

# **Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilisation and Reintegration Project (SEDRP – P112712)**

## **Payment Verification Survey 2014**

**November 11<sup>th</sup> 2015**



Physical Address  
P.O BOX 7227  
Remera Kigali  
Tel:+ 250587159



This report was prepared by independent consultants. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this report are entirely those of the authors and based on independently acquired, validated and analyzed data. They do not necessarily represent the views of the RDRC. Do not reproduce without the RDRC and the author's permission.

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

RDF	Armed Force
AG	Armed Group
AF	Additional Financing
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CBR	Community Based Reintegration
CCI	Cross Cutting Issue
CPS	Country Partnership Strategy
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DDR	Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration
EA	Environmental Assessment
EDRP	Emergency Demobilisation and Reintegration Programme
EDPRS	Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
ERM	Environmental Risk Management
ESMF	Environmental and Social Management Framework
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
FDG	Focus Group Discussion
FMFA	Financial Management Framework Agreement
FARG	Fund for the Support of Genocide Survivors
FPP	Final Project Proposal
GoR	Government of Rwanda
HQ	Head Quarters
IA	Implementing Agency
IGA	Income Generating Activities
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IPP	Initial Project Proposal
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau
KII	Key Informant Interview
LODA	Local Administrative Entities Development Agency
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MIC	Middle Income Country
MINALOC	Ministry of Local Government (Rwanda)
MIS	Management Information System
MoD	Ministry of Defense
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NCPD	National Council for Persons with Disabilities
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OP/BP	Operational Policy / Bank Procedures
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PIM	Project Implementation Manual
PIP	Project Implementation Plan
PMU	Project Management Unit
PNDDR	Programme National de Désarmement, Démobilisation et Réintégration
RDF	Rwandan Defense Force
RDRC	Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Commission
RDRP	Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Programme
RFQ	Request for Quotations

SC	Steering Committee
SEDRP	Second Emergency Demobilisation and Reintegration Programme
SPIP	Social Protection Implementation in Planning
SSR	Security Sector Reform
TA	Technical Assistance
TDRP	Transitional Demobilization and Reintegration Program
TL	Team Leader
TOR	Terms of Reference
TT	Task Team
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNMISS	United Nations Mission to South Sudan
VOIP	Voice Over Internet Protocol
WB	World Bank

## Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	v
Table of Figures.....	vi
Note on Terminology.....	vii
Executive Summary.....	viii
ii. Summary of Findings.....	ix
ii(a). Expectations Prior to Demobilization.....	ix
ii(b). Demobilization Center Experience.....	ix
ii(c). Return, Reinsertion and Reintegration.....	x
ii(d). Basic Needs Kit (BNK).....	xi
ii(e). Recognition of Service Allowance (RSA).....	xi
ii(f). Reintegration Grant (RG).....	xii
ii(g). Vulnerability Support Window (VSW).....	xii
ii(h). Support to Form a Cooperative or Association.....	xiv
ii(i). Reinsertion Kits (RK).....	xiv
iii. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	xv
1. Background to the Project and the Study.....	1
1.5. Purpose of the Payment Verification Study.....	2
1.6. Methodology.....	2
1.7. Limitations and Challenges.....	3
1.8. Demographics.....	4
2.1. Expectations prior to Demobilization.....	6
2.2. Demobilization Center Experience.....	6
2.3. PDOP (and mini-PDOP where relevant).....	7
2.4. Training: Literacy (Language) and Numeracy.....	8
3. Return, Reinsertion and Reintegration.....	10
3.1. Basic Needs Kit (BNK): received by Ex-RDF and Ex-AG.....	12
3.2. Recognition of Service Allowance (RSA): received by Ex-RDF.....	13
3.3. Re-integration Grant (RG).....	14
3.4. Vulnerability Support Window (VSW): received by Ex-RDF and Ex-AG.....	16
3.4.1. Use of the Vulnerability Support Window (VSW) support.....	18
3.5. Support to Form a Cooperative or Association.....	21
3.5.1. Training for Cooperatives.....	21
3.5.2. Learning Tours.....	22
3.5.3. Project Competitions.....	22
3.6. Reinsertion Kit (RK) for Ex-AGs and dependents.....	23
Annex 1. Survey Form.....	24
Annex 2. Documents Reviewed (all studies).....	52

## Table of Figures

Table 1 - Distribution of the sample: Category of ex-combatant by Survey area .....	3
Table 2 - Demographics of respondents .....	4
Table 3 - District (place) of reintegration by Category of beneficiary .....	10
Table 4 - Type of benefit received by Category of beneficiary .....	11
Table 5 - Reintegration option / RG spent on *by* Category of beneficiary .....	14
Table 6 - Actual sub-project RG used on byCategory of respondent.....	15
Table 7 - Relevant issues at time of award by Category of respondent .....	18
Table 8. Vocation/Apprenticeship trained in or IGA supported under VSW by category of beneficiary .....	19
Table 9 - Participation in cooperatives training or touring *by* Category of beneficiary .....	21
Table 10 - THK contents received *by* Category of beneficiary.....	24

## **Note on Terminology**

**Eligibility** in the report is self-reported eligibility in response to the questions posed in the PVS survey.

## Executive Summary

1. The January 2013-June 2014 Payment Verification Study (PVS) verifies allocation and disbursement of payments and benefits under the Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (SEDRP) based on the feedback provided by a sample of ex-combatants from Rwandan Defense Force (RDF) and Armed Groups (AGs) of Rwandan origin who have programmed through Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) during the SEDRP since 2009.
2. The original grant of SDR 5.2 million (US\$8.0 million equivalent) for the Second Demobilization and Reintegration Project (SEDRP) was approved on August 27, 2009, and became effective on June 9, 2010. The original project is co-financed by (i) a US\$2 million government counterpart contribution, (ii) a co-financing single-purpose, single-country MDTF grant which became effective on January 5, 2011 for US\$ 4.6 million, and (iii) a second co-financing single-purpose, single-country MDTF grant which became effective on January 5, 2011 for US\$ 4.5 million.
3. A first Additional Financing (AF) for US\$2.3 million using the balance of the co-financing MDTF was signed on December 30, 2013. The US\$2.3 million additional financing was processed separately from the trust fund for IDA, to ensure continuation of the program beyond December 31, 2013, and extend the project until June 30, 2014. A second additional financing in the form of a US\$8.9 million IDA Credit was approved on April 30, 2014, with a June 30, 2016 closing date. Subsequently, the co-financing MDTF (Sweden, the Netherlands) was extended until June 30, 2016 in order to match the project's closing date. In addition, Sweden contributed an additional US\$2 million in two installments (January 2015 and January 2016) to be split between a RETF and BETF through a Grant Agreement dated March 6, 2015.
4. While not directly relevant to the period, it is important to note that both the IDA Credit and the co-financing MDTF have been extended respectively until December 31, 2017, and June 30, 2018. The project new closing date is thus December 31, 2017.
5. The rationale for the original grant was to support the third phase of the GoR "programme of assistance to transition of former combatants and government soldiers to a civilian life that was originally launched in 1997 after the genocide".<sup>1</sup> This 'third phase' sought to support the demobilization of 5,500 members of the Rwandan Armed Groups (AGs) including 500 child soldiers and 4,000 members of the Rwanda Defense Forces (RDF) as well as the return of approximately 10,000 family members of AGs and to deliver reintegration assistance to 400 ex-combatants left over from the second phase.
6. The Additional Financing has been intended to support the efforts of the GoR to facilitate the long-term peaceful reintegration of ex-AG members (except for those accused of genocide crimes) into civilian life. The rationale for the second Additional Financing has been to consolidate the results of the SEDRP. Essentially the Additional Financing is intended to target the "return of members of AGs from eastern DRC to Rwanda", namely the then estimated 1,200 Forces Démocratiques pour la Libération du Rwanda (FDLR) combatants.<sup>2</sup> The FDLR in

---

<sup>1</sup> World Bank, 2009: 1.

<sup>2</sup> World Bank, 2014: 2.

Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) are considered “an on going destabilizing factor in the region” and so the “repatriation of remaining members of [AGs] in eastern DRC is ... a vital and unmet objective of the GoR.”<sup>3</sup> Targeting AGs in DRC was to include “scaling the SEDRP” to include extended demobilization and reintegration services for the predicted incoming cohort which at the time of evaluation has not yet fully materialized.

## **ii. Summary of Findings**

7. Overall, the PVS finds that the majority of eligible beneficiaries surveyed in this study confirmed that received their intended benefits and, in most cases, such individuals were satisfied with what they received and felt that the benefits contributed significantly to improving their social and economic reintegration.

8. The PVS finds that there appears to be a high degree of equity in provision across the various benefit packages and demographic subgroups (the strata) in the sample.

9. The PVS finds that respondents feel positive regarding skills, information, and training received during the SEDRP. They are least positive regarding post-training follow-up and support and with the quality of toolkits provided under the project. Generally, respondents voiced ‘mixed feelings’ regarding aspects of the financial assistance provided through the SEDRP.

### **ii(a). Expectations Prior to Demobilization**

10. The PVS finds that respondents reported having modest expectations prior to arriving at the demobilization center, with over half (53.1 percent) expecting to acquire vocational skills but with fewer beneficiaries expecting to learn business (38.2 percent) or agricultural (26.2 percent) skills. Expectations were lower regarding material support with only a third expecting to receive a toolkit (32.7 percent) and/or additional money (30.5 percent), and little else. Generally, expectations were highest among youth and lowest among older recipients. Yet, there appears to be no evidence that these contrasting expectations correlate to benefit provision rates across the various age groups.

### **ii(b). Demobilization Center Experience**

11. The PVS finds that despite (or perhaps owing to) low expectations, actual demobilization center experiences were generally positive, with noticeably higher praise given for the non-material support than the material assistance provided. Most of the respondents reported participating in the critical aspects of the experience: verification and registration (97.2 percent), pre-demobilization orientation (93.4 percent), HIV/AIDS counseling (92.8 percent), and medical screening (84.0 percent) and treatment (73.9 percent) and psychosocial screening/treatment (77.6 percent).

12. However, the PVS finds that the reported rate of receipt for essential items was generally much lower: demobilization ID card issuance (86.8 percent), discharge letter (70.9 percent),

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

blanket (54.9 percent), soap (53.3 percent), sleeping mat (43.4 percent), and medicine (32.0 percent). Ex-RDF respondents reported the lowest numbers (74.8 percent of Ex-RDF received the demobilization ID card; 62.2 percent received the discharge letter; 10.3 percent, blanket; 17.6, soap; 10.4 percent, sleeping mat; 21.4 percent, medicine).<sup>4</sup>

13. The PVS finds that for respondents the most frequently cited aspects of the Reception Centre in need of improvement were medical care services (37.2 percent) and housing and accommodation (36.0 percent).

14. DDR project beneficiaries took part in the Pre-Discharge Orientation Program (PDOP) at the demobilization center. The PVS finds that nearly all respondents received information on social opportunities, the RDRP, public sector services, civic rights, duties and responsibilities, and NGOs offering services to ex-combatants. Between 85 percent and 93 percent of respondents received additional information on HIV/AIDS, sexual/reproductive health, cooperatives, banking, and economic opportunities in their community.

15. Feedback on the PDOP was largely positive with 85.2 percent of PDOP participants feeling satisfied or very satisfied with the information sessions, and similar percentages reporting satisfaction with the trainings.

16. The PVS finds that the majority of respondents reported having used what they learned in the PDOP, with 49.2 percent reporting having already used their knowledge and skills to a large or very large extent, and 33.1 percent to an 'average extent.'

17. Less than 25 percent of respondents reported attending numeracy or literacy trainings, a service that only applies to those with no literacy and numeracy skills; 94.3 percent who attended the numeracy trainings and 94.5 percent who attended the literacy trainings were ex-AG, and the response was positive for those who did attend. Two-thirds of attendees felt the literacy/numeracy trainings boosted their confidence, and the vast majority reported using the skills to improve their daily lives, particularly with mobile phone use, dealing with authorities, and reading/signing documentation.

### **ii(c). Return, Reinsertion and Reintegration**

18. After leaving the demobilization center, respondents resettled across all 30 districts, with Huye, Kicukiro, and Rubavu being the most resettled among the sample. The PVS finds that 95.4 percent of the survey respondents reported that they had freely chosen their reintegration location, and the vast majority cited family reasons for doing so. Younger respondents reported freedom of choice to a lesser extent (89.8 percent) than their older counterparts (95.9 percent of 30-39 years, 97.4 percent of 40-54, and 100 percent of 55 and older).

19. The PVS verifies that the RDRC proceeded with reinsertion and reintegration payments and benefits as provided in the project documents, and confirmed that benefits were disbursed to ex-combatants. These benefits included BNK, RSA, RG, VSW and THK. Amongst the stratified

---

<sup>4</sup> According to the RDRC, there has been a tendency of reluctance to collect all items on the discharge day knowing that they can return to collect them in the future. The RDRC also cautions that respondents may have offered such responses based on a speculative expectation of more supplies.

random sample, 98.0 percent of the ex-combatants had received at least one of the listed benefits; 10 of the 505 respondents had not yet received any of the five listed benefits at the time of survey.

**ii(d). Basic Needs Kit (BNK)**

20. The Basic Needs Kit (BNK) should be provided to all demobilized ex-combatants. Since the entire sample was demobilized, it was expected that all the respondents in the sample would indicate that they obtained the BNK. The PVS finds that 97.8 percent of respondents who felt they were eligible confirmed having received the kit. Respondents most frequently applied the BNK toward household consumables (31.3 percent of respondents) and transportation (30.2 percent). Overall, satisfaction levels were high and the BNK largely met or exceeded beneficiaries' expectations. Ex-RDF respondents comprised the majority of those least satisfied with the various aspects of the kit. The 10 respondents who claimed not receiving the kit cited uncertainty around eligibility criteria and losing their ID/documentation as primary reasons for non-receipt.<sup>5</sup>

**ii(e). Recognition of Service Allowance (RSA)**

21. The Recognition of Service Allowance (RSA) should be provided to all ex-RPA/RDF, and certain ex-FAR ex-combatants (such as those that upheld the Arusha Peace Accord and registered with their RDRP Provincial Program Office). Overall, 65.5 percent of those who felt they were eligible received this benefit<sup>6</sup>. It was found that 91.3 percent of the ex-RDF received the RSA.

22. The PVS finds that for those who were eligible for this benefit but did not receive it, the largest percentage (50.0 percent) indicated that this was due to their failure to register at the pertinent Sector Office.<sup>7</sup>

23. The PVS finds that 81.7 percent of the RSA beneficiaries felt that there was sufficient communication about receiving the benefit: poor communication did not appear to be linked to non-receipt of the benefit and the majority of those who did not receive the RSA reported that communication was sufficient.

24. The PVS finds that in general attitudes regarding the RSA were mixed in terms of satisfaction and expectation, which appeared to correlate to some degree with payment disbursement delays. Beneficiaries most frequently cited 'family social responsibilities' (18.2 percent), 'household consumables' (12.7 percent), and 'loan repayments' (11.8 percent) as the primary uses of the RSA payment.

---

<sup>5</sup> The RDRC responds that BNK is paid on discharge day and the Demobilisation ID cards are issued on the same date. Those who did not receive the kit on discharge day were possibly being hospitalized or absent due to reasons based on themselves not due to loss of ID cards. These variables were not considered by the survey.

<sup>6</sup> The RDRC reports that the money is paid through individual ban accounts and beneficiaries who might happen to have outstanding loans may be affected.

<sup>7</sup> The RDRC responds that because the RSA is paid through banking system it is probable that ex-combatants were reluctant to go for payment vouchers at sector offices. Some find their money gone to service outstanding loans. These variables were not considered by the survey.

**ii(f). Reintegration Grant (RG)**

25. The Reintegration Grant (RG) should be provided to all demobilized ex-combatants that were able to produce a viable proposal for an income-generating sub-project.

26. The PVS finds that the disbursement levels under the RG were similar to the BNK, as 95.9 percent of respondents (who self-identified as eligible for the benefit) were provided with RGs (comprising 93.2 percent of eligible ex-RDFs, 96.9 percent of eligible ex-AGs, and 93.3 percent of the eligible former child combatants<sup>8</sup>, though, according to the RDRC, it is likely that the latter received this support in the form of VSW for their families).

27. Those who did receive the RG reported satisfaction with most aspects of the grant. Responses were divided evenly as to whether the reintegration option chosen was appropriate for their individual circumstance or the structure of the local economy.

28. The PVS finds that a large proportion (60.2 percent, given their current life circumstances; 57.9 percent, given the local economy; 58.9 percent, given the community) stated that they would not have made the same choice in retrospect.

29. The PVS finds that recipients most frequently applied their payment towards agricultural (33.7 percent), ‘general’ (28.6 percent), and non-farm related (26.2 percent) income-generating activities. The survey results suggest that RG payments, by and large, were applied to appropriate project-related activities, with the notable exceptions of the 8.5 percent who claimed to have “squandered it.”

30. Receipt of RG required recipients to submit a proposal for a viable sub-project and the PVS finds there has been a 71.1 percent success rate. Crop (for 30.8 percent) and livestock farming (27.4 percent) topped the list of sub-projects by a wide margin.

31. The PVS has not been able to identify why 28.9 percent of RG recipients reported having received the grant without developing a sub-project.<sup>9</sup>

32. The PVS finds that 20.0 percent of recipients applied at least part of the RG towards housing, which would generally not be considered part of sub-project expenses; such spending was most common among ex-AG, disabled, those returning with dependents, and older respondents. Furthermore, 8.5 percent identified they ‘squandered’ the grant but there was no particular subgroup that stood out over another in this area.

**ii(g). Vulnerability Support Window (VSW)**

33. The Vulnerability Support Window (VSW) was less widely accessible to beneficiaries, due to more restricted eligibility criteria. The PVS finds that 82.1 percent of those respondents who self-identified as eligible for VSW support received it. The VSW was awarded to support

---

<sup>8</sup> The RDRC responds that former child combatants do not receive classic reintegration grant (RG) rather the families hosting these children receive reintegration support (VSW) while their children are at attending school.

<sup>9</sup> The RDRC responds that some beneficiaries are reluctant to prepare subprojects once they know that the RG will be used to repay the bank loan. This variable was not considered by the survey.

vulnerable ex-combatants to access to employment opportunities, and was provided through apprenticeship training (68.6 percent of VSW beneficiaries), vocational skills training (26.6 percent of VSW beneficiaries), financial support for an income-generating activity (11.5 percent of VSW beneficiaries) and support to continue formal education (4.2 percent of VSW beneficiaries).

34. The PVS finds that the average profile of a VSW recipient was a married, male ex-AG, 37 years of age, most likely residing in the Southern Province or Kigali City. Overall, less than 50 percent of total respondents from the various vulnerable subgroups received VSW support. However, 86.8 percent of the eligible youth, 60.0 percent of eligible disabled, 80.0 percent of eligible ex-child combatants (n12), 66.7 percent of eligible elderly, and 100.0 percent of eligible females (n3) received this benefit. For the survey purposes, respondents self-defined if they were eligible for the VSW benefit, and the percentages above represent those self-defined eligible respondents that were actually selected to receive the benefit.

**Table . VSW Support (Self-identified eligible)**

		Total PVS	Male	Female	Under 30 years olds	30 year olds and over	16-29 years (under 30s)	30-34 years	35-39 years	40 years or more (40 and over)	Disabled	Able-bodied	Former child soldier	Adult ex-combatant
Q12.2 Were you eligible (i.e. did you meet the criteria) for the support known as the VSW?	Yes (of entire VSW sample)	73.9	73.7	100	68.9	75.3	68.9	72.9	77.2	75.2	84.0	72.2	68.2	74.2
	No	26.1	26.3	0.0	31.1	24.7	31.1	27.1	22.8	24.8	16.0	27.8	31.8	25.8
Q12.3 Did you get the VSW support?	Yes (of those who responded yes tot Q1.2.2 above)	82.1	82.0	100	86.8	80.9	86.8	77.6	84.6	80.2	60.0	86.8	80.0	82.2
	No	17.9	18.0	0.0	13.2	19.1	13.2	22.4	15.4	19.8	40.0	13.2	20.0	17.8
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Q12.4 Did you receive the VSW support yourself or did you defer it to your spouse?	Myself	285	283	2	53	230	53	49	65	116	50	235	15	270
	My spouse	97.3	97.3	100	97.8	97.1	97.8	100	96.2	96.5	96.4	97.4	100	97.1
		2.7	2.7	0.0	2.2	2.9	2.2	0.0	3.8	3.5	3.6	2.6	0.0	2.9
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
		221	220	1	45	174	45	36	52	86	28	193	11	210

Source: 2014 PVS dataset

35. The PVS finds that overall, 62.3 percent felt some level of satisfaction with the VSW package, and the package met or exceeded the expectations of 68.4 percent of the recipients. Insufficient training or insufficient training length, post-training follow-up, lack of capital, and ‘not having the right tools’ were found to be the most commonly cited aspects of the VSW needing improvement.

36. The PVS finds that younger beneficiaries received support for continuing formal education at noticeably higher rates than their older counterparts. In total 44.4 percent of VSW education beneficiaries had completed their two-year VSW course of education sponsored by the SEDRP, with the most commonly cited reason for non-continuation being ‘no money to pay fees.’ Notably, there appeared to be no relationship between prior education level and whether or not the respondent received VSW support.

37. The PVS finds that of those who received skills training (vocational or apprenticeship), the largest percentage (15.7 percent) trained in welding, followed by crop/livestock farming (11.2 percent), hairdressing (9.9 percent), and mechanic (8.1 percent). However, 61.9 percent of VSW beneficiaries reported deriving their primary income from skills areas in which they were not trained (22.0 percent from crop farming, 11.7 percent from private security, 9.0 percent from casual labor, and 19.3 percent from ‘nothing’). 42.1 percent of skills training beneficiaries derive their primary income from crop farming, even though 63.2 percent of VSW recipients stated that ‘no access to arable land’ was a relevant issue to their personal circumstance at the time of VSW award/receipt.

38. The PVS finds that several popular vocations in which beneficiaries were trained (mechanic, hair dressing, and carpentry) were found to be vocations that were earning the trainees very little income. With regards to the most popular trade (welding), 60.0 percent of those trained in that vocation were currently deriving their primary income from non-welding activities (crop farming, casual labor, selling goods and private security). However, when asked if they would choose the same vocation again in retrospect, most of these respondents responded in the affirmative.

39. In response to the findings regarding the VSW, a number of questions have arisen for the RDRC to consider regarding the criteria and implementation of the VSW, mainly with respect to: (i) whether beneficiaries required more direction with regards to choosing a skills area (for example, better market analysis, fewer but more viable choices, how they could leverage existing resources), and (ii) whether the VSW adequately equipped beneficiaries to begin generating income as soon as possible.

#### **ii(h). Support to Form a Cooperative or Association**

40. The PVS finds that support to form a cooperative or association was also offered to beneficiaries, with 39.1 percent of those who felt they were eligible participating in RDRC-contracted training in cooperatives, entrepreneurship, project preparation, and management. Much smaller numbers also participated in learning tours (15.1 percent), technical assistance/coaching (7.1 percent), and project competitions (26.1 percent).<sup>10</sup>

The PVS finds that youth respondents participated at much higher rates than other beneficiaries, and ex-armed forces and disabled respondents participated to a noticeably lesser extent; 4.64 percent of youth attended RDRC-sponsored training, 30.9 percent attended a learning tour, 15.0 percent received technical assistance, and 22.1 percent participated in a competition, compared with lower numbers in other age categories overall; 45.1 percent of ex-AG attended cooperatives training, compared with 26.0 percent of ex-RDF, 18.4 percent of ex-AG attended a learning tour.

#### **ii(i). Reinsertion Kit (RK)**

41. The PVS finds that the Reinsertion Kit reached 95.4 percent of survey respondents who considered themselves eligible. The kit was intended for all ex-AG combatants returning with

---

<sup>10</sup> The RDRC responds that these low percentages are likely to be a result of this benefit being applied to beneficiaries with leadership roles in cooperatives only.

dependents, and 95.5 percent of those who returned with dependents confirmed they received the benefit. For those who received the kit, most were satisfied with the contents albeit nearly a fourth reported breakage of items after use.

### **iii. Conclusions and Recommendations**

42. In summary, the 2015 PVS makes the following specific conclusions for consideration by the RDRC.

43. Conclusion 1. Most respondents reported receiving critical non-material support at the Demobilization Centers but far fewer reported receiving essential items (for example, blanket, soap, sleeping mat, and medicine). Housing, accommodation and medical care services<sup>11</sup> were the two most frequently mentioned areas for improvement.<sup>12</sup>

44. Conclusion 2. Literacy and numeracy training was accessed by ex-AG respondents at much higher rates than ex-RDF in both the PDOP and after, irrespective of education level or other vulnerability factors. As noted above, this benefit is provided to those ex-AG identified by the RDRC as neither literate nor numerate. This service provided on a voluntary basis.

45. Conclusion 3. Lack of post-training support and follow-up was a common theme throughout the PVS, particularly with regards to training and education support (e.g. literacy and numeracy training, vocational and apprenticeship skills training, and support to form economic cooperatives). Specific forms of support desired by ex-combatants were not surveyed in the study. Rather, respondents were given the option to select a generic response.

46. Conclusion 4. Payment disbursement and kit delivery also emerged as common themes within the research, notably with regards to the RSA and RG: long delays of the RG access (17.3 weeks on average)<sup>13</sup>, in particular appear to have potentially impacted sub-project viability and related economic reintegration outcomes for affected beneficiaries.

47. Conclusion 5. Questions emerged regarding whether VSW skills training and RG sub-projects were appropriate for the individual circumstances and structure of the local economy. The majority of VSW skills training participants reported deriving income from non-skills-related activities, and more than half of RG recipients felt that the sub-project was inappropriate for their situation and would have made a different choice in retrospect. There is some mitigation in this conclusion given the fluidity of local economies and the RDRC's approach which is to refrain from being directive regarding choice of IGA or training made by ex-combatants.

48. Conclusion 6. While a third of the sample participated in economic cooperatives training, very few participated in the learning tours, technical assistance and project competitions, despite

---

<sup>11</sup> The RDRC responds that shortfalls in accommodation and medical services have been addressed by the commission. The PVS does not verify this response.

