



Trust Fund Committee Meeting May 25/26, 2010 – Paris **MINUTES**

Participants

AfDB	Ginette Nzau-Muteta
Belgium	Isabelle Witoek
Finland	Heini Pulli
France	Camille Grousselas and Charles Girard
Norway	Håvard Hoksnes
Sweden	Lena Schildt and Pernilla Trädgårdh
TDRP Team	Maria Correia, Anton Baaré, Aki Stavrou, René Bauman, Philip Lancaster, Christopher Saunders, Benjamin Burckhart, Chantal Rigaud

Summary

1. The first TDRP Trust Fund Committee (TFC) meeting was held in Paris on May 25 and 26, 2010. Six of the seven TDRP donors were represented.¹ Aside from financial reporting, the meeting gave the opportunity to the TDRP team to present progress to date as well as directions for future programming. At the start of the meeting, Maria Correia reminded participants of the three objectives of the TDRP, its guiding principles, the type of activities it can finance and the thematic areas identified at the outset (see annex 1).

I. Multi-country Demobilization and Reintegration Program (MDRP) Closure

2. **MDTF.** The MDRP accounts are now closed and the surplus has been reimbursed to all donors. Donors who have asked that their surplus be transferred to the TDRP account will shortly receive the respective administrative agreements. One issue (UNDP ineligible expense of about \$25,000 in the CAR PRAC) remains unresolved; however this issue will be dealt with at the level of the World Bank's Africa Region along with other issues with the UNDP, and any resources recovered will be returned to the donors. The trust fund audit, completed last March, found no reservations in the way the MDRP multi-donor trust fund was managed.

3. **Findings from MDRP final reports.** Two final reports on the MDRP were presented and discussed: the Independent Evaluation (IE), carried out by Scanteam, and the Implementation Completion Memorandum (ICM), a required World Bank report for all trust funds (see annex 2). The ICM referred to the MDRP's original logframe, demonstrating how the region had changed from 2002 to 2009 in terms of political stability and absence of violence, reduction in the number of Internally Displaced Persons, increase in exports of goods and reduction of military expenditures. Overall, stability and security in the region have improved, and MDRP contributed to this achievement, albeit of course

¹ France and Belgium will shortly join the Trust Fund Committee officially once the legal agreement to transfer their MDRP surplus is counter signed.



not the only factor. Although the depth of analysis varied as did the emphasis in the two reports, the key messages and lessons are consistent. These included:

- The regional nature of the program, despite being inherently risky and complex, was the only suitable option. Among other advantages, it ensured coherence and coordination of DDR programs in the region. On the other hand, the lack of a robust regional peace process impacted negatively the MDRP's ability to meet its objectives. Furthermore, without dedicated resources, the MDRP's regional agenda took second stage to the national programs.
- The MDRP was too technocratic in its approach to DDR. The political dimension of demobilization was recognized, but donors were not able to propose a collective approach in carrying out their political role. The emphasis on national ownership was correct, but the legitimacy or capacity of the respective governments affected implementation of DDR programs. In hindsight, continuous political risk analysis should have been carried out, and flexibility built in to projects to allow for adjustments as needed during implementation. Applying a national ownership model also means much more attention to capacity building.
- The MDRP's large and diverse partnership was ambitious and innovative. However, it would have required dedicated attention and resources to make it function more smoothly, and to strengthen relationships between development, diplomacy and military actors. The donors themselves encountered internal difficulties in this regard.
- On the operational side, a key lesson from the MDRP is that in some contexts, it makes sense to separate DDr (disarmament, demobilization and reinsertion) from R (reintegration). DDr is basically a security operation involving institutions such as the Ministry of Defense, whereas R is more of a developmental activity. The quality of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems varied significantly by country depending on capacity. Finally, as was done for children, a dedicated window for other vulnerable groups such as women and the physically-disabled should be established.
- The World Bank provided good stewardship for the MDRP: the program met its objectives, and the Bank committed over US\$ 250 million in IDA grants, which would have been very unlikely had the MDRP been managed by another organization. Implementation of the program however revealed some weaknesses related to Bank procedures and policies, organizational structure and staffing. Given the World Bank's interest and commitment to its fragile states agenda, lessons from the MDRP are highly relevant.

