



Uganda Demobilization and Reintegration Project Beneficiary Assessment



Anthony Finn • Clare Jefferson • Santa Vusia • Deogratias Yiga

Copyright © 2012
The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433
www.tdrp.net
www.worldbank.org

This Study was produced under the Transitional Demobilization and Reintegration Program (TDRP). The findings, interpretations and conclusions herein are those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect the views of the TDRP donors, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/World Bank and its affiliated organizations, its Executive Directors, or the governments they represent.

The World Bank does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in this work do not imply any judgment on the part of The World Bank concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

Rights and Permissions

The material in this publication is copyrighted. Copying and/or transmitting portions or all of this work without permission may be a violation of applicable law. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank encourages dissemination of its work and will normally grant permission to reproduce portions of the work promptly.

Queries on rights and licenses, including subsidiary rights, should be addressed to:
the Office of the Publisher, The World Bank, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433, USA
Fax: 202-522-2422. E-mail: pubrights@worldbank.org

Cover: Duina Reyes
Photos: TDRP/Burrall



Programme transitionnel de démobilisation et réintégration

Uganda Demobilization and Reintegration Project Beneficiary Assessment

December 2011

*Anthony Finn
Clare Jefferson
Santa Vusia
Deogratias Yiga*

Contents

List of Acronyms	v
Introduction	1
1. Purpose of the study	1
2. Methodology	2
3. Limitations and challenges	3
1. Overview of the Analysis of Reporters and Community Reintegration	4
Unique challenges: female community members and female reporters	5
2. Demographic and Core Indicators.....	7
2.1 Marriage and marriage breakdown.....	8
2.2 Educational achievement and training	8
2.3 Land tenure, food security and conflict	9
2.4 Additional reintegration dimensions	11
2.4.1. Factional dimensions	11
2.4.2 Economic dimensions	11
2.4.3 Social dimensions	12
3. Economic Reintegration	13
3.1 Migration	14
3.2 Additional reintegration dimensions.....	15
3.2.1 Factional dimensions	15
3.2.2 Economic dimensions	15
4. Social and Political Reintegration	16
4.1 Social networks	16
4.2 Perceptions of community, trust and solidarity	16
4.3. Empowerment and social change.....	17
4.4 Additional reintegration dimensions.....	17
4.4.1 Factional dimensions	17
4.4.2 Political dimensions.....	17

5. DDR Process	18
5.1 Reinsertion payment: use, sensitization and expectations	19
5.2 Community experiences	20
5.3 Additional reintegration dimensions.....	20
5.3.1 Factional dimensions	20
5.3.2 Social dimensions	20
6. Conclusions.....	22
6.1 Economic reintegration	22
6.1.1 Community driven development.....	22
6.1.2 Rural-urban periphery	23
6.2 Social reintegration	23
6.2.1 Younger reporters	23
6.2.2 Female community members	23
Annexes	25

List of Tables

Table 1. Type of respondent by sample location (actual sample)	2
Table 2. Type of respondent by gender and age (actual sample)	3
Table 3. Marital status (combined)	9
Table 4. Reinsertion assistance: Time between SSD or formal demobilization and amnesty	18
Table 5. Receipt of reinsertion assistance (by armed group and year of receipt of amnesty).....	19

List of Acronyms

AC	Amnesty Commission
ADF	Allied Democratic Forces
AG	Armed Group
CFP	Community Focal Person
DDR	Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration
DRT	Demobilization and Resettlement Team
GoU	Government of Uganda
HHI	Household income
ICRS	Information, Counseling and Referral System
IGA	Income Generating Activity
IOM	International Organization for Migration
LRA	Lord's Resistance Army
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDRP	Multi-Donor Demobilization and Reintegration Program
NALU	National Army for the Liberation of Uganda
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NUDIPU	National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda
NUSAF	Northern Uganda Social Action Fund
PRA	People's Redemption Army
SSD	Spontaneous Self Demobilization
UgDRP	Uganda Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project
UPA	Ugandan People's Army
UPF	Ugandan Patriotic Front

UPDA	Ugandan Peoples Defense Army
UNRF	Ugandan National Rescue Front
WHO	World Health Organization
WNBF	West Nile Bank Front

Note on terminology

In this report the term “shifting” is used regarding reporter migration. This is because the local term was more familiar to the respondents in the sample and was the common term throughout the studies.