<sup>12</sup> The RDRC responds that all ex-AGs in Mutobo receive all material benefits and leave the facility with them in their possession. Furthermore questions regarding material benefits may receive "dishonest answers based on speculative expectations for more supplies". The PVS does acknowledge that this is a possibility not just in this section of data but in any section soliciting responses around material benefit. However, this response is not verifiable by the study.

<sup>13</sup> The RDRC attributes this to beneficiaries' delays in picking payment vouchers.

largely positive feedback and reported outcomes—such training could be immensely beneficial for all ex-combatants planning to start or join a cooperative/association.

## 1. Background to the Project and the Study

49. By virtue of the sample drawn for the study, the 2014 PVS examines the nature and extent of access to the various reinsertion and reintegration payment by ex-RDF and ex-AG members of Rwandan origin who are beneficiaries of SEDRP since 2009 in comparison with and correlated with a sample of Rwandan civilians that is representative of Rwandan society across gender and age vectors.

50. The original grant of SDR 5.2 million (US\$8.0 million equivalent) for the Second Demobilization and Reintegration Project (SEDRP) was approved on August 27, 2009, and became effective on June 9, 2010. The original project is co-financed by (i) a US\$2 million government counterpart contribution, (ii) a co-financing single-purpose, single-country MDTF grant which became effective on January 5, 2011 for US\$ 4.6 million, and (iii) a second co-financing single-purpose, single-country MDTF grant which became effective on January 5, 2011 for US\$ 4.5 million.

51. A first RDF for US\$2.3 million using the balance of the co-financing MDTF was signed on December 30, 2013. The US\$2.3 million RDF was processed separately from the RDF for IDA, to ensure continuation of the program beyond December 31, 2013, and extend the project until June 30, 2014. A second RDF in the form of a US\$8.9 million IDA Credit was approved on April 30, 2014, with a June 30, 2016 closing date. Subsequently, the co-financing MDTF (Sweden, the Netherlands) was extended until June 30, 2016 in order to match the project's closing date. In addition, Sweden contributed an additional US\$2 million in two installments (January 2015 and January 2016) to be split between a RETF and BETF through a Grant Agreement dated March 6, 2015.

52. While not directly relevant to the period, it is important to note that both the IDA Credit and the co-financing MDTF have been extended respectively until December 31, 2017, and June 30, 2018. The project new closing date is thus December 31, 2017. The rationale for the original grant was to support the third phase of the GoR "programme of assistance to transition former combatants and government soldiers to a civilian life, that was originally launched in 1997 after the genocide".<sup>14</sup> This 'third phase' sought to support the demobilization of 5,500 members of the Rwandan Armed Groups (AGs) including 500 child soldiers and 4,000 members of the Rwanda Defense Forces as well as the return of approximately 10,000 family members of AGs and to deliver reintegration assistance to 400 ex-combatants left over from the second phase. At the time of project preparation, the World Bank presented an analysis that the strength of Rwanda AGs in the region, mainly *Forces Démocratiques de Libération du Rwanda* (FDLR) combatants, was 8,000 combatants.

53. The second RDF is intended to support the GoR's efforts to facilitate the long-term peaceful reintegration of ex-AG members (except for those accused of genocide crimes) into civilian life. The rationale for the second Additional Financing has been to consolidate the results of the SEDRP. Essentially, the RDF is intended to target the "return of members of AGs from eastern DRC to Rwanda", namely the then estimated 1,200 FDLR combatants.<sup>15</sup> The FDLR in DRC are considered "an on going destabilizing factor in the region" and so the "repatriation of

---

<sup>14</sup> World Bank, 2009: 1.

<sup>15</sup> World Bank, 2014: 2.

remaining members of [AGs] in eastern DRC is ... a vital and unmet objective of the GoR.”<sup>16</sup> Targeting AGs in DRC was to include “scaling the SEDRP” to include extended demobilization and reintegration services for the predicted incoming cohort which at the time of evaluation has not yet materialized.

## **1.5. Purpose of the Payment Verification Study**

54. The purpose of the payment verification study is:

- (a) To explore the nature and extent of access to various reinsertion and reintegration payments;
- (b) To understand the use and impacts of these payments; and
- (c) To understand general views and perceptions of these payments.

## **1.6. Methodology**

55. The methodology used for the PVS is quantitative. In summary, the study is based on data acquired as follows:

- (a) Quantitative sample of 505 respondents

56. The quantitative survey was undertaken in all provinces of Rwanda in two phases between January and February 2015, focusing on beneficiaries who had received benefits from the project between January 2013 and June 2014. The stratified random sample of ex-combatants stratified by armed group or force, year of demobilization, gender and disability and benefit was drawn by the RDRC from the agency’s own Management Information System (MIS) database. A separate random sub-sample of former child ex-combatants was drawn.

57. The quantitative tool (Annex 1) for the 2015 PVS is a new tool, designed specifically for this study to substantially refine the 2012 PVS and incorporate an assessment of new aspects of the project (such as the PDOP). The quantitative tool was designed, refined and piloted in the field before being fully implemented. Data was acquired in hard copy, captured in CSPro and analysed in SPSS.

58. During the quantitative survey, respondents were assured that wherever possible anonymity would be provided to respondents. The consultants were required to share the SPSS database with the RDRC so responses are anonymous only in so far as they are not attributed in reporting.

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

**Table 1 - Distribution of the sample: Category of ex-combatant by Survey area**

	Overall	Kigali City	Eastern Province	Western Province	Southern Province	Northern Province
ex-RDF	156 30.9%	71 85.5%	24 43.6%	18 12.9%	14 9.2%	29 38.7%
ex-Armed Group	349 69.1%	12 14.5%	31 56.4%	122 87.1%	138 90.8%	46 61.3%
Total (count)	505	83	55	140	152	75

*Source: 2015 PVS Dataset*

59. At the close of fieldwork, the actual sample comprised of 505 respondents, distributed across all five provincial sample areas: 16.4 percent (n83) respondents were from Kigali City, 10.9 percent (n55) were from Eastern province, 27.7 percent (n140) from Western province, 30.1 percent (n152) from Southern province, and 14.9 percent (n75) from Northern province.

60. Analysis of survey data relied upon the following guidance for determining valid percentages as cited in the SEDRP Independent Project Evaluation (2015):

Regarding ‘eligibility’ for VSW, it is defined as all beneficiaries who have been demobilized in a certain time frame and are screened to determine their level of vulnerability. Based on this screening, the most vulnerable are selected to receive VSW. This indicator measures to what extent those who have been selected and registered in a particular. However, for the purposes of collecting quantitative data, the PVS (like the Independent Evaluation, Tracer and CDS) relies on self-identified eligibility as is standard practice in quantitative surveys. As such that may be one of the reasons for variances between the independent data collected by the consultants and that held by the RDRC.

## **1.7. Limitations and Challenges**

61. While this PVS has benefited from a much larger sample size than the previous PVS survey, there were challenges with data analysis and reporting with regards to the small number of female respondents ( $n=3$ ), rendering it impossible to draw statistically significant conclusions for the subset. Furthermore, challenges were encountered with regards to the analysis of the ‘55 and older’ and ‘former child combatant’ subsets due to statistically insignificant counts when stratified by a number of key variables. Therefore, findings were only noted for these subsets in cases where obvious deviation from the overall sample was observed.

62. Irregularities in reporting numbers also presented challenges for analysis and reporting, particularly in cases where a subset of respondents was asked to respond about a specific benefit, but the number of respondents exceeds the number of those who previously indicated they received this benefit. For such cases, percentile analysis was generally conducted on a question-by-question basis.

## 1.8. Demographics

63. Key demographics<sup>17</sup> captured in this study are: (i) armed force vs. armed group; (ii) age; (iii) gender; (iv) vulnerable groups—female (derived from gender information); (v) vulnerable groups, former child combatant; (vi) vulnerable groups, disabled; and (vii) vulnerable groups, returned with dependents. Demographic information for the ‘youth’ and ‘elderly’ vulnerable groups was captured and presented within ‘age,’ as ‘16-29 years’ and ‘55 years or more,’ respectively. Additional demographic information pertaining to marital status and educational achievement was also gathered for respondents.

**Table 2 - Demographics of respondents**

	Category		Age of respondent at last birthday				Vulnerable Groups				Total
	ex-RDF	ex-Armed Group	16-29 years	30-39 years	40-54 years	55 years or more	Female	Former Child Combatant	Disabled	Returned with Dependents	
Count	156	349	98	197	196	10	3	33	79	241	505
% Total	30.9%	69.1%	19.4%	39.0%	38.8%	2.0%	0.6%	6.5%	15.6%	47.7%	100.0%

*Source: 2014 PVS Dataset*

64. Overall, 30.9 percent of the sample (n156) was ex-RDF and 69.1 percent (n349) was ex-AG. Respondents 40-54 years of age comprised the largest segment of the ex-armed forces subgroup (n90), while those ages 30-39 years of age comprised the largest segment of ex-armed group respondents (n141). The vast majority of respondents who returned with dependents (94.6 percent) were ex-AG. Respondents with a disability were evenly distributed across the two primary armed group categories.

65. In terms of age, 19.4 percent (n98) were youth (16-29 years), 39.0 percent (n197) were 30-39 years of age, and 38.8 percent (n196) were 40-54 years; only 2.0 percent (n10) represented the ‘elderly’ demographic (55 years or more, for the purposes of this study).

66. Four primary vulnerable groups were identified in the sample for the purposes of analysis and reporting: Female respondents, which comprised less than 1.0 percent of the sample (n3); former child combatants, which comprised 6.5 percent (n33); respondents with a disability (15.6 percent, n79); and respondents who returned with dependents, which comprised nearly half of the overall sample (n241). Regarding the former child combatant respondents in the sample, 69.7 percent (n23) were reunified with a family member following demobilization; the vast majority of former child combatants (93.9 percent) were ex-armed group and youth survey respondents (72.7 percent). The respondents with a disability most frequently identified as ‘Category 4’ (30-49 percent Permanent Disability Rate (PDR)) (n27), with only 3.8 percent (n3) identifying as ‘Category 1’ (90-100 percent PDR); the 40-54 age group comprised the most disabled respondents (48.7 percent).

---

<sup>17</sup> Three female former combatants participated in the study, two of which were from the ex-armed group subset. The three females were 36, 37, and 50 years of age; none of the females were former child combatants, and none were disabled. One of the female respondents returned with dependents.

67. With respect to marital status of the sample, the majority (58.4 percent, n295) was married in a monogamous relationship at time of research, with an additional 23.2 percent (n117) cohabiting with a significant other. Furthermore, the survey found 14.1 percent (n71) to be single, 1.0 percent to be widowed (n5), 1.0 percent to be married (polygamous) (n5), and only 1.6 percent to be separated (n4) or divorced (n4). Three additional respondents identified as 'abandoned,' while one reported as being 'in a relationship.'

68. In terms of highest grade in education completed by the respondents, over half (n286) responded that primary education was the highest they had completed; 17.9 percent (n90) completed through junior secondary, 7.0 percent (n35) through secondary, and 0.6 percent (n3) completed university. Additionally, twenty-three respondents (4.6 percent) had completed vocational training, and 13.1 percent (n66) had reported having no level of formal education.

## **2. Demobilization and Services during Demobilization**

69. This section presents an analysis of: (i) expectations prior to demobilization; (ii) experience at the demobilization center or in the case of former child soldiers, the child protection center; (iii) the PDOP, and (iv) literacy and numeracy training.

### **2.1. Expectations prior to Demobilization**

70. On the whole, expectations of the sample at the beginning of the demobilization program were modest, but varied across activities and support, as well as across the different demographic sub-groups.

71. In terms of the types of skills respondents expected to learn as a result of their participation in the program, 53.1 percent expected to acquire vocational skills, while 38.2 percent anticipated learning business skills, and 26.2 percent expected agricultural skills. The least expected skills were literacy (17.2 percent) and number/counting skills (17.6 percent).

72. Expectations were comparably lower among the sample regarding the types of items they expected to receive. While the most widely expected items were a toolkit and additional money fewer than a third of respondents reported having any expectation of receiving either (32.7 percent and 30.5 percent respectively). Fewer respondents anticipated being given a house (21.5 percent), seeds for planting (20.4 percent), formal education (20.7 percent), land (19.4 percent), or money for school fees for family members (17.6 percent).

73. Notably, there was a clear pattern of heightened expectations across all activities and support among respondents from Western Province and Southern Province. The ex-AG groups reported much higher expectations in terms of the skills they would learn across all skill areas. As might be expected, there was a clear inverse relationship between expectations and age across all questions in this section.

### **2.2. Demobilization Center Experience**

74. With regards to the respondents' actual experience in the demobilization center, the responses were generally positive, though far more respondents reported receiving non-material support than essential items.

75. Nearly all of the respondents acknowledged undertaking verification and registration (97.2 percent), pre-demobilization orientation (93.4 percent) and HIV/AIDS voluntary counseling and testing (92.8 percent). A large majority reported receiving health-related support such as medical screening and treatment (84.0 percent and 73.9 percent respectively), as well as psychosocial screening and treatment (77.6 percent).

76. Similarly, the vast majority of respondents stated that they had access to vital private sector services such as communication services for example mobile reception, landlines and postal services) (92.6 percent), banking (88.2 percent) and transportation (81.9 percent).

77. Notably, far fewer PVS survey respondents were successful in obtaining essential items at the demobilization center. While the majority of the sample reported receiving a demobilization ID card (86.8 percent), only 62 percent reported receiving a national ID number. In total 58.7 percent of the ex-RPA/ex-RDF compared to 65.1 percent of the ex-AG obtained a

national ID number (Q5.1.7). In total 75.0 percent of ex-RDF compared to 92.0% of the ex-AG obtained the Demobilisation ID Card at the demobilisation centres (Q5.2.4).

78. In total, 70.9 percent of ex-combatants received a discharge letter and 54.9 percent reported receiving essential items such as a blanket. Other essential items were received as follows: soap (53.3 percent), a sleeping mat (43.4 percent), and medicine (32.0 percent), with the ex-RDF sub-group reporting the lowest numbers.<sup>18</sup>

79. Despite the high number of participants reporting having not received essential items, only a minority of those surveyed reported critical need for improvement in the program. Of those who indicated that some level of improvement was necessary the most often cited area of improvement was medical care services (37.2 percent), followed closely by housing and accommodation (36.0 percent), career guidance (30.3 percent), meals (30.0 percent), psychological counseling (28.8 percent), reproductive or sexual health care services (27.8 percent), sanitation (24.1 percent), drinking water (22.7 percent), and bathing water (20.5 percent). Ex-RDF and former child soldier respondents were noticeably more vocal in expressing the need for these improvements across the board.

### **2.3. PDOP (and mini-PDOP where relevant)**

80. As part of the demobilization center experience, survey respondents reported taking part in the PDOP intended to prepare them for civilian life. The PDOP offered information and training in a variety of key areas. Overall, feedback was very positive with regards to most aspects of the program.

81. Nearly all of the respondents reported receiving social information, specifically covering the demobilization and reintegration program (99.0 percent), the social opportunities in their community of return (98.6 percent), public sector services in their community of return (97.7 percent), civic rights, duties, and responsibilities (94.5 percent), and the various NGOs offering services to ex-combatants (78.0 percent).

82. A great majority of those surveyed also received economic and health care information specifically relating to HIV/AIDS (95.9 percent), sexual or reproductive health (91.8 percent), establishing an economic cooperative (90.4 percent), opening a bank account (88.2 percent), and economic opportunities specific to their community of return (87.2 percent). All three female respondents reported receiving information in all listed areas.

83. Although nearly all respondents reported receiving economic, social, and health information, not all reported feeling completely satisfied with the outcome, as 4.4 percent of valid responses returned 'dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' values, while 10.4 percent respondents felt neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

84. Some respondents also reported receipt by their dependents of various services from a mini-PDOP. Such services included: (i) HIV/AIDS voluntary counseling and testing (reported by 88.1 percent of mini-PDOP recipient families); (ii) general briefing and orientation (81.7

---

<sup>18</sup> According to the RDRC, there has been a tendency of reluctance to collect all items on the discharge day knowing that they can return to collect them in the future. The RDRC also cautions that respondents may have offered such responses based on a speculative expectation of more supplies.

percent); (iii) discussion on health insurance and universal basic education (80.7 percent); (iv) discussion on gender-based violence (78.6 percent); (v) cultural activities (69.0 percent); (vi) individual counseling (63.8 percent); (vii) group counseling on general health issues (60.5 percent); (viii) group counseling on child health and nutrition (60.3 percent); (iv) socio-medical profiling (40.5 percent); (x) medical and psychosocial screening for children (34.2 percent); (xi) organized tour of health centers and education offices (26.5 percent); and (xii) organized tour of cooperatives for women (21.4 percent).

85. In addition to information sessions, the PDOP also offered training in literacy, numeracy and entrepreneurship, though significantly fewer respondents reported receiving such trainings compared with the various information sessions. Although three-quarters (n380) received training in entrepreneurship, a mere 27.5 percent (n139) and 26.3 percent (n133) of the sample reported receiving training in literacy and numeracy, respectively.

86. Despite the low numbers of respondents receiving skills training in the PDOP, satisfaction regarding the trainings was very high, with 93.2 percent of those who responded feeling satisfied or very satisfied with the language used to conduct the trainings, 90.4 percent feeling satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of trainers or training staff, 87.6 percent with the relevance of the course material, 87.4 percent with the number of participants, 87.1 percent with the training time arrangements, 85.6 percent satisfied or very satisfied with the training content, and 82.0 percent with the length of the trainings. Respondents were least satisfied with the level of post-training support and follow-up, with a quarter feeling either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, and 15.9 percent feeling neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the level of support/follow-up.

87. Overall, the vast majority of respondents reported having used what they learned in the PDOP, with half (n232/472) having used their knowledge and skills to a large or very large extent, and one third (n156), to an average extent. Furthermore, respondents reported high levels of confidence in the assistance they had received from the PDOP, with three-quarters (n343) replying that the program had prepared them for civilian life in their communities of return to a large or very large extent.

88. Notably, there appeared to be a perfect inverse relationship between age and receipt of PDOP information and training in all areas (i.e. the younger the respondent, the higher the likelihood that the respondent received critical PDOP information and training). There was no notable variance in responses within the sub-groups of survey area, sex or ex-child-soldier status.

#### **2.4. Training: Literacy (Language) and Numeracy**

89. Literacy and numeracy trainings were a key component of the demobilization program. Of 505 total respondents, only 109 reported attending numeracy training and 105 reported attending trainings in literacy. The apparent low numbers may be due to such trainings being aimed exclusively at those beneficiaries who were neither numerate nor literate which may have been only a small subset of the sample. Regardless, for those who actually attended these trainings, the response was positive. The number who were officially eligible (not self-identified) is not known in the survey.

90. The overwhelming majority of attendees were ex-Armed Group respondents, with nearly a third of that sub-group participating in both the literacy (29.5 percent) and numeracy (28.5 percent) courses, far higher than ex-RDF respondents. Over half (56.5 percent) of surveyed attendees reported having learned something new to a large or very large extent, and 28.7 percent

(n31) to an average extent. Such trainings also boosted confidence to a large or very large extent for 61.2 percent (n63) of the literacy training attendees and 67.6 percent (n69) of the numeracy training attendees.

91. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of surveyed attendees reported using their skills to improve their daily lives. The most frequently cited use of the literacy training centered on increased ability to use a mobile phone (97.1 percent), followed closely by increased confidence when dealing with authorities (92.2 percent), and ability to read and sign documentation (89.2 percent). Ability to read or understand signposts (84.2 percent), to read the newspaper (80.4 percent), and to help children with their homework (71.6 percent) were also frequently cited. Responses regarding the use of acquired numeracy skills were also very high, with 99.0 percent of the training attendees reporting the ability to handle money when making a payment, and similarly percentages having the ability to keep track of their personal savings (91.2 percent), operate the income and expenditure for income generating activities (89.2 percent), to participate in a cooperate saving group (85.3 percent), and to keep track of loan repayments (82.7 percent), as a result of the trainings.

92. The attendees of the literacy and numeracy trainings generally reported positive feelings regarding the training received, with half (n53) feeling satisfied to a large extent, a quarter (n24) to a very large extent, and 21 respondents (19.4 percent) feeling satisfied to an average extent.

### 3. Return, Reinsertion and Reintegration

93. This section presents an analysis of the return, reinsertion and reintegration of survey respondents and their dependents as it relates to the receipt and use of assistance from the RDRC and, where relevant, through mainstream services. This section focuses on satisfaction, receipt and use of supports by the sub-samples of the PVS.

94. After leaving the demobilization center, the respondents settled in their place of reintegration, indicated in the table below. The sample was spread across all of Rwanda's 30 districts with Huye (r=39), Kicukiro (r=38), Rubavu (r=36) Karongi (r=31), and Gasabo (r=30) having the largest representation. Among the three primary categories of ex-combatants, Kicukiro was the district most frequently settled by the ex-RPA/RDF respondents (r=36), while the ex-AG respondents primarily resettled in Huye (r=36) and Rubavu (r=32). Among the small sub-sample of ex-FAR, the largest number resettled in Musanze (r=3).

95. In line with the overall results, the youth sampled (16-29 years) most frequently reported resettlement in Huye district (r=16), Kicukiro and Gasabo appeared to be the most resettled districts for those 30 to 54 years of age. The former child combatants had largely resettled in Karongi (r=5), Musanze (r=5), and Rubavu (r=5); Rubavu also proved popular with the respondents with disabilities (r=7) and those returning with dependents (r=24). The three females of the survey resettled in Bugesera, Huye, and Nyarugenge.

Table 3 - District (place) of reintegration by Category of beneficiary

% (n/498)	Total	Category		Age of respondent at their last birthday				Vulnerable Groups			
		Ex-RDF	Ex-Armed Group	16-29 years	30-39 years	40-54 years	55 years or more	Female	Former Child Combatant	Disabled	Returned with Dependents
Bugesera	5.4	5.3	5.5	7.2	6.7	3.1	10.0	33.3	6.1	5.1	4.2
Burera	2.2	5.3	0.9	0.0	2.1	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	1.7
Gakenke	3.0	2.6	3.2	1.0	3.1	4.2	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.6	3.3
Gasabo	6.0	13.2	2.9	3.1	5.1	8.9	0.0	0.0	9.1	5.1	2.9
Gatsibo	0.8	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.5	10.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0
Gicumbi	4.2	3.9	4.3	0.0	5.1	5.2	10.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.3
Gisagara	2.4	0.0	3.5	3.1	3.1	1.6	0.0	0.0	3.0	1.3	3.8
Huye	7.8	2.0	10.4	16.5	4.1	7.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	5.1	10.9
Kamonyi	1.4	0.7	1.7	1.0	1.5	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.8
Karongi	6.2	1.3	8.4	8.2	7.7	3.6	10.0	0.0	15.2	3.8	8.4
Kayonza	1.6	2.0	1.4	2.1	1.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.8
Kicukiro	7.6	24.3	0.3	3.1	7.7	9.9	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.3	0.4
Kirehe	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Muhanga	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.5	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	2.5
Musanze	4.8	6.6	4.0	4.1	4.1	6.3	0.0	0.0	15.2	2.6	4.2
Ngoma	1.2	2.0	0.9	0.0	1.5	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	1.3
Ngororero	1.6	0.0	2.3	1.0	2.1	1.0	10.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.1
Nyabihu	5.0	6.6	4.3	3.1	5.1	5.7	0.0	0.0	3.0	9.0	5.0
Nyagatare	0.8	2.0	0.3	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.8
Nyamagabe	3.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	5.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	5.0
Nyamasheke	4.8	0.0	6.9	10.3	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	6.1	6.4	7.5
Nyanza	5.2	0.7	7.2	6.2	5.6	4.7	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	5.9
Nyarugenge	3.4	9.2	0.9	1.0	3.1	5.2	0.0	33.3	3.0	2.6	1.7
Nyaruguru	3.6	0.0	5.2	3.1	5.1	2.1	10.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	5.0
Rubavu	7.2	2.6	9.2	11.3	7.7	5.2	0.0	0.0	15.2	9.0	10.0
Ruhango	3.2	2.0	3.8	4.1	3.6	2.6	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.6	3.8
Rulindo	1.4	1.3	1.4	0.0	1.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Rusizi	2.6	0.7	3.5	5.2	1.5	1.6	20.0	0.0	6.1	5.1	2.1
Rutsiro	0.8	0.0	1.2	3.1	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	1.3	0.8
Rwamagana	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Count (Total)	498	152	346	97	195	192	10	3	33	78	239

Source: 2015 PVS Dataset

96. While the survey did not probe place of origin, the respondents were asked if they freely chose the community in which they resettled and reasons for doing so. Overall, 95.4 percent of respondents reported that they had freely chosen their reintegration location, and the vast majority cited family reasons for doing so, with over a third also citing economic reasons, and a quarter citing safety and security; a small minority also cited education opportunities. Results in this area varied little across the different sub-groups of survey participants. Age, however, appeared to have an inverse relationship to whether or not the respondent freely chose their place of reintegration, with 89.8 percent of the ‘under 30s’ reporting free choice, compared with 95.9 percent of the 30 to 39 cohort, 97.4 percent of the 40 to 54 cohort, and 100 percent of those over 55 years of age.

