



Action on Armed Violence
Post-Conflict Rehabilitation and Reintegration

MINE ACTION AND ARMED VIOLENCE REDUCTION

Liberia

CASE STUDY | SEPTEMBER 2012

GICHD | CIDHG



The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), an international **expert organisation** legally based in Switzerland as a non-profit foundation, works for the **elimination** of mines, explosive remnants of war and other explosive hazards, such as unsafe munitions stockpiles. The GICHD provides **advice** and capacity development support, undertakes applied research, disseminates knowledge and best practices and develops **standards**. In **cooperation** with its partners, the GICHD's work enables national and local authorities in **affected countries** to effectively and efficiently **plan, coordinate, implement, monitor and evaluate** safe mine action programmes, as well as to implement the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, the Convention on Cluster Munitions and other relevant instruments of international law. The GICHD follows the humanitarian principles of **humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence**.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
FROM WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION DISPOSAL TO REINTEGRATION: THE REASONS BEHIND THE SHIFT	5
Organisation-wide shift	5
Liberia	5
PROGRAMME	6
Context	6
Feasibility study	7
Programme implementation	8
The Tumutu Agricultural Training Programme (TATP)	8
Sineo Agricultural Training Programme (SATP)	12
Costs	12
MONITORING AND EVALUATION	13
RESULTS	14
Economic reintegration	14
Social reintegration and non-return to illicit livelihoods	14
TRANSITION TO NATIONAL OWNERSHIP	16
GENDER AND DIVERSITY	17
LESSONS LEARNT AND CHALLENGES	17
CONCLUSIONS	18
ANNEXES	21
Annex 1 Documents consulted	21
Annex 2 Baseline Assessment Questionnaire for Individual Graduates	22 - 40

INTRODUCTION¹

Action on Armed Violence (AOAV), formerly ‘Landmine Action’,² began its activities in Liberia in February 2006 by implementing a Weapons and Ammunition Disposal (WAD) programme. Preliminary field research conducted by AOAV in Lofa, Nimba, Bong, Bomi and Gbarpolu counties in 2006, revealed high levels of contamination by small arms ammunition, mortars, grenades and other explosive devices that had been dumped by armed groups alongside roads or near villages. The existence of concentrations of ammunition dumps in areas surrounding military command posts – known locally as ‘Killing Zones’ – was also noted with concern.

A December 2004 report by the United Nations (UN) Panel of Experts on Liberia claimed that, although the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL)-led Disarmament, Demobilisation, Rehabilitation and Reintegration (DDRR) programme had collected 27,000 of the weapons known to have been held by rebel combatants during the civil war, many remained unaccounted for. Considering assault rifles alone, the Panel of Experts claimed that only 63.5 per cent of the assault rifles imported during the war were successfully collected. This meant that at least 1,825 assault rifles were still in circulation in the country in late 2004, posing a serious threat to human security in post-conflict Liberia.³ With this in mind, AOAV designed its WAD programme to reduce the harm caused by weapons, ammunition and unexploded ordnance (UXO), mainly in the country’s northern region.⁴

The objectives of AOAV’s WAD programme were to:

- a) help communities identify and report UXO to UNMIL by using community liaison
- b) dispose of weapons and ammunitions retained by local residents after the DDRR process
- c) carry out UXO risk education in high-risk areas

AOAV worked closely with local communities as well as UNMIL, which had been given sole permission by the Government of Liberia (GOL) to destroy Explosive Remnants of War (ERW).⁵ Although AOAV worked with UXO as well as weapons and ammunition, it played a slightly different role with each. AOAV’s UXO work focused on risk education and working with communities to identify and report UXO to UNMIL; its weapons and ammunition work focused on procuring the necessary disposal equipment, training local staff to collect and destroy weapons and ammunition, and also developing their project finance and management capacity.

Based on the success of its WAD programme,⁶ AOAV expanded its role in Liberia in January 2008 by launching a distinct programme that focuses not on the *instruments* but rather on the agents of armed violence.⁷ The reintegration programme targets (i) ex-combatants excluded from the DDRR process and (ii) war-affected youth engaged in illegal and criminal activities, or at high risk of re-engaging in conflict. The programme seeks to reduce the incidence of armed violence perpetrated by these individuals by providing them with agricultural, life and business skills,⁸ numeracy and literacy training, and psychosocial counselling to enable them to achieve a sustainable, legal livelihood within the rural sector. The programme also aims to relocate them away from their previous areas of activity—preferably to their communes of origin. This is to (a) help break the command structures under which they were organised even after the conflict, and (b) allow them to start their new ventures in a supportive, familiar environment.

The purpose of this case study is to examine AOAV’s reintegration programme in Liberia, the rationale for and reasons behind its shift into this area of work, and to identify lessons learnt from AOAV’s experience in Liberia to date.

FROM WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION DISPOSAL TO REINTEGRATION: THE REASONS BEHIND THE SHIFT

Organisation-wide shift

The broadening of AOA's activities in Liberia took place as part of a more general, long-term, organisation-wide shift away from mine action and towards cluster munitions and, eventually, Armed Violence Reduction (AVR). Under its original name—Landmine Action—the organisation was founded in 1992 as the U.K. arm of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL). As such, it originally focused on international law advocacy, working with civil society organisations around the world to strengthen international norms on the availability and use of instruments of war.

Between 1997 and 2009, Landmine Action played a leading role, in the UK and internationally, in a number of notable humanitarian disarmament agreements. These included the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Treaty (1997), the Convention on Conventional Weapons, Protocol V (2003), the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development (2006), the Convention on Cluster Munitions (2008) and the Oslo Commitments on Armed Violence (2010). This progression illustrates the organisation's broadening mandate, starting strictly with mine action, but, eventually, expanding to include wider security issues.

In 2006, Landmine Action began to complement its advocacy work by implementing field programmes in Liberia. Shortly after, the organisation also became involved in an Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) and survey programme in Western Sahara and, in 2007, a mine/ERW clearance programme in Guinea-Bissau. Despite breaking with the organisation's traditional focus on advocacy, its field programmes remained consistent with its institutional motto—"Landmine Action: controlling the technology of violence."

The substantive focus on the instruments of armed violence began to change in 2008, when Landmine Action began to recognise that their programmatic interventions would be more effective if they addressed issues in a more holistic and integrated manner. Through a consultative process involving the senior level of the organisation's programme and policy staff as well as its Trustees, the organisation decided to broaden its mandate. For example, Landmine Action's strategic direction for 2008-2011 outlined a broader agenda of armed violence reduction and peace-building, largely focused on working with people, both as agents and victims of armed violence. It also emphasised the need to complement its global advocacy and research by broadening the organisation's activities through country programmes targeting communities affected by armed violence.

The change in the organisation's name aptly reflects this shift. Beginning with organisation-wide discussions in 2008 and 2009, Landmine Action officially changed its name to 'Action on Armed Violence' in early 2010, to ensure consistency with its new strategic direction (hereafter the organisation will be referred to solely as AOA).

Liberia

AOA's strategic shift in support of AVR was also taking place in practice. AOA's Liberia programme was already broadening into the wider human security sector before the headquarter-level decision to shift the organisation's strategic commitment. In fact, the training and reintegration programme in Liberia, although not operational until January 2008, was originally designed and planned as early as September 2006, only six months after the start of AOA's WAD programme in the country. Through its Liberia programme, AOA was already broadening its activities, indicating that the institutional shift was a two-way process, characterised by both the discussions at headquarters level and informed by the pilot implementation of broader activities at the programme level.

PROGRAMME

Context

The August 2003 Accra Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) signed between the Liberian Government and the Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD) and the Movement for Democracy in Liberia (MODEL) rebel groups formally brought an end to 14 years of civil conflict in Liberia, which had killed more than 150,000 and displaced 850,000 Liberians. As part of the Accra Agreement, the parties requested the deployment of UNMIL, which was mandated to support the National Transitional Government in implementing the agreement, including by coordinating and implementing a nation-wide DDR process⁹. In fact, DDR became the central and most pressing task of UNMIL.

According to a 2003 report to the UN Security Council, the UN Secretary-General acknowledged that the presence of thousands of armed ex-combatants would be one of the greatest challenges to post-conflict Liberia. By the time the CPA was signed, it was estimated that there were between 27,000 and 38,000 combatants¹⁰ who would need to be demobilised, disarmed, rehabilitated and reintegrated into Liberian society. The programme's success has been a source of dispute. Despite successfully disarming and demobilising 101,496 people by the end of the programme, an UNMIL and USAID-led evaluation in 2007 concluded that "the reintegration programme has failed to provide sustainable alternative livelihoods for ex-combatants. The majority of ex-combatants are still unemployed, and thousands have regrouped for the purpose of illegally exploiting natural resources in diamond and gold mining areas, as well as on rubber plantations."¹¹

This trend had begun even before the conflict's end. Towards the end of the conflict, many LURD rebels occupied key rubber plantations, which allowed them to finance their activities and guarantee a source of income. However, once the conflict ended, many rebels, still organised under their former command structures, continued to tap rubber illegally. In fact, many rebels who originally registered to take part in the DDR process dropped out and turned to illegal rubber tapping as a quicker and more profitable source of income. The biggest plantation, Guthrie plantation, located in Bomi County, central-western Liberia, is estimated to have had between 2,500 and 4,000 ex-combatants involved in illegal tapping and selling of rubber.

