

Stockholm Initiative on Disarmament Demobilisation Reintegration

Testing the Principles



FOLKE BERNADOTTE ACADEMY



REGERINGSKANSLIET

**Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Sweden**

Preface

From the very outset, the key objective of the Stockholm Initiative on Disarmament Demobilisation Reintegration (SIDDR) was to arrive at a set of recommendations aimed at relevant actors engaged in programmes for disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of ex-combatants. The goal was to place DDR within the framework of a peace process. A DDR programme is one of many transitional mechanisms facilitating the creation and sustainability of a situation that provides both sufficient security and minimum basic conditions for long-term peaceful development. The SIDDR emphasised the political aspects of DDR and its potential to support a peace process. This is something that only a few years ago was scarcely discussed in the international debate on challenges for sustainable peace.

Based on suggestions made at the official launch in New York in March 2006, a joint follow-up project was created in collaboration between the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Sweden and the Folke Bernadotte Academy. The idea of the follow-up project was not to evaluate the Report, but rather to attempt to test the relevance of its recommendations and findings in practice.

The mandate of the Folke Bernadotte Academy, as a Swedish focal point for peace and security and civilian/military training, allows for a broad approach to issues like DDR and Security System Reform (SSR). By taking the results and recommendations of the SIDDR to ongoing peace talks and presenting it to negotiating parties, the follow-up project learned many valuable lessons that confirmed the need for a comprehensive view. One general observation made was that even though DDR as a concept should be introduced early on in negotiation settings and discussed by the parties in order to prepare for what is going to happen when a peace agreement has been signed, the terminology and sequence of the process must be adapted to each particular situation.

The content of the SIDDR recommendations was verified, though slightly modified, by the follow-up project. Whereas the SIDDR process discussed the importance of dealing with DDR early on in a peace process in order to support the implementation of a peace agreement, the follow-up project also highlighted the function of DDR as a mediation tool, or as a confidence-building measure, to move the political process forward.

The lessons learned from the follow-up project, summarised in this report, are particularly valuable to the Folke Bernadotte Academy as a training institute. It is not only negotiating parties and external mediators that must be aware of cultural, historical, religious and socio-economic factors shaping the context in which the peace process unfolds. Any peace-keeping mission should also have a bottom-up approach and the ability to understand what factors shape the cause of events, so as

to enable mandates and activities to be adapted to each particular situation. This report and its concluding recommendations will be used as guidance in the FBA's training and its support to peace building efforts. It can also be used as reference for future facilitation of negotiations.

In November 2006, the Folke Bernadotte Academy assembled a group of representatives from international organisations with experience of peace processes in general and DDR processes in particular, with the aim to generate discussion on the dilemma of approaching DDR in a flexible manner adapted to each situation on the ground, while keeping the generally accepted concept intact. The SIDDR process and the UN's IDDRS (Integrated DDR Standards) process have succeeded in bringing different actors together, using a common language. Elaborating on terminology would jeopardise the progress made. The seminar concluded, however, that in order to find the right ways of introducing DDR in each particular situation, it would be helpful to look at DDR more as a flexible concept consisting of various components, from which suitable programmes can be tailored.

The SIDDR process itself has now officially ended. In order to maintain the outcome of the SIDDR, all the background material, including this report, will be available via the Folke Bernadotte Academy's official website: www.folkebernadotteacademy.se. I would like to express particular thanks to all those who have participated in the follow-up activities throughout the year as well as at the concluding seminar in November 2006.

The Folke Bernadotte Academy hopes to continue to contribute to international efforts in this area, together with the Swedish National Defence College, other Swedish actors, and the SIDDR network of expertise. This, in turn, will strengthen Sweden's capacity to continue to develop its contribution to international peace and security.



Michael Sahlin
Director-General
Folke Bernadotte Academy

1.	The SIDDR Process	7
	Working process	7
	Follow-up	8
	Concluding seminar	10
2.	Political dimensions of DDR	11
3.	Testing the principles	15
	Terminology – flexibility in negotiations	17
	Positions and Interests	17
	Decommissioning, breaking a stalemate	19
	Disarmament and reintegration as confidence building measures	20
	Managing security at the national level: implications for ownership	22
	Managing armies and arms	22
	Rightsizing the security sector	24
4.	Developing the SIDDR recommendations	27
	The international community's commitment to support a national process?	27
	Frameworks to move the process forward	29
	Combatant and community focus	31
	DDR/SSR relations	33
	Parallel processes – SALW and transitional justice	36
	Economic reconstruction	37
	End note	39
	Annex 1. SIDDR Executive Summary	41
	Annex 2. SIDDR Recommendations	43
	Annex 3. Additional recommendations	47

The SIDDR process

Working Process

The Stockholm Initiative on Disarmament Demobilisation Reintegration (SIDDR) was initiated in November 2004. Over a one-year period, some 130 participants – representing 27 governments, 24 non-governmental organisations, academic institutes and government agencies, and 14 UN agencies and international organisations (including the African Union, the European Union and the World Bank) – gathered in working groups, plenary meetings, round tables and temporary electronic consultative networks. The aim of the international working process was to challenge conventional wisdom and to develop proposals for a predictable framework for the planning and implementation of Disarmament Demobilisation Reintegration (DDR) processes.

In November 2005, a draft report on the SIDDR was made available for comments, criticism and additional observations at a final conference. The year-long working process had, along with parallel processes, such as the United Nation's Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS)¹ and the World Bank's Multi-Country Demobilization and Reintegration Program (MDRP)², managed to move collective knowledge and accumulated experience in the field forward.

At the time of the initial SIDDR meetings, international policy debate rarely treated DDR as a tool in political negotiations. The main message of the SIDDR, having advocated for the inclusion of a political perspective from the outset of the process, was that *a DDR component should be viewed as a central element of any peace negotiation or peace process, that it has to be dealt with in the context of other ongoing peace building, security and development processes, and that it must be adapted to specific cultural, social, economic and political conditions.*

The SIDDR Final Report states that the primary aim of DDR programmes is to contribute to a secure and stable environment in which an overall peace process and transition can be sustained. It is only in this kind of 'enabling' environment that political and security restructuring, as well as social and economic reconstruction and longer-term development, can take root. Even though the

Final Report was an interpretation of the discussions produced by the core secretariat rather than a negotiated product, it broadly reflected the contemporary international policy debate on DDR.

All academic and policy analysis commissioned for the SIDDR has been made available in the compilation, Background Studies, which has been disseminated to participants, academic institutes, organisations and other relevant stakeholders.

The SIDDR Final Report was handed over to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 10 March 2006. It was publicly launched by a work-shop presentation at the Swedish Permanent Mission in New York. The Report includes recommendations aimed at the UN Security Council, the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, the Secretariat, relevant funds and programmes and UN Peace Missions, as well as bilateral and multilateral financial donors to DDR programmes. It is also intended as guidance for mediators and facilitators of peace processes as well as for the negotiating parties themselves, to help them better understand DDR issues and their impact on peace processes. An executive summary of the SIDDR Final Report can be found in Annex 1 and its recommendations are listed in Annex 2 (sorted by numbers).

Follow-up

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Sweden, encouraged by SIDDR participants, saw the need for a continued focus on the operational potential of the findings and recommendations of the Final Report. For this reason, a specific mandate to establish a project under the leadership of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs was given to the Folke Bernadotte Academy, a Swedish governmental agency (hereafter referred to as the FBA). The purpose of this project was to follow-up on the results and recommendations of the SIDDR (hence it will hereafter be referred to as the follow-up project). In contrast to the more policy oriented SIDDR Report, the follow-up project purposely shifted its focus towards more practical issues, dilemmas, challenges and opportunities associated with negotiations and peace processes, in other words, testing the principles in practice (see chapter 3).

As the FBA is a training and methodology/research institute devoted to contributing to increased quality and effectiveness in international conflict and crisis management, with a particular focus on peace operations, efforts were made to incorporate the SIDDR results into the FBA's courses and programmes. The SIDDR Final Report and Background Studies have also been disseminated and presented in relevant academic and policy oriented forums around the world. Some processes conducted during 2006 that are of specific significance from the SIDDR perspective (in addition to the IDDRS and the MDRP) include: the EU Concept for Support to DDR, approved jointly by the Commission and

the Council in December 2006; the African Union's Framework Document on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development (PCRDR); the conferences on DDR in Africa arranged by the government of Sierra Leone and the United Nation's Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (UNOSAA); and the Implementation Framework on Security System Reform coordinated by the OECD/DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Cooperation (CPDC). The follow-up project has furthermore significantly benefited from the newly established website; UN-Peacemaker³, which has gathered peace agreements relevant to peace and security and the current international system.

Already upon its assembly in Pretoria in March 2005, the first SIDDR working group recommended further exploration of the conflict panorama immediately prior to a peace agreement. Consequently, the political recommendations (primarily recommendations 1-4 and 9-10 in Annex 2), became the centre of attention for the follow-up project. The SIDDR recommendations were presented with reference to relevant ongoing peace processes. One general conclusion drawn from this experience, is that even though DDR as a concept should be addressed early on and discussed by the parties to any peace negotiation in order to prepare for the situation after a peace agreement has been signed, *it must be taken into account that the terminology and sequencing and even design of the DDR process must be adapted to each particular situation.*

Important lessons have been learned about the dynamics of a peace negotiation and the role that DDR can play in peace processes by linking concrete security concerns to popular hopes, aspirations and demands for a future social order. These dynamics have proved to be relevant in most conflict settings. Whereas the SIDDR Report identifies DDR as a crucial component in any peace process and identifies its role relative to parallel concerns, the follow-up project goes deeper into the political dynamics. DDR as a concept is at the very nexus of security and peace building. On the one hand, a well implemented DDR programme can be a means to move a peace process forward, providing opportunities and alternatives for sustainable peace. On the other hand, depending on the particular approach, DDR may be a barrier to peace, obstructing any positive development (this is illustrated in the next chapter, using examples from Angola, Sierra Leone and DR Congo).