**Table 4 - Type of benefit received by Category of beneficiary**

Eligibility and receipt of the various benefits <i>Proportion of respondents that indicated yes</i>		Total PVS	ex-RDF	ex-AG	Male	Female	Disabled	Able-bodied	former child combatant	Adult ex-combatant	Under 30 years olds	30 year olds and over	16-29 years (under 30s)	30-34 years	35-39 years	40 years or more (40 and over)
Q9.2 Were you eligible (i.e. did you meet the criteria) for the BNK?	Yes % n=	94.7 495	91.4 152	96.2 343	94.7 492	100 3	92.2 77	95.2 418	50.0 28	97.4 467	83.9 93	97.2 398	83.9 93	100 89	96.3 107	96.5 202
Q9.3 Did you receive the BNK? (of those eligible)	Yes % n=	97.8 465	94.9 138	99.1 327	97.8 462	100 3	97.2 71	98.0 394	100 15	97.8 450	100 79	97.4 382	100 79	97.8 89	98.0 100	96.9 193
Q10.2z Were you eligible (i.e. did you meet the criteria) for the RSA?	Yes % n=	65.5 200	95.2 125	16.0 75	65.7 198	50.0 2	83.7 43	60.5 157	33.3 6	66.5 194	30.8 26	70.7 174	30.8 26	66.7 30	69.6 46	72.4 98
Q10.3 Did you receive the RSA? (of those eligible)	Yes % n=	91.3 127	91.3 127	0.0 0	91.3 126	100 1	94.6 37	90.0 90	0.0 0	91.3 127	100 5	91.0 122	100 5	94.4 18	94.1 34	88.6 70
Q11.2 Were you eligible (i.e. did you meet the criteria) for the RG?	Yes % n=	87.7 505	75.6 156	93.1 349	87.6 502	100 3	83.5 79	88.5 426	45.5 33	90.7 472	81.6 98	89.1 403	81.6 98	92.2 90	91.6 107	86.4 206
Q11.4 Did you receive the RG? (of those eligible)	Yes % n=	95.9 443	93.2 118	96.9 325	95.9 440	100 3	97.0 66	95.8 377	93.3 15	96.0 428	97.5 80	95.5 359	97.5 80	98.8 83	95.9 98	93.8 178
Q12.2 Were you eligible (i.e. did you meet the criteria) for the support known as the VSW?	Yes % n=	73.9 352	85.2 115	68.4 237	73.7 350	100 2	84.0 50	72.2 302	68.2 22	74.2 330	68.9 74	75.3 275	68.9 74	72.9 59	77.2 79	75.2 137
Q12.3 Did you get the VSW support? (of those eligible)	Yes % n=	82.1 285	82.1 106	82.1 179	82.0 283	100 2	60.0 50	86.8 235	80.0 15	82.2 270	86.8 53	80.9 230	86.8 53	77.6 49	84.6 65	80.2 116
Q23.2 Were your family eligible (i.e. did you meet the criteria) for the THK?	Yes % n=	76.9 281	69.1 68	79.3 213	77.1 280	0.0 1	81.4 43	76.1 238	57.1 21	78.5 260	69.6 56	78.8 222	69.6 56	86.7 45	76.9 65	76.8 112
Q23.3 Did your family receive the THK? (of those eligible)	Yes % n=	95.9 217	95.7 46	95.9 171	95.9 217	0.0 0	91.7 36	96.7 181	100 12	95.6 205	97.4 39	95.5 176	97.4 39	97.4 39	98.0 49	93.2 88

Source: 2015 PVS Dataset

97. All respondents qualified for some type of benefit as a critical aspect of their participation in the demobilization and reintegration program, and indeed 98.0 percent (495 out of 505) of survey participants reported receiving at least one of the five benefit packages. The five main benefits offered were the Basic Needs Kit (BNK), Recognition of Service Allowance (RSA),

Reintegration Grant (RG), Vulnerability Support Window (VSW), which included vocational training or assistance for starting an economic cooperative, and the Reinsertion kit. Some benefits required special eligibility (for example, the RSA was only awarded to former civil servants, i.e. professional soldiers, thus former members of the armed groups did not qualify for this benefit). All benefits are described in detail later in this section. While a large majority (r=455/505) of the respondents reported receiving the BNK, only 45.5 percent of former child combatants reported receiving this benefit, for which all participants were eligible. Overall, 84.2 percent (r=425) received the RG, with former child combatants, again, reporting a far lower percentage (42.4 percent).

98. Respondents used the different cash benefits in a variety of ways, with ‘household consumables,’ ‘transportation,’ ‘education/training costs,’ ‘agricultural production,’ and ‘family social responsibilities’ appearing most frequently in the surveys. Along those lines, over half of the respondents used the Basic Needs Kit to benefit either primarily or secondarily for household consumables (n[p]138; n[s]90), while nearly a third reported using the benefit for transportation costs (r=133). For those who were eligible and received the Recognition of Service (n110), ‘family responsibilities’ topped the list, with 34.5 percent of RSA recipients reporting using the benefit for that purpose; household consumables was cited by a quarter of RSA recipients, while ‘improved living conditions’ was also reported frequently as a secondary use (n15). The Reintegration Grant, however, was applied towards agricultural production (n[p]=73/276, n[s]=40/276) far more frequently than any other single use, with ‘income generation activities’ being the next likely use. Given that vocational and economic cooperatives training was a critical component of the Vulnerability Support Window, analysis would expect to find high numbers of respondents reporting using the benefit for ‘education and training costs,’ and indeed, 51.4 percent (n94/183) of VSW recipients/participants used the benefit primarily to those ends, while 37.4 percent (n55/183) listed ‘education and training costs’ as a secondary use. Furthermore, a quarter of recipients reported using the benefit to fund income generating activities (r[p]=23/183, r[s]=18/183). Lastly, of the 118 respondents who received the Reinsertion kit, 80.2 percent reported using it for the purchase of household consumables (r[p]=62, r[s]=28), while 37.4 percent applied the benefit to general living expenses (r[p]=16, r[s]=24), and 28.7 percent to ‘family social responsibilities’ either as a primary or secondary use. On the whole, there was no notable deviation in benefit use across the different sub-groups surveyed.

### **3.1. Basic Needs Kit (BNK): received by Ex-RDF and Ex-AG**

99. The Basic Needs Kit (BNK) was the first reinsertion payment and was intended to target all demobilized ex-combatants. The total value of the BNK was approximately FRw60,000 per beneficiary and the ex-combatants would receive the BNK in cash prior to their departure from the demobilization centers.

100. Of those respondents who considered themselves eligible for this benefit, 97.8 percent reported receiving the BNK, and doing so before leaving the demobilization center; the n10 respondents who reported not yet receiving the kit cited uncertainty regarding the eligibility criteria or due to losing their ID or documentation as reasons. According to the RDRC, however, it is more likely that those who did not receive the kit did not receive the ID card as well (as opposed to losing it later), given that the BNK payment and the ID cards were issued on the same date. While the BNK was aimed at all demobilized ex-combatants, 39 survey participants responded ‘not applicable’ to whether or not they had received the BNK, and therefore did not offer a reason as to why they did not receive the benefit. Of those who did not respond in the affirmative to receiving the BNK, their profile was evenly divided across ex-RDF and ex-AG,

and 16-29 years of age and 30-54 years of ages; most were not disabled and did not return with dependents; n15 were former child combatants, and none were female.

101. Overall, the level of satisfaction with the BNK was high. Two-thirds of recipients responded that they were either satisfied (51.5 percent; n239) or very satisfied (16.6 percent; n77) with the BNK, and 71.5 percent (n316) responded that the value of the benefit was equal to what they expected, with 22.9 percent having expected more; ex-RDF respondents comprised the majority of the 10 to 15 percent of recipients least satisfied in all aspects (variety, value, quality, quantity and relevance) of the kit. Nearly all respondents felt that the communication regarding how to receive the BNK was sufficient, with those not receiving the benefit on the discharge day comprising the majority of respondents who felt communication was insufficient.

102. Of those recipients who reported encountering problems transporting the items (5.7 percent; 22 respondents), most (66.7 percent) were found to be ex-AG returning with dependents. Notably, only one recipient of the BNK with a disability (1.9 percent) reported having problems transporting the items. No notable deviation from overall results was observed with regards to the other vulnerable sub-groups.

### **3.2. Recognition of Service Allowance (RSA): received by Ex-RDF**

103. The Recognition of Service Allowance (RSA) is a cash payment to ex-combatants who were former professional soldiers and therefore, civil servants. The RSA is differentiated by rank but equal for all eligible ex-combatants of comparable rank. Given the eligibility criteria for this benefit, the demographics of RSA recipients closely mirrored that of the ex-RDF sub-groups.

104. With regard to the RSA, n131 ex-RDF indicated that they had been eligible to receive the benefit, comprising a quarter of all survey participants and 91.3 percent of eligible respondents.<sup>19</sup> The most common reason for not receiving the RSA (cited by 50.0 percent) was not registering at the Sector Office in their community of return. 33.3 percent (n2) attributed the non-receipt to not opening a bank account and 16.7 percent (n1) to being away at the time; 66.7 percent (n4) of these non-recipients were disabled. While the percent of RSA recipients (84 percent) closely mirrored that of eligible respondents who felt there was sufficient communication about receiving the benefit (81.7 percent), the majority of those who felt communication was insufficient did indeed receive the RSA. Notably, all respondents who indicated that they were both eligible and understood the criteria but did not receive the allowance were 40 years of age or older (n6).

105. In contrast to the BNK, attitudes regarding the RSA were mixed. While 57.9 percent of recipients indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the allowance, 30.7 percent were dissatisfied, or in fact, very dissatisfied, with the RSA. 34.2 percent (n38) stated that the value of the allowance fell short of expectations but only 15 percent felt that the benefit was less than other recipients of comparable rank. Again, expectations regarding the value of the RSA appeared to decline with increased age, mirroring overall attitudes about the demobilization and reintegration assistance discussed in Section 2. No notable deviation from overall results was observed with regards to other sub-samples or vulnerable groups.

---

<sup>19</sup> RSA recipients included one female (100 percent of eligible females)

106. Of the recipients, 12.3 percent reported that they did not receive the RSA within three months of returning to their communities. Dissatisfaction with the allowance appeared to have no correlation with whether or not the payment was received within three months of reinsertion.

### 3.3. Re-integration Grant (RG)

107. The Reintegration Grant (RG) was the third reinsertion payment, which was aimed at all demobilized soldiers. RDF and armed group ex-combatants demobilized in Stage II of the RDRP received a reintegration grant (RG) of FRw120,000 three months after their demobilization. The RG was provided after ex-combatants received extensive counseling (including on business development) to help ensure that the choice of reintegration options (and related sub-project) corresponded to individual circumstances and the local economic opportunity structure. After a three-month delay, the RG was made available to eligible demobilized ex-combatants to develop a viable sub-project. The three-month timeline in the provision of this support aimed to allow ex-combatants to gain an appreciation of civilian life and their local economic environment and thus enable them to make more informed decisions.

108. The RG was aimed at all adult ex-RDF and adult ex-AGs. Of eligible respondents, 95.9 percent reported receiving the RG benefit (93.2 percent of ex-RDF, 96.9 percent of ex-AGs, and 93.3 percent of the ex-child combatants). Of the few eligible non-recipients who actually responded to why they did not receive the RG, not registering at the Sector Office in their community of return was most frequently cited as the reason.

109. In terms of the practicalities of receiving the grant, the vast majority of recipients characterized the process in a positive manner. Nearly all (96.0 percent) of the grant recipients felt that communication on how to receive the RG payment was sufficient. On-time payment was reported in 87.1 percent of cases, with delayed payments arriving most frequently three to eight weeks later than anticipated. While just over a third (35.7 percent) of the recipients reported using an existing bank account to receive the payment, just over half of the recipients had to open a new bank account. 91.9 percent of such individuals stated that the process was easy.

Table 5 - Reintegration option / RG spent on \*by\* Category of beneficiary

%	Overall	Category		Age of respondent at last birthday				Vulnerable Groups			
		Ex-RDF	Ex-Armed Group	16-29 years	30-39 years	40-54 years	55 years or more	Female	Former Child Combatant	Disabled	Returned with Dependents
Education for the children	9.4	7.5	10.5	5.3	11.6	7.9	30.0	0.0	0.0	11.5	12.0
Formal education	8.9	4.7	10.4	10.7	8.0	9.9	0.0	0.0	15.4	9.8	10.1
Scholarships	7.2	4.7	8.1	5.3	5.7	9.9	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.6	8.8
Housing	20.0	9.4	23.7	12.0	21.8	20.5	50.0	0.0	23.1	24.6	23.0
Tools	13.9	6.5	16.4	12.0	16.8	12.8	0.0	0.0	15.4	18.3	16.8
Employment	6.5	3.7	7.5	5.3	6.3	7.9	0.0	0.0	15.4	11.5	8.3
Agricultural income generating activities	33.7	23.1	37.3	33.3	38.3	28.3	30.0	0.0	23.1	21.3	37.8
Non-farm income-generating activities	26.2	20.2	28.2	25.3	29.3	23.5	30.0	33.3	23.1	33.3	29.2
Income generating activities in general	28.6	23.4	30.4	22.7	29.7	32.2	10.0	33.3	7.7	24.6	32.6
Vocational and apprenticeship training	26.9	26.2	27.2	32.0	25.3	28.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	30.3

Source: 2015 PVS Dataset

110. The RG required recipients to choose a specific reintegration option following extensive counseling. The majority of grant beneficiaries reported exercising freedom of choice with regards to their own reintegration, with 85.5 percent of eligible respondents reporting that they felt their choice of reintegration option was made freely. Furthermore, 85.6 percent felt that the choice was an informed decision. In general, the grant money was most frequently applied to some sort of income-generating activity, namely agricultural (33.7 percent), general (28.6 percent), and non-farm-related (26.2 percent). Overall, a 26.9 percent of recipients spent at least some of the grant on vocational and apprenticeship training. Notably, 20.0 percent applied at least some of the RG towards housing, which would generally not be considered part of a beneficiary's sub-project. Such spending was most common among ex-AG, the disabled, those who returned with dependents and older respondents.

Table 6 - Actual sub-project RG used on by Category of respondent

% Category	Overall	Category		Age of respondent at last birthday				Vulnerable Groups			
		Ex-RDF	Ex-Armed Group	16-29 years	30-39 years	40-54 years	55 years or more	Female	Former Child Combatant	Disabled	Returned with Dependents
Farming: poultry	4.2	3.7	4.4	4.7	5.4	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	2.6
Bee keeping	0.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Beer brewing	0.6	0.0	0.7	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Boda boda, taxi driver	0.8	2.4	0.4	1.6	0.7	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Carpentry	0.8	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Casual labour	1.7	1.2	1.8	3.1	1.3	0.8	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
Charcoal	0.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0
Construction	4.0	2.4	4.4	3.1	4.0	4.6	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	4.6
Driving vehicle	0.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0
Electrician	0.6	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Farming: crops	30.8	22.0	33.5	32.8	31.5	29.2	12.5	0.0	30.0	31.9	31.8
Farming: livestock	27.4	19.5	29.8	20.3	28.2	28.5	62.5	50.0	30.0	27.7	30.3
Hairdressing	1.1	2.4	0.7	3.1	0.7	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Health worker	0.6	0.0	0.7	1.6	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.0
Mechanic	0.6	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0
Money from family	1.1	3.7	0.4	0.0	2.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Open or run a shop	0.6	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Restaurant, tea shop	0.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Savings, loan, lending	0.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0
Security guard, private security	1.1	2.4	0.7	0.0	1.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Tailoring	1.1	2.4	0.7	0.0	0.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Tannery, leather production	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Teacher	0.3	0.0	0.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Trading	0.8	1.2	0.7	1.6	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Welding	3.1	3.7	2.9	6.3	1.3	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
Business	0.8	0.0	1.1	1.6	0.7	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.0
Digging	0.6	1.2	0.4	0.0	0.7	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hair dressing, beautician	0.8	0.0	1.1	1.6	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Selling goods	6.2	9.8	5.1	4.7	6.7	6.9	0.0	0.0	20.0	8.5	5.6
Squandered it	8.5	13.4	7.0	9.4	7.4	9.2	0.0	0.0	20.0	14.9	6.2
Count (total)	351	82	269	64	147	129	8	2	10	47	192

Source: 2015 PVS Dataset

111. Respondents were fairly evenly divided on the appropriateness of their chosen reintegration options, with 37.8 percent reporting that their choice suited their individual circumstance or structure of the local economy to a large extent, 27.0 percent reporting 'to neither a small nor large extent,' and 30.2 percent, to a small or very small extent. Quite notably, when asked whether they would re-make the same choice of reintegration option today, around 60

percent stated that they would not re-make their choice in retrospect given what they know about their personal life circumstances (60.2 percent), the local economy (57.9 percent), or the community (58.9 percent).

112. The Reintegration Grant required recipients to develop a ‘sub-project.’ Of those who received the RG, 71.1 percent reported that they did indeed develop a viable RG sub-project. According to the RDRC, for those beneficiaries who have outstanding bank loans, the RG would be applied first to the loans, and the remaining amount (if any) would be applied to the sub-project, which may explain such cases. Of those who received the grant, 89.3 percent received advice on developing their sub-project, 89.3 percent of which reported that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with the advice. As with the reintegration option, a great majority (96.0 percent) of recipients felt that their choice of sub-project was made freely.

113. There appears to have been little deviation in the survey results between the respondents’ first choice of sub-project, and the actual sub-project they developed, chief among them being crop and livestock farming (n[f]=233, n[a]=206) by a considerable margin. The most noticeable deviation between first choice and actual sub-project appears to occur within the youth sub-sample, in which only 14.5 percent of those respondents had chosen crop farming as their first choice, but in reality 32.8 percent ultimately employed that sub-project. Overall, 8.5 percent (n30) of recipients confessed to ‘squandering’ the grant; such behavior was distributed fairly evenly across the various sub-groups.

114. These survey results, in combination with the findings on reintegration options spending above, seem to suggest that Reintegration Grant payments were indeed applied to appropriate sub-project activities in most of the cases; very few beneficiaries reported spending the grant money on non-income-generating items or activities.

115. In line with the above results, nearly half (46.6 percent) of RG respondents reported engagement in crop or livestock farming as their primary means of income generation, and half (48.1 percent) as their secondary means; the remainder of responses was spread thinly among a variety of other activities, chief among these being casual labor (8.5 percent) and private security (7.7 percent). When asked what RG sub-project they would choose ‘now’ given what they now know about the local economy, livestock farming (22.1 percent) and crop farming (10.2 percent) continued to stand apart, with ‘selling goods’ (13.7 percent; 20.7 percent of disabled sub-group) and administration (7.5 percent) being the notable deviations from the data on actual sub-projects employed.

116. Overall, recipients were satisfied with the Reintegration Grant, with only 11.5 percent indicating feelings of dissatisfaction or deep dissatisfaction. There appeared to be some relationship between level of expectation and satisfaction, as two-thirds of those who felt dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the benefit, overall, indicated that the benefit was less than expected. There appeared to be no correlation with delay of the benefit and level of satisfaction.

### **3.4. Vulnerability Support Window (VSW): received by Ex-RDF and Ex-AG**

117. The Vulnerability Support Window (VSW) was determined by a narrow vetting process by the RDRP provincial offices. The VSW was designed to support ex-combatants identified as economically, socially or medically vulnerable. There are narrow eligibility criteria for application to this grant. It is a grant designed to support, through apprenticeship, vocational training or small grants for income generating activities, those that remain vulnerable after the disbursement of the BNK, RSA and RG payments. The VSW entailed access to training,

apprenticeship and in specific limited instances a small grant and rapid income generation training, or for continuing formal education. VSW assistance was offered on a grant basis with an average amount of assistance not exceeding FRw150,000 (US\$330). Beneficiaries of VSW support received access to vocational training for six months, apprenticeship training for four months, and in some cases a small grant for income generation activity.

118. While the survey questionnaire stated that “only a small number of ex-combatants were eligible for this grant,” nearly half (n234/505) of the overall sample reported receiving the VSW, which amounted to 82.1 percent of respondents who felt they were actually eligible for the benefit. The support could be utilized by the respondent or deferred to the respondent’s spouse; only six respondents reported deferring the VSW to their spouse.

119. The average profile of a VSW recipient was that they were male, 37 years of age, most likely resided in Southern Province (32.9 percent of VSW recipients) or Kigali City (20.9 percent), were ex-AG (62.8 percent), and married-monogamous (56.4 percent). Within the various vulnerable sub-groups, 86.8 percent of eligible youth, 60.0 percent of eligible disabled, 80.0 percent of eligible ex-child combatants, 66.7 percent of eligible elderly, and 100 percent of females who felt they were eligible received the benefit. Despite the high numbers, less than 50 percent of respondents in each of the vulnerable sub-groups did not receive Vulnerability Support Window benefits, given that many simply did not meet the eligibility criteria. Notably, education level and returning with dependents appeared to have little relationship between receiving the VSW and not receiving the VSW.

120. The majority of recipients surveyed reported feeling satisfied with the support, with over half (53.5 percent; n115) feeling ‘satisfied’ and 8.8 percent feeling ‘very satisfied.’ The value of the VSW benefit was on par with expectations for 68.4 percent of recipients, failing to meet expectations for 22.6 percent of recipients. Communication related to receiving the support did not appear to be a notable problem, as 87.9 percent of recipients felt the level of communication was sufficient. Similarly, the majority of VSW recipients reported receiving information about the various options for using the support, namely on vocational training (95.1 percent), apprenticeship training (86.2 percent) and training on income generation (84.7 percent), as well as receiving advice on what type of usage would be best for each individual (85.1 percent). Far fewer, albeit around two-thirds of recipients (64.5 percent), also received information on continuing formal education. There was no notable deviation across sample sub-groups with regards to satisfaction and communication, with the exception of category of combatant: ex-armed group recipients reported noticeably higher levels of satisfaction with the VSW benefit than ex-armed forces, with only 11.1 percent of ex-AG recipients feeling dissatisfied or ‘very dissatisfied’ with the outcome, compared with 30.3 percent of ex-RPA/RDF recipients.

121. The survey also probed level of appropriateness of the VSW to the recipient’s personal circumstances via various vulnerability factors at time of award. However, far fewer recipients responded to this set of questions (about n76 on average) than the other questions in this sections, and therefore caution should be exercised in making conclusions from the data presented here; the reason for the significantly lower numbers of responses is unclear given that this question set was open to all recipients of the VSW. About two-thirds of the respondents for this section listed lack of vocational skills (65.8 percent), lack of assets (64.5 percent), no access to arable land (63.2 percent), lack of skills for establishing an income generating activity (59.7 percent), lack of income (57.9), and not owning a personal house (57.7 percent), as issues relevant to their circumstances at the time of VSW award. Furthermore, n16 individuals (21.4 percent) cited ‘permanent disability,’ and n17 (22.4 percent) reported ‘chronic disease.’ Responses were

distributed evenly across all categories of soldiers. Youth reported these issues far less frequently, with the notable exception of ‘lack of skills for establishing an income generating activity.’ Conversely, those who returned with dependents reported elevated percentages with regard to the vulnerability factors in every area but ‘lack of skills for establishing an [IGA].’ Response numbers from ex-FAR, respondents 55 years and older, and former child combatants were far too few for drawing reliable conclusions related to relevant issues and the VSW. While two of the three females in the sample reported receiving VSW support, none responded to this question set.

**Table 7 - Relevant issues at time of award by Category of respondent**

%	Overall (r/T)	Category		Age of respondent at last birthday				Vulnerable Groups			
		Ex-RDF	Ex-Armed Group	16-29 years	30-39 years	40-54 years	55 years or more	Female	Former Child Combatant	Disabled	Returned with Dependents
Did not own a personal house	r=41/71	60.0	55.6	28.6	56.7	66.7	No Response	No Response	0.0	41.7	73.9
No access to arable land	r=48/76	67.6	59.0	28.6	75.0	60.0	100.0	NR	0.0	71.4	83.3
Lack of income	r=44/76	62.2	53.8	14.3	59.4	68.6	0.0	NR	0.0	57.1	66.7
Lack of assets	r=49/76	67.6	61.5	28.6	68.8	68.6	100.0	NR	0.0	64.3	75.0
Lack of vocational skills	r=50/76	64.9	66.7	42.9	65.6	71.4	100.0	NR	0.0	71.4	70.8
Lack of skills for establishing an income generating activity	r=46/77	62.2	57.5	57.1	56.3	63.9	100.0	NR	50.0	71.4	52.0
Permanent disability	r=16/76	16.2	25.6	14.3	18.8	25.7	0.0	NR	0.0	64.3	32.0
Already had a chronic disease	r=17/76	18.9	25.6	14.3	21.9	22.9	100.0	NR	0.0	42.9	36.0

Source: 2015 PVS Dataset

### 3.4.1. Use of the Vulnerability Support Window (VSW) support

122. The Vulnerability Support Window offered four options for support for qualifying individuals: (1) a six month vocational skills at a reputable Vocational Training Institute, (2) four-month apprenticeship training, (3) financial support for income generation, including two weeks of relevant training offered before actual access to IGA support, or (4) support for continuing formal education, either lower secondary, upper secondary, tertiary, or university education. Within the VSW recipient subset, 68.6 percent received apprenticeship training, 26.6 percent received vocational training, 11.5 percent received financial support for an IGA, and 4.2 percent received support to continue their formal education. As might be expected, younger beneficiaries were likely to have received support for continuing formal education than their older counterparts (with the obvious exception of respondents 55 and older, whose numbers in this section were far too low to include in statistically relevant analysis). Additionally, far lower ratios of VSW disabled beneficiaries reported receiving IGA support.

123. Several of the survey questions probed VSW support for continuing formal education. Overall, eight respondents reported currently being enrolled in formal education, and n28 reported having completed formal training or education at the time of survey. Of the nine beneficiaries who reported using the VSW for continuing formal education, four have completed their education and four are currently enrolled. The most frequently cited reasons for not having completed formal education were ‘no money to pay fees’ (n26), ‘other family responsibilities’ (n19), ‘no time’ (n16), and ‘poor health’ (n15).

124. The vast majority of VSW recipients received some type of skills training, which included apprenticeship, vocational, or income generation training. As mentioned above, several individuals received more than one type of support. Of those respondents who received VSW skills training, 93.2 percent (n218) felt that they exercised freedom to independently choose which type of training they received, and indeed there was little degree of divergence in vocation chosen and vocation actually trained in. By far, the largest percentage of beneficiaries trained in welding (15.7 percent), followed by crop/livestock farming (11.2 percent, combined) hairdressing/beautician (9.9 percent, combined), and mechanic (8.1 percent). However, electrician was also popular among ex-RDF (r=8), as was construction (n5) and crop farming (n5) with youth. The only female who responded to the question had been trained in welding. The PVS finds that 14.8 percent of the respondents who supposedly received VSW support reported that they used it on ‘nothing.’ It is possible that such respondents simply did not understand the question. It is also very likely that such individuals actually received VSW support in the form of a cash benefit for an IGA, but did not apply it as such. Regardless, the reason for the high figure remains unclear from the given data, thus, meriting further investigation. In addition to basic skills training, three-quarters (r=161) of the beneficiaries received project planning and entrepreneurship training as part of their support package, and over three-quarters of those individuals reported feeling satisfied (r=102) or very satisfied (r=25) with the outcome.

