Nations Mission in Nepal (UNMIN).

3.3 PBF support for DDR in Nepal

DDR-related activities in Nepal are undertaken within two complementary funding arrangements. The government established the national multi-donor Nepal Peace Trust Fund in February 2007, as a collective financing and coordinating mechanism for peacebuilding. The DDR-related support from NPTF enabled the establishment of the basic infrastructure of 19 cantonment sites, and temporary shelters in 28 sites.

In March 2007, the UN established the UN Peacebuilding Fund for Nepal as a complementary instrument to the national trust fund. PBF funding is incorporated within the UNPFN structure and is the largest single funding contributor.

Table 2 –DDR activities in Nepal 2007-2011

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET (US\$)	TIMELINE (MM/YY)	UN AGENCIES
Project Support to Discharge of Adult Maoists Army Personnel from the Cantonment sites (UNPFN/A-3)	499,614	11/07 - 12/10	UNDP
Programme Support for Children and Adolescents Formerly Associated with the Maoist Army in Nepal * (PBF/NPL/B-2)	622,969	03/09 - 03/10	UNICEF
Support to Female Members of the Maoist Army* PBF/NPL/B-2	224,614	03/09 - 12/10	UNFPA
Discharge and Reintegration Assistance to Maoist Army UNPFN/A-6	3,392,216	01/09 - 05/10	UNDP
Support to the Rehabilitation of Verified Minors and Late Recruits UNPFN/A-7	9,349,660	06/10 - 05/12	ILO, UNDP, UNFPA & UNICEF
Monitoring, reporting and response to conflict related child rights violations* PBF/NPL/E-2	2,332,421	04/10 - 12/11	OHCHR & UNICEF
TOTAL	16,421,424		
* Highlighted rows represent the projects supported by the PBF			

Six of the eight projects under the UNPFN's Cantonment and Reintegration cluster specifically addressed "DDR"-related activities in Nepal. Falling under "conflict prevention and reconciliation" under the PBF's Priority Plan for Nepal,¹⁴⁴ PBF contributed US\$ 2.2 million towards the DDR related projects, which amounts to 13 per cent of the total (US\$ 16 million) amount spent on DDR activities to date and 22 per cent of PBF's total contribution to Nepal (US\$ 10 million).

3.4 Catalytic, relevance and sustainability of PBF funding

PBF contributions in Nepal focused specifically on children and women. Indeed, seventy four per cent (74 per cent) of the VMLR in the cantonment sites were children below the age of 18 at the time of their initial verification of which 30 per cent were girls or young women. Therefore, the DDR of VMLR required that particular attention be given to child- and gender-specific needs. As highlighted in table 2, PBF projects focused on the discharge of

¹⁴⁴ The PBF Priority Plan for Nepal covered the 12-month period of 2008 to a total of US\$ 10 million. The Priority Plan outlines the following priorities for PBF support: 1. Strengthen state capacity to sustain peace for accelerated recovery in areas where there is a serious risk of future conflict; 2. Foster the accelerated recovery of groups, or areas, where the risk of conflict is heightened specifically addressing women and member of traditionally marginalised groups; 3. Support local communities, including through women's groups, to mitigate the risk of increasing armed violence including the proliferation of small arms, and diffuse tensions over specific issues that could result in conflict; 4. Leverage UN's comparative advantage vis-à-vis other actors. PBF thus supported "DDR" related activities by supporting rehabilitation under the heading of "Conflict prevention and Reconciliation" and focused on women and children. PBF Priority Plan for Nepal, pp.5-6 <www.unpbf.org/docs/Nepal_PBF_Priority_Plan.pdf>.

children, support to females in the Maoist Cantonments, including VMLR, for health and reproductive services and support for the monitoring of CAAFAG.

The project on discharge of minors had as its primary objective “to support the overall peace process in Nepal through the promotion of the rights of children and youth who have been affected by the conflict”. Its activities led to the successful discharge and socio-economic reintegration of the 2,973 verified minors through formal education and psychosocial support. In partnership with the CAAFAG Working Group—a network UNICEF established in 2006 comprising UN, international and national NGOs¹⁴⁵—the project activities additionally encouraged and promoted community engagement in the social reintegration of VMLRs.