The essence of the SIDDR messages was verified through the follow-up project, as will be outlined below, although the particular solutions found will not always be expressed literally and sequentially as disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration. In fact, the very terminology in itself, with its assumption of a three-step sequence, can sometimes hinder a positive outcome, which examples in this report will illustrate.

Concluding seminar

In November 2006, the FBA organised a work-shop for a group of representatives from international organisations, with general experience of peace processes and of DDR processes in particular, together with key individuals from the SIDDR network. The aim was to generate discussion on the particular dilemma identified by the follow-up project: how to approach DDR in a flexible manner – adapted to each situation on the ground – while still keeping the generally accepted concept intact.

The participants agreed that the concept of DDR should not be undermined by attempts to establish new terminologies at the international level. Continued support should be given to efforts within the donor community to achieve a common understanding of complicated interlinked interventions. It was, however, also found to be equally important to find the right way of applying the DDR concept to each particular situation. DDR therefore, should be approached much more carefully and flexibly, allowing the more concrete issues of arms and armies, security and development to be addressed within a locally derived language, with a mutually accepted set of meanings and agreed actions. Such a process would be embedded in specific local and national conditions and inclusively owned by the key stakeholders.

Many of the representatives at the concluding seminar had participated in meetings throughout the SIDDR. They appreciated the opportunity to meet once again in a network of skilled and experienced people to discuss difficult dilemmas and challenges of peace and security. The follow-up project has furthermore drawn on the experience and understanding of other practitioners, as well as academic work. This report makes use of the lessons drawn from their experience and presents examples of how the DDR concept can be introduced and used in different negotiating settings and peace processes.

The political dimension of DDR, including its role in an overall peace process and the discussion of national versus international leadership and ownership, has been the main focus of this project. To avoid any misunderstanding, the term ‘DDR’ will be used throughout the report, with the understanding that it describes *a flexible process in which weapons are removed from armed actors and from political discourse and where sustainable social and economic reintegration of formerly armed combatants (armies) is promoted as an alternative to military conflict.*

Political dimensions of DDR

The knowledge accumulated from recent experiences and international policy processes has moved thinking forward by placing DDR at the centre of the political discussion. Lessons learned from the follow-up project confirm the importance of addressing DDR as an issue in negotiations. Peace agreements are rarely blueprints. They should rather serve as frameworks for a continuous and augmented process over time. In order to establish DDR as a part of such a dynamic course of action, it is crucial to understand the various approaches and their possible entry points.

The bartering of 'blood diamonds' in Sierra Leone in the 1990s gave individual combatants (or at least their commanders) better opportunities to find a sustainable livelihood and, perhaps most importantly, it gave the RUF (Revolutionary United Front) access to power over resources and thereby political control. Combined with a weak capacity of the national government to encourage participation, either by sticks or by carrots, there was little incentive to take part in the obligatory DDR programme. It was not until British support strengthened the national government's capacity to put military pressure on the RUF, to follow commitments already made in peace agreements, that a proper DDR process was able to take place.

In Angola, two peace processes failed due to manipulation of the DDR process by one party, UNITA. Even though several peace agreements were signed, it was only when its leader, Jonas Savimbi, was killed in an ambush that UNITA was finally defeated in practice, and a peace building process could truly commence.

In both situations, there was a clear victor in the conflict who could dictate the conditions of the peace agreement. The idea of disarming, demobilising and reintegrating the combatants of the defeated party was fairly easy to argue in the negotiations. Both the previous peace agreements in Sierra Leone and in Angola included clear written directions on the disarmament and demobilisation of former RUF and UNITA fighters respectively. In both cases, however, the peace processes were manipulated by the leaders and periods of peace were used by the rebel groups to mobilise and prepare for resumed fighting. In short, the political will was absent to resolve the issue of arms and armies or to design and implement an effective DDR programme.

An illustration from the peace process in the Democratic Republic of Congo further emphasises the political dynamics of the DDR component in the overall peace building process. The Lusaka Agreement of October 1999 calls for the formation of a new national, restructured and integrated army of the DR Congo, including all signatories: FAC (government forces), the Congolese Rally for Democracy (RCD) and the Congolese Liberation Movement (MLC). Redundant soldiers from all three armies were to be subject to a DDR programme. The fact that the agreement would affect all signatories equally made the use of terminology uncontroversial in itself. The positions for high-level commanders in the national army were to be distributed equally among the signatories. Nevertheless the process gave rise to frictions related to dignity and pride.

One General, chosen by RCD to be part of the senior command of the new Congolese national army (FARCD), initially refused to present himself for its constitution in Kinshasa, proclaiming that the process was merely an integration of the two rebel groups into the former Government's forces (FAC). When he was later persuaded to change his decision, President Kabila refused to accept the General on grounds of having shown lack of military discipline for not arriving when called upon. Although the General was meant to fill a position attributed to RCD in the context of the peace agreement, the matter could not be resolved. There were indications that the General would have been prepared to leave the country for studies abroad if he had been given a scholarship. Due to several reasons, that did not materialize. The General was left with few options. More than six months later, in May 2004, he led an armed attack on the South Kivu provincial capital Bukavu.

This case shows how easily a dissatisfied, powerful commander risks becoming a spoiler and a threat to a peace process and durable peace. It also raises the question to what extent, for both moral and practical reasons, special solutions should be available.

In the given examples of victory settlements or when two or more parties equally contribute to the formation of a new army, as politically sensitive each step of the process would be, the DDR terminology seems to have worked reasonably well as a mechanism for approaching the demilitarisation issue. Treating DDR too technically and literally, however, may ignore the fact that individual agendas, perceptions and emotions are generally involved. In particular, the perception of the real meaning of an agreement has significant influence on its potential as well as on the commitment of each stakeholder to comply with the process. Therefore, it is paramount that the various contextual factors be assessed as a first step in broaching DDR in a peace process. The nature and duration of the struggle, local cultural norms regarding arms bearing and use, the availability of alternative livelihoods for men and women in military service and the manner in

which the conflict ended are significant factors shaping the disarmament question and methodology. The attitude among political and military leaders also varies, depending on the particular situation. In any event, no party wants to be perceived to have surrendered and given up its final objective. *Here, a balancing of power, or, as a minimum, allowing dignity and respect to all parties in the final disposal of power, is part and parcel of understanding the factors shaping the outcome of the conflict in the first instance.*

This observation is even more obvious when it comes to DDR in negotiated settlements with asymmetric power relations. The very use of the terminology ‘Disarmament Demobilisation Reintegration’ in a negotiated settlement where one party is a national government and the other a rebel group, has proved to be contentious. The follow-up project has focused particularly on these types of situations and has thereby become particularly aware of the potential disparity between internationally accepted terminology and local or national perceptions. It has explored elements of trust and confidence in relation to disarmament or demilitarisation as such. The project has also reconfirmed the link to other parallel processes, such as Security System Reform (SSR) and Transitional Justice (TJ), which are described in the SDDR Report as equally important for a sustainable peaceful development.

Testing the Principles

In all negotiated settlements, some sort of security component is necessary in order to facilitate a transition from war to peace. Without a guarantee that the process will continue or a build-up of trust and confidence between parties is ensured, the incentive to lay down arms – often the only source of power for an armed party to a peace process – would simply not be sufficient. Examples from earlier peace processes in Angola and Sierra Leone illustrate *how a lack of political will to comply makes even the most clearly defined DDR component in a peace agreement impossible to implement*.

As previously stated, the introduction, design and implementation of a DDR component is very much dependent on the political and cultural circumstances in each situation. It is therefore crucial for mediators and facilitators to understand the context of the conflict and the objectives of parties and actors in a negotiation. Similarly, the more the negotiating parties know about alternative solutions for security and safety elements in a peace process, the more they can adapt their aspirations and goals to what is realistic and achievable.

The SDDR recognised that it may be difficult to insist that DDR (and related SSR and TJ issues) be dealt with in detail in peace talks, since this may lead to overburdened and unnecessarily prolonged negotiations. At the same time, it would be likely to create problems in implementing the peace agreement if DDR or SSR and TJ processes were not touched upon at all. This is also why the SDDR Report suggests that parties to peace negotiations should have access to impartial advisers and technical expertise on such matters (see recommendation 5).

Throughout the follow-up project, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Sweden and the Folke Bernadotte Academy emphasised this recommendation and *offered assistance to peace negotiations by providing neutral technical support on DDR-related issues*. The principles for engagement were the enabling characteristics of each potential situation and, most importantly, that the parties themselves welcomed a mutually respected dialogue. It was important that all organisations and individuals involved saw the intervention as a neutral exercise that would benefit all sides. Even when no joint workshop was arranged, both parties had to be

aware of the approach taken towards the other party or parties and of the mutual openness to listening to and learning from alternative ideas and experiences.

The consultative activities were set up as round tables where information was presented and critically examined by the participants. The intention was to use the results of the SIDDR process as a platform, in order for the parties to create a shared language and terminology for describing the situation and addressing critical issues of security and development. The discussion of these issues among the representatives of both negotiating parties, aimed at enabling the consolidation of each side's understanding, interests, and positions, and thereby building trust and confidence between the parties. This gave them a common basis from which they could engage in dialogue when formally negotiating issues of peace, security and development. A team of resource persons was also available at the workshops, allowing the Final Report and its recommendations to be complemented by examples from other negotiations and peace processes gained from personal experience. The resource persons were chosen for their operational, real life experience, as opposed to their academic reputation. It may be argued that their expertise derived from and was shared in the oral tradition of peacemaking and peace building and not from their publications as such.

From the point of view of the SIDDR Report, no specific solutions to existing challenges were provided or even suggested to the parties. The idea was merely to make impartial information available, and to perhaps create a common understanding of the need in the negotiations for a broad approach to the question of armies, arms and ex-combatants. If issues are not resolved when signing the peace agreement, it should at the very least be clear to the parties why a solution has not been reached, and a mechanism for continued supervision and monitoring of the situation should be set up (as suggested in the SIDDR Report, recommendation 2).