**Table 8. Vocation/Apprenticeship trained in or IGA supported under VSW by category of beneficiary**

%	Overall (%)	Category		Age of respondent at last birthday				Vulnerable Groups			
		Ex-RDF	Ex-Armed Group	16-29 years	30-39 years	40-54 years	55 years or more	Female	Former Child Combatant	Disabled	Returned with Dependents
Bee keeping	0.9	1.3	0.7	0.0	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
Boda boda, taxi driver	0.4	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0
Carpentry	6.3	0.0	9.8	7.3	6.7	5.7	0.0	0.0	9.1	3.4	9.7
Casual labor	0.9	1.3	0.7	2.4	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Catering, hotel	1.8	1.3	2.1	2.4	2.2	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	2.2
Computers	0.4	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0
Construction	6.7	2.5	9.1	12.2	4.4	4.6	33.3	0.0	0.0	3.4	8.6
Electrician	4.9	10.0	2.1	7.3	3.3	5.7	0.0	0.0	9.1	6.9	0.0
Farming: crops	6.7	1.3	9.8	12.2	6.7	3.4	0.0	0.0	18.2	6.9	9.7
Farming: livestock	4.5	0.0	7.0	7.3	2.2	5.7	0.0	0.0	9.1	3.4	8.6
Hairdressing	7.2	12.5	4.2	9.8	7.8	5.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	1.1
Health worker	0.4	0.0	0.7	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Masonry	3.1	5.0	2.1	0.0	3.3	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	1.1
Mechanic	8.1	13.8	4.9	2.4	8.9	10.3	0.0	0.0	18.2	6.9	2.2
Plumbing or water pump maintenance	4.5	7.5	2.8	0.0	3.3	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	4.3
Tailoring	7.2	3.8	9.1	7.3	8.9	5.7	0.0	0.0	18.2	10.3	9.7
Trading	0.4	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Welding	15.7	15.0	16.1	17.1	14.4	14.9	66.7	100.0	9.1	3.4	23.7
Hair dressing, beautician	2.7	1.3	3.5	0.0	4.4	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	2.2
Selling goods	2.2	1.3	2.8	2.4	3.3	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	2.2
Nothing	14.8	18.8	12.6	7.3	17.8	16.1	0.0	0.0	9.1	20.7	10.8
Total (count)	223	80	143	41	90	87	3	1	11	29	93

Source: PVS, 2015

125. The skills training and additional project planning/ entrepreneurship education appeared to be benefiting some of the VSW beneficiaries, as several reported deriving income from an economic activity similar to that in which they were trained. It is notable, however, that a combined 20.6 percent of the subset reported deriving their income primarily from private security (n26/223) or casual labor (n20/223). Additionally, another 20 percent (n43/223) of VSW-

trained individuals reported that they were currently deriving income from ‘nothing.’ Furthermore, several of the first-choice vocations (for example, mechanic (n25), hair dressing (n25), carpentry (n17)) were also areas in which the VSW beneficiaries received their training (mechanic (n18), hair dressing (n22), carpentry (n14)), and if they were to have repeated the entire process at the time of survey, most indicated that they would have chosen the same training path (mechanic (n24), hair dressing (n15)). Yet, very few of the VSW beneficiaries were gaining their primary income from any of these activities (mechanic (n4), hair dressing (n5), carpentry (n4)).

126. This pattern holds true to an extent even with regards to the most popular trade, welding, as 21 beneficiaries (60.0 percent) who were trained in welding were not working in that trade at the time of the survey. Of those trained in welding but not working in that trade, six were crop farming, three were engaged in casual labor, three were selling goods, three were working in private security, three were doing nothing, and the balance were performing other various income generating activities. With regards to crop farming, n15 respondents were trained in this area, yet 94 indicated that they engaged in crop farming for generating income (49 indicated this was their primary source of income). In essence, if crop farming, private security, casual labor, and ‘nothing’ is taken together, it forms a fairly accurate picture of the primary economic activities for the majority of the VSW subset—none of which is a primary area of VSW training for the vast majority of VSW beneficiaries.

127. The fact that so many VSW beneficiaries were not earning income from their training could be notable, but it is unclear based on the evidence as to why this is the case. According to the RDRC, this may be attributed to labor market dynamics and prevailing market realities. Nonetheless, no conclusion can be drawn from the data, thus meriting further investigation. Respondents praised the level of training received, with the vast majority feeling satisfied or very satisfied with training in project planning and entrepreneurship (n[s]=102, n[v]=25), training content (n[s]=154, n[v]=35), quality of trainers (n[s]=150, n[v]=47), relevance of the training course (n[s]=152, n[v]=42), language spoken (n[s]=148, n[v]=63), session size (n[s]=163, n[v]=44).

128. Similarly less than a quarter of VSW beneficiaries cited insufficient training as the reason for not working in their area of training. While not explicitly cited as a reason for not being able to find work in their skills area, an elevated number of respondents (21.7 percent; n49) felt dissatisfied with the length of the training, and nearly half (48.5 percent; n107) were not satisfied with the level of post-training and follow-up. While the length of the training courses may not be considered short (six months for vocational training and four months for apprenticeship), relative to Rwandan guidelines, these findings suggest that the content and quality (i.e. effectiveness of outcomes) of training for the course duration might be worth evaluating.

129. The toolkit also appeared to play some role in the mismatch between skills and income generation, as a large majority (80.9 percent) cited ‘lack of capital,’ while 62.3 percent reported that they did not have the right tools. Though 83.0 percent reported receiving a toolkit and nearly half were satisfied or very satisfied with it, it is notable that it took anywhere from one month to more than a year for 35.2 percent of trainees to receive their toolkit, which is a very long period of time to not use newly acquired skills; 14.6 percent reported never receiving the toolkit. Indeed, numerous respondents reported that the time between the completion of training and actually generating an income could be measured ‘in months,’ as opposed to just ‘weeks’ for 20.9 percent. For 17.6 percent of the subset (n27), the process took years, which is significant for the most economically vulnerable subset of all beneficiaries. Additionally, 57.8 percent of toolkit recipients stated that the number of items in the kit were insufficient. Similarly 68.2 percent

reported that they did not receive all of the tools they needed to get the job done, and in fact needed different additional items (70.8 percent) rather than more of the same tools.

130. While a certain degree of flux can be expected with regards to labor market dynamics, market realities, individual circumstances, and beneficiary aspirations, the findings in this section raise the following questions for the RDRC to consider:

- 1) Does the VSW do enough in terms of market research for its intended beneficiaries?
- 2) Are enough VSW beneficiaries being encouraged to leverage the existing resources already at their disposal, especially when it is obvious that there exists no viable market in many communities for numerous beneficiaries' newly acquired skills (for example, welding, mechanics, hair dressing, carpentry).

### 3.5. Support to Form a Cooperative or Association

131. As part of RDRP support, the Program offered beneficiaries a variety of activities aimed at strengthening their knowledge and skills with regards to forming economic cooperatives or associations. According to the RDRC, support to cooperatives was provided to the entity rather than the individual ex-combatant. Just over a third of eligible respondents (n163) reported participating in RDRC-contracted training in cooperatives/associations, entrepreneurship, project preparation, and management (39.1 percent); learning tour experiences (15.1 percent); receiving technical assistance or coaching (7.1 percent); and participating in economic cooperative project competitions (26.1 percent). Youth respondents were found to have participated in all activities to a greater extent than other groups, and ex-armed forces and disabled respondents were found to have participated to a lesser extent than the overall sample. For those who did not attend any of the activities listed above, non-participants most frequently cited travel logistics (16.9 percent = 'could not get there,' 11.5 percent = 'too far away') as the principal factor; such respondents tended to be 'returned with dependents,' disabled, and/or aged 30-39 years.

**Table 9 - Participation in cooperatives training or touring \*by\* Category of beneficiary**

Overall % (r/T)	Total (%)	Category		Age of respondent at last birthday				Vulnerable Groups			
		Ex-RDF	Ex-Armed Group	16-29 years	30-39 years	40-54 years	55 years or more	Female	Former Child Combatant	Disabled	Returned with Dependents
Attended RDRC-sponsored training	39.1	26.0	45.1	46.4	38.5	34.8	50.0	50.0	34.5	32.3	48.7
Attended a learning tour	15.1	9.0	18.4	30.9	12.0	10.0	0.0	50.0	27.3	6.7	18.8
Received technical assistance or coaching	7.1	1.1	10.9	15.0	5.3	5.1	25.0	0.0	15.8	2.4	9.0
Participated in a cooperative project competition?	26.1	0.0	32.4	22.2	20.0	31.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.5

Source: PVS, 2015

#### 3.5.1. Training for Cooperatives

132. This training refers to training as part of Reintegration programming as provided by RDRC. Not all members of a cooperative receive training, rather representative are trained. As mentioned above, 39.1 percent (n163) reported attending the training in cooperatives/associations, entrepreneurship, project preparation and management. Feedback was largely positive with regards to these trainings, with nearly half of the attendees reporting that they learned something to a large (n43) or very large (n19) extent, and nearly three-fourths of attendees feeling satisfied (n79) or very satisfied (n21) with the training received.

133. Sentiments, however, were less positive in terms of post-training outcomes, with over a third of attendees stating that they have used what they learned to only a small (n34) or very small (n17) extent. For those who have not used what they learned in the training, the most frequently cited reason by far was that there was ‘no opportunity to apply knowledge’ (73.9 percent), followed by ‘socio-political situation did not allow for applying knowledge’ (34.5 percent), with ex-armed group respondents ages 30-39 constituting the bulk this subset. Far fewer responded with ‘lack of confidence’ and ‘training did not correspond to actual needs.’ Furthermore, only 36.7 percent of attendees had either formed or joined a cooperative since their training at the time of research, though the vast majority of such respondents (90.4%) were still part of that cooperative. The respondents who returned with dependents were twice as likely to have formed/joined a cooperative, while former child combatants and the disabled half as likely as others. None of the three females reported forming/joining a cooperative.

### **3.5.2. Learning Tours**

134. Overall, 42 survey participants reported that they participated in a learning tour. According to the RDRC, the learning tour support was given to an existing cooperative or association as part of capacity building in response to requests and on RDRC advice. Similar to the cooperative training, feedback was positive with regards to the tours, with two-thirds of participants feeling they learned something to a large (r=24) or very large (r=4) extent, and three-quarters feeling satisfied (r=23) or very satisfied (r=7) with the learning tour.

135. Post-tour outcomes were more positive than the cooperatives trainings, with only 18 percent reporting that they had used what they had learned to a small (r=4) or very small (r=3) extent. For those who have not used what they learned from touring, responses were in line with reasons for the cooperative trainings in the previous section - over half of the respondents, again, cited ‘no opportunity to apply knowledge’ (r=18) and ‘socio-political situation did not allow for applying knowledge’ (r=17). About a quarter of the respondents also cited ‘training did not correspond to actual needs’ (r=9) and ‘lack of confidence’ (r=8).

### **3.5.3. Project Competitions**

136. As noted above, in general, the PVS finds that 51 of 139 respondents (36.7%) formed a cooperative as a result of the training in support of forming a cooperative. According to the RDRC, all cooperatives were eligible to participate in project competitions provided they registered with the local authorities. N12 of the overall sample reported that their cooperative participated in a project competition, n7 of which were awarded a prize for their efforts. Awards were based on an assessment of the performance of a project owned by the participating cooperative—one cooperative won First prize, two won Second prize, and four won Third prize. Five of the seven received a cash prize which may have been worth up to FRw1,000,000.

### 3.6. Reinsertion Kit (RK) for Ex-AGs and dependents

137. According to the RDRC, the Reinsertion kit was aimed at all returning ex-Armed Group demobilized combatants with dependents. The purpose of the kit was to provide the ex-combatants with essential items to re-establish themselves within a household. The RK items provided for their basic essential needs related to food provision (such as maize, beans, *sosoma*, salt, oil, flour), water storage (jerry can), sleeping materials (sheeting, mats, blankets), hygiene provision (soap). In addition to this, transportation costs were provided to cover the return fares for the collection of the RK. The contents of each THK varied from family to family.

138. Overall, 95.4 percent of those who considered themselves eligible for receiving the RK reported receiving the benefit for their families. The RDRP aimed to provide the kit to all returning ex-AG with dependents. However, the PVS found that amongst the respondents that did get the RK, 69.2 percent returned with dependents (in Q11.1) and 30.8 percent did not return with dependents<sup>20</sup>. Of the ten respondents that replied ‘no’ to receiving the RK (the remainder of the sample responded ‘not applicable’), four cited uncertainty around the eligibility criteria, four cited insufficient follow-up, and two believed that they were disqualified due to their affiliation with an armed group. Nearly all 94.4 percent (n=202/214) felt that there was sufficient communication regarding receiving this benefit.

139. The PVS finds 96 percent (n=194/202) of RK recipients reporting on-time receipt of benefit that largely met (64.5%) or exceeded (11.3%) expectations—though the RK failed to meet expectations for a quarter (24.2%) of the beneficiaries. Level of satisfaction for the various aspects of the kit was average to high (including variety 67.2% large/very large extent; quantity 51.2%; usefulness 69.4%; value 62.3%, quality 70.6%), with recipients being most dissatisfied with the number of items (quantity 51.2% large/very large extent). The most frequently reported issues related to the kit involved breakage after use (26.2%), breakage upon arrival (15.9%), items missing upon arrival (14%), faulty items (10.9%), and items stolen in transit (8.9%).

---

<sup>20</sup> Some ex-AGs arrive before or after their families.

**Table 10 - RK contents received \*by\* Category of beneficiary**

Item	%	Age of respondent at last birthday				Vulnerable Groups			
	Ex-Armed Group	16-29 years	30-39 years	40-54 years	55 years or more	Female	Former Child Combatant	Disabled	Returned with Dependents
Beans	93.0	91.4	93.0	90.4	100.0	0.0	70.0	88.2	94.3
Maize	92.4	88.6	94.2	89.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	91.2	94.3
Flour	60.4	57.1	62.4	59.7	28.6	0.0	60.0	48.5	60.3
Sosoma	50.9	68.6	75.3	69.4	42.9	0.0	80.0	69.7	76.9
Oil	90.9	91.4	89.3	89.0	85.7	0.0	80.0	85.3	91.7
Salt	89.0	85.7	87.1	84.9	100.0	0.0	80.0	82.4	87.7
Hoe	72.9	80.0	70.6	69.9	57.1	0.0	90.0	70.6	74.6
Matches	58.2	54.3	59.5	56.2	40.0	0.0	70.0	45.5	56.7
Soap	87.3	85.3	89.2	86.1	100.0	0.0	80.0	87.5	89.0
Utensils	94.8	100.0	94.0	91.7	100.0	0.0	100.0	94.1	95.9
Water Jeri Can	83.9	85.7	80.0	79.5	85.7	0.0	70.0	79.4	85.2
Plastic sheeting	90.9	88.2	90.6	84.9	84.9	0.0	60.0	85.3	91.0
Sleeping mat	47.7	44.1	48.2	43.1	0.0	0.0	50.0	30.3	47.5
Cleaning Material	62.1	67.6	62.4	61.1	28.6	0.0	90.0	60.6	61.7
Bus fare	90.3	91.4	87.1	89.0	85.7	0.0	80.0	76.5	91.0

Source: PVS, 2015

## Annex 1. Survey Form

### REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



## RWANDA DEMOBILIZATION AND REINTEGRATION COMMISSION

### Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Program

SEDRP PAYMENT VERIFICATION STUDY, FEB 2015

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

**1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENT / UMWIRONDORO W'UBAZWA**

1.1	Survey Area <i>Aho ubushakashatsi bukorerwa</i>	1.1
	1 = Kigali City / Umujyi wa Kigali 2 = Eastern Province / intara y'Iburasirazuba 3 = Western Province / intara y'Iburengerazuba 4 = Southern Province / intara y'Amajyepfo 5 = Northern Province / intara y'Amajyaruguru	
1.2	Enter the name of the respondent <i>Amazina y'ubazwa</i> WRITE THE SURNAME IN UPPERCASE & THE COMMON NAMES IN LOWERCASE / <i>ANDIKA AMAZINA Y'UBAZWA MU NYUGUTINKURU IRIKURIKIRA MU NYUGUTINTOYA</i>	
	1.2	
1.3	Enter the Demobilisation ID number <i>Inomero y'uwasezerewe mu ngabo. ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE ALL 2 LETTERS + 5 DIGITS</i>	
	L L - D D D D D	
1.4	Enter the Rwandan National ID number <i>Inomero y'irangamuntu ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE ALL 16 DIGITS</i>	
1.5	Enter the category of demobilised soldier <i>Umutwe wa gisirikari</i>	1.5
	1 = ex-RPA or ex-RDF 2 = ex-FAR 3 = ex-AG	
1.6	Enter the sex of the respondent <i>Igitsina</i>	1.6
	1 = Male / Gabo 2 = Female / Gore	
1.7	Are you a former child ex-combatant? <i>Wabawasezerewe mu ngabo ukiri umwana?</i>	1.7
	1 = Yes / Yego 2 = No / Oya	2⇒ skip to Q1.9
1.8	If a former child ex-combatant: Were you without an address or reunified with your family? <i>Niba warasezerewe mu ngabo uri umwana; Wabantaho wagiraga ubarizwa cyangwa wasubijwemu muryango?</i>	1.8
	1 = without an address / ntaho nabarizwaga 2 = Reunified with family / Nasubijwe mu muryango	
1.9	Enter the age of respondent at their last birthday <i>Ufite imyaka ingaha y'amavuko?</i>	1.9
	ENTER THE COMPLETE YEARS ONLY / UZUZA IMYAKA NEZA GUSA	
1.10	What is your marital status? <i>Ni iyihe rangamimerere yawe?</i>	1.10
	1 = Married monogamous / uwashakanye n'umwe 2 = Married polygamous / uwashakanye na benshi 3 = Cohabiting / ubana n'uwo batasezeranye 4 = Divorced / mwaratandukanye 5 = Separated / kwahukana 6 = Widowed / umupfakazi 7 = In a forced relationship / guterura 8 = Single / ingaragu 9 = In relationship / hari uwo mukundana 10 = Abandoned / watawe n' uwo bashakanye	
1.11	Did you return with dependents? <i>Waba waragarukanye n'umuryango?</i>	1.11
	1 = Yes / Yego 2 = No / Oya	
1.12	What is the highest grade in education you have completed? <i>Ni ikihe cyiciro cy'amashuri warangije?</i>	1.12
	1 = None / ntacyo 2 = Primary / abanza 3 = Junior Secondary / icyiciro cyambere cy'amashuri yisumbuye 4 = Secondary / Ayisumbuye 5 = Vocational / amashuri y'imyuga 6 = University / kaminuza	
1.13	Compared to <u>non-ex-combatants</u> in your community, how do you feel you are doing economically? <i>Ugereranyije n'abatwariye bawe batabaye mu gisirikare, ubona ubukungu bwawe bumeze bute?</i>	1.13
	1 = Very much worse / bubwiye cyane 2 = Worse / bubwiye 3 = Same as non-ex-combatants / Kimwe n'abandi 4 = Better / bwiza 5 = Very much better / Bwiza cyane	

1.14	Compared to <u>other ex-combatants</u> in your community, how do you feel you are doing economically? <i>Ugereranyije n'abaturanyi bawe babaye mu gisirikare, ubona ubukungu bwawe bumeze bute?</i>	1.14
	1 = Very much worse / <i>bubi cyane</i> 2 = Worse / <i>bubi</i> 3 = Same as non-ex-combatants / <i>Kimwe n'abandi</i> 4 = Better / <i>bwiza</i> 5 = Very much better / <i>bwiza cyane</i>	
1.15	Do you have <i>Mutuelles de Santé</i> ? <i>Ufite mutuelle?</i>	1.15
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
<b>2. DISABILITY OF THE RESPONDENT / UBUMUGA BW' UBAZWA</b>		
2.1	Do you have any disability? <i>Waba ubana n'ubumuga?</i>	2.1
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2⇒Next section 3
2.2	What is the category of your disability? <i>Uri mu kihe cyiciro cy' ababan n' ubumuga?</i>	2.2
	1 = Category 1 (90%-100% Permanent Disability Rate - PDR) / <i>Ikiciro cya mbere (Ubumuga bwa Burundu)</i> 2 = Category 2 (70%-89% PDR) / <i>Ikiciro cyakabiri</i> 3 = Category 3 (50%-69% PDR) / <i>Ikiciro cya Gatatu</i> 4 = Category 4 (30%-49% PDR) / <i>Ikiciro cya Kane</i>	
2.3	Do you receive a house from the RDRC? <i>Wahawe inzu na komisiyo?</i>	2.3
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2⇒skip to Q2.7
	Does your house have any of the following features? <i>Inzu yawe ifite bimwe muri ibi bikurikira?</i>	
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
2.4.1	Internally disabled-friendly / <i>Mu nzu imbere, birakorohera kuhagenda</i>	2.4.1
2.4.2	External access ramps / <i>Ifite amatara yo hanze</i>	2.4.2
2.4.3	Paved front yard / <i>Imbere y' inzu yawe hari sima</i>	2.4.3
2.5	To what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the house? <i>Ni ku rugero rungana rute unyurwa cg utanyurwa n' inzu yawe?</i>	2.5
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinyurwa na gacye</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinyurwa</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied not satisfied / <i>biraringaniye</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>ndanyurwa</i> 5 = Very satisfied / <i>ndanyurwa cyane</i>	
2.6	How many months after demobilization did you receive your house? <i>Wahawe inzu nyuma y' amezi angaha usezerewe mu ngabo?</i> ENTER RAW NUMBER IN MONTHS / <i>shyiramo umubare</i>	2.6
2.7	Have you been told about the disability workshops run by the RDRC? <i>Waba warabwiwe ku mahugurwa y' ababana n' ubumuga ategurwa na komisiyo?</i>	2.7
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2⇒skip to Q2.10
2.8	Have you attended a disability workshop run by the RDRC? <i>Witabairiye amahugurwa y' ababana n' ubumuga ategurwa na komisiyo?</i>	2.8
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2⇒ skip to Q2.10
2.9	To what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the disability workshop? / <i>Ni ku rugero rungana rute wanyuzwe cg utanyuzwe n' amahugurwa y' ababana n' ubumuga ategurwa na komisiyo?</i>	2.9
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe na gake</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied not satisfied / <i>biraringaniye</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	
2.10	Do you receive your Monthly Allowance? <i>Ese uya wakira amafaranga y'ubufasha ya buri kwezi?</i>	2.10
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2⇒ section 3
2.11	When did you receive your first payment? <i>Ni ryari wabonye ayo mafaranga bwa mbere?</i>	2.11
	1 = Before 9 months after demobilisation / <i>Mbere y'amezi 9 nyuma yo gusezererwa</i> 2 = 9 months after demobilisation / <i>amezi 9 Nyuma yo gusezererwa</i> 3 = After 9 months after demobilisation / <i>Nyumay'amezi 9 nyuma yo gusezererwa</i>	

If male former child soldier / *niba ari umuhungu wahoze mu gisirikere* ⇒ Q3.3  
 If male not a former child soldier / *niba atari umuhungu wahoze mu gisirikere* ⇒ section 4

**3. SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS AT THE DEMOBILIZATION CENTRE / CHILD REHABILITATION CENTRE**  
**AMATSINDA YIHARIYE MU KIGO CYO GUSEZERA INGABO / IKIGO CYO GUSEZERERA ABANA MU NGABO**

3.1 <b>WOMEN ONLY</b>	Did you receive services / support at the Demobilisation Centre that were specific to your needs as a female? / <i>Wahawe ibicyenerwa by' ibanze bigenerwa abagore mukigo cyo gusereraingabo?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	3.1
<b>WOMEN ONLY</b>	What, amongst the listed services at the demobilisation centre, did you receive? <i>Ni bihe muri ibi bikurikira wahawe?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
3.2.1	Childcare <i>Kwita ku bana</i>	3.2.1
3.2.2	Separate Accommodation <i>Uburyamo butandukanye n' ubw' abagabo</i>	3.2.2
3.2.3	Feminine sanitary needs <i>Ibicyekenerwa by' isuku by' abagore</i>	3.2.3
3.2.4	Information sessions for women and delivered by women <i>Ibiganiro bigenewe abagore byatanzwe n' abagore.</i>	3.2.4
If female former child soldier / <i>niba ari umukobwa wahoze mu gisirikere</i> ⇒ Q3.3 If female not a former child soldier / <i>niba atari umukobwa wahoze mu gisirikere</i> ⇒ section 4		
3.3 <b>FORMERCHILD XC ONLY</b>	If a former children combatant: Did the services received at the Child Rehabilitation Centre (CRC) meet your needs as a child ex-combatant? <i>Abana basezerewe mu gisirikere gusa: Serivise waherewe mu kigo gisubiza abana mu buzima busanzwe zarahuye n' ibyo wifuzaga nk' umwana wahoze ari umusirikare?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	3.3
<b>FORMERCHILD XC ONLY</b>	Did you receive any of the following listed services at the Child Rehabilitation Centre (CRC)? <i>Ni ubu bwoko bwa serivisi muhabwa mu kigo cyo gusubiza abana bahoze ari abasirikare mu buzima busanzwe cya Muhoza?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
3.4.1	Counselling / Guidance on choice of education, skills training, apprenticeship <i>Inama mu guhitamo uburezi, guhabwa amahugurwa mu by' ubumenyi</i>	3.4.1
3.4.2	Psychosocial counselling <i>Ubujyanama mu mibanire n' abandi</i>	3.4.2
3.4.3	Training <i>Amahugurwa</i>	3.4.3
3.4.4	Medical screening <i>Ijonjorwa ry' ubuvuzi</i>	3.4.4