Despite its proximity to Monrovia, Guthrie remained outside the control of the Government of Liberia until September 2006, when the GOL, together with UNMIL, took control of Guthrie, forcing many ex-occupiers to leave. Many of those at Guthrie were in fact ex-combatants, but had not taken part in the DDR process, probably because they had no weapons to hand in, preferred to remain in the rubber tapping business, or feared possible repercussions from their former commanders. Without proper training and employment options, UNMIL feared that these individuals would continue to pose a threat to Liberia's security by turning to violent crime, illicit rubber tapping, gold/diamond mining, or joining armed groups in neighbouring Cote d'Ivoire or Guinea.

As a result of these concerns, UNMIL's Security Sector Reform (SSR) consultant and the West African Conflict Adviser for the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID) approached AOA to develop possible options for the rehabilitation and reintegration of Guthrie's ex-combatants ahead of the GOL/UNMIL take over. AOA was approached not only because of their experience working in Liberia and their good relationship with local communities, but also because AOA staff shared an interest in addressing the issue, and believed AOA could be the platform for doing so.

Feasibility study

After the UNMIL/DFID request, AOAV carried out a feasibility study, funded by DFID, to identify:

- > the unregistered ex-combatants working at Guthrie plantation and their status within the plantation economy
- > the reasons why these ex-combatants did not enter the DDRR process
- > the ex-combatants' perceptions regarding the post-conflict reconstruction process in Liberia
- > the type of skills training package that would most likely provide a sustainable livelihood option for the majority of the group



In parallel with the Guthrie feasibility study, another team of Monrovia-based staff conducted research into potential training activities for these ex-combatants. This involved a review of existing literature on DDRR in Liberia as well as interviews with the government, the UN Joint Implementation Unit (JIU), the National Commission for Disarmament, Demobilisation, Rehabilitation and Reintegration (NCDDRR), and ex-combatants. In conjunction, both research processes identified several points of entry for potential support to the DDRR process, which included:

- > the rebuilding of the Liberian economy would have to be based on agriculture
- > food security is a key issue in Liberia: the limited (and imbalanced) access to food and other resources is a key driver of local-level conflict in Liberia; the production of food is crucial for development, food security and conflict prevention
- > there is the real possibility of making an income-generating and sustainable livelihood from agriculture in both the employed and self-employed sectors
- > rehabilitation programmes that included follow-up support and monitoring seemed to offer greater prospects for reintegration than “fire and forget” training where trainees received their certificate and were then “fired off” to fend for themselves
- > many rehabilitation activities had not taken into account national realities; for example, information technology (IT) training in a country with no IT jobs and mechanical training, which was not accompanied by the provision of workshop tools, job placement or a sufficient market for such skills
- > training had rarely included even the minimum literacy, numeracy and business skills necessary for employment or self-employment

The research also outlined recommendations for how to design a programme to address these failings:

- > focus on offering participating ex-combatants training in sectors with the greatest employment and/or business start-up opportunities, namely agriculture
- > work together with the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) to rehabilitate an old Liberia Rubber Development Authority (LRDA) training facility in Salala, Bong County, to use as a training centre
- > develop, together with the MOA, a professional standard training curricula for, among others, rice seed multiplication, cash- and tree-crop cultivation, small business start-up management, and marketing for a projected figure of up to 400 trainees at a time, including both ex-combatants and qualifying local residents
- > develop, together with qualified local non-governmental organisations (NGOs), an on-site social reintegration and psychosocial counselling programme to be run throughout the duration of the training course
- > conclude an agreement with the MOA and other relevant Ministries (eg Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Land, Mines and Energy) on the allocation of land grants to graduates of the training courses on either an individual or cooperative basis.

Programme implementation

The Tumutu Agricultural Training Programme (TATP)

In contrast to the scattered, general training offered under the UN's DDRR programme, the Tumutu Agricultural Training Programme (TATP) provides comprehensive training over an extended period (four to six months) in agriculture. By providing ex-combatants with a sustainable and legal alternative to illegal rubber tapping and mineral extraction, TATP aims to enable their economic and social reintegration into society. This reduces both trainees' continued involvement in illegal and/or criminal activities and the risk of re-recruitment into crime and rebel groups in the future.

Objectives

It is clear that although the programme's main objectives focus on reducing the number of ex-combatants involved in illicit resource extraction, and promoting stability and licit economic activity, the programme also aims to meet a variety of other objectives, including to:

- > thoroughly train trainees in MOA-approved agricultural techniques and ensure this training is absorbed and that trainees are able to implement the agricultural techniques after the course
- > economically and socially integrate/reintegrate the trainees
- > increase the agricultural capacity of trainee-receiving communities
- > increase the MOA's capacity to plan and manage agricultural training
- > ensure that the agricultural training programme eventually becomes a self-sustaining, nationally-funded country-wide agricultural training programme

Below is a detailed description of the different elements and phases adopted by the programme to achieve these objectives.

Trainee Selection

Course One

In addition to providing key insights and recommendations for developing the programme, the research team in charge of the feasibility study also identified and selected the first 'batch' of ex-combatants that would take the course. Of the 25 camps in Guthrie, 22

proved to be operational. From these camps, 2000 people were screened, of whom over 700 were interviewed and, finally, 394 were identified as ex-combatants who had not entered the DDRR process. This figure included 35 women fighters and 35 who would have been considered child soldiers at the time when the conflict ended.

After Course One

Although the feasibility study was a one-off activity, the research team remained responsible for the selection and registration of trainees for subsequent courses. With the situation in Guthrie stabilised after course one, AOAV's subsequent courses at TATP demanded that they work in loose partnership with UNMIL and the GOL to identify potential 'hotspot' areas. The AOAV's research team would then enter these hotspot areas to identify populations at risk, publicise the programme, and eventually screen and register interested persons with a detailed registration questionnaire developed by AOAV.

Site Selection and Rehabilitation

When the GoL took over Guthrie in 2006, many of those illegally extracting rubber were given legal concessions under the Government's interim management team to extract rubber legally; others, including the 394 ex-combatants selected by the feasibility study, were expected to leave the plantation. Given this requirement, Tumutu, the former LRDA site in Salala, Bong County, seemed an appropriate choice. It was far enough from Guthrie to make a return difficult while also being close enough to Monrovia to be logistically feasible. In addition, Tumutu was big enough to house 400 students and had enough land and high soil quality to sustain the trainees' farming activities.

Once Tumutu was selected, AOAV recruited a Liberian architect/construction manager to revive the derelict site and turn it into a model residential site for training (the second site in Sinoe was built based on the same parameters).

As a residential training site, trainees are given meals, lodging, clothing, basic medical care and personal items while in residence.

Curriculum Design

In discussion with the MOA, AOAV recognised that the lack of national vocational standards for agricultural training in Liberia and the absence of any agricultural training curricula would require the development of a curriculum from scratch. AOAV used the British Military Systems Approach to Training as the basis for the course design and hired an international agriculture expert to help with the technical component. The curriculum was designed using a participatory process that featured the in-depth engagement of various stakeholders including the MOA, LRDA, the Central Agricultural Research Institute (CARI), and community leaders. Although AOAV provided the curriculum and project management skills, it was the other stakeholders, especially the MOA's technical experts, who contributed most of the actual content, including local agricultural knowledge. And despite the extensive consultative process, the curriculum was still finalised in a short time span of two months.

The curriculum was designed to include relevant training on technical agricultural techniques, life and business skills, psychosocial counselling, literacy and numeracy. A technical team designed the technical modules, which span five core agricultural subjects: rice production, rubber culture, animal husbandry, vegetable production, tree crops and oil palm. Recognising the inadequacy of the three to five day life skills component of the UN-led DDRR programme in Liberia, the curriculum's life skills component includes a daily hour of formal training reinforced by informal, one-to-one training and psychosocial counselling, where appropriate, which lasts throughout the entire duration of the course.

The life skills component includes subjects such as effective communication; conflict analysis and transformation; early warning and early recovery; challenges of reconciliation; leadership styles and skills in civil society; understanding post-traumatic stress disorder; and community initiatives and development. The psychosocial counselling component was adapted from existing material and methodologies designed and already being used by the National Ex-Combatant Peace Building Initiatives (NEPI)¹², a Liberian NGO. AOV sub-contracted the life skills and psychosocial component of the first course entirely to NEPI, both due to the organisation's experience, but also the clear benefits of having trainers with local knowledge and legitimacy. After the transfer of knowledge from NEPI through the experience of the first course, AOV staff themselves began to deliver the psychosocial and life skills component of subsequent courses.

Finally, the course also includes literacy, numeracy and business skills components, which are crucial not necessarily for social rehabilitation but for economic reintegration. Numeracy and literacy training was deemed so crucial to the retention of the rest of the curriculum that it was included as a daily one hour session. The first courses lasted between four and six months, but currently AOV is able to achieve the courses' main objectives in a three month timeframe.

The trainers

Through its close collaboration with the MOA, AOV was able to enlist the assistance of highly experienced agricultural trainers seconded from the MOA to teach at Tumutu. The social rehabilitation component of the course—life skills, psychosocial counselling—was carried out first by NEPI staff, who were themselves ex-combatants, and then by AOV staff. The business skills, literacy and numeracy components were taught by trainers hired by AOV; they had backgrounds in secondary skill teaching and business management.

AOV's teaching and programme staff regularly participate in workshops and working groups on technical and vocational education and training, and on ex-combatant training.