In effect, this approach was envisaged to have the added value of building a 'coalition for change' within the parties, thereby strengthening the potential for successful implementation of the peace agreement among the parties to the conflict.

Terminology – flexibility in negotiations

The following are some examples of the follow-up project's experiences of DDR-related dilemmas, where different terms and unconventional solutions have helped to move the process forward.

Positions and interests

In May 2006, through the Swedish Embassy in Manila, the follow-up project arranged two separate round tables with the Government of the Philippines (GOP) and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) respectively. The two parties were involved in peace negotiations over the island of Mindanao in the southern Philippines. The lessons learned from the SIDDR process were made available, along with international experiences and highlighted examples of how armed elements had been handled in previous negotiations and peace processes around the world, with a particular focus on reintegration. Resource persons from various conflict-ridden areas such as Aceh, Cambodia, the DR Congo or Northern Ireland participated in the discussions. Each round table had a total of about 30 participants representing both civilian and military sectors.

The round tables covered the main technical areas of terminology, concepts and strategy; targeting individual combatants and conflict-affected communities; programme eligibility, data requirements and design; disarmament and weapons control approaches and techniques; challenges and options for economic and social reintegration programmes (including transitional justice and reconciliation); security arrangements for ensuring the safety of former combatants and conflict-affected communities; and institutional arrangements for financing, implementation and monitoring.

In the case of Mindanao, the very term 'DDR' was a highly political issue, not least to the Moro Islamic Liberation Front. *Disarmament* was seen as tantamount to surrender and since there was no clear victor in the conflict, simply giving up their arms was not considered an option. Even the term *reintegration* seemed difficult to introduce in the seminars. To *re-integrate* combatants implies that they are to some extent alienated from society and need assistance to find their way back. In this case, MILF fighters only served as soldiers for a few months at a time. A rotation system was used, so that combatants could tend to their farms for the rest of the year, i.e. they were already included in the daily life of their communities. In addition, there was discussion about the term 'reintegration' being interpreted narrowly to mean 'integration' into the national army and police force.

On Mindanao, weapons were used in a cultural sense, as a means to identify a person as 'Bangsamoro', i.e. belonging to the Muslim population on the island. Being forced to 'disarm' could be perceived as being stripped of one's cultural identity. For the individual soldier, bearing arms was not only part of a broader identity, but also a guarantee that ensured personal security and survival and possibilities to sustain a livelihood. Peace accords had been signed before, but unless a real change occurred in perceived safety, there was little likelihood of disarmament becoming a reality. It was also a matter of pride. The traditional sword, called a 'Kris', was even to be found on the flag, as a central symbol of the Bangsamoro identity.

The experiences gained from the seminars in the Philippines confirmed the SIDDR discourse (outlined primarily in the second chapter of the Final Report) on the need to place DDR within an overall peace building framework. Adapting a DDR component to the specific circumstances of each situation may require modification of the terminology and sequence of the process itself. It was evident that to take the *position* of arguing for a traditional view of DDR according to a fixed definition would block the process. The *interest* of both parties, however, was to demilitarise the island of Mindanao. Representatives from both sides seemed to argue that a focus on development and reconstruction of communities on Mindanao, prior to complete disarmament, would be much more productive. Only when there was enough trust and confidence that the demands of the MILF fighters had been attended to and that the peace agreement had been implemented, would there be a willingness to give up arms.

Terms such as 'demilitarization', 'economic mainstreaming', 'economic normalisation', and 'self-transformation' were much more acceptable, especially to the MILF, than the conventional terminology of disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration as such. The results, recommendations and general message of the SIDDR proved, however, to be very relevant. In the Mindanao context, the parties seemed to prefer to change the order of the terms, so as to speak of an RDD-process. Naturally, no culture can argue that heavy machine guns would be at the heart of their identity. However, a reduction in the number of weapons could be accomplished gradually and in such a way that neither of the parties would 'lose their face'. (In her 2006 State of the Nations speech, Philippine President, Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, highlighted the continued efforts to reach sustainable peace in conflict-ridden areas, especially in Mindanao.⁴)

Of the alternative concepts that were introduced in the discussions, the ones that seemed to attract most popularity were 'demilitarisation' of society and 'normalisation' of the situation. Although different terms were used, the core message remained the same as that of the DDR terminology.

Both parties recognised the usefulness of discussing among themselves issues on which there might be different views and understandings even within each

party. Civilian and military representatives expressed different opinions on what was needed. The potential value of transitional justice mechanisms, from vetting to truth-telling, in the overall design of balanced demilitarisation, economic normalisation and social reconciliation programmes, was examined. One major observation that came out of these discussions was that whatever transitional justice mechanism was mentioned in support of a ‘normalisation’ process, it would be a two-sided process exposing both parties. This insight possibly restrained some people from expressing strong views that ‘the other party’ would be responsible for compensating for whatever atrocities had been committed towards members of their own group.

However, representatives of the Philippine Government were concerned that any peace agreement without a military surrender by the MILF would be jeopardised by the fact that Bangsamoro fighters would be able to remobilise as soon as the normalisation process failed to move in a direction that was favourable to them. Bearing in mind earlier experiences, when splinter groups had turned their back on previously signed peace agreements and resumed their fighting, there could be little confidence that history would not be repeated as long as weapons were in the hands of individual fighters. The SIDDR, however, included a presentation of one situation which attracted interest (Northern Ireland) where such concerns had resulted not just in a stalemate, but also in a solution allowing for continued negotiations.

Decommissioning, breaking a stalemate

In order to obtain accurate information on relevant examples, the follow-up project, as previously mentioned, drew on expertise from individuals with personal experience. One such resource person supporting project round tables was General John de Chastelain, who, as a Canadian representative, chaired the independent International Body that was called upon to support the peace talks in Northern Ireland.

Negotiations between the Republican side (predominately Catholics) and the Unionist side (predominately Protestants) had been deadlocked when the Republican Sinn Fein’s military branch (the IRA) refused to disarm until they saw progress in the political negotiations. The issue of disarmament as a symbol of defeat cropped up in this context as well. Unionist representatives on the other hand, did not want to be involved in any peace talks that also included parties linked to armed groups.

In its recommendations, the International Body, at the joint request of the Irish and British governments, had presented a series of suggestions on how ‘decommissioning’ of paramilitary groups could occur without any perception

of surrender or defeat, as well as on enhanced confidence-building measures to support continuity in peace talks.

One representative of a Unionist paramilitary group described the violence in Northern Ireland as follows: 'Getting access to a gun is not difficult. In fact most of the weapons used in this conflict were homemade out of things you can buy in a grocery store. What we need in this society is not a decommissioning of weapons but a decommissioning of the mindset'.

In the decommissioning process in Northern Ireland, the issue of arms and disarmament could be detached from the political negotiations by a series of trust-building mechanisms on both sides, complemented by mutual assurance that the arms would be made 'permanently inaccessible or permanently unusable'. The decommissioning process, in which the International Body played a key monitoring role and was therefore able to guarantee that agreements had been fulfilled even though not all weapons had been destroyed in public, is an example of creative process management. The *stalemate was broken* when the process could allow for concerns on both sides to be satisfied.⁵ Decommissioning in Northern Ireland certainly included the concept of Disarmament Demobilisation Reintegration, though not in its literal sense and order.

The historical agreement for the two long-term enemies to begin power-sharing from 8 May 2007 showed that there was political will on both sides to find a permanent solution to the conflict. Conflict fatigue surely contributed to a peace treaty which is hoped to end decades of hostilities. Gerry Adams, head of the Catholic Sinn Fein party, has called the deal to restore the political institutions the beginning of 'a new era' on the island.⁶

Disarmament and reintegration as confidence-building measures

A successful peace process gradually transforms military conflict into a political process and fighting in the battlefield into discussion and debate within a democratic framework. Even for today's peaceful democracies, such processes have historically taken tremendous time, effort and sacrifice. A ceasefire agreement or a political peace agreement should therefore not be seen as a once-and-for-all guarantee of peace. It represents as much a starting point as a final goal. In an immediate post-conflict environment, meeting imminent security concerns is crucial. With the right approach, timing and sequence, there may, however, also be opportunities for change in a more long-term process. Dispersed power balances or weakened organisational structures in crucial institutions could provide openings for the constructive formation of a new society.

It is within this context that DDR should be defined. In no single one of the situations where the follow-up project has been involved, has DDR been able to completely eliminate the flow of arms and ammunition. Where there is a demand for weapons, there will unfortunately also be a supply. This is not to say that efforts to reduce Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) are futile. However, access to weapons alone is rarely the real reason for conflict: various factors are involved, which is why many different angles must be considered when determining the factors of a peace process. The DDR concept provides both incentives and disincentives that can influence a peace process and at best move it forward.

The Aceh Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), signed in August 2005, was used in the follow-up project to shed light on one situation where DDR became an incentive for continued engagement in the peace process. The MoU called for GAM (Gerakan Aceh Merdeka) to publicly destroy 840 pieces of weapons and demobilise 3000 combatants. It proved difficult for the leadership to convince loyal fighters to disarm. However, one GAM representative participating in the follow-up project made it clear that the movement led to far greater opportunities through political discussion than through a continuous military struggle. He used a metaphor to explain this to his troops: ‘When a craftsman creates a table, he uses an axe to cut down a tree and sharp tools to construct it and carve out beautiful decorations. But when the table is done, using those tools again would only destroy the beautiful piece of art that has just been produced.’

The illustration given above should not be misunderstood to imply that SIDDR glorifies war as a means of gaining political power. The metaphor, however, articulates the fact that total military victory is rarely attainable and even less likely to be sustained. A fairly negotiated peace is often the long-term solution to armed conflict and is in the interest of all parties. As much as advertising the GAM leadership’s ability to convince their troops of the advantages of the political process, it illustrates a turning point in the conflict, in which the ripeness of the situation gave both parties the ability to agree to negotiate.

