

5. DDR Process

The study examined reporters and community experiences and expectations regarding the DDR process. Data and analysis in annexes 1 and 2 can give a richer understanding of the processes involved.

Findings are disaggregated by stages in the DDR process and then by reporter evaluation of the AC. It is important to bear in mind that aside from how reporters may return to their communities, the DDR process is not uniform for all reporters: the main variable is when reporters received amnesty.

Table 4. Reinsertion assistance: Time between SSD or formal demobilization and amnesty

Did you receive the AC package - in other words reinsertion assistance?	Time between SSD and formal demobilization and amnesty (years)					
	0 years					
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	Other	Total
Yes	63.5%	0.0%	75.0%	87.5%	100.0%	68.7%
No	36.5%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%	0.0%	31.3%
	1-4 years					
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	Other	Total
Yes	58.0%	0.0%	71.4%	0.0%	100.0%	59.7%
No	42.0%	100.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	40.3%
	5-9 years					
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	Other	Total
Yes	33.3%	0.0%	84.6%	0.0%	100.0%	40.3%
No	66.7%	100.0%	15.4%	100.0%	0.0%	59.7%
	10-14 years					
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	Other	Total
Yes	0.0%	21.1%	100.0%	71.4%	0.0%	22.6%
No	100.0%	78.9%	0.0%	28.6%	100.0%	77.4%
	15-19 years					
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	Other	Total
Yes	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	84.2%	100.0%	74.1%
No	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%	25.9%

Table 5. Receipt of reinsertion assistance (by armed group and year of receipt of amnesty)

	2008				2009				2010			
	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF	LRA	WNBF	ADF	UNRF
Yes	60.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	68.4%	14.3%	93.3%	85.0%	25.0%	25.0%	72.7%	86.7%
No	40.0%	100.0%	33.3%	100.0%	31.6%	85.7%	6.7%	15.0%	75.0%	75.0%	27.3%	13.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	15	14	6	1	57	14	15	20	68	120	11	15

The factors influencing the overall DDR experience for reporters have been (i) the time between spontaneous self-demobilization or a formal demobilization process and demobilization where amnesty is given; (ii) sensitization and expectations regarding reinsertion; (iii) the high levels of family and community acceptance, and (iv) breaking former command structures. Reintegration involves the preparation of the community for receipt of reporters. By reviewing their experience of the DDR process the community identified sensitization and dispelling fears as key aspects of their experience.

Based on the time between spontaneous self-demobilization or formal demobilization and receipt of amnesty, there is inconsistency with the numbers of reporters who have received reinsertion assistance, although this has decreased in recent years.

While there are various official reasons why some reporters do not receive reinsertion assistance, (reporters may not have spent sufficient time in rebellion, they may be outside the cut-off date for inclusion in a backlog of reporters awaiting reinsertion assistance by the AC or they may have demobilized recently when there has been insufficient funds to pay the reinsertion assistance) the end result is that there is inconsistency across groups and the perceptions of reporters do not reflect the official reasons why they may or may not have received assistance.¹¹

5.1 Reinsertion payment: use, sensitization and expectations

Of those surveyed, 17.0% of reporters identified that their primary needs were met to a large extent by the

reinsertion assistance, 31% to a medium extent, and 52.0% to a small extent. Despite this, only 31.1% of the female reporters, 41.9% of males and 42.6% of disabled reporters identified that their expectations (what they perceived they were entitled to) were met and they did receive the rehabilitative process they were expecting. Gender has no significant impact on the analysis of reinsertion payments but the average payment to female reporters is still less than their male counterparts.¹² There is a correlation between the amount of information received by reporters and the likelihood of receiving payments from the AC. In other words, it appears that if reporters are appropriately sensitized then they are more likely to be able to navigate the reinsertion system and access support.

11 The AC explained that the reasons why a reporter may or may not receive a package are well known. The report gives other reasons, and more criteria were added after the World Bank reporter backlog audit. One of the key reasons, other than insufficient funds, is that effective in 2006, the AC decided not to give reinsertion packages to reporters who had stayed in the community for more than two years. For example, during the implementation of UgDRP, a total of 3,342 reporters were demobilized. Of these, over 2,000 WNBF reporters and others had lived in the community for more than 2 years and as such they did not receive any re-insertion package. However all reporters are entitled to other benefits like referrals, training, and startup capital. During the implementation of UgDRP, a total of 3,360 reporters received reinsertion packages of whom 3052 were backlog (demobilized before 2008 but not given reinsertion packages at the time) and 308 were trickle-in (freshly demobilized) reporters.

