



International Alert.

DDR: Supporting
Security and
Development
The EU's added value

September 2006

Understanding conflict. Building peace.


Conflict
Prevention
Partnership

This partnership is
financed by the
European Union



About This Report

This report has been produced by International Alert under the Conflict Prevention Partnership, which is financed by the European Union. We are grateful for the additional support from Sida (Swedish International Development Agency). The contents of the report are the sole responsibility of International Alert and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of our donors.

About International Alert

International Alert is an independent peacebuilding organisation working in over 20 countries and territories around the world. Our dual approach involves working directly with people affected by violent conflict as well as at government, EU and UN levels to shape both policy and practice in building sustainable peace. Our regional work is based in the African Great Lakes, West Africa, the Caucasus, the Andean region of South America, Sri Lanka, Nepal and the Philippines. At both regional and international levels, our thematic work focuses on the role of business, humanitarian aid and development, gender, security and post-conflict reconstruction in the context of building peace.

International Alert is grateful for the support of our core donors: Irish Aid (Department of Foreign Affairs Ireland); Danida (Danish International Development Agency); DFID (UK Department for International Development); Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland; The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Sida (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency); and SDC (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation).

About The Conflict Prevention Partnership

The Conflict Prevention Partnership is a cooperative effort by the International Crisis Group – International Alert, the European Policy Centre and the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office – whose aim is to work to prevent conflicts worldwide by helping improve the European Union's conflict prevention, crisis management and peacebuilding capacities. It is financed by the European Union. The contents of its website and all documents produced by the partnership are the sole responsibility of its members and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

© International Alert 2006

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without full attribution.

Layout by D. R. Ink, info@d-r-ink.com

Printed by Nuffield Press

Front cover image: © International Alert

DDR: Supporting Security and Development

The EU's added value

By Edward Bell and Charlotte Watson

September 2006

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	9
Current International Thinking around DDR Programmes	11
<i>UN Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS)</i>	12
<i>Stockholm Initiative on DDR (SIDDR)</i>	13
<i>Multi-Country Demobilisation and Reintegration Program (MDRP)</i>	13
Implementation Considerations and Challenges	16
The Role of the EU	21
<i>EU Instruments</i>	21
<i>Security</i>	23
<i>Governance</i>	25
<i>Livelihoods</i>	26
<i>Justice and Reconciliation</i>	27
<i>The Scope for EU Involvement</i>	29
Conclusion	30

Executive summary

The problems faced by countries emerging from years of violent conflict are enormous, highly complex and intricately interconnected. Amongst the greatest challenges are the presence of large numbers of ex-combatants and the ongoing violence perpetrated by members of still-active rebel groups. These ex-combatants will ultimately need to be demobilised and reintegrated into civilian life or perhaps into newly constituted security services. Ex-combatants, as well as the many others associated with them (such as wives, porters, cooks, sex slaves), are likely to have known no other way of life than war and violence. Their sense of identity is integrally linked with the armed structures they have been fighting with. As ex-combatants have a potent ability to 'spoil' the peace process and progress towards security and development it is largely accepted that they need special attention.

At the same time, millions of ordinary people within communities will be continuing to suffer many of the extreme hardships that have resulted from their experience of the conflict and resulting violence. This suffering, and accompanying tensions over such issues as the availability of and access to land, may then be further increased by the return of thousands of displaced people. Often, they see widespread impunity enjoyed by those who have perpetrated acts of violence. It seems clear that if communities are not given the chance to voice their concerns, needs and expectations the initiatives of external agencies will be unlikely to win the public support and acceptance that are essential to successful outcomes.

The European Union (EU) is amongst a number of international actors that aim to address these kinds of issues relating to ex-combatants and to the communities or security structures into which they will move. It contributes substantial amounts of money to specific DDR initiatives, supporting time-bound linear demobilisation and reintegration programmes such as the World Bank's Multi-country Demobilisation and Reintegration Programme (MDRP) and UN Trust Funds for DDR, and is involved in overall planning for DDR programmes in-country. In addition, and crucially, it has competencies and funding instruments that can be used to implement security, development, governance and justice activities. Combined effectively together, and reinforced through political dialogue, these can play a fundamental role in driving and sustaining reintegration processes.

Current International Thinking around DDR Programmes

The debate on DDR and its end goals has advanced significantly in recent years, through processes such as the UN Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS), the Stockholm Initiative on DDR (SIDDR) and the Multi-donor Reintegration Programme (MDRP). There is now a growing understanding that DDR is a political, social and economic process that has long term development implications and which has to be sustainable rather than simply being an explicitly military activity with a primary focus on short term stability and security.

Progress in dealing with ex-combatants in countries emerging from conflict will, to a great extent, depend on whether programmes and structures are designed so as to be mutually reinforcing. 'Good practice' thinking in the international community has now put "the sustainable social and economic reintegration of former combatants" as "the ultimate objective of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR)"¹. However, there continues to be a lack of recognition given to the role that existing and complementary processes and mechanisms can, and do, play in helping communities and ex-combatants come together again.

1 See the [DRAFT] Integrated-DDR Standards – chapter on *Economic and Social Integration*. UN Inter-Agency Working Group on DDR.

A major challenge to achieving this complementarity is that DDR currently means different things to different people. In reality it should be seen both as:

- a) A discrete *programme* implemented over a relatively short time frame, which requires a range of guiding principles and expertise on planning and implementation, such as those being developed in the UN system. Time-bound DDR programmes are not an end in themselves, but a necessary initiative for longer term reintegration and community building. They can have considerable value in producing rapid and visible results, which can build confidence in fragile peace-processes and bring short term security to war-torn communities. However, given the constraints on achieving significant results in a short time frame in such challenging environments, it is essential that such DDR programmes manage expectations of ex-combatants (and communities) and ensure that they do not exceed what the initiatives can actually provide.
- b) A *goal* to which a wide range of other external assistance activities will be extremely relevant and important. This goal is to help ex-combatants move away from the roles and positions that defined them during the conflict to identifying themselves (and being identified) as members of families and communities with corresponding responsibilities and opportunities. Depending on the context it will require not only the reintegration of ex-combatants into civilian society but also reconciliation and rehabilitation, wholesale economic (re)construction, governance and justice reform. Jobs and income generation are a critical aspect of this and are often the principal concern of local people and ex-combatants alike.

A short term discrete DDR *programme* must be situated and planned within an integrated approach to the long term goal. This means also focusing on sustainable reintegration and reconciliation in communities.

Implementation Considerations and Challenges

Whilst thinking on DDR has advanced, there remain substantial challenges both at the policy level and in implementation on the ground. Linking DDR programmes with broader peacebuilding and development initiatives and tackling certain key issues would facilitate and sustain efforts to deal with ex-combatants as a risk to peace. Considerations include:

- ***DDR requires early planning*** – The instability of the operating environment in countries emerging from war restricts the time frame for planning of DDR. Better preparation is possible if planning is initiated whilst negotiations are going on but before agreement is reached. This preparation could involve labour market surveys and improving knowledge of existing community structures and ongoing activities relevant to DDR.
- ***DDR needs to be driven from the bottom-up as well as the top-down*** – Community-level activities are as important as high level engagement as (re)construction begins. The target group of a DDR programme and potential host communities need to be involved as active participants.
- ***Effective DDR involves identifying who needs what*** – As underlined in UN Security Council Resolution 1325, tailored solutions need to be found based on the different needs of men, women, boys and girls. This will be determined in part by whether they did or didn't carry weapons – and more generally by their age, origins and experience during the war.
- ***Two-way channels of communication are vital*** – People affected by DDR programmes (and related initiatives) need information on what the process involves, what is expected of them, what they in turn can expect, and why it is important. They also need to be able to give their

feedback on needs, issues and ideas. Success in this aspect significantly improves the success of DDR programmes and projects.

- *Maintaining a focus on participatory process and recognising that the 'how' is often more important than the 'what'* – Participatory processes can render civilian and co-operative life within communities a more attractive option than engaging in war and violence. Processes to determine, for example, rural development programmes, security sector reform or other governance-related initiatives can in themselves facilitate a transition from social exclusion and unpredictable clientelism to a system based on institutionalised relationships and transparency over aims, budgets and methods.
- *Linking DDR measures that target ex-combatants with longer term initiatives that identify and address the needs and concerns of communities* – Whilst activities that focus specifically on ex-combatants are vital to ensure they do not act as 'spoilers', it is necessary to ensure that they are matched by, are linked to and support community programmes that benefit other returnees and people who remained in the community throughout the fighting.
- *Avoiding duplication of activities and structures* – Better integration of discrete DDR programmes with community initiatives will help ensure that activities mutually reinforce each other. It must also be made clear to organisations operating in an area emerging out of conflict that the success or failure of their own work is integrally linked to the success or failure of DDR.
- *DDR and SSR are intricately connected* – Movement of individuals from armed groups and former security services into newly constituted force structures has substantial implications for thousands of ex-combatants and for community security.
- *Generating hope in the future, and mobilising the energy of societies to sustain it, significantly depends on the ability to earn money* – Jobs and income generation are often the principal concern of local people and ex-combatants alike.

The Role of the EU

The EU is in a strong position to pursue the goal of DDR in a holistic and coherent manner. In 'post-conflict' contexts, the EU is often one of the biggest players in supporting peace processes, through both the 1st and 2nd pillars, and in 1st pillar funding for on-going projects continued during the conflict. This is not only due to the funding provided to DDR programmes through multilateral trust funds but also from its capabilities in the political, trade and development assistance fields, which enable it to address relevant issues related to security, governance, livelihoods, justice and reconciliation, all of which are key to successful DDR. EU involvement in such areas could include:

Security: The security situation in a 'post-conflict' context is a key factor, not only because ensuring the provision of security is essential to facilitating the return of both ex-combatants and other returnees (refugees, IDPs and abductees) and hence to working towards sustainable peace but also because it will likely determine the extent of EU interventions, their scope and timing.