4. The IE has been sent to all former MDRP partners for comments and will be finalized in June. The ICM has been circulated to former MDRP donors for comments and will also be finalized shortly. A legacy publication on the MDRP is being prepared, as well as country reports that will tell the MDRP story.

5. **Comments and Recommendations.** Donors asked that: (a) numbers presented in the ICM be disaggregated by gender; (b) a plan be prepared showing how these lessons are incorporated into the TDRP and how they can be used in other DDR programs; (c) the dissemination of lessons target senior policy staff in their countries and agencies. For the latter, it was agreed that a road show be carried out



rather than one regional meeting. The African Development Bank asked that its role be noted more substantially in the reports as its work in this area is pioneering. In the long term, the body of knowledge developed over the life of the MDRP and the TDRP will need to be preserved in a sustainable way (for example through African regional programs, or universities). Lastly, donors asked that they be kept abreast of another review being undertaken by Scanteam on the use of multi donor trust funds in fragile states, in which the MDRP is featured.

II. TDRP Regional Programming

A. DDRnet

6. Anton Baaré presented the DDRnet (see annex 3), a network of DDR practitioners that would gather representatives of client governments, donors (contributing and non-contributing) and other DDR stakeholders in the Great Lakes including UN agencies and implementing agencies. The purpose of the network is to coordinate and share information on DDR and related activities, including strategic matters related to DDR and the security/development nexus. Proposed topics for the network are: the politics of demobilization, foreign armed groups, DDR in the context of shadow economies, DDR and youth employment, communications in DDR programs, characteristics of sustainable reintegration and resilient communities, and enhanced M&E.

7. Two DDRnet expert seminars took place in late April in Brussels: the first one on the politics of demobilization and the second one on foreign armed groups/the FDLR (see minutes in annexes 4 and 5). The format of these events (using Chatham house rules) makes them well suited for participants to speak freely and engage fully into the discussions. A second meeting on foreign armed groups, focusing on the LRA, is being planned for June 17 in Washington, DC. The TDRP team sought donors' feedback on other relevant themes they would like to see addressed in DDRnet events.

8. **Comments and Recommendations:** Donors asked for clarification on how participants were selected for the Brussels events. Some countries have special representatives to the Great Lakes region who would be interested in attending. The TDRP team explained that the objectives of the Brussels discussions led the decisions on participants. Events are open to donors however, and for future events, the TDRP team will prepare a calendar that will be circulated in advance to allow donors to plan the participation of their relevant staff. The AfDB is interested in the events on youth employment and shadow economies. In discussing the possible fora to disseminate information coming out of DDRnet events, the Inter Agency Working Group on DDR was mentioned. Since the Bank, through TDRP, has asked to become a member, participants asked whether the Bank would thus adopt and follow the IDDRS (International DDR Standards). As a set of normative standards, the IDDRS take a rights-based justification for action, which is not necessarily applicable to all member organizations. Moreover, it is meant for action by UN agencies. At a regional level the IDDRS does not provide the right framework for action.

B. Foreign Armed Groups

9. Philip Lancaster presented the findings of the UN Group of Experts for DRC on the *Forces démocratiques de Libération du Rwanda* (FDLR - see annex 4). The presentation had been given a month before in Brussels during the DDRnet expert seminar on foreign armed groups. It had received wide praise for the level of detail it provided as well as the insight into the workings of the rebel group. The



TDRP had also sent a mission to eastern DRC in late 2009 to evaluate the situation and make recommendations for possible TDRP involvement.

10. During the discussion, it was mentioned that the upcoming elections in Rwanda would likely not have an impact on the FDLR situation. As to similarities between the FDLR and the LRA, the TDRP team noted that the Ugandan rebel group is as reactive and resilient as the FDLR. It relies heavily on members in the diaspora, just like the FDLR. The two groups represent complex problems that need a good understanding of all their dimensions. Unfortunately, up to now, each agency or organization has taken a narrow focus (e.g. rights-based approach) to deal with this issue.