Within such a setting, the public destruction of 840 weapons by GAM (and the withdrawal of Indonesian troops from Aceh) was a symbolic action officially ending the conflict. Several stakeholders, including the Indonesian Government, doubted that this really meant that GAM would not have access to many more arms. Arguably, the tsunami that hit Aceh (and GAM) shortly before the signing of the MoU contributed to a situation where there was greater political will to put an end to violence. Nevertheless, the destruction of weapons served as a confirmation that GAM was now committed to a political process instead of military conflict. In this sense, DDR in itself can be a *confidence-building measure* (as in Aceh or in Northern Ireland), helping the peace process move forward.

Another approach emerging from the Aceh experience that reaffirms a key finding regarding reintegration is the need to balance individually targeted benefits with community benefits. In Aceh, a community-based approach to reintegration is being utilised not only to accentuate the importance of the community sharing in the peace dividend, but also to protect the identity of individual GAM fighters during the early implementation of the peace agreement. Individual fighters will, to be sure, have priority in reintegration, but within a more subtly defined and implemented community driven and owned reintegration programme.

Managing security at the national level: implications for ownership

Throughout the Stockholm Initiative, the importance of national ownership of peace processes was discussed extensively. The Final Report states in its recommendations (recommendations 8–9) that national leadership and institutions should have the leading role and political responsibility for DDR. In Nepal the negotiating parties have taken firm control of definitions and solutions in the peace talks. The right choice of words to describe challenges, dilemmas and opportunities is part of understanding the national level and its relations with the international community. Experiences from Nepal further allowed the follow-up project to more closely analyse relations between DDR and Security System Reform.

Managing armies and arms

When, in June 2006, representatives of the SIDDR first visited the Nepalese capital Kathmandu, the general atmosphere among most stakeholders was positive and rapid progress was expected in preparation for national elections. By November 2005, seven political parties, all represented in the official interim parliament, had already built a coalition and signed a joint agreement with the CPN – the Maoist guerrilla – on how to cooperate in a mutual drive towards ‘democracy, peace, prosperity, social advancement and free sovereignty’. This ‘12-point agreement’ had been followed up by a second agreement comprising of eight points, signed in June 2006, in which the Seven Party Alliance (SPA) and the CPN (Maoists) expressed their commitment to respect previous agreements, to obey democratic norms and values, and to guarantee free and fair elections for a Constituent Assembly. The ‘Eight-point agreement’ also contained a paragraph requesting the United Nations to ‘...help in the monitoring and management of the armies and arms of both government and Maoist side’.

According to the SPA and the CPN (Maoists) themselves, no external representation was needed to monitor the ongoing peace talks, because the parties

were generally in agreement on most components and the discussions were held in a spirit of optimism and common understanding. Having succeeded in setting aside the common political enemy, the monarchy, both parties were convinced that they would be able to unite upon the future system for the country. As in the case of the MILF in Mindanao, the term ‘disarmament’ was perceived as implying defeat for the Maoists in Nepal, who claimed to be in control over large parts of the countryside and thus did not see themselves as having been defeated. Several international actors (including the SIDDR) raised concern that the term ‘management of armies and arms’ allowed scope for interpretation. It seemed unclear what the two parties included in the concept, and this could eventually lead to disagreements and threaten continued dialogue – especially since there was no external mediator present.

On 22 November 2006, the parties signed a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) providing a framework for the restructuring of the state. Even though it does not go into detail, the CPA generally expresses a commitment to deal with important challenges in the restructuring process. On 28 November, a supplementary Agreement on the Management of Arms and Armies was signed. It includes a mechanism for storage of weapons in containers, under the supervision of the UN but with the Maoists still holding the key, similar to the Northern Ireland case that had previously been described to both parties. As in Northern Ireland, there was still reluctance in Nepal to call the solution a disarmament process.

When SIDDR representatives visited Nepal again in January 2007, the UN mission was just about to deploy monitors in the campsites where Maoist fighters had started to assemble. The rebels were to stay in cantonments, and the army soldiers in barracks, until free and fair elections for a Constituent Assembly could be held. Many serious threats to the peace process still exist, not least due to limited capacity in overseeing and being able to guarantee security while implementing the process of managing armies and arms. While focusing on imminent concerns, there is a general disregard by the Interim Constituent Assembly to address potential upcoming threats to stability and security. The situation of insufficient stability has obliged the Constituent Assembly to, at the last minute, postpone elections that were planned to take place in June 2007. Despite this deficiency in advance planning, SPA and CPN (Maoists) have, when necessary, been able to agree on outstanding difficulties and provide a framework for continued commitment to dialogue, not least by extracting lessons learned from other experiences and adapting them to specific Nepalese circumstances.

Right-sizing the Security Sector

The SIDDR Final Report asserts (paragraph 17), that DDR can relate to an extensive SSR process in the sense that it addresses those redundant soldiers who do not become part of a reconstructed democratic national army or police force. Despite the fact that the peace processes were manipulated in the examples given from Angola and Sierra Leone, there was only one party dictating the conditions for the shape and size of the future national army. DDR processes were to encompass the defeated armed groups and the size of the national army would probably be determined by economic incentives rather than on decisions made in peace negotiations.

While previous recommendations are still valid, experiences from Nepal highlight the fact that, for a negotiated peace to be sustained, making clear arrangements for the shape and form of the national security structure before any agreements regarding the disarmament of individual combatants, might also be politically crucial.

Since the mid 1990s, the Nepalese national army expanded from 35 000 to a total of about 100 000 soldiers. The Maoists claimed to control 35 000 armed combatants within their parallel structure, the Nepalese People's Army (NPA). This is also roughly the figures that have been presented indicating the number of soldiers who have registered in the cantonment sites (even though these are yet to be screened). Furthermore, the heavily armed security police and an organised private Maoist militia adds to the figures, contributing to a vast number of armed units. Even though some people advocate for a permanent large national Nepalese Army (NA), it seems inevitable, not least due to the financial cost of providing for such numbers of soldiers under an official national budget, to reduce the armed forces in general, i.e. to 'right-size' the army, and to facilitate the integration of redundant combatants into civilian sectors of Nepalese society.

At the same time, Maoists are demanding leading positions within a new national army, controlled by the future Constituent Assembly. It is unlikely that the CPN (Maoists) will agree to a comprehensive reintegration process (DDR) before a political decision is made on their future participation in the Nepalese Army (SSR). Easy access to armed combatants will remain a bargaining card until such demands are attended to.

The many security-related challenges facing the peace process in the DR Congo are unquestionably partly due to the fact that so few details were given on SSR in the peace agreement. This blurred the potential options for ex-combatants, which in turn diminished the potential to set the stage for a DDR programme.

Forthcoming agreements within the framework of ‘management of armies and arms’ must include both traditional SSR and DDR concerns and it seems that a potential Nepalese DDR process (even though it would not bear such a name) would ideally be well embedded within an overall SSR umbrella. In fact, that is already the case as the CPA talks of integration and downsizing as operational terms for the integration of Maoist fighters into the national army, and the subsequent ‘right-sizing’ (demobilisation and reintegration into civilian life) of that same unified army.⁷

The major challenges ahead for the leaders of Nepal are to produce a definition of the criteria that qualify Maoist officers and soldiers to be integrated in the national army, practical management of the integration, as well as finding employment opportunities for soldiers demobilised from both the NPA and the NA who are to find a civilian livelihood when the Nepalese Army is eventually right-sized. The sequence and details are still to be worked out and the peace process would obviously benefit from a parallel focus, not least when eventually adding the Transitional Justice component, which has been mentioned but not yet fully discussed in negotiations. As a minimum, vetting criteria for agreed standards in the new Nepalese Army should make sure that serious human rights violators are screened out.

Thus far, the peace process has been firmly manoeuvred by the national actors themselves, clearly putting the message across that this is a Nepalese concern to be handled by the Nepalese. The choice of terminology appears to be a successful means of moving the process forward and avoiding obstructions related to prestige or misinterpretations of emotionally strong words. As has been shown above, components of the concepts described internationally as DDR and SSR are also essential in this case, even though the process is generally referred to as ‘management of armies and arms’. The fact that this wording demands more of the international community in terms of understanding and being able to support the peace process, is so far not a concern for the Nepalese.

One important observation must, however, be highlighted. Naturally, strong national ownership does not automatically provide legitimacy and leadership that includes the entire population. Ideally, a political negotiation and peace process should leave room for an increased number of stakeholders over time. In Nepal, the political negotiations are very much limited to the Kathmandu Valley, with representatives of elite classes on both sides. Excluding, at earlier stages, stakeholders who will later become either key actors or potential spoilers of the political process, jeopardises the chances of success. It is, however, not simply a matter of involving interest groups in a constructive way at each stage of the process. Civil society often mirrors the conflict and the ‘real’ victims may not be represented at all. Most NGOs in Kathmandu represent ideas and interest groups

that can be found within the parties to the negotiations. In all likelihood, the agreements made in current political discussions will benefit the supporters of the groups represented at the table. The Nepal case illustrates the importance of inclusiveness, as far as feasible, in peacemaking and peace building processes.

Troubling turbulence has been observed in parts of the country, particularly in the Terai area in southern Nepal, where representatives of the Madhesi population have been showing discontent with the political discourse, accusing the principal parties to the CPA, the Maoists and the government, of failing to sufficiently represent them in the process. Ignoring these signs, jeopardizes ongoing discussions on political ideals and eventually risk turning a positive debate into a clash between cultures.

Developing the SIDDR recommendations

The international community's commitment to support a national process?

A country's transition from conflict to peace, from military to civilian orientation – with a focus on democracy – has multiple dimensions and intersecting activities, which require programme coherence and close collaboration among different actors. The international community has generally come a long way in understanding the interrelations between different activities, both in practice and at policy level. Thinking in the area of peace and conflict management has succeeded in merging security aspects with attention on long-term stability and sustainable peace. Concepts focused on human security – the rights of all individuals to live in freedom from fear and freedom from want and to exercise the right to live in dignity⁸ – have supported increased attention for alternative and broader sources of stability, with the objective of building trust and creating firm conditions for economic and social development.

