

IT TAKES A VILLAGE

An Action Agenda on the Role of Civil Society in the
Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Those Associated
With and Affected by Violent Extremism

August 2018

A photograph showing the back of a young boy's head and shoulders. He is wearing a bright yellow t-shirt. In the background, several men in military uniforms are standing in a line on a dirt ground. The background is slightly out of focus, emphasizing the boy in the foreground.

Copyright © 2018 Global Center on Cooperative Security
All rights reserved.

For permission requests, write to the publisher at:
1101 14th Street NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005
USA

DESIGN: Studio You London

FRONT COVER PHOTO: UN Photo/Tobin Jones. Former child soldiers enlisted by al-Shabaab are handed over to the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) after their capture by forces of the African Union Mission to Somalia. November 2012

SUGGESTED CITATION: Christina Nemr, Lara Nonninger, Eva Entenmann, Fulco van Deventer, and Bibi van Ginkel, "It Takes a Village: An Action Agenda on the Role of Civil Society in the Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Those Associated With and Affected by Violent Extremism," Global Center on Cooperative Security, August 2018.





IT TAKES A VILLAGE

An Action Agenda on the Role of Civil Society in the
Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Those Associated
With and Affected by Violent Extremism

By **Christina Nemr, Lara Nonninger, Eva Entenmann,
Fulco van Deventer and Bibi van Ginkel**

August 2018

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

GLOBAL CENTER ON COOPERATIVE SECURITY

CHRISTINA NEMR

Christina Nemr is a Senior Fellow with the Global Center on Cooperative Security. She works on countering violent extremism (CVE) topics including rehabilitation and reintegration, gender and CVE, youth empowerment, counternarratives, and the nexus between development and CVE. She spent five years with the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Counterterrorism with a portfolio of CVE policy and program development, research, and multilateral initiatives. She holds a BA in foreign affairs and history from the University of Virginia and an MA in forensic psychology from Marymount University.

LARA NONNINGER

Lara Nonninger is a Program Officer at the Global Center. She focuses on countering violent extremism issues, as well as financial inclusion and integrity. She has previously interned with the Royal United Services Institute and the International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law. She holds a BA in war studies and history from King's College London and an MA in international peace and security from the same university. She is currently pursuing a law degree in the United Kingdom.

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR COUNTER-TERRORISM – THE HAGUE

EVA ENTENMANN

Eva Entenmann is a Program Manager at the International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – The Hague (ICCT). She is responsible for the preparation, implementation, and monitoring of various ICCT activities. Her areas of interest include foreign fighters, rule-of-law-related aspects of (counter)terrorism, civil society engagement, and rehabilitation of violent extremist offenders. Prior to ICCT, Eva worked at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, was a Research Associate at the Public International Law and Policy Group, edited a journal at the Australian Institute of International Affairs, and contributed to the International Bar Association's International Criminal Court Program.

FULCO VAN DEVENTER

Fulco van Deventer is an ICCT Associate Fellow and the co-founder and deputy director of the Human Security Collective (HSC). He has extensive experience in the fields of security, countering violent extremism, deradicalization, human security, and resilience, as well as justice and reconciliation. For the past 10 years, he has focused on strengthening the capacity of civil society actors to enhance their role in conflict prevention, security, and CVE. At HSC and ICCT, he works on the nexus between counterterrorism measures, security, and civil society engagement.

BIBI VAN GINKEL

Bibi van Ginkel is a Research Fellow at the ICCT and a Senior Research Fellow at the Security Unit of the Netherlands Institute for International Relations (Clingendael). Currently, she also serves as a senior consultant to the UN Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate on a project developing global guidelines to facilitate the collection of information and evidence by military and other relevant criminal law actors within a rule-of-law framework. She holds a PhD from the Law Faculty of Utrecht University, where she also worked as a lecturer for almost 10 years.



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Global Center and International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – The Hague (ICCT) gratefully acknowledge the U.S. Department of State for its generous support of this project. They are also deeply appreciative of the civil society representatives, practitioners, and researchers whose experiences and insights informed this action agenda. The authors especially wish to thank their regional partners on this project—the Centre for Sustainable Development and Education in Africa; Le centre des stratégies pour la sécurité du Sahel Sahara; Youth, Arts, Development & Entrepreneurship Network; and Portal Indonesia NGO—who contributed their experience and input and helped facilitate the consultations, meetings, and workshops that yielded the valuable insights captured in the action agenda. The authors are likewise indebted to Betty Bigombe, Hashim Pondeza, Okello Augustine Kezzy, Robert Ochola, Osman Moallim, Mira Kusumarini, Dina Zaman, and Elina Noor for their contributions to this document. Special thanks also to Eelco Kessels, Scott Townley, Rafia Bhulai, Melissa Lefas, Junko Nozawa, Naz Yalbir, Gregory Chauzal, Leon Bystrykh, Lenneke Huisman, Stefan Harrigan, and Saif Sarwar, whose insights informed this project. The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Global Center or its advisory council, the ICCT, the abovementioned contributors, or the U.S. government.

ABOUT THIS REPORT

Over a period of two-and-a-half years, the Global Center on Cooperative Security and the International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – The Hague (ICCT), along with four subregional partners—the Centre for Sustainable Development and Education in Africa; Le centre des stratégies pour la sécurité du Sahel Sahara (C4S); Youth, Arts, Development & Entrepreneurship Network; and Portal Indonesia NGO—implemented a project to examine the role of civil society organizations (CSOs) in the rehabilitation and reintegration of those associated with and affected by violent extremism. The project aimed to first understand how CSOs work within their communities and with their governments to support the rehabilitation and reintegration of violent extremist offenders, victims of violence, and affected communities. It then supported the work of select CSOs by facilitating small grants to bolster existing efforts or pilot innovative approaches. The findings and lessons learned from the project have culminated in the development of this action agenda, which provides policy and programmatic recommendations for stakeholders working on rehabilitation and reintegration and the role of CSOs in supporting that process.

The project focused on three regions: the Sahel (Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, and Senegal); the Greater Horn of Africa (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Tanzania, and Uganda); and Southeast Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines). While each region has its own rich experiences and unique challenges, there are overarching lessons that emerged—lessons that are applicable to a variety of rehabilitation and reintegration contexts. The action agenda therefore is not divided by region but, rather, by themes and the audiences to whom the recommendations are directed.

PROJECT METHODOLOGY

To develop the recommendations laid out within these pages, intensive desk research was combined with consultation missions in select countries to understand the experiences, challenges, and opportunities inherent to rehabilitation and reintegration and how civil society has been involved in such efforts to date. The findings from the research and consultations were then gathered into draft action agendas that were validated through three separate regional workshops. The first workshop took place in Lagos, Nigeria in December 2016 and was attended by 27 civil society participants from the eight focus countries in the Sahel. The second workshop took place in Djibouti in August 2017, and was attended by 20 civil society participants from the six countries in the Greater Horn of Africa. The third and last workshop took place in Jakarta, Indonesia in September 2017 and was attended by 25 civil society participants from the three countries in Southeast Asia.

Following the regional validation workshops, the project team consolidated feedback and continued refining the broader action agenda through consultations and input from regional civil society partners. Concurrent to this process, 15 CSOs from across the three focus regions implemented local projects funded through the small-grants component of this project—seven in the Sahel, two in the Greater Horn of Africa, and six in Southeast Asia. More information and lessons learned from each of the local projects can be found in the text boxes in the report.

The action agenda consists of six guiding principles and 10 recommendations targeted to a range of audiences. Each guiding principle and recommendation is followed by examples that illustrate the ways a recommendation has been put into practice or offer suggestions for implementing a given recommendation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations	vi
Introduction	1
The Role of Civil Society Organizations	2
Regional Landscapes	5
Sahel	5
Greater Horn of Africa	8
Southeast Asia	9
Rehabilitation and Reintegration Challenges Across Regions	11
Guiding Principles for Comprehensive Rehabilitation and Reintegration	13
Recommendations on the Role of CSOs in Rehabilitation and Reintegration	25
Developing Rehabilitation and Reintegration Frameworks	25
Improving Training, Safety, and Security	28
CSO Networks and Partnerships	30
Enhancing CSO Capacity	34
Appendix	43

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AQIM	Al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb
CSO	civil society organization
CVE	countering violent extremism
DDR	disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration
FTF	foreign terrorist fighter
GCTF	Global Counterterrorism Forum
ICCT	International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – The Hague
IDP	internally displaced person
ISIL	Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant
LRA	Lord’s Resistance Army
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
NAP	national action plan
NGO	nongovernmental organization
P/CVE	preventing and countering violent extremism
RFTF	returned foreign terrorist fighter
UN	United Nations
U.S.	United States
VEO	violent extremist offender

INTRODUCTION

As governments search for the most effective responses to violent extremism and terrorism, they must also contend with the process of dealing with those who have committed or supported acts of violence, either at home or as foreign fighters abroad. Many individuals may go through the criminal justice system while others may not, but all will likely require some sort of assistance to leave behind violent activity and reenter society. “Rehabilitation” and “reintegration” are the terms used to describe these processes—where rehabilitation is a purposeful, planned intervention that aims to change the factors believed to be the cause of a person’s criminal behavior and reintegration refers to a safe transition to the community in which a person’s changed attitudes and behavior, and community acceptance and assistance, lead to their productive functioning in society.¹ Taken together, successful rehabilitation and reintegration are key components of strategies for long-term peace, stability, and security.

Although rehabilitation and reintegration can be controversial topics, especially when it comes to perceptions of appropriate punishment for individuals associated with terrorism and violent extremism, such initiatives form an integral and cost-effective component of general crime prevention strategies.² Effective rehabilitation and reintegration can reduce the number of individuals who return to violent extremist activities, thereby increasing community safety, easing pressure on law enforcement, and alleviating prison overcrowding. Rehabilitation and reintegration programming is also suited for implementation outside of a detention setting, a context that works well in cases where violent extremist offenders (VEOs) will avoid prison time.³ Above all, a focus on rehabilitation and reintegration programming adheres to international human

Rehabilitation is a purposeful, planned intervention that aims to change the factors believed to be the cause of a person’s criminal behavior. Reintegration refers to a safe transition to the community in which a person’s changed attitudes and behavior, and community acceptance and assistance, lead to their productive functioning in society

rights law and UN standards that state that the rehabilitation of offenders and their successful reintegration into the community should be the objective of criminal justice systems.⁴

Yet, rehabilitation and reintegration programming in the context of violent extremism is far from an established and standardized concept. Stakeholders designing rehabilitation and reintegration programming need to carefully consider the legal implications of such interventions, the overall objectives and scope of their programs, the approaches they will take, the actors they will involve, and the ways they will measure results. Though complex and multifaceted, this process is somewhat easier to control and coordinate when the target audience for rehabilitation and reintegration is moving through the criminal justice system. There, rehabilitation and reintegration can be mandated and guided by authorities within custodial settings or through

1 Tinka Veldhuis, “Designing Rehabilitation and Reintegration Programmes for Violent Extremist Offenders: A Realist Approach,” International Centre on Counter-Terrorism–The Hague, March 2012, <https://icct.nl/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/ICCT-Veldhuis-Designing-Rehabilitation-Reintegration-Programmes-March-2012.pdf>.

2 United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, “Introductory Handbook on the Prevention of Recidivism and the Social Reintegration of Offenders,” 2012, http://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/crimeprevention/Introductory_Handbook_on_the_Prevention_of_Recidivism_and_the_Social_Reintegration_of_Offenders.pdf.

3 Ibid, p. 8.

4 Ibid, p. 13. See also “Compendium of United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal,” United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2006, http://www.unodc.org/pdf/compendium/compendium_2006.pdf.

other judicial measures. However, rehabilitation and reintegration become more complex when considering their application for those who are associated with violent extremism but do not go through the criminal justice system. How will stakeholders access or engage those individuals? Adding to the layers of complexity, VEOs are not the only group that require rehabilitation and reintegration. Stakeholders must also address the rehabilitation and reintegration of those affected by terrorism and ensure that their needs are considered. Equally important, rehabilitation and reintegration programs should also include family and community members to address the factors and grievances that can hinder the long-term reconciliation needed for lasting rehabilitation and reintegration.

It is the responsibility of governments to develop, implement, resource, and assess rehabilitation and reintegration programming, but they cannot address all of the complexities and ambiguities alone. Partnering with and engaging a broad set of stakeholders can be an effective strategy to support the various components necessary for effective rehabilitation and reintegration. Primary among these stakeholders are civil society actors. Civil society organizations (CSOs) are often comprised of a range of actors, including family and community members, religious leaders, social support organizations, victims' groups, and other nongovernmental actors who represent a range of community interests and can be the crucial difference between recidivism or successful reintegration.

THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS

Experiences over the years have shown that violent extremist groups tend to thrive in areas where civil society has limited agency or space to function.⁵ CSOs with credibility, legitimacy, and the freedom to operate help channel and address the grievances that can hinder community resilience to violent extremism. They often have the best access to and engagement with their communities as well as the

UNPACKING TERMS

Frameworks for rehabilitation and reintegration should define their beneficiaries, stakeholders, and contexts to ensure inclusive approaches that adequately balance the needs of affected communities with those of perpetrators.

Individuals associated with and affected by violent extremism

In recognition that such definitions may not necessarily be exhaustive and permanent, this action agenda uses the phrase "individuals associated with and affected by terrorism and violent extremism" to demonstrate the broad range of beneficiary groups. This includes, but is not limited to, perpetrators, (former) combatants, (former) violent extremist offenders, (returning) foreign terrorist fighters, forcibly conscripted individuals, (in)direct victims and survivors, families and friends of victims and survivors, communities affected by violence, and families and peer networks of perpetrators.

Actors and service providers in the rehabilitation and reintegration process

Specific government agencies, including prisons and probation authorities, should be the primary providers of rehabilitation and reintegration. However, other stakeholders may also be involved, or even responsible, for elements of the rehabilitation and reintegration process. These include civil society organizations, social workers, psychologists, religious authorities, traditional leaders, families, and communities.

Environments where rehabilitation and reintegration can take place

Rehabilitation and reintegration can be implemented in a number of contexts, including in detention settings, prisons, halfway houses, and the community.

⁵ U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development, "Department of State & USAID Joint Strategy on Countering Violent Extremism," May 2016, <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1866/FINAL%20--%20State%20and%20USAID%20Joint%20Strategy%20on%20Countering%20Violent%20Extremism%20%28May%202016%29.pdf>.

long-standing relationships and stature to help overcome community distrust of top-down policies and actors. The engagement and relationships help to ensure that local communities have an opportunity to shape the policies affecting them. In certain contexts, CSOs may be the only actors who have the access and the credibility to those associated with violent extremism who may question the legitimacy of formal authorities.⁶ As such, CSOs are well placed to bridge any interests between authorities and communities or individuals. This access is especially important in societies where tribes and clans are prominent pillars of community structures—CSOs can support efforts to link these traditional mechanisms with countering violent extremism (CVE) and rehabilitation and reintegration programming.

Though not all CSOs have expert knowledge on radicalization and violent extremism, their expertise in related fields, such as gang and ethnic violence, working with marginalized youth such as orphans and street children, promoting reconciliation, and advocacy on the inclusion of women in peace and security, is an invaluable asset for developing more specialized knowledge of violent extremism that has positive implications for rehabilitation and reintegration. To ensure effectiveness, stakeholders must take care to partner with CSOs that represent a diversity of viewpoints and interests, prioritize the broader interests of the community they represent, and ensure the accountability of authorities to the community.

In the context of rehabilitation and reintegration specifically, CSOs can provide services that are beyond the scope of government officials, such as prison guards. For example, they can offer religious counseling, arrange for legal aid, or facilitate access to and involvement of family members while individuals are detained. During the transition phase from custodial settings to reentering society, CSOs are often the only service providers that can facilitate

Civil society organizations include families, community members, religious leaders, social support organizations, victims groups, and other nongovernmental actors who represent a range of community interests and can be the crucial difference between recidivism or successful reintegration.

continuity in the VEOs' rehabilitation process. This is particularly the case in countries where formal probation, reintegration, and aftercare and social work services are lacking or underdeveloped, as is common in some of the focus countries of this project. Lastly, CSOs are especially crucial during the process of reintegration, that is, the return into communities after participating in conflict or the aftercare following prison or detention time. CSOs can assist with that process by providing various necessary components, including legal aid, psychosocial counseling, educational opportunities, vocational training, and most importantly, sensitization to help wary communities understand how the rehabilitation and reintegration of perpetrators benefits the entire community in the long term.

A number of international frameworks have recognized the important role that CSOs can and do play and have called on governments to provide space for CSO engagement. For example, UN Security Council Resolution 2396 calls on member states to develop and implement comprehensive and tailored rehabilitation and reintegration strategies in response to returning and relocating foreign terrorist fighters (FTFs), including their spouses and children. The resolution underscores the importance of a “whole of

6 For more on the roles that CSOs can play in counterterrorism and P/CVE work, see: Political Settlements and Research Program, “Fionnuala Ni Aolain’s Remarks on Civil Society Empowerment and Women, Peace and Security,” 6 November 2017, <http://www.politicalsettlements.org/2017/11/06/fionnuala-ni-aolains-remarks-on-civil-society-empowerment-and-women-peace-and-security>; Jeong-Woo Koo and Amanda Murdie, “Liberty or Security: Do Civil Society Restrictions Limit Terrorism?,” Center for Strategic & International Studies, 4 June 2018, <https://www.csis.org/blogs/international-consortium-closing-civic-space/liberty-or-security-do-civil-society-restrictions>.

government” approach and recognizes the role that CSOs can play in rehabilitation and reintegration efforts, calling for member states to work with local communities, mental health and education practitioners, and other relevant CSOs to address the challenges posed by returnees and relocators. The Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF) and other international platforms and multilateral organizations have likewise developed a host of memoranda

and guidance documents that outline the various ways CSOs can and should be incorporated into rehabilitation and reintegration efforts.⁷ Taken together, these frameworks offer guiding principles on the ways CSOs contribute to rehabilitation and reintegration, as well as broader preventing and countering violent extremism (P/CVE) efforts, and how their efforts might be integrated into formal processes.