11. The TDRP team cautioned against equaling numbers of FDLR rebels to the level of threat they represent. As long as the FDLR leadership is in place, the group will remain a threat. The donors asked whether the ongoing DDR/RR process was making a difference. Despite an increase in defections after the recent military operations (Umoja Wetu, Kimia II and Amani Leo) to about 150 to 200 rebels a month, it is difficult to gage if new recruitments replace fully those who have left. In any case, the face of the FDLR is evolving as newer members replace old ones. It was noted that the DDR process is still essential, however it cannot compensate for political or military defeat. Important intelligence is gathered by those who leave the movement, even though this is not the goal of DDR.

12. **TDRP Role on ForAGs.** The role of the TDRP is evolving. At the Expert Seminar in Brussels, participants decided to set up an FDLR task force that would be facilitated by the TDRP. TDRP's role will be one of coordination, and generation and dissemination of information. It will include for example carrying out a mapping exercise of the response to the FDLR issue (who is doing what), including advocacy organizations.

13. **Comments and Recommendations.** Donors were generally satisfied with the emerging role of the TDRP in acting as a convener and providing technical assistance on ForAGs, however some of them want to consult with their headquarters on the FDLR task force and the role of the TDRP. They cautioned against the TDRP taking on a different role than originally agreed to. They stressed the importance of remaining transparent. The TDRP technical team reassured them that TDRP's role would be as facilitator. But in this role, it will be able to shed light on crucial questions. The term "task force" was seen as problematic and will be revisited. The work program for the task force, including next meetings, is being developed and will be shared with donors.

C. Facility for Quality Enhancement and Innovation

14. Aki Stavrou presented the objective and proposed activities of a facility for quality enhancement and innovation supported by the TDRP (see annex 5). Anchored in the third objective of the Program ("to facilitate a dialogue, information exchange and learning on D&R in the region"), the facility will engage DDR practitioners at various levels and through various means: technical assistance, mentoring and capacity building activities, workshops, study tours, etc. In particular, the facility would support monitoring and evaluation tasks by overseeing the design of research and evaluation methodologies, sampling and survey instruments, and by identifying and managing consultant expertise. The facility would seek to create synergies with partners such as academic institutions, research agencies and think tanks, NGOs and civil society. At the end of the TDRP, the facility would aim to merge all findings, and locate them in an adequate repository.

15. The team is currently carrying out the first phase of the facility, which comprises scoping missions in the different GLR countries to identify the current status of M&E and corollary needs; missions to DRC, Rwanda, Uganda and RoC have been carried out. An implementation phase will follow from end 2010 to June 2012. The last phase will consist of synthetic reporting on the activities carried out. Following the initial scoping missions, a few common themes are emerging, including regional activities (for a full list, see presentation in annex 7). Among them:

- Carrying out baseline studies and/or tracer studies on ex-combatants, their families and the communities where they reintegrate,
- Improving database quality through technical assistance addressing collection and consistency of data, input and storage processes.
- Training and capacity building for reintegration staff in DDR implementing agencies.
- Studying the impact of ex-combatants mobility on their reintegration, or the impact of reintegrating ex-combatants into conflict zones.
- Supporting reintegration through cultural and sports events.

16. Lastly, following many questions raised on gender, the TDRP team presented an overview of how the TDRP is working with LEAP to address gender and D&R issues in the region (see annex 6). The general approach is to consult with LEAP on gender issues that are raised by the quality enhancement facility and if for some reason LEAP is unable to address them, to consider dealing with them through the TDRP. To this end, the TDRP has already identified some possible strategic alliances (e.g. Harvard Humanitarian Initiative).

17. **Comments and Recommendations.** Donors appreciated that the lessons from the MDRP were taken into consideration and applied in the proposed quality enhancement activities. The following suggestions emerged during the discussion: (a) the TDRP should be selective and strategic given the short time span of the TDRP (including developing a logframe of activities; (b) donors need to be informed ahead of time of upcoming missions in order to be able to participate; (c) quality enhancement work should build on the work of existing research institutions; (d) transitional justice should be considered as part of the facility's activities; and (e) the TDRP team will link with DDR programs in other countries outside the GLR to spread the lessons from the facility. Relationships with UN organizations were discussed, and the TDRP team reported on its contacts with the various agencies individually to establish specific relationships around shared interests/themes. For the time being, there was no need to formalize these relationships through memoranda of understanding. Moreover, once the TDRP would become a full member of the IAWG on DDR, relating to UN organizations through that structure would be facilitated. On gender, donors emphasized their interest in being informed on LEAP activities.