Reintegration

The most important direct measure of the programme's success, at the outcome level, is whether trainees successfully reintegrate, both economically and socially, into their respective communities of choice. Although the programme's ultimate aim was to meet certain security outcomes (e.g. cooling hotspots such as Guthrie), successful reintegration was a crucial intermediate outcome that had to be met to reach that aim. Consequently, much analysis and planning was dedicated to reintegration from the early days of the programme's design. In essence, AOV knew that three elements would be vital to a successful reintegration:

- (1) graduates would have to be given a suitable start-up package
- (2) graduates would have to choose their communities themselves
- (3) AOV would have to play a major role in reaching out to potential host communities for sensitisation purposes and to secure usable land for the graduates

The following is a more detailed discussion of the reintegration package and the relocation process.

Reintegration Package

Graduates are provided with a suitable start-up package with essential tools, seeds, animals, building material and other items ranging between USD 150 (eg vegetable farm) and USD 450 (e.g. pig production), depending on the activity they have chosen to pursue. AOV knew that in order to create enough incentive for ex-combatants to fully abandon their former illegal activities, the reintegration package would have to prove sufficient to allow graduates of the training course to make a medium-to-long-term living. With this in

mind, the reintegration package was designed to be distributed in two phases. The first package is issued when the course is completed to allow graduates to start-up their agricultural activities soon after their arrival at their respective host communities. The second package is issued five weeks after the completion of the course and only if graduates demonstrate that they met all of the agreed targets outlined in their student contracts, which they signed before leaving the training site. By distributing the package in two phases, AOA V was also able to reduce the risk that graduates would sell their reintegration packages for short-term profit.

In addition, graduates are encouraged to relocate to their respective communities in collectives rather than as individuals. AOA V believes this enables graduates both to farm on a much larger scale, thereby being able to produce and sell more, and to offer each other moral support, a factor seen as crucial to successfully rehabilitating them to participate in social life.



Relocation

Upon completing the course, trainees themselves choose the community into which they are reintegrated. Since all students selected for the first class at Tumutu had come from Guthrie, AOA V encouraged them to return to their communities of origin or to relocate to communities where their families now live. After graduates select their communities of choice, AOA V plays a key role in engaging the chosen communities to (a) gain permission from and secure usable land from local chiefs and (b) sensitise local residents about the arrival of the graduate(s). Guaranteeing access to the necessary agricultural land is crucial to rehabilitating the graduates; it allows them to grow crops which they can sell and/or subsist on. Ensuring the receiving community is favourable is crucial to successful social reintegration. For this reason, apart from negotiating with local chiefs to secure graduates access to land, AOA V's field teams also conduct community surveys to assess how favourable and ready the chosen communities are to host graduates. Section 4 (below) provides greater detail on AOA V's outreach work in receiving communities.

The Reintegration Team

The original project proposal submitted to DFID included funding for a Reintegration Team specifically responsible for carrying out community sensitisation, relocation, reintegration package distribution and follow-up activities, as well as monitoring graduates after course completion. As funding for this was not available, AOA V adjusted its programme accordingly, relying on the already-formed and active field research team to also take on the reintegration tasks in addition to their trainee selection and registration responsibilities.

Beyond Guthrie

The first class to go through the training course at Tumutu was primarily composed of ex-combatants from Guthrie rubber plantation. Of the 379 trainees admitted to the first course in February 2008, 300 came from Guthrie and 79 came from the surrounding Bong County. This meant that although located in Bong County, Tumutu was initially designed to serve not just ex-combatants, but ex-combatants specifically located at the Guthrie plantation, which is in Bomi County. As UNMIL and the GOL fully established their control over Guthrie, the programme no longer tailored exclusively to students from Guthrie, or specifically for ex-combatants. For example, of the 365 trainees that participated in course two, only 130 were from Guthrie, while more than 50 per cent came from Lofa Bridge, Lofa County, and Bong County itself. And, in course three, none of the trainees were from Guthrie. Of the 375 trainees attending course three, 235 came from Gbaploru County, 115 from Nimba and 50 from Bong.

Moving beyond the focus on Guthrie Plantation, these subsequent courses targeted areas popular for small-scale and often illicit diamond and gold mining as well as logging. UNMIL and GOL identified these areas as hotspots due to the high concentration of young men—some of them ex-combatants—who flock there from around the country looking for “easy money.” Although these men do not necessarily pose a threat, the fear was that if natural resource prices declined, they would easily transition into a life of violent crime.

Alongside preparations for course three, AOAV also opened a new agricultural training site in the more remote Sinoe County, located in the Southeast of Liberia.

Sinoe Agricultural Training Programme (SATP)

Unlike Tumutu, which was identified through the AOAV feasibility study, the site at Sinoe was opened under a direct request from the MOA to AOAV in mid-2009. Similar to the September 2006 operation to re-take control over Guthrie, the GOL planned to reclaim the Sinoe Rubber Plantation—until then illicitly occupied and managed by a former rebel commander. As a result, they requested that AOAV build a second site that would specifically target ex-combatants living in the 35 communities in and around Sinoe. Tumutu created some initial apprehension by local residents in Bong County, due to the arrival to their county of hundreds of ex-combatants from other regions, but Sinoe encountered no such issues; it was placed squarely in the area it was meant to target. AOAV also worked informally with German Agro Action, the most prominent and well-known NGO in the region, to ensure its visibility and sensitivity to the local context.

Much smaller than Tumutu, the Sinoe site was designed and built to house 200 trainees at one time. Although funded through humanitarian aid from the German Federal Foreign Office, the Sinoe programme has the same objectives as the TATP, including the eventual transfer to full national ownership. For this reason, the monitoring and evaluation procedures are the same for both the TATP and SATP.

Costs

Both training facilities operate under the same cost structures. On average, the cost of running a course ranges between USD 1,100 and 1,400 per student, including all overheads and administrative fees. The cost per student may vary within this range depending on the length of the course and the components included in the curriculum. Using this rate, a course at Tumutu (400 students) can cost between USD 440,000 and USD 560,000 while a course at Sinoe (200 students) can cost between USD 220,000 USD and 280,000.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The programmes are monitored internally by AOA V staff at several points through each course as well as during the reintegration phase.

The trainee's absorption of course materials is assessed twice throughout the duration of the course, via both a mid- and an end-of-course exam. The International Project Manager, the Head Teacher and the NEPI Team Leader also meet periodically throughout the duration of the course to assess student behaviour as well as the quality of both the teaching and counselling services being offered. Similarly, the Technical Team meets weekly or monthly to assess the management of the site's farm and the technical abilities and skill retention of the trainees. Upon successful completion of the course, each trainee receiving an aggregate mark of at least 50 per cent in the theoretical portion of the mid- and end-of-course exams and 80 per cent in the practical portion of the exams receives a 'Certificate of Achievement' from the MOA. Students with marks lower than those stipulated by the MOA only receive a 'Certificate of Attendance'.

However, the true measure of programme's success lies in the monitoring and evaluation of the reintegration phase. Based on the programme's original logical framework, many indicators can be used to measure the success rate of meeting the stated objectives. These may include, among others, a reduction in the incidence of ex-combatant related crimes, an increase in the stability and legal economic activity in areas of natural resource extraction targeted by the programme, and an increase in the agricultural production of trainee-receiving communities. However, the two main indicators of successful reintegration are whether trainees graduating from the course with a 'Certificate of Achievement' are indeed living economically and socially viable lives in their communities of choice, and whether they are doing this without returning to illicit livelihoods such as illegal resource extraction or violent crime.

To assess the degree to which graduates are living peacefully in their new communities (a measure of social reintegration) and the degree to which graduates have absorbed the training received and are able to make a living by implementing these techniques (a measure of economic reintegration), AOA V uses an internal questionnaire. The questionnaire surveys graduates three to five months after graduation (often conducted at the same time as graduates are contacted for the disbursement of the second phase of their reintegration packages).

In addition to AOA V's internal monitoring and evaluation procedures, in 2009-2011, Yale University and Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA), carried out a comprehensive quantitative and qualitative survey-based evaluation of the programme. As part of the evaluation, 1,330 youth were recruited and divided into a 'treatment' group (those taking the TATP course three and SATP course two) and a 'control' group (those not taking the courses). The evaluation team collected extensive survey data ahead of the course, including detailed data on economic activities (especially engagement in agriculture), expenditures and assets, family, physical and psychological health, political attitudes, attitudes towards violence, aggressive behaviours and war. The evaluation team then followed up with survey respondents 12 to 16 months after the completion of the course (or 20 months after the initial survey, for the 'treatment' group).

For the qualitative portion of the evaluation, three research assistants followed 37 members of the treatment group and 13 members of the control group at regular intervals over a two year period. The qualitative researchers interviewed participants before, during and after the intervention, often multiple times.

Rather than reporting on outputs, the 2009-2011 evaluation sought to measure the impact of the programme on graduate's lives as compared to those who never participated in the training. Although small and medium impacts observed cannot be solely attributed to the treatment with enough statistical significance to confidently claim causation, such evidence is still strongly suggestive of treatment impact.