⁷ The addendum to The Hague-Marrakesh Memorandum specifies that CSOs, alongside the private sector, could provide different rehabilitation-related services in the context of returning FTFs, such as mental health support, education, vocational training, and religious or other counseling; it also highlights that some CSOs “offer voluntary intervention or rehabilitation programs.” See Recommendation 5.

The UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) “Handbook on the Management of Violent Extremist Prisoners and the Prevention of Radicalization to Violence in Prisons” echoes this, emphasizing that CSOs are crucial during the *reintegration* process as part of a holistic and multi-sectoral approach. See UNODC, “Handbook on the Management of Violent Extremist Prisoners and the Prevention of Radicalization to Violence in Prisons,” October 2016, pp. 128, 140, https://www.unodc.org/pdf/criminal_justice/Handbook_on_VEPs.pdf.

The Council of Europe (CoE) highlights that CSOs are a key factor for the safety and security of released VEOs. See CoE, “Council of Europe Handbook for Prison and Probation Services Regarding Radicalisation and Violent Extremism,” 1 December 2016, p. 139, <https://rm.coe.int/16806f9aa9>. The CoE also reminds governments that the experiences and/or expertise of CSOs may have added value in prison and probation settings.

The Radicalization Awareness Network (RAN) also highlights the importance of community actors, including CSOs, in both rehabilitation and reintegration. For example, see Magnus Ranstorp, “Developing a Local Prevent Framework and Guiding Principles,” RAN Centre of Excellence, November 2016, https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/policy_paper_developing_local_prevent_framework_guiding_112016_en.pdf.

REGIONAL LANDSCAPES

Throughout the past few decades, the three focus regions of this project have endured conflict and violent extremism and have subsequently had experience with rehabilitation- and reintegration-related initiatives. In the Sahel and the Greater Horn of Africa, the majority of this experience has been in the form of disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) programming, while Southeast Asia has had experience with postconflict reconciliation initiatives. All three regions also have an active civil society landscape, though the space for CSO involvement in rehabilitation and reintegration, as well as the capacity to implement rehabilitation and reintegration initiatives, varies greatly from country to country.

THE SAHEL

In recent years, the most dominant violent extremist threats in the Sahel have come from two main groups—Al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) and its affiliates, and Boko Haram. Though both groups have recently declined as a result of national, regional, and international military actions, they have remained resilient in their presence and commitment to attacks.⁸ Governments in the region are currently detaining thousands of individuals suspected of ties to violent extremist groups, but coherent strategies to classify, prosecute, manage, and rehabilitate and reintegrate are still lacking.⁹ This problem is further compounded by the fact that the Sahel has some of the highest prison overcrowding rates in the world, exceeding 230 percent in certain countries.¹⁰ Hence, rehabilitation and reintegration programming is not just a means to further effective processes of

reconciliation and reentry into society, but also a way to alleviate strains on criminal justice systems. Indeed, several countries in the Sahel are developing rehabilitation and reintegration programs for violent extremists or have already done so. In many instances, however, such programs are predominantly led by the military with little input or involvement of other actors. Drawing on previous experiences with DDR and community-based justice and reconciliation mechanisms, as well as more recent experiences with rehabilitation and reintegration in the violent extremism context, the Sahel has many lessons to offer.

In 2009, the Nigerian government implemented an amnesty program designed to end the fighting in the Niger Delta between militant rebel groups and government forces. The 26,000 militants who handed in their weapons over the next few years were pardoned for crimes and received vocational training and a monthly stipend until they secured jobs.¹¹ However, the program has struggled in its attempts to deliver peace and stability because it has focused on material assistance for a small group of individuals at the expense of the wider community and has not adequately addressed the underlying grievances driving the original conflict.¹² Perhaps lessons from this conflict have led the Nigerian government to take a more comprehensive approach to dealing with the Boko Haram insurgency and violent extremism in recent years. In 2014, the government launched a CVE initiative, which included a prison-based program designed to address individual radicalization and facilitate rehabilitation and eventual reintegration.¹³ In April 2016, Nigeria passed the Abuja Declaration on the Treatment of Violent Extremist Offenders, which

8 Jennifer G. Cooke and Thomas M. Sanderson, “Militancy and the Arc of Instability: Violent Extremism in the Sahel,” Center for Strategic and International Studies, September 2016, p. 2, https://csis-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/publication/160922_Sanderson_MilitancyArcInstabilitySahel_Web.pdf.

9 Ibid.

10 UN Office of Drugs and Crime, “Sahel Programme 2013-2017 Progress Report,” January 2016, p. 25, https://www.unodc.org/documents/westandcentralafrica/Sahel_Programme_Progress_Report_January_2016.pdf.

11 “Niger Delta Still Unstable Despite Amnesty,” IRIN News, 25 November 2011, <http://www.irinnews.org/report/94306/analysis-niger-delta-still-unstable-despite-amnesty>.

12 Oluwatoyin O. Oluwaniyi, “Post-Amnesty Programme in the Niger Delta: Challenges and Prospects,” *Conflict Trends*, January 2011, pp. 46-55. <http://lekiworld.com/AU/docs/175.pdf>.

13 Atta Barkindo and Shane Bryans, “De-Radicalising Prisoners in Nigeria: Developing a Basic Prison Based De-Radicalisation Programme,” *Journal for Deradicalization*, no. 7 (2016): 1-25.

lays out a strategy for the handling and management of VEOs and the engagement of CSOs.¹⁴ Building on this work and related initiatives, Nigeria launched a policy framework and national action plan (NAP) for P/CVE in late 2017.¹⁵ The policy framework and NAP outline a whole-of-society approach for P/CVE with emphasis on partnerships and alliances with CSOs, including in rehabilitation and reintegration initiatives.¹⁶

Since mid-2014, Cameroon has experienced increasing levels of Boko Haram violence. Despite the heavy-handed and military-centric government response to the insurgency, the region experienced over 491 attacks between 2013 and 2017, killing nearly 1,600 people. In addition, the proximity of Cameroon's Far North Region to northeast Nigeria, as well as the high levels of disenfranchisement, lack of basic services, and low socioeconomic performance, has made the large youth population susceptible to militant influences—though recruitment has decreased considerably since 2014. Throughout 2017, rehabilitation and reintegration activities for former Boko Haram fighters in Cameroon have expanded, particularly in the Far North. In late 2017, the UN Development Programme and Germany launched an “Integration Regional Stabilization of the Lake Chad Region” program, which includes a focus on the reintegration of former militia fighters in Cameroon.¹⁷ This program was implemented partly

in response to UN Security Council Resolution 2349, which highlighted the need for rehabilitation and reintegration programs in the Lake Chad region.¹⁸ In addition, a UN Population Fund (UNFPA) project in the Far North has been working with young people, particularly internally displaced persons, to counter violent extremist radicalization and refer affected youth to rehabilitation centers.¹⁹ Specific government efforts to address rehabilitation and reintegration have been limited, however. As of late 2017, approximately 200 former fighters were still held in army-controlled camps pending construction of rehabilitation and reintegration camps within Cameroon, and 200 others remained in the care of local councils and UN agencies.²⁰ Furthermore, as of late 2017, the governmental response to the phenomenon did not include a reintegration element.²¹

Between 1992 and 1997, Chad embarked on a DDR program for adult soldiers that demobilized 20,000 troops, a process that was later repeated between 2011 to 2013 for another 10,000 soldiers.²² In 2007, with support from the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), the government launched DDR programs for child soldiers recruited into government forces and rebel groups. This included the payment of \$830 for each fighter laying down their arms, as well as psychological support and skills training to facilitate

14 In 2016, the Nigerian government launched Operation Safe Corridor—a military-led initiative designed to rehabilitate and reintegrate former Boko Haram members. The Nigerian Army established a rehabilitation camp in northeast Nigeria, in which former Boko Haram fighters were meant to be profiled, documented, and offered vocational training, with the ultimate goal of facilitating rehabilitation and reintegration. A few months into the existence of Operation Safe Corridor, the Nigerian Army reported that over 8,000 former Boko Haram members voluntarily surrendered to the program. Despite these proclaimed successes, the strategy and underlying framework of Operation Safe Corridor remain opaque, and the low levels of transparency, lack of a legal framework, and military-led nature with little CSO involvement, have instigated concerns about human rights abuses.

15 Federal Republic of Nigeria, Office of the National Security Adviser, Counter-Terrorism Centre, “Nigerian Government Presents Policy Framework and National Action Plan for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism to Members of the Public,” <http://ctc.gov.ng/nigerian-government-presents-policy-framework-and-national-action-plan-for-preventing-and-countering-violent-extremism-to-members-of-the-public>.

16 Federal Republic of Nigeria, “Policy Framework and National Action Plan for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism,” August 2017, <http://ctc.gov.ng/pcve-nsa-book>.

17 United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), “Germany and UNDP Join Forces for Integrated Regional Stabilization of the Lake Chad Basin Region,” 15 November 2017, <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/news-centre/news/2017/l-allemanne-et-le-pnud-unissent-leurs-forces-pour-la-stabilisati.html>.

18 United Nations Security Council, S/RES/2349, 31 March 2017, paras 29-32.

19 United Nations Population Fund, “Cameroon: Empowering Youth to Achieve Social Cohesion,” 21 February 2017, <http://cameroon.unfpa.org/fr/news/cameroon-empowering-youth-achieve-social-cohesion>.

20 Moki Edwin Kindzeka, “Former Boko Haram Fighters Wait for Rehabilitation Facility,” *Voice of America*, 17 December 2017, <https://www.voanews.com/a/bokio-haram-rehabilitation-cameroon/4167341.html>.

21 Crisis Group, “Cameroon's Far North: Reconstructing Amid Ongoing Conflict,” *Briefing No. 133*, 25 October 2017, <https://www.crisisgroup.org/africa/central-africa/cameroon/b133-extreme-nord-du-cameroun-le-casse-tete-de-la-reconstruction-en-periode-de-conflit>.

22 Amnesty International, “A Compromised Future: Children Recruited by Armed Forces and Groups in Eastern Chad,” 2011, <https://www.amnesty.org/download/Documents/24000/afr200012011en.pdf>; Comité de Suivi d'Appel à la Paix et à la Réconciliation Nationale au Tchad, “Mémorandum, Tchad: un climat politique apaise, mais une situation sécuritaire toujours préoccupante,” <https://ccfd-terresolidaire.org/IMG/pdf/tchadsituation.pdf>.

reintegration into society.²³ However, insufficient resources and continued insecurity hindered effective implementation, and many children remobilized.²⁴ In 2010, just over 800 former child soldiers underwent the UNICEF-supported reintegration program,²⁵ while a 2010 UN Security Council report indicated that reintegration support has been offered to 281 children.²⁶ The Chadian child soldier DDR program appears to have had limited success, evidenced by the re-recruitment of formerly demobilized children and a lack of political and military will to carry out a robust national DDR program.²⁷ The lingering conflict in Chad furthermore presents fertile ground for the continued recruitment of children, making permanent rehabilitation and reintegration a more complex endeavor.²⁸ To address its more recent challenges of AQIM and Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL)-affiliated conflicts, Chad opened a center in early 2018 for the prevention of violent extremism and the disengagement of violent extremists led by independent Chadian scholars.²⁹

The threat of violent extremism in Mauritania has increased over the years due to its proximity to conflict zones in Algeria and Mali, but the number of in-country terrorist attacks has been considerably lower than that of its West African neighbors.³⁰ Despite this relative stability amid high levels of violent extremist activity in neighboring countries, Mauritania is unlikely to be inoculated against

possible future tumult.³¹ In particular, sociopolitical disenfranchisement in the country's periphery, central government neglect, and high levels of youth unemployment present a fertile ground for possible radicalization among young Mauritians.³² However, the implementation of rigorous counterterrorism strategies, as well as collaborative work with Islamists to engage in theological debates, have so far been successful at stemming the threat of violent extremism in the country. At present, it is estimated that around 70 individuals are incarcerated for colluding or sympathizing with violent extremists and terrorist organizations.³³ In recent years, Mauritania's approach to the rehabilitation of detained violent extremists has focused on disengaging individuals from violent activity and partnering with mosques to work toward reintegration.³⁴ This approach has relied heavily on religious figures teaching the basics of Islam and does not incorporate a wider role for CSOs in rehabilitation and reintegration.³⁵ Though a heralded program, two key cases of recidivism following government-led prison rehabilitation programs have cast a shadow on its overall success.³⁶

Since its independence in 1960, Mali has endured four rebellions and has subsequently implemented a range of DDR efforts, particularly in the north. Its experience offers many lessons, especially where efforts were counterproductive and arguably helped contribute to the most recent crisis from 2012 onward.³⁷

23 Salma Zulfiqar, "UNICEF and Partners Support Reintegration of Child Soldiers in Chad," UNICEF, 28 May 2010, https://www.unicef.org/protection/chad_53771.html.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid.

26 UN Security Council, "Report of the Secretary General on Children and Armed Conflict in Chad," S/2011/64, 9 Feb 2011, http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2011/64&Lang=E&Area=UNDOC.

27 Amnesty International, "A Compromised Future," p. 28.

28 Mary Jonasen, "Child Soldiers in Chad: A Policy Window for Change," *Intersections*, 10/1, 2009, p. 325, https://depts.washington.edu/chid/intersections_Winter_2009/Mary_Jonasen_Child_Soldiers_in_Chad.pdf.

29 "Terrorism Study Center Established in Chad," *Africanews*, 31 January 2018, <http://www.africanews.com/2018/01/31/jihadism-study-center-established-in-n-djamena>.

30 UNDP, "Preventing and Responding to Violent Extremism in Africa: A Development Approach," 2016, <http://www.slundp.org/content/dam/sierraleone/docs/annualreports/Report%20on%20Violent%20Extremism18Nov2015.pdf>, p. 11.

31 Katrina Manson, "Mauritania 'Vulnerable' to Increase in Islamic Extremism," *Financial Times*, 13 April 2014, <https://www.ft.com/content/9d154d56-bff0-11e3-b6e8-00144feabdc0>.

32 Anouar Boukhars, "Mauritania's Precarious Stability and Islamist Undercurrent," *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, February 2016, <https://carnegieendowment.org/files/Brief-Boukhars-Mauritania.pdf>, p. 9-10.

33 Ibid., p. 12.

34 Obi Anyadike, "Briefing: The New Jihadist Strategy in the Sahel," *IRIN*, 4 February 2016, <http://www.irinnews.org/feature/2016/02/04/briefing-new-jihadist-strategy-sahel>.

35 Boukhars, "Mauritania's Precarious Stability and Islamist Undercurrent."

36 Ibid., p. 13.

37 For more information, see Grégory Chauzal and Thibault van Damme, "The Roots of Mali's Conflict: Moving Beyond the 2012 Crisis," *Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Clingendael)*, March 2015, https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/The_roots_of_Malis_conflict.pdf.

DDR has been incorporated as part of the current international assistance mission to Mali, but it hinges on successful implementation of the comprehensive peace agreement. Here, authorities will need to keep in mind earlier challenges faced as part of DDR processes, including corruption, internal rivalries, politicization, depletion of resources, clientelism, and lack of accountability mechanisms. To address current and future threats, the Malian government has developed a national CVE strategy, which the Malian Ministry of Foreign Affairs will coordinate and monitor.³⁸

Niger has experienced multiple, extended periods of political instability since achieving independence in 1960. Of particular note is the friction between the government and the Tuareg minority that culminated in the peace accords of the mid-1990s. Since then, the Nigerien government has implemented multiple DDR programs to avoid a return to conflict.³⁹ These have included reintegrating Tuareg ex-combatants into the Nigerien military, integrating Tuareg leaders into state-owned companies, and offering academic education opportunities and microloans. The government has also made sustained efforts to create a more inclusive political environment while decentralizing power to give Tuareg communities more control. While DDR initiatives are ongoing and often afflicted by slow or incomplete implementations, it is notable that Niger has largely avoided the Tuareg secessionist conflict that has plagued Mali.⁴⁰ To address current crises, the Nigerien government is undertaking a DDR program for former Boko Haram members in the Diffa region; but in the absence of the conditions necessary for successful DDR, many challenges hinder effective implementation.⁴¹

GREATER HORN OF AFRICA

The Greater Horn of Africa has for decades been affected by various forms of conflict and violence. Though the levels of conflict and drivers of violence vary from country to country, the most visible instances of violence in recent years have been perpetrated by al-Shabaab, which surpassed Boko Haram as the deadliest militant Islamist group in Africa in 2016 and is active primarily in Somalia and Kenya.⁴² Yet other groups similarly give cause for concern. While the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) has largely been dismantled in Uganda, it continues to recruit members and carry out attacks in surrounding countries. In fact, Uganda's experience with the LRA and the subsequent amnesty and DDR processes provide lessons for rehabilitation and reintegration programs for violent extremists, including lessons for the roles of CSOs. Such lessons are particularly important as the Greater Horn of Africa suffers from severe prison overcrowding, similar in nature to the Sahel, and will need to articulate viable classification, detention or alternatives to detention, and rehabilitation processes.⁴³ Indeed, several countries are leading the way on rehabilitation and reintegration efforts for violent extremists associated with al-Shabaab, including carving out a role for CSOs.