FORMERCHILD XC ONLY	To what extent were you satisfied or dissatisfied with the following services and facilities at the CRC? <i>Ni ku rugero rungana rute wanyuzwe cyg utanyuzwe na servisi zikurikira n' ibikoreshwa mu kigo gisezerera abana bahoze mu gisirikare?</i>					
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe na gake</i>	2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i>	3 = Neither dissatisfied not satisfied / <i>biraringaniye</i>	4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i>	5 = Very satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	
3.5.1	Accommodation / <i>amacumbi</i>					3.5.1
3.5.2	Food / <i>ibyokurya</i>					3.5.2
3.5.3	Handling by the staff / <i>kwitabwaho n' abayobozi</i>					3.5.3
3.5.4	Civic education / <i>uburere mboneragihugu</i>					3.5.4
3.5.5	Agriculture training / <i>amahugurwa ku buhinzi</i>					3.5.5
3.5.6	Counselling / guidance on choice of education, skills training, apprenticeship <i>Inama mu guhitamo uburezi, guhabwa amahugurwa mu by' ubumenyi</i>					3.5.6
3.5.7	Psychosocial counselling / <i>ubujyana mu mibanire n' imibereho</i>					3.5.7
3.5.8	Training / <i>Amahugurwa</i>					3.5.8
3.5.9	Medical screening / <i>Ijonjorwa ry' ubuvuzi</i>					3.5.9
3.6 FORMERCHILD XC ONLY	Since going home from the CRC, were you visited by RDRC staff? <i>Kuva usubiye mu muryango uvuye mu kigo gisezerera abana bahoze mu ngabo, wasuwe n' abakozi ba komisiyo?</i>					3.6
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>					2⇒ Skip to 3.8
3.7 FORMERCHILD XC ONLY	If yes: How many times have you been visited by RDRC staff? <i>Niba ari yego: Wasuwe inshuro zingaha n' abakozi ba komisiyo?</i> WRITE THE NUMBER OF TIMES VISITED. <i>ANDIKA INSHURO WASUWE MU MIBARE.</i>					3.7
3.8 FORMERCHILD XC ONLY	When was the first time you were visited by RDRC after you left the Child Rehabilitation Centre? <i>Ni ryari wasuwe bwa mbere na komisiyo nyuma yo kuva mu kigo gisubiza abana bahoze ari abasirikare mu buzima busanzwe?</i>					3.8
	1 = 1-3 weeks / <i>nyuma y' icyumweru n' ibyumweru 3</i> 2 = 1-2 months after / <i>nyuma y' ukwezi n' amezi 2</i> 3 = 3-6 months after / <i>nyuma y' amezi 3 n' amezi 6</i> 4 = 7 months to one year after / <i>nyuma y' amezi 7 n' umwaka</i> 5 = More than a year later / <i>hashize umwaka</i> 6 = Never been visited / <i>sindasurwa narimwe</i>					
3.9 FORMERCHILD XC ONLY	In the event that you experience any problems, do you feel free to contact the RDRC? <i>Mugihe uhuye n' ikibazo, wumva nta kibazo guhamagara komisiyo?</i>					3.9
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>					
3.10 FORMERCHILD XC ONLY	On those occasions that you feel the need to contact the RDRC, are you able to? <i>Mugihe wumva ucyeneye guhamagara komisiyo, birakorohera?</i>					3.10
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>					
<b>4. EXPECTATIONS OF DEMOBILISATION / IBYARI BYITZWE MU GUSEZERERWA</b>						
ALL	Before you started the demobilisation programme, did you <u>expect</u> to learn the following <u>skills</u> in the training? / <i>Mbere yo gutangira gahunda yo gusezererwa, wigeze uteganyaga ko hari ubumenyigiro wahugurwamo muri ibi bikurikira?</i>					
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>					
4.1.1	Vocational skills <i>Ubumenyi bw'imyuga</i>					4.1.1
4.1.2	Agricultural skills <i>Ubumenyi mu by'ubuhinzi</i>					4.1.2
4.1.3	Literacy skills <i>Ubumenyi bwo gusoma no kwandika</i>					4.1.3
4.1.4	Number and counting skills <i>Ubumenyi bw'imibare no kubara</i>					4.1.4
4.1.5	Business skills eg entrepreneurial skills <i>Ubumenyi mu by'ubucuruzi urugerokwihangira imirimo</i>					4.1.5

	Before you started the demobilisation programme, did you <u>expect</u> to be <u>given</u> any of the listed items following the training? <i>Mbere yo gutangira gahunda yo gusezererwa, wigeze uteganya guhabwa bimwe muri ibi bikoresho bikurikira?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego                      2 = No / Oya	
4.2.1	A toolkit <i>Ibikoresho</i>	4.2.1
4.2.2	Seeds <i>Imbuto</i>	4.2.2
4.2.3	A house <i>Inzu</i>	4.2.3
4.2.4	Land <i>Ubutaka</i>	4.2.4
4.2.5	Formal education <i>Amashuri</i>	4.2.5
4.2.6	School fees for your family <i>Amafaranga y'ishuri</i>	4.2.6
4.2.7	Additional money <i>Andi mafaranga</i>	4.2.7
<b>5.ACTUAL EXPERIENCE AT THE DEMOBILISATION CENTRE / IBYO YUNGUKIYE MU KIGO CYO GUSEZERERWAMO</b>		
	At the demobilisation centre, did you undertake any of the following listed activities? <i>Mu kigo cyo wazerezewemo, wigeze ukorerwa kimwe muri ibi bikurikira</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego                      2 = No / Oya	
5.1.1	Verification and Registration <i>Kugenzurwa no kwiyandikisha</i>	5.1.1
5.1.2	Issue of demobilization ID <i>Guhabwa ikarita yo gusezererwa</i>	5.1.2
5.1.3	Medical screening <i>Kwisuzumisha</i>	5.1.3
5.1.4	Medical treatment <i>Kwivuza</i>	5.1.4
5.1.5	HIV / AIDS voluntary counselling and testing <i>Kwipimisha ku bushake no guhabwa inama ku gakoko gatera SIDA</i>	5.1.5
5.1.6	Pre-demobilisation orientation programme <i>Gahunda ibanziriza gusezererwa</i>	5.1.6
5.1.7	Obtained a national ID number <i>Wabonyelkarita y'indagamuntu</i>	5.1.7
5.1.8	Psychosocial screening and treatment <i>Ubujyana n' ubuvuzi</i>	5.1.8
	What essential items did you receive in your demobilization centre? <i>Ni ibihe bikoresho by'ingenzi wakiriye usezererwa?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego                      2 = No / Oya	
5.2.1	Soap <i>Isabune</i>	5.2.1
5.2.2	Blanket <i>Ikingiti</i>	5.2.2
5.2.3	Sleeping Mat <i>Umukeka / umusambi</i>	5.2.3
5.2.4	Demobilisation ID Card <i>Ikarita yo gusezererwa</i>	5.2.4
5.2.5	Discharge Letter <i>Ibaruwa igusezerera</i>	5.2.5
5.2.6	Medicine <i>Imiti</i>	5.2.6
	What, amongst the listed <u>services at the demobilisation centre</u> , do you suggest can be improved? <i>Ese muri izi service zo mu kigo cyo gusezererwamo, ni iyihe ubona yanozwa?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego                      2 = No / Oya	
5.3.1	Medical care <i>Kwivuza</i>	5.3.1
5.3.2	Psychological counselling <i>Ubujyanama</i>	5.3.2
5.3.3	Career guidance <i>Ubujyanama mu mikorere</i>	5.3.3

5.3.4	Reproductive or sexual health care services <i>Service zo kwita ku myororokere</i>	5.3.4
	What, amongst the listed facilities at the demobilisation centre, do you suggest can be improved? <i>Mu bufasha bubera mu kigo cyo gusezererwamo, ni izihe ubona zanonosorwa?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
5.4.1	Accommodation / housing <i>Amacumbi</i>	5.4.1
5.4.2	Meals <i>Ibyo kurya</i>	5.4.2
5.4.3	Drinking water <i>Amazi yo kunywa</i>	5.4.3
5.4.4	Bathing water <i>Amazi yo koga</i>	5.4.4
5.4.5	Sanitation <i>Isuku</i>	5.4.5
	Were the following private sector services accessible to you at or nearby to the demobilisation centre? <i>Ese muri izi service z'abikorera ku giti cyabo, hari iziboneka aho utuye cg hafi y'ikigo cyo gusezererwa?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
5.5.1	Transportation services <i>Service zo gutwara abantu n'ibintu</i>	5.5.1
5.5.2	Communication services such as mobile reception, landlines, postal services <i>Uburyo bw'itumanaho nka telefone igendanwa, reseau na service z'iposita</i>	5.5.2
5.5.3	Banking services <i>Service z'amabanki</i>	5.5.3
<b>6. THE PRE-DISCHARGE ORIENTATION PROGRAMME (PDOP) / INGANDO</b>		
<b>Read out</b>	The main purpose of pre-demobilisation orientation programme (PDOP) is to provide ex-combatants with critical information regarding programme benefits, implementation arrangements at the central and local levels, economic reintegration opportunities including entrepreneurship skills, health issues (including HIV / AIDS voluntary counselling and testing (VCT), reproductive health, etc.), civic rights and duties (including women's legal rights) and literacy skills. <i>Impamvu ya mbere nyamukuru y'ingando ni uguha abahoze ari ingabo ubumenyi bukwiye kuri programu z'inyungu, gushyira mu bikorwa ku ducentre atuyemo amahirwe yo kongera ubukungu, harimo kwihangira imirimo, ibijyanye n'ubuzima (nko kwipimisha no gushaka inama kuir virus itera SIDA (VTC, imyorokere,...), uburenganzira bwa muntu (uburinganire) no kongera ubumenyigiro.</i>	
	Did you receive any of the listed economic information during the PDOP? <i>Wigez e wakira amakuru bukurikira ku makuru y'ubukungu mu ngando?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
6.1.1	Information about how to open a bank account <i>Wagiriwe inamay'uko bafungura konti muri banki</i>	6.1.1
6.1.2	Information about economic opportunities in your community of return <i>Amakuru ajyanye n'amahirwe yo kugera ku bukungu mu gace utuyemo</i>	6.1.2
6.1.3	Information about establishing an economic cooperative <i>Amakuru y'uko washinga koperative</i>	6.1.3
	Did you receive any of the listed social information during the PDOP? <i>Wigeze wakira amakuru akurikira ku buzima rusange mu ngando?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
6.2.1	Information about the demobilisation and reintegration programme <i>Amakuru kuri gahunda yo gusezerera no gusubizwa mu buzima busanzwe</i>	6.2.1
6.2.2	Information about social opportunities in your community of return <i>Amakuru ku mibanire n'abaturanyi</i>	6.2.2
6.2.3	Information about civic rights, duties and responsibilities <i>Amakuru ku burenganzira bwa muntu, ku mirimo no munshingano</i>	6.2.3
6.2.4	Information about what NGOs offer services to ex-combatants <i>Amakuru kuri service ibigo bitegamiye kuri leta biha abasezerewe mu ngabo</i>	6.2.4
6.2.5	Information about public sector services in your community of return <i>Amakuru kuri gahunda za leta mu muryango ugiye gusubiramo</i>	6.2.5
	Did you receive any of the listed health care information during the PDOP? <i>Waba warabonye amakuru akurikira ku kwita ku buzima bwiza mu ngando?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
6.3.1	Information about HIV and AIDS <i>Amakuru kuri gakoko gatera SIDA</i>	6.3.1
6.3.2	Information on sexual or reproductive health <i>Amakuru ku buzima bw'inyorokere</i>	6.3.2

	Did you receive any of the listed <u>skills training</u> during the PDOP? <i>Waba warahuguriwe umwe muri iyi mirimo mu gihe mwari mu ngando?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
6.4.1	Training in how to read (literacy training) <i>Kwiga gusoma no kwandika</i>	6.4.1
6.4.2	Training in numbers and counting (numeracy training) <i>Kwiga kubara</i>	6.4.2
6.4.3	Training in entrepreneurship <i>Amahugurwa yo kwihangira imirimo</i>	6.4.3
	To what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the following aspects of the various training modules you received in the PDOP? <i>Ni ku ruhe rwego waba waranyuzwe cg utaranyuzwe n'ibi bikurikira mu byo wahuguwemo mu ngando?</i>	
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe na gake</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>biraringaniye</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	
6.5.1	Training content <i>Ibigize amahugurwa</i>	6.5.1
6.5.2	Training length <i>Igihe amahugurwa yamaze</i>	6.5.2
6.5.3	Quality of the trainers or training staff <i>Ubumenyi bw'abatangaga amahugurwa</i>	6.5.3
6.5.4	Relevance of the training course <i>Akamaro k'amasomo mwahuguwemo</i>	6.5.4
6.5.5	Language spoken or used to deliver the training course <i>Ururimi rwakoreshejwe mu gutanga amahugurwa</i>	6.5.5
6.5.6	Size, or the number of people taking part in, the training sessions <i>Ingano y'abakurikiranye amahugurwa</i>	6.5.6
6.5.7	Time arrangements for the training sessions <i>Gahunda y'amahugurwa</i>	6.5.7
6.5.8	Post-training support and follow-up <i>Gushyigikirwa no gukurikiranwa nyuma y'amahugurwa</i>	6.5.8
6.6	How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the information you received in the PDOP? <i>Ni gute wanyuzwe cg utanyuzwe n'amasomwaboneye mu ngando?</i>	6.6
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe na gake</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>biraringaniye</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	
6.7	To what extent have you used what you learnt in the PDOP? <i>Ni ku ruhe rugero wakoresheje ubumenyi wakuye mu ngando</i>	6.7
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ku rugero ruto cyane</i> 2 = Small extent / <i>ku rugero ruto</i> 3 = Average / <i>mu rugero ruringaniye</i> 4 = Large extent / <i>ku rugero runini</i> 5 = Very large extent / <i>ku rugero runini cyane</i>	
6.8	To what extent do you feel that the PDOP prepared you for civilian life back in the community of return? <i>Ni ku ruhe rwego wumva ko ingando yaguteguye mu gusubira mu buzima busanzwe?</i>	6.8
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ku rwego ruto cyane</i> 2 = Small extent / <i>ku rwego ruto</i> 3 = Average / <i>mu rwego ruringaniye</i> 4 = Large extent / <i>ku rwegorunini</i> 5 = Very large extent / <i>ku rwego runini cyane</i>	
<b>7. LITERACY AND NUMERACY TRAINING / AMAHUGURWA YO KUBARA, GUSOMA NO KWANDIKA</b>		
	Did you attend the <u>literacy and numeracy trainings</u> at the demobilization centre? <i>Ese witabiriye amahugurwa yo gusoma no kubara mu kigo cyo gusezererwamo?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
7.1.1	Literacy trainings <i>Amahugurwa yo gusoma no kwandika</i>	7.1.1
7.1.2	Numeracy trainings <i>Amahugurwa y'imibare no kubara</i>	7.1.2
		If both responses are 2 ⇒ section 8
7.2	To what extent have you learnt anything new from the <u>literacy and numeracy training</u> ? <i>Ni ku ruhe rwego washoboye kwiga ikindi gishya mu mahugurwa yo kubara, kwandika no gusoma</i>	7.2
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ku rwego ruto cyane</i> 2 = Small extent / <i>ku rwego ruto</i> 3 = Average / <i>mu rwego ruringaniye</i> 4 = Large extent / <i>ku rwegorunini</i> 5 = Very large extent / <i>ku rwego runini cyane</i>	
7.3	Generally how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the <u>literacy and numeracy training</u> you received? <i>Muri rusange ni gute wanyuzwe cg utanyuzwe mu mahugurwa yo kwandika, gusoma no kubara?</i>	7.3

	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe na gake</i>	2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i>	3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>biraringaniye</i>	4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i>	5 = Very satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	
<b>LANGUAGE TRAINING ONLY / AMAHUGURWA MU NDIMI GUSA</b>						
7.4	To what extent did the literacy training give you more confidence in everyday life? <i>Ni ku ruhe rwego amahugurwa yo kwandika nogusoma yakongereye icyizere mu buzima bwa buri muni</i>					7.4
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ku rwego ruto cyane</i>	2 = Small extent / <i>ku rwego ruto</i>	3 = Average / <i>mu rwego ruringaniye</i>	4 = Large extent / <i>ku rwego runini</i>	5 = Very large extent / <i>ku rwego runini cyane</i>	
	Did you make use of your literacy training in any of the listed methods? <i>Wigeze ukoresha ubumenyi wakuye mu mahugurwa yo gusoma no kwandika</i>					
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i>		2 = No / <i>Oya</i>			
7.5.1	Ability to read the newspaper <i>Ubushobozi bwo gusoma ibinyamakuru</i>					7.5.1
7.5.2	Ability to read and sign documentation <i>Ubushobozi bwo gusoma no gusinyira inyandiko</i>					7.5.2
7.5.3	More confidence when dealing with authorities <i>Kwigirira icyizere mu gihe uvugana n'abayobozi</i>					7.5.3
7.5.4	Help children with homework <i>Gufasha abana gukora umukoro wo mu rugo</i>					7.5.4
7.5.5	Read or understand signposts <i>Gusoma no gusobanukirwa ibyapa</i>					7.5.5
7.5.6	Better able to use mobile phone <i>Kumenya neza gukoresha telefone igendanwa</i>					7.5.6
<b>NUMBER TRAINING ONLY / AMAHUGURWA YO KUBARA GUSA</b>						
7.6	To what extent did the numeracy training give you more confidence in everyday life? <i>Ni ku ruhe rwego amahugurwa yo kubara yakongereyemo icyizere mu buzima bwawe bwa buri muni?</i>					7.6
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ku rwego ruto cyane</i>	2 = Small extent / <i>ku rwego ruto</i>	3 = Average / <i>mu rwego ruringaniye</i>	4 = Large extent / <i>ku rwego runini</i>	5 = Very large extent / <i>ku rwego runini cyane</i>	
	Did you make use of your numeracy training in any of the listed methods? <i>Wigeze ukoresha ubumenyi wakuye mu mahugurwa yo kubara muri ibi bikurikira?</i>					
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i>		2 = No / <i>Oya</i>			
7.7.1	Ability to handle money when you make a payment <i>Ubushobozi bwo gukoresha amafaranga</i>					7.7.1
7.7.2	Ability to operate the income and expenditure for a income generating activity <i>Ubushobozi bwo gukoresha neza amafaranga ubonano kuyashora mu mushinga ubyara inyungu</i>					7.7.2
7.7.3	Ability to keep track of your personal savings <i>Ubushobozi bwo gukurikirana uburyo wizigamira</i>					7.7.3
7.7.4	Ability to participate in a cooperative saving group <i>Ubushobozi bwo kwifatanya n'abandi mu makoperative yo kuzigama</i>					7.7.4
7.7.5	Ability to keep track of your loan repayments <i>Ubushobozi bwo kugenzura uko wishyura inguzanyo wahawe</i>					7.7.5
<b>8. RETURN TO THE COMMUNITY / GUSUBIRA MU MURYANGO RUSANGE</b>						
8.1	District of Reintegration (Place of reintegration) <i>Akarere wakiriwemo ugarutse</i>					8.1
ALL	1=Bugesera 2=Burera 3=Gakenke 4=Gasabo 5=Gatsibo	6=Gicumbi 7=Gisagara 8=Huye 9=Kamonyi 10=Karongi	11=Kayanza 12=Kicukiro 13=Kirehe 14=Muhanga 15=Musanze	16=Ngoma 17=Ngororero 18=Nyabihu 19=Nyagatare 20=Nyamagabe	21=Nyamasheke 22=Nyanza 23=Nyarugenge 24=Nyaruguru 25=Rubavu	26=Ruhango 27=Rulindo 28=Rusizi 29=Rutsiro 30=Rwamagana
8.2	Sector of reintegration (Place of reintegration) / <i>umurenge wakiriwemo ugarutse</i> WRITE OUT IN FULL / <i>andika mu magambo arambuye</i>					
	8.2					
8.3	Cell of reintegration (Place of reintegration) / <i>akagari wakiriwemo ugarutse</i> WRITE OUT IN FULL / <i>andika mu magambo arambuye</i>					
	8.3					
8.4	Village of reintegration (Place of reintegration) / <i>umudugudu wakiriwemo ugarutse</i> WRITE THE VILLAGE NAME / <i>andika mu magambo arambuye</i>					

	8.4	
8.5	After demobilisation, did you <u>freely choose</u> which community you would return to (i.e. did you choose the place of reintegration)? <i>Umaze gusezererwa ni wowe wihitiyemo aho uzatura?</i> 1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	8.5 2⇒skip to next section 9
	Are any of the following reasons responsible for choosing that place of reintegration? <i>Muri izi mpamvu zikurikira, haba harimo iyatumye uhitamo aho uzatura</i> 1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
8.6.1	Family reasons <i>Impamvu z'umuryango</i>	8.6.1
8.6.2	Education opportunities <i>Amahirwe yo kwiga</i>	8.6.2
8.6.3	Safety and security <i>Umutekano</i>	8.6.3
8.6.4	Economic reasons <i>Impamvu z'ubukungu</i>	8.6.4
<b>9. BASIC NEEDS KIT (BNK) / IBIKENERWA BY'IBANZE</b>		
<b>Read out</b>	The Basic Needs Kit (BNK) was the first reinsertion payment. Total value of the BNK is about RFW 60,000 per beneficiary and the ex-combatants of the RDF and AGs would receive the BNK in cash prior to their departure from the demobilisation centres. <i>Ibyo kurya bimara 3: imbuto n'ibikoresho bikenewe mu rugo, amafaranga y'urugendo amugeza aha atuye, agaciro k'ibikenewe ni ibihumbi 60,000 ku bahoze ari abasirikare ba RDF n'abitandukanyije n'abacengeze mbere y'uko bava mu ngando.</i>	
9.1	Do you feel that you had a clear <u>understanding of the eligibility criteria</u> for receiving the BNK? <i>Ese wumva warasobanukiwe neza n'ibisabwa ku zuzwa kugira uhabwe ibikenerwa by'ibanze?</i> <b>ALL</b> 1 = Yes, understood eligibility criteria / Yego, nasobanukiwe n'ibisabwa 2 = No, did not understand eligibility criteria / Oya, sinasobanukiwe n'ibisabwa	9.1
9.2	Were you eligible (i.e. <u>did you meet the criteria</u> ) for the BNK? <i>Waba wari wujuje ibisabwa?</i> <b>ALL</b> 1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	9.2 2⇒skip to section 10
9.3	Did you <u>receive</u> the Basic Needs Kit? <i>Waba warabonye ibikenerwa by'ibanze?</i> 1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	9.3 1⇒skip 9.5
9.4	If No, why did you not receive the BNK? <i>Niba ari Oya, ni ukubera iki utabibonye?</i> 1 = Uncertain about the eligibility criteria / <i>kutamenya ibyasabwaga kuzuzwa</i> 2 = Away at the time e.g. hospital, visiting / <i>sinari mpari kiriya gihe</i> 3 = I (respondent) did not follow-up sufficiently with the RDRC on this benefit / <i>kudakurikirana ku buryo buhagije kugirango mpabwe ibikoresho by'ibanze</i> 4 = Lost your ID or documentation or letter / <i>kubura indangamuntu cg n'ibindi byangombwa</i>	9.4
9.5	Do you feel there was sufficient communication on how to receive your BNK? <i>Ese wumva harabayeho gutanga amakuru neza ku buryo bwo kwakira amafaranga y'imperekeza</i> 1 = Sufficient / <i>ku buryo buhagije</i> 2 = Insufficient / <i>ntibuhagije</i>	9.5
9.6	Was the value of the BNK received less, equal or greater than what you expected? <i>Amafaranga y'imperekeza yawe yambere yaba yarahwanye nayo mwateganyaga kubona?</i> 1 = Less than expected / <i>yari make</i> 2 = Equal to what was expected / <i>yari ahagije</i> 3 = Greater than expected / <i>yari menshi</i>	9.6
9.7	Did you receive your BNK before leaving the demobilisation centre? <i>Waba warahawe amafaranga yawe y'imerekeza mbere yo kuva mu kigo mwasezererwagamo?</i> 1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	9.7 1⇒skip 9.9
9.8	Did you collect the BNK payment during the 30 day period or did you collect it the following month? <i>Mwaba mwarabonye imperekeza yanyu ya mbere mu minsi 30 cyangwa nyuma yayo?</i> 1 = 30 day window / <i>mu gihe cy'iminsi 30</i> 2 = After the 30 day window / <i>nyuma y'iminsi 30</i>	9.8

9.9	Overall, how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the BNK? <i>Muri rusange. Ni gute wanyuzwe n'imperekeza yawe?</i>	9.9
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe cyane</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>nta nakimwe</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	
	To what extent were you dissatisfied or satisfied with the following aspects of the BNK? <i>Ni kuruhe rwego waba waranyuzwe cg utaranyuzwe n'ibi bikurikira bigize imperekeza?</i>	
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe cyane</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>nta nakimwe</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	
9.10.1	The range (variety) of items <i>Ubwoko bw'ibikoresho bitangwa</i>	9.10.1
9.10.2	The quantity (how many) of the items <i>Ingano y'ibikoresho bitangwa</i>	9.10.2
9.10.3	Usefulness of the items to your situation <i>Akamaro k'ibikoresho ku ruhande rwawe</i>	9.10.3
9.10.4	The value of the items <i>Agaciro k'ibikoresho</i>	9.10.4
9.10.5	The quality (how well made) of items <i>Ubuziranenge bw'ibikoresho</i>	9.10.5
	Thinking about the quality (how well made) of the items in the BNK, were any of the listed factors relevant to you? <i>Utekereje ku buziranenge bw'ibikoresho bigize imperekeza, muri ibi bikurikira hari icyakubaye</i>	
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
9.11.1	Some items broke when you initially used them <i>Ibikoresho byangirika bigikoresheya</i>	9.11.1
9.11.2	Some items were faulty or did not work as intended <i>Bimwe mu bikoresho ntibyakoraga</i>	9.11.2
9.11.3	Some items were broken when you received them <i>Bimwe mu bikoresho twabyakiriye byangiritse</i>	9.11.3
	Did any of the following incidents apply to you? <i>Muri ibi bikurikira hari icyakubayeho?</i>	
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
9.12.1	Your BNK was stolen in transit <i>Imperekeza yawe yibwe ukiri mu nzira</i>	9.12.1
9.12.2	Your BNK was missing items that others received <i>Mu mperekeza yawe hari ibyaburaga abandi babonye?</i>	9.12.2
9.13	Did you experience problems transporting the BNK from the RDRC offices to your community of return? <i>Waba waragize ikibazo mu kugezamperekeza yawe iwawe?</i>	9.13
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
<b>10. RECOGNITION OF SERVICE ALLOWANCE (RSA) / IMPEREKEZA Y'ISHIMWE</b>		
<b>Read out</b>	The RSA is a cash payment to ex-combatants who were former professional soldiers and therefore, civil servants. The RSA is differentiated by rank but equal for all eligible ex-combatants of comparable rank. In certain cases the ex-FAR ex-combatants also qualified for the RSA. <i>RSA ni imperekeza y'ishimwe ihabwa abasezerewe mu ngabo bagasubizwa mu buzima busanzwe. Iyi mperekeza y'ishimwe igenerwa abahoze mu ngabo za RDF iyi mperekeza y'ishimwe yagenerwaga abasezerewe mu ngabo za RDF. Iyi mperekeza itangwa hakurikijwe amapeti ku buryo bungana bujije ibisabwa, rimwe na rimwe iyi mperekeza ihabwa abahoze mu ngabo zatsinzwe iyo bujije ibisabwa.</i>	
10.1	Do you have a clear understanding of the eligibility criteria for receiving the RSA payment? <i>Waba usobanukiwe neza n'ibisabwa mu guhabwa imperekeza y'ishimwe?</i>	10.1
<b>ALL</b>	1 = Yes, understood eligibility criteria / <i>Yego, ndabisobanukiwe</i> 2 = No, did not understand eligibility criteria / <i>Oya, simbisobanukiwe</i>	
10.2	Were you eligible (i.e. did you meet the criteria) for the Recognition of Service Allowance (RSA)? <i>Mwaba mwarasanze mwujije ibisabwa mu guhabwa imperekeza y'ishimwe?</i>	10.2
<b>ALL</b>	1 = Yes as ex-RDF / <i>Yego</i> 2 = Yes as specific ex-FAR / <i>Yego</i> 3 = No - Not Eligible (did not meet the criteria) for RSA / <i>Oya, sinujuje ibisabwa</i>	3 ⇒ skip to next section 11
10.3	Did you receive the Recognition of Service Allowance (RSA)? <i>Mwaba mwarabonye imperekezay'ishimwe?</i>	10.3
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	1 ⇒ skip to Q10.5