The 'Results' section below will report both on the AOAV's internal evaluation of TATP's course three (impact measured against stated objectives) and on the comparative analysis of the 'treatment' and 'control' groups before and after course three (impact measured against control group), according to the results of the joint 2011 AOAV, Yale University and IPA evaluation.¹³

RESULTS

According to the programme's key stated objectives, AOAV's internal evaluation of TATP's course three revealed the following results:

Economic reintegration

Absorption and implementation of agricultural techniques

- > 96.7 per cent of the graduates say they are successfully implementing the agricultural techniques taught during the course by engaging in some sort of farming, while only 3.3 per cent said they were not farming
- > of those that said they were farming, 56.3 per cent were doing it as their sole employment, whilst 49.47 per cent were pursuing other, additional sources of income (this can be explained by the employment opportunities that exist in the areas of reintegration, especially in Gbarpolu County where mining and logging activities are relatively prevalent)

Ability to earn a livelihood from farming

- > 92 per cent of graduates were eating two or more meals per day, with only eight per cent eating one meal per day
- > of the 92.8 per cent of graduates that report that they had, or were currently making money, the average monthly income is 1,775 Liberian Dollars (LD) (around \$25 US)¹⁴
- > graduates that formed collectives appeared have greater success than their individual counterparts, and were achieving a greater income level than individual farmers. In addition, graduates who are farming as part of a collective appear to be more positive about their future success and profitability in the rural economy

Social reintegration and non-return to illicit livelihoods

- > a total of 95 per cent of graduates were still in their chosen community of reintegration at the time of the evaluation
- > 100 per cent of community respondents claimed that the graduates are welcome and/or useful to the community. In fact, qualitative interviews indicated that the vast majority of community members specifically mentioned the graduate's skills, hard work, changed behaviour or usefulness in developing the community
- > almost all graduates mention peace-building approaches learnt at TATP as an asset that they use in their communities; this is confirmed by the qualitative interviews with community members
- > 96 per cent of graduates reported feeling safe in their host community

- > Whilst 19 per cent of graduates reported incidences of violence in communities since their return from TATP, only 2.3 per cent admitted to being part of this violence themselves
- > Only 9.5 per cent of graduates claim they are still in contact with former commanders, suggesting that the wartime command structures might have been successfully deconstructed¹⁵

The comprehensive 2009-2011 evaluation that AOAV carried out in conjunction with Yale University and IPA (see previous section for more details on the evaluation's methodology) revealed the following results:



Economic reintegration

- > more than a year after completion of the programme, trainees are at least 25 per cent more likely than the control group to be engaged in agriculture, and 37 per cent more likely to have sold crops
- > the evaluators witnessed a sizable increase in average wealth from the programme, especially in household durable assets, but no change in current income, savings or spending for the average programme participant
- > graduates' agricultural enterprises are sustainable and profitable but their current revenue generation and employment generation is modest

Social Reintegration and Non-Return to Illicit Livelihoods

- > prior to the programme, in 2009, 44 per cent of youth were engaged in at least one illicit activity, falling to 42 per cent two years later (in both the treatment and control group)
- > overall, rates of illicit mining went up in both the treatment and control group, most likely because of sky-rocketing gold prices over the course of the programme and study
- > nevertheless, participation levels fell among the treatment group, as agricultural hours seem to substitute somewhat for hours spent in illicit activities
- > although the programme had little impact on rates of participation in illicit activities like mining, those who participated in the programme do spend fewer hours engaged in illicit activities

In terms of the psychosocial component of the course, the evaluation witnessed a marked decrease in aggressive and risky behaviour as well as in emotional distress and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms. Among males, these improvements were witnessed equally in both the 'treatment' and the 'control' groups. However, among females, there was a notable difference, with women in the 'treatment' group reporting 30 per cent fewer depression and PTSD symptoms.¹⁶

The evaluation concluded that, in comparison to other (although there are few) demobilisation programmes of its kind, AOAV's programme is unambiguously the most successful. This is attributable to the intensity and long-term engagement of the programme as well as its focus on 'hard' cases and 'hotspot' areas.

Unfortunately, AOAV's internal evaluation did not focus on the entire scope of the project, but rather strictly on the outputs (what was produced) of the course. This left the courses' outcomes (the difference made) unexamined. What was the impact of the programme on security and stability, as well as on the incidence of illicit natural resource extraction in the 'hotspot' areas from which trainees were recruited? Are trainees who are farming also still involved in illicit activities to supplement their income? More research is certainly necessary to determine the wider impact of the programme, but the results available remain unequivocal in demonstrating the value that the programme has had on the trainees' and local community members' lives.

TRANSITION TO NATIONAL OWNERSHIP

To date, the transition to full national ownership of the project has still not occurred; the reason for this lies beyond AOAV's control. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed between AOAV and the MOA agreed a gradual handover of the costs of the programme to the MOA, including (a) having the MOA fund various administrative positions as well as trainers' salaries from TATP course two onwards and (b) eventually having the TATP and SATP as government-owned agricultural training sites not focused on ex-combatant rehabilitation but rather on providing agricultural training to a wider pool of Liberians.

The MOA has not been able to take over the funding responsibilities listed in the MoU, as the costs have not been covered by their annual budgets. In line with current government policies, the MOA handed over the responsibility for the sites to the Ministry of Youth and Sports (MOYS) in June 2011. In 2012, AOAV signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the MOYS, which states that the MOYS owns the site while AOAV remains the implementing agency for training, when funding is available. Since the beginning of 2012, the MOYS has facilitated funding through a World Bank-funded programme called Youth Employment through Skills.

GENDER AND DIVERSITY

Women were included in all courses, albeit in much lower numbers than men. This can be attributed to both the lower number of female ex-combatants, but also to the responsibilities that women have in Liberian households (women identified as potential trainees had two to three children). However, with the focus on ex-combatants moving to vulnerable youth, more and more women are joining the programme; the last course at Sinoe, for example, consisted of 25 per cent women.

Of the women who do attend the courses, certain key differences have been noted in comparison to their male counterparts. For example, a number of the female graduates proved unable to successfully clear and plant their land by themselves, forcing them to hire casual labour (men) to assist them with this labour intensive work. In addition, without the necessary funds, many women have had to turn to part time employment in the informal sector in an attempt to generate the funds to start their farms. As a result, AOAV noticed that 85.5 per cent of women, compared to 37.9 per cent of men, are farming part time. To address this issue, the internal evaluation of course three recommended that a cash component be added to the reintegration package—to enable female farmers to hire external manual labour—and that graduates be strongly encouraged to reintegrate as collectives rather than individuals.¹⁷

Persons with disabilities were not excluded from the courses, but their participation was conditioned by their ability to undertake the practical labour component of the course. AOAV reports that its courses have been attended by several persons with disabilities, including amputees, epileptics and individuals with partial sight.

LESSONS LEARNT AND CHALLENGES

AOAV has identified many challenges and learnt various lessons about how to improve the programme's effectiveness. For example, after course one, AOAV noticed that many graduates failed to produce their first harvest, causing AOAV to adjust the quality of seeds provided. Similarly, AOAV noticed that many graduates spent the cash amount provided at the end of the course on non-essential, non-agricultural items, leading them to place a greater emphasis on financial management during the subsequent courses. A viable cash amount would therefore be needed to ensure that graduates could provide for themselves before their first harvests could yield a profit.

The most recent 2009-2011 evaluation identified several additional lessons:

- > The private returns to capital investments, including goods, assets or cash, tend to be higher than returns to skills. Therefore, greater capital assistance would be useful to ensure the success of graduate's economic ventures in agriculture. This assistance could come as conditional cash transfers, informal insurance and easier access to credit (IPA).
- > Although agriculture is important, other micro-enterprise assistance could provide alternative and diversified bases from which graduates could access local markets and establish a start-up that is profitable and sustainable. This would mean that skills other than agricultural skills should have more prominence in the course, and that different reintegration packages are needed (IPA).
- > Animal science forms a part of the course curriculum, and animals have been offered as a reintegration option. However, procuring such animals has been difficult for logistical and financial reasons. Furthermore, owning animals places greater financial strain on graduates, who are forced to feed and care for their health, but are unable to sell their meat locally, where most people simply cannot afford to purchase meat. Therefore, it was decided that animals should no longer be provided as an option (AOAV).

- > Although profitable in the long term, rice and rubber are not productive in the short term. Therefore, graduates choosing to grow rice and rubber should also be provided with a more diverse set of vegetable seeds with a shorter production cycle, which they can rely on until their longer term products can produce results (AOAV).
- > A focus on agriculture alone is not sufficient to ensure improved livelihoods and economic development. An increased focus on formal employment opportunities is crucial to successful reintegration. As a result, AOAV has facilitated job opportunities for graduates, and supported employment applications to concessions. The 2012 courses at Tumutu, for example, will specifically focus on more formal employment placements following graduation. To facilitate this, AOAV is developing its relationships with concession holders, informing them about the programme and the technical skills of graduates, and sensitising employers to the job- and life-skills of graduates of the programme.

Through its experience since 2008, AOAV has developed a comprehensive training manual that includes several of the recommendations above. The manual has been shared with relevant actors and all recent material will form an integral part of the MOYS vocational training department and future policies.

CONCLUSIONS

AOAV has successfully worked with the Government of Liberia, the United Nations, local organisations and local communities to design and implement an effective training and reintegration programme in Liberia. With a focus on ‘hotspots’ and a long-term engagement with trainees, the programme complements the wider security sector reform and economic development processes being prioritised by the Liberian government.

With minor exceptions, most trainees seem to have been successfully reintegrated into their new communities, removed from their previous command structures and are either surviving or enhancing their economic security through the agricultural skills learnt and the reintegration packages provided. Although the Ministry of Agriculture has been unable to provide the funding to assume responsibility, its commitment and close partnership with AOAV laid the ground for an eventual transfer of management and operational responsibilities to national authorities. AOAV’s experience in Liberia can certainly serve as a good practice example for others looking to implement similar programmes in post-conflict areas, including the UN, international and local NGOs, and national governments.