Given the high number of women VMLR and the lack of reproductive services available to them, the PBF funded project “support to female members of the Maoist army” enabled UNFPA to recruit and place gynaecologists in the cantonment sites, and to undertake measures to improve the conditions of reproductive health services in the sites, such as conducting Reproductive Health Service Clinics six days every month in all seven cantonment sites.¹⁴⁶ During the discharge process, UNFPA provided technical assistance to address gender concerns. Further, the support enabled social workers from CAAFAG Working Group to be made available to accompany female VMLRs, to counsel family members, if needed, and to provide women with referrals for their reproductive health needs and provide certain beneficiaries with temporary accommodation near the cantonment for up to 2 weeks or accompaniment support (implemented in partnership with UNICEF).

UNICEF and OHCHR undertook the project “Monitoring, reporting and response to conflict related child rights violations”, as mandated by Security Council resolutions 1612 and 1882 on rights of the child. The project strengthened the national capacity to monitor and report on the discharge and rehabilitation process of minors and ongoing violations of children’s rights. The project extended support for informally or self-released CAAFAG and other children affected by armed conflict. UNICEF, with the help of the CAAFAG Working Group, also sought to locate the 1,130 verified minors who were absent during the discharge process.

Relevance

All three of the PBF-supported projects contributed directly towards supporting the peace process, given that the CPA and AMMAA identified the VMLR as a group to be rehabilitated. In particular, PBF helped to fill specific gaps during the verification and cantonment of VMLR and during their discharge, particularly with respect to vulnerable groups. The facilities for women were identified as inadequate during the three years delay between the initial cantonment and the discharge, and the UNFPA project improved the conditions for the female adults and girls present at the sites.

Furthermore, the projects were relevant to the UNIRP reintegration as it filled a gap, whereby many of the women or girls would otherwise have been unable to participate in the reintegration programmes. The Nepalese caste system and strict social norms for women meant that many women would have difficulty returning to their communities, especially the case with children fathered by a man from another caste. It is also a cultural taboo to have non-family members care for children, making it difficult for VMLR with children to participate in the reintegration options. As many of the vocational or education centers required transportation far from their homes, safety and childcare concerns of many would prevent them from participating in the reintegration. During the discharge and reintegration process, UNFPA was able to continuously ensure that the specific needs, protection and safety of women were being addressed, such as accommodating for childcare, nutritional support for children, allowance for children under the age of five and supporting school boarding.

The flexibility of the PBF (and UNPFN) allowed for the design and implementation of the reintegration options to be as relevant as possible, not only to the UNIRP programme but also relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries and communities more broadly. Planning and implementing well-tailored activities was challenging given that the gov-

¹⁴⁵ CAAFAG (Children Associated with Armed Forces and Armed Groups) Working Group comprises of UN agencies: UNFPA, WFP; INGOs (Save the Children, IRC, ICRC, Search for Common Ground, PLAN, CARE, and TPO); and national NGOs. The National Human Rights Commission, OHCHR and UNMIN are observers.

¹⁴⁶ Services such as screening, treating and referring reproductive health problems of female PLAs and adjoining communities were provided. In total 9775 females benefitted from this service while 210 complicated cases were provided with referral services. The most valuable contribution of the project was bringing in gynaecologists in the cantonment and providing referral services at tertiary centers. The referral mechanism was aligning with the Government of Nepal’s referral system.

ernment and Maoist Party imposed several restrictions on the rehabilitation of VMLR. These restrictions included imposing a funding ceiling on rehabilitation costs per combatant, restricting the amount of public awareness and sensitization that could be undertaken and limiting access to sites where needs profiling could take place. The PBF's flexibility allowed for the activities and reintegration options to be designed on an ad hoc basis, being tailored according to the most suitable needs on the ground despite the limitations.

Catalytic

PBF funding was not particularly financially catalytic, as donors were widely hesitant to fund the rehabilitation, given the delays between the verification and actual discharge and the highly political nature of the exercise. However, PBF funding filled financial gaps for undertaking these activities. The fund was able to support preparatory activities, training and process, which are typically not associated with tangible outputs and results and thus, albeit critical areas of work,¹⁴⁷ are very difficult to receive funding for. In the case of Nepal, the support for the preparatory activities is seen to have been catalytic in enabling the UN's unprecedented delivery-as-one approach to the type of DDR-related activities undertaken within the UNIRP.