Although founded just over a decade ago and currently experiencing significant attrition due to U.S., Ethiopian, Kenyan, and African Union Mission to Somalia actions, al-Shabaab has demonstrated a consistent ability to survive and adapt. The group continues to pose a threat to Somalia's stability and

38 U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Counterterrorism, "Country Report on Terrorism 2016," July 2017, pp. 38-41, <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/272488.pdf>.

39 Republique du Niger, "Rapport Periodique Combine de la Republique du Niger (2003-2014): Sur la Mise en Oeuvre de la Charte Africaine des Droits de l'Homme et des Peuples," July 2014, p. 84; Republic of Niger, UN Volunteers, UNDP and Cooperation Francaise, "Projet de Consolidation de la Paix Dans la Region de Diffa: Mission d'Evaluation Finale," April 2003, p. 4 et seqq.

40 Frederic Deycard and Yan Guichaoua, "Mali and Niger Tuareg Insurgencies and the War in Libya," *African Arguments* (September 2011); Swedish Defence Research Agency (Forsvarsdepartementet), "Explaining the 2012 Tuareg Rebellion in Mali and Lack Thereof in Niger" (2012), pp. 4-6; IRIN, "Can Niger Offer Mali Lessons on the Tuareg?" 11 April 2013, <http://www.irinnews.org/report/97823/can-niger-offer-mali-lessons-tuareg>.

41 Vanda Felbab-Brown, "Under the Hot Sahel Sun: 'Post'-Boko Haram Challenges in Niger and Nigeria," Brookings Institution, 8 June 2017, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2017/06/08/under-the-hot-sahel-sun-post-boko-haram-challenges-in-niger-and-nigeria>.

42 Africa Center for Strategic Studies, "Map of Africa's Militant Islamist Groups," 26 April 2017, <https://africacenter.org/spotlight/map-africa-militant-islamic-groups-april-2017/>.

43 Penal Reform International, "Alternatives to Imprisonment in East Africa: Trends and Challenges," 2012, <https://www.penalreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/alternatives-east-africa-2013-v2-2.pdf>.

its relations with neighboring countries. To address the threat in a more coordinated manner, the Somali government developed a National Strategy on P/CVE in 2016 that emphasized the role of civil society as a key partner in such initiatives, including rehabilitation and reintegration efforts.⁴⁴ To facilitate the rehabilitation and reintegration process, the Somali government developed the National Program for the Treatment and Handling of Disengaging Combatants and Youth at Risk through the Inter-Ministerial Task Force on Disengaging Combatants.⁴⁵ This program seeks to support youth previously engaged with armed groups, particularly al-Shabaab, including by establishing facilities to offer rehabilitation and reintegration opportunities to young Somalis in line with international child protection standards.⁴⁶ The government estimates that through this program, 4,500 former combatants will be rehabilitated and reintegrated with support from UN entities, international organizations such as the International Organization for Migration, and Somali civil society.⁴⁷

Al-Shabaab's numerous acts of terrorism within Kenya's borders, as well as its continued recruitment of Somali refugees in Kenya, have made it the primary focus of Kenyan counterterrorism and CVE efforts. In 2016, Kenya launched its National Strategy to Counter Violent Extremism, a comprehensive effort that emphasizes the roles that the government, CSOs, religious organizations, and the private sector can play in helping to reduce the threat of violent extremism.⁴⁸ The national strategy includes the need to focus on rehabilitation and reintegration, and efforts are ongoing to rehabilitate and reintegrate both violent extremists detained in prisons as well as returning

al-Shabaab recruits who were offered amnesty. CSOs have had an instrumental role in developing and implementing these programs, though lingering tensions between government and civil society have hindered full partnerships.⁴⁹

To deal with the violence wrought by the LRA, the Ugandan government passed the Amnesty Act in 2000, which established the Amnesty Commission and Demobilization and Resettlement Team, colloquially known as the Amnesty Commission. Through the Amnesty Commission the government undertook numerous DDR programs, whose beneficiaries were combatants, their dependents and communities, youth, women, and the disabled.⁵⁰ The Amnesty Commission served as the convening body that identified CSOs and other groups who received resources to implement DDR programming. Through the commission, 3,342 individuals from various rebel groups demobilized, while 3,428 individuals received some form of reintegration support. The LRA and another armed rebel group, the Allied Democratic Forces (ADF), did not, however, fully demobilize during the time frame of the program and continued to sow discord.⁵¹ The process, however, did lay the foundation for the role of CSOs in rehabilitation and reintegration, lessons that Uganda now integrates in its efforts to deal with the predominantly ADF-led Salafist-Jihadist recruitment.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

While Southeast Asia has a long history of radical militancy, the region has experienced a significant increase in terrorist activity in the last 15 years.

44 Federal Republic of Somalia, "National Strategy and Action Plan for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism," 27 June 2016, <http://www.radiomuqdisho.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/CVE-Strategy-26-August-English.pdf>.

45 Anneli Botha, "Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Former al-Shabaab Fighters in Somalia," *RIMA Occasional Papers* 5, no. 25 (December 2017).

46 UN Development Programme, "The UN in Somalia: 2014," p. 52, <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/unct/somalia/docs/publications/FINAL%20UN%20SOMALIA%20Yearbook%20Layout.pdf>.

47 Ibid.

48 The European Union Emergency Trust Fund for Stability and Addressing the Root Causes of Irregular Migration and Displaced Persons in Africa, https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/eutf-hoa-ke-34-kenya-cve_en_0.pdf.

49 Eelco Kessels, Tracey Durner, and Matthew Schwartz, "Violent Extremism and Instability in the Greater Horn of Africa: An Examination of Drivers and Responses," Global Center on Cooperative Security, April 2016, p. 27, http://www.globalcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/GCCS_VIOLENT-EXTREMISM_low_3.pdf.

50 Taies Nezam and Alexandre Marc, "Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration," World Bank, 1 February 2009, no. 119, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/776831468324547527/pdf/514150NWP0DDR0no01190Box342027B01PUBLIC1.pdf>.

51 World Bank, "Demobilization and Integration in Uganda: Laying the Foundation for Post-Conflict Recovery by Building Regional Peace," 20 March 2013, <http://www.worldbank.org/en/results/2013/03/20/demobilization-and-integration-in-uganda-laying-the-foundation-for-post-conflict-recovery-by-building-regional-peace>.

The terrorist group Jemaah Islamiya, most known for carrying out the 2002 Bali bombings, has been operational in all three focus countries of this project. Although it has recently been dormant, with the majority of its leaders killed or incarcerated, Indonesians in particular fear the group's return. In Malaysia, terrorists had been more inclined to commit attacks abroad. This changed in June 2016, however, with an ISIL-affiliated attack on a nightclub in Kuala Lumpur. The Philippines has experienced both religious and left-wing violent extremism, most notably by the Abu Sayyaf Group and the New People's Army, making it one of the countries most frequently affected by terrorism. In fact, the 2017 siege of the Philippine city of Marawi by ISIL-aligned terrorist groups raised concerns that Southeast Asia could become the next hub for ISIL as it loses territory in Iraq and Syria. Furthermore, all three countries have had a significant number of citizens who traveled abroad as foreign fighters. Coupled with porous borders and vast coastlines, there is considerable cross-border terrorism-related activity and violent extremist movement across the region.

In Indonesia, the National Counter-Terrorism Agency is the main coordinating body for counterterrorism-related information and activities among different agencies. It developed the Terrorism Prevention Blueprint (Blueprint Pencegahan Terorisme) and, in late 2013, the Deradicalization Blueprint (Blueprint Deradikalisasi), which serve as the basis for national counterterrorism and deradicalization programs. Although the government built a specialized deradicalization center in Sentul and officially launched an integrated rehabilitation module for VEOs in 2016, there is no coherent or consistent multi-stakeholder program aimed at rehabilitating and reintegrating convicted VEOs. However, a multitude of rehabilitation-related activities have been initiated during the past decade. These activities have been implemented by various government and law enforcement agencies, NGOs, and civil society actors—including religious groups, victims, and former VEOs—universities, and, to a lesser extent, the private sector.

Malaysia has a law enforcement-driven counterterrorism framework in which deradicalization plays a prominent role. The government has also implemented a rehabilitation and reintegration program, which garners significant state funding and is administered by a combination of the police, home affairs ministry, and religious and prison departments. Families and a number of semigovernmental NGOs have also been involved in its implementation. In 2016, the government developed an integrated rehabilitation module with a 250-page handbook detailing an extensive rehabilitation curriculum. Overall, Malaysia's state-centric approach has claimed a high success rate in rehabilitating VEOs, a claim that is as yet unverified but is further bolstered by the small number of terrorist attacks given Malaysia's comparatively large population of foreign fighters. This state-centric approach leaves little space for constructive engagement with civil society, however, whose representatives report little involvement with such initiatives.

The Philippines has a long-standing history of dealing with militancy and postconflict reintegration. Its most active struggle in Mindanao has taken on increasing importance as militant groups fighting for Mindanao's liberation have linked with transnational terrorist groups including ISIL. Plans to increase the Philippine army's presence in Mindanao by 6,000 underscore the military-centric approach taken to address the violent extremist insurgency in the region.⁵² However, the Philippine government has likewise increased efforts to undertake softer approaches through P/CVE and rehabilitation and reintegration initiatives. A recent example is the government's Resilient Communities in Conflict Affected Communities (Payapa at Masaganang Pamayanan, or PAMANA) program, which ensures the development of conflict-affected areas while peace negotiations with various groups are ongoing. A focus of this program is counterradicalization and the reintegration of former combatants through psychosocial tools and other support mechanisms.⁵³ With regard to CVE-specific initiatives, the President's Anti-Terrorism Council Program Management Center (ATC-PMC) is the

52 Mike Crismundo, "Army Opens Recruitment of 6,000 New Soldiers for Mindanao," *Manila Bulletin*, 15 June 2018, <https://news.mb.com.ph/2018/06/15/army-opens-recruitment-of-6000-new-soldiers-for-mindanao>.

53 Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process, "Payapa at Masaganang Pamayanan (PAMANA)," <https://peace.gov.ph/2016/11/payapa-masaganang-pamayanan-pamana>.

primary body providing guidance on policy and programming. However, the ATC is not a coordinating body; its activities are implemented independently by other government agencies. Although there is no centralized rehabilitation program, rehabilitation initiatives such as education and vocational training are implemented in the primary prison housing those suspected of terrorism-related offenses.

REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION CHALLENGES ACROSS REGIONS

Though diverse in experiences and responses to conflict and violent extremism, all three focus regions offer overarching lessons and continued challenges that impact the development and implementation of rehabilitation and reintegration in today's context. For example, while governments and donors often prioritize the criminal justice process of bringing terrorists to justice, the reality is that there are many practical challenges in capturing, trying, and imprisoning VEOs. Authorities must also recognize the importance of rehabilitation and reintegration as both a part of and an alternative to the criminal justice approach, as well as a crucial component of a sustainable, long-term strategy to prevent and counter terrorism.

In other cases where rehabilitation and reintegration programming is considered or implemented, it is too often developed as a top-down approach led by the government and military. This approach tends to devalue the role of CSOs and deny them credibility as partners in rehabilitation and reintegration and in P/CVE efforts more generally. In other cases, the space in which CSOs can freely operate in relation to P/CVE has diminished considerably, despite the proliferation of P/CVE NAPs that promote whole-of-society approaches and the importance of CSO engagement.⁵⁴ CSOs are sometimes viewed with suspicion or considered a hindrance, especially where

the protection of human rights is concerned, or they are instrumentalized as organizations to which undesirable work can be outsourced.

Even when CSOs are provided the space to operate, they often face issues of access, capacity, and resources. For example, CSOs encounter consistent challenges in trying to access correction facilities or designated camps in conflict zones to provide services. When they do have access, they oftentimes have a shortage of individuals who are qualified to take on specialized rehabilitation and reintegration work, including psychosocial counseling, legal aid, and economic support. These components are an important part of the rehabilitation and reintegration process but are sometimes relegated in favor of an approach that relies heavily on religious counseling. Though religious counseling can be an important component of rehabilitation and reintegration, it should ideally be supplemented with tailored interventions addressing the structural factors that may have driven involvement with or support for violent extremism.⁵⁵ CSOs also face constraints in resources, primarily consistent funding, which would enable them to provide sustained care and improve their own capacity, expertise, and effectiveness.

Furthermore, a narrow focus on rehabilitating and reintegrating perpetrators of violent extremism comes at the expense of all other groups who are likewise affected by violent extremism, such as victims of terrorism or internally displaced persons (IDPs). Addressing the needs of all those affected by a given conflict can have positive impacts on the success of rehabilitation and reintegration initiatives for VEOs, as such an approach acknowledges the breadth of suffering and helps preempt resentment and grievances.

These challenges are not meant to be exhaustive but simply aim to illuminate the context in which current rehabilitation and reintegration efforts exist. Together with the regional landscape, they provide substantive background for the guidelines and recommendations that follow.

54 Koo and Murdie, "Liberty or Security: Do Civil Society Restrictions Limit Terrorism?"; Saskia Brechenmacher, "Civil Society Under Assault: Repression and Responses in Russia, Egypt, and Ethiopia," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2017, http://carnegieendowment.org/files/Civil_Society_Under_Assault_Final.pdf.

55 Kessels, Durner, and Schwartz, "Violent Extremism and Instability in the Greater Horn of Africa."

THE ROLE OF CSOS IN REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION

Guiding Principles and Recommendations

● CIVIL SOCIETY ● GOVERNMENTS ● INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND DONORS

Indicates the audience to whom the guiding principle or recommendation is directed

-
- **GUIDING PRINCIPLE 1.** Establish legal and operational frameworks for the prosecution, rehabilitation, and reintegration of those associated with and affected by terrorism, in coordination with multiple stakeholders and in line with existing or developing P/CVE frameworks.
-
- ● ● **GUIDING PRINCIPLE 2.** Ensure that rehabilitation and reintegration strategies and programs benefit the wide range of individuals and groups associated with and affected by violent extremism.
-
- ● **GUIDING PRINCIPLE 3.** Develop rehabilitation and reintegration programs that address a wide range of needs, including psychosocial, vocational, financial, educational, legal, religious, familial, and communication needs.
-
- ● ● **GUIDING PRINCIPLE 4.** Facilitate community ownership in rehabilitation and reintegration initiatives, especially in reducing stigma, communicating grievances, providing specialized services, and tapping into traditional justice and reconciliation mechanisms.
-
- ● ● **GUIDING PRINCIPLE 5.** Incorporate age and gender sensitivities and perspectives into rehabilitation and reintegration program development.
-
- ● **GUIDING PRINCIPLE 6.** Draw on experiences from postconflict rehabilitation and reintegration programming as well as DDR in developing rehabilitation and reintegration programs for those associated with and affected by violent extremism.
-
- **RECOMMENDATION 1.** Formally integrate CSOs in the design and implementation of national rehabilitation and reintegration frameworks.
-
- **RECOMMENDATION 2.** Articulate a role for CSOs in cross-border collaboration mechanisms.
-
- ● ● **RECOMMENDATION 3.** Elaborate safety protocols and measures for local actors involved in rehabilitation and reintegration, with particular emphasis on intervention providers and clients.
-
- ● ● **RECOMMENDATION 4.** Facilitate training for frontline staff on rehabilitation and reintegration, including how to best involve CSOs.
-
- ● ● **RECOMMENDATION 5.** Create and further develop national and—where appropriate—cross-border civil society networks for organizations working in rehabilitation and reintegration.
-
- **RECOMMENDATION 6.** Collaborate with actors, within and beyond civil society and government, including academia, international and regional organizations, and the private sector to exchange information, coordinate activities, and cooperate on implementation.
-
- **RECOMMENDATION 7.** Develop and invest in rehabilitation and reintegration expertise and capacity building among CSOs to increase effectiveness and ensure sustainability.
-
- ● **RECOMMENDATION 8.** Provide sustained long-term funding on faster timelines.
-
- ● ● **RECOMMENDATION 9.** Gather data related to violent extremism and rehabilitation and reintegration through ethical research and share studies where appropriate.
-
- ● ● **RECOMMENDATION 10.** Incorporate monitoring and evaluation into all programming to ensure learning and increase long-term effectiveness.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR COMPREHENSIVE REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION

Building on frameworks such as the GCTF's *Rome Memorandum on Good Practices for Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Violent Extremist Offenders*, the following guiding principles outline some considerations that stakeholders should take into account when developing and implementing rehabilitation and reintegration programs to address violent extremism.⁵⁶ Each guiding principle is accompanied by a few examples of how the principle has been applied or the consequences of overlooking the principle. Such examples are not meant to indicate a best practice but, rather, to illustrate how rehabilitation and reintegration or P/CVE issues have been applied in local contexts with varying levels of resources and human capital and different cultural and legal backgrounds. Examples that stem from activities funded through the broader project's small grants component are clearly labeled as such in the title.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 1.