10.4	If No, why did you not receive the RSA? <i>Niba ari Oya, ni ukubera iki?</i>	10.4
	1 = Did not register at Sector Office in your community of return / <i>Siniyandikishije kubiro by'umurenge ntuyeho</i> 2 = Did not open bank account / <i>Sinafunguje konti muri banki</i> 3 = You had no ID card / <i>Ntandagamuntunagiraga</i> 4 = Formerly part of an armed group not eligible for the payment / <i>Nahoze mu ngabo zitemerewe kubona iyi mperekeza</i> 5 = Away at the time / <i>Sinari mpari icyo gihe</i>	
10.5	Do you feel there was sufficient communication on how to receive your RSA payment? <i>Ese wumva harabayeho gutanga amakuru neza ku buryo buhagije bwo kwakira imperekeza y'ishimwe?</i>	10.5
	1 = Sufficient / <i>Burahagije</i> 2 = Insufficient / <i>Ntibuhagije</i>	If no RSA given, skip to next section 11
10.6	Was the value of the RSA received less, equal or greater than what you expected? <i>Amafaranga mwabonye imperekeza y'ishimwe yaba yarahwanye nayo mwateganyaga kubona?</i>	10.6
	1 = Less than expected / <i>Make</i> 2 = Equal to what was expected / <i>Ahagije</i> 3 = Greater than expected / <i>Arimenshi</i>	
10.7	Was the value of the RSA received less, equal or greater to what ex-combatants you know of comparable rank received? <i>Ese amafaranga y' imperekeza y'ishimwe wabonye yari make, yanganaga cg yararenze kuyo abandi uzi mwanganyaga ipeti babonye?</i>	10.7
	1 = Less than expected / <i>Make</i> 2 = Equal to what was expected / <i>Ahagije</i> 3 = Greater than expected / <i>Arimenshi</i>	
10.8	Was the RSA made within three month after you returned to your community of return? <i>Imperekeza y'ishimwe yanyu yaba yaraziye mu gihe cy'amezi atatu nyuma yo gusubizwa mu buzima busazwe?</i>	10.8
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	1 ⇒ skip to Q10.10
10.9	If no, how late (in weeks) was this <u>RSA payment</u> ? <i>Niba ari Oya, byatwaye igihe kingana iki?</i>	10.9
	NUMBER IN WEEKS / <i>Umubare w'ibyumweru</i>	
10.10	Overall, how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the RSA? <i>Muri rusange, ni gute wanyuzwe cyagwa utanyuzwe n' imperekeza y'ishimwe?</i>	10.10
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>Sinanyuzwe na gato</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>Sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>Ntanakimwe</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>Naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very Satisfied / <i>Naranyuzwe cyane</i>	
<b>11. REINTEGRATION GRANT (RG) / INKUNGA YO KWITEZA IMBERE</b>		
<b>Read out</b>	The Reintegration Grant (RG) was the third reinsertion payment which was targeted at all demobilised soliders. RDF and armed group ex-combatants demobilized in stage II of the RDRP received a reintegration grant (RG) of FRw120,000 three months after their demobilization. The RG was provided after ex-combatants received extensive counselling (including on business development) to help ensure that the choice of reintegration options (sub-project) corresponded to individual circumstances and the local economic opportunity structure. The three month delay in the provision of this support aimed to allow ex-combatants to gain an appreciation of civilian life and their local economic environment and thus enable them to make more informed decisions. <u>Note</u> : The sub-project was given to people (who already had some degree of vocational skills so they just need the capital). While the VSW was given to people with very little vocational skills. The RG was made available to demobilized ex-combatants that developed a viable sub-project. <i>RG ni inkunga yo kwiteza imbere igenewe abasirikare bose basezerewe mu ngabo.</i> <i>Abagize RDF naba ex-combata basezerewe mu ngabo ni ikiciro cya gatatu (III) cya mafaranga RDRP wahabwa imperekeza ingana na frw120000 amezi atatu nyuma yo gusezererwa. Iyi mperekeza ihabwa nyuma y'uko abasezerewe bahawe amahugurwa (harimo nay kwiteza imbere) kugira ngo bategurire kuzahitamo neza imishinga bazakora bitewe n'uburyo babayeho n'ubukungu bwaho batuye. Ayo mezi 3 ni ayo gutegura aba excombata kumenyera ubuzima bwa gisivire n'ubuzima bubakikije mu byubukungu kugira bazashobore guhitamo neza imbyemezo bazafata.</i> <i>Icyitonderwa: iyi mishinga mito ihabwa abantu (bafite ubumenyiringiro mu myuga bakeneye ubushobozi kugira bakore). Mu gihe VSW ihabwa abafite ubumenyi buke ku myuga.</i>	
11.1	Do you feel that you had a clear understanding of the eligibility criteria for receiving the RG payment? <i>Wumva warasobanukiwe neza n'ibisabwa kuzuzwa kugira ubone inkunga yo kwiteza imbere?</i>	11.1
<b>ALL</b>	1 = Yes, understood eligibility criteria / <i>Yego, narasobanukiwe</i> 2 = No, did not understand eligibility criteria / <i>Oya, sinasobanukiwe</i>	
11.2	Were you eligible (i.e. did you meet the criteria) for the RG? <i>mwari mwujuje ibisabwa kugira muhabwe inkunga yo kwiteza imbere?</i>	11.2
<b>ALL</b>	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2 ⇒ skip to next section 12

11.3	Did you develop a viable sub-project? <i>Waba warakoze umushinga uciriritseuremerwa?</i>	11.3
ALL	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
11.4	Did you receive the Reintegration Grant (RG)? <i>Mwaba mwarabonye inkunga yo kwiteza imbere?</i>	11.4
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	1⇒Skip to Q11.6
11.5	If No, why did you not receive the RG? <i>Niba ari Oya, ni ukubera iki?</i>	11.5
	1 = Did not register at Sector Office in your community of return / <i>siniyandikishije ku biro by'umurenge</i> 2 = Did not open bank account / <i>sinafunguje konti muri banki</i> 3 = You had no ID card / <i>nta ndangamuntu ngira</i> 4 = Formerly part of an armed group disqualified from the payment / <i>nahoze mu ngabo zitemerewe iyi mperekeza</i> 5 = did not complete the appropriate paperwork / <i>sinujuje ibipapuro bisabwa</i> 6 = Away at the time / <i>sinari mpari icyo gihe</i> 7 = Did not develop a viable sub-project proposal / <i>nta mushinga wemewe nakoze</i>	
11.6	To obtain the RG, you were required to have a bank account. Did you open a new bank account for this purpose, or were you able to use an existing bank account? / <i>Kugira ngo ubone iyi mperekeza hasabwaga kuba ufite konti muri banki. Waba warafunguje konti kubw'iyi mpamvu cg wakoreshye iyo wari usanganywe?</i>	11.6
	1 = Opened a new bank account / <i>wafunguje konti nshya</i> 2 = Used an existing bank account / <i>wakoreshye iyo wari usanganywe</i> 3 = Given cash in hand / <i>nahawe amafaranga mu ntoki</i>	2⇒Skip to Q11.8
11.7	If open a new account: Was the process of opening a new bank account easy or difficult? <i>Niba warafunguje indi konti. Byari byoroshye cg bikomeye?</i>	11.7
	1 = Easy / <i>byaribyoroshye</i> 2 = Difficult / <i>byarangoye</i>	
11.8	Do you feel there was sufficient communication on how to receive your RG payment? <i>Wumva haratanzwe amakuru ahagije mu buryobwo kwakira inkunga yo kwiteza imbere?</i>	11.8
	1 = Sufficient / <i>burahagije</i> 2 = Insufficient / <i>ntibuhagije</i>	If no RG given, skip to next section 12
11.9	Was the value of the RG received less, equal or greater than what you expected? <i>Amafara y'inkunga yo kwiteza imbere wahawe yaba yari make, ngana cg aruta ayo wateganyaga?</i>	11.9
	1 = Less than expected / <i>Make</i> 2 = Equal to what was expected / <i>arahwanye</i> 3 = Greater than expected / <i>Arimenshi</i>	
11.10	Was this RG payment made three months after you returned to your community of return? <i>Inkunga yo kwiteza imbere yaje nyuma 'amezi atatu usubiye mu muryango mugari?</i>	11.10
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	1⇒skip to Q11.12
11.11	If no, how late (in weeks) was this third reinsertion payment? <i>Niba ari Oya byaba byaratwaye igihe kingana iki? (ibyumweru)</i>	11.11
	IN WEEKS / MU BYUMWERU	
11.12	Overall, how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the RG? <i>Muri rusange, ni gute wanyuzwe cyangwa utanyuzwe n'i inkunga yo kwiteza imbere?</i>	11.12
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe cyane</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>ntanakimwe</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	
11.13	Prior to receiving the RG, did you receive business development advice (i.e. advice on how to develop a sub-project for the use of your RG)? <i>Mbere yo guhabwa inkunga yo kwiteza imbere, waba warahawe inama mu bijyanye no gukora imishinga iciriritse yo kwiteza imbere?</i>	11.13
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	2⇒skip to Q11.15.1
11.14	How dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the business development advice? <i>Ni gute wanyuzwe cyangwa utanyuzwe n'inama zo kwikorera umushinga?</i>	11.14
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe cyane</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>ntanakimwe</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	

	There were various reintegration options that you could use your RG on. What reintegration option did you choose to spend your RG on? <i>Hariuburyo butandukanye washoboraga guhitamo wari kubonamo inkunga yo kwiteza imbere, ni ubuhe wahisemo?</i>	
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
11.15.1	Children's education <i>Kwiga kw'abana</i>	11.15.1
11.15.2	Formal education <i>Kujya mu ishuri</i>	11.15.2
11.15.3	Scholarships <i>Kurihirwa amashuri</i>	11.15.3
11.15.4	Housing <i>Inzu</i>	11.15.4
11.15.5	Tools <i>Ibikoresho</i>	11.15.5
11.15.6	Employment <i>Akazi</i>	11.15.6
11.15.7	Agricultural income generating activities <i>Imirimo y'ubuhinzi izana umusaruro</i>	11.15.7
11.15.8	Non-farm income-generating activities <i>Imirimo itari iy'ubuhinzi izana umusaruro</i>	11.15.8
11.15.9	Income generating activities in general <i>Imirimo itanga umusaruro</i>	11.15.9
11.15.10	Vocational and apprenticeship training <i>Amahugurwa y'imyuga no kwihugura</i>	11.15.10
11.16	Do you feel you had freedom to independently chose the reintegration option you wanted? <i>Wumva warihitanyemo ubwawe uburyo washakagakwiramo inkunga yo kwiteza imbere?</i>	11.16
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2⇒skip to Q11.19
11.17	If yes: To what extent did the reintegration option you chose, suited your individual circumstances? <i>Niba ari Yego, ni ku ruhe rugero ubwo buryo wahisemo bwagufashije ukurikije ibihe warurimo?</i>	11.17
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ku rugero ruto cyane</i> 2 = Small extent / <i>ku rugero ruto</i> 3 = Neither small nor large extent / <i>ruringaniye</i> 4 = Large extent / <i>ku rugero runini</i> 5 = Very large extent / <i>ku rugerorunini cyane</i>	
11.18	If yes: To what extent was the reintegration option you chose, suited to the structure of the local economy? <i>Niba ari Yego, ni gute ubwo buryo bwagufashije ukurikije ubukungu bw'aho utuye?</i>	11.18
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ku rugero ruto cyane</i> 2 = Small extent / <i>ku rugero ruto</i> 3 = Neither small nor large extent / <i>ntanakimwe</i> 4 = Large extent / <i>ku rugero runini</i> 5 = Very large extent / <i>ku rugero runini cyane</i>	
11.19	Do you feel your choice of reintegration option was an informed decision? <i>Wumva uburyo wahisemo aribwo bwari bukwiriye?</i>	11.19
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
	If you could re-make the choice of reintegration option today, given what you know now about the following listed factors, would you make the same choice? <i>Niba byashobokaga kongera guhitamouyu munsu, ukurikije ibyo uzi kuri ibi bikurikira, wagira amahitamo nkaya mbere?</i>	
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
11.20.1	Your personal life circumstances <i>Uburyo ubayeho</i>	11.20.1
11.20.2	The local economy <i>Ubukungu bw'aho utuye</i>	11.20.2
11.20.3	The community <i>Umuryango mugari</i>	11.20.3

	Answer the following questions which ask about the sub-project you used your RG. Subiza ibi bibazo bikurikira ku mushinga wakoreshejemo inkunga yawe yo kwiteza imbere <b>SELECT THE OPTIONS IN THE LIST / HITAMO MURI IYI LISITE</b>	
	1 = Administration / <i>ako mu biro</i> 2 = Farming – poultry / ubworozzi bw' inkoko 3 = Bee keeping / <i>korora inzuki</i> 4 = Beer brewing / <i>kwenga inzoga</i> 5 = Boda boda / taxi driver / <i>gutwara moto cyagwa tagisi</i> 6 = Carpentry / <i>ububaji</i> 7 = Casual labour / <i>imirimo isazwe</i> 8 = Catering, Hotel / <i>kwita ku bantu, hoteri</i> 9 = Charcoal / <i>amakara</i> 10 = Computers / <i>mudasobwa</i> 11 = Construction / <i>ubwubatsi</i> 12 = Driving vehicle / <i>gutwara imodoka</i> 13 = Electrician / <i>amashanyarazi</i> 14 = Farming - crops / <i>ubuhinzi</i> 15 = Farming – livestock / <i>ubworozzi</i> 16 = Fishing / <i>uburobyi</i> 17 = Hairdressing / <i>gutunganyaimisatsi</i> 18 = Health worker / <i>ubuzima</i> 19 = Hustle / <i>umukomisiyoneri</i> 20 = Laundry / <i>gusukuraimyenda</i> 21 = Masonry / <i>ubufundi</i> 22 = Mechanic / <i>ubukanishi</i> 23 = Money from family / <i>amafarngay'umuryango</i> 24 = Money from friends / <i>amafarngay'inshuti</i> 25 = Open, Run shop / <i>iduka</i> 26 = Plumbing, Waterpump / <i>ubuplobiye</i> 27 = Restaurant, Tea shop / <i>resitora</i> 28 = Savings, Loan, lending / <i>kubitsanokugurizanya</i> 29 = Security guard, private security / <i>ubuzamu</i> 30 = Tailoring / <i>ubudozi</i> 31 = Tannery, Leather production / <i>gutunganya impu</i> 32 = Teacher / <i>ubwarimu</i> 33 = Telephone, radio repair / <i>gukora amatelefone</i> 34 = Trading / <i>ubucuruzi muzamahanga</i> 35 = Welding / <i>gusudira</i> 36 = Business / <i>gushorampani</i> 37 = Digging / <i>ubucukuzi</i> 38 = Hair dressing / beautician / <i>gutunganya imisatsi</i> 39 = Selling goods / <i>ubucuruzi</i> 40 = Squandered it / <i>gukoresha amafaranga nabi</i>	
11.21.1	What was your <b>first choice</b> of sub-project that you wanted to use your RG on? <i>Ni uwuhe mushinga wa mbere washakaga gukoreshamo inkunga yawe yo kwiteza imbere?</i>	11.21.1
11.21.2	Which is the <b>actual sub-project</b> you used your RG grant on? <i>Ni uwuhe mushinga uciriritse ukora wakoreshejemo inkunga yawe yo kwiteza imbere?</i>	11.21.2
11.21.3	What are you <b>currently doing</b> for income generation or money? <i>Niki ukora ubu kinjiza amafaranga?</i>	11.21.3
11.21.4	What else (in addition to the above income generation) are you currently doing for income generation or money? ( <b>additional activity 1</b> ) <i>Uretse icyo utubwiye hejuru, niki kindi ukora kikwinjiza amafaranga?</i>	11.21.4
11.21.5	If you were given a chance to choose your RG sub-project again, given what you know now about the local economy, what type of sub-project <b>would you choose today</b> ? <i>Ukurikije uko uzi ubukungu bwaho utuye, wongeye guhabwa amahirwe yo guhitamo umushinga wo gukoreshamo inkunga yawe yo kwiteza imbere, ni uwuhe wahitamo?</i>	11.21.5
11.22	Do you feel you had freedom to independently chose the RG sub-project you wanted? <i>Wumva warahisemo ubwawe nta gitugu ubwo wafataginkunga y'umushinga uciriritse?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	11.22

## 12. VULNERABILITY SUPPORT WINDOW / INKUNGA Y' ABATISHOBOYE

<b>Read out</b>	The Vulnerability Support Window (VSW support) was determined by a narrow vetting process by the RDRP provincial offices. Only a small number of ex-combatants were eligible for this grant. The VSW is designed to support ex-combatants identified as economically, socially or medically vulnerable. There are narrow eligibility criteria for application to this grant. It is a grant designed to support, through apprenticeship, vocational training or small grants for income generating activities, those that remain vulnerable after the disbursement of the BNK, RSA and RG payments. The VSW entailed access to training, apprenticeship and in specific limited instances a small grant and rapid income generation training, or for continuing formal education. VSW assistance was offered on a grant basis with an average amount of assistance not exceeding FRw150,000 (US\$330). Beneficiaries of VSW support received access to vocational training for six months, apprenticeship training for four months, and in some cases a small grant and a two weeks training in income generation. <i>Inkunga y' abatishoboye ihabwa abasezerewe mu ngabobatishoboye kurusha abandi, bamenyekana biciye mu majonjora hakarebwa uwujije ibisabwa. Iyo nkunga ingana n' amafaranga ibihumbi ijana na mirongo itanu (150000frw). Abatoranyijwe nk' abatishoboye bagenerwa amahugurwa mubyo bihitayemo komisiyo ikabishyurira amafaranga asabwa.</i>	
12.1	Do you feel that you had a clear understanding of the eligibility criteria for receiving the VSW support? <i>Wumva warasobanukiwe neza ibisabwa kugira ubone inkunga y'abatishoboye?</i>	12.1
<b>ALL</b>	1 = Yes, understood eligibility criteria / <i>Yego, narasobanukiwe</i> 2 = No, did not understand eligibility criteria / <i>Oya, sinasobanukiwe</i>	
12.2	Were you eligible (i.e. did you meet the criteria) for the support known as the Vulnerability Support Window (VSW support)? <i>Wari wujije ibisabwa kugira ubone inkunga y'abatishoboye?</i>	12.2
<b>ALL</b>	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2⇒ skip to section 18
12.3	Did you get the VSW support? <i>Ese mwarabonye inkunga yabatishoboye?</i>	12.3
<b>ALL</b>	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2⇒ skip to Q12.5.1
12.4	Did you receive the VSW support yourself or did you defer it to your spouse? <i>Ni wowe wiyakirye inkunga y' abatishoboye cg watumyeumufasha wawe?</i>	12.4

	1 = Myself / <i>nyjewe</i> 2 = My spouse / <i>umufasha wanjye</i>	1 ⇒ skip to Q12.5.1
12.4.1	If your spouse received the VSW on your behalf what were the reasons? <i>Niba uwo mwashakanye yarahawe inkunga y' abatishoboye mu mwanya wawe ni iyihe mpamvu yabiteye?</i> 1 = I have a disability / <i>mbana n' ubumuga</i> 2 = I was sick / <i>nari ndwaye</i> 3 = I was busy / <i>ntamwanya nari mfite</i> 4 = I trust her / him / <i>ndamwizera</i> 5 = She / He was more qualified / <i>yandushaga amashuri</i>	12.4.1
	At the time of awarding the VSW were any of the following issues relevant to your circumstances? <i>Igihe uwo mwashakanye yafataga inkunga y' abatishoboye mu mwanya wawe, muri ibi bibazo bikurikira hari icyaba cyarabiteye?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
12.5.1	Did not own a personal house <i>Nta nzu nagiraga</i>	12.5.1
12.5.2	No access to arable land <i>Nta butaka nari mfite</i>	12.5.2
12.5.3	Lack of income <i>Ntacyo ninjizaga</i>	12.5.3
12.5.4	Lack of assets <i>Nta mitungo nari mfite</i>	12.5.4
12.5.5	Lack of vocational skills <i>Nta bumenyi bw' imyuga nari mfite</i>	12.5.5
12.5.6	Lack of skills for establishing an income generating activity <i>Nta bumenyi bwo kwihangira umurimo ubyara inyungu nari mfite</i>	12.5.6
12.5.7	Permanent disabled <i>Mfite ubumuga bwa burundu</i>	12.5.7
12.5.8	Already had a chronic disease <i>Nari mfite indwara idakira</i>	12.5.8
12.6	Do you feel there was sufficient communication on how to receive your VSW? <i>Wumva harabayeyeho gutanga amakuru ahagije ku buryo bwokwakira iyi nkunga y' abatishoboye?</i> 1 = Sufficient / <i>burahagije</i> 2 = Insufficient / <i>ntibuhagije</i>	12.6  If no VSW given, skip to next section 18
12.7	Was the value of the VSW support you received less, equal or greater than what you expected? <i>Agaciro k' inkunga y' abatishoboye wabonye kari gacye, kangana cg karutaga agaciro k' inkunga wateganyaga kubona?</i> 1 = Less than expected / <i>make</i> 2 = Equal to what was expected / <i>ahwanye</i> 3 = Greater than expected / <i>arimenshi</i>	12.7
12.8	Overall, how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with all you benefited from the VSW support? <i>Murirusange, ni gute wanyuzwe cyagwa utanyuzunwe n' inkugawahawe igenewe abatishoboye?</i> 1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe cyane</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>ntanakimwe</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	12.8
<b>13. USE OF VSW SUPPORT / IKORESHA RY' INKUNGA Y' ABATISHOBOYE</b>		
	Did you receive any of the following information about the various options for the use of the VSW support? <i>Wigeze wakira mu makuru akurikira ajyanye n' uburyo butandukanye wakoresha inkunga y' abatishoboye?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
13.1.1	Information on apprenticeship training <i>Amakuru ku mahugurwa yo kwiyongera ubumenyi</i>	13.1.1
13.1.2	Information on vocational training <i>Amakuru ku mahugurwa y' imyuga</i>	13.1.2
13.1.3	Information on training on income generation <i>Amakuru ku mahugurwa yo gushaka ikinjiza amafaranga</i>	13.1.3
13.1.4	Information on continuing formal education <i>Amakuru yo ku gukomeza kwiga</i>	13.1.4
13.1.5	Advice on what type of useage would be best for you. <i>Inama kucyo wakora cyaba cyiza kuri wowe.</i>	13.1.5
	What did you use your VSW support for? <i>Ese iyi nkunga wayikoresheje iki?</i>	

