

# Review of: "Evolution and Challenges of DDR: A Policy Review Through the Prism of Colombia's Three-Generational Experience"

Janet E. Lord<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Maryland, Baltimore

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an article addressing an issue that is still quite marginal in the peacebuilding literature, namely, case studies on disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) programs, with a case study of the experience of Colombia. The author's methodology is a policy review that works through three generations of DDR programming, as applied to Colombia. The author provides a useful conceptual mapping of these three generations of DDR programs by way of introducing the key elements of DDR as it has evolved across numerous post-conflict initiatives.

The author has done a good job of researching the piece and writes in a clear style. My feedback is intended to be constructive and is offered to make the paper stronger in several respects.

The author takes some time at the outset to sketch the historical evolution of DDR programming. I think these sections could benefit from spelling out key terms and definitions for the reader, and by enhancing citations in a few places.

First, the author clearly has extensive knowledge of DDR, but not all readers will have this knowledge. As such, terms such as "DDR protocols" must be defined for the reader. It is unclear from the article how this term is being used - as a generic umbrella term for "DDR programs" or something else such as a legal instrument or policy paper spelling out the parameters for DDR in a given locale? In another place in the introduction, the author uses the term "DDR procedures." This is, again, confusing. While the term "generations" is defined in the introduction, it would benefit from a citation.

In the first section, the author is also keen to introduce the topic and points to various points along the evolutionary development track of DDR processes. This section could be clearer and could include more recent coverage of DDR. The IDDRS the author cites are in fact the original ones and not the newly revised IDDRS which discusses the conceptual shift the author covers. This seems like an important gap that bears mention and that could help explain the trajectory of DDR programming. The author might also mention other key actors in DDR, including, for instance, the World Bank, which continues to fund DDR and injects emergency funding where it goes wrong.

The first section promises an explanation of the methodology used, but this is not really covered at all in the section. The author really ought to think about adding something to explain the policy review approach being used and the process by which the author went about doing the policy review.

The author might think about whether and how the paper could do a better job of ensuring that ex-combatants are not

treated as a homogenous group in the discussion. Some mention is made in passing about the different categories of ex-combatants, but likely more is needed. There is literature, for instance, that specifically addresses ex-combatants with disabilities in the Colombian context, but no mention is made of this literature. The newly revised IDDRS also underscores the issue of taking more intersectional approaches. This could certainly enrich the analysis.

Finally, the policy analysis could likewise benefit from a clearer benchmark against which the conclusions are being made. The IDDRS could be a useful guide in this respect, as could international human rights standards perhaps. The analysis seems rather generic and relies too much on secondary literature, whereas the author could set up a framework for the analysis that allows for a more detailed and original set of observations, given that Colombia is one of the very well-traversed DDR processes in the existing literature.