Establish legal and operational frameworks for the prosecution, rehabilitation, and reintegration of those associated with and affected by terrorism, in coordination with multiple stakeholders and in line with existing or developing P/CVE frameworks.

To address the wide-ranging needs for the rehabilitation and reintegration of those associated with and affected by terrorism, governments should develop legal and operational frameworks in coordination with multiple stakeholders and in

line with international and human rights laws and principles.⁵⁷ These frameworks should include the widest possible range of affected groups and elaborate the central aims and components of rehabilitation and reintegration programs. They should also account for the varying needs of adults versus juveniles (whose rehabilitative needs are favored over punitive measures) and the differing approaches for men versus women, and boys versus girls, in compliance with international standards such as the Paris Principles.⁵⁸ These frameworks need not be standalone guidelines but, rather, should be linked to any existing or future P/CVE NAPs.

Frameworks should clarify the roles, responsibilities, and protections for each stakeholder involved in the rehabilitation and reintegration process and should acknowledge the multidisciplinary nature needed to undertake rehabilitation and reintegration. For government agencies, this may include the security sector, law enforcement, the judiciary, and correction and probation departments, among other criminal justice actors, as well as the education, foreign affairs, and social affairs ministries. These efforts are enhanced and supported when civil society, academia, the private sector, and the media are brought on as partners. CSOs, in particular, can help support the development of relevant frameworks, ensuring their feasibility and practicality from a community perspective and safeguarding community interests. (For more on the role of CSOs in developing rehabilitation and reintegration frameworks, see Recommendation 1).

56 See Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF), "Rome Memorandum on Good Practices for Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Violent Extremist Offenders," <https://www.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/Framework%20Documents/A/GCTF-Rome-Memorandum-ENG.pdf>.

57 See Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF), "Initiative to Address the Life Cycle of Radicalization to Violence, Addendum to the Rome Memorandum on Good Practices for Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Violent Extremist Offenders," <https://www.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/Toolkit-documents/English-Addendum-to-the-Rome-Memorandum-on-Legal-Frameworks.pdf>.

58 UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), "The Paris Principles: Principles and Guidelines on Children Associated With Armed Forces or Armed Groups," February 2007, para. 3.6, https://www.unicef.org/protection/files/Paris_Principles_EN.pdf. For an in-depth analysis of juveniles convicted of violent extremist offenses, see Global Center on Cooperative Security and International Centre for Counter-Terrorism–The Hague, "Correcting the Course: Advancing Juvenile Justice Principles for Children Convicted of Violent Extremism Offenses," September 2017, http://www.globalcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/GCCS_CORRECTINGCOURSE_LOW_10.17.pdf.

EXAMPLE 1: Nigeria Policy Framework and National Action Plan for P/CVE

In August 2017, the Nigerian government published its Policy Framework and National Action Plan for P/CVE, developed in close consultation with civil society and other community stakeholders in the country. The Policy Framework and National Action Plan were developed in response to the UN Secretary General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism to create a robust response to the shifting patterns and facets of violent extremism in Nigeria. It serves as a "broad policy framework to provide direction and coordination for the various initiatives that have been launched" to address violent extremism in the country, centered around a whole-of-society approach.

The Policy Framework and National Action Plan seeks to complement Nigeria's existing counterterrorism strategies with a soft, community-based approach to

P/CVE in the country. In doing so, it has been designed to support ongoing counterterrorism and P/CVE initiatives, such as the military's Operation Safe Corridor, the Nigeria Prison De-Radicalization Program, engagement with CSOs, and the country's judicial response to violent extremism and terrorism.

The Policy Framework and National Action Plan specifically seeks to (1) coordinate P/CVE programs at the national, state, and local levels, (2) strengthen the justice system, (3) enhance the capacity of individuals and communities to counter and prevent violent extremism, and (4) institutionalize and integrate strategic communication in P/CVE programs at all levels. In furtherance of these objectives, the strategy emphasizes collaboration with key sectors of civil society, as well as working with victims and perpetrators of violent extremism toward their rehabilitation and reintegration back into society.

EXAMPLE 2: Uganda Peace, Recovery, and Development Plan

In 2007, the Ugandan Office of the Prime Minister implemented a special rehabilitation-focused program called the Peace, Recovery, and Development Plan for Northern Uganda (PRDP). The program was to be a tool to address protracted poverty and to enhance the standard of living in northern Uganda, as well as to tackle the devastation and displacement caused by the two-decade-long civil war (1986-2006) in northern Uganda against the LRA.⁵⁹ Through the project, the Ugandan government created a dedicated department to "initiate, design, and coordinate" efforts toward the recovery and development of northern Uganda.⁶⁰ Two of the program's objectives specifically focus on the rehabilitation and reintegration of individuals associated with and affected by armed groups:

- Strategic Objective 2: Rebuilding and Empowering Communities of the PRDP includes a component for the return and resettlement of IDPs, focusing on

pre-departure and post-arrival assistance, such as conducting security assessments in areas of return and providing return kits and livelihood support for IDPs to further facilitate their reintegration.

- Strategic Objective 4: Peace Building and Reconciliation of the PRDP addresses the rehabilitation and reintegration of former combatants through public awareness-raising programs, the provision of counseling to traumatized individuals, putting in place support mechanisms for intra- and intercommunity conflict management, and ensuring the availability of nontraditional accountability and justice mechanisms. Strategic Objective 4 also addresses the needs of former combatants through socioeconomic reintegration, including through "Demobilization Certificates," bursaries for formal education, skills training and apprenticeships, and providing support for income-generating activities.

59 International Alert, "Monitoring the Impact of the Peace, Recovery and Development Plan on Peace and Conflict in Northern Uganda," July 2013, https://www.international-alert.org/sites/default/files/Uganda_PRDPNorthernUganda_EN_2013.pdf, p. 6; Elliot Bertasi, "Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development: The PRDP for Northern Uganda," *Baker Scholar Projects* (2013), http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_bakerschool/22; Republic of Uganda, "Peace, Recovery, and Development Plan for Northern Uganda," September 2007, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Uganda_PRDP-2007.pdf, p. iii.

60 Ibid.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 2.

Ensure that rehabilitation and reintegration strategies and programs benefit the wide range of individuals and groups associated with and affected by violent extremism.

The obvious target audience for rehabilitation and reintegration programs includes those who supported terrorism or joined terrorist groups, those convicted of terrorism-related offenses, and returning and relocating foreign fighters. However, programs should also take into consideration those affected by violent extremism. To increase the likelihood of effectiveness, it is important that rehabilitation and reintegration programs support the social network around individuals undergoing rehabilitation and reintegration to stop further radicalization, encourage disengagement, and provide a supportive network for the rehabilitation and reintegration process. For example, programs should address the needs of spouses and children of incarcerated

VEOs, particularly in cases where the VEO was the primary breadwinner. Addressing family needs will help prevent violent extremist groups from filling the financial gap and negatively influencing the family while also alleviating financial pressure and helping facilitate rehabilitation programming for the incarcerated individual, whose primary concern may be their family's well-being.

Moreover, the long-term healing and reconciliation necessary for successful rehabilitation and reintegration is only possible when the needs of all those affected by the violence and conflict are met. Such groups include the victims of violent extremism—such as abducted women, any offspring conceived in captivity, and IDPs—as well as vigilante forces, deportees sent back from transit countries as they were on their way to conflict zones, and recipient communities. Direct victims of violent extremism especially require tailored programs to address physical injuries, practical challenges, and potential trauma to help ease them back into their communities.

EXAMPLE 3: Financial Empowerment for Wives of Violent Extremist Offenders in Indonesia

In an effort to engage the varying groups affected by violent extremism and terrorism, the University of Indonesia's Police Research Center is implementing an "Entrepreneurship and Proselytization Empowerment Program" for wives of incarcerated VEOs. As part of this program, eligible women receive counseling and business training to empower them to launch their own ventures or to turn existing undertakings into more profitable enterprises, while their husbands (often the traditional breadwinners) are serving prison sentences.⁶¹

Having concluded their first project cycle in mid-2017, the university's program has demonstrated high levels of success among its 18 participants. Empowering women to start their own businesses not only ensures a steady income for their families, it also provides work opportunities for the husband upon his release and creates a source of positivity and stability.

Similar activities are also being carried out by the Indonesian Institute for International Peace Building (Yayasan Prasasti Perdamaian),⁶² which offers loans and business training to wives of VEOs recently released from prison. The NGO provides loans between \$375 and \$750 to women to support them in setting up their own businesses.

61 Krithika Varagur, "Empowering Women to Break the Jihadi Cycle," *New York Times*, 20 June 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/20/opinion/empowering-women-to-break-the-jihadi-cycle.html>.

62 Institute for International Peace Building (Yayasan Prasasti Perdamaian), "Outreach Division," <https://prasasti.org/programs/outreach-division>.

EXAMPLE 4: Small Grant to Carefronting in Nigeria

The Nigeria-based NGO Carefronting implemented a year-long project entitled “Training of Selected CSOs and NGOs in Borno State on Trauma Consciousness and Resilience, Community Cohesion, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation.” The organization has years of experience in healing and reconciliation and principally focuses on peace-building, conflict transformation, trauma consciousness, and P/CVE.

Acknowledging the absence of programs addressing the psychological needs of victims and survivors of Boko Haram violence in northeastern Nigeria, Carefronting developed a project to equip community members with the requisite skills to act as first responders to trauma. Outside intervention in conflict-affected areas, such as Maiduguri, can be short-lived and dependent on the evolving security situation. Thus, empowering local stakeholders to help each other overcome trauma results in more robust coping mechanisms and builds resilience and sustainability.

Through the project, Carefronting implemented several trainings for NGOs across Maiduguri, Adamawa,

and Yola, focused on trauma consciousness and resilience, community cohesion, and forgiveness and reconciliation. Building on these trainings and with the aim of expanding support, Carefronting developed a training manual on forgiveness and reconciliation that was distributed to over 150 organizations within Nigeria, alongside additional training, and disseminated globally through various international forums.

Carefronting’s holistic approach to trauma consciousness, reconciliation, and forgiveness resonated with both communities and the local police and security services, who welcomed the focus on both victims and perpetrators of violent extremism. Participants demonstrated an increased understanding of the need to focus on psychological support to accompany security measures, physical reconstruction, and material aid. In a demonstration of the sustainability of this project, several participants from the trainings are now working as counselors in communities and IDP camps or with hospitals, universities, and the military. Additionally, other NGOs have now mainstreamed Carefronting’s training elements into their own community engagements.

EXAMPLE 5: Small Grant to BALAY Rehabilitation Center in the Philippines

BALAY Rehabilitation Center is a Philippine-based human rights NGO that focuses on the provision of psychological and rehabilitation services for IDPs and survivors of torture and violence in Mindanao. Through its project titled “Psychosocial Response to Victims of Perpetrators of Extremism in Mindanao, Philippines,” BALAY aimed to improve the psychosocial well-being of victims while also assessing their ability to interact with and change perceptions of perpetrators of violent extremism. BALAY also engaged with government agencies, such as the Department of Social Welfare and Development, to amplify the impact of the project and to ensure that victims receive the long-term attention and care they require.

BALAY’s engagement concentrated on Marawi, a city in Mindanao that had 98 percent of its population forcibly displaced during a siege by violent extremist groups affiliated with ISIL that ended with a military intervention. While relative calm returned to the city

in late 2017, the victims of violence continue to suffer immense psychological trauma in addition to coping with widespread losses of lives and livelihoods. To this end, BALAY conducted several visits to the city, forming strategic partnerships with other NGOs and CSOs, as well as with relevant government bodies.

Through these engagements, BALAY identified 12 survivors, seven of which were children who had been held captive for several months, for whom the NGO developed psychological assessments, interventions, and support activities. This included home visits and listening sessions, individually and with family members, to offer survivors an opportunity to speak about their experiences in a safe environment. Additionally, the program provided psychological support sessions during which BALAY provided grief-processing tools to survivors and their families. During implementation, BALAY kept local municipal leaders up to date about their findings, ensuring that any government action could benefit from their work, and vice versa. Furthermore, capacity-building training was provided for municipal personnel to further enhance their ability to engage with survivors.

It is important to note that operating in a postconflict environment such as Mindanao presents unique challenges. There was an overwhelming number of survivors and victims, and access to them was burdened by security concerns and lack of infrastructure. These challenges and others revealed a pressing need to provide local government units with the requisite training in psychological first aid, mental health support, case management, and case documentation to ensure

that survivors and victims receive the proper initial and sustained support they need for successful rehabilitation and reintegration.

Based on the insights, BALAY has produced a framework, intervention plan, and referral system to guide future efforts. Moving forward, it seeks to continue its support for the survivors who were initial participants in this project, as well as apply the lessons learned to dealing with perpetrators of violence.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 3.

Develop rehabilitation and reintegration programs that address a wide range of needs, including psychosocial, vocational, financial, educational, legal, religious, familial, and communication needs.

A comprehensive rehabilitation and reintegration plan requires acknowledging and addressing the relevant needs of individuals as they transition from conflict or prison environments back into society, while at the same time addressing the needs of victims and preparing communities to receive them. Such needs may include (1) psychosocial support and trauma counseling; (2) vocational and skills training; (3) education; (4) financial support; (5) legal aid and

counseling; (6) religious counseling; (7) support systems for families; and (8) community sensitization campaigns to reduce stigma.

No one institution, agency, or organization can take on the challenging and long-term work necessary to address all of these needs. The various components of an effective rehabilitation and reintegration program therefore necessitate multidisciplinary teams equipped to handle these aspects—ideally characterized by public-private partnerships where possible. Governments should take the lead in initiating such multidisciplinary teams in close coordination and collaboration with CSOs, while all stakeholders involved must allot the appropriate time and resources necessary to undertake each component.

EXAMPLE 6: Small Grant to Indonesian Institute for Society Empowerment

The Indonesian Institute for Society Empowerment (INSEP) delivers a multidisciplinary approach to community empowerment, including via advocacy activities in the fields of education and culture. INSEP's project, "Increasing Religious Leaders' Participation in the Deradicalization and Reintegration of Former Terrorist Offenders," addressed the important role religious counseling plays in rehabilitation and reintegration in Indonesia.

Through the project, INSEP implemented a workshop bringing together religious leaders, government representatives, and academics working on issues related to violent extremism. The workshop aimed to provide religious leaders with information on how VEOs joined terrorist groups and what role they could play in offering support and counseling to support their rehabilitation and reintegration. The discussions highlighted the various challenges inherent in the role of religious leaders and

other CSOs in rehabilitation and reintegration, including low levels of community participation in rehabilitation and reintegration efforts, poorly developed systems to select preachers, and a need for more frequent meetings of mosque representatives on the drivers of recruitment and radicalization.

Further challenges hindering successful rehabilitation and reintegration in Indonesia include issues with assessing VEOs to apply tailored interventions, a dearth of personnel with specialized knowledge, and prevailing community reluctance to welcome former violent extremists. As identified by INSEP's dialogues, key audiences to engage on these issues include former violent extremists and their families, religious leaders, academics, relevant ministries, CSOs, and local community groups. These diverse constituents each play a central part in the larger quest for developing and implementing a more resonant, long-term, and sustainable rehabilitation and reintegration framework in Indonesia.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 4.

Facilitate community ownership in rehabilitation and reintegration initiatives, especially in reducing stigma, communicating grievances, providing specialized services, and tapping into traditional justice and reconciliation mechanisms.

Many foreign fighters and VEOs, as well as victims of violent extremism, will return to communities that must be prepared to receive them. Local communities—including local leaders, religious and political figures, and local businesses—therefore play a critical role in sustainable rehabilitation and reintegration. They must be involved in the development of programming and given ownership of certain components. Stakeholders can work with and through civil society to engage local communities as much as possible. Their involvement can assist in the following ways:

- 1. Reducing stigmatization:** Former members of violent extremist groups, as well as victims of violent extremism, often face high levels of stigma and prejudice upon reentering their communities. This stigma is most often expressed by recipient communities, but can also manifest as self-stigmatization, especially in the case of former inmates. Victims abducted by violent extremists can also be shunned by communities because of the stigma of association, particularly in cases of sexual violence and resulting impregnation. Community-led initiatives can support awareness-raising campaigns to reduce misconceptions and socialize the need and mutual benefit of successfully rehabilitating and reintegrating those associated with and affected by violent extremism. Elements of these campaigns may include explaining the diverse motives for joining and leaving violent extremist groups, including forced recruitment and abductions; the possibility of affecting change; and the power of forgiveness and reconciliation. Socialization and sensitization campaigns could be conducted through traditional and new media, including TV, radio, newspapers, and social media, as well as education campaigns and community roundtables.
- 2. Communicating grievances:** The resources and opportunities afforded to recipients of rehabilitation and reintegration programs can be

significant. Law-abiding community members, particularly those who may be struggling to make ends meet, may be resentful of the efforts made to procure livelihood and other assistance for perpetrators of violence. In a worst-case scenario, the feelings of injustice and unfair treatment may incentivize individuals to engage with violent extremist groups. Collaborating with local communities can ensure that recipient communities' needs, concerns, and fears are acknowledged and addressed to prevent the emergence of grievances that can fuel further violence and community discord. While it is the responsibility of governments to understand and address sources of discontent, interlocutors such as CSOs can help facilitate dialogues between community members and local government officials to air concerns related to rehabilitation and reintegration.