There are no specific plans to replicate the programme in other countries. However, AOAV is developing new field programmes in Sierra Leone and Burundi, and is expanding its programme in Western Sahara to work directly with victims and institutions. The organisation is focusing on building its understanding of the armed violence context in the countries where it now operates; AOAV is also developing tools to measure and monitor armed violence. A central component of AOAV’s new integrated approach to its interventions is the development of strategies that are sensitive to local contexts, and which address each of the elements of the Armed Violence Lens—instruments, agents and victims. If ongoing assessments of the armed violence situation in its countries of operation reveal the need for a programme similar to that in Liberia, AOAV would certainly use its experience in Liberia, but would carefully examine how to adapt the model to local reality.

Although it is seeking to broaden its programmes, AOA V continues to engage in advocacy, both on the international and national levels. In Burundi, for example, AOA V has trained 25 women who were associated with armed groups and were injured as a result of armed violence, in disability rights and advocacy work. It is now also planning to train a core group of people in the Training Centre for the Development of Ex-Combatants (Centre d'encadrement et du developpement des anciens combattants au *Burundi*; CEDAC), its local partner, to take on the facilitation role and train others on the same issue. Through such training, AOA V is aiming to strengthen Burundian civil society and hoping to sow the seeds for policy engagement, and eventual policy change, on the issues of armed violence and disability.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ This case study was written by Albert S. Mülli based on a desk-based review of relevant documents and telephone interviews with Melissa Fuerth, AOA Field Programme Manager, and Chris Lang, AOA Liberia Country Manager.
- ² Formerly 'Landmine Action', the organisation changed its name in 2010 to reflect its broadening activities.
- ³ United Nations Security Council, Letter dated 6 December 2004 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1521 (2003) concerning Liberia addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/2004/955, 6 December 2004.
- ⁴ Landmine Action, Final Report to Jersey Overseas Aid Commission, Liberia 2006 (internal document).
- ⁵ As the main international actor in Liberia, only the UN was given permission to handle politically and militarily sensitive issues and materials.
- ⁶ Key achievements for 2006, after one year of implementation, include the safe collection and disposal of over 50 assault rifles, 10,000 rounds of small arms ammunition (SAA) and over 150 items of unexploded ordnance (UXO).
- ⁷ The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee developed an analytical tool called the Armed Violence Lens, which captures the key elements and levels of armed violence, namely the people affected by armed violence, the agents of violence, the instruments used for violence and the wider institutional/cultural environment that enables and/or protects against violence.
- ⁸ "Life skills" refers to topics such as effective communication, conflict resolution, leadership and community organisation.
- ⁹ Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR) is the general term given to post-conflict activities that seek to disarm and ultimately reintegrate combatants into a peaceful, post-conflict society. However, different country-specific programmes will often adapt the name to reflect the particularities of the programme. In Liberia, the term "rehabilitation" was added to emphasize the programme's focus on providing ex-combatants with professional training to facilitate their re-entry into the legal economy.
- ¹⁰ This figure is often referred to as a high initial estimate by the Secretary-General. Other estimates place the figure somewhere between 10,000 and 15,000 core combatants involved in the conflict. For more information, see: James Brabazon, RIIA, London 02/2003. Liberia; Security Challenges, ICG, Brussels 11/2003.
- ¹¹ Thomas Jaye, "Transitional Justice and DDR: The case of Liberia," International Center for Transitional Justice, Research Brief, June 2009.
- ¹² NEPI has since changed its name to Network for Empowerment and Progress Initiatives.
- ¹³ AOA conducted an internal evaluation of participants in TATP's course one, but because an internal and external evaluation was only both available for course three, it was decided that, for comparative reasons, it would be best to only showcase the results of course three.
- ¹⁴ AOA warns that they believe that many of the graduates did not understand the notion of a monthly income. From analysing the data, it appears that a number of graduates may have been reporting their total income since the end of the course rather than a monthly income.
- ¹⁵ Attributing this as an impact of TATP is difficult since AOA does not know how many trainees were still in contact with their former commanders before the course.
- ¹⁶ These differences are, however, statistically insignificant.
- ¹⁷ AOA has also been developing separate initiatives which are not agriculture-based and specifically address the needs of women.

ANNEX 1 | DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Action on Armed Violence (AOAV), “Improving security, lives and livelihoods by breaking the cycle of violence,” AOAV Programme Briefing, May 2011

Jeannie Annan and Christopher Blattman, “Evaluating a Landmine Action ex-combatant reintegration program in Liberia,” Draft Baseline Report, Innovations for Poverty Action, Yale University, March 2010

Jeannie Annan and Christopher Blattman, “Reintegrating and Employing High Risk Youth in Liberia: Lessons from a randomized evaluation of a Landmine Action an agricultural training program for ex-combatants,” Innovations for Poverty Action, Yale University, December 2011

Landmine Action, Final Report to Jersey Overseas Aid Commission, Liberia 2006 (internal document)

Liberia Armed Violence Observatory (LAVO), “First report on progress,” December 2011

Melissa Fuerth, “An assessment of armed violence and insecurity in the Liberian capital,” Action on Armed Violence (AOAV), Monrovia, Liberia, June 2011

Nelson Alusula, “Disarmament, Demobilisation, Rehabilitation and Reintegration (DDRR) in Liberia,” Institute for Security Studies, South Africa, July 2008

Rob Deere and Chris Lang, “Report on Implementation of Tumutu Agricultural Training Project in Liberia: Course 1,” Landmine Action, May 2009

Steven Archibald, “Feasibility Study into the Rehabilitation & Reintegration of Unregistered Ex-Combatants Guthrie Rubber Plantation,” Landmine Action, December 2006

Thomas Jaye, “Transitional Justice and DDR: The case of Liberia,” International Center for Transitional Justice, Research Brief, June 2009

United Nations Security Council, Letter dated 6 December 2004 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1521 (2003) concerning Liberia addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/2004/955, 6 December 2004

William Hopkins, Laura Lindegaard and Umar Jalloh, “Tumutu Agricultural Training Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Report,” AOAV, November 2010

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

LMA TATP Reintegration Baseline Assessment Questionnaire for Individual Graduates						
Date of Interview		Name of Interviewer:		TATP ID:		
New Contact Info		Age: <input type="checkbox"/> Salala Resident <input type="checkbox"/> Longform ID		Sex of Graduate: 1. Male <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Female <input type="checkbox"/> Marital Status Code: _____		
Name of Graduate		Reintegration District: _____ Family/Sponsor Contact in community? 1) Yes 2) No				
Reintegration County:		Reintegration Community:		Tribe		
Reintegration Community:		Religion		Religion		
Did you move here to be with someone? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> Interviewee lives in a house. How many people live with you? _____ Adults _____ Children		<input type="checkbox"/> Interviewee lives in a compound/quarter/attached houses. How many people live with you? _____ Adults _____ Children		
If TATP graduate moved to this community to be with certain people, get demographic information and check the second left-hand column if the graduate moved here to be with this person. Get the basic demographic information of all the people the TATP Graduate lives with including, friends, relatives, spouse(s), children (do not need names of children, just adults), stranger family members in the household and any other TATP Graduates that the interviewee lives with in the same household.						
Moved here to be with	Name	Sex	Age	Relation to Graduate (write TATP Grad)	Tribe	Religion
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>		Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
What is your intended occupation in this community?					
Who is the main earner of your household and what is his/her occupation or main source of income for this household ?					
How much does this person earn in a month? (If not known in liberties/ US dollars, get an estimation in trade goods or crops harvested)					
How many times do you eat a meal (rice/ fufu & soup) a day?					
How many times does your household eat a meal (rice fufu & soup) per day?					
Have you had any alcoholic drinks since you have moved here? 1) Yes 2) No			If yes -How many alcoholic drinks do you drink in a week?		
Have you had marijuana or any other drugs since you have moved here? 1) Yes 2) No			If yes -What drugs have you taken and how many times have you used them since you have been here?		
Have you already spent some or all of your reintegration allowance? 1) Yes 2) No			If yes - How much have you spent and what did you buy with it?		

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

Items	# or Y/N	Items	# or Y/N	Items	# or Y/N	Items	# or Y/N
Pots: Eating Utensils:		Buckets: # of Rooms		Eating pans: Foam mattresses:		Tubs/ Gallons: Straw mattresses: Candles	
Wooden beds: Radios:		Bamboo beds: Wheelbarrows: Farming tools (cutlasses, scratching hoes, standing hoes, shovels, rakes, etc.):		Bicycles: Soap/ Dettol Poultry (chicken ducks, guinea fowl, geese):		Motorbikes: Torch/ flashlight Livestock (goats, pigs, sheep, rabbits, etc.):	
						Finished floor? Dirt floor? Does household have access to land How many football fields/acres? Held by deed? Communally held & passed through families?	Y / N Y / N Y / N Y / N Y / N Y / N

What type of roof do you have? Check major roofing material used when house has different materials in roof

1. Plastic Sheets	
2. Tatch/Palm Leaf	
3. Palm/Bamboo Mats	
7. Other (explain):	

What are the walls of your house made out of? Check major material used when house has different materials in walls

1. Plastic Sheets	
2. Tatch/Palm Leaf	
3. Palm/Bamboo Mats	
4. Mud / Clay	
5. Wood Planks	
6. Concrete / Brick	
Other (explain):	

What is your main source of drinking water?