Immediate EU engagement is likely in two areas: (i) supporting (and, in some cases through a military operation, ensuring) the demilitarisation of armed groups and (ii) the short term integration of the security sector within the framework of longer term reform. Building on progress (slowly) being made across the EU institutions and among Member States on the concept of security sector reform (SSR), a common understanding of ex-combatant-related issues may allow mandates to be longer (where, for example, it is quite clear that a disarmament and

demobilisation process will clearly last over a year) and more easily renewable. Steps could also be taken to ensure that 2nd pillar action is systematically accompanied by measures supported under the 1st pillar at the community level that will facilitate and sustain the reintegration process over an even longer period. Both these processes must account for the special needs of women who have become involved with fighting forces.

Governance: The lack of democratic participation and the absence of accountability in the political system are root causes of violent conflict and unless addressed they will pose a long term threat to the ability of communities to deal with the return of ex-combatants. Improved governance will also be a fundamental basis for the revival of economic activities and interactions.

The EC has the ability and scope to implement governance programmes so as to help professionalise ministries and assist them in, for example, addressing the reintegration challenges faced by communities and authorities. Support to parliament and civil society organisations will also be a key factor in the success of such programmes and in enhancing the accountability and transparency of the government and ministries.

The EU can participate in a harmonised donor approach to SSR. The design and implementation of programmes to improve the governance of the security sector are particularly important given that the newly created services providing security and justice do not have the capacity, or perhaps even commitment, to protect the communities that they are supposed to serve.

Livelihoods: In countries emerging from war, jobs and income generation are often the issue - the principal concern of local people and ex-combatants alike and one of the determining factors in whether those who have been living by the gun will be willing to disarm and reintegrate into society.

The EC is often a major player in both infrastructure rehabilitation and construction as well as in rural development. It also supports training initiatives with a view to diversifying job opportunities. This offers an important opening for strengthening reintegration programmes. The EC can also use its political voice and influence to push for a greater focus on job and income generation in an interim Poverty Reduction Strategy. In doing so, participatory processes at the local level can help direct livelihood support to responding to actual opportunities and actual needs.

Justice and reconciliation: Justice and reconciliation issues are integrally linked to DDR, specifically the reintegration aspect, in the context of whether ex-combatants will be accepted back into communities.

The EU can offer significant support to the processes and institutions of transitional justice and reconciliation and can design initiatives for the longer term effectiveness and reputation of justice institutions, both formal and informal.

The EU can help reduce potentially dangerous historical grievances, giving a voice to ordinary victims by supporting Truth Commissions and ensuring that they are properly constituted, with respected and untarnished experts.

Conclusion and Recommendations for the EU

For the EU, the implications of looking at DDR programmes through a broader lens are, firstly, that the EU is already doing more to support DDR than would seem to be the case if one looked only at funding for DDR programmes as such. Secondly, the EU also has the potential to do considerably

more, by connecting other peacebuilding programmes to DDR and optimizing the use of the human and financial resources that it can mobilize on the ground. Its political dialogue with host governments should be used to create and protect the space for this kind of strategic engagement. Thirdly, the EU can better capitalise on this potential if it acts to specifically include the links between DDR and other programmes into its programming and strategic planning.

By taking this broader view of DDR, EU interventions in societies recovering from war will be far more effective. The EU can see its activities as tools to achieve the end goal of securing the peace process by facilitating ex-combatants' return to communities rather than focusing only on the mechanism itself. The instruments available through both the 1st and 2nd pillars enable engagement on a range of geographic and thematic programmes and there is great potential for these to be used to enhance and strengthen DDR processes. By considering its activities on security, governance, livelihoods and justice and their relationship to DDR, the EU would be able to maximise the effectiveness of its interventions and ongoing projects.

Specifically the EU should ensure that it:

1. Makes maximum use of the EU's comparative advantage to pursue the *goal* of DDR. Political dialogue as well as external assistance in the areas of security, governance, the economy and justice and reconciliation can be orientated to help drive and sustain progress towards this goal. For example:
 - providing capacity development to support activities such as the Ministry of Finance's budgeting for the costs of newly integrated security services or the Ministry dealing with land issues working to mitigate tensions surrounding returnees and implement land reforms in order to better drive local economies. Capacity development for parliament and civil society organisations is also vital as they play a key role in ensuring the accountability and transparency of the government and ministries.
 - building on progress (slowly) being made across the EU institutions and among Member States on the concept of SSR and DDR.
 - using development and livelihoods projects as an opportunity to promote more meaningful participation in local political and economic life, strengthening inter-group trust and the capacity of communities to collaborate effectively and manage conflict without resorting to violence.
2. Combines a range of instruments to optimise outcomes on stability and development. This might involve crisis management within the Common Foreign & Security Policy (CFSP)/ EU Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) in addition to the activities of the Commission. Areas of consideration include:
 - ensuring that 2nd pillar action is systematically accompanied by measures supported under the 1st pillar at the community level that will facilitate and sustain the reintegration process over an even longer period.
 - where appropriate initiating joint EC and Council Missions. The EU's experience in the context of the Aceh Monitoring Mission provides important lessons learned for future missions in the area of DDR.
3. Ensures a coherent and flexible approach, in terms of programmes and goals, within the EU institutions and with Member States and other organisations such as the UN and World Bank. This applies to both DDR programmes and to other initiatives, such as rural development programmes, which are key for progress towards the overarching goals. This could involve:
 - setting the development of an EU strategy on DDR programming within the context of the UN Integrated DDR Standards and the Stockholm Initiative on DDR.

4. Supports DDR-related activities through political dialogue with the country in question.
5. Ensures that both the target group and potential host communities are involved as active participants in all phases of DDR. This will require effective information exchange with them, two-way communication processes and the establishment of feedback mechanisms. In addition there will need to be collaboration with non-governmental organisations and media active in the given context.
6. Promotes an understanding of DDR as both a discrete programme implemented over a relatively short time and as a goal to which a wide range of other external assistance and peacebuilding activities will be extremely relevant and important.

The extent of the EU's involvement will, however, be influenced by a number of factors including the existing resources and capacity on the ground and the political will of the EU, its Member States and the host governments. In order for the DDR to be addressed as a long term and multi-actor process there must be increased co-ordination and coherence between the pillars of the EU and other organisations. Furthermore training and awareness raising are needed to increase in-house expertise, not just amongst DDR policy and programming staff but also for development planners and implementers

Introduction

In countries emerging from years of violent conflict, the problems are enormous, highly complex and intricately interconnected. These include ruined economies and collapsed or failed governance and justice institutions combined with a huge degree of insecurity, with no sure guarantee that the country will not descend back into violent conflict and chaos. Further complications arise from the fact that often the motivations, interests and even origins of the fighting forces concerned span borders and connect into international flows (both legal and illegal) of finance, arms and commodities.

In this context, one of the greatest challenges to those attempting to support post-conflict transition, reduce human suffering and tackle the causes of violent conflict are the (ex) combatants themselves. The presence of large numbers of ex-combatants and those associated with fighting forces (women as well as men, children as well as adults, girls as well as boys) poses a great threat to sustainable peace. Many of these people know no other way of life and their sense of identity is integrally linked with the armed structures they have been fighting with. Often ex-combatants lack the marketable skills, material assets and social networks required to find alternative livelihoods, and a return to war or a life of criminality and banditry offer the most viable way of life. Access to weapons further adds to their potential to act as 'spoilers' to peace processes. Meanwhile, millions of ordinary people within communities suffer the extreme hardships that have resulted from their experience of the conflict and resulting violence and often see widespread impunity enjoyed by those who have perpetrated those acts of violence. This suffering, and accompanying tensions, may then be further increased by the return of thousands of displaced people.

Balancing short term imperatives with longer term concerns is an unavoidable issue faced by those who are working to build peace in post-conflict contexts. As ex-combatants have a potent ability to 'spoil' the peace process and progress towards security and development, it is largely accepted that they need special attention. However, the tendency has been for external actors to come at this challenge uniquely through a disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) programme. This often ends up functioning as a distinct and separate *mechanism* of short term duration, implemented in a linear step-by-step manner and driven from the top down, rather than being seen as an end goal that can be achieved and strengthened by a range of other types of assistance, particularly at the community level.

'Good practice' thinking in the international community has now put "the sustainable social and economic reintegration of former combatants" as "the ultimate objective of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR)".² However there continues to be a lack of recognition given to the role that existing and complementary processes and mechanisms can, and do, play in helping communities and ex-combatants come together again. Moreover there is also the danger that existing structures, particularly at the community level, may be undermined by DDR programmes which establish parallel or competing structures.

Real thought needs to go into the best way of ensuring that programmes and structures are complementary, community focused and tailored to the same end goal which is essentially facilitating the (re)integration of ex-combatants, as well as other groups, into communities where they are accepted and can play a meaningful role. Time-bound DDR programmes do have considerable potential value if they can produce rapid and visible results that build confidence in fragile peace processes and bring short term security to war-torn communities. Although the

2 See the [DRAFT] Integrated-DDR Standards – chapter on Economic and Social Integration. UN Inter-Agency Working Group on DDR.

distribution of benefits in the short term may not be equitable, it is possible for these to be offset by security gains if the security objectives of DDR are well-communicated to the wider community. Overall, however, it is progress towards the end *goal* that will determine the likelihood of strengthened peace and stability or of a return to conflict.