The term “spontaneous self demobilization” is used to denote the process whereby reporters left insurgency/ escaped captivity but did not demobilize as the result of an agreed process and did not receive amnesty.

The term “formal demobilization” is used to denote when reporters (WNBF and UNRF) demobilized en masse as a result of an agreement between the Amnesty Commission and the Government of Uganda.

“Amnesty” or “demobilization” is used to denote when reporters are given amnesty.

Introduction

The World Bank commissioned this survey of reporters and the communities within which they have settled as part of a batch of final studies and an evaluation at the end of the Uganda Demobilization and Reintegration Program (UgDRP) in June 2011.¹

The analysis in this beneficiary assessment is complemented by what is presented in the companion studies, particularly: *The Drivers of reporter Reintegration in Northern Uganda (2011)*, *A Report into the Relationship between the Amnesty Commission and its Implementing Agents (2011)* as well as the *Final Independent Evaluation of the UgDRP 2008 – 2011 (2011)*, all of which were conducted concurrently in the second half of 2011.

1. Purpose of the study

The purpose of the beneficiary assessment was to document the demobilization, repatriation, reconciliation and reintegration experience of reporters and how their community perceived the dialogue, reconciliation and reporter reintegration processes. The survey and subsequent analysis examined the experiences in the following areas:

a. Demographics

Information pertaining to standard demographics plus levels achieved in education and training including vocational training, and aspirations in these areas.

b. Housing and security

Analysis of current situation, actual and perceived risks to safety and preliminary indicators of levels of trust in the community.

c. Land, livestock and food security

Analysis of access to land and general food security.

d. Reintegration experiences

For reporters and community members, an analysis of the levels of acceptance of reporters and reporter reintegration in the community and family, and the degree to which the community focal persons (CFPs) are effective. For reporters, an analysis of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) experiences and reintegration status. For the community members an analysis of views of the community on reintegration of reporters and pertinent dynamics such as acceptance, respect, stigma.

e. Economic issues

Analysis of current status, actual vulnerability and perceived vulnerability. Also, an analysis of perceived possibility of improvement or worsening of economic status. Sub-headings for analysis include: income, savings and credit and economic associations. Specific focus on economic issues stratified by gender, disability and non-economically active reporters.

f. Migration

Analysis of shifts by respondents including frequency and drivers and how they relate to conflict, reconciliation and reintegration.

g. Social capital

Analysis of social capital dynamics and indicators including: trust and solidarity; collective action and cooperation; social cohesion; empowerment, and so-

¹ Implemented between August 2008 and June 2011, the UgDRP was established to build upon previous support to the Amnesty Commission through the MDRP to assist in the DDR of 14,545 reporters at a cost of USD 4.2 million. The UgDRP was originally planned to be worth USD 8.254 million for the purpose of bringing an end to the protracted conflict in northern Uganda. In 2008 a multi-donor trust fund managed by the World Bank was established to implement the program.

cial change. The analysis triangulates actual indicators with perceptions of the effect of conflict, reconciliation and reintegration on same.

2. Methodology

The overall methodology consisted of four dynamics:

- a) Document review (Phase One);
- b) Quantitative sampling and survey (Phase Two);
- c) Qualitative survey (Phase Three);
- d) Analysis (Phase Four).

At inception the parameters for the sampling were 394 reporters and 180 community members. The sample of reporters was proportionally divided by demobilization and resettlement team (DRT) in line with the percentage of reporter population received through each DRT². Community members sampled follows the same percentage distribution. The second parameter applied to the sample was similarity in gender between reporter and community samples. The third was similarity in age and the fourth was similarity in location. The fifth parameter was that reporters must have been demobilized between August 2008 and June 2011; that is, during the lifetime of the UgDRP.³ As the Information, Counseling and Referral Services (ICRS) returns data on the year of demobilization and not the month, the sample was widened slightly to anyone received between 2008 and 2011.