III. Country DDR programs Highlights

18. Maria Correia gave an overview of TDRP activities in the seven GLR countries (DDR operations, Technical assistance and regional activities) and a quick update of the ongoing programs in Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi (see annex 8). More detailed updates were given for the CAR and DRC (see below).

19. In **Rwanda**, the US\$4.5 million TDRP grant will soon be transferred into the country's multi-donor trust fund. Two conditions for effectiveness of the new operation still need to be met. In **Uganda**,

an extension of one year until June 2011 is in process. In general, project implementation has been slower than expected due to the failure of the Juba process, and capacity of the government and Amnesty Commission remain weak. Donors asked if a DDR staff was going to be based in Rwanda as this had been discussed in the past and a lack of coordination among actors in the country was evident. Maria responded that now that the TDRP regional agenda on foreign armed groups was becoming clearer, the matter would be reconsidered.

A. Central African Republic (CAR)

20. Chris Saunders presented the status of the proposed community reintegration project in the CAR (see annex 9). The disarmament and demobilization process being supported by UNDP is experiencing delays, and presidential elections, which were due to take place in April, have been postponed indefinitely. Despite these delays, reintegration activities can proceed, and may even create favorable conditions for demobilization. The proposed project is estimated at US\$10 million: US\$8 million from the TDRP and US\$2 million from the Japanese Social Development Fund (JSDF), another trust fund managed by the World Bank.²

21. The Project will target ex-combatants and their dependents as well as members of militia and gangs, and the communities at large. The project will focus on the north of country and support those communities with the highest concentration of ex-combatants. Four international NGOs will implement the project in four different areas. They will provide the services in Re/integration), i.e. livelihoods & basic social infrastructure; capacity development; and reconciliation.

22. Some of the risks identified include a very short timeframe for implementation (estimated at about 20 months) and the sustainability of the project. On this last point, the TDRP team is linking with the European Commission's *Pôles de Développement* as well as other World Bank projects in the country. On coordination with other actors and the UN, the selected NGOs have already started interacting with each other about their respective tasks. As for the UN, the division of responsibility has been clear from the start: UNDP would handle disarmament and demobilization, and the TDRP would cover reintegration. On gender, the issue of young men at-risk was emphasized.

23. **Comments and Recommendations:** Donors suggested that the quality enhancement facility follow the CAR program closely as it would be a good case study of doing R (reintegration) before DD (this point is currently being discussed). Risks associated with reintegrating armed combatants into communities were also discussed. This type of reverse DDR has been used in other countries (e.g. Afghanistan and Somalia) and the expectation is that reintegration of combatants into communities will create the adequate conditions for disarmament. Documents will be sent to donors for endorsement of the CAR operation in the summer.

B. Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)

24. René Bauman presented an update of DDR in the DRC (see annex 10), which includes support to the DRC's National Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Program through an IDA (additional financing) grant of US\$50 million, an AfDB grant of US\$25 million, and a multi-donor trust fund of about US\$10 million to the eastern DRC. He presented and explained the numbers of demobilized and reintegrated in phase 1 and 2, and the remaining caseload for reintegration. He noted that following the

² A proposal to JSDF had been made 18 months ago and was recently approved.



LEAP pilot project in Kindu, helping vulnerable women with economic reintegration, activities are being replicated in six other towns.

25. Some of the current constraints that the program faces are the continuous presence of unsecured pockets in the east of the country, the high rate of mobility of the demobilized population in a vast country, and the limited number of UEPN-DDR staff responsible for monitoring, in particular considering the recent project extension until September 2011. Among various challenges in the near future, the TDRP is concerned about the capacity of the Government to finish and improve reintegration activities, despite the 15-month extension of the project's closing date, and larger challenges such as the reform of the military and police. The TDRP team noted that the government wanted to enhance reintegration activities and that an initial workshop planned under the facility for quality enhancement would give more insight into these activities.