It is also essential for security and development actors to pay particular attention to the links between DDR, community security and changes to the size, composition and governance of the security services. DDR and a strategy for SSR that addresses both governance and operational issues should, therefore, be linked together. This is important so as to make SSR and DDR efforts mutually reinforcing.

The EU is among a number of international actors that aim to address these kinds of issues relating to ex-combatants and to the communities or security structures into which they will move. It contributes substantial amounts of money to specific DDR initiatives, such as UN Trust Funds for DDR and is involved in overall planning for DDR programmes in-country. In addition it has competences and funding instruments that can be used to implement security, development, governance and justice activities. Combined effectively together, and reinforced through political dialogue, these can play a fundamental role in driving and sustaining reintegration processes.

This paper forms part of the EU-financed Conflict Prevention Partnership (www.conflictprevention.net) between Crisis Group, International Alert, the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO) and the European Policy Centre (EPC). It has been informed by an expert seminar, '*EU and DDR: Supporting Security and Development*' held in Brussels, hosted by the Finnish Presidency of the European Union, the European Commission and International Alert (in its role as part of the CPP), on 13 July 2006.

The paper provides:

- an overview of current international thinking around DDR
- implementation considerations and challenges
- the range of EU instruments available to enhance and strengthen DDR processes
- the role the EU can play, particularly looking at DDR as a means to an ends and part of a broader holistic process. Focusing on aspects related to security, governance, livelihoods and justice and reconciliation
- recommendations on how the EU might be able to enhance and improve its contribution in this area

Current International Thinking around DDR Programmes

In the last decade, DDR programmes have become an integral component of peace agreements, implemented across the world from Liberia and Sierra Leone, to Kosovo to Afghanistan. Despite their widespread use, their success has been limited. The consequences of inadequate DDR programmes rebound at the community, national, regional and even international levels, impacting on the success of peace agreements, stability of states and regions, human development and on crime, security and human security in all contexts. Inadequate DDR has been attributed to a plethora of reasons including lack of planning, funding, commitment, co-ordination and communication.

DDRR in Liberia

Due to various political pressures the Liberian Disarmament, Demobilisation, Rehabilitation and Reintegration (DDRR) process was started on 11 December 2003, despite fears that the time was not yet right. Poor preparations and lack of planning, the absence of a monitoring system and the presence of less than half the proposed 15,000 UN troops in country all combined to produce a highly precarious situation. One result was that, on the first day of the process, United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) officials were overwhelmed by the number of ex-combatants who appeared and were unable to process everyone. This led to confusion, frustration and anger. Armed ex-combatants took over Camp Schieffelin, the cantonment site near Monrovia, and many returned to Monrovia, brandishing guns and rioting. Despite this the process was not suspended until 27 December.

After some rethinking UNMIL relaunched the process with a nationwide public information campaign in January 2004 and DDRR began again in earnest in April 2004. This was despite the fact that the armed factions had not provided UNMIL with a list of combatants, making it impossible to establish the number of ex-combatants to be catered for. Initial estimates, and budgeting, for 38,000 ex-combatants were revised by UNMIL and National Transitional Government of Liberia (NTGL) after the December process to 53,000 but even this estimate was dwarfed by the approximately 103,000 people who eventually ended up being accepted for the process. Underestimations due to lack of information, poor screening and the broad eligibility criteria (allowing individuals, including women and children, who had not been weapons bearers but had been associated with the fighting forces to qualify) contributed to this situation and resulted in the existing budget being totally inadequate for the implementation of full DDRR activities. The short term nature of the approach meant the reintegration process suffered as a result.

In terms of reintegration and rehabilitation, the process was focused on three main pillars and was planned to offer:³

- A transitional support programme, including start-up allowance and repatriation of ex-combatants to their local communities;
- Transitional payments to assist foreign ex-combatants to return to their home countries; and
- A social services programme, which included macro and micro infrastructure development, education, vocational training and outreach. Specific aspects of the social services programme covered the establishment of specific social service requirements for male, female and child ex-combatants.

3 For details see Integrated Mandate Implementation Plan, *UNMIL*, Monrovia, Liberia, 21 April 2004.

However, given the budgetary shortfalls, it proved impossible to deliver on the promises that were made at the early stages of DDR. The resources or infrastructure have not been available in order to provide the requisite level of training and/or education or the transitional payments. This has led to frustrations, tensions and some feelings of being deserted by the international community, who promised so much yet failed to deliver.

Over the last five years or so there has been an emerging recognition at the international level that approaches to DDR need to be rethought or at least strengthened and that it is vital to see a DDR programme as only one part of a broader post-conflict recovery programme. In this context a number of initiatives⁴ have emerged which focus beyond the 'lessons learned' style research of the past, three of which are discussed below.

UN Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS)

The UN Inter-Agency Working Group, consisting of 15 UN agencies, departments, funds and programmes was established by the Executive Committee on Peace and Security in March 2005. The Working Group has been responsible for the creation of the UN Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS). These IDDRS are a set of new policies and concepts for planning, developing, implementing and monitoring DDR programmes. The task of the Working Group was further supported by the General Assembly's Resolution 59/296 which stressed the need for "*strengthened cooperation and coordination between the various actors within and outside the United Nations system to ensure both the effective use of resources and coherence on the ground in implementing disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration programmes*".⁵

The IDDRS consist of 26 modules on five different levels:

- a) Level one provides for an introduction to the standards and a glossary;*
- b) Level two sets out the strategic concepts of an integrated approach to disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration in a peacekeeping context;*
- c) Level three elaborates on the planning and implementation structures used at Headquarters and in the field;*
- d) Level four provides considerations, options and tools for undertaking disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration operations;*
- e) Level five covers the United Nations approach to critical cross-cutting issues, such as gender, youth and children associated with fighting forces, cross cutting border movements, food assistance, HIV/AIDS and health.*⁶

The guiding principles of the IDDRS are to ensure DDR programmes are inclusive, people centred, rights based, context specific, transparent and accountable, nationally owned, integrated and well planned. They acknowledge the importance of pre-programme assessments which should begin as soon as possible in order to map reintegration options and profile beneficiaries and areas of return. They have developed profiling tools which aim to provide a clear sense of the needs of men, boys, women and girls. Special attention is given to mid-level commanders and youths.

In theory the IDDRS present a real opportunity to revitalise DDR programmes and, while they are designed for UN agency co-ordination, the UN hope they will also provide the overarching strategy for the co-ordination of other DDR interventions. However there remains doubt as to how feasible they will be in practice given the complexities of the UN and DDR processes.⁷

⁴ Other international initiatives focusing on DDR include the Conference on DDR and Stability in Africa, organised by the Government of Sierra Leone and the United Nations Office of the Special Advisor on Africa and the African Union's policy framework for post-conflict reconstruction and development.

⁵ Report of the UN Secretary General on *Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration*, A/60/705, 2nd March 2006.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ As a contribution to the IDDRS process the UNDP produced a Practice Note on DDR which sets out to define DDR and the UNDP's role in the process. See www.undp.org for further information.

Stockholm Initiative on DDR (SIDDR)

The Stockholm Initiative on DDR (SIDDR) was a year long initiative that was established by the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs in November 2004 with an aim to “review current DDR practice, challenge assumptions, consider the topic afresh and make recommendations to strengthen interventions that support peace processes”.⁸ The process was focused around three key themes (although it is acknowledged that the topics are closely interrelated):

- Political aspects and the role of DDR in a peace process and a transition
- Reintegration
- Financing DDR programmes

With regard to the time frame of DDR, the SIDDR saw DDR as beginning with a peace agreement and ending when a sufficient degree of security was obtained. DDR is seen as a way of preparing the ground for long term reintegration and sustainable peace. The SIDDR also suggested that DDR should also play an important role in peace processes, through *inter alia* building confidence, establishing definitions and mandates for peace agreements and creating flexible institutions.

The SIDDR concluded by advancing recommendations where appropriate and by illustrating tensions and dilemmas. While SIDDR was a finite process it provided a useful forum for looking at DDR in a holistic way and examining the “shortcomings, dilemmas and challenges within the broader political framework”.⁹ In terms of follow up, the findings of the initiative will be disseminated at regional, and in some cases national, consultations and the Folke Bernadotte Academy has been assigned by the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs to further take forward the findings.

Multi-Country Demobilisation and Reintegration Program (MDRP)

While both IDDRS and SIDDR have at this stage contributed to the policy thinking around DDR a more direct contribution to policy implementation is the multi-agency initiative that supports demobilisation and reintegration in the Great Lakes region of Central Africa. The Multi-Country Demobilisation and Reintegration Program (MDRP) is the largest initiative of its kind,¹⁰ focusing on a comprehensive, region-wide approach supporting activities in seven countries: Angola, Burundi, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo, Rwanda and Uganda. This focus on regional co-ordination is key given the problems that have arisen in the past in this and other regions, particularly in West Africa but also, for example, in the Balkans and Southeast Asia.

The MDRP is driven by the “*belief that no single donor or agency alone can address the challenges of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR).*” It works by complementing “*national and regional peace initiatives, providing vital support for the social and economic reintegration of ex-combatants. It provides comprehensive support for demobilization and reintegration (D&R) by helping establish standard approaches throughout the region, coordinating partner initiatives, and providing financial and technical assistance in the demobilization, reinsertion and reintegration of ex-combatants.*”¹¹ In practice, however, it is faced by similar types of operating constraints as other initiatives (see box below). The MDRP has also received criticism for not including a component to support the first ‘D’ (of DDR) due to the World Bank’s policy not to provide direct support to the disarmament of ex-combatants. This leaves bilateral donors and other UN agencies to finance and

8 *Final Report of the Stockholm Initiative on Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration*, Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 2006.