The survey sample was drawn in two parts: (i) able-bodied reporters disaggregated primarily by gender and age; (ii) disabled reporters, primarily disaggregated by gender and age. The disabled sample was broken down proportionally by DRT and by gender. The community member survey of 180 was divided as follows: 120 who have parity based on gender and age with the reporter sample and 60 randomly sampled and including disabled community members, older and younger community members without applying other prescriptive criteria. Reporter samples were drawn to include two supplementary lists from which field teams randomly selected reporters when those on the primary list were not contactable. During field work some working adjustments were made to the sample as challenges arose, but these adjustments did not affect the consistency of the overall sample.

It was determined that 10% of the sample should com-

prise disabled reporters. In the ICRS, the Amnesty Commission sorts the disability field by (i) amputees; (ii) blind and partially blind; (iii) paralysis and partial paralysis; (iv) body and head injury; (v) other. The “other” field included minor injuries and ailments, so to calculate the percentage of total reporters, this category was omitted giving just over 9% of disabled reporters.

At the close of fieldwork the *actual* sample was: 410 reporter surveys (69.3% of overall total) and 182 community surveys (30.7% of overall total). The sample point and gender distribution is shown in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Type of respondent by sample location (actual sample)

Sample location	Reporter	Community
Kampala	14	0
Arua	162	54
Gulu	21	42
Central	8	12
Kasese	21	12
Kitgum	146	49
Mbale	38	13
Total	410	182

2 The Amnesty Act established the Amnesty Commission and identified that among other monitoring and coordination functions the AC will “monitor programs of (i) demobilization; (ii) reintegration; and (iii) resettlement of reporters”. A seven member DRT established by the Act and under the supervision of the AC was constituted to “draw programs for: (a) de-commissioning of arms; (b) demobilization; (c) re-settlement; and (d) reintegration of reporters. The AC, through the DRTs, has maintained six offices as follows: Central, Gulu, Kitgum, Mbale, Arua, Kasese and a liaison office in Beni in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

3 The AC was executing some of its activities under a memorandum of understanding with IOM (with UNDP funding) for the most part of 2008 until end of December 2008.

Table 2. Type of respondent by gender and age (actual sample)⁴

	Reporter			Community		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
18-30 years	109	48	157	51	33	84
31-40 years	86	14	100	29	11	40
Over 40 years	108	42	150	44	12	56
Total	303	104	407	124	56	180

3. Limitations and challenges

a. Data

There were challenges with data in the AC’s ICRS and particularly data drawn for the sample, which delayed the field work. Time was spent to manually clean up the data to arrive at the sample. Thus negative effects of this limitation were managed.

b. Issues pertaining to identification, location and participation of reporters

Reporter migration made it difficult to locate some of them. The survey team imposed a 100% margin of error on samples, created two substitute lists of reporters for the AC, and utilized CFPs, old command structures and where relevant, associations such as NUDIPU to help identify and locate appropriate respondents. Also, the timing of the survey coincided with the beginning of the rainy season. Given that many reporters are occupied with agriculture and

considering the changing weather patterns, they were engaged in attending to their crops. However, through the measures outlined above the negative effects of this limitation were managed.

c. Disabled sub-groups: comparative analysis between community and reporters

In the analysis, it was not possible to compare disabled reporters to disabled community members. This is because despite using local networks, authorities and bodies such as the NUDIPU, only nine disabled community members were sampled compared to 70 disabled reporters. However, disabled people from each sample can be compared to the rest of that sample, meaning that disabled reporters can be compared to able-bodied reporters and disabled community members to able-bodied community members.

⁴ Some respondents did not provide their age, which explains the difference in total numbers between tables 1 and 2.