The aim of the SIDDR process was to better define the place of DDR, its limitations and its relationship to other processes, within these emerging concepts and a coherent framework for achieving sustainable peace and security (perhaps this is best expressed in recommendations 1–3 and 10 of the Final Report). For the international community, DDR is the accepted term for describing the demilitarisation of armed organisations and the transformation process whereby ex-combatants move away from the roles and positions that defined them during the conflict to identifying themselves as citizens and members of the community. However, the aims and interests of each stakeholder in a conflict or peace process influence the course of events and the possibilities for progress. Any external actor involved must be aware of these dynamics and adapt their frameworks so as to contribute productively. As long as all available mechanisms are flexible enough

to adapt to real needs, while simultaneously not breaching agreed requirements, it should not be of key importance whether the concept is called ‘DDR’, ‘Demilitarisation and Social and Economic Normalisation’ or ‘Managing of arms, armies and ex-combatants’.

For better or worse, donor countries and international organisations also have their own agendas for involvement in conflict and post-conflict situations. First and foremost, it must be ensured that tax-payers’ money, particularly money allocated to Official Development Aid (ODA), is not used for doubtful activities connected to military aggression or human rights abuses. Established concepts, where each component is defined and put into a framework, help prevent such mistakes. Unfortunately, the downside is the need of many actors to show donors or taxpayers impressive results. In this endeavour, the concepts sometimes become buzzwords and are then perceived as the primary goals rather than as means to achieve a result. High visibility interventions and sensational conferences without sensitivity to the local circumstances may do the process more harm than good. Nevertheless, these types of events are still arranged in the hope of drawing attention to the significance of the arranger’s own organisation.

Defined mandates help organisations focus on their comparative advantages and hopefully deliver quality products or projects. However, if the regulations are too rigid, they may prevent different organisations from working outside their own administrative system. Contrary to the intended purpose, an activity using the mandate as a starting point instead of an assessment of real needs, risks undermining stability in a peace process, especially when there is a lack of political sensitivity to the situation.

One MILF commander at the consultation in Cotabato referred to a proposal for DDR programmes provided by a principal international donor as a great offence to the Bangsamoro people. Definitions and terminology must be used flexibly in order not to hinder a comprehensive approach to meeting complexity on the ground.

For national stakeholders and parties to a negotiation, on the other hand, it is important to understand that different solutions reached in a peace agreement have implications for the possibility of international donors to be involved. The criteria generally adopted for Official Development Aid by OECD/DAC prevent peace-keeping budgets or military structures in a recipient country from being funded by resources allocated to development. Most donors would be reluctant to financially support a process of ‘managing armies and arms’ in general, without a proper understanding and control of its contents, especially if it means that individual soldiers are kept under military command.

The IDDRS and SIDDR processes have succeeded in bringing different actors

together, using the same language. Elaborating recklessly on new terminology would jeopardise the substantial progress made in the common understanding of complicated issues. But it is equally important to let each process emerge from specific needs and circumstances. The factual situation should be the key point for deciding what resources are to be used, not the terminology established at the international level. As highlighted in this report, DDR must therefore be more widely viewed as a ‘concept’ as opposed to a one-size-fits-all mechanism. In fact, using more adjustable terms could sometimes provide scope for DDR to be understood at the international level, while simultaneously allowing flexibility in each particular situation.

As regional processes take on the policy debate, experiences from IDDRS and SIDDR processes are important. But it is crucial that the international community supports in a way that provides the scope and mechanisms to allow for a political discussion to take place, at regional level, with a bottom-up approach.

Recommendations:

- › DDR is a concept that helps the international community understand linkages between security and development in post-conflict settings. It facilitates the use of resources (i.e. civilian or military, ODA or non-ODA) in support of a peace process. It is important not to undermine successful progress made in the attempt to bring diverse aspects together into a common understanding.
- › In practical situations, the term DDR can sometimes obstruct a peace process, even though the concept and its components are generally understood as important. Adapting internationally established terminologies, models and mechanisms to the specific circumstances of national and local conditions is essential to create a level of confidence in the process and enhance national ownership, leadership and commitment. Putting DDR into practice therefore requires flexibility, allowing cultural, social, economic and historical specifics to influence the methods and mechanisms of DDR/the management of armies, arms and ex-combatants.
- › Regional policy processes for DDR and SSR should have a bottom-up approach, while drawing on knowledge attained at the global level.

Frameworks to move the process forward

Peace agreements can be formulated either as instruments for peace (i.e. Aceh MoU) or as a constitution for the following peace process (i.e. Darfur PA).

What is most suitable in each case depends on the situation and on the level of commitment among the parties. The power relations, nature of the conflict and

the way in which the conflict was ended are factors that should influence the choice of direction. The central challenge, especially in situations using the peace agreement as an instrument for the process, is to accomplish a transformation of a mindset rather than a quantitative disarmament.

Understanding the nature of the conflict and the way it ended is also key in order to understand the role a DDR component can play. The way in which DDR is approached, what definitions are used in negotiations and what implementation mechanisms are set up, obviously influence the later stages of the DDR process and quite likely the peace process itself. DDR is unlikely to take place before the parties feel secure and their vital interests are protected. Leaders and high-rank officers will most likely be reluctant to demobilise the troops under their control unless they are confident that an agreement will be reached in which their demands, or at least some of them, are met. Bearing in mind this aspect, bringing in the issue of DDR too early in negotiations could jeopardise attempts to build up trust between the parties and at worst create a deadlock.

The second SDDR recommendation suggests forming committees to continue a discussion of outstanding issues. If the military matters are not finally resolved within the agreement itself, there should be a space available in which the sources of power are gradually diversified, reducing the use of military power. In fact, finding ways to transfer security concerns and military power into the political sphere can create openings for such continued dialogue, through mechanisms such as rule of law, economics, governance, institutional development, etc. In Northern Ireland and in Nepal (although the final results are yet to be seen), the parties have managed to deal with the military issues within a framework acceptable to all stakeholders, thereby keeping a continued dialogue open.

Trust, knowledge and long-standing relations are important factors for successful negotiation and subsequent implementation processes. Choices made in the negotiation phase lay the foundation for the decisions that are to guide implementation. Knowledge about the whole process, with its challenges, dilemmas and pitfalls, would facilitate the involvement of external parties and allow for opportunities and confidence-building with and between the parties. It is often the case that the actors involved in negotiations – setting the concepts and aspirations for the following implementation process – leave as soon as a deal is made. Much would be gained if at least some continuity could be assured, perhaps by involving some of the same individuals in the implementation phase, so that terminology and activities can be harmonised throughout the whole process. DDR is not literally sequential and may require different approaches with different timing and sequences, depending on the specific situation. Having a DDR expert, with knowledge of the earlier phases, present throughout the whole process would be one way to support a sustainable process. For the national actors, this

type of continuity would likely also facilitate cooperation with members of the international community involved in post-conflict reconstruction programmes.

Recommendations:

- › A peace process is a long-term procedure of transforming military conflicts into a peaceful political discourse, within a democratic framework. Introducing necessary components at the right time is crucial to move the process forward. Bringing DDR into the negotiations too early may jeopardise attempts to build trust between negotiating parties.
- › When the time is right, DDR can be used as a diplomatic tool and confidence-building measure between the parties. If approached in a sensitive way, its components can help parties to ongoing talks move away from locked positions and look at their interests from alternative perspectives. DDR can thus be a means to transform a military conflict into a peaceful political discussion, without necessarily altering the power balance between the negotiating parties.
- › An understanding of the conflict not only helps to determine the type of reintegration programmes needed to secure peace. It can also identify what type of agreement and mechanism is needed to make the parties accountable to agreed DDR commitments. Sustained commitment by external parties throughout the implementation phase would build stronger relationships and awareness amongst all parties of the needs to meet requirements at international, national and local levels.

Combatant and community focus

Institutional structures, administration and not least financing are rarely adequate in the immediate aftermath of a violent conflict. International funds are often tied to the signing of a peace agreement. Having said that, from a political perspective, what may be needed during negotiations are some signs that improvement is on the way. This may help to promote confidence in the peace process and enhance the political will. In one negotiating setting in Asia, suggestions were raised by one party for unilaterally committed support to recovery programmes before a general peace agreement was reached. The reason was to show sincerity and thereby build confidence in the process.

A transitional reintegration programme (referred to in the SDDR Report as reinsertion) that attends to immediate reconstruction and reintegration, at least until more sustainable programmes are set up, can help buy time in the early phases of a fragile peace process. In the case of Mindanao, an early programme of this type could also serve as a mechanism in favour of a more stable environment

and so function as an incentive to move the peace talks forward. DDR can also be a way of managing the aspirations of ex-combatants and of the communities receiving returning combatants, at least in an initial phase, if programmes are designed so as to build confidence between returning combatants and communities.

It is important to demonstrate hope in the process. However, it is also important that the promise of DDR initiatives does not inflate expectations of what will be offered, i.e. that aspirations are not raised too high *because of* the anticipated programme. This happened in Cambodia for example, where rumours about how much would be offered to ex-combatants started a market for identity cards. Disappointment is a dangerous emotion in insecure situations and can lead to stigmatisation or regression.

The current situation in Liberia points to the need for sustainability in setting up reintegration programmes. In an attempt to tackle the challenges of disarmament quickly, over 100 000 individuals were included in a programme that offered USD 300 in exchange for the disposal of a weapon or stack of ammunition. This approach yielded rapid results in terms of the number of soldiers taking part in the DDR programme. Within a situation that lacked labour opportunities, it did, however, also create a risk of thousands of former combatants aimlessly trying to find a livelihood, threatening security in a fragile post-conflict state. But even worse, the ‘cash for guns’ approach in West Africa has contributed to the arms market moving across regional borders, to wherever the price is highest for an ‘ex-combatant’ taking part in a DDR programme.