Piped into dwelling		Household Hand-pump Well
Public tap/ Standing pipe		Public Hand-pump Well
Public Unprotected dug well		Household Unprotected Dug Well
Surface water creek/Stream/ River/ Lake		(Rain or Well) Water Tank
		Purchase small clear plastic bags
Tanker Truck		Bottled Water
Unprotected Spring Water		Cart with Jerry Cans
Other (explain):		

Read: First I am going to ask you some questions about the sources of conflict/ problems in your reintegration community

1. Please describe situations that are likely to produce violence/conflict in your community?

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>2. Since you have been here, what are the most common sources of conflict or palava in your new community? DO NOT READ ANSWERS & Please circle all that apply and have the respondents answer to what degree this source is a frequent source of conflict with 1 = one-time in a year, 2 = sometimes cause conflict and 3= frequently causes conflict</p> <p>1) Access to land ___ 2) Crop failure/ Food Security ___ 3) Unemployment ___ 4) Ethnic Discrimination ___ 5) Religious discrimination ___ 6) Political intolerance ___ 7) Ex-combatant returnees ___ 8) National Government corruption/ not accountable ___ 9) Local Government corruption/ not accountable ___ 10) Abuse from Elders/ Misuse of traditional authority ___ 11) Domestic violence- beating of women ___ 12) Domestic violence- child abuse ___ 13) Sexual & Gender Based Violence ___ 14) Rumors/ inaccurate information ___ 14) Alcohol/ drug abuse ___ 15) Crime- armed robbery, violent assault ___ 16) Crime - stealing from farms ___ 17) Crime - stealing from households 18) HIV/AIDS ___ 19) Other diseases & access to medical care ___ 20) Polygamy or unfaithfulness ___ 21) Polygamy - fighting over access to wives & husbands ___ 22) Other -Explain & rating: _____</p>	<p>Read: Now I am going to ask you some questions about security in your reintegration community</p> <p>3. Since you have been here, how would you rate on a scale of 1-4 the level of violence in your new community? 1) Not at all violent 2) Occasionally violent 3) Somewhat violent 4) Very violent</p>	<p>4. Since you have arrived here, how safe do you feel in this community? 1) I feel safe 2) I feel Somewhat safe 3) I do not feel safe at all 4) Don't know/ No strong opinion</p>
<p>5. Have there been any violent incidents recorded in your community since you have arrived here? 1) Yes 2) No -If yes - How many beatings or fights with fists? ___ How many beatings of children? ___ How many beatings of women? ___ How many rapes or sexual assaults? ___ How many violent acts with knives? ___ How many violent acts with cutlasses? ___ How many violent acts with guns? ___ How many violent acts with another weapon? Describe and # of incidents: _____</p>	<p>6. Have you encountered any problems in this village like people being hostile to you since you have come here from graduation? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>7. If Yes to Previous question - What was the source of tension/hostility that you encountered when returning to this community? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS and please circle & rank one answer on a scale of 1-3 with 1 representing the most important source of hostility and 2 being somewhat of a source for hostility and 3 being the least important source of hostility 1) Discrimination by military/police/UNMIL ___ 2) Discrimination by local authorities-LRDC, Justice of the Peace, etc. ___ 3) Discrimination from traditional authorities -Elders/Chiefs & their family ___</p>
<p>8. Can you describe what happened to make you feel threatened by them (ask about all the threats that apply)?</p>		

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>members _____</p> <p>4) Discrimination from community members _____</p> <p>5) Graduate's own family resistance _____</p> <p>6) If other please describe & rank _____</p>	
<p>9. Since you have come here, anyone abused or threatened your child, spouse or other member of your household?</p> <p>1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>If Yes- Did you report it? 1) Yes 2) No</p> <p>If No - Why not?</p> <p>If Reported - Did this have an effect? If Yes, what was the effect?</p> <p>If Yes- Who did you report it to? 1) Yes 2) No 3) Other - Explain:</p>
<p>10. Since you have come here, has someone threatened you?</p> <p>1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>If Yes- Did you report it? 1) Yes 2) No</p> <p>If No - Why not?</p> <p>If Reported - Did this have an effect? If Yes, what was the effect?</p> <p>If Yes- Who did you report it to? 1) Yes 2) No 3) Other - Explain:</p>
<p>11. Since you have come here, has someone beat you or abused you?</p> <p>1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>If Yes- Did you report it? 1) Yes 2) No</p> <p>If No - Why not?</p> <p>If Reported - Did this have an effect? If Yes, what was the effect?</p> <p>If Yes- Who did you report it to? 1) Yes 2) No 3) Other - Explain:</p>
<p>12. Since you have come here, have there been problems of violence in your household?</p> <p>1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>If Yes- Did you report it? 1) Yes 2) No</p> <p>If No - Why not?</p> <p>If Reported - Did this have an effect? If Yes, what was the effect?</p> <p>If Yes- Who did you report it to? 1) Yes 2) No 3) Other - Explain:</p>
<p>13. Since you have come here, has anyone stolen any</p>	<p>If Yes- Did you report it? 1) Yes 2) No</p> <p>If No - Why not?</p> <p>If Reported - Did this have an effect? If Yes, what was the effect?</p> <p>If Yes- Who did you report it to? 1) Yes 2) No 3) Other - Explain:</p>

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

livestock/chickens or crops from your farm? 1) Yes 2) No	If Reported - Did this have an effect? If Yes , what was the effect? 1) Yes 2) No	1) Yes 2) No 3) Other - Explain:
14. Since you have come here, has anyone stolen any farming supplies from you? 1) Yes 2) No	If Yes - Did you report it? 1) Yes 2) No If No - Why not? If Reported - Did this have an effect? If Yes , what was the effect?	If Yes - Who did you report it to? 1) Yes 2) No 3) Other - Explain:
Read: I know you have been here only a short time but please answer any of the following questions that you can about how this community solves problems between the people here		
15. How are conflicts resolved in your community? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS 1) Through violence/ force/ intimidation (strongest man wins) 2) Through traditional mediation 3) Through traditional dialogue 4) Through traditional ceremonies 5) LNP /UNMIL /UNPOL intervention 6) Courts/ Justice of the Peace decides 7) District Commissioner or representatives decide 8) Chiefs & Elders decide 9) Other - Describe how:	16. Who or what institution(s) are responsible for resolving conflict in your reintegration community? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS 1) Government ministries 2) District Commissioner & representatives 3) LNP/UNMIL /UNPOL 4) Community organisations/ professional associations 5) Local chiefs/ traditional authorities 6) Community elders 7) Women in the community 8) I do not know yet 9) Other - Describe who/what:	
17. Can you describe to me the process for solving problems that confront your reintegration community?		

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>18. What is the role of women in this process for solving problems that confront your reintegration community? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS Please circle one:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No role 2) Small role/ Only resolve domestic problems 3) Advise chiefs & elders on what the issues are 4) Play major role 5) Other -Describe: 	<p>19. What is the role of youth in this process for solving problems that confront your reintegration community? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS Please circle one:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No role 2) Small role 3) Youth groups/ leaders are consulted by the chiefs/ elders on what the issues are 4) Play major role 5) Other -Describe: 	<p>20. Do you think of the LNP/ UNPOL/ UNMIL as a means to ensure community security or do they represent a threat to security? THE ANSWERS REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They help ensure security/ They make me feel safe 2) They are a source of insecurity/ I am afraid of them 3)) Other -Describe:
<p>21. How does someone become a Town Chief in this community? 1) They are elected by the people here 2) They are elected by the Board of elders 3) Hereditary – a man becomes the chief after his father/ uncle/ patron passes away 4) I don't know 5) Other- explain:</p>	<p>22. How does someone become a member of the Board of Elders in this community? 1) They are elected by the people here 2) They are elected by current members of the Board of elders 3) They are elected by the people here when a member passes away 4) They are elected by current members of the Board of elders when a member passes away 5) The town chief selects them 6) I don't know 7) Other- explain:</p>	<p>23. Since you have lived here, have you been fined by the community leaders or have you been made to do free labor for someone in this community by the community leaders? 1) Yes 2) No 3) Other- Explain:</p>
<p>24. If Yes to the previous question: Why were you fined or made to do free labor for? What did you do? Who did you do it to? How was your sentence decided and by whom? Did you have a chance to defend yourself? What does your sentence include?</p>	<p>25. How would you describe the relationships between yourself and the Town Chief and the Board of Elders? 1) They make fair decisions and I appreciate their work 2) I do not agree with them sometimes but they are in charge 3) The people here do not agree with them sometimes but they are in charge 4) The people here do not agree with them all the time but they are in charge</p>	<p>26. How would you describe the relationships between yourself and the local government authorities (such as the Plantation authorities or the County superintendent/ District Commissioner and their representatives)? 1) They listen to me/us and meet my/our needs 2) They welcomed us back home</p>