IV. TDRP Trust Fund Update

26. Chris Saunders presented an update on the TDRP trust fund accounts: receipts, commitments, disbursements (see annex 11). Legal agreements were recently sent to those donors willing to transfer their MDRP surplus into the TDRP trust fund. Once this is done, the amount of the TDRP TF will stand at US\$30.6 million (including investment income), which is sufficient to cover planned activities. Disbursements have remained low to date in light of the delays encountered in both the CAR and Rwanda operations, which together represent US\$12.5 million, but will pick up in the coming months as the TDRP's regional agenda shapes up.

27. **Comments and Suggestions.** Donors asked for clarifications on the administrative fee and staff costs line items. Chris also noted that movements between line items are possible depending on need. Based on the numbers presented and the CAR project timeframe, some donors noted that the TDRP will run out of time before being able to implement the proposed programs and use up its resources. The TDRP team is already considering this possibility.

V. Conclusions and Next Steps

28. Maria presented the conclusions of the meeting and proposed next steps (see annex 12). In general terms, the TDRP is the exit strategy for the MDRP, and so it is important to prepare early for the TDRP's close. This strategy will involve linkages with appropriate African institutions that will be able to receive and pass on the knowledge accumulated by the two regional programs. Through consultations with think tanks and research institutes such as the Institute for Peace and Security Studies at the Africa Peace and Security Programme of the Addis Ababa University, the TDRP is already setting the stage to empower the African Union to be the repository for MDRP/TDRP knowledge. Various other strategic alliances (with IAWG on DDR, DPKO, CEPGL, ICGLR, UNICEF, UNESCO) are ongoing and will also ensure that the programs' lessons are passed on and used. Finally, the Fragile States Group at the African Development Bank is also a prime partner in the closing strategy.

29. In conclusion, it is important to note again that the TDRP is different from the MDRP in that it operates in a much different context and seeks to put a firm close to a DDR facility in the Great Lakes region. The TDRP offers great opportunities for meaningful action at the regional level, but limited options at the national level. The focus of TDRP activities therefore will be put on technical assistance

and quality enhancement, ensuring strategic prioritization of activities. Besides the CAR and Rwanda operations, there will not be other financing of DDR operations (donors do not want to finance a new operation in the Republic of Congo).

30. Opportunities for regional knowledge production, innovation and learning are strong and will allow for the generation of policy advice, good practices for improved DDR, and fertilization across countries.

31. **Comments and Recommendations.** Donors welcomed the clear emphasis on closing strategy at this stage, and offered support as they are already involved in collaborative relationships with some of the actors that the TDRP has contacted. Sweden for example is already supporting the African Union's peace and security architecture and some funds are set aside for the ICGLR. Through cross-support and regular information sharing, these linkages can be strengthened. Donors raised the need to extend the TDRP given the timeframe of the CAR operation but it was ultimately agreed to wait and see how the program develops and to revisit the issue next year.

Next Steps

- CAR project to be sent to Trust fund Committee for endorsement (July 2010)
- DDRnet
 - FDLR task force: propose scope/nature of task force and prepare work plan
 - LRA event on June 17: send invitations to donors
 - Prepare schedule and budget for other events and share with TFC
- Quality enhancement and innovation
 - Consolidate findings of missions and define strategy
 - Prioritize activities, implementing arrangements and partners, and prepare budget and results framework
 - Define gender and DDR activities and budget, in coordination with LEAP, in particular do a joint meeting of the TDRP and LEAP at the next gathering.
- Road show on MDRP lessons and strategic alliances/closure strategy targeting regional bodies in Africa and current and former MDRP partners.
- Follow up work on strategic alliances, including budgeting, joint work programs and results
- Prepare an activity-based budget by year
- Others:
 - Provide regular donor updates of upcoming events and missions
 - Share Scanteam report on MDTFs and Fragile States
 - Prepare table showing MDRP lessons incorporated into TDRP approach and activities.
 - Hold the second TFC meeting in a year, with videoconferences organized in between as needed.