This is why the SIDDR Report (in recommendations 10–11) distinguishes between short-term reinsertion programmes to help stabilise the situation and move the process forward, and long-term sustainable reintegration to more firmly support economic and social recovery and development. While both the short and the long-term focus must consider parallel processes and adapt to circumstances related to the overall peace process, the latter should promote a development-oriented focus, aimed at creating sustainable livelihoods. A DDR programme alone cannot attend to all the needs of a post-conflict society, nor does it have the power to transform a society entirely on its own merits.

The follow-up project has reconfirmed the need to deal with implementation early on, indeed, already during negotiations. Creating predictable alternatives for ex-combatants make them less likely to return to violence and disrupt ongoing peace efforts while awaiting more long-term, sustainable reintegration and a return to a productive civilian life. This may be particularly important for female combatants. A figure of up to 40% has been cited for the number of female CPN (Maoists) fighters. It is unlikely that these women will have participated in a war only to go back to the life they had before the conflict started. Finding realistic

alternatives for women to break out of traditional patterns can therefore be crucial when planning reintegration programmes.

At the same time, local communities require a capacity to absorb returning soldiers. The process should be regarded as positive for the communities as well, so as not to create new tensions and the risk of renewed conflict. The SIDDR proposal of a multi-donor Trust Fund mechanism with different windows, one for long-term reintegration of ex-combatants and one for support to affected communities, is a component supporting such an approach.

As put forward in the SIDDR report, DDR should be placed within the broader framework of the peace process in general, contributing to stability. In this sense, DDR is not about short-term security, but would best fit into the broader concept of ‘human security’, including safety for the post-conflict society at large.

Recommendations:

- › Early economic and social development activities can help to build trust between negotiating parties. Especially in asymmetric power relations, support from the stronger party for the communities of the weaker party can serve as a sign that other commitments made in the negotiations will also be realised and that the peace process is moving in the right direction.
- › Early discussion of DDR in negotiations can help stakeholders reach a more realistic understanding of what can be delivered through a reintegration programme, as well as what will be required on their part. Knowing that development funds will be available in a post-conflict society after a peace agreement has been signed, and being prepared for what type of assistance/aid to request, can put leaders in a better position to convince their own soldiers to comply, thereby avoiding splinter groups.
- › During implementation of a peace agreement, DDR can be a way of managing the aspirations of ex-combatants and of communities receiving returning combatants, at least in an initial phase. Reinsertion activities such as vocational training can be used to buy time until more sustainable programmes have come into place. Reintegration programmes can also be used to promote confidence-building at the local level, among returning combatants and communities.

DDR/SSR relations

As discussed in the case of Nepal, DDR is sometimes closely linked with reform or reshaping of the security system. With a human security approach, there might be reason to postpone a DDR process in immediate post-conflict settings. This is particularly the case when, as in Nepal, the SSR/DDR options are unclear, i.e. the

political discussion has not been concluded regarding what the alternatives would be in terms of integrating armed forces or reintegrating redundant combatants into civilian communities. The dilemma becomes even more complicated in situations where negotiations take place between two parties controlling different parts of the country. Premature disarmament and demobilisation of rebel groups that may be the only actors available to ensure stability in the post-conflict communities, can risk opening up a safety gap in which criminal groups take over.

The idea of temporarily keeping ex-combatants in a military structure – a ‘holding pattern’ (as described in paragraph 44 of the Final Report), – could provide to not only offer an opportunity in these cases, while waiting for sustainable reintegration programmes to come into place, but also as a safety guarantee until a political solution has been achieved that can ensure human security. This issue is particularly manifest when tackling increased risks of instability due to reintegration programmes that are inadequate and poorly designed and funded, owing to a lack of long-term donor commitments, as well as to local institutional weaknesses and weak labour absorption in a typical war-torn economy. In a similar way, transforming armed groups into temporary organic forces or border patrols may serve as insurance to the negotiating parties that they have not lost their bargaining cards, so that there can be continued commitment to the process. Encouraged by the SIDDR findings, the Folke Bernadotte Academy, supported by the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, has initiated a study with the aim to look more deeply into previous experiences of these types of transitional military mechanisms, since the collective knowledge in this field is still weak.

Identifying options to support sustained peace talks becomes a real challenge in fragile situations when the outcome of negotiations is still unclear. The Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) in Northern Uganda has voluntarily assembled in cantonment sites as a sign that there is now an opening for an agreement that would put an end to two decades of violent conflict. The assembling soldiers are not disarmed and there is no agreement tying them to stay in the camps. Ensuring the livelihood of the combatants while in cantonments would probably strengthen the chances of successful peace talks. Yet financial support to the LRA, known to be one of the most brutal rebel forces in Africa, can certainly be questioned. Whatever consequences the situation leads to, the example brings out a genuine moral dilemma.

Donors struggling with the question of whether to temporarily support military structures for the sake of safety and human/community security also need to consider the technicalities of the financing issue. There is an ongoing debate within the OECD/DAC on what can be regarded as Official Development Aid (ODA). Transitional mechanisms under civilian control may not be a problem

for donors to support. Financing the livelihood of armed personnel still under military control is, however, currently not defined as ODA. Without undermining established concepts, there may be a need to develop additional tools, to be used flexibly within existing frameworks.

Consideration should be given to exploring possibilities for a complementary window in the multi-donor Trust Fund, providing alternative mechanisms for combatants and communities, as proposed by the SIDDR report (see recommendation 18).⁹ A ‘third window’ intended for security-related matters would facilitate support to military transitional mechanisms in support of the peaceful development of a political process following a military conflict. The development of such a tool would probably require increased flexibility in ODA regulations. Tying the use of funds to approval by an independent international body, such as the UN Peace Building Commission (which currently has a focus on Burundi and Sierra Leone), and allowing this body to define certain ‘countries in specific need’, could be one way to ensure that the rationale for such interventions remains firmly controlled.

Flexibility in terminology, concept and tools at the international level help understand relationships between different options and highlight pitfalls and opportunities. However, standard formulas and strategies are no substitute for an understanding of the local circumstances and reasons to support (or not to support) early negotiations. Ultimately, if donors are sincere about contributing to peace and stability in post-conflict situations, they must have the courage to commit to a long-term support to meet the needs of each particular situation, irrespective of internal bureaucracy or established financing practices.

Recommendations:

- › When approaching the DDR component, consideration should also be given to the situation of the national security system in general. If the issue of SSR is subject to political dispute, the chances of a DDR programme succeeding are probably limited. Early assessment of needs and aspirations, as well as what is ultimately expected by the combatants, is therefore of the utmost interest. More can also be done to study transitional mechanisms that would allow control over armed groups while awaiting political solutions.
- › A multi-donor Trust Fund with a dual focus on combatants and communities, as proposed by the SIDDR report, could be complemented with a ‘third window’ intended for security-related matters. Approval by an independent international body, such as the UN Peace Building Commission, defining a category of ‘countries in specific need’, can open the way for discussion of the use of ODA funds for such ‘unconventional’ programmes.

Parallel processes – SALW and Transitional Justice

A DDR programme in itself cannot take care of all the needs of a post-conflict environment. In a sense, in many situations it is more of a symbolic gesture to officially destroy the arms of a force that no longer fulfils a purpose. Illegal arms in general are a government concern, but DDR programmes can be designed so as to feed into a broader approach towards reducing the flow of Small Arms and Light Weapons. The sooner creative solutions acceptable to all parties involved can be found, the easier such threats to human security can be approached.

The purpose of UNDP's Community Security Fund in Sudan is to 'assist in creating positive, stable and more secure community environments that will allow DDR or interim Arms Reduction and Control (ARC)-related activity to take root, and then support that activity'.¹⁰ Local tradition entails that in times of peace, weapons should be stored in a community house situated in the centre of the village, under public surveillance. This custom has served as a warning system for possible threats to stability, in that as long as weapons are kept in the store, there is peace. In the modern version of this tradition, weapons have been positioned behind a brick wall in the community house, accessible but not without tearing down the house and thereby letting everyone know that the ceasefire has been broken. The example illustrates the importance of finding creative solutions that work in a local context, but also how different objectives can be merged.

The links between DDR processes and processes for Transitional Justice, previously highlighted in the SIDDR process, were strengthened by the political focus of the follow-up project. The interface between DDR and SSR may also allow for the critical application of Transitional Justice mechanisms. Transitional Justice processes should not automatically be connected with DDR as this would probably result in a number of undesired consequences and most likely create disincentives to participate. In some cases, however, and when specific conditions are fulfilled, information could be shared so as to avoid mistakes. For example, a 'vetting' process to ensure the quality of those entering into a new national security structure should avoid the re-hiring of commanders or soldiers who have been responsible for serious war crimes or crimes against humanity, in particular when there is also a restructuring of the national police.

In addition to monitoring arms decommissioning, the UN Monitoring Mission in Nepal (UNMIN), is also registering combatants and plans to later survey them. This data, if relevant and reliable, can form a solid basis for planning and designing options for an integration programme for the reconstituted army and a reintegration programme for those going into civilian life. Here, defining the standard for soldiers and commanders given a place in a new national army can become a subtle but powerful means of applying transitional justice, while retaining the possibility of safeguarding against impunity. This mechanism can

help ensure that a truth and reconciliation process does not become an open-ended, immutable amnesty programme.

Often, combatants are treated as perpetrators, yet compensated through DDR programmes, while their families may be treated as victims. Transitional Justice processes, such as truth-telling, could help all stakeholders understand the conflict and their respective roles, sorting out different views and perceptions. Transitional Justice initiatives could also, preferably, help strengthen stability in post-conflict societies where the risk of individual vengeance is otherwise high.

Recommendations:

- › While there are limitations to what a single DDR programme can achieve, it should aim to use opportunities for synergies with other initiatives in a post-conflict society. A badly designed DDR component, on the other hand, risks blocking the possibility of attending to issues that might give rise to conflicts later on in the peace process. In any event, a DDR process should never be implemented in total isolation.
- › When there is no immediate possibility of applying justice, vetting can be a subtle yet critical Transitional Justice mechanism for use in selection of participants in a reconstituted army or in awarding reintegration assistance packages. The door can at least be kept open by not unjustly rewarding perpetrators or allowing newly reconstituted security institutions to get off on the wrong foot by recruiting individuals who may have committed egregious crimes against humanity.