9 *Ibid.*

10 The MDRP is financed through two separate but complementary sources: World Bank/IDA funds amounting to up to an estimated US\$200 million, and a Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) of an estimated US\$300 million, of which US\$200 million is currently committed.

11 See www.mdrp.org for more information.

tackle this aspect separately, (although, in theory, within the MDRP framework), creating the risk that it will not be tackled in a timely or effective manner.

The MDRP in Burundi

In Burundi, preparations under the MDRP were initiated by the World Bank in February 2003, leading to the establishment of a Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Coordination Committee (the DDR-CC). The government formally established a National Commission for Demobilization, Reinsertion and Reintegration (NCDRR) on August 28, 2003 with an Executive Secretariat (ES/NCDRR) to lead the national programme and to coordinate the contributions of international partners. Overall the programme aimed to contribute to the reallocation of government expenditure from defence to social and economic sectors over a period of five years.

In the 16 months following the start of the process, an estimated 19,000 individuals were demobilised. In a very challenging and unstable operating environment, the following difficulties, delays and dilemmas emerged in the initiation and running of the programme.

- *Problems of political authority and national capacity:* Given the transition government's limited authority, discussions did not pick up speed until after the clear victory of the Conseil national pour la défense de la démocratie-Forces pour la défense de la démocratie (CNDD-FDD) party in mid-2005.
- *Factional interests in the process and accessing the benefits of the programme:* The commanders and leaders competing for power and influence sought to maximise the funds and the number of security service positions that would benefit their supporters. This made it difficult, for example, to reach agreement on the harmonisation of ranks.
- *Difficulties in categorising recipients of funds:* The regional framework for the MDRP helps sets the size of demobilisation and reintegration payments relative to those made available in the wider sub-region. This does not, however, prevent the problem that, locally, it may not be understood why an individual who is categorised as an ex-combatant receives much more than a 'Gardien de la Paix' or a child soldier, and how these figures are decided upon.
- *Delays starting rural development programmes:* It has taken a number of years to launch such programmes and this has risked exacerbating the feeling that ex-combatants have so far received favourable treatment.
- *Continuing availability of small arms:* The MDRP does not have a disarmament element (although ex-combatants can't enter the demobilisation camps with weapons) Civilian disarmament is only now being discussed through a UNDP programme. In Burundi, as elsewhere, motivating the desire to give up arms is one of the hardest problems for international actors to address.
- *Difficulties in sufficiently linking DDR to initiatives in the security sector:* There are a few thousand ex-combatants now serving in the army and even larger numbers who were taken into the new police force (which increased from 3,000 pre-war to a very roughly estimated 20,000 now).
- *Time gap between beginning demobilisation and starting reintegration:* There was a long period between the first waves of ex-combatants and the initiation of measures necessary for 'reintegration' Some delays occurred, for example, in negotiating the procurement procedures for the National Commission and further delays occurred when it became clear that very few local NGOs would be deemed to have the necessary capacity and financial solidity to take on the burden of implementing the reintegration component of the program.

The IDDRS, SIDDR and the MDRP, as well as other processes, have advanced the debate on the process of DDR and its end goals. Where DDR was generally seen as an explicitly military process with a primary focus on short term stability and security, there is now a growing understanding that it is a process that has long term development implications and has to be sustainable. DDR programmes must therefore be situated within a much broader strategy aimed at tackling the challenges faced by societies attempting to recover from armed conflict. This calls for DDR to be seen as both:

a) A discrete *programme* implemented over a relatively short time frame, which requires a range of guiding principles and expertise on planning and implementation, such as those being developed in the UN system. Time-bound DDR programmes are not an end in themselves, but a necessary initiative for longer term reintegration and community building. They can have considerable value in producing rapid and visible results which can build confidence in fragile peace processes and bring short term security to war-torn communities. However, given the constraints on achieving significant results in a short time frame in such challenging environments, it is essential that such DDR programmes manage expectations of ex-combatants (and communities) and ensure that they do not exceed what the initiatives can actually provide. It is also important that, under DDR programmes, there are sufficient resources after demobilisation (and disarmament) to fund vital longer term and sustainable reintegration efforts. Human and financial resources must be sufficient to balance short term imperatives with longer term concerns. On this issue, the UN has produced valuable integrated standards which should be considered by the EU with a view to exploring the value of incorporating them.

b) A *goal* to which a wide range of other external assistance activities will be extremely relevant and important. This goal is to help ex-combatants move away from the roles and positions that defined them during the conflict to identifying themselves (and being identified) as members of families and communities with corresponding responsibilities and opportunities. Depending on the context it will require not only the reintegration of ex-combatants into civilian society but also reconciliation and rehabilitation, wholesale economic (re)construction, governance and justice reform. This may often mean providing *help to transform* society – to encourage the attitudes, the behaviour, and the structural conditions in society that lay the foundations for peaceful, stable and ultimately prosperous social and economic development.

A short term discrete DDR *programme* must be situated and planned within an integrated approach to the long term *goal*. This means also focusing on sustainable reintegration and reconciliation in communities. Jobs and income generation are a critical aspect of this and are often the principal concern of local people and ex-combatants alike.

Progress in Aceh

DDR in Aceh has been relatively well planned and monitored in comparison to the ad hoc approaches in many other post-conflict contexts. This is due to the fact that DDR provisions were written into the MoU signed by both warring parties to end the conflict. The EU's role in the process of demobilisation and reintegration was also written into the MoU and agreed by the Government of Indonesia. Needs assessments were carried out in advance of reintegration, revealing useful (if not complete data) on amnestied prisoners (by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM)) and of ex-combatants (by the World Bank and the EU's Aceh Monitoring Mission).

Implementation Considerations and Challenges

DDR is beginning to be seen as a means to an end rather than an end in itself. DDR processes must therefore be situated within a much broader strategy aimed at tackling the challenges faced by societies attempting to recover from armed conflict. However, there are still substantial challenges to implementation on the ground, particularly around how to go about understanding and responding to local voices and need. There are ideas and approaches that have begun to be drawn out at the policy level but have yet to be put into practice. Key challenges and issues include:

Planning for DDR – Given the context in which DDR programmes are devised and the fact that the implementing agencies cannot design activities until they are asked to do so, the time frame for planning of DDR tends to be restricted. As a result programmes are not always based on a clear understanding of the situation or on accurate information. Efforts must be made to initiate activities prior to, or in parallel with, a peace process. For example, labour market surveys can be undertaken before official planning for DDR is started; this would enable realistic training and employment packages to be offered to ex-combatants. Furthermore information can be gathered on existing community structures and ongoing activities which could be drawn in and built on. Any development organisations operating in-country as the prospects of achieving a peace agreement start to strengthen should be involved in the planning from the start. They have to be made aware that the success or failure of DDR is integrally linked to the success or failure of their own work.

DDR needs to be driven from the bottom-up as well as the top down - While security-related activities and high-level engagement on security issues remain essential in war-torn contexts, community-level activities must be accorded similar importance as (re)construction begins. The target group of a DDR programme and potential host communities more generally need to be involved, and treated, as active participants. Failure to do this can, amongst other things, lead to poor uptake of DDR amongst the people affected and a risk that it will remain a process discussed by officials and elites and where financial benefits are manipulated and misdirected.

Engaging the people who are actually affected by DDR efforts in the design and implementation of programmes will help ensure that solutions are tailored to the different needs of men, women, boys and girls as articulated by UN Security Council Resolution 1325. Among the fighters and dependents, there will be overlapping groups of people with different experiences of the conflict and differing needs. Among the dependents of fighters, for example, there will be women (and girls) who do not want to rejoin their male partners after the conflict. There will be children and adults who may have been abducted during the hostilities and forced to fight or serve the armed group in some way and there will be orphans and women who have no family to return to.

Two-way channels of communication/information flows – For DDR to be successful both the target group and potential host communities need to know exactly what the process involves, what is expected of them, what they in turn can expect, and why it is important. Furthermore the process must be two-way as there is an enormous amount of useful information (e.g. who has the weapons) that communities can provide. They need to be persuaded to buy into the process and be treated as active participants.

Given the constraints on achieving significant results in a short time frame in such challenging environments, it is essential that DDR programmes manage expectations of ex-combatants and

communities and ensure that they do not exceed what the initiatives can actually provide. The strategic use of media (e.g. radio, drama, video clips and town hall meetings) and outreach programmes, including local civil society groups and media organisations, can facilitate the communication process. Care must be taken to ensure information is not withheld by militia commanders and faction leaders, who control its flow in order to manipulate the ambitions of their fighters and 'clients'.

Inadequate communication flows and failure to manage expectations can, amongst other things, lead to poor uptake of DDR. Furthermore if ex-combatants who do buy-in to DDR have false expectations of what is on offer then the security situation may degenerate. When they are confronted with reality and tensions and misunderstandings amongst communities they may mutiny and resort back to violence.

Communication in Burundi and Liberia

In Burundi, the MDRP agreed with the national power-holders to fund 18 months' salary for ex-combatants (\$600) in one payment on exit from the demobilization camp (after 8-10 days there), to be followed by reintegration payments in 3 tranches over the next 2 years or so. However, there is little awareness amongst Burundians as to why an 'ex-combatant' gets \$600 while a Gardien de la Paix (armed to support a 'political' party locally) gets only \$100 (when many of them were fighting from the beginning in the name of their movement). Minors (perceived rather differently from a Western view of a child's 'innocence') get about \$330. Moreover, these payments were available when no MDRP funds were yet reaching communities affected by the arrival of these returnees. Delays starting rural development programmes (such as those planned by the EC and World Bank) risk having exacerbated this feeling that ex-combatants have so far received favourable treatment.