Instead of being hindered financially by the delays in the discharge process, the UN was able to use the UNPFN/PBF funds in a way that "allowed them to plan in a more unified way."¹⁴⁸ It also allowed them to advocate collectively for the early release of the VMLR. By the time the discharge was finally allowed, the foundation already existed for the UN to rapidly prepare and complete the discharge process despite the abrupt and short timeline allotted for the discharge (40 days). Under such conditions and demands, the prepositioning of services, logistics and the UN's joint-effort was critical for the successful completion of the discharge within the 40 days.

According to UNICEF, children's issues are often missed out in DDR-type planning and UNICEF's engagement may only take place once several decisions for the programme have already been made. Therefore, for UNICEF, receiving PBF funding allowed them to participate on a level footing in the early planning of the activities, which also promoted a more coordinated and integrated approach to UNIRP programme.

The CAAFAG Working Group, which UNICEF had previously established in 2006 and was a beneficiary of the PBF support, is widely perceived to have produced several catalytic and sustainable contributions towards peacebuilding. The CAAFAG Network established mechanisms (such as youth clubs, trained psychosocial workers, education and peacebuilding activities) that have become a model for other related and unrelated projects. The network and the mechanisms and facilities it established have brought VMLR and communities together at music events and festivals, cultural events, reconciliation meetings, visits to museums, and visits to local youth clubs. Several VMLR informed the UNIRP implementers that these events were the first time they had been able to positively interact with the communities.

More specifically, according to the UNIRP review conducted in February 2011, the above activities were observed to have contributed to:

- a) Setting VMLR free from the chain of command;
- b) Changing communities' negative perceptions against those who are "disqualified", especially women, because such interventions are conducted in a way to ensure mutual respect for all;
- c) Making VMLR feel that they are accepted;
- d) Promoting mutual understanding between VMLR and community members through repeated interactions;
- e) Harmonizing highly politicized communities;
- f) Facilitating interpersonal skills of participants; and
- g) Employment of VMLR in some cases by promoting interaction between VMLR and community members.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷ Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict [A/63/881-S/2009/304], 11 June 2009, pp.14, 25.

¹⁴⁸ Telephone interview, UNICEF-Nepal, 4 August 2011.

¹⁴⁹ Interagency Programming Mission Report, UN Interagency Rehabilitation Programme, February 2011, pp.15-16.

The UNIRP review further highlighted that peacebuilding activities creatively acted as an entry point to approach some VMLR who were not enrolled in any of the packages.¹⁵⁰

Finally, the relationship and engagement of the government and Maoist Party with the UN has improved to a degree and it could be argued that the collective, integrated approach of the UN and the positive practices and outcomes of the programmes, to which PBF played an important role, was catalytic in easing and facilitating the relationship between the government, Maoists and UN.

Sustainability

A priority of the PBF is that it provides support in activities that become part of longer term national or development funding. The Nepal Government is reportedly looking at the various structures and components of the PBF-supported discharge of children and adolescent project in order to replicate the components in its National Action Plan for conflict-affected children. Likewise, other UNICEF programmes, including within the UNIRP, have been able to benefit from the CAAFAG mechanism. Another non-DDR-related project, focusing on child labour, will also be drawing lessons from the CAAFAG reintegration programme and use the same structures and replicated mechanisms for vulnerable children. In addition, the government led “Juvenile Justice Coordination Committee” will also be working with CAAFAG established structures, social workers, psychosocial counsellors, to conduct social inquiry and to provide psychosocial support to children in conflict with law.

Sustainability is, however, a particularly challenging issue for DDR-type activities undertaken in Nepal and elsewhere and will be explored further below.