- 3. Providing services:** Communities can play a role in providing vocational training to VEOs and assisting with the search for employment and accommodation, as well as facilitating the social networks necessary to help individuals get back on their feet. Local places of worship can also play a role in providing long-term religious guidance and social support where desired. For example, in the context of violent Islamist extremism, local religious teachers who teach at small neighborhood mosques are often in constant touch with their congregation and can help arrange resources and support.
- 4. Working with and through existing traditional justice and reconciliation mechanisms:** Rehabilitation and reintegration interventions should not attempt to reinvent the wheel. In many communities, traditional or informal justice mechanisms can provide tried-and-tested methods to reintegrate and rehabilitate victims and offenders back into their communities, with a focus on forgiveness and reconciliation. CSOs may work alongside or within such mechanisms, providing support and guidance where needed and appropriate. While governments should acknowledge the importance of traditional justice mechanisms, CSOs are best placed to undertake and lead such initiatives due to their informal nature rooted in customs and traditions.

EXAMPLE 7: Restaurant Employment for Formers as Part of Rehabilitation and Reintegration Efforts in Indonesia

The Institute for International Peace Building (Yayasan Prasasti Perdamaian), founded in 2008 in Indonesia by former VEO Noor Huda Ismail, offers former VEOs meaningful work in restaurants and bakeries (two of each in Semarang and Solo). The businesses operate as a social enterprise aimed at tackling former VEOs' engagement with and involvement in violence through social and psychological engagement.⁶³ It provides individuals with a sense of purpose while also improving their socioeconomic standing. The initiative further allows former VEOs to make a positive social contribution while providing them with a supportive social network as an alternative to militant-based relationships.

As participants have noted, this new social network gives them the self-respect and dignity needed to return to mainstream society and positively affects their social outlook. For example, many of the former VEOs have stated that the act of serving a diverse customer base promotes a positive attitudinal shift in their perceptions of the "other." Beyond the benefits of full-time employment, participants are also made to feel part of the community and society at large. By acknowledging and addressing the specific social and economic drivers that can facilitate reentry into violent extremism, the initiative offers an effective reintegration pathway that offers a new peer network and consistent income. The founder's background also gives the initiative an additional trustworthiness and legitimacy in the eyes of reintegrating VEOs.

⁶³ Ben Bland, "Indonesian Scheme Serves Up a New Life for Reformed Militants," *Financial Times*, 10 June 2014, <https://www.ft.com/content/f9992764-e700-11e3-aa93-00144feabdc0>.

EXAMPLE 8: Small Grant to Association Jeunesse de la Paix et la Non-Violence in Chad

Chad-based CSO Association Jeunesse de la Paix et la Non-Violence (AJPNV, or Youth Association for Peace and Non-Violence) implemented a program titled "Sensitizing and Reinforcing Community Capacity in Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Violent Extremist Offenders." Through the project, the AJPNV organized awareness campaigns on the necessity of rehabilitation and reintegration for reintegrating VEOs to prevent recidivism and trained religious and traditional leaders, youth organizations, women, political party chiefs, CSOs, and the media on issues relating to violent extremism and recidivism. The large diversity of participants

ensured a broad base for capacity building and contributed to establishing a network of stakeholders.

The AJPNV also implemented a training for CSOs specifically focused on violent extremism and its effects on communities, as well as a follow-up workshop addressing the topic of prevention and how it relates to rehabilitation and reintegration. In tandem, these two trainings offered an opportunity for CSOs in N'djamena to enhance their understanding of violent extremism, CVE, and rehabilitation and reintegration, while providing a platform for dialogue, capacity building, and experience sharing among participants. Participants subsequently returned to their home communities to host meetings with local constituents to pass on the lessons of the workshop, training over 400 individuals.

EXAMPLE 9: Small Grant to Rumah Katu Community in Indonesia

Based in Sulawesi, Indonesia, Rumah Katu Community has worked with the victims and survivors, IDPs, and former fighters involved in episodes of interreligious violence in Poso in the late 1990s and early 2000s. To address the growing issues relating to rehabilitation and reintegration of VEOs in the region, Rumah Katu Community developed a 45-minute video titled “The Way Home,” which follows the fictitious but highly representative story of a recently released VEO who returns to his hometown. The movie portrays the struggles involved in securing employment, coping with rejection and prejudice, and reengaging with community members, friends, and family. The film thereby emphasizes the message that the success of rehabilitation and reintegration hinges in large part

on how the community responds to former VEOs. By embracing reconciliation, the community can play a role in fostering peace and stability.

Rumah Katu Community screened the film in over 10 different locations across the region with audiences consisting of local government officials, university students, community leaders, and business leaders. Audiences expressed a new appreciation for the difficulties former VEOs face as they struggle to rebuild their lives postrelease and expressed a willingness to help facilitate such efforts where possible. Using film has proven to be a highly effective means to creatively convey messages of rehabilitation and reintegration, while at the same time engaging with large numbers of individuals from diverse backgrounds. The localized nature of the movie, set in Poso, further contributed to the movie’s resonance and ability to effectively engage with target populations.

EXAMPLE 10: Small Grant to West Africa Network for Peacebuilding in Nigeria

The West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP) is a regional organization focused on conflict prevention and peace-building through dialogue and collaboration. WANEP Nigeria’s project, “Enhancing the Nigerian Police and NGOs’ Skills and Capacity to Facilitate the Reintegration and Rehabilitation of ex-Boko Haram Members to Local Communities in Bauchi State, Northeast Nigeria,” addressed the vital yet often underemphasized community-police relationship in rehabilitation and reintegration efforts. Working alongside the Bauchi Human Rights Network, WANEP Nigeria brought together local police, local government, and CSO and community representatives to receive training on human rights and VEO rehabilitation and reintegration.

The community-level dialogues between police and community members were a critical component of the project as they offered a rare opportunity to exchange ideas and concerns. These dialogues uncovered key obstacles to successful rehabilitation and reintegration in Bauchi that stemmed from poor community-police relations. For example, a lack of clear role and responsibility allocation among the police, the security forces, and vigilante groups has resulted in confusion over who is responsible for security matters.

Furthermore, police inability to keep tips and shared information confidential has resulted in revenge attacks and decreased the number of community members who feel comfortable sharing security concerns with local officials.

Though initial views on the application of human rights in security matters were mixed, the sustained dialogues helped raise awareness about how a commitment to human rights can help address the drivers of violent extremism, including injustice, corruption, and socioeconomic deprivation, and can help with rehabilitating and reintegrating former Boko Haram members by ensuring an even-handed and human rights-oriented approach. However, the continued skepticism of participants toward rehabilitation and reintegration investments for VEOs highlighted the need to sensitize recipient communities to the benefits of rehabilitation and reintegration.

As a direct result of the trainings and dialogue, a key outcome of the project was a joint commitment by the police, local government authorities, and community leaders to strengthen transparency and community safety partnerships platforms. Furthermore, the organizations who were trained on the role of human rights in rehabilitation and reintegration will develop trainings for other partner NGOs and service providers.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 5.

Incorporate age and gender sensitivities and perspectives into rehabilitation and reintegration program development.

To be effective while abiding by “do-no-harm” principles, rehabilitation and reintegration programming must account for the gendered and generational dimensions of those associated with and affected by violent extremism, and the special considerations each age and gender group may warrant during rehabilitation and reintegration. Programs must account for the specific needs and rights of children in line with international frameworks that favor the promotion of rehabilitation and reintegration over more punitive approaches.⁶⁴ Moreover, children should be viewed primarily as victims of offenses against international law rather than only perpetrators.

In the context of gender, numerous frameworks have illuminated the considerations that must be incorporated, including the need to acknowledge the gendered motivations for joining a violent extremist organization, address any experiences of sexual violence and stigmatization related to sexual violence, and ensure visibility of and access to rehabilitation and reintegration services.⁶⁵

Though gender considerations apply equally to men, boys, women, and girls, it is important to recognize and highlight the specific barriers and limitations women and girls may face in the context of rehabilitation and reintegration policy and programming as it regards their experiences and needs. For example, women and girls who were part of violent extremist groups, either willingly or by force, may have been elevated in status, privilege, and freedom that they then lose when returning to strictly patriarchal communities.⁶⁶ From the perspective of the community receiving former VEOs, gendered

divisions in caregiving may mean that women shoulder the burden of caring for returning VEOs, particularly in the case of juveniles.⁶⁷ To adequately anticipate and provide for these varying experiences, the development of rehabilitation and reintegration policy and programming must incorporate the diverse perspectives of men, women, boys, and girls.

64 For more information see Global Center on Cooperative Security and International Centre for Counter-Terrorism, “Correcting the Course: Advancing Juvenile Justice Principles for Children Convicted of Violent Extremism Offenses.”

65 See UN Security Council Resolutions (UNSCR) 1325 (2000), 2242 (2015), 2178 (2014), as well as Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF), “Good Practices on Women and Countering Violent Extremism,” <https://www.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/Framework%20Documents/A/GCTF-Good-Practices-on-Women-and-CVE.pdf>.

66 Odharnait Ansbro, “‘He Was the Love of My Life’: Why Women Marry Into Boko Haram,” *News Deeply*, 6 March 2017, <https://www.newsdeeply.com/womenandgirls/articles/2017/03/06/love-life-women-marry-boko-haram>.

67 Vanessa A. Farr, “Gender-Aware Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR): A Checklist,” *PeaceWomen*, p. 6, <http://www.peacewomen.org/assets/file/Themes/unifem-ddrgenderchecklist.pdf>.

EXAMPLE 11: Empowering Rape Victims and Widows in Northeastern Nigeria

The Centre for Sustainable Development and Education in Africa (CSDEA) launched an initiative to empower rape victims and widows in northeastern Nigeria in November 2017. The project aims to renovate and equip a skills acquisition center in Jimeta/Yola Adamawa State that will provide psychosocial support, mentoring, and livelihood training to 1,000 rape victims and widows traumatized by the violent actions of Boko Haram and other violent groups.⁶⁸

Of the first batch of 100 project participants, 30 percent were kidnapped and raped by Boko Haram as young girls or housewives. The other 70 percent lost their husbands in violent circumstances to Boko Haram and other violent groups. Almost all the women participating

in the project have lost at least a child or immediate family member to the activities of violent extremist groups in northeastern Nigeria and require intensive psychosocial support, which the CSDEA is delivering through psychologists and trauma specialists.

As part of their training for financial independence, the CSDEA explored industries the participants would be interested in to make a living. Sixty percent of women stated a preference for cattle rearing, 33 percent wanted to engage in tailoring, and the remaining 7 percent wanted to work in the restaurant business or rear chickens. To ensure the delivery of relevant skills, the CSDEA is partnering with private practitioners in the cattle-rearing business who will train at the center as well as at ranches, and will also engage owners of local tailoring businesses who will provide trainings at their shops. The CSDEA is also exploring engagement opportunities with restaurants and poultry farms.

68 Centre for Sustainable Development and Education in Africa, “CSDEA Launches New Initiative to Provide Psycho-Social Support, Mentoring and Livelihoods Skills to 1000 Rape Victims and Widows in North Eastern Nigeria,” 27-28 November 2017, <http://csdea-africa.org/csdea-launches-new-initiative-to-provide-psycho-social-support-mentoring-and-livelihoods-skills-to-1000-rape-victims-and-widows-in-north-eastern-nigeria>.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 6.

Draw on experiences from postconflict rehabilitation and reintegration programming as well as DDR to develop rehabilitation and reintegration programs for those associated with and affected by violent extremism.

Based on the rich experiences from postconflict rehabilitation and reintegration and DDR experiences in the Sahel, East Africa, and Southeast Asia, stakeholders may want to draw on the lessons learned to help strengthen VEO-focused rehabilitation and reintegration programs. Previous engagements that offer useful lessons include DDR programs focused on ex-combatants, child soldiers, and militia members, as well as rehabilitation and reintegration support for IDPs, victims of violence, and street children. Informal community-based justice mechanisms likewise offer lessons on the transformative power of reconciliation for rehabilitation and reintegration. These experiences can provide important

guidance regarding relationship building, delivery structures and partners, and engagement outreach, such as government-CSO engagement, collaboration among CSOs, and engagement with target communities.

However, all lessons learned must be appropriately tailored to the context of violent extremism, taking into account the varying motivations and experiences of the individuals involved, as well as the legal, strategic, and functional implications of applying traditional DDR practices to the context of (ongoing) counterterrorism operations. For example, programming needs to consider if the same type of assistance can be provided to all participants or if individually tailored interventions are needed for those implicated in violent extremism. While the latter is likely to increase effectiveness, it is also more resource, time, and personnel intensive. Additionally, the interventions may have unintended consequences, for instance, changing the conflict dynamics and politicization, as well as stoking perceptions of injustice.⁶⁹

69 For more, see Vanda Felbab-Brown, “DDR in the Context of Offensive Military Operations, Counterterrorism, CVE and Non-Permissive Environments: Key Questions, Challenges, and Considerations,” Brookings Institution, 4 June 2015, <https://www.brookings.edu/research/ddr-in-the-context-of-offensive-military-operations-counterterrorism-cve-and-non-permissive-environments-key-questions-challenges-and-considerations>.

EXAMPLE 12: Small Grant to Coalition Communautaire pour la Paix et la Promotion du Vivre Ensemble in Niger

Niger-based CSO Coalition Communautaire pour la Paix et la Promotion du Vivre Ensemble (COPAVE, or Community Coalition for Peace and the Promotion of Living Together) undertook a research study in Cote d'Ivoire to assess the successes and challenges of the Ivorian amnesty and DDR program, and the reconciliation program, implemented following the country's civil war in 2007 and postelectoral crisis in 2011. This research study served the purpose of learning from and adapting best practices and challenges experienced as part of Cote d'Ivoire's DDR program for application in Niger's Diffa region, the heart of the Boko Haram insurgency in Niger. After consulting with traditional leaders, politicians, civil society leaders, youth, Economic Community of West African States representatives, and victims of violence in Cote d'Ivoire, COPAVE developed a catalog of lessons learned and recommendations. Key good practices included the following:

- Due regard for the rule of law and a judicial response to terrorism offenses;
- A focus on local communities and victims to assess local needs, grievances, and hopes for the future; this

includes a focus on youth not affiliated with VEOs to ensure they are not disadvantaged in rehabilitation and reintegration efforts;

- Finding a viable consensus among all stakeholders to avoid false promises and to ensure accountability;
- A focus on listening exercises to extract the underlying motivations of former combatants to tackle the problem in the long run;
- Soliciting support from international organizations and the international civil society community.

The study was subsequently shared with Nigerien CSO actors and government representatives to assess how best to apply the lessons learned in the Nigerien context. Based on CSO and government feedback, COPAVE implemented capacity-building training for CSOs and government representatives focused on further developing the topic of rehabilitation and reintegration in Diffa. To sustain the impact of the program, COPAVE has planned a community mobilization workshop to enhance community participation in rehabilitation and reintegration with the help of traditional and religious leaders and is working with the National Human Rights Commission of Niger and the Ministry of the Interior to develop a rehabilitation and reintegration action plan.

EXAMPLE 13: Niger Delta Amnesty and DDR Experience in Nigeria

Nigeria developed an amnesty and DDR program in 2009 to address the over decade-long Niger Delta insurgency, which resulted in particularly high levels of violence in 2008, killing over 1,000 between January and August 2008. The strategy was poorly executed, however, as resources were primarily focused on militants and not on the communities that bore the brunt of the insurgency. This has led to a resurgence of violence and triggered large-scale antigovernment resentment among communities.

The amnesty program operated on the premise that Niger Delta militants who surrendered their arms would receive an unconditional pardon and immunity from prosecution. Over 26,000 former militants surrendered and signed up for the government's DDR efforts, including rehabilitation and reintegration initiatives.⁷⁰ Two years into the program, violence levels in the Niger Delta have diminished, but have not disappeared completely.⁷¹ In addition to other problems, studies have shown that the focus on militants did not prioritize self-sufficiency and independence. The amnesty program put

a heavy emphasis on stipends and allowances for former militants, which made up over 37 percent of the amnesty program's 2014 budget. This created dependency on the government as it made peace and stability contingent on the government's ability to pay. Furthermore, a study from 2014 found that out of 11,700 individuals who graduated from amnesty-related programs, only 238 found employment.⁷²

Additionally, the provision of resources and education to militants caused grievances among peaceful communities whose residents did not benefit from the DDR program and felt they were at a disadvantage. For example, former militants received monthly stipends of \$400 and job training at a time when Nigeria's minimum monthly wage stood at \$60⁷³ and victims of violent attacks in the region were struggling to find jobs.⁷⁴

The Nigerian government was heavily affected by the global plummet of oil prices in 2015 and consequently struggled to maintain monthly payments to former militants, triggering tensions among former insurgents.⁷⁵ In 2016, the Niger Delta experienced a renewed flare-up of attacks on oil pipelines,⁷⁶ indicating that the underlying dynamics that had initially led to violence had not been successfully addressed through the amnesty program.

70 Angela Ajodo-Adebanjoko, "Towards Ending Conflict and Insecurity in the Niger Delta Region," African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes, 12 September 2017, <http://www.acCORD.org.za/ajcr-issues/towards-ending-conflict-insecurity-niger-delta-region>.