In Liberia, the lack of feed back mechanisms meant that, during the DDRR programme, UNMIL was unaware of whether fighters and community members actually understood the messages being communicated and hence the processes under way. Even once UNMIL began popularizing messages this did not necessarily lead to greater understanding and awareness. In many instances, the views of the fighters and communities were not solicited to ascertain their understanding of their roles and responsibilities in the entire DDRR process. A strong and well co-ordinated communication strategy with local ownership is a key component to ensuring that there is an effective channel through which there is an exchange of ideas.

Maintaining a focus on participatory process and recognising that the "how" is often more important than the "what" - Participatory processes to determine, for example, rural development programmes, security sector reform or other governance-related initiatives can in themselves facilitate a transition from social exclusion and unpredictable clientelism to a system based on institutionalised relationships and transparency over aims, budgets and methods.¹² Assistance should be designed and orientated so as to widen the space for the maximum number of people to determine and monitor outcomes. This will help address the common problem affecting fragile contexts where the lack of democratic experience in the country makes it extremely difficult to create the accountability of authorities to citizens and motivate governments to be responsive to the public's needs and concerns.

Meaningful participation (of men and women) must be ensured at all relevant levels as the projects are designed so that the outcomes are adapted to actual needs and concerns as much as possible. Great care is needed to avoid favouring one societal group while excluding others. Generating a sense of being a stakeholder in a brighter future is important so that civilian and co-operative life within communities are a more attractive option than engaging in war and

12 See "A Brief Description of Donor Support to Local Government in Burundi", Peter Uvin, (July 7 2005).

violence. It requires patience, commitment and longer term financial support to nurture the participatory capacity and the skills sets of communities, NGOs and the media.

Linking DDR measures that target ex-combatants with longer-term initiatives that identify and address the needs and concerns of communities – While activities that focus specifically on ex-combatants are vital to ensure they do not act as ‘spoilers’, it is necessary to ensure that other community based initiatives provide for, and support, other groups including those who may be excluded from the DDR process, returnees, internally displaced peoples (IDPs) and victims of abuse during the war.

Better integration of discrete DDR programmes with community initiatives will help ensure that activities mutually reinforce each other. The initiation of projects that support individuals as members of the community, rather than because of their identity as ex-combatant or victim, and communities as a whole can have a huge impact in facilitating social reintegration. Rural infrastructure development, community reconciliation projects and measures to improve access to justice are all examples of initiatives that can contribute to the successful demobilisation and, in particular, reintegration of ex-combatants.

Linking DDRR activities with Community Development in Liberia

In some villages in northern counties in Liberia, there have been situations where DDR initiatives and work by development agencies have undermined each other. Negative impacts have, for example, resulted from development organisations contracting workers from Monrovia and transporting them to the village where a project is being implemented rather than employing local ex-combatants who have been through skills training as part of the DDRR process. This has inevitably led to frustrations on the part of the ex-combatants, some of whom have suggested that if this continues they might seek out alternative sources of income, for example by engaging in illicit diamond mining.

In contrast, there are cases where parallel projects have been co-ordinated so that, by targeting both ex-combatants and civilians, they can mutually reinforce reintegration and reconciliation at the community level. One such project is the 867,224 Euros grant from the EC Delegation in Liberia to the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) to carry out a Peace and Stabilization Project in south-eastern Liberia. Implementation began in September 2005 with an implementation period of one year.

The overall objectives of the project are to improve security in three counties (Maryland, River Gee and Grand Kru) by alleviating immediate frustrations among beneficiaries. The proposal suggests that this will be achieved by providing work opportunities so that civilians and ex-combatants can work together to improve local infrastructure and initiate an increase in economic turnover and promote a more reconciled and peaceful environment. From the inception stage, it has been anticipated that this community development approach, providing employment opportunities to all community members, ex-combatant or otherwise, would encourage the reintegration process by providing the means through which formally opposing groups could work together to solve common problems. The main target group is unemployed ex-combatants (60%) and unemployed civilians (40%). An average of 1,500 people will be included in the project per month throughout the year and up to 4,500 people may become direct beneficiaries over the 12 months. The full population of 269,000 will benefit indirectly. The main project activities include the rehabilitation of 500km of roads and repairs to 16 minor bridges and other infrastructure as prioritised by the communities.

Avoiding duplication of activities and structures - Greater awareness is needed about existing structures and mechanisms and it is essential that where these do exist, be they at the community or national level or international development initiatives, they are built on and strengthened where appropriate rather than bypassed and replicated.

More broadly, all organisations operating in an area emerging out of conflict need to be made aware that the success or failure of DDR is integrally linked to the success or failure of their own work. Moreover, it is crucial that agencies who traditionally do not see their mandate as being related to conflict issues and DDR realise the impact that such a lack of awareness may have, not just on the success of their projects but on community security itself.

DDR and SSR are intricately connected – Security and its provision are key both in the early stages of a peace process and for its long term sustainability. The process of DDR will be hugely influenced by negotiations over the composition and reform of the security sector. The extent and nature of the movement of individuals from armed groups and security services into newly constituted structures will have substantial implications for thousands of ex-combatants. The implementation of the demobilisation phase has a strong influence on who (re-)enters military or police and who opts for civilian life.

The processes of DDR and SSR are integrally connected and need to be considered in conjunction with each other. Who is recruited into the security forces, how the recruitment is done and what training is offered will have substantial impacts on community perceptions of security and their confidence in the security sector's ability and willingness to ensure their 'freedom from fear'. For example, if ex-combatants from one group are recruited and are responsible for policing in an area where there are members of other armed groups reintegrated into the community then this could lead to tensions, potential for harassment and non co-operation. On the other hand, if individuals from the security forces are from the same group as some members of the community then there is the chance of problems arising over corruption and favouritism.

Where ex-combatants are seen to have committed grave human rights violations, moving them into newly constituted security structures raises a number of concerns about impunity from justice, failure to adhere to the rule of law and damage to trust and reconciliation. It may be argued that, in highly fragile post-conflict states, there may be no other option to integrating ex-combatants into security forces, although in some more socio-economically advanced post-conflict states such as Indonesia and Serbia, there may be more resources available to create other reintegration opportunities.

The crucial point is that communities need to be involved in decisions on the provision of security as they should be on the process of DDR. One of the primary roles of a security service is to ensure a safe and secure environment for the population. If communities are not given the chance to voice their concerns, needs and expectations around the role of the new security sector then they are unlikely to support or accept the changes and may well continue to resort to making their own provisions. This may in turn complicate attempts at disarmament.

Generating hope in the future, and mobilising the energy of societies to sustain it, significantly depends on improving access to livelihood opportunities – Jobs and income generation are often the issue - the principal concern of local people and ex-combatants alike. Poverty and the near-absence of job opportunities are major factors underlying and perpetuating state fragility. Combined with the very low levels of government revenue and minimal levels of public and private investment, they severely constrain the ability to provide a peace dividend in line with the expectations of both the former fighters and citizens more broadly. Often, it is the government (and the donors backing it) that are seen to bear the primary responsibility to provide jobs and affordable goods and services. Their actual or perceived failure to deliver in this task can lead to the conflict re-emerging.

In many contexts, the majority of the population barely scrape a living from agricultural activities. Rural economies, in particular, may scarcely be monetised. Much depends on the availability and access to land, and so, particularly where land is ever-scarcer, this issue fractures society and is a structural trigger cause of conflict. The return of refugees and ex-combatants will aggravate the situation. At the national and local level, corruption and competition amongst elites to control sources of wealth further undermines economic development and investment as well as the emergence of a vibrant private sector.

It will need to be a priority, therefore, to create jobs, building local markets in goods and labour and engaging the local private sector to generate livelihoods and a desire for peace. Labour-intensive activities can serve to occupy the mass of unemployed youth in the short term and to help drive longer term economic growth thereafter. Initiatives to improve livelihoods will also help communities cope with the potential influx of returnees, the flow of which will have to be carefully managed.

In tackling unemployment, it should be noted that ex-combatants themselves have the potential to be a significant human resource for the local and national economy, but also that significant numbers of them, particularly youth, will not feel part of that economy and will not see a common interest in community development. The challenge is to bridge this gap.

Monetising and diversifying the rural economy in Burundi

Weak banking infrastructure and very limited access to financial services are major obstacles to economic development, reducing people's ability to conceive and realize business plans or improve on their subsistence living conditions. This problem affects rural areas in particular. In Burundi, a study found that the banking system worked reasonable well in the distribution and receipt of D and R payments but the different groups benefited differently. Most ex-army had accounts but the other armed groups did not and required a brief 'education' session in the demobilisation camps on how to open one. Some initiatives (such as one begun by International Alert in Burundi) are looking to find ways to increase people's awareness on how to make and manage money, and make it last. The radio is one potentially significant medium for trying to achieve this.

The most severe obstacle is the economic system where there are very few ways to find a job and secure an income. Pressure on land is so high that alternative livelihoods or more 'modern' agricultural methods to improve land exploitation and diversity of crop choices are vital. The problems are exacerbated by the education (secondary and vocational) system which is not equipped to absorb ex-combatants who either are still of 'education' age (i.e. anything under 25 or so) or wish to acquire professional skills to enable them to have other livelihood opportunities. A related issue is whether there is an existing or potential market in which to make a living from those skills. There is also perhaps scope to build on the apparent interest of the Burundian ministry responsible for education and skills in strengthening its capacity in the area of vocational skills development.