3.5 Challenges and lessons

Despite many of the positive achievements coming from the PBF support, the DDR-related activities themselves faced, and continue to face, several challenges. For starters, several circumstances around the discharge and government and Maoist imposed limitations on the rehabilitation programme created a number of difficulties, which the UN and its implementing partners had to overcome. These include:

- The nature in which the Maoist discharged the VMLR in the first place fostered anger and resentment. For most VMLR, the discharge came as a surprise and was taking place against their will.
- The political agreements considered the VMLR as being “disqualified” from the army. This was despite the many years of service of some combatants, who consequently felt frustrated and betrayed, and which only compounded the already negative stigma associated with the armed group.
- In the first year, the government and Maoist Party imposed tight restrictions on the outreach and communication about the DDR activities, including the issuance of negative press. As a result, the participants and the communities started with a poor perception of the programme as well as having mismatched expectations.
- The government and Maoist Party imposed a funding ceiling on the amount of support an individual VMLR could receive.
- The government and Maoist Party only granted limited access to cantonment sites and other areas, hindering the profiling of needs and stronger market analysis, etc.
- There remains limited national ownership and political buy-in from the Government and the Maoist Party.

These circumstances had several programmatic consequences for UNIRP and its partners. First, only the education option of rehabilitation had a community-matching approach whereby for every two VMLR enrolled in education, one other vulnerable child received the same support. This approach improved the social cohesion between the

¹⁵⁰ Interagency Programming Mission Report, UN Interagency Rehabilitation Programme, February 2011, p. 15.

community and verified minors and helped to minimize the stigma associated with being a VMLR. However, the community approach could not be extended to the other options due largely to the UN's limited access to the VMLR and communities to be able to plan and prepare such approaches. Given that Nepal has a traditionally entrenched caste system and that many of the VMLR who married or had children from another caste may not be received back into their communities, compounded by the negative stigma associated with being VMLR, the rehabilitation process would have benefited from a stronger community based approach to the programme.

Second, because of the limited access to the cantonments sites for needs profiling and more in depth market analysis, most training has taken place in centralized urban areas and not decentralized enough for rural areas where most of VMLR come from.

Third, UNIRP was given less than two months to train counselors and to develop orientation tools posed a number of challenges. The UNIRP inter-agency review undertaken in February 2011 noted, "the recruited counselors, while competent in their own areas of work, were not prepared to face the realities and specificities of the caseload they engage with".¹⁵¹ As a result, the quality of the orientation and counselling provided to each participant was not consistent. Compounded by the negative propaganda of the government and Maoist Party, local implementing partners thus reported several difficulties in dealing with the VMLR because they "have higher expectations; have to face stigmatization from communities; have strong opinions that are different from others; and [of cultural relevance] they are not modest".¹⁵² The UNIRP review further pointed that trainees are dissatisfied with the duration of the training and there has been a low interest and enrollment rate among females.¹⁵³ However, recent gender-specific interventions in year two have seen female enrollment increase.

The existence and capacity of the CAAFAG Working Group, established prior to the UNIRP programme, gave UNICEF an edge over the other agencies and mechanisms for dealing with these challenges. Given the delays in discharging the VMLR, a possible lesson could be to have invested more in establishing networks similar to the CAAFAG model—even if it is through other community peacebuilding or development programmes or target groups—so that a strong supportive local base and infrastructure can be established in advance that requires only additional tailoring to be used in DDR contexts.

A particular lesson highlighted by UNDP regarding UNIRP implementation is that while the government and Maoist party restricted the communication and outreach of the programme in the first year, and in year 2 the UN had a series of outreach communication via text messaging, radio public service announcements, telephonic outreach and outreach through the CAAFAG Network, they should have found ways to invest more in public relations in the development of orientation tools (videos, catalogues, etc.).

An upcoming challenge identified by the UNIRP review relates to the sustainability of assistance to children who require more support than is provided through the 2-year duration of the programme. The review warned that there could be a high number of drop-outs from the education programmes from those who will not be finished their studies within the 2-year duration of the programme and especially for those who live outside of the home to get their education. This challenges emphasizes the broader value and need for ensuring there is an adequate and sustainable exit strategy in place to link the reintegration programmes into more sustainable recovery and development programmes.

¹⁵¹ Interagency Programming Mission Report, UN Interagency Rehabilitation Programme, February 2011, p.7.

¹⁵² Interagency Programming Mission Report, UN Interagency Rehabilitation Programme, February 2011, pp. 10, 11, 12, 27.

¹⁵³ Interagency Programming Mission Report, UN Interagency Rehabilitation Programme, February 2011, pp. 10, 11, 12, 27.