71 IRIN, "Niger Delta Still Unstable Despite Amnesty," 25 November 2011, <http://www.irinnews.org/report/94306/analysis-niger-delta-still-unstable-despite-amnesty>.

72 Margaret Abazie-Humphrey, "Engaging the Nigerian Niger Delta Ex-Agitators: The Impacts of the Presidential Amnesty Program to Economic Development," European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes, 23-26 June 2014, p. 3, https://www.eadi.org/typo3/fileadmin/Documents/Events/General_Conference/2014/gc2014-abazie-humphrey-41.pdf.

73 Tarila Marclint Ebiede and Arnim Langer, "How Amnesty Efforts in the Niger Delta Triggered New Violence," *The Conversation*, 8 March 2017, <http://theconversation.com/how-amnesty-efforts-in-the-niger-delta-triggered-new-violence-74085>; KU Leuven, "Reintegration of Ex-Combatants in the Niger Delta Region," <https://soc.kuleuven.be/crpd/reintegration-of-ex-combatants-in-the-niger-delta-region>.

74 Reuters, "Nigeria's Buhari Sacks Head of Niger Delta Amnesty Programme," 13 March 2018, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-nigeria-delta/nigerias-buhari-sacks-head-of-niger-delta-amnesty-programme-idUSKCN1GP2E0>; Abazie-Humphrey, "Engaging the Nigerian Niger Delta Ex-Agitators."

75 Ebiede and Langer, "How Amnesty Efforts in the Niger Delta Triggered New Violence."

76 Kelvin Ebiri, "Nigeria: Niger Delta and Broken Promises," *The Guardian*, 31 January 2016, <https://guardian.ng/saturday-magazine/cover/niger-delta-and-broken-promises>.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ROLE OF CSOS IN REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION

The involvement of CSOs in rehabilitation and reintegration is an important aspect of an effective multisectoral response to violent extremism that acknowledges the necessity of community engagement and support. The following section offers specific recommendations to support the role of CSOs in rehabilitation and reintegration processes that build on existing guidelines elaborated by international platforms such as the GCTF, as well as the guiding principles previously outlined.⁷⁷ All recommendations are grouped by theme and followed by illustrative examples of positive or negative outcomes as a result of adherence, or lack thereof, to the recommendation. Examples include experiences from both the rehabilitation and reintegration field specifically, and the P/CVE field generally, to showcase a broad array of applications. Examples that stem from activities funded through the project's small grants component are explicitly labeled as such in the title.

DEVELOPING REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORKS

RECOMMENDATION 1.

Formally integrate CSOs in the design and implementation of national rehabilitation and reintegration frameworks, plans, and policies.

Governments are encouraged to devise and implement rehabilitation and reintegration frameworks, plans, and policies in close coordination with CSOs, carving out roles, responsibilities, and protections to allow CSOs the space to operate. The involvement of CSOs helps translate policy to practice, informs the feasibility of programming, establishes accountability, improves outreach to and credibility among traditionally marginalized community groups (such as women and youth), provides important insights and expertise, and safeguards community interests.

Governments are further encouraged to consider the role that informal justice processes can play and how CSOs can lead those processes. Community-based social accountability measures such as traditional justice can support the reconciliation necessary for long-term sustainability of rehabilitation and reintegration. In all cases, stakeholders should take care to consult a broad segment of CSOs representing diverse interests and should be mindful of the CSO's standing and track record in the community when engaging partners.

It is important to note, however, that CSOs should be viewed as autonomous entities operating within government-developed frameworks and coordinating with government and other stakeholders where necessary. Though they have critical roles to play, they should not be viewed as mere implementers of government policy, nor should they be exploited for information-gathering purposes. CSO credibility hinges on trust-based relationships with communities that may be imperiled if any information shared in good faith for the purposes of rehabilitation and reintegration is abused by security and intelligence services to surveil or detain individuals.

To effectively involve CSOs and build mutual trust for engagement in rehabilitation and reintegration, governments could form regular roundtables with CSOs at the local and national levels. Governments may consider developing a memorandum of understanding with individual CSOs or CSO networks to help institutionalize partnerships and formalize ways to entrust CSOs with the delivery of certain programming. To maintain effective oversight and accountability when outsourcing such activities, governments can consider releasing official tender mechanisms or calls for proposals, making sure that these include robust monitoring and evaluation measures (also see recommendation 16).

⁷⁷ See "Additional Guidance on Aftercare and Reintegration Programmes for Violent Extremist Offenders," <https://toolkit.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/En/Additional-Guidance-on-Aftercare-and-Reintegration-Programmes-for-VEO.pdf> and "Building on the GCTF's Rome Memorandum: Additional Guidance on the Role of Religious Scholars and other Ideological Experts in Rehabilitation and Reintegration Programme," https://toolkit.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/En/UNICRI_SPAIN_Religious_Scholars_in_Rehab.pdf.

To formalize and solidify such activities, governments may also consider the establishment of dedicated government departments, offices, or focal points within relevant ministries to further strengthen collaboration with civil society on rehabilitation and reintegration issues. This type of support to CSOs would further contribute to building personal relationships and trust, as well as ensure that CSOs' resources are used most effectively and efficiently and programming is implemented in a coordinated and consistent manner.

Finally, frameworks should allow for the legal protection of CSOs working with VEOs, access to individuals (such as those in detention), and provisions for the physical safety of CSO workers. They should also allot the necessary resources and account for the time needed to develop and implement rehabilitation and reintegration programming and assess results.

EXAMPLE 14: Small Grant to Local Youth Corner Cameroon

Cameroon-based NGO Local Youth Corner Cameroon (LOYOC) focuses on working with young people to promote sustainable peace and development and to prevent and counter violent extremism through advocacy, sociocultural dialogue, capacity building, and empirical research. Through this project, LOYOC developed a program aimed at empowering youth civil society actors as agents of rehabilitation and reintegration of individuals interested or engaged in violent extremism in Cameroon. In implementing this project, the organization carried out rehabilitation and reintegration sensitization activities across Cameroon's 10 regions, identifying the key issues in each region and drawing attention to and discussing these key areas of concern during regional sensitization activities. This strategy ensured a closely tailored approach, accounting for local characteristics and dynamics. For instance, LOYOC's sensitization focused on the role of youth in P/CVE and interreligious collaboration in the Far North Region, whereas its activities in Adamawa focused on violent extremist

radicalization in urban centers and rehabilitation and reintegration strategies for VEOs.

Following its training, advocacy, and sensitization activities, LOYOC developed a youth-focused action agenda on the role of CSOs in rehabilitation and reintegration. The action agenda was shared with numerous local and national government officials, as well as law enforcement, prison officials, and the minister of youth affairs and civic education in Cameroon, who pledged to integrate a role for youth-focused CSOs in ongoing rehabilitation and reintegration efforts.⁷⁸ Additionally, LOYOC developed a National Youth Network on rehabilitation and reintegration to put into practice the recommendations from the action agenda.⁷⁹

To share its work with a broader audience, LOYOC initiated sensitization campaigns through radio to discuss the challenges of rehabilitation and reintegration and what role youth CSOs can play. LOYOC also used radio engagements to encourage other CSOs, local governments, business leaders, and community leaders to make a commitment to engage in rehabilitation and reintegration.

78 Local Youth Corner Cameroon, "Action Agenda on Engaging Youth Civil Society in Reintegration and Rehabilitation of Violent Offenders in Cameroon," 20 Feb 2017, <http://loyoc.blogspot.com/2017/02/last-draft-action-agenda-on-engaging.html>; Local Youth Corner Cameroon, "CYPAN and LOYOC Peace and CVE Advocacy Team Received Audience by the Cameroon Minister of Youth Affairs and Civic Education," 25 Jul 2017, <http://www.loyocameroon.org/cypan-and-loyoc-peace-and-cve-advocacy-team-received-in-audience-by-the-cameroon-minister-of-youth-affairs-and-civic-education>.

79 "National Rehabilitation and Reintegration Network," *Facebook*, <https://www.facebook.com/National-Rehabilitation-And-Reintegration-Network-604317886422329>.

EXAMPLE 15: Small Grant to United Religious Initiative-Great Lakes in Uganda

The United Religious Initiative-Great Lakes (URI-GL), a Ugandan-based NGO, implemented a project titled “Building the Capacity of Religious and Community Actors in the Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Violent Extremist Offenders and Returning Foreign Terrorist Offenders in Uganda.” The project aimed to create a network of religious and community leaders engaged in rehabilitation and reintegration and to improve religious and community leader relationships with security personnel. Project activities included training on violent extremism challenges and rehabilitation and reintegration approaches, and dialogues to facilitate trust and relationship building. Efforts focused on the eastern Busoga subregion, specifically the districts of Bugiri, Mayuge, and Namayingo, which have become known violent extremist hot spots in recent years.

URI-GL’s activities and engagements revealed that participants had scant knowledge of violent extremism and signs of violent extremism but noted the existence of discriminatory arrest patterns vis-à-vis violent extremism suspects. Community dialogues emphasized that rehabilitation and reintegration are not effective when only focused on returnees and that all efforts should holistically focus on their families, the neighborhood, and acquaintances of the VEO. Dialogues also revealed the critical role women play as both recruiters and facilitators, including by playing nursing and caretaker roles, transporting material goods, sharing information from one group to another, and brainwashing children in violent extremist activities. Throughout implementation of the project, participants displayed a gradual shift from feelings of hate and mistrust toward notions of forgiveness, reconciliation, and a willingness to listen to one another.

RECOMMENDATION 2.

Articulate a role for CSOs in cross-border collaboration mechanisms.

The cross-border nature of terrorism necessitates the need for strong cross-border cooperation at the regional and international levels in terms of mutual legal assistance, information and expertise sharing, and implementing common policies. This is especially relevant for governments in the Sahel, East Africa, and Southeast Asia, where terrorist groups make use of undergoverned spaces in border regions and operate across state lines. Authorities are therefore encouraged to collaborate with their counterparts across borders to pave the way for sharing intelligence, exchanging good practices, and coordinating responses to the management of individuals associated with and affected by terrorism. Such collaboration is particularly important in cases where a VEO originating from one country is apprehended in a neighboring country or where those associated with and affected by violent extremism are transferred across national borders at other stages of the rehabilitation and reintegration

process or upon release. Due to CSOs’ understanding of local and regional dynamics, as well as language skills, they may be well positioned to support governments in engaging with individuals associated with and affected by terrorism who originate from neighboring countries. This may be further supported by harnessing cross-country CSO networks, which can facilitate contacts and communications to an apprehended individual’s home country and community.

Cross-border collaboration is further relevant because of the artificiality of borders in some contexts. For example, between Kenya and Somalia, families can be spread across borders and travel back and forth constantly. Cross-border collaboration can help clarify questions of which government will be responsible for prosecution, imprisonment, rehabilitation, and reintegration and what role CSOs can play in the latter process in terms of providing guidance, access, and continuity of service. This may also hold true in instances where individuals are moved within one country but across administrative (state) lines, for example, to different prisons or upon release.

EXAMPLE 16: Counterterrorism and P/CVE Cooperation in Southeast Asia

Counterterrorism and P/CVE cooperation is increasingly evident in Southeast Asia, particularly among Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines. In June 2017, the three countries struck a trilateral agreement (“Trilateral Maritime Patrol Indomalphi”) to jointly carry out naval patrols in an effort to apprehend ISIL-affiliated organizations from operating in the region’s maritime

and coastal areas. Furthermore, the three countries have shared intelligence and expertise on terrorism and counterterrorism, including collaboration on countering terrorism financing and tackling cyberspace-based terrorist activity.⁸⁰ This collaboration was further strengthened in November 2017 when the three countries pledged to continue their joint efforts toward deradicalization, rehabilitation, and reintegration vis-à-vis violent extremism, though a potential role for civil society has yet to be articulated.⁸¹

80 Prashanth Parameswaran, “What Did the ASEAN Trilateral Terror Meeting Achieve?” *The Diplomat*, 28 Jun 2017, <https://thediplomat.com/2017/06/what-did-the-asean-trilateral-terror-meeting-achieve>.

81 Straits Times, “Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines to Discuss Cooperation in Counter-Terrorism,” 10 November 2017, <https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/se-asia/indonesia-malaysia-philippines-to-discuss-cooperation-in-counter-terrorism>.

EXAMPLE 17: Multinational Joint Task Force in the Lake Chad Region

In the Lake Chad region, Cameroon, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria are collaborating to defeat Boko Haram through the Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF). The MNJTF has taken a predominantly military approach that achieved relative success containing Boko Haram in 2015 and 2016. However, following containment and

in the lead-up to disengagement programs for Boko Haram fighters, the four countries have failed to agree on a synchronized legal framework for demobilization and rehabilitation and reintegration as recommended in UN Security Council Resolution 2349.⁸² This has resulted in situations where former Boko Haram members enjoy complete impunity in one country, while other former Boko Haram members face detention under harsh circumstances and extrajudicial killings in the neighboring country.

82 UN Security Council, S/RES/2349, 31 March 2017, paras 29-32.

IMPROVING TRAINING, SAFETY, AND SECURITY

RECOMMENDATION 3.

Elaborate safety protocols and measures for local actors involved in rehabilitation and reintegration, with particular emphasis on intervention providers and clients.

Rehabilitation and reintegration work is often carried out in volatile postconflict settings or settings that still involve active conflict or violence, with potentially dangerous VEOs or with individuals with connections to dangerous groups both inside and outside a custodial setting. Due to these sensitivities and potential risks to life and limb, CSOs operating in this field should be aware of possible security risks

and how to mitigate them. Risk mitigation strategies should also be applied to beneficiaries of CSO work, such as victims, IDPs, VEOs, and returnees, as well as other stakeholders, including information sources, interviewees, and consultants.

In volatile settings where governments have not outlined specific security protocols, CSOs should maintain open avenues of communication and coordinate with local authorities, where possible, to ensure safety and security. Security measures could include confirming curfew timings or arranging protection by police or the military. Any CSOs working directly with (released) VEOs or returnees should take precautions to screen the individuals to the extent possible to both ensure dedication to the programming and minimize any risk of violence.

Additionally, staff in close contact with VEOs are more likely than the average stakeholder to deal with intimidation, threats, and persuasion; so training should also incorporate elements of protection, response, and resilience techniques.

There may be instances where CSOs may not have positive relationships with local authorities, for example, in high-risk areas where military-led responses to violent extremism are dominant and CSO work is viewed less favorably. To maintain safety and security in such contexts, CSOs should consider developing and implementing security and safety standard operating procedures, to include regular

check-in protocols, emergency plans, and first aid training and kits.

To mitigate against potential data security threats, CSOs should have procedures in place that protect their staff's personal information and privacy. Client file management systems should also be protected to avoid information being accessed by unauthorized persons. The ability of CSOs to safeguard the privacy and confidentiality of information can be crucial to the success of programming because their legitimacy, access, and credibility for carrying out rehabilitation and reintegration activities may be compromised if these principles are violated.

EXAMPLE 18: CSO Safety and Security Protocols in Indonesia

Civil Society Against Violent Extremism (C-SAVE), an umbrella organization of CSOs that partners with Indonesia's National Agency for Countering Terrorism to address violent extremism in Indonesia, has developed a safety and security protocol as part of multi-stakeholder rehabilitation and reintegration operating procedures for working with violent extremists. The Rehabilitation and Reintegration Safety and Security Protocol was developed in collaboration with the Indonesian Ministry of Welfare to help social workers understand the potential risks of working with violent extremists, the precautions to be taken, and the contingency and response actions in unexpected situations.

C-SAVE developed the security protocol after realizing that civil society actors and government social workers working in P/CVE are exposed to different risks of which they are often unaware. For example, there have been cases where prison officials and police officers have been recruited by VEOs. There have also been reported incidents of attacks and sexual abuse against social workers.

The Safety and Security Protocol covers 16 activities in different phases of the rehabilitation and reintegration process, ranging from arrival in custodial settings and assessments to health checks, coordination with various stakeholders, implementation of rehabilitation and reintegration activities, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities.

RECOMMENDATION 4.

Facilitate training for frontline staff on rehabilitation and reintegration, including on how to best involve CSOs.

Governments should ensure that all frontline staff in law enforcement, prisons, probation, and local government are equipped to manage the rehabilitation and reintegration of VEOs and returning foreign fighters. The ability to effectively and humanely handle this population is instrumental to the success of their eventual rehabilitation and reintegration, as well as preserving their own safety. Training programs should therefore prioritize upholding human rights standards and emphasize the importance of impartiality and withholding judgement when dealing with VEOs

and foreign fighters who are often stigmatized and exceptionalized.

Trainings can also benefit from the support of CSOs who can serve as training and intervention providers, given their specialized knowledge and insights. They often have insight on local drivers leading to grievances and how recruitment and radicalization take place and may offer ways to facilitate pathways to disengagement and rehabilitation and reintegration. Relatedly, incorporating CSO involvement will help frontline staff understand the important role CSOs can play in rehabilitation and reintegration and illuminate ways that staff can work with them to facilitate the process, in line with operational and legal rehabilitation and reintegration frameworks.