Managing expectations - like many natural resources, assistance in fragile 'post-conflict' contexts involves the introduction of a valuable commodity into an environment which lacks effective institutions of governance. Depending on who benefits and who does not, it can inadvertently become something worth fighting for, thus fuelling further conflict. *Managing expectations*, paying attention to the needs and pitfalls of information flow and understanding the complexity of the process are, therefore, critical issues. This requires staffing numbers and individual skills that are proportionate to the scale of the task.

The Role of the EU

There is great potential for the EU to use its available instruments to enhance and strengthen DDR processes. In particular, by recognising that even though some issues and projects may not initially seem to be related to DDR, they become highly relevant when a more holistic approach to the process and the end goal is taken. As mentioned above, for DDR to be effective the EU needs to consider its activities in a broad range of sectors, specifically security, development, governance and justice activities.

EU Instruments

In 'post-conflict' contexts, the European Union is often one of the biggest players in supporting peace processes, through both the 1st and 2nd pillars, and in 1st pillar funding for on-going projects continued during the conflict. The Commission is able to engage through a range of geographic and thematic programmes, and these are currently evolving with a view to the new Financial Perspectives. Currently budget lines exist under bilateral assistance agreed with partner governments, under the Rapid Reaction Mechanism and under additional programmes such as election support or, in Asia and Latin America, Aid to Uprooted People. The Commission also contributes substantial amounts of money to specific DDR initiatives, supporting time-bound linear demobilization and reintegration programmes (such as the World Bank's Multi-country Demobilisation and Reintegration Program – MDRP) and to UN Trust Funds for DDR, and is involved in overall planning for DDR programmes in-country. One of the disadvantages of supporting such multi-lateral trust funds however is that the EC retains very little control over how the money itself is managed and how the activities it is intended for are implemented. Processes should therefore be established to ensure that evaluations are carried out, not just on the funding aspect of EC contributions to trust funds but on the activities too.

The EC and the DDRR Trust Fund in Liberia

The EC has been the biggest single contributor to the UN Trust Fund, with three contributions totalling €18.25 million or US \$ 21.9 million, just over 31% of the overall budget of US \$71 million.

The first contribution of €4.15m was targeted at the social aspects of demobilisation and towards supporting the establishment of the Joint Implementation Unit (JIU) and National Commission on DDR and reintegration activities. The second, of €5 million, was committed entirely to reintegration activities, consisting of formal education opportunities, agriculture and income generation activities, vocational training, apprenticeship and job placement and small enterprise development. A third contribution will provide €1.6 million for the demobilisation of the Armed Forces of Liberia (AFL) once other donors have committed to this and the process is underway as it has experienced numerous delays for political reasons. It will also provide €9.1 million for RR activities for the remaining caseload of ex-combatants.

These contributions to the Trust Fund make up 75% of the EC's monetary commitments to the DDRR process. The additional 25% has supported parallel projects including vocational training projects implemented by local NGOs and managed by the UNDP. The benefit of such parallel projects is that they avoid the bureaucracy and delays that the Trust fund has been

plagued by and enable a more flexible and holistic approach to the process. The EC, along with other donors, has been critical of the way the Trust Fund has been managed and implementation has occurred and has been pushing for an evaluation, both of how contributions have been spent and how activities have been implemented.¹³

Under the 2nd pillar, and often supported by Community funds, the Council of the EU may initiate a deployment of Member States personnel under the European Security and Development Policy and on the legal basis of a Joint Action agreed by Council. Coming under the Common Foreign and Security Policy budget, relevant actions can include civilian crisis management (possibly accompanied by military engagement) as well as CFSP support to a Rule of Law or Border management initiative. The way that the EU combines and sequences such activities will, *inter alia*, have significant impacts on the ability of societies to absorb ex-combatants into civilian life.

For demobilisation and reintegration to be effective in the long term, the EU needs to consider security, development, governance and justice activities, both new and on-going, together.¹⁴ Laying the foundations for collective hope in a peaceful future will involve trade-offs between (i) rapid investment of a so-called 'peace dividend' in order to maintain a minimum level of stability and trust among the ordinary population, and (ii) designing and implementing activities on a medium to long term perspective, which should, wherever relevant, also take full account of activities, structures and mechanisms already put in place by on-going actors and programmes. These will need to inform the formulation and implementation of a transitional plan that subsequently moves into a long term strategy to tackle the root causes of fragility and conflict.

For the EU (and as the new financial perspective takes shape), the flexibility accorded by availability and types of funding and by the breadth and length of an initiative are critical issues. On the 1st pillar side, attention is needed to ensure that administrative and contracting procedures used by Delegations and Brussels-based directorates are 'fit for purpose' – in terms of the rapidity with which they can be used and how they are adapted to evolving circumstances. Of course, this has to be balanced with accountability, but it is essential that terms of reference and financing decisions are flexible enough given the constantly shifting challenges at hand.

As regards the second pillar, the deployment of European civilian and/or military personnel is inevitably a challenging undertaking. On top of the operational challenges, the political issues involved in mounting peace support missions can be complex and explosive. It is therefore all the more important that the procedure for negotiating mandates is clearly defined and well understood, so as to facilitate rapid decision-making.

The Aceh Monitoring Mission, Indonesia

Launched on 15 September 2005, the Aceh Monitoring Mission (AMM) is a civilian mission within the framework of the European Security and Defence Policy. The EU's Political and Security Committee (PSC) exercises the political control and the strategic guidance of the AMM under the responsibility of the Council of the EU. The scope of the AMM is, *inter alia*, to monitor the demobilisation and reintegration of Free Aceh Movement (GAM) and monitor and assist with the decommissioning and destruction of its weapons, ammunition and explosives. It is also to monitor the human rights situation and, where appropriate, provide assistance in this field. The AMM has established an office in 12 districts (out of 21).

13 The EC has made provision for an evaluation of its own contributions to the DDR process, both as part of the Trust Fund but also to parallel projects. However to date the evaluation has been dogged by technical difficulties and delays and a time has still not been confirmed.

14 See, for example, "The EU's Peace-building Role in the Great Lakes: Impacts, Opportunities and Challenges", International Alert 2006.

The costs of the AMM are financed from the EU budget (the reference amount for the mission under the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy budget line is €9 million) and by contributions of EU Member States and participating countries (€6 million - of which 4.1 million has been given by Sweden). The European Commission has donated €4 million (through its Rapid Reaction Mechanism) for the reintegration into civilian life of political prisoners and GAM combatants. These funds are intended to cover the basic needs of 2,000 prisoners and 3,000 former combatants and their families (estimated to total 25,000 people in all) for a period of six months (medical care, subsistence allowances, return to their communities) and the establishment of a framework for long-term reintegration.

In terms of linking the first and second pillars of the EU, the joint mission between the Commission and Council personnel in Jakarta meant that, as soon as the Memorandum of Understanding was ready, both EU policy and personnel were in place for the implementation phase. This timely joint action has been seen to be behind the successes of the EU's involvement in Aceh. Moreover, planning for DDR began in June-July 2005, even prior to the MoU meaning that the common problem of the time-lag between the peace agreement and DDR implementation was largely avoided.

Key challenges that have been identified include the absence of a clear demobilisation stage and difficulties with the brevity of the time frame, the lack of psychological and social assistance, vocational training, etc., and shortcomings in planning, structuring and financing the reintegration stage. As in so many other contexts, one of the most critical problems is how to generate jobs and income. It is recommended that more reintegration expertise and advisors are needed to support the DDR process.

The absence of available information has also caused difficulties. For example, GAM provided hardly any concrete data on the number of ex-combatants for demobilisation. At the root of this is the lack of trust between communities and the government. Two-way communication has not been sufficiently prioritised as a key way to address this.

The EU is in a strong position to pursue the goal of DDR in a holistic and coherent manner. In 'post-conflict' contexts, the European Union is often one of the biggest players in supporting peace processes, through both the 1st and 2nd pillars, and in 1st pillar funding for on-going projects continued during the conflict. This is not only due to the funding provided to DDR programmes through multilateral trust funds but also from its capabilities in the political, trade and development assistance fields which enable it to address relevant issues related to security, governance, livelihoods all of which are key to successful DDR.

Security

The security situation in a 'post-conflict' context is a key factor not only because ensuring the provision of security is essential to facilitating the return of both ex-combatants and other returnees (refugees, IDPs and abductees) and hence to working towards sustainable peace but also because it will likely determine the extent of EU interventions, their scope and timing.

During the cease-fire and the post-conflict transition access to different parts of the country normally increases. However armed groups, or remnants of them, often remain active and continue to cross international borders more or less unhindered. They can continue to wreak havoc on the local population and often persist in new recruitment, including from among those fighters who have not reaped the benefits of the new political order or who see the prospect of receiving DDR cash payments.

Alongside this, and connected with it, the cease-fire and post-conflict transition period are often associated with increasing criminality fuelled by a stagnant economy, dysfunctional law enforcement services and the widespread presence of small arms in communities. A massive rise in rape and violence mainly against women and young girls, but also against men and boys, is often a particularly striking part of this trend. Experience shows that this is a direct consequence of years of war and violence and the consequent decline in moral and social values.