Economic reconstruction

Sustainable reintegration must be tied to markets. Without demand, there is no incentive to grow more crops than you need to feed your own family. Any stakeholder in a peace negotiation should consequently bear in mind the need to identify opportunities to establish sustainable reintegration programmes for former combatants, as realistic alternatives. Traditionally, reintegration has been seen as something subsequent to a peace agreement, when in fact it is very much at the heart of a political discussion.

A lack of economic development can pose a threat to security, especially in societies where there is an uneven distribution of resources. Long-term commitments by a number of actors to achieve social and economic development in a post-conflict society are therefore necessary for security reasons and for a successfully implemented peace agreement. Strategies and creative ideas are needed not least to define in what way economic actors in the private sector can

contribute to stability and development. One of the most important tasks is to create employment opportunities, thus providing alternatives to warfare. The process of economic and social development needs to be initiated at an early stage in parallel with demilitarisation, in order to progress with socio-economic recovery, to inspire and give people hope of a better life, and offer a better chance to those who have been directly involved in conflict. A certain level of security is of course needed to create the necessary conditions for investment. The development of economic activity, on the other hand, provides alternatives for personal and societal progress, and makes people less inclined to move back to conflict.

At some plantations on the Island of Mindanao, former combatants have been offered small-holder supply of bananas to larger companies as a program for ensuring markets and earnings for former combatants. This has functioned well for both returning soldiers, giving them admittance to land, and farm owners, giving them access to labour.¹¹ In some areas, concerns were raised about the ex-combatants' habit of bringing their arms to the fields; the ex-combatants, in turn, replied that they were not willing to jeopardise their security. The solution found involved women from the soldier's original villages coming and guarding the weapons on the site of the farm while their husbands were working. Eventually, the situation was considered so stable that weapons were no longer needed and the women could stay at home in the villages guarding them.

In Nepal, several leading businessmen have come together to found the National Business Initiative (NBI), with the aim of contributing to a peaceful political and recovery process. The NBI, together with the German Organisation for Technical Cooperation (GTZ), has started to map out business opportunities and possibilities for soldiers and members of society to find employment or take part in reintegration programmes that also support the development of infrastructure and general economic conditions. Having all the information about the state of the economic infrastructure, demand and potential business development available when preparing for reintegration programmes, helps to make reintegration programmes sustainable, by tying them to 'real' opportunities.

Recommendations:

- › Early inclusion of actors that are familiar with economic opportunities in the post-conflict society makes it easier to design sustainable DDR programmes that can contribute to long-term economic and social development. Understanding the economic actors and opportunities, as well as the capacity of institutions that can link them together (e.g. microcredits, market access, etc.), is critical for jump-starting reintegration opportunities for sustainable livelihoods.

End note

The Stockholm Initiative on Disarmament Demobilisation Reintegration has been an inclusive process, dedicated to improving policy and mechanisms contributing to a predictable framework for DDR engagements. The follow-up project has provided some additional recommendations, presented in Annex 3. The SIDD process itself has officially ended, even though more additional questions have been raised than the questions initially identified.

There is a need for continued broad engagement on these issues. Training courses and manuals for DDR exist and help introduce the concept to relevant staff. However, many of the dilemmas, trade-offs and challenges that arise during the implementation of a DDR process cannot be explained in a textbook or through general courses or recommendations. A platform for continued dialogue between qualified staff could be of additional use, where lessons learned are adapted to new circumstances, and knowledge and experience is exchanged and subsequently passed on in a network. High-level training in DDR – the management of armies, arms and ex-combatants – enhances awareness among mediators and negotiators. Continued support and facilitation through technical expertise provided to negotiating parties and third party mediators can make a valuable contribution to peace talks.

Treating DDR in peace negotiations in its full political as well as technical aspects, from the outset is central in creating an immediate short term stability necessary to buy time to address more complex yet critical issues of security sector reform and justice.

Recommendations:

- › A continued dialogue is needed on DDR and its relationship with parallel processes within an overall peace building framework, with lessons learned being adapted to new circumstances, and experience and knowledge being exchanged and subsequently passed on.
- › High-level training in DDR – the management of armies, arms and ex-

combatants – enhances awareness among mediators and negotiators. The actors should have access in their work to technical expertise that can support and facilitate negotiating parties and third party mediators in DDR-related matters.

Annex I.

SIDDR Executive Summary

The Stockholm Initiative on Disarmament Demobilisation Reintegration was initiated with the aim of proposing ways and means to contribute to the creation of a predictable framework in which DDR processes can be planned and implemented. The primary aim of DDR programmes is to contribute to a secure and stable environment in which an overall peace process and transition can be sustained. It is only in this kind of environment that political and security restructuring as well as social and economic reconstruction and longer-term development can take root.

A DDR programme is just one of many elements in a peace process. This is an obvious but often ignored fact. A clear view on the potentials and limitations of a DDR programme is required in order to maximise its contribution to a peace process. It is also a highly political element. When implemented, the DDR programme should ideally influence and contribute to a secure environment that can provide minimum basic conditions to enable long-term development without the immediate threat of violent conflicts. The issue of Security System Reform, often considered to be another crucial element in a war to peace transition, thus has close linkages to DDR. This is an area where the report welcomes further studies. DDR programmes must also be designed and implemented in conformity with other parallel programmes that also influence the success or failure of peace processes (i.e. justice and reconciliation, community-based reconstruction etc.).

It is critical to ensure that a combatant need not return to using violence to survive. This report therefore endorses the provision of what has come to be known as a 'transitional safety net' that enables the combatant to survive, take care of his/her family and cope while adjusting to his/her new status as a productive member of society. This immediate short-term focus is called reinsertion so as to separate it from the longer-term focus of sustainable reintegration that ideally should lead to development.

Creating alternative incentives to violence for ex-combatants makes it less likely that they will disrupt ongoing peace efforts while awaiting a more long-term, sustainable reintegration and return to a productive civilian livelihood. Concurrently, the local communities need to be taken into account. On the one hand they require capacity to absorb returning soldiers. In addition, realisation that the process is valuable for the communities as well, is needed so as not to create new tension and sow the seeds for renewed conflict. Thus, the report endorses the idea of establishing parallel programmes early on to provide communities with support for receiving ex-combatants as a direct complement to the DDR programme. Early in a post-conflict situation, DDR funding is usually the

only substantial funding available.

The report argues that a key-funding instrument for DDR processes should be multi-donor trust funds, with two windows: one for financing programmes aimed at ex-combatants (men and women) and one for affected communities. The latter should also be used to fund projects in support of non-combatants associated with armed groups. In the absence of strong state and local capacity, the private sector and civil society can also provide supporting and sometimes substituting roles. The report encourages active efforts to establish appropriate links between DDR programmes and transitional justice initiatives. Public trust would be maximised if the different programmes were designed in ways that guarantee maximum inclusiveness.

The various mechanisms of funding DDR programmes have advantages and disadvantages. What is important is to ensure that there is sufficient coordination of various funding streams, that such coordination is linked to an overall strategic peace building framework and that the issue of national ownership is adequately considered. Ideally, the programming of the implementation of a peace agreement would provide the basis for a coordination framework for funding.

The report highlights dilemmas and provides some recommendations and food for thought to be used as tools by actors involved in DDR programmes. A continued focus is needed if the recommendations of this report are to be realised.

Annex 2.

SIDDR Recommendations

1. The primary aim of DDR is to contribute to a secure and stable environment in which the overall peace process and transition can be sustained. Thus, DDR should ideally facilitate the creation and sustainability of a situation characterised by (a) sufficient security and (b) minimum basic conditions for long-term peaceful development. DDR is one of many elements in a peace process and it can be used as a political instrument to support a peace building framework.
2. Peace agreements should at least provide an overall framework for security during a political transition and identify where DDR is relevant. This framework should include an agreement on the future national defence force as well as clear indications on how the parties should deal with DDR during the implementation phase (setting up committees, creating transparency and information facilities, etc.).
3. As not all information is available at the time of negotiations, DDR would benefit from the creation of flexible mechanisms that can allow for the originally missing information to be included in the implementation in due time. This could include the set up of responsible institutions, technical assistance, capacity development and sensitisation support to stakeholders to allow them to involve themselves in this issue in a meaningful way. It also helps ensuring that the international community speaks with one voice (i.e. is coordinated) when addressing DDR issues.
4. Peace missions must be given the capacity to deal with DDR as a component in a peace process that is highly political in character. This capacity should encompass both military and political elements. The SIDDR therefore recommends that specific competence on DDR issues be added to the political work of the peace mission.
5. An international advisory team of independent DDR experts (to be housed amongst the multilateral, bilateral and non-governmental community) should be established to assist in negotiations but also, when needed, the peace mission and the parties to a peace agreement in implementing sound DDR programmes. If mandated to monitor and verify the manner in which agreed upon DDR measures are being implemented, this team can also become a confidence-building measure for the warring parties during the peace agreement negotiations.
6. The Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG) should have access to a UN technical team trained to analyse the situation from a DDR needs and possibilities perspective.