EXAMPLE 19: Training for Religious Leaders Working With Inmates

As part of a multiannual program conducted by the International Centre on Counter-Terrorism and the UN Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute in Mali, several trainings were conducted for religious leaders working with prisoners. In April 2017, 23 Malian religious leaders (mainly imams) from different parts of the country, including Gao, Kidal, Mopti, Sikasso, and

Tessalit, were brought together for a training on violent extremism from a psychological perspective. The second part of the training focused on what roles religious leaders can or should play within the prison environment, either through delivering religious services (e.g., Friday sermons) to the prison population or through direct counseling of individual inmates. As an outcome of the training, the prison authorities institutionalized a monthly meeting with the Haut Conseil Islamique to discuss vetting procedures for imams who can perform religious services in prison.

EXAMPLE 20: Small Grant to Civil Society Against Violent Extremism in Indonesia

Civil Society Against Violent Extremism (C-SAVE), an umbrella network of CSOs in Indonesia, implemented a pilot project titled “Ex-Terrorist Inmates Social Reintegration Program,” which aimed to increase the capacity of parole officers to facilitate the social reintegration of VEOs. Through the project, and in collaboration with the Directorate General for Corrections (DGC), C-SAVE developed a social reintegration training curriculum for parole officers and CSO members in Bogor and Depok districts to enhance

rehabilitation and reintegration processes during and after incarceration.

By focusing on parole officers, C-SAVE’s work bridged an important gap to ensure that those in direct contact with VEOs after release are familiar with their needs and struggles. Furthermore, it sought to enhance parole officers’ awareness of partners outside of prison, including Indonesia’s vibrant CSO scene and other relevant community members. Working in close partnership with the DGC, the prison administration has recommended that the program be delivered to more parole officers across the country.

EXAMPLE 21: Training for Prison Authorities on Improving Management of VEOs in Indonesia

In cooperation with the DGC in Indonesia, the Global Center works with Indonesian CSOs to provide trainings, technical assistance, and support to prison authorities to improve the management of VEOs and address

radicalization and recruitment in Indonesian prisons. The program incorporates knowledge and expertise from correctional services around the world and focuses on building the capacity of frontline prison staff to manage terrorism-related offenders, understand the effect of prison on these offenders, and contribute to their rehabilitation.

CSO NETWORKS AND PARTNERSHIPS

RECOMMENDATION 5.

Create and further develop national and, where appropriate, cross-border civil society networks for organizations working in the rehabilitation and reintegration space.

The Sahel, East Africa, and Southeast Asia have vibrant civil societies working on a range of CVE-specific and related topics, including rehabilitation

and reintegration. National, regional, and cross-border CSO networks can therefore provide opportunities for collaboration that strengthen rehabilitation and reintegration efforts. By forming networks, CSOs can avoid duplication (an aspect frequently observed in the rehabilitation and reintegration space), complement and learn from each other’s work, pool their resources and expertise for more effective programming, and attract more funding. This coordination helps reduce friction between CSOs working in similar areas that may be competing for limited resources.

Possible avenues to precipitate cooperation could include joint actor mapping exercises, exchange of research and databases, sharing of expertise and skills, policy advocacy, and partnerships to apply for funding in common areas of interest. To achieve this, umbrella structures could be created or deepened to ensure that all actors involved are able to develop a common agenda in a way that is not counterproductive or competitive, but respects the different strengths, expertise, and working areas of individual CSOs. Such networks need not focus on rehabilitation and reintegration in particular, but may choose to incorporate rehabilitation and reintegration in their agendas or working groups as part of existing initiatives. Individual or group representatives of networks may also be appointed or elected to represent the CSO network with other stakeholders, such as governments or international organizations.

Cross-country networks may be especially useful in contexts where violent extremist activity is not a

national phenomenon per se, but instead exists in particular areas within a country or across several neighboring countries. The Lake Chad region presents an illustrative example of this: while Cameroon, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria are all affected by the Boko Haram insurgency, it is largely concentrated within the countries' border regions with diminished potency in other parts of these states.

When developing and deepening networks, it is critical to account for the diversity in rehabilitation and reintegration approaches, which are strongly dependent on local dynamics and realities. These differ not only among countries and regions, but are also nuanced within countries, for example depending on local characteristics such as existing traditional justice mechanisms, level of ongoing conflict, or terrorist activity. It is important to ensure that rehabilitation and reintegration approaches remain locally resonant and are woven into the social fabric of distinct locations.

EXAMPLE 22: CSO Networks in Nigeria

The Network of Civil Society Organizations in Borno (NECSOB) and the Partnership Against Violent Extremism (PAVE) are examples of two P/CVE CSO networks in Nigeria. NECSOB is a network of CSOs operating in Nigeria's northeast, the area of the country most heavily affected by Boko Haram violence. The network seeks to pool resources, provide mutual support, and ensure collaboration in activities and focuses predominantly on addressing the needs of victims of Boko Haram violence, vulnerable children, and women. It has recently been recognized by the state government of Borno and has subsequently been integrated into state-level processes.

PAVE started in 2014 as a multi-stakeholder network of CSOs and government representatives working toward peace and security in areas afflicted by violent extremist violence in Nigeria. In 2016, PAVE turned into a purely civil society network that collaborates closely with the Nigerian government at federal and state levels.

In a recent conference in Abuja hosted by the Club de Madrid, PAVE published "Civil Society Declaration on Processes Towards Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism in Nigeria,"⁸³ drafted by over 30 civil society representatives, aimed at preventing violence and recruitment into violent groups, producing and amplifying alternative narratives, and fostering effective and meaningful partnerships.

83 Club de Madrid, "Nigeria: Civil Society Declaration on Processes Towards Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism," 25 May 2017, http://www.clubmadrid.org/img/noticias/2017/07/04/CIVIL_SOCIETY_PCVE_WORKING_GROUP_DECLARATION-MAY_2017-FINAL-signed.pdf.

EXAMPLE 23: Sahel Network on Preventing Violent Extremism

Nigeria-based Centre for Sustainable Development and Education in Africa has set up the Sahel Network on Preventing Violent Extremism (SNPVE), uniting over 20 civil society organizations across the Sahel in their commitment to PVE and to promoting peace-building and development in the Sahel region. The SNPVE's focus areas include the reintegration and rehabilitation of offenders and victims, providing services such

as psychosocial support, prison deradicalization, vocational and skills training, education, and legal aid. The network also works toward justice sector reform through collaborating with law enforcement and security officers to develop and implement prison reforms and to promote the rule of law and human rights. In pursuing a holistic approach toward PVE, the group of CSOs also engages with affected communities, primarily through early-warning and response mechanisms, mentoring, dialogue, and civic education on counter and alternative narratives.⁸⁴

84 Sahel Network on Preventing Violent Extremism, "Abuja Civil Society Declaration on Preventing Violent Extremism," 28 November 2017, <http://snpve.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Abuja-Civil-Society-Declaration-on-Preventing-Violent-Extremism.pdf>.

RECOMMENDATION 6.

Collaborate with actors within and beyond civil society and government, including academia, international and regional organizations, and the private sector to exchange information, coordinate activities, and cooperate on implementation.

CSOs and governments should consider collaborating with other actors that may provide valuable input, resources, and guidance for rehabilitation and reintegration programming. Potential actors include regional and international universities, think tanks, international and regional NGOs, and the private sector. Partnerships should articulate distinct roles for and expected contributions from each entity, while also clarifying who will take the lead on each task.

Universities and educational institutions may support CSOs in developing and implementing programs based on empirical research and data. Such research could subsequently be disseminated through launch events, training workshops, and the publication of recommendations. Universities can themselves further enhance their engagement in rehabilitation and reintegration, for example through the inclusion of aspects of rehabilitation and reintegration, peace studies, conflict resolution, and peace-building into existing teaching curricula. Universities could also assist with components of reintegration by exploring the possibility of offering scholarship opportunities to individuals associated with or affected by terrorism.

Think tanks further have the convening power to bring together different stakeholders—from government to CSO representatives—to hold candid and critical discussions, often in depoliticized settings behind closed doors. Distinct from academia, think tanks can also generate policy-focused research and analyses for the consideration and action of governments.

Collaborating with the private sector can help identify market opportunities to guide skills training and may also yield employment opportunities to enable reintegration. Stakeholders should consider involving business leaders in their discussions on rehabilitation and reintegration early on to raise the sector's awareness of how it can contribute to efforts. In other cases, employers may benefit from sensitization training relating to employing those associated with and affected by violent extremism.

Developing relationships with journalists and other media actors can also help raise awareness about and build support for rehabilitation and reintegration programs. Effective use of the media can help prevent further recruitment of fighters as well as encourage desertion of violent extremist groups, particularly when former violent extremists have an opportunity to share their stories to a broad audience. However, partnerships with media should prioritize safety and security to safeguard sensitive information and protect CSOs as they undertake potentially controversial work with violent extremist offenders.

EXAMPLE 24: Small Grant to University of Diffa in Niger

The University of Diffa (UoD) implemented a project to raise awareness and provide training for regional authorities and CSOs on receiving and reintegrating former Boko Haram members.

In collaboration with the governor of Diffa and the president of the regional committee responsible for managing former Boko Haram members, UoD first engaged in grassroots dialogue in Bosso, Diffa, Maine Soroa, and N'guigmi, meeting with Boko Haram victims, religious leaders, women, youth organizations, and family members of Boko Haram supporters. Dialogue focused on themes of forgiveness and the role of the central government in rehabilitation and reintegration.

In May 2017, the UoD then hosted an international symposium on the deradicalization and reintegration of Boko Haram deserters. The symposium was held to support government efforts on deradicalization and reintegration, which formally launched in Niger's Diffa region in December 2016. It brought together approximately 200 representatives from international and local NGOs, universities in the Lake Chad region, traditional chiefs and military leaders of the Multinational Joint Task Force, government and embassy representatives, and religious authorities. Key

outcomes of the symposium included acknowledgment of the need to sensitize local populations in the Diffa region to the virtues of forgiveness and tolerance to lay the groundwork for effective reintegration into recipient communities and the need to strengthen and consolidate community capacities in peace-building and peace consolidation. Participants particularly emphasized that international and local priorities should focus on methods of conflict resolution, deradicalization and reintegration, transitional justice, and sustainable development approaches.

The information and experiences gathered from the grassroots engagement and the symposium were then used to design a three-day workshop for 60 participants from the Diffa region. The key focus areas of the workshop included familiarizing participants with international best practice documents on rehabilitation and reintegration, including the GCTF's Rome, Hague-Marrakech, and Neuchatel memoranda, thereby spreading awareness of rehabilitation and reintegration in these communities. A central lesson that emerged from the workshop was the need to translate such international documents and good practices into the local languages, primarily Kanuri and Peulh, to ensure that communities at the forefront of rehabilitation and reintegration have the right frameworks and competencies to successfully tailor rehabilitation and reintegration to former Boko Haram members.

EXAMPLE 25: Addressing the Psychological and Social Needs of Victims and Perpetrators of Boko Haram

The NEEM Foundation is a nonprofit NGO founded in response to the problem of insecurity in Nigeria. The NEEM Foundation is most active in the northeast, addressing the psychological, social, and rehabilitation and reintegration needs of victims of Boko Haram, as well as former Boko Haram militants and those associated with them and other armed groups. These services are desperately needed in Borno, the state most affected by Boko Haram's violence and destruction. Resources are extremely limited, however. NEEM Foundation staff estimate that a workable ratio for addressing the needs of those traumatized by conflict would be one psychologist for every 4,000 residents,

but Maiduguri, the capital of Borno State, currently has one psychologist for about every 375,000 residents. The figures are much worse in other local government areas of Borno and other states in the northeast.⁸⁵

The NEEM Foundation is working to address this gap by training lay counselors (including gender-based violence and expressive therapy specialists), peace coaches, protection officers, and religious leaders who can assist in rehabilitation, reintegration, and general psychosocial support in the northeast. The foundation also offers a nine-month course in counseling and is advocating for an increase in universities offering psychology degrees and encouraging students to enter the public health field. Encouragingly, the University of Maiduguri has recently opened 600 positions for psychology students, but further academic and training programs are needed to address the scale of the challenge.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Aryn Baker, "Boko Haram's Other Victims," *Time Magazine*, 27 June 2017, <http://time.com/boko-harams-other-victims>.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

ENHANCING CSO CAPACITY

RECOMMENDATION 7.

Develop and invest in rehabilitation and reintegration expertise and capacity building among CSOs to increase effectiveness and ensure sustainability.

Recognizing that rehabilitation and reintegration are a central elements in the lifecycle of P/CVE interventions, international organizations and donors should support governments and CSOs in enhancing their capacity to design and implement rehabilitation and reintegration activities. CSOs remain involved in their communities long after the completion of individual grants and projects; focusing on building their organizational and staff capacity greatly improves the potential of sustaining and expanding those efforts. Examples of investment include building organizational capacity in relation to project management, financial administration, and M&E techniques; knowledge sharing on (preventing and countering) violent extremism; training on

communication and outreach strategies; and supporting efforts to apply existing expertise from related fields to rehabilitation and reintegration work.

To further sustain CSO work on rehabilitation and reintegration, it is also helpful for international organizations and donors to engage respective governments to advocate for constructive engagement with CSOs and communities. This can include providing support to a civil society–government engagement process, particularly in regions with low levels of collaboration. International organizations and donors can also play a mediating or facilitating role to encourage dialogue between all stakeholders. Positive engagements with host governments can help ensure a safe working environment for civil society members and build stronger links between governments and local communities, CSOs, and international actors. These engagements, in turn, can strengthen the exchange of information and experiences between the various stakeholders, contributing to more effective and targeted interventions.

EXAMPLE 26: Small Grant to Lembaga Penguatan Masyarakat Sipil in Indonesia

Lembaga Penguatan Masyarakat Sipil (LPMS, or Institute for Strengthening Civil Society), an Indonesia-based CSO, implemented a project titled “Strengthening Civil Society Groups to Support the Rehabilitation and Reintegration of VEOs in the Post-Conflict Area of Poso.” Focusing on the Central Sulawesi area of Poso, which experienced high levels of interreligious violence in the late 1990s and early 2000s, the LPMS’s central areas of work include promoting peace and tolerance by strengthening grassroots communities.

Through the project, the LPMS delivered two workshops on rehabilitation and reintegration capacity building for local CSOs, organized network-building activities for rehabilitation and reintegration stakeholders, and held focus group discussions in five different communities on the importance of local support for rehabilitation

and reintegration efforts. In total, the project engaged a diverse group of 152 individuals. Though many participants initially exhibited negative attitudes about rehabilitation and reintegration for former violent extremist combatants, assessments following the workshops and focus group discussions demonstrated a willingness to be involved in rehabilitation and reintegration. These results suggest that CSOs can act as important interlocutors in helping change perceptions on rehabilitation and reintegration.

The project also found that existing rehabilitation and reintegration approaches implemented by local government and the security services have disproportionately focused on economic rehabilitation and reintegration. While undeniably important, a more diversified rehabilitation and reintegration approach incorporating other components, such as psychosocial counseling, is required to ensure sustainable rehabilitation and reintegration.

EXAMPLE 27: Small Grant to New Era Educational Charitable Support Foundation in Nigeria

The New Era Educational Charitable Support Foundation (NEEDCSI) is a Nigeria-based not-for-profit organization focused on working with disadvantaged youth to provide them with the necessary skills to become advocates of peace and positive change. As part of this project, NEEDCSI implemented a project titled “Strengthening Citizens Against Radicalization Through Leadership and Reintegration Training in Northern Nigeria,” focused on preventing youth radicalization and supporting effective rehabilitation and reintegration by providing base-level psychosocial training and tools to strengthen the capacity of local communities to address grievances that lead to support for violent extremism. As part of their efforts, NEEDCSI organized specialized trainings for 25 community and faith-based organizations, focused on international best practices on prevention, disengagement, and rehabilitation and reintegration. Using training of trainers and advocacy and stakeholder mobilization practices, the project directly reached over

500 stakeholders, including traditional, community, and religious leaders.

Furthermore, the organization spearheaded the creation of weekly Peace Education Clubs in four schools, reaching over 1,000 students in Jos. The Peace Education Clubs provided safe spaces for students to learn traits and skills including confidence, peace-building, negotiation, and communication, which built student capacity to address concerns relating to violent extremism. To expand the key messages of the Peace Education Clubs to a broader audience, NEEDCSI ran a radio program called “Dialogue in Nigeria” that reached eight states and over 10 million listeners. The radio program helped spread messages of care and compassion for marginalized communities while also raising awareness of security issues. Evaluation of the project showed an increased awareness of local communities and youth as to their role in addressing grievances as well as their role in facilitating rehabilitation and reintegration for marginalized individuals. The project also demonstrated the impact of community and stakeholder ownership in developing responses to recruitment and radicalization to violence.

EXAMPLE 28: UN Support to NGOs and CSOs Working on Deradicalization

The UNFPA’s and UN Development Programme’s preventing radicalization program in Cameroon’s Far North Region is working in close collaboration with local NGOs and CSOs to implement its program and deliver rehabilitation and reintegration services to Cameroonian youth. Radicalized youth are identified through a structured process and subsequently referred

to specialized deradicalization centers supported by the UNFPA, the Saare Tabitha center for girls, and the Institut Camerounais pour l’Enfance for boys. In these centers, youth receive psychological rehabilitation support, provided by local NGOs, Jeunesse Active pour la Lutte Contre la Pauvreté, le VIH/SIDA et ses Souffrances, and Association pour la Protection des Enfants Eloignes de leur Famille au Cameroun. Youth also receive professional and vocational skills training in areas such as sewing.⁸⁷

⁸⁷ UNFPA, “Cameroon: Empowering Youth to Achieve Social Cohesion.”