In such situations, the EU and its international partners will need to engage rapidly in two areas: (i) supporting (and, in some cases through a military operation, ensuring) the demilitarisation of armed groups and (ii) the short term integration of the security sector within the framework of a longer term reform process. Where the Council bodies are engaging in these areas, the more that the relevant committee delegates are familiar with the details of the complex situation on the ground and the more they are liaising with their national experts, the better an ESDP deployment can help address the challenges that sit at the nexus of security and development – particularly those relating to ex-combatants.

Building on progress (slowly) being made across the EU institutions and among Member States on the concept of Security Sector Reform, common understanding of ex-combatant-related issues may allow mandates to be longer (where, for example, it is quite clear that a disarmament and demobilisation process will clearly last over a year) and more easily renewable. Reluctance among Member States to agree longer mandates could perhaps be addressed by giving the “willing” more freedom to provide pooled funding (rather than meeting costs where they fall). Steps could also be taken to ensure that 2nd pillar action is systematically accompanied by measures supported under the 1st pillar at the community level that will facilitate and sustain the reintegration process over an even longer period. Both these processes must account for the special needs of women who have become involved in fighting forces.

DDR and SSR in Burundi

On top of the problems of reintegrating ex-combatants comes the challenge of creating a new army and a new police force out of the former soldiers and fighters who moved into these agencies of the state, bringing their past ethos into the new institutions. Critical to a stable Burundian future, these SSR-related issues of transforming law enforcement agencies into effective and accountable public services, and of achieving very substantial cuts in the numbers of police, are among the most sensitive areas of negotiation. This sensitivity results largely from the continued ethnic, social and economic cleavages in the country and the actual and perceived power that resides in the army and police. Progress made, however, has significant impacts on the extent to which the actions of the security services improve actual and perceived human security.

The Arusha Accord which marked the beginning of the end of violent conflict in Burundi made reference to the need for a demobilization and reintegration process to address the needs of those former combatants who do not remain with the new defence and security forces. The responsibilities and attributes of the army and national police force, and the integration of combatants of all armed parties into them, were key provisions of the Accord. Separately, on November 2, 2003, the Government and the CNDD-FDD (Nkurunziza) signed a Forces Technical Agreement (FTA) outlining the process and scope of the integration of CNDD-FDD (Nkurunziza) forces and the Forces Armées Burundaises (FAB) into the new National Defense Force (NDF), and the allocation of set proportions of personnel and officers to each side.

During this prolonged period, donors including the European Commission financed essential supplies to armed groups and the army to prevent a return to war during the cease fire

agreement. Also during the transition period following the peace accords, initial security sector activities involved integrating the former Gendarmerie and several thousand members of former rebel groups into the new national police force, and moving a few further thousand members of the armed groups into the army. Many national politicians like to think that this is SSR but, essentially, the police have no training in their civilian tasks and have retained their guns and the army is still far from being a cohesive force. Leadership is highly politicised, and a clear division of responsibility and line of authority among ministries are both lacking.

Mechanisms for internal and external oversight and accountability (in a Western sense) are largely non-existent – whether in parliament, civil society or the relevant civilian ministry. Aside from the severe lack of infrastructure (police stations, cars/bicycles, accommodation etc.), the new security services have little understanding of what their new role is. Meanwhile the police, like the army of around 30,000 troops, is over-sized and represents a huge (and barely overseen) burden on the national budget. Given the fungibility of aid, this further emphasises that DDR and SSR must together be integrated into financial planning within the new government's negotiations with the IMF and into the Poverty Reduction Paper Process.

Governance

The absence of accountability in the political system and the lack of democratic participation are root causes of violent conflict and unless addressed they will pose a long-term threat to the ability of communities to deal with the return of ex-combatants. Improved governance will also be a fundamental basis for the revival of economic activities and interactions.

The EC has the ability and scope to implement governance programmes so as to help professionalise ministries and assist them in, for example, addressing the reintegration challenges faced by communities and authorities. These could include capacity development on how the Ministry of Finance budgets for the costs of newly integrated security services. Another example would be to strengthen the capacity of the Ministry dealing with land issues to mitigate tensions surrounding returnees and implement land reforms in order to better drive local economies. Equally, capacity building is normally needed for the range of Ministries from Planning to Agriculture and Education to Health to plan for the unavoidable and foreseeable pressures arising during reintegration processes. Supporting the capacity development of parliament and civil society organisations is also vital as these bodies are a key factor in the success of governance programmes and in enhancing the accountability and transparency of the government and ministries.

In local communities, governance programmes can serve to help people understand and realise their rights and obligations as citizens, express their needs and wishes to the authorities and take part in the management of their affairs. Programmes focused on the administration of localities (such as managing the local challenges of returnee civilians and ex-combatants) can serve to help develop capacity to manage local interests and provide services that do not fall to the central government.

In terms of the intricately inter-connected area of security sector governance, personnel in the 'new' army and police may well be drawn from the ranks of former fighters in the former rebel forces, and have only a (para) military, rather than law enforcement background. The newly created services providing security and justice do not have the capacity, or perhaps even commitment, to protect the communities that they are supposed to serve. In addition, the existence of continued militia violence (or insurgency) and remnants of fighting forces can lead authorities to try to justify or forgive human rights abuses by the security forces. This makes the design and implementation of programmes to improve the governance of the security sector particularly important.

To assist these processes, the EU can participate in a harmonised donor approach to SSR.¹⁵ In post-conflict contexts, this usually involves, in the first instance, moving many thousands of ex-combatants from several of the warring parties into newly formed national army and police units. Previously warring factions will compete to align this highly political process with their vested interests (such as in defining the harmonisation of ranks). Legislation is often hastily passed by newly installed parliamentarians with little expertise in SSR issues. In these contexts, assistance needs to be provided to improve the level of expertise in the transitional - or newly elected government, parliament *and* civil society. Institution building at the state and local level, accompanied by sustained programmes to engage non-governmental groups in the process, can help ensure that the reconstituted security sector is subject to civilian oversight and operates within the rule of law. The ability of society to drive and monitor improvements in the security sector will often depend on the resources, capacity and legal freedoms of national and local media (particularly the radio). This is an important area to which the EU could add significant value at relatively low cost.

Livelihoods

In countries emerging from war, jobs and income generation are often the issue - the principal concern of local people and ex-combatants alike and one of the determining factors in whether those who have been living by the gun will be willing to disarm and reintegrate into society. In such contexts local economic systems are afflicted by the breakdown of markets, the development of non-monetary economies and the non-payment of wages by public and private employers. The problems are exacerbated because people have used their savings and sold their assets in the effort to cope with life in the midst of war. In addition, continuing physical insecurity, involving attacks and threats against civilians and sporadic militia violence, as well as the theft and depletion of livestock are additional problems for farming and marketing activities. Job and income generation opportunities, particularly for women, are few and far between, and where sources of actual and potential wealth do exist, they are likely to be the object of competition among elites or the focus of continued fighting amongst those with guns.

While the majority of funds for specific and narrow 'DDR programmes' get sucked into the demobilisation process, too little attention is given to livelihood support activities. It is essential to embed the 'ex-combatant' factor as one part of broader (re)construction and rehabilitation projects. This means, for example, designing activities that will improve revenues from the agriculture sector and infrastructure projects so that they meet community needs. The EC is often a major player in both infrastructure rehabilitation and construction as well as in rural development. It also supports training initiatives with a view to diversifying job opportunities. This offers an important opening for strengthening reintegration programmes. Taking advantage of this, it is important to ensure that the beneficiaries of these programmes are not only the returning ex-combatants, but also other returnees and those members of the community who remained during the war. Failing to include all these groups as beneficiaries can create or exacerbate tensions; successful inclusion can act as a driver for tolerance and reconciliation.

EC funding for vocational training projects in Liberia

Two Liberian NGOs - the Liberia Opportunities Industrialization Centers (LOIC) and the Community Empowerment & Skills Development (CESD) - run reintegration and rehabilitation projects, supported by EC funding. The aim of the vocational training project is to facilitate the economic reintegration of ex-combatants, in line with the measures and entitlements set out in the Comprehensive Peace Accord. The ex-combatants were offered a core course and a choice of specialisations (agriculture, tailoring, mechanics, plumbing, metalwork, electronics) lasting eight months.

15 See the EU Concepts on SSR as well as the OECD DAC Guidelines on Security Sector Reform and Governance www.oecd.org/dac/conflict/ssr

LOIC was contracted to train 1,500 ex-combatants in seven sites, and CESD 1,440 in seven locations. In both cases, the NGO had to open or rehabilitate rural sites as a precursor to training. The NGOs signed contracts in July 2004. Subsequently the EC decided through a 1st rider to the contract to link the projects to the UN Trust fund by contracting UNDP to provide monitoring and oversight of activities and finances. The UN, NGOs and EC signed a MoU to this effect in September 2004.

The EC's projects represent a major opportunity for promoting more meaningful participation in local political and economic life, strengthening inter-group trust and the capacity of communities to collaborate effectively and manage conflict without resorting to violence.¹⁶ Initiatives can help to repair community rifts and (re)build social and business networks necessary for economic growth and counteracting problems associated with weak or destroyed formal institutions supporting livelihoods.¹⁷ By focusing on enhancing local production as well as the purchasing power capacity of local markets, EC projects can help reduce risks to peace posed by ex-combatants.

Improving financial structures and systems can also be an important accompaniment of reintegration processes. The banking system plays a key role in the context of specific DDR programmes where ex-combatants are eligible for transitional safety allowances. Where there is no banking system then access to payments and credit is obviously complicated. Supporting the improvement of these structures and access to them for the whole community will likely have a positive impact.