	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
13.2.1	For apprenticeship training (with six month training) <i>Ku mahugurwa yo kwiyongera ubumenyi (mu mezi atandatu)</i>	13.2.1
13.2.2	For vocational skills training in a Vocational Training Institute (with four months training) <i>Ku mahugurwa y'imyuga (mu mezi ane)</i>	13.2.2
13.2.3	Financial support for income generation (with two weeks training) <i>Gushora imar imu kwiteza imbere (mu mezi abiri)</i>	13.2.3
13.2.4	For continuing formal education (either Lower secondary, upper secondary, tertiary or University education) / <i>Ku gukomeza amashuri (ayisumbuye cyagwa kaminuza)</i>	13.2.4
<b>14. USE OF VSW FOR CONTINUING FORMAL EDUCATION</b>		
<b>IKORESHWA RY' INKUNGA Y' ABATISHOBOYE MU GUKOMEZA AMASHURI</b>		
14.1 ALL	Are you currently enrolled in formal education? <i>Ese ubu uriga mu mashuri asanzwe??</i>	14.1
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
14.2 ALL	Have you completed your formal training or education? <i>Ese washoje amashuri??</i>	14.2
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	1 ⇒ skipto Q14.4
14.3	If no: Why have you not completed your formal training or education? <i>Niba ari Oya, kubera iki utayasoje?</i>	14.3
	1 = No money to pay for fees / <i>Nta mafaranga yo kwisyuhura</i> 2 = No time / <i>Nta mwanya</i> 3 = Engaged in income generation / <i>Niyemeje kujya mu mirimo itanga inyungu</i> 4 = Other family responsibilities / <i>Kubw'ishingano z'umuryango</i> 5 = Poor health / <i>Ubuzima butameze neza</i> 6 = Studies no longer relevant to my vocation / <i>Inyigisho zari zihabanye n' impano yanjye</i> 7 = My education is ongoing / <i>Ndacyari mu ishuri</i>	
14.4 ALL	If used VSW for formal education: Did the RDRC make a payment for your education fees? <i>Niba innkunga yawe warayikoresheje mu kwiga: ni komisiyo yakwishyuriraga amafasharanga y' ishuri?</i>	14.4
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	2 ⇒ next section 15
14.5	To what extent do you feel the support of the VSW contributed to you getting back into formal education? <i>Ni Kuruhe rwego wumva iyi nkunga yaba yaragufashije mu gusubira kwiga?</i>	14.5
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ku rwego ruto cyane</i> 2 = Small extent / <i>ku rwego ruto</i> 3 = Average / <i>kurwego ruriganiye</i> 4 = Large extent / <i>ku rwego runini</i> 5 = Very large extent / <i>ku rwego runini cyane</i>	
14.6	Are you still receiving formal education support under VSW? <i>Waba ugihabwa inkunga ihabwa abatishoboye ibafasha mu myingire y' amashuri?</i>	14.6
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	2 ⇒ 14.9
14.7	If Yes, do you intend to continue your education after the two year VSW support? <i>Niba ari yego, urateganya gukomeza amashuri nyuma y' imyaka ibiri y' inkunga ihabwa abatishoboye?</i>	14.7
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	1 ⇒ 14.8.1 2 ⇒ 14.11
	If Yes: How do you intend to support your continued education? <i>Niba ari yego, ni gute uteganya kwifasha mu masomo yawe?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
14.8.1	From parents / relatives / <i>gufashwa n' umuryango / abavandimwe</i>	14.8.1
14.8.2	Work part time to finance it / <i>gukora ibiraka ngo mbashye kwiyishyura amafaranga y' ishuri</i>	14.8.2
14.8.3	Look for further support from NGOs / <i>gushaka inkunga mu miryango itegamiye kuri Leta</i>	14.8.3
14.8.4	From friends / <i>izava mu nshuti</i>	14.8.4
14.8.5	A loan from a formal bank or lending institution / <i>inguzanyo ya banki cg ikigo gitanga inguzanyo</i>	14.8.5
14.8.6	From my existing savings / <i>mu yo nzigamiye</i>	14.8.6

	If Yes: How do you intend to support your continued education? Niba ari yego, ni gute uteganya kwifasha mu masomo yawe? 1 = Yes / Yego 2 = No / Oya	
14.8.7	No idea / nta gitekerezo	14.8.7
14.9	Did you actually continue your formal education after the two year VSW grant? Waba warakomeje amashuri yawe nyuma y' imyaka ibiri y'inkunga igenewrwe abatishoboye? 1 = Yes / Yego 2 = No / Oya	14.9 1⇒14.10.1 2⇒14.11
	If yes, identify all the sources from where did the money come from your continued formal education? Niba ari yego, wakuyeye amafaranga yagufashije gukomeza amashuri? 1 = Yes / Yego 2 = No / Oya	
14.10.1	From parents / relatives / yavuye mu mumuryango / abavindimwe	14.10.1
14.10.2	Work part time to finance it / gukora ibiraka ngo mbashye kwishyura	14.10.2
14.10.3	Look for further support from NGOs / gushaka inkunga iva mu miryango itegamiye kuri Leta	14.10.3
14.10.4	From friends / yavuye mu nshuri	14.10.4
14.10.5	A loan from a formal bank or lending institution / inguzanyo nahawe na banki cyangwa ikigo gitanga inguzanyo	14.10.5
14.10.6	From my existing savings / yavuye muyo nzigamyeye	14.10.6
14.11	Did you complete your formal education? Warangije amashuri yawe? 1 = Yes / Yego 2 = No / Oya	14.11
<b>15.VSW TRAINING ON VOCATIONAL, APPRENTICESHIP, INCOME GENERATION</b>		
	How dissatisfied or satisfied were you in the following aspects of the training as part of the VSW support? Ni gute wanyuzwe cyagwa utanyuzwe n' ingingo zikurikira zigize amahugurwa nka kimwe mu gice kigize ubufasha bw' inkunga y' abatishoboye? 1 = Very dissatisfied / sinanyuzwe cyane 2 = Dissatisfied / sinanyuzwe 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / ntanakimwe 4 = Satisfied / naranyuzwe 5 = Very Satisfied / naranyuzwe cyane	
15.1.1	Training content Ibigize amahugurwa	15.1.1
15.1.2	Training length Umwanya amahugurwa yamaze	15.1.2
15.1.3	Quality of the trainers / training staff abatanze amahugurwa / abakozi	15.1.3
15.1.4	Relevance of the training course Amasom ajoyanye	15.1.4
15.1.5	Language spoken or used to deliver the training course Ururimi rwavugagwa cyangwa wakoreshejwe mu gutanga amahugurwa	15.1.5
15.1.6	Size, or the number of people taking part in, the training sessions Inganocg umubare bw'abahugurwaga	15.1.6
15.1.7	Time arrangements for the training sessions Uko igihe cyakoreshwaga	15.1.7
15.1.8	Post-training support and follow-up Gufashwa no gukurikiranwa nyuma y'amahugurwa	15.1.8
15.2	Did you receive <u>training in project planning and entrepreneurship</u> as part of the apprenticeship, vocational or income generation training? Wigeze uhabwa amahugurwa yo gutegura umushinga no kwihangira umurimo? 1 = Yes / Yego 2 = No / Oya	15.2 2 ⇒ skip to next section 16

15.3	Generally how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the <u>training in project planning and entrepreneurship</u> you received on apprenticeship, vocational or income generation? <i>Muri rusange ni gute wanyuzwe cg utanyuzwe?</i>	15.3
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe cyane</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>ntanakimwe</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	
<b>FORMER CHILD XC ONLY</b>	To what extent were you satisfied or dissatisfied with the following types of economic reintegration support you received? <i>Ni kuruhe rwego waba waranyuzwe cg utaranyuzwe gute ni izi nkunga zigufasha gusubira mu buzima busanzwe zikurikira?</i>	
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe na gake</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied not satisfied / <i>biraringaniye</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	
3.5.1	Vocational training / Apprenticeship / <i>Amahugurwa y' imyuga</i>	3.5.1
3.5.2	Formal education / <i>Uburezi bwo mu mashuri</i>	3.5.2
3.5.3	Income generation activity support for parents / relatives / <i>Imirimo ibyara inyungu iterwa inkunga n' ababyeyi / abavandimwe</i>	3.5.3
<b>16. TYPES OF VOCATIONAL, APPRENTICESHIP, INCOME GENERATION THAT VSW USED FOR</b>		
	Answer the following questions which ask about your vocation, apprenticeship, or income generation activities acquired with your VSW, your preferences, and your current income generation. <i>Subiza ibisubizo bikurikira bibaza ku myuga, ubumenyi ngiro cyangwa umurimo wo kongera umusaruro ijyanye n'iyi nkuga, iyo wahisemo n'ibyo uri kwinjiza ubu.</i> <b>SELECT THE OPTIONS IN THE LIST / HITAMO MURI IYI LISITI</b>	
	1 = Administration / <i>ako mu biro</i> 16 = Fishing / <i>uburobyi</i> 29 = Security guard, private security / <i>ubuzamu</i> 2 = Farming - Poultry / <i>ubworozi bw' inkoko</i> 17 = Hairdressing / <i>gutunganyaimisatsi</i> 30 = Tailoring / <i>ubudozi</i> 3 = Bee keeping / <i>kororainzuki</i> 18 = Health worker / <i>ubuzima</i> 31 = Tannery, Leather production / <i>gutunganya impu</i> 4 = Beer brewing / <i>kwengainzoga</i> 19 = Hustle / <i>umukomisiyoneri</i> 32 = Teacher / <i>ubwarimu</i> 5 = Boda boda / taxi driver / <i>gutwaramotocyagwatagisi</i> 20 = Laundry / <i>gusukuraimyenda</i> 33 = Telephone, radio repair / <i>gukoraamatelefone</i> 6 = Carpentry / <i>ububaji</i> 21 = Masonry / <i>ubufundi</i> 34 = Trading / <i>ubucuruzimuzamahanga</i> 7 = Casual labour / <i>imirimoisazwe</i> 22 = Mechanic / <i>ubukanishi</i> 35 = Welding / <i>gusudira</i> 8 = Catering, Hotel / <i>kwita ku bantu, hoteri</i> 23 = Money from family / <i>amafaragay'umuryango</i> 36 = Business / <i>gushoraimpari</i> 9 = Charcoal / <i>amakara</i> 24 = Money from friends / <i>amafaragay'inshuti</i> 37 = Digging / <i>ubucukuzi</i> 10 = Computers / <i>mudasobwa</i> 25 = Open, Run shop / <i>iduka</i> 38 = Hair dressing / beautician / <i>gutunganyaimisatsi</i> 11 = Construction / <i>ubwubatsi</i> 26 = Plumbing, Waterpump / <i>ubuplobiye</i> 39 = Selling goods / <i>ubucuruzi</i> 12 = Driving vehicle / <i>gutwaraimodoka</i> 27 = Restaurant, Tea shop / <i>resitora</i> 40 = Nothing / <i>ntanakimwe</i> 13 = Electrician / <i>amashanyarazi</i> 28 = Savings, Loan, lending / <i>kubitsanokugurizanya</i> 14 = Farming - crops / <i>ubuhinzi</i> 15 = Farming – livestock / <i>ubworozi</i>	
16.1.1	What was your <u>first choice</u> of vocation / apprenticeship / income generation activity that you wanted to use your VSW for? <i>Ese ni iki wahisemo bwa mbere wakoreshye iyi nkuga?</i>	16.1.1
16.1.2	Which is the vocation / apprenticeship / income generation activity you were actually <u>trained in or supported in under the VSW support?</u> <i>Ni uwuhe mwuga wahuguwemo ukora cyangwa wakoreshyemo inkunga y' abatishoboye?</i>	16.1.2
16.1.3	What are you currently doing for income generation or money? <i>Ese ubu uri gukora iki kikwinjiriza amafaranga?</i>	16.1.3
16.1.4	What else (in addition to the above income generation) are you currently doing for income generation or money? ( <u>additional activity 1</u> ) <i>Ni ikihe kindi ukora kinjiza amafaranga?</i>	16.1.4
16.1.5	If you were given a chance to choose your vocational training, apprenticeship or income generation supported under the VSW support again, given what you know now about the local economy, what type of sub-project <u>would you choose today</u> . <i>Ushingiyeye uko ubona ubukungu bwaho utuye, uhawe andi mahirwe y' umwuga uhugurwamo, ni ubuhe bwoko bw' umushinga wahitamwo?</i>	16.1.5
16.2	Do you feel you had freedom to independently chose the type of vocation / apprenticeship / income generation activity training you wanted? / <i>Wumva waragize ubwigenge mu guhitamo umwuga cg igikorwa kinjiza amafarangawashakaga guhugurwamo?</i>	16.2
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
16.3	How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the vocation / apprenticeship / income generation activity you were trained in? <i>Ni gute wanyuzwe cyangwa utanyuzwe n'amahugurwa wahawe?</i>	16.3
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe cyane</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>ntanakimwe</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	

16.4	To what extent has your income changed as a result of the VSW vocation / apprenticeship / income generation activity? <i>Dushingiye ku musaruro w' inkunga y' abatishoboye, ni kuruhe rugero amafaranga winjiza yiyongereye?</i>	16.4
	1 = Very much less money / amafaranga macye cyane 2 = Less money / amafaranga macye 3 = Same as before / ntacyahidutse 4 = More money / amafaranga yariyongereye 5 = Very much more money / amafaranga yariyongereye cyane	
16.5	Are you currently working in the vocation / apprenticeship / income generation activity in which you were trained with your VSW? <i>Ubu waba ukora umwuga cyangwa umushinga wahuguriwe?</i>	16.5
	1 = Yes / Yego 2 = No / Oya	1 ⇒ section 17
	Are any of the following, reasons why you are not working in that vocation / apprenticeship / income generation activity <i>Haba hari imwe muri izi mpamvu yatumye udakora uwo mwuga?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego 2 = No / Oya	
16.6.1	Lack of access to capital <i>Kubura igishoro</i>	16.6.1
16.6.2	Did not have the right tools <i>Kutangira ibikoresho biboneye</i>	16.6.2
16.6.3	Training was not sufficient / you did not learn enough <i>Amahugurwa ntiyari ahagije / sinize byinshi</i>	16.6.3
16.6.4	Training did not apply to your life circumstances <i>Amahugurwa ntahura n'ubuzima tubamo</i>	16.6.4
16.6.5	Unrest / Insecurity prevented me from working in that vocation <i>Umutekano muke wambujije kugira icyo nkora</i>	16.6.5
16.6.6	Was not interested in the training skills <i>Sinishimiye ubumenyi nakuye mu mahugurwa</i>	16.6.6
16.6.7	You did not want to make use of the training skills <i>Sinashatse gukoresha ubumenyi nahawe</i>	16.6.7
16.6.8	Other employment opportunities came up <i>Nabonye andi mahirwe y'imirimo</i>	16.6.8
16.6.9	Prejudice by the clients / community against ex-combatants <i>Kutishimirwa n'abakiriya</i>	16.6.9
16.6.10	You could not make a money or a profit from this vocation / apprenticeship / income generation activity <i>Uyu mushinga ntiwari kwunguka</i>	16.6.10
16.6.11	Too many other people offer / engage in this vocation / apprenticeship / income generation activity <i>Hari benshi bakoraga uyu mwuga</i>	16.6.11
16.6.12	I have not finished my training <i>Sinarangije amahugurwa</i>	16.6.12
<b>17. VSW TOOLKITS IN SUPPORT OF THE VOCATIONAL TRAINING, APPRENTICESHIP, INCOME GENERATION</b>		
17.1	Did you receive a toolkit? <i>Wahawe ibikoresho?</i>	17.1
	1 = Yes / Yego 2 = No / Oya	2 ⇒ Skip to 17.4
17.2	Generally how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the toolkit you received? <i>Muri rusange ni gute wanyuzwe cyangwa utanyuzwe n'ibikoresho wahawe?</i>	17.2
	1 = Very dissatisfied / sinanyuzwe cyane 2 = Dissatisfied / sinanyuzwe 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / ntanakimwe 4 = Satisfied / naranyuzwe 5 = Very Satisfied / naranyuzwe cyane	
17.3	From the completion of the training, how long did it take to receive the toolkit? <i>Musoje amahugurwa, byatwaye igihe kigana gute kugira mubone ibikoresho?</i>	17.3
	1 = 1-3 weeks / nyuma y' icyumweru n' ibyumweru 3 2 = 1-2 months after / nyuma y' ukwezi n' amezi 2 3 = 3-6 months after / nyuma y' amezi 3 n' amezi 6 4 = 7 months to one year after / nyuma y' amezi 7 n' umwaka 5 = More than a year later / hashize umwaka 6 = Never / / ntacyo	

17.4	From the completion of the training, how long did it take to <u>start generating an income</u> ? <i>Nyuma yo gusozza amahugurwa, byagutwaye igihe kigana gute kugira ushobore gutangira kugira icyo winjiza?</i>	17.4
	1=In weeks / <i>mu byumweru</i> 2=In months / <i>mu mezi</i> 3=In years / <i>mu myaka</i>	
	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the toolkit? <i>Ni kuruhe rwego wemeranya cyangwa utemeranya ni izi mvugo zikurikira ku bijyanye n'ibikoresho?</i>	
	1 = Very much disagree / <i>ntitwemeranya cyane</i> 2 = Disagree / <i>ntitwemeranya</i> 3 = Neither disagree or agree / <i>ntanakimwe</i> 4 = Agree / <i>turemeranya</i> 5 = Strongly agree / <i>turemeranya cyane</i>	
17.5.1	The number of items in the toolkit was sufficient. <i>Umubare w'ibikoresho wari uhagije</i>	17.5.1
17.5.2	The items in the toolkit were good quality. <i>Ibikoresho byari bifite ubuziranenge</i>	17.5.2
17.5.3	The items in the toolkit were useful. <i>Ibikoresho byarakoraga</i>	17.5.3
17.5.4	You knew how to use the tools in the toolkit. <i>Narizi kubikoresha.</i>	17.5.4
17.5.5	The tools matched the training you received. <i>Ibikoresho byari bijyanye n' amahugurwa wahawe.</i>	17.5.5
17.5.6	The toolkit is valuable <i>Byari bifite agaciro</i>	17.5.6
17.5.7	You got all the types of tools you needed in the toolkit. <i>Ubwoko bwose bw' ibikoresho narinkeneyenarabubonye.</i>	17.5.7
	Specifically, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the toolkit? <i>Byumwihariko, ni ku rugero rungana rute wemeranya cg utemeranya n'imvugo zikurikira zivuga ku bikoresho?</i>	
	1 = Very much disagree / <i>sinemeranya nabyo na gato</i> 2 = Disagree / <i>sinemeranya nabyo</i> 3 = Neither disagree or agree / <i>bigereranyije</i> 4 = Agree / <i>ndabyemera</i> 5 = Strongly agree / <i>ndabyemera cyane</i>	
17.6.1	Some items were of low quality / easy to break / <i>ibikoresho bimwe byari bibi / byangirika vuba</i>	17.6.1
17.6.2	Some items were faulty / did not work / <i>ibikoresho bimwe byari byarangiritse / bidakora</i>	17.6.2
17.6.3	Some items were broken when you received them. / <i>ibikoresho bimwe twabyakiriye byarangirtse</i>	17.6.3
17.6.4	Some of the tools were missing when you received them / <i>mu bikoresho byakiriwe, hari ibyaburagamo</i>	17.6.4
17.6.5	You wanted different additional items to what you received / <i>kubyo nakiriye, narinkeneye ibindi.</i>	17.6.5
17.6.6	You wanted more items of the same kind / <i>nifuzaga ibindi bikoresho bisa n' ibyo nahawe.</i>	17.6.6
17.6.7	Your toolkit was missing items that others received / <i>mu bikoresho byaburagamo, abandi bari babifitee.</i>	17.6.7
	What do you suggest can be improved about the toolkits which were handed out following the vocational training? / <i>Mu bikoresho byatanze mu mashuri y' imyuga, hari icyo ubona cyahindurwa?</i>	
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
17.7.1	Better quality items / <i>Ibikoresho byiza</i>	17.7.1
17.7.2	Different types of items / <i>Ubwoko butandukanye bw' ibikoresho</i>	17.7.2
17.7.3	Greater quantities of items / <i>Ibikoresho byinshi</i>	17.7.3
17.7.4	Better means of transporting the toolkit from the RDRC offices to your community of return <i>Uburyo bwiza bwo gutwara ibikoresho biva ku biro bya komisiyo bigera aho dutuye.</i>	17.7.4
17.7.5	Nothing can be improved about the toolkit / <i>ntacyo</i>	17.7.5

**18. SUPPORT TO FORM A COOPERATIVE / ASSOCIATION / INKUNGA YO GUSHINGA AMAKOPERATIVE / AMASHYIRAHAMWE**

ALL	Did you attend or participate in any of the listed activities? <i>Ese waba waritabiriye kimwe muri ibi bikorwa bikurikira?</i>		
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya		
18.1.1	Attended the RDRC contracted resource persons – sponsored training in cooperatives / associations, entrepreneurship, project preparation and management / <i>Narayitabiriye</i>	18.1.1	1 ⇒ compl section 19
18.1.2	Attended the learning tour <i>Nagiye mu rugendo shuri</i>	18.1.2	1 ⇒ compl section 20
18.1.3	Received technical assistance or coaching <i>Nahawe ubufasha mu bijyanye na tekinike cg ubujyanama</i>	18.1.3	1 ⇒ compl section 22
	If all responses above are 2 ⇒ Q18.2.1		
	Are any of the following listed reasons why you did not attend the training or touring or receive technical assistance or coaching? <i>Hari impamvu nimwe muri izi zikurikira yakubujije kwitabira amahugurwa cg urugendo shuri?</i>		
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya		
18.2.1	It was too far away / <i>hari kure cyane</i>	18.2.1	
18.2.2	You couldn't get there / <i>sinabashaga kugerayo</i>	18.2.2	
18.2.3	It was too long / <i>hari harehare</i>	18.2.3	
18.2.4	You did not need to learn those things / <i>sinashakagabyitabira</i>	18.2.4	
18.2.5	You did not want to do more training / <i>ntayandi mahugurwa nari nkeneye</i>	18.2.5	
18.2.6	Family responsibilities prevented me / <i>nabujijwe n' inshingano z' umuryango</i>	18.2.6	
			⇒ next section 22

**19. TRAINING ON COOPERATIVE / AMAHUGURWA KU MAKOPERATIVE**

19.1	If training: To what extent did you learn anything from the training in cooperatives / associations, entrepreneurship, project preparation and management? <i>Niba warahuguwe, ni kuruhe rugero waba hari icyo wamenye ku bijyanye n' amakopretive / amashyirahamwe, kwihangira imirimo, gutegura imishinga no kuyicunga?</i>	19.1	
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ruto cyane</i> 2 = Small extent / <i>ruto</i> 3 = Average / <i>rugereranyije</i> 4 = Large extent / <i>runini</i> 5 = Very large extent / <i>runini cyane</i>		
19.2	If training: To what extent have you used what you have learned from training in cooperatives / associations, entrepreneurship, project preparation and management? <i>Niba warahuguwe, ni kurugero rungana iki wakoresheje ibyo wigiye muri ay mahugurwa?</i>	19.2	
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ruto cyane</i> 2 = Small extent / <i>ruto</i> 3 = Average / <i>rugereranyije</i> 4 = Large extent / <i>runini</i> 5 = Very large extent / <i>runini cyane</i>		
	If training: Why have you not used what you have learned? <i>Niba warahuguwe, kuki utakoresheje ubumenyi wakuye muri ayo mahugurwa?</i>		
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya		
19.3.1	No opportunity to apply knowledge / <i>ntamahirwe nagize yo kubukoresha</i>	19.3.1	
19.3.2	Training did not correspond to actual needs / <i>amahugurwa ntayo yari ajyanye n' ibyo nari nkeneye</i>	19.3.2	
19.3.3	Socio-political situation did not allow to apply knowledge (external factors) / <i>izindi mpamvu zambujije kubukoresha</i>	19.3.3	
19.3.4	Lack of confidence / <i>nta kizere nari nifitiye</i>	19.3.4	
19.4	If training: How satisfied or dissatisfied were you in the training you received? <i>Niba warahuguwe, ni gute wanyuzwe cg utanyuzwe n' amahugurwa wahe?</i>	19.4	
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe na gato</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>biriganiye</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>		

If training: To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the training? <i>Niba warahuguwe, ni ku rugero rungana rute wemeranya n' izi mvugo zikurikira zivuga ku mahugurwa?</i>		
1 = Very disagree / <i>simbyemera na gato</i> 2 = Disagree / <i>simbyemera</i> 3 = Neither disagree nor agree / <i>birageraranyije</i> 4 = Agree / <i>ndabyemera</i> 5 = Very much agree / <i>ndabyemera cyane</i>		
19.5.1	Training content / <i>ibigize amahugurwa</i>	19.5.1
19.5.2	Training length / <i>ubunini bw' amahugurwa</i>	19.5.2
19.5.3	Quality of the trainers / training staff / <i>ubushobozi bw' abahugura / abafashamyumvire</i>	19.5.3
19.5.4	Relevance of the training course / <i>amasomoyari ajyanye n' amahugurwa</i>	19.5.4
19.5.5	Language spoken or used to deliver the training course / <i>ururimi rwakoreshejwe mu itangwa ry' amahugurwa</i>	19.5.5
19.5.6	Size, or the number of people taking part in, the training sessions / <i>ingano / umubare w' abakurikiranye amahugurwa</i>	19.5.6
19.5.7	Time arrangements for the training sessions / <i>gahunda y' amahugurwa</i>	19.5.7
19.5.8	Post-training support and follow-up / <i>gufashwa no gukurikiranwanyuma y' amahugurwa</i>	19.5.8
19.6	Have you formed or joined a cooperative since your training? <i>Waba warakoze cg waragiye muri koperative nyuma yo kwitabira amahugurwa?</i>	19.6
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2 ⇒ skip to section 20
19.7	Are you still part of that cooperative? <i>Uracyari umunyamuryango w' iyo koperative?</i>	19.7
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2 ⇒ skip to section 20
19.8	How many people are in your cooperative (ENTER RAW NUMBER) <i>Muri abanyamuryango banagahe muri iyo koperative? (Shyiramo Umubare)</i>	19.8
19.9	What is the mix of people in your cooperative? <i>Abagize iyo koperative ni abantu bavanze?</i>	19.9
	1 = Excombatants only / <i>abasezerewe mu ngabo gusa</i> 2 = Ex-combatants and civilians / <i>abasezerewe mu ngabo n' abatwaga basanze</i>	
<b>20. EXPERIENCE OF THE LEARNING TOUR / ICYO WUNGUKIYE MU RUGENDOSHURI</b>		
20.1	If touring: To what extent did you learn anything from the learning tour? <i>Niba waragiye mu rugendoshuri, ibyo wungukiyemo biri ku rugero rungana iki?</i>	20.1
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ruto cyane</i> 2 = Small extent / <i>ruto</i> 3 = Average / <i>ruringaniye</i> 4 = Large extent / <i>runini</i> 5 = Very large extent / <i>runini cyane</i>	
20.2	If touring: To what extent have you used what you have learned from the learning tour? <i>Niba waragiye mu rugendoshuri, ni ku rugero rungana ikiwakoreshije ibyo wungutse?</i>	20.2
	1 = Very small extent / <i>ruto cyane</i> 2 = Small extent / <i>ruto</i> 3 = Average / <i>ruringaniye</i> 4 = Large extent / <i>runini</i> 5 = Very large extent / <i>runini cyane</i>	
	If touring: Why have you not used what you have learned? <i>Niba waragiye mu rugendoshuri, kuki utakoreshije ibyo wungutse?</i>	
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
20.3.1	No opportunity to apply knowledge / <i>nta mahirwe nagize yo kubikoresha</i>	20.3.1
20.3.2	Training did not correspond to actual needs / <i>amahugurwa ntiyari ahuye n' ibyifuzo byanjye</i>	20.3.2
20.3.3	Socio-political situation did not allow to apply knowledge (external factors) / <i>impamvu zitanturutse</i>	20.3.3
20.3.4	Lack of confidence / <i>kutigirira icyizere</i>	20.3.4
20.4	If touring: How satisfied or dissatisfied were you in the training you received? <i>Niba waragiye mu rugendoshuri, ni gute wanyuzwecg utanyuzwe amahugurwa wahawe?</i>	20.4
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwena gato</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>biringaniye</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	