7. National leadership and institutions should have the leading role and political responsibility for the disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of the ex-combatants, even when internationally or regionally mandated peace missions or international institutions have crucial roles in the organisation, supervision and monitoring of the DDR process.
8. Transparency in decision-making, resource availability and information sharing coupled with broad consultation processes are important tools for building national ownership and leadership in the DDR process.
9. DDR programmes in the contexts of peace processes should be designed so that they make a contribution to security and stabilisation in the immediate post-conflict environment and lay the foundation for future sustainable long-term development.
10. To make sure that reintegration programmes can achieve their immediate security goal without becoming overloaded with other aims and, at the same time, that they remain consistent with the longer-term objectives of sustainable peace and development, assistance towards the reintegration of ex-combatants should be disaggregated into two sequential components: (a) transitional reintegration assistance, reinsertion, in the near-term as a part of or directly following demobilisation, and (b) sustainable reintegration assistance in the medium to longer-term.
11. The reinsertion programmes can be designed through the provision of a cash and/or in-kind safety net, or through the creation of 'first step' programmes such as labour intensive public works cleanup and reconstruction, and/or military service corps, with the purpose of ensuring stability while the grounds are prepared for more sustainable reintegration programmes.
12. A security-focused DDR process which emphasises reinsertion should target ex-combatants for support. In turn, donors should try to provide matching funds for parallel programmes, including programmes that provide matching funds for the benefit of receiving communities and other special war-affected groups.
13. Gender sensitive DDR programmes to address female ex-combatants, including gender-differentiated programmes, should be implemented. Similarly, it must be guaranteed that other women, men and children associated with the war who may not qualify for DDR programmes that focus directly on the ex-combatants are addressed through parallel programmes.
14. In the face of the destruction and disruption of productivity and productive assets, DDR programmes may benefit from an enhanced effort to stimulate the local private business sector and dormant civil society to become involved through the provision of affirmative action, reduction of barriers to doing business, access to credit, technology and know-how, and other such incentives and opportunities.

15. The private sector and civil society should be encouraged through appropriate policy and programming incentives to support local capacity building in parallel with support to economic and social reintegration efforts.
16. DDR programmes should be designed and implemented in relation to transitional justice measures. The programmes should not only seek to minimise potential tensions with transitional justice measures (by, e.g. avoiding blanket amnesties), but should capitalise on the potential complementarities with transitional justice measures to reconstitute civic trust and smooth the process of social reintegration.
17. By emphasising reintegration programmes that are inclusive and participatory, such programmes would highlight transparency and accountability mechanisms and promote inclusive democratic governance through inclusive consultation and decision-making.
18. The international community should give serious consideration to channelling the bulk of DDR funding through a multi-donor trust fund mechanism with pre-committed financing. Such a trust fund should be flexible and able to work with a variety of international and national partners in a highly politicised post-conflict situation. In UN-supported operations the trust fund should complement assessed contributions. Consideration should be given to the possibility of having two different windows for different components of the DDR process: one for the long-term reintegration of ex-combatants and one for support to affected communities. In non-UN supported operations as well as in cases where assessed contributions are insufficient, the trust fund should integrate backwards and promote financing for all components of the DDR process. Such a pre-committed multi-donor trust fund should finance all necessary elements of the DDR process.
19. Donors supporting pre-committed multi-donor trust funds or member states providing assessed contributions for DDR must show patience and not press for disbursement before the political and security conditions are supportive of DDR, or the technical preparations have been completed.
20. Decisions on institutional management of pre-committed multi-donor trust funds should be made on a case-by-case basis depending upon actual institutional competence, demonstrated comparative advantage and mandate, as well as on the institution's capacity to manage resources in an accountable manner and to mobilise funds.
21. Given the benefits and drawbacks of different financing instruments (trust funds and others), it might be useful to consider sequencing differing financing instruments and sources in accordance with their respective procedures and legal constraints.
22. It is essential that the members of the international community (diplomatic,

security and development) support their national partners in undertaking a comprehensive planning process for both DDR and longer-term development and security objectives as early in the peace process as possible. This will help avoid gaps between support provided through DDR programmes and longer-term development and security efforts. This has implications for the institutional approach to DDR planning.

23. To allow for evaluations and monitoring of DDR processes as well as to measure the efficiency of financial contributions, more work should be done on data collection and financial reporting of DDR processes. More transparency is also called for from all actors involved.
24. Funding from the Peace Building Commission can become an important contribution to DDR funding. It would be useful if all DDR funding approved by the Peace Building Commission can be considered as OECD-DAC eligible.

Annex 3.

Additional Recommendations:

- › DDR is a concept that helps the international community understand linkages between security and development in post-conflict settings. It facilitates the use of resources (i.e. civilian or military, ODA or non-ODA) in support of a peace process. It is important not to undermine successful progress made in the attempt to bring diverse aspects together into a common understanding.
- › In practical situations, the term DDR can sometimes obstruct a peace process, even though the concept and its components are generally understood as important. Adapting internationally established terminologies, models and mechanisms to the specific circumstances of national and local conditions is essential to create a level of confidence in the process and enhance national ownership, leadership and commitment. Putting DDR into practice therefore requires flexibility, allowing cultural, social, economic and historical specifics to influence the methods and mechanisms of DDR/the management of armies, arms and ex-combatants.
- › Regional policy processes for DDR and SSR should have a bottom-up approach, while drawing on knowledge attained at the global level.
- › A peace process is a long-term procedure of transforming military conflicts into a peaceful political discourse, within a democratic framework. Introducing necessary components at the right time is crucial to move the process forward. Bringing DDR into the negotiations too early may jeopardise attempts to build trust between negotiating parties.
- › When the time is right, DDR can be used as a diplomatic tool and confidence-building measure between the parties. If approached in a sensitive way, its components can help parties to ongoing talks move away from locked positions and look at their interests from alternative perspectives. DDR can thus be a means to transform a military conflict into a peaceful political discussion, without necessarily altering the power balance between the negotiating parties.
- › An understanding of the conflict not only helps to determine the type of reintegration programmes needed to secure peace. It can also identify what type of agreement and mechanism is needed to make the parties accountable to agreed DDR commitments. Sustained commitment by external parties throughout the implementation phase would build stronger relationships and awareness amongst all parties of the needs to meet requirements at international, national and local levels.
- › Early economic and social development activities can help to build trust between negotiating parties. Especially in asymmetric power relations, support from the

stronger party for the communities of the weaker party can serve as a sign that other commitments made in the negotiations will also be realised and that the peace process is moving in the right direction.

- › Early discussion of DDR in negotiations can help stakeholders reach a more realistic understanding of what can be delivered through a reintegration programme, as well as what will be required on their part. Knowing that development funds will be available in a post-conflict society after a peace agreement has been signed, and being prepared for what type of assistance/aid to request, can put leaders in a better position to convince their own soldiers to comply, thereby avoiding splinter groups.
- › During implementation of a peace agreement, DDR can be a way of managing the aspirations of ex-combatants and of communities receiving returning combatants, at least in an initial phase. Reinsertion activities such as vocational training can be used to buy time until more sustainable programmes have come into place. Reintegration programmes can also be used to promote confidence-building at the local level, among returning combatants and communities.
- › When approaching the DDR component, consideration should also be given to the situation of the national security system in general. If the issue of SSR is subject to political dispute, the chances of a DDR programme succeeding are probably limited. Early assessment of needs and aspirations, as well as what is ultimately expected by the combatants, is therefore of the utmost interest. More can also be done to study transitional mechanisms that would allow control over armed groups while awaiting political solutions.
- › A multi-donor Trust Fund with a dual focus on combatants and communities, as proposed by the SIDDR report, could be complemented with a ‘third window’ intended for security-related matters. Approval by an independent international body, such as the UN Peace Building Commission, defining a category of ‘countries in specific need’, can open the way for discussion of the use of ODA funds for such ‘unconventional’ programmes.
- › While there are limitations to what a single DDR programme can achieve, it should aim to use opportunities for synergies with other initiatives in a post-conflict society. A badly designed DDR component, on the other hand, risks blocking the possibility of attending to issues that might give rise to conflicts later on in the peace process. In any event, a DDR process should never be implemented in total isolation.
- › When there is no immediate possibility of applying justice, vetting can be a subtle yet critical Transitional Justice mechanism for use in selection of participants in a reconstituted army or in awarding reintegration assistance packages. The door can at least be kept open by not unjustly rewarding perpetrators or allowing newly reconstituted security institutions to get off on

the wrong foot by recruiting individuals who may have committed egregious crimes against humanity.

- › Early inclusion of actors that are familiar with economic opportunities in the post-conflict society makes it easier to design sustainable DDR programmes that can contribute to long-term economic and social development. Understanding the economic actors and opportunities, as well as the capacity of institutions that can link them together (e.g. microcredits, market access, etc.), is critical for jump-starting reintegration opportunities for sustainable livelihoods.
- › A continued dialogue is needed on DDR and its relationship with parallel processes within an overall peace building framework, with lessons learned being adapted to new circumstances, and experience and knowledge being exchanged and subsequently passed on.
- › High-level training in DDR – the management of armies, arms and ex-combatants – enhances awareness among mediators and negotiators. The actors should have access in their work to technical expertise that can support and facilitate negotiating parties and third party mediators in DDR-related matters.

Footnotes

1. www.unddr.org
2. www.mdrp.org
3. www.unpeacemaker.org (all agreements referred to by this report can be downloaded from this web site)
4. www.gov.ph-sona/2006sonatechnicalreport.pdf
5. For further reading see John de Chastelain: 'The Northern Ireland peace process and the impact of decommissioning' in 'From Political Violence to Negotiated Settlements', University College Dublin Press 2004.
6. Gerry Adams (Sinn Fein) quoted in BBC March 26 2007, available from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/6496065.stm>
7. See section 4; 'Managing of army and arms' in Comprehensive Peace Agreement
8. A/59/2005 – Report of the UN Secretary General; 'In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all'.
9. The European Commission and the Council of the European Union picks up this recommendation in the jointly approved; 'EU concept for support of DDR' (§18).
10. The Community Security Fund – Principles and Guidelines §1.1
11. For further reading see Sylvia Conception et al in 'Breaking the Links Between Economics and Conflict in Mindanao' International Alert 2003.



Copyright © Folke Bernadotte Academy, 2007
Editors: Lena Sundh, Nat Colletta, Jens Samuelsson Schjørlien
Graphic Design: Johan Cnattingius / kingston.se
Project Manager: Anna Sahlin Engsner / kingston.se
ISBN 978-91-633-0676-1
First edition 2007
Printed in Sweden by Rolf Tryckeri AB, Skövde 2007

Order from the Folke Bernadotte Academy,
Marie Berglund; Telephone +46 612 822 00
www.folkebernadotteacademy.se

The Stockholm Initiative on DDR also published its *Final Report*
and a compilation entitled *Background Studies*, in 2006.