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

		<p>3) They have ignored me/us since I/we got here</p> <p>4) Other - Explain:</p>
<p>5) They misuse their authority and fine the people here for any little thing and then get free labor from us</p> <p>6) Other - Explain:</p>	<p>29. Did the people here do something to welcome/ reconcile you with the community?</p> <p>1) Yes</p> <p>2) No</p> <p>3) Don't know</p> <p>IF Yes- What did they do to welcome you?</p>	<p>32. Are you confident that you will be able to stay here for your life if you choose?</p> <p>Please circle one:</p> <p>1) Confident</p> <p>2) Somewhat confident</p> <p>3) Not confident</p> <p>4) Don't know</p>
<p>27. How do you think people are treating you in your new community so far?</p> <p>1) Good</p> <p>2) Fine</p> <p>3) So-so</p> <p>4) Bad</p> <p>5) Other - Explain:</p>	<p>28. How do you think people in your new community see you (perceive you) so far?</p> <p>1) Good</p> <p>2) Fine</p> <p>3) So-so</p> <p>4) Bad</p> <p>5) Other - Explain:</p>	<p>31. Are you confident that you will be fully reintegrated and reconciled with this community?</p> <p>Please circle one:</p> <p>1) Confident</p> <p>2) Somewhat confident</p> <p>3) Not confident</p> <p>4) Don't know</p>
<p>30. If No to previous question: Are the people here planning to do something to welcome/ reconcile you with the people here?</p> <p>1) Yes</p> <p>2) No</p> <p>3) Don't know</p>	<p>READ: Now I would like to ask your opinions about relations between people. In particular, I would like to ask you how you think people should react in certain situations.</p>	
<p>33. If a man insulted your neighbor, would it be acceptable for your neighbor to seriously beat him?</p> <p>1) Yes</p> <p>2) No</p>	<p>34. If YES to Previous question: Would you yourself do the same in this situation?</p> <p>1) Yes</p> <p>2) No</p>	<p>35. If a man was caught stealing from one of your neighbors, would it be acceptable for your neighbor to seriously beat him?</p> <p>1) Yes</p> <p>2) No</p>
		<p>36. If YES to Previous question: Would you yourself do the same in this situation?</p> <p>1) Yes</p> <p>2) No</p>

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>37. If a man's wife were to burn his supper, would it be acceptable for him to beat her? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>38. If YES to Previous question: Would you yourself do the same in this situation? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>39. If a man's wife were to argue with him or talk back, would it be acceptable for him to beat her? 1) Yes 2) No</p>
<p>40. If YES to Previous question: Would you yourself do the same in this situation? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>41. If a man wants a woman sexually and she refuses him/ says no to him - is it alright for him to take her anyways? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>42. If YES to Previous question: Would you yourself do the same in this situation? 1) Yes 2) No</p>
<p>Read: Now I am going to ask you some questions about how you have been getting along with the people here.</p>		
<p>43. Since you have come here, have you encountered a problem/ argument here that you were tempted to settle by force? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>44. If yes to previous question - Who was involved and why did you feel the need to use force? What happened? How did you handle this problem?</p>	
<p>45. Have you been involved in a physical fight since you have been here? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>46. If Yes to previous questions - Who was involved and why did you feel the need to use force? What happened?</p>	
<p>47. If Yes to previous questions - get the level of violence and # of violent incidents- Did you use: 1) fists____ 2) knives____ 3) cutlasses____ 4) guns____ 5) Other – Explain & get number:</p>		

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>48. If Yes to previous questions- ask: What and who made you become violent? REMEMBER - DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) I was insulted by _____ 2) I was threatened by _____ 3) I was beaten by _____ 4) My friend/ spouse relative/ child was threatened or beaten by _____ 5) Someone stole from me and I think it was _____ 6) Other – Describe: _____ 	<p>49. Since you have come here, have you been involved in a crime (stealing, assault, rape murder, stabbing, etc)?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes 2) No 	<p>50. If Yes to previous question - What was the crime? What was your role in this crime? Why did you do this?</p>
<p>51. When did you have the greatest sense of social belonging? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Here and now in this community 2) At Tumutu during training 3) At Tumutu day of / week of graduation 3) Where I was living before I went to Tumutu 4) Other - Describe: _____ 	<p>52. Do you ever share a meal with community members other than other TATP Graduates or your relatives and members of your household?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes 2) No <p>-If Yes- How many times in a month/ week? _____</p>	<p>53. Do you attend religious services or traditional ceremonies/ events with other community members?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes 2) No <p>-If Yes - How many times in a week/month? _____</p>
<p>54. Do community members other than relatives/ members of your household or other TATP Graduates let you (or your spouse) watch their children?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes 2) No <p>-If Yes - How many times in a week/month? _____</p>	<p>55. If you have children, do you let community members other than your relatives/ members of your household/ other TATP Graduates watch your children?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes 2) No 3) N/A <p>-If Yes - How many times in a week/ month? _____</p>	<p>56. Who do you spend the most time with? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Other TATP Graduates in the community 2) Other Ex-combatants who did not go to Tumutu for training 3) Friends in another town (like Monrovia) 4) Friends here 5) Family here in this community 5) Family in another town 6) My spouse & children here 7) My spouse & children in another town 8) I am mostly by myself 9) Other – Explain: _____

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>57. When you are not busy working in the household or on your farming, how do you spend your free time? Who do you spend it with? What do you do together or alone? Where do you go?</p>	<p>58. Are you currently a member, participant or a volunteer for groups/ activities in your reintegration community? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS & Circle whatever applies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) drama, choir, or dance club 2) farmers group or cooperative 3) water committee 4) church, prayer or bible study group 5) school committee (Parent Teacher Association- PTA) or school clubs 6) sports team 7) volunteers for an NGO/clinic 8) Public community meetings/events 9) Youth Group 10) Women's group 11) Mens Group 12) Traditional societies 13) A susu (an association in which the members make rotating withdrawals but no interest is involved) 14) A kuu (an association in which people join together to labor together on projects) 15) TATP Collective 16) N/A 17) If other activities/ groups - Describe:
<p>59. If interviewee belongs to a community group ask the next 6 questions: How many times in a week/month do you meet?</p>	<p>60. Of the groups that you are a part of, which group do you feel the closest to? (Use the number)</p> <p>61. Do you feel like you are a valued member of the group?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes 2) No 3) Don't know 4) Other - Explain:

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

	<p>64. Since you have been here and joined this group, have you had trouble getting along with the others in this group often, sometimes, or almost never?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Often 2) Sometimes 3) Never 4) Other - Explain: 	<p>67. What illnesses have you suffered from since you have lived here? Please circle all that apply & have the respondent rate them according to how often people in his/her household suffer from that illness:</p> <p>1 = one-time in a year we will suffer from this 2 = sometimes we are suffering from this 3 = suffering from this all the time</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Malaria _____ 2) Typhoid _____ 3) Tuberculosis _____ 3) Yellow Fever _____ 4) Dysentery _____ 5) Colds/ Fevers _____ 6) HIV/ AIDS _____ 7) Other STDs _____ 8) Other illnesses - Explain & Rate: _____
	<p>63. Do you consider the others in the group to be like your brothers and sisters very much, somewhat, or not at all?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Very much 2) Somewhat 3) We are getting to know another now 4) They do not accept me at all 5) Other - Explain: 	<p>66. If Yes to previous question-Can you join these public events or access these public resources? REMEMBER -DO Not Read ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes I am welcome to join 2) I am uncomfortable with the others in this community in those situations 3) I have been told I am not welcome and I can not join in 4) Other - Explain:
<p>62. Do you feel that people in this group understand you a lot, somewhat, or not at all?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes they understand me 2) They understand me somewhat 3) They do not understand me at all 4) Don't know 5) Other - Explain: 	<p>65. In this community is there any form of public entertainment?</p> <p>REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Shared radio 2) Shared television 3) Public drama or musical performances 4) Other - Explain: 	

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>68. What medical services do you have access to here? Please circle all that apply REMEMBER -DO Not Read THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Basic clinic (plantation clinics) 2) hospital in _____ (name of town) 3) traditional healers 3) traditional midwife 5) NGO or missionary clinic in _____ (name of community) 6) NGO or missionary clinic in _____ (name of community) occasionally 7) Other - Explain: 	<p>69. Is this medical service better or worse than the medical service you had before you came to Tumutu for training? 1) Better 2) Worse 3) About the same 4) Other - Explain:</p>	<p>70. Is this medical service better or worse than the medical treatment you received at Tumutu? 1) Better 2) Worse 3) About the same 4) Other - Explain:</p>
<p>71. Are the children & the young people here able to go to school? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes 2) No because it is too expensive for most to go 3) No because it is affordable but you have to travel far 4) No because it is too expensive and you have to travel far 5) Most of the children & the young people are working too hard right now 6) Other - Explain: 	<p>72. Where are people in this community able to attend school around here? 1) There is a school of grades _____ here 2) There is a school of grades _____ about _____ minutes/ hours walking distance away in _____ (name of community)</p>	
<p>73. Do you wish to go back to school? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes 2) No 3) Maybe in the future 4) I am working too hard right now 5) Other - Explain: 	<p>74. If Yes to previous question- Is there a school here or nearby that you would like to attend? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>75. If yes to previous question- Have you signed up to go to school there? 1) Yes 2) No</p>
<p>76. If No to previous question - What has prevented you from attending school here? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Lack of funds 2) Too far to travel there 	<p>77. Who do you rely on when you are flat? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Parents 	<p>78. Is this person or group of persons reliable? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Always willing to help