	If touring: To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the learning tour? <i>Niba waragiye mu rugendoshuri, ni kuruhe rugero wemeramywa n' izi mvugo zikurikira zivuga ku rugendoshuri?</i> 1 = Very disagree / <i>simbyemera na gato</i> 2 = Disagree / <i>simbyemera</i> 3 = Neither disagree nor agree / <i>birageraranyije</i> 4 = agree / <i>ndabyemera</i> 5 = very much agree / <i>ndabyemera cyane</i>	
20.5.1	Tour location / <i>aho rwabereye</i>	20.5.1
20.5.2	Tour length / <i>uko urugendo shuri rwanganaga</i>	20.5.2
20.5.3	Relevance of tour / <i>urugendoshurirwari rujyanye nibyo dukora</i>	20.5.3
20.5.4	Post-tour support and follow-up / <i>gufashwano gukurikiranwanyuma y' urugendoshuri</i>	20.5.4
<b>21. PROJECT COMPETITION / IRUSHANWA RY' IMISHINGA</b>		
21.1	Did your cooperative participate in a project competition? <i>Koperative yanyu yitabiriye amarushanywa y' imishinga?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	21.1 2⇒section 22
21.2	If yes: Were you awarded a prize in the project competition? <i>Niba ari Yego, hari igihembo mwatsindiye muri ayo marushanwa?</i> 1 = Yes, First prize / <i>Yego, igihembo cya mbere</i> 2 = Yes, Second prize / <i>Yego igihembo cya kabiri</i> 3 = Yes, Third prize / <i>Yego igihembocya gatatu</i> 4 = No / <i>Oya</i>	21.2 4⇒next section 22
21.3	If yes: Did your cooperative get a cash prize? <i>Niba ari Yego,koperative yanyu yahawe igihembo cy' amafaranga?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	21.3 2⇒section 22
21.4	What was a cash value of your prize in Frw? <i>Icyo gihembo cyanganaga n' amafaranga anaghe?</i> ENTER THE AMOUNT / <i>SHYIRAMO UMUBARE</i> 21.4	
<b>22. RETURNING WITH DEPENDANTS / GUTAHUKANA N'UMURYANGO</b>		
22.1	Did you return with dependents? <i>Wagarukanye n'umuryango?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	22.1 2⇒next section 23
22.2	Were your dependents offered social orientation training? <i>Umuryango wawe wahawe amahugurwa ku bijyanye n' imibanire?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	22.2
22.3	From where did your dependents return? <i>Umuryango watahutse uturuka he?</i> 1 = North KIVU / <i>kivu y' amajyaruguru</i> 2 = South KIVU / <i>Kivu y' amajyepfo</i> 3 = Other / <i>ahandi</i>	22.3
22.4	What Transit Centre did your dependents attend? <i>Bakiriwe muri center?</i> 1 = Nkamira (Mutobo), Western Province 2 = Nyagatare, Western Province	22.4
22.5	How long was your dependent in the Transit Centre? <i>Bamaze igihe kingana iki muri transit center?</i> 1 = Less than 7 days / <i>munsi y' iminsi 7</i> 2 = 7 days / <i>iminsi 7</i> 3 = More than 7 days / <i>hejuru y' iminsi 7</i> 4 = More than 14 days / <i>hejuru y'iminsi 14</i>	22.5
22.6	Did any of your dependents need medical care? <i>Mu muryango wawe, hari abari ukeneye kuvuzwa?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	22.6 2⇒next section 23

22.7	Did they receive medical care? <i>Baravuwe?</i>	22.7
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	2⇒skip to Q22.9
22.8	How satisfied or dissatisfied were your dependents with this medical care? <i>Abo mu muryango wawe banyuzwe cg ntibanyuzwe n' ubuvuzi bahawe?</i>	22.8
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>ntibanyuzwe na gacye</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>ntibanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor <i>satisfied / bigereranyije</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>baranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very Satisfied / <i>baranyuzwe cyane</i>	
22.9	Did they receive psychosocial screening and support? <i>Waba warahawe inkunga ihabwa abakorewe isuzuma ry' imibereho?</i>	22.9
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	2⇒skip to Q22.11
22.10	How satisfied or dissatisfied were your dependents with this medical care? <i>Abo mu muryango wawe banyuzwe cg ntibanyuzwe n' ubuvuzi bahawe?</i>	22.10
	1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>ntibanyuzwe na gacye</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>ntibanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor <i>satisfied / bigereranyije</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>baranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very Satisfied / <i>baranyuzwe cyane</i>	
22.11	Were any of your dependents transferred to hospital? <i>Mu muryango wawe, hari ababa baroherejwe mu bitaro?</i>	22.11
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	2⇒skip to Q22.14
22.12	If transferred to hospital: How long were any of your dependents in hospital? <i>Nba baroherejwe mu bitaro, bamazeyo igihe kingana iki?</i>	22.12
	1 = Yes less than 3 months, <i>munsi y' amezi atatu</i> 2 = No more than 3 months / <i>bitarengeje amezi atatu</i>	
22.13	If transferred to hospital: Were their medical bills paid for by the RDRC? <i>Amafaranga yo kwivuza yaba yaratanzwe na RDRC?</i>	22.13
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
	Did any of your dependents receive any of the following mini-PDOP (pre-demobilisation orientation programme) services? <i>Ese umuryango wawe waba warahawe iz serivisi zikurikira mu gihe cy' ibiganiro bibanziriza gusezererwa mu ngabo?</i>	
	1 = Yes / Yego      2 = No / Oya	
22.14.1	General briefing and orientation <i>Amabwiriza rusange no gusobanurirwa</i>	22.14.1
22.14.2	Socio-medical profiling <i>Gushyirwa mu byiciro by' ubuzima</i>	22.14.2
22.14.3	Medical and psychosocial screening for adults <i>Gusuzumwa no gushyirwa mu byiciro by' ubuzima ku bakuze</i>	22.14.3
22.14.4	Group counselling on general health issues <i>Guhabwa inama mu matsinda ku bijyanye n' ubuzima</i>	22.14.4
22.14.5	Medical and psychosocial screening for children <i>Gusuzumwa no gushyirwa mu byiciro ku bana</i>	22.14.5
22.14.6	Group counselling on child health and nutrition <i>Guhabwa inama mu matsinda ku mirire n' ubuzima bw' abana</i>	22.14.6
22.14.7	Discussion on GBV <i>Ikiganiro kw' ihohoterwa rishingiye ku gitsina</i>	22.14.7
22.14.8	Individual counselling <i>Inama kuri buri muntu</i>	22.14.8
22.14.9	Discussion on health insurance and universal basic education <i>Ikiganiro ku bwisungane bw' ubuzima n' uburezi bw' ibanze</i>	22.14.9
22.14.10	Organised tour of health centres and education offices <i>Urugendo shuri ku ku bingo nderabuzima n' ibiro by' amashuro</i>	22.14.10
22.14.11	National ID processing <i>Gahunda yo guhabwa indangamuntu</i>	22.14.11
22.14.12	Organised tour of women's cooperatives <i>Urugendo shuri rw' amakoperative y' abagore</i>	22.14.12
22.14.13	Cultural activities <i>Ibikorwa bijyanye n' umuco</i>	22.14.13

22.14.14	HIV / AIDS Voluntary Counselling and Testing (VCT) <i>Kwisuzumisha no guhabwa inama ku gakoko gatera sida ku bushake</i>	22.14.14
<b>23. REINSERTION KIT (THK)</b>		
<b>Read out</b>	The Reinsertion kit (THK) was provided to all returning ex-combatants with dependants. The content of the THK varied. The purpose of the THK was to provide the ex-combatants with essential items to re-establish themselves within a household. The THK items provided for their basic essential needs related to food provision (such as maize, beans, sosoma, salt, oil, flour), water storage (jerry can), sleeping materials (sheeting, mattress), hygiene provision (soap). In addition to this, transportation costs were provided to cover the return fares for the collection of the THK. <i>THK ni inkuga ihabwa abasezerewe mu ngabo bose bajyanye n'umuryango. Ibigize THK biratadukanye. Impamvu ya THK bihabwa abasezerewe mu ngabo hamwe n'ibikoresho by'ingenzi bibafasha mu rugo rwabo. THK igizwe n'ibikenewe by'ingenzi nk'ibyo kurya (ibigori, ibishyimbo, sosoma, umunyu, amavuta, ifu), ibibika amazi, amashuka na matera, iby'isuku (amasabune). Ikiyogeraho ni igiciro cy'ingendo zo gusubira iwabo baje gufata THK.</i>	
23.1	Do you feel that you had a clear understanding of the eligibility criteria for receiving the THK? <i>Wumva warasobanukiwe neza n'ibisabwa kuba wujuje kugira ube wakwemererwa guhabwa inkuga y'umuryango?</i>	23.1
<b>ALL</b>	1 = Yes, understood eligibility criteria / <i>Yego, ndayisobanukiwe</i> 2 = No, did not understand eligibility criteria / <i>Oya, sinyisobanukiwe</i>	
23.2	Were your family eligible (i.e did you meet the criteria) for the THK? <i>Mwarasanze umuryango wanyu wujuje ibisabwa kugira mubone iyo nkuga?</i>	23.2
<b>ALL</b>	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	2 ⇒ skip to section 24
23.3	Did your family receive the Reinsertion kit? <i>Umuryango wanyu wabonye iyo nkunga?</i>	23.3
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	1 ⇒ skip to Q23.5
23.4	If No, why did you not receive the THK? <i>Niba ari Oya, ni ukubera iki?</i>	23.4
	1 = Uncertain about the eligibility criteria / <i>kudasobanukirwa n'ibisabwa</i> 2 = Pre-existing bank loan / <i>kuba nari mfitse inguzanyo ya banki</i> 3 = Insufficient follow-up by respondent with the RDRC on this payment / <i>gukurikiranwa bidahagije kwabakora muri RDRC mu kwisyuhura</i> 4 = Formerly part of an armed group disqualified from the payment / <i>nari mu ngabo zitemerewe iyi nkuga</i> 5 = Away at the time / <i>sinari mpari kiriya gihe</i>	
23.5	Do you feel there was sufficient communication on how to receive your THK? <i>Wumva harabayeho gutanga amakuru ahagije mu buryo bwo guhabwa iriya nkuga?</i>	23.5
	1 = Sufficient / <i>burahagije</i> 2 = Insufficient / <i>ntibuhagije</i>	If no THK given, skip to next section 24
	Which of the following items in the dependants Reinsertion kit (THK) did you get? <i>Niba waratahanye n'umuryango ni ibihe bikoresho muri ibi bikurikira waba warabonye?</i>	
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
23.6.1	Beans <i>Ibishyimbo</i>	23.6.1
23.6.2	Maize <i>Ibigori</i>	23.6.2
23.6.3	Flour <i>Ifu</i>	23.6.3
23.6.4	Sosoma (a very nutritious flour produced from the mixture of maize grains, soy beans and sorghum) <i>Sosoma</i>	23.6.4
23.6.5	Oil <i>Ubuto</i>	23.6.5
23.6.6	Salt <i>Umunyu</i>	23.6.6
23.6.7	Hoe <i>Isuka</i>	23.6.7
23.6.8	Matches <i>Ibirinti</i>	23.6.8
23.6.9	Soap <i>Isabune</i>	23.6.9

23.6.10	Utensiles <i>Ibikoresho byo mugikoni</i>	23.6.10
23.6.11	Water Jeri Can <i>Ijerikani</i>	23.6.11
23.6.12	Plastic sheeting <i>Shitingi</i>	23.6.12
23.6.13	Sleeping mat <i>Matera</i>	23.6.13
23.6.14	Cleaning Material <i>Ibikoresho by' isuku</i>	23.6.14
23.6.15	Bus Fare reimbursement / transport <i>Anafaranga y'urugendo</i>	23.6.15
23.7	Was the value of the THK received less, equal or greater than what you expected? <i>Inkuga y'umuryangomwahawe yaba yarahwanye nayo mwateganyaga kubona?</i> 1 = Less than expected / <i>macye</i> 2 = Equal to what was expected / <i>yarahwanye</i> 3 = Greater than expected / <i>arimenshi</i>	23.7
23.8	Was the provision of the THK on time? <i>Inkuga y'umuryangoyanyu yaba yaraziye igihe?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	23.8 1⇒skip to Q23.10.1
23.9	Overall, how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the Reinsertion kit? <i>Muri rusange, ni gute wanyuzwe cg utanyuzwe n'inkuga y'umuryango wahawe?</i> 1 = Very dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe cyane</i> 2 = Dissatisfied / <i>sinanyuzwe</i> 3 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>ntanakimwe</i> 4 = Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe</i> 5 = Very Satisfied / <i>naranyuzwe cyane</i>	23.9
	To what extent were you dissatisfied or satisfied with the following aspects of the THK? <i>Ni kuruhe rwego utanyuzwe cg wanyuzwe n'ibi bikurikira ku nkuga y'umuryango wahawe?</i> 1 = Very small extent / <i>ruto cyane</i> 2 = Small extent / <i>ruto</i> 3 = Average / <i>ruringaniye</i> 4 = Large extent / <i>runini</i> 5 = Very large extent / <i>runini cyane</i>	
23.10.1	The range (variety) of items <i>Ubwoko bw'ibikoresho</i>	23.10.1
23.10.2	The quantify (how many) of the items <i>Ubwinsi bw'ibikoresho</i>	23.10.2
23.10.3	Usefulness of the items to your situation <i>Akamaro k'ibikoresho mu buzima turimo</i>	23.10.3
23.10.4	The value of the items <i>Agaciro k'ibikoresho</i>	23.10.4
23.10.5	The quality (how well made) of items <i>Ubuziranegye bw'ibikoresho</i>	23.10.5
	Thinking about the quality (how well made) of the items in the THK, were any of the listed factors relevant to you? <i>Utekereje ubuzirategye bw'ibikoresho wahawe, haba hari ibyakubayeho muri ibi bikurikira?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
23.11.1	Some items broke when you used them <i>Ibikoresho bimwe byangiritsenkibikoresha</i>	23.11.1
23.11.2	Some items were faulty or did not work as intended <i>Bimwemu bikoresho byari byangiritse cg ntibyigeze bikora nkuko byari byitezwe</i>	23.11.2
23.11.3	Some items were broken when you received them <i>Bimwemu bikoreshonabihawe byarangiritse</i>	23.11.3
	Did any of the following incidents apply to you? <i>Haba hari icyakubayeho muri ibi byango?</i> 1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	
23.12.1	Your THK was stolen in transit <i>Inkuga yawe yaba yaribwe uri mu nzira</i>	23.12.1
23.12.2	Your THK was missing items that others received <i>Inkuga yawe hari ibyo yaburaga abandi babonye</i>	23.12.2

23.13	Did you experience problems transporting the THK from the RDRC offices to your community of return? <i>Waba waragize ibibazo mu gutwara inkuga yawe usubira iwanyu?</i>	23.13
	1 = Yes / <i>Yego</i> 2 = No / <i>Oya</i>	

**24. MAIN USAGE OF THE REINSERTION AND REINTEGRATION PAYMENTS**

	What was each of the following payment or benefit mainly used for? <i>Muri ibi bikurikira, ni iki kingenzi wakoreshije inkunga wahawe?</i>		
	1 = Household consumables / <i>gutunga umuryango</i> 2 = Housing / <i>gushaka inzu</i> 3 = Land / <i>ubutaka</i> 4 = Loans repayments / servicing loans / <i>kwishuraimyenda</i> 5 = Agricultural production / <i>umugaruro w'ubuhinzi</i> 6 = Improved living conditions / <i>kongera imibereho</i> 7 = Education / training costs / <i>kwishura amashuri n'amahugurwa</i>	8 = Transportation / <i>ingendo</i> 9 = Medical expenses / <i>kwishura kwivuza</i> 10 = Family social responsibilities / <i>inshingano z'umuryango</i> 11 = General living expenses / <i>imibereho rusange</i> 12 = Savings / <i>kuzigama</i> 13 = Income generation activities / <i>imirimo y'injiza umugaruro</i> 14 = I sold it / <i>narabigurishije</i>	
24.1.1	BNK <i>Imperekeza 1</i>	First use <i>Gukoreshwa bwa mbere</i>	24.1.1
24.1.2		Second use <i>Gukoreshwa bwa kabiri</i>	24.1.2
24.2.1	RSA (ONLY IF RDF) <i>Imperekeza 2</i>	First use <i>Gukoreshwa bwa mbere</i>	24.2.1
24.2.2		Second use <i>Gukoreshwa bwa kabiri</i>	24.2.2
24.3.1	RG <i>Imperekeza 3</i>	First use <i>Gukoreshwa bwa mbere</i>	24.3.1
24.3.2		Second use <i>Gukoreshwa bwa kabiri</i>	24.3.2
24.4.1	VSW <i>Inkunga y'abatishoboye</i>	First use <i>Gukoreshwa bwa mbere</i>	24.4.1
24.4.2		Second use <i>Gukoreshwa bwa kabiri</i>	24.4.2
24.5.1	THK <i>Inkuga y'umuryango</i>	First use <i>Gukoreshwa bwa mbere</i>	24.5.1
24.5.2		Second use <i>Gukoreshwa bwa kabiri</i>	24.5.2

**THANK YOU / MURAKOZE**

ENUMERATOR'S CODE	SUPERVISOR'S CODE	DATA CODERS CODE	DATA CAPTURER CODE
Date of interview ___ / ___ / 2015 DD / MM / YYYY	Date of quality control ___ / ___ / 2015 DD / MM / YYYY	Date of quality coding ___ / ___ / 2015 DD / MM / YYYY	Date of data entry ___ / ___ / 2015 DD / MM / YYYY

## **Annex 2. Documents Reviewed (all studies)**

2011. African Development Bank. *Rwanda: Bank Group Strategy Paper 2012-2016*.
2000. Barth, Fredrik. "Boundaries and Connections" *Signifying Identities: Anthropological Perspectives on Boundaries and Contested Values*. Ed. Anthony P. Cohen. London: Routledge: 17 – 36.
2006. Boothby, Neil. *What happens when child soldiers grow up? The Mozambique case study Intervention*, Volume 4, Number 3, Page 244 - 259
1982. Cohen, Anthony P. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Routledge.
2014. Finn et al. *Making Vocational Training Work: a Study in Vocational Training (Rwanda)*. World Bank.
2015. Finn, Anthony. *Things Come Together, Things Fall Apart: The Family During the Absence, Return and Reintegration of Ex-Combatants*. World Bank/LOGiCA (forthcoming)
2007. GoR. *Economic Development & Poverty Reduction Strategy 2008 - 2012*
2011. GoR. *Implementation Plan for the National Social Protection Strategy (2011-2016)*
2013. Karengera, Stephen MD. *Baseline survey to establish the extent to which Integrated Rehabilitation and Production Workshops (IRPWs) could improve the livelihoods of ex-combatants with disabilities*. RDRC.
1992. OECD. *The DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance*.
1986. OECD. Glossary of Terms Used in Evaluation, in 'Methods and Procedures in Aid Evaluation.
2000. OECD. *Glossary of Evaluation and Results Based Management (RBM) Terms*.
2012. Omaar, Rakiya (RDRC Consultant). Update on Leadership of Rwandan Armed Groups.
- 2008 RDRC/BNK & Associates. *Final Tracer, Community Dynamics and Impact Assessment of Sensitization Program: an Integrated Study*.
2007. RDRC/Stavrou et al. *Beneficiary Impact Assessment and Tracer Study 2013*. RDRC. *Rwanda Demobilization And Reintegration Programme*.
2012. RDRC. *Impact Assessment of Health Insurance, Housing, Monthly Allowances and other Entitlements for Disabled Ex-combatants*.
2010. RDRC. *Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Program (RDRP) Phase III ESMF*.
2013. RDRC. *Annual Activity Report*.
2013. RDRC. Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Programme. *Draft Quarterly Progress Report*. April to June 2013.
- 2013 RDRC. Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Programme. *Draft Quarterly Progress Report*. January to March 2013.
2013. RDRC. Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Programme. *Quarterly Progress Report*. October to December 2013.

2013. RDRC. Rwanda Demobilization And Reintegration Programme. *Draft Quarterly Progress Report*. July to September 2013.

2013. RDRC. Second Emergency Demobilisation and Reintegration Project (SERDP – P112712) *Tracer and Community Dynamics Survey (Data Collected in October 2012)*.

2013. RDRC. Second Emergency Demobilisation and Reintegration Project (SERDP – P112712). *Payment Verification Survey(Data Collected in October 2012)*.

2013. RDRC. Fully Validated SPSS Database (Tracer, Community Dynamics and PVS).

2014. RDRC. Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Programme. *Quarterly Progress Report*. April to June 2014.

2014 RDRC. Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Programme. *Quarterly Progress Report*. January to March 2014.

2014 RDRC. Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Programme. *Quarterly Progress Report*. July to September 2014.

2014 RDRC. Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Programme. *Quarterly Progress Report*. October to December 2014.

2014. RDRC. *Annual Activity Report*.

2015. RDRC. Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (SEDRP) Revised Project Implementation Manual (Draft).

n.d. Schauer, Elizabeth et al. Building a national framework for the psychosocial rehabilitation & reintegration of ex-combatants in Rwanda. Vivo.

2015. Specht, Irma. *LOGiCA Family Study Country Report: Rwanda*. World Bank/LOGiCA.

2001 (revised 2013). *World Bank. Disability and World Bank Safeguards Campaign Revised OP 4.12*.

(2015). UN. *Global Sustainable Development Report*.

2011. World Bank. *Aide Mémoire*. Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712) Implementation Support Mission ~February 1-11, 2011.

2011. World Bank. *Aide Mémoire*. Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (SEDRP/P112712). Mid-Term Review Mission ~ June 20-July 6, 2011.

2011. World Bank. *Aide Mémoire*. Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712). Implementation Support Mission ~October 24-November 4, 2011.

2012. World Bank. *Aide Mémoire*. Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712). Implementation Support Mission ~ June 28th - July 6th 2012.

2012. World Bank. *Aide Mémoire*. Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712). Implementation Support Mission. November 29 – December 18, 2012.

2013a. World Bank. *Guidelines for Reviewing World Bank Implementation Completion and Results Reports: A Manual for Evaluators (Updated: Nov 12, 2013)*.

2013. World Bank. *Aide Mémoire*. Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712). Implementation Support Mission. December 3 – December 20, 2013.

2013. World Bank. *Aide Mémoire*. Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712). Implementation Support Mission. March 25 – March 29, 2013.

2013. World Bank. *Aide Mémoire*. Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712). Pre-Appraisal Mission. September 23 – October 8, 2013.
2014. World Bank. *Aide Mémoire*. Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712). Implementation Support Mission. October 20-31, 2014.
2014. World Bank. *Aide Mémoire*. Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712). Implementation Support Mission. March 13-28, 2014.
2014. World Bank. *Aide Mémoire*. Rwanda Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712). Implementation Support Mission. June 16-June 28, 2014.
2014. World Bank. *Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project Simplified Procurement Plan for FY July 2014-June 2015*.
2014. World Bank. Report No: ISR13579. *Implementation Status & Results Rwanda. Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712)*. April 6 2014
- (n.d.) World Bank. *Project Information Document (PID) Appraisal Stage*. Report No.: 84952
2014. World Bank. Report No: ISR14915. *Implementation Status & Results Rwanda. Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project (P112712)*. 11 June 2014
2014. World Bank. *Amended and Restated Financing Agreement (Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project) between Republic of Rwanda and International Development Association*. March 12, 2014.
2014. World Bank. *Integrated Safeguards Datasheet Appraisal Stage*. January 16 2014.
- 2014(a). World Bank. *Project paper on a proposed additional credit in the amount of SDR5.8 million (US\$8.97 million equivalent) to the Republic of Rwanda for the Second Emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project*. April (4)7, 2014
2014. World Bank. *Country Partnership Strategy for Rwanda FY 2014-2018*.
2014. World Bank. *A Study of Gender, Masculinities and Reintegration of Former Combatants in Rwanda: Results from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES)*. LOGiCA/Promundo.
2013. Hinkel, Harald. *The War Within: A Critical Examination of Psychosocial Issues and Interventions in DDR*. World Bank.
2005. King, Elizabeth. "Educating for Conflict or Peace: Challenges and Dilemmas in Post-Conflict Rwanda" *International Journal*. LX (4): 904-918.
2013. King, Elizabeth *From Classrooms to Conflict in Rwanda*. Cambridge University Press.
1982. Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Columbia University Press.
2007. Muhorakeye, C. *Recherche psychosociale*. Rwanda Demobilization and Reintegration Commission/Program.
2005. Nilsson, A. *Reintegrating ex-combatants in post-conflict societies*. Stockholm: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA); Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance & Conflict Management.
2002. Palmer, Ian. 'Psychosocial Costs of War in Rwanda'. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*. Vol. 8 pp 17- 25.

2013. Rieder, Heide and Thomas Elbert. 'Rwanda – lasting imprints of a genocide: trauma, mental health and psychosocial conditions in survivors, former prisoners and their children.' *Conflict and Health*. Vol 7 Issue 6, pp 1-13.

2015. Specht, Irma. *LOGiCA Family Study Country Report (Phase 2 and 3): Rwanda*. World Bank.

1975. Sperber, Dan. *Rethinking Symbolism*. Cambridge UP.

1985. Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography." *Subaltern Studies IV*, (1985): 331 – 363.

2015. Tankink, Marian. *LOGiCA Family Study: Anthropological Report (Phase 1)*. World Bank.

*2011 Ruberangeyo, Theophile et al. Social Protection: an ongoing process*. ILO/UNDP

2015. UN Security Council. *Resolution 2211 (2015) Adopted by the Security Council at its 7415th meeting, on 26 March 2015*.