The EC can use its political voice and influence to push for a greater focus on job and income generation in an interim Poverty Reduction Strategy in order to try to ensure that it is embedded in the overall macro-level framework for the transition. In so doing, participatory processes at the local level can help direct livelihood support to responding to actual opportunities and actual needs. Equally important for communities is the provision of assistance to help address the problems arising from a lack of information and knowledge on economic circumstances, needs and opportunities. The strains resulting from the return of ex-combatants as well as of thousands of displaced people renders even more important the process of elaborating and implementing the externally-funded initiatives. Procedures and criteria for decision-making need to be transparent and well communicated.

Justice and Reconciliation

Justice and reconciliation issues are integrally linked to DDR, specifically the reintegration aspect, in the context of whether ex-combatants will be accepted back into communities. The actual and perceived impunity of ex-combatants who have perpetrated severe acts of violence and other abuses of human rights can significantly impact on tensions and the potential for reintegration at the community level. The exclusion from amnesty of those responsible for acts of genocide, crimes against humanity or participation in coups d'états is unlikely to be enough to assuage these concerns.

As with the institutions of governance, the justice system in countries emerging from conflict is usually profoundly dysfunctional and, even where it could be said to function, it tends to be afflicted by tensions between formal and informal systems and by the collapse of public trust in the earlier established system of justice. This may arise due to the actual or perceived corruption in the judiciary or the sense that it is influenced by certain ethnic groups to the exclusion of others. Public mistrust may well be particularly acute because of the actual and perceived impunity of ex-combatants who have perpetrated severe acts of violence and other abuses of human rights. Moreover, if political prisoners are released without due process or community sensitisation, this will further undermine public faith in justice and the provision of security.

¹⁶ See, for example, in a non-conflict (but multi-ethnic) context, the Public Works Programme project in Malawi co-financed by the EC. The EC's Micro-Projects Initiative in the Niger Delta is another example of where communities have become far more involved in local life in a context by virtue of their involvement in, and financial contribution to, community infrastructure development.

¹⁷ See World Bank/ILO study 2005.

These problems and tensions are often partially hidden from international actors like the EU, especially if their personnel are deployed in justice and rule of law programmes for a year or less. It is important to recognise these gaps in knowledge and to respect the greater extent of the knowledge in local communities, where people often know precisely who committed what crimes, and are shocked, resentful and fearful that the perpetrators are allowed to walk free.

On the issue of reconciliation it is important to acknowledge that this is an often neglected area both for the victims of conflict and for the ex-combatants themselves. A key part of the reconciliation process is acknowledging and accepting the problem and learning to move forward from this point. Such a process takes time and needs external support and/or facilitation. Ex-combatants at best might receive an hour or so of trauma counselling in the brief time they spend in demobilisation cantonment sites but this is in no way sufficient to enable them to come to terms with events and their new position. For victims, lack of access to trauma counselling and the perception that the perpetrators of atrocities are enjoying impunity have a hugely negative impact on the potential for reconciliation.

EC's support in the justice sector in the DRC¹⁸

To help establish the rule of law in the DRC, the European Commission launched an audit by the Comité Mixte de Réforme de la Justice, which also involved the Minister of Justice, judicial experts and other donors (United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUC) and High Commissariat for Human Rights (HCDH), France, UK and Belgium). Recommendations were presented in November 2004, and a Comité Mixte de Suivi, made of the Ministry of Justice and development partners, was established in the following year. No further action was taken under the transition government, however, and reforms in the judiciary will now have to take place under the new Constitution. The justice sector in DRC is weak and unaccountable and most crimes remain unpunished. Magistrates are not paid properly and are often corrupt. After years of neglect, courts are under-resourced and the justice system is in dire need of a major overhaul.

The Commission plans to launch a programme in the post-transition phase to support three main activities in the judiciary system: the establishment of the newly created High Judicial Council (Conseil Supérieur de la Magistrature); administrative reforms of the Ministry of Justice; and rehabilitation of the judiciary chain in Kinshasa (from the First Instance court to the Supreme Court). The Commission also plans to continue its support for the rehabilitation of the judicial system in the East. In 2003, a grant, worth €585.000, from the rapid reaction mechanism (RRM) was used to support the restoration of the justice sector in Bunia. A nationwide programme totalling €28m (under 6th to European Development Fund) is also to be completed at the end of this year. This includes (i) the physical rehabilitation of a number of courts and tribunals as well as the documentation centre of the Ministry of Justice, (ii) the rehabilitation of jurisdictional capacities through the production and dissemination of legal documents (iii) an awareness-raising campaign for the population on the rule of law.

In this area, the EU can offer significant support to the processes and institutions of transitional justice and reconciliation and can design initiatives for the longer term effectiveness and reputation of justice institutions, both formal and informal. The value of prosecuting past abuses by warring groups is much debated but it seems clear that transitional justice processes have the ability to undermine and sideline perpetrators, reducing their ability to prolong a conflict, and also preventing them from re-emerging post-transition as organised criminals. By supporting Truth Commissions and ensuring that they are properly constituted with respected and untarnished experts, the EU can help reduce potentially dangerous historical grievances, giving a

18 See International Alert's CPP working paper, *EU Peacebuilding in the Great Lakes region: Impacts, challenges and opportunities*, 25 May 2006.

voice to ordinary victims. In addition, transitional justice support can also help a society draw the dividing line between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour whilst at the same time acting as a deterrent for certain categories of perpetrator and for the return of ex-combatants to the way of violence and war. In the justice system, projects to support local and mobile courts and community reconciliation can be highly constructive where they improve access to justice and tackle issues of impunity which undermine the forging of better relations among divided communities.

The Scope for EU Involvement

For the EU, the implications of looking at DDR programmes through a broader lens are, firstly, that the EU is already doing more to support DDR than would seem to be the case if one looked only at funding for DDR programmes as such. Secondly, the EU also has the potential to do considerably more, by connecting other peacebuilding programmes to DDR and optimizing the use of the human and resources that it can mobilize on the ground. Its political dialogue with host governments should be used in order to create and protect the space for this kind of strategic engagement. Thirdly, the EU can better capitalise on this potential if it acts to specifically include the links between DDR and other programmes into its programming and strategic planning. It can be added that the EU is also well placed to encourage this approach among bilateral donors and other multilateral actors.

The extent of the EU's involvement will, however, be influenced by a number of factors and requirements. These include:

- *The EU's presence on the ground.* The EU's contribution to DDR in its widest sense will necessarily be determined by existing resources and capacity on the ground, political will of the EU, its Member States and the host governments, the perception of the EU within the host country and the history and context of the country.
- *Increased coordination and coherence between the pillars of the EU and other organisations* to ensure that DDR is addressed as a long term and multi-actor process.
- *Greater in-house expertise* through training and awareness raising, not just amongst DDR policy and programming staff but also for development planners and implementers.

Conclusion

DDR programmes remain the key mechanism for facilitating the return of ex-combatants to a civilian life and a place in society. Given that ex-combatants pose the highest risk to destabilising peace, it is accepted that there is a need for a specific programmatic focus on this group and targeted DDR programmes will rightly continue to be used to try to deliver visible peace-dividends, build confidence in the short term and transition into longer term activities. However, there is also the realisation that this needs to be carefully balanced against the needs of the broader community in an attempt to minimise jealousies and tensions.

International thinking on DDR has developed considerably in recent years and there has been a shift from viewing DDR as a purely military process to seeing it as a wider, and highly political, process with long term development implications. Furthermore, progress has been made in emphasising the need for national ownership and community input. However, while progress has been made in theory there still remain many challenges in practice. These include ensuring programmes are based on solid information given the restricted timeframes for planning, providing a sustained information exchange on DDR processes so both ex-combatants and communities are aware of what is going on, securing national and community ownership and ensuring feedback to the programme implementers. In addition whilst there has been recognition that DDR makes up only one part of a broader post-conflict recovery programme there is a real need to ensure that a holistic community driven approach is taken. Actors and programmes which focus on issues that may not traditionally be seen as relevant or within the remit of DDR must be aware that in fact they could have a significant role and impact in supporting the process explicitly or through parallel, complementary programmes.

Intervention in societies recovering from war will be far more effective if the EU views DDR programmes through a broader lens. Then, rather than focusing only on the mechanism itself, the EU could see the programmes as tools to achieve the end goal of securing the peace process by facilitating ex-combatants' return to communities. The instruments available through both the 1st and 2nd pillars enable engagement on a range of geographic and thematic programmes and there is great potential for these to be used to enhance and strengthen DDR processes. By considering its activities on security, development, governance and justice and their relationship to DDR the EU would be able to maximise the effectiveness of its interventions and ongoing projects.

Specifically, the EU should ensure that it:

1. Makes maximum use of the EU's comparative advantage to pursue the *goal* of DDR. Political dialogue as well as external assistance in the areas of security, governance, economic and justice and reconciliation can be orientated to help drive and sustain progress towards this goal.
2. Combines a range of instruments to optimise outcomes on stability and development. This might involve crisis management within the CFSP/ESDP in addition to the activities of the Commission.
3. Ensures a coherent and flexible approach, in terms of programmes and goals, within the EU institutions and with Member States and other organisations such as the UN and World Bank. This applies to both DDR programmes and to other initiatives, such as rural development programmes, which are key for progress towards the overarching goals.
4. Supports DDR-related activities through political dialogue with the country in question.

5. Ensures that both the target group and potential host communities are involved as active participants in all phases of DDR. This will require effective information exchange with them and collaboration with non-governmental organisations and media active in the given context.
6. Promotes an understanding of DDR as both a discrete programme implemented over a relatively short time and as a goal to which a wide range of other external assistance and peacebuilding activities will be extremely relevant and important.