RECOMMENDATION 8.

Provide sustained long-term funding on faster timelines.

CSOs working on rehabilitation and reintegration efforts require sufficient and sustained resources to respond to emergent threats and fast-changing developments in dynamic environments. To this end and where possible, funding should be longer term and dispensed in quicker and at more regular intervals, supported by shorter application review timelines.

In addition to project-based funding, donors may also consider providing trusted CSO partners with core organizational funding. This funding would enable CSOs to react to changing circumstances and developments promptly, without having to go through renewed proposal submission and application processes, which could render their planned interventions useless by the time funding has been approved and dispensed. Such organizational funding could be especially relevant where there are frequent changes in government due to conflict and political instability or where there is a prevalence of undergoverned spaces.

Given the sensitive nature of rehabilitation and reintegration programming, which often requires direct engagement with current and former members of violent extremist groups, donors should also consider flexibility in project recipients as much as possible, within legal parameters. For example, trusted CSOs could be afforded the opportunity to engage in soft loan and microcredit endeavors to further promote and enhance the socioeconomic elements of the reintegration of former militants. This would allow for the restoration of trust between former VEOs and the community by allowing VEOs to meaningfully contribute to economic transformation of their communities, while also aiding in their long-term reintegration.

Likewise, to ensure that new programs and projects meet the needs of recipient communities on the ground, CSO partners should be encouraged to undertake and share needs assessments prior to program design. In addition to ensuring that programs respond to local needs, such assessments would also contribute to the growing research in the rehabilitation and reintegration field.

EXAMPLE 29: Facilitating Sustained Funding

In providing support for CSOs, international donors may want to consider models from local contexts. In Uganda, the Local Government Finance Commission (LGFC) oversees a process that provides cash flow to local district governments based on performance.

Local district governments must first provide a budget detailing their needs for one fiscal year. Based on their handling of provided funds over the course of a year, the LGFC provides a score that determines the level of funding that will be provided and the priority areas for the following fiscal year. The LGFC therefore ensures accountability and transparency in spending and

reporting while also creating a sustained cycle of funds to local districts.

In a similar manner, CSOs who have worked with national or international organizations and have a good track record of implementation could be prequalified for yearly funding from a consolidated fund as a way of ensuring uninterrupted implementation and sustainability of programs. To broaden the pool of CSOs who receive funding, international organizations and donors can consider asking prequalified CSOs to engage their networks in project implementation and perhaps even set up a model of providing small grants to smaller organizations.

RECOMMENDATION 9.

Gather data related to violent extremism and rehabilitation and reintegration through ethical research, and share studies where appropriate.

To facilitate the design of effective programming, stakeholders are encouraged to undertake evidence-based research in compliance with international, regional, and national ethical guidelines relating to human rights and privacy.⁸⁸ Stakeholders should also consider who is best positioned to gather certain data. For example, police, prison, and judicial authorities are well placed to collect information on numbers and profiles of VEOs and foreign fighters. CSOs may be better placed to collect information about local grievances, perceptions of government-led rehabilitation and reintegration programming, and community reconciliation practices. In all cases, however, stakeholders should abide by the strictest standards of ethics and “do no harm” principles in the collection, handling, storage, and dissemination of any data. In certain cases, data sharing may even be counterproductive, especially in cases where CSO credibility hinges on their prioritization of privacy and confidentiality. In such cases, de-identification practices can help anonymize sensitive but important data that would help build a useful evidence base.

Research should also take care to explore the gendered and generational dimensions of radicalization and recruitment and their roles within violent extremist organizations. These studies should also explore the different dynamics at play in the involvement of men versus women, adolescents, and children—recognizing that it can be difficult to delineate victim versus perpetrator in these contexts.

Where in-person data gathering may be a fraught exercise due to security and access concerns, phone or online surveys and questionnaires may be alternative tools to glean information quickly and develop responses that positively affect programming on the ground. Universities and think tanks may also be

useful partners in research initiatives, with an ability to contribute to research designs and methodology to ensure the validity of hypotheses and the robustness of data analysis.

Where appropriate, all stakeholders should ensure that their research findings are disseminated widely, including to audiences who can utilize the research to incorporate them into programming and act on findings. Such audiences include CSOs, which may be prevented from accessing or viewing research due to exclusive distribution or language limitations.

To ensure wider distribution to relevant audiences, international actors should consider partnering with local CSOs to produce resonant and actionable research or, similarly, to help form networks of local CSOs who can contribute to research that helps inform programming. Such partnerships should not limit research to country-specific outputs but should also allow for regional comparative studies. Furthermore, funding for research must take into account that violent extremism is a dynamic and fluid phenomenon, which means that any reports produced will need to be updated to stay relevant. One way to produce collaborative, dynamic, and regional research is to develop agreements between national or international universities and select CSOs wherein the CSO has local ownership of the research questions developed and analyzed.

⁸⁸ For an overview of the privacy and human rights considerations for data collection, see United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, “A Human Rights-Based Approach to Data,” 2018, <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/GuidanceNoteonApproachtoData.pdf>.

EXAMPLE 30: Small Grant to Muslim Centre for Justice and Law in Uganda

The Muslim Centre for Justice and Law (MCJL), a Uganda-based NGO with a focus on access to justice, human rights education, and P/CVE, conducted an analytical study into the effectiveness of the Ugandan Amnesty Commission's efforts with respect to rehabilitating and reintegrating former VEOs and the extent to which Muslim civil society played a role in these efforts. The findings of this study then served as a baseline from which to raise awareness and build capacity among Muslim CSOs, clerics, and lay leaders to effectively engage in rehabilitation and reintegration activity in Uganda.

By supplementing the research study with dialogue, workshops, and trainings, the MCJL engaged with a diverse group of individuals who are part of Muslim civil society in Uganda. The workshops addressed

issues such as capacity building among former VEOs, religious counseling, obstacles to reintegration in communities, the role of victims, and the prospect of a national rehabilitation and reintegration program. Furthermore, the MCJL worked to enhance participants' familiarity with international P/CVE documents such as the GCTF Rome Memorandum. These efforts served to translate international good practices to the Ugandan context and provided participants with the requisite rehabilitation and reintegration skills to translate the recommendations into action within their local communities. Engagement with police, prison wardens, and local council leaders on the Rome Memorandum further enhanced institutional understanding of international best practices and their applicability within the Ugandan context. The project's overall findings underscored the need for holistic approaches toward rehabilitation and reintegration, with particular focus on reformed justice systems and ensuring adherence to universal human rights standards.

EXAMPLE 31: Small Grant to IMAN Research in Malaysia

Malaysian CSO IMAN Research built an electronic resource center for stakeholders working on CVE, including in the field of rehabilitation and reintegration. The online hub, named Pusat Rujukan CVE (pusatrujukancve.com), is the first of its kind in Malaysia and provides a central repository of information for practitioners, researchers, and the public in the interest

of education and exchange. The resource center collects relevant reports, articles, videos, guides, and resources from the CSO network and provides other publicly available materials relevant to CVE and rehabilitation and reintegration. The resource center is available to the public for free; interested organizations who wish to share their material can contact the website's administrator. As the focus of the resource hub is to aid CVE practitioners in Malaysia, the resource hub is collecting materials in English, Bahasa Malaysia (Malay), and Arabic.

EXAMPLE 32: Study on the Role of Youth in P/CVE in the Lake Chad Region

The Progress Study on Youth, Peace, and Security was mandated by UN Security Council Resolution 2250 to develop the UN Secretary General's Global Report on Youth, Peace, and Security to be presented to the General Assembly.⁸⁹ The Secretary-General's report aims to carry out a progress study on the positive contribution of youth to peace processes and conflict resolution to recommend effective responses at the local, national, regional, and international levels.

As a contribution to the global study, the Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and State Building (CSPPS)

commissioned a report in collaboration with the CSDEA on the role that youth have played in preventing violent extremism in the Lake Chad region. The CSPPS, as well as the CSDEA, are members of the UN Interagency Working Group on Youth and Peacebuilding.

The working group is presently responsible for coordinating the development and dissemination of the UN Secretary-General's report. To develop the report, the CSPPS and CSDEA worked with their networks of local CSOs in Chad, Cameroon, Niger, and Nigeria to identify resources, collect data, and offer policy and programming recommendations.

⁸⁹ United Nations General Assembly, "Identical Letters Dated 2 March 2018 From the Secretary-General Addressed to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council," A/72/761, 2 March 2018.

EXAMPLE 33: Review of Deradicalization Program in Indonesia

Daya Makara University of Indonesia, in partnership with the DGC, conducted a review of a deradicalization program for terrorist inmates and concluded that the program requires a thorough reevaluation and reorientation.⁹⁰ The review found that the reeducation

program on state ideology and national insights had no significant impact on terrorists' mindset on terrorist acts. Furthermore, the provision of entrepreneurship training without sufficient preparation and a subsequent plan for sustainability was also considered unsuccessful in terms of positive economic impact and behavioral change. Research results will be used for policy advocacy and will also be shared with other CSOs working on rehabilitation programming.

⁹⁰ Daya Makara University of Indonesia, "Video on the Dissemination Seminar of Daya Makara University Research Results," 8 February 2018, <http://dasprui.com/en/index.html>.

RECOMMENDATION 10.

Incorporate M&E into all programming to ensure learning and increase long-term effectiveness.

M&E are crucial elements in any programming but are still underdeveloped in the P/CVE context and in rehabilitation and reintegration, in particular. Robust M&E mechanisms will help not only to measure the effectiveness, impact, and change (both negative and positive) achieved by programming, but may also assist in understanding why a certain change occurred. If applied correctly, M&E can foster learning and contribute to a better understanding of radicalization, deradicalization, disengagement, and desistance processes. While all stakeholders, including CSOs, are encouraged to incorporate M&E processes in their programming, donors can play a key role in driving this activity.

Donors are encouraged to require detailed M&E plans in tenders and to provide illustrative M&E guidelines and modules or training opportunities for

grant recipients and local CSOs. Furthermore, donors should help grant recipients develop theories of change and should maintain flexibility in adjusting them as appropriate. Where feasible, stakeholders should form partnerships with universities and think tanks to help develop robust M&E frameworks.

International organizations and other donors should also encourage funding recipients to be frank in their evaluations and not to frame all outcomes as positive simply to please donors. Such encouragement should be accompanied by reassurances that funding recipients will not be penalized for honest assessments and evaluations.

Where possible, funders should share results and assessments with relevant stakeholders. This process will enhance the overall effectiveness of rehabilitation and reintegration programs by ensuring that lessons learned and experiences gained are shared among a wider audience that can incorporate lessons in the design of current and future programming.

EXAMPLE 34: Evidence-Based Programming in Somalia

In 2013, the Somali Federal Government and a coalition of Somali CSOs launched a social reconciliation program called Quraca Nabadda. Quraca Nabadda, which means “tree of peace,” works to build peace and reconciliation, nurture culture and arts, and promote positive Somali stories to build community and contribute to national cohesion. Throughout the years of the program’s implementation, the coalition has placed a strong emphasis on M&E and evidence-based research to inform policymaking and feed into Somalia’s national CVE strategy.⁹¹ Quraca Nabadda incorporates qualitative and quantitative methods of measurement and analysis

to assess the behavioral and cognitive shifts required for reduction of violent extremism. For example, a program for community members in Baidoa administered pre- and postintervention surveys to measure attitudes, perceptions, and behavior related to trauma and conflict. The program focused on raising awareness of community and clan interactions, perceptions and trust, and peace and reconciliation. Program facilitators were trained to carry out interviews in a respectful manner that emphasized the human rights of participants, while addressing any trauma. The program was also careful to adhere to strict protocols of anonymity and confidentiality. Based on lessons learned throughout the program, it is being expanded to address the needs of defectors from al-Shabaab.

91 Relief Web, “Speaker of Somali Parliament, H.E. Mohamed Osman Jawari, Launches Groundbreaking Social Reconciliation Programme to ‘Reknit the Social Fabric of Somalia,’” 13 December 2013, <https://reliefweb.int/report/somalia/speaker-somali-parliament-he-mohamed-osman-jawari-launches-groundbreaking-social>.

EXAMPLE 35: CSO-University Partnerships for M&E in Tanzania

Twaweza is an East Africa-focused NGO based in Tanzania that works on assessing local community responses to issues of violent extremism, as well as other socioeconomic and political developments. Twaweza's programs include Uwezo, Africa's largest annual citizen assessment to assess children's learning levels across hundreds of thousands of households, and Sauti za Wananchi, Africa's first nationally representative mobile phone survey.

Underpinning this work is a strong commitment to M&E, which is undertaken by multiple research teams across the organization.

Twaweza has also partnered with researchers from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton University, Georgetown University, and the Amsterdam Institute of International Development to develop and institutionalize a learning and independent evaluation framework. Such partnerships build internal capacity while also allowing others to learn from challenges and opportunities.



The UN Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), through a Quick Impact Project, supports community radio in Gao, Mali
February 2018
UN Photo/Harandane Dicko

APPENDIX: LIST OF CSOS FUNDED THROUGH THE SMALL GRANTS PROGRAM

	COUNTRY	GRANTEE	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Sahel	Cameroon	Local Youth Corner (LOYOC)	Empowering youth civil society actors as agents of rehabilitation and reintegration for people with a history of or propensity for violence in Cameroon.
	Chad	Association Jeunesse de la Paix et Non-Violence (AJPNV)	Raising awareness and building community capacities to rehabilitate and reintegrate violent extremist offenders in Chad.
	Niger	Coalition Communautaire pour la Paix et la Promotion du Vivre Ensemble (COPAVE)	Research study and follow-on workshop on good practices in rehabilitation and reintegration in Cote d'Ivoire to apply to Niger.
	Niger	University of Diffa	Raising awareness and training regional authorities and CSOs in the process of receiving and reintegrating former Boko Haram supporters.
	Nigeria	Carefronting	Training select CSOs and NGOs in Borno on trauma consciousness and resilience, community cohesion, and forgiveness and reconciliation.
	Nigeria	New Era Educational and Charitable Support Foundation (NEEDSCI)	Strengthening citizens against radicalization through leadership and reintegration training in northern Nigeria.
	Nigeria	West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP)	Building capacity of NGOs to promote rehabilitation and reintegration and to strengthen collaboration between government and NGOs at the state level for effective implementation of rehabilitation and reintegration programs.
Greater Horn of Africa	Uganda	Muslim Centre for Justice and Law (MCJL)	Building the capacity of Muslim civil society and community leaders in rehabilitation and reintegration of violent extremist offenders.
	Uganda	United Religious Initiative–Great Lakes (URI-GL)	Building the capacity of religious and community actors in the rehabilitation and reintegration of violent extremist offenders and returning foreign terrorist fighters in Uganda.
Southeast Asia	Indonesia	Civil Society Against Violent Extremism (C-SAVE)	Skills training for prison staff to support disengagement of terrorist inmates.
	Indonesia	Indonesian Institute for Society Empowerment (INSEP)	Increasing religious leaders' participation in the deradicalization and reintegration of former terrorist offenders.
	Indonesia	Lembaga Penguatan Masyarakat Sipil (LPMS) Poso	Strengthening CSOs to support the rehabilitation and reintegration of VEOs in the post-conflict region of Poso.
	Indonesia	Rumah Katu Community (RKC)	Media advocacy campaign to increase awareness and sensitize communities to the importance of rehabilitation and reintegration, and especially the work of the RKC.
	Malaysia	Iman Research	Civil society electronic resource center and capacity building on CVE and rehabilitation and reintegration.
	Philippines	BALAY Rehabilitation center	Providing and systematizing support for victims and perpetrators of violent extremism in Mindanao.





The Global Center on Cooperative Security works with governments, international organizations, and civil society to develop and implement comprehensive and sustainable responses to complex international security challenges through collaborative policy research, context-sensitive programming, and capacity development. In collaboration with a global network of expert practitioners and partner organizations, the Global Center fosters stronger multilateral partnerships and convenes key stakeholders to support integrated and inclusive security policies across national, regional, and global levels.

The Global Center focuses on four thematic areas of programming and engagement:

- multilateral security policy
- countering violent extremism
- criminal justice and the rule of law
- financial integrity and inclusion

Across these areas, the Global Center prioritizes partnerships with national and regional stakeholders and works to ensure respect for human rights and empower those affected by transnational violence and criminality to inform international action.



International Centre for
Counter-Terrorism - The Hague

The International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – The Hague (ICCT) is an independent think and do tank providing multidisciplinary policy advice and practical, solution-oriented implementation support on prevention and the rule of law, two vital pillars of effective counter-terrorism.

ICCT's work focuses on themes at the intersection of countering violent extremism and criminal justice sector responses, as well as human rights related aspects of counter-terrorism. The major project areas concern countering violent extremism, rule of law, foreign fighters, country and regional analysis, rehabilitation, civil society engagement and victims' voices.

ICCT connects experts, policymakers, civil society actors and practitioners from different fields by providing a platform for productive collaboration, practical analysis, and exchange of experiences and expertise, with the ultimate aim of identifying innovative and comprehensive approaches to preventing and countering terrorism.