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>3) School officials refused to let me register 4) I was threatened by others in the community when I tried to register/ said I wanted to go back to school 4) I do not feel welcome even though no one in particular threatened or abused me about going to school 5) Other - Explain:</p>	<p>2) Spouse(s) 3) My relatives 4) Relatives of my spouse(s) 5) Community elders 6) Local chiefs 7) Friends in this community 8) Friends who lives elsewhere 9) Other TATP Graduates 10) Myself 11) Other - Explain:</p>	<p>2) Can help me small small 3) I can not get help from them 4) N/A 5) Other - Explain:</p>
79. What types of work do you do here to generate funds when you are flat? How much can you earn from each type of work?		
<p>80. Have you had access to support for your farming? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>81. If Yes to previous question- Who or what organization has given you support? REMEMBER - DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS 1) Family 2) Friends here in community 3) Other TATP Graduates 4) Government Ministry (MoA, Ministry of Internal Affairs, Development extension workers etc.) 5) Local Government officials (through District Commissioner) 6) Other - Explain:</p>	<p>82. If Yes to #68- What type of support have you received? REMEMBER - DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS 1) Tools/ tool repair 2) Seeds, fertilizers and pesticides, etc. 3) Technical advice 4) They labored with me on my land 5) Other - Explain:</p>
<p>83. If Yes to #68- If you are getting agricultural support, are you confident that is enough for you to be a successful farmer? 1) Confident 2) Somewhat confident 3) Not Confident 4) Other - Explain:</p>	<p>84. Will you be successful without that support? 1) Yes 2) No Why or why not?</p>	
<p>85. Have you offered to share your learning about agriculture with anyone here? 1) Yes 2) No 3) Not yet but I plan to do so</p>	<p>86. If Yes to previous question - What did you share with them? (Describe):</p>	

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>4) I am keeping to myself 5) Other - Explain:</p>	
<p>87. Are planning to share this knowledge with more people? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>88. Why or why not?</p>
<p>89. If you share this learning how do you think it will affect your standing in the community? REMEMBER - DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS 1) I will become a leader here through sharing my new skills 2) I will be seen as a valued member of this community 3) More people here will begin to trust me 4) It will not have a positive or negative effect either way 5) It will just make people jealous & resentful so I am trying not call attention to myself 5) Other Explain:</p>	<p>The Following Questions are for TATP Graduates who live in Collectives Only. Please skip this section if you the respondent is reintegrating as an individual</p> <p>90. Has your collective been making decisions as a group (collectively) so far? 1) Yes 2) No 3) We have not made any decisions yet 4) Other - Explain:</p> <p>91. How do you & your brothers/ sisters in your collective make decisions that affect all of you and your work?</p>
<p>92. Are you satisfied with this process? 1) Yes 2) No Why or why not?</p>	<p>93. If No to previous question - What effort will you make to improve this process?</p> <p>94. How would you describe the quality of your relationship with your brothers & sisters in your collective? 1) We get along and work together well 2) We are having problems but we are trying small 3) We have plenty plenty problems so far and it is not easy 4) We are angry at each other all the time, I want to leave the collective 5) Other - Explain:</p>

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>95. Have you sat down together and created agreed on rules for your group?</p> <p>1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>96. If No to previous question - Have you discussed doing this together?</p> <p>1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>97. If No to previous question - Have you suggested making these guidelines to your brothers/ sisters?</p> <p>1) Yes 2) No</p>
<p>98. Do you think having rules you all agree on will help you to live peacefully together?</p> <p>1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>99. Why or why not?</p>	<p>Do Not Read Out Loud: The next seven questions are similar to the questions on the long-form questionnaire about the respondent's motivation to fight. Try to word these questions differently from when you were doing longform to get fresh answers.</p>
<p>100. Do you see yourself as becoming a fighter again?</p> <p>1) Yes 2) No 3) Not sure</p>	<p>101. If you fought in other wars and now say you would not fight again, what is different today? - Explain:</p>	<p>102. If interviewee does not want to fight again - why not? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <p>1) Tired of war; your attitude has changed 2) You did not get any material benefit 3) New responsibilities (family) 4) Current ownership of property or expected ownership of property 5) Other - Explain:</p>
<p>103. If respondent says he/she would fight again ask why? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <p>1) Living by the gun is easier and more fun 2) To make money - loot & steal 3) Fighting gets you power over others and your own life 4)Other -Explain:</p>	<p>104. When did you feel the safest in your life? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <p>1) When I was with my Faction/ Battalion during the Civil war (1989-1997) 2) When I was with my Faction Battalion during the Insurgency (2000-2003)</p>	<p>105. When did you feel the greatest sense of social belonging? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <p>1) When I was with my Faction/ Battalion during the Civil war (1989-1997) 2) When I was with my Faction Battalion during the Insurgency (2000-2003) 3) When I was with my friends from my</p>

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>106. What time in your life do you think that you possessed greater power to determine your own fate (When you got to do what you want to do)?</p> <p>REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) When I was with my Faction/ Battalion during the Civil war (1989-1997) 2) When I was with my Faction Battalion during the Insurgency (2000-2003) 3) When I was with my friends from my Faction/ Battalion after the war ended (2003/2004 until respondent came to Tumutu- on Guthrie for Guthrie respondents) 4) In Tumutu during the TATP 5) In this community now 6) Other - Explain: 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) When I was with my Faction/ Battalion after the war ended (2003/2004 until respondent came to Tumutu- on Guthrie for Guthrie respondents) 4) In Tumutu during the TATP 5) In this community now 6) Other - Explain: 	<p>Faction/ Battalion after the war ended (2003/2004 until respondent came to Tumutu- on Guthrie for Guthrie respondents)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) In Tumutu during the TATP 5) In this community now 6) Other - Explain:
<p>Read: Now I am going to ask you some questions about how you are doing with your farming and finding a livelihood</p>	<p>107. Do you have access to land here yet?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Yes 2) No 3) I have been promised land but have not been given access yet 4) N/A - I do not need land for my chosen profession which is: _____ 5) Other - Explain: 	<p>108. If Yes to previous question - How did you get access to the land?</p> <p>REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) From family 2) From local Chiefs 3) From local Government officials 4) From Government ministry (MoA) 5) Took it for myself 6) My brothers/ sisters and I (in a TATP Collective) took land for ourselves 7) Other - Explain:
<p>109. If you have access to land, what is the quality of land that you have access to? REMEMBER -DO NOT READ THE ANSWERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) good for my chosen agricultural profession 2) adequate for my chosen agricultural profession 3) Will be difficult for me to produce/ harvest from this land with my chosen agricultural profession 4) It will be impossible for me to produce/harvest from this land with my chosen agricultural profession 5) Other - Explain: 	<p>110. Please have the respondent describe in detail:</p> <p><u>Why</u> is this land suitable / not suitable to grow or raise <u>what</u> you want to farm?</p>	<p>111. If you have land- How much have you been given access to (in acres/ football fields)?</p>
<p>112. If you have been given access to land - ask: Do you now own this land, is it owned by your family or has someone allowed you use it for a while?</p>	<p>113. If the respondent does not own the land he/she has been given access to - ask: How long can you expect to be able to use</p>	<p>114. If the respondent has not been given access to land and they need it for their chosen professions ask: Why do you think you have not gained access to land in this community yet?</p>

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

	this land?	
<p>115. If the respondent has not been given access to land and they need it for their chosen professions ask: Do you think you will eventually get access to land in this community? 1) Yes 2) No 3) Don't know</p>	<p>116. If respondent does not own their own land ask: Do you intend to own your own land someday?</p>	<p>117. If respondent does not own their own land and intends to -ask: A. How will you generate enough income to save up to buy your own land? B. How long do you think it will be until you own your own land?</p>
<p>118. Before you went for training at Tumutu, how well off do you think you were compared to most other people in your village/ camp/ town? 1) I was well off 2) I was living comfortably enough 3) I was poor 4) I was very poor</p>	<p>119. I know it has been a short time, but since you have come to this community, but have you been able to generate any income in wages/ money since you have come here? 1) Yes 2) No - If Yes - How much money have you earned since you arrived here? Liberties/ US Dollars How have you earned this money?</p>	<p>120. I know it has been a short time, but since you have come here, but have you been able to generate any income in trade goods since you have come here? 1) Yes 2) No -If Yes - What /how much in trade goods have you earned since you arrived here?</p>
<p>121. Now that you have moved here, how do you think you sustain yourself compared to most of the people in your village? 1) I am well off 2) I am living comfortably enough 3) I am poor 4) I am very poor</p>		<p>122. I know it has been a short time since you have come here, but have you been able to raise any crops or animals since you have been here? 1) Yes 2) No -If Yes - What have you raised or grown so far?</p>
<p>123. Are you currently dependent on a relative or another to have a place to live right now? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>124. If Yes to previous question - ask: Do you intend to become independent of this person? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>125. Do you own your own home? 1) Yes 2) No 126. If No to previous question - Do you intend to have your own home? 1) Yes 2) No</p>

ANNEX 2 | BASELINE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL GRADUATES

<p>127. If Yes to the previous question-ask: Are you saving any money so you can have your own home someday? 1) Yes 2) No</p>	<p>128. If Yes to the previous question-ask: How much are you able to save in a month?</p>	<p>129. If Yes to the previous-ask: How long do you think it will take you to own your own home someday?</p>
<p>130. Do you think you will continue with the profession you chose at Tumutu? 1) Yes 2) No</p>		
<p>131. Why or why not?</p>		
<p>132. What types of other jobs or opportunities have you found to be available here?</p>		
<p>Read: Thanks for letting us check on how you are doing today. We will be interviewing you again soon.</p>		

NOTES



**Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
Centre International de Déminage Humanitaire | Genève**

7bis, av. de la Paix | P.O. Box 1300 | 1211 Geneva 1 | Switzerland
t. + 41 (0)22 906 16 60 | f. + 41 (0)22 906 16 90
info@gichd.org | www.gichd.org