12 The AC explained that except in situations where some activities (like training) are specifically targeted to different genders, all reporters, whether females or males, received the same benefits. For example the re-insertion package given by AC is the same (both the monetary and the physical items) for both males and females (and even children above 12 years of age).

5.2 Community experiences

The community was sensitized about formal reinsertion mainly through the radio (34.8%) and word of mouth (25.9%). Only 17.1% were informed via community meetings but this is by far the preferred means of communication by the community. 12.7% of community members identify that they were not informed.

5.3 Additional reintegration dimensions

5.3.1 Factional dimensions

A dimension of successful or unsuccessful reintegration is the extent to which reporters break or continue to maintain ties with other reporters and former commanders. The study finds that reporters have very little contact with former commanders and to a large extent do not benefit materially from residual command structures. However, these structures still exist: in the field work for this study former commanders assisted the field teams to identify and locate difficult to find reporters who had been randomly chosen for the sample.

It is evident from responses that contact with former commanders does not convert into gains in employment or income generating opportunities: 93.3% of reporters state that they do not acquire income generating opportunities in this way, 4.6% seldom and 2.1% often. There is no variance across genders and age categories.

Reporters reflected on the elements of the DDR process during which they were in contact with the AC and responded as follows: 53.3% of reporters were satisfied and 20.2% dissatisfied with the content of the reintegration package given by the AC; 41.3% were satisfied and 44.3% were dissatisfied with the cash component of the AC reinsertion package; 51.6% were satisfied with the local regional office administration of the reinsertion process and 31.5% were dissatisfied.

Regarding gender there is approximate parity in satisfaction and dissatisfaction rates in female and male reporters for: (i) preparation for demobilization and (ii) work of regional AC offices. Disparities exist in relation to the content of the reinsertion package where

60.3% of female reporters in comparison to 50.8% of males are satisfied, and 13.7% dissatisfied compared to 22.6% of males. Disparities also exist regarding the cash component of the reinsertion package: 52.6% of female reporters and 37.6% of male reporters are satisfied with the component and 29.8% of female reporters are dissatisfied compared to 49.1% of male reporters. Throughout each aspect of reinsertion, disability is also a factor. Approximately 50% of disabled reporters are satisfied with each aspect. The highest proportion of dissatisfied is so in relation to the cash component of the reinsertion package (37.5%) and to the work of the regional AC office during the reinsertion process (27.9%).

Dissatisfaction can be expected around reinsertion payments as often these payments are expected to provide for more than simply subsistence, when in fact they are designed to be temporary assistance with only essential items. Arguably information is the main aspect of the work of the AC which could affect reporters' satisfaction. Across the sample, the experiences with AC sensitization activities were mediocre at best, and there is confusion regarding eligibility for reinsertion assistance and the reasons for same.

5.3.2 Social dimensions

On the whole reporters were welcomed by their families (only 2.6% said that their families were unwelcoming) and many were quickly accepted by their communities. 72.9% of reporters said that the community was totally accepting and 26.3% that it was partially accepting.

In general, the kind of exclusion and barriers to reintegration experienced by reporters is rarely physically violent and is more symptomatic of the rebuilding of ties with the community in the state of uncertainty by all parties and the perceived caution of the community in accepting back some reporters. The reporters of the ADF experienced these exclusions more than reporters from the other armed groups.

Taking frequency of meeting as an indicator, it is clear that reporter and community are well integrated. Only 13.2% of community members do not have direct contact with reporters. Community fears pertaining to reporters which were evident at formal reinsertion are now largely dispelled. Originally 56.4% of community

members had fears relating to reporters and now only 3.3% of the community has fears about reporters.

The community is largely confident that it behaved appropriately in terms of welcoming reporters back and facilitating their reintegration. Only 21.8% of community members believe the community should have behaved differently. Of this 21.8%, 17.9% believed the community should have provided more general support; 25.0% believe the community could have better shown respect, forgiveness and welcome to male reporters, and 14.3% believe the community could have

better avoided isolating male reporters, blaming them and creating stigma.¹³ Given the overall picture of reintegration the reflection of over three quarters of the community that they behaved appropriately indicates how well the community welcomed back reporters.

13 This is based on how community members were asked first regarding female reporters and second regarding male reporters. The division by gender was given in the questions so community members were prompted to think about female and male reporters separately .