

Reparation in the Ongwen case: Perspectives from victims and other participants in the International Criminal Court's Access to Justice project¹

Christian B. N. Gade

Aarhus University, Denmark

Working paper prepared for the International Criminal Court

15 July 2021

1. Introduction

I have been responsible for conducting an external and independent impact assessment of the Access to Justice project carried out by the Kampala Field Office of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in connection with the trial of Dominic Ongwen. The impact assessment was financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, as represented by the Royal Danish Embassy in Uganda, and co-financed by Aarhus University. The preliminary report of the impact assessment was published in March 2021, and it presented some, but not all, of the data that had been collected on reparation for the impact assessment.² Thus, after Trial Chamber IX issued an order for submissions on reparations on 6 May 2021, the ICC contacted the embassy and requested that I shared additional data on reparation.

This working paper, which has been prepared for the ICC against the background of the above-mentioned request, presents quantitative survey data on reparation from 2,915 people who have participated in the Access to Justice project, and also qualitative interview data from focus group interviews with 110 of these respondents. The survey data was collected before the verdict in the Ongwen case, and the interview data both before and after. The quantitative analysis compares data from two main groups of respondents: Group 1, which consists of the 62.2% of the respondents who considered themselves to be victims of the crimes that were investigated by the ICC in the Ongwen case; and Group 2, which consists of the 37.8% of the respondents who did not consider themselves to be victims of these crimes, but out of whom 76.0% considered themselves to be victims of other crimes committed during the war in Northern Uganda. The main results for the two groups are briefly summarized below.

¹ Thanks to Abonga Francis who has collected most of the data that will be presented in the following in his capacity as a consultant at Aarhus University. I am also deeply grateful to Isabelle Sauer, Sofie Budhoo Bjerregaard, and Marcella Myers who have all contributed significantly to the development of this working paper.

² The preliminary report of the impact assessment is available here: https://pure.au.dk/portal/files/213191010/Access_to_justice_preliminary_report.pdf.

Results for Group 1

Among the respondents who considered themselves to be victims of crimes investigated by the ICC in the Ongwen case, there were more respondents who had increased expectations regarding reparation, than respondents who had lower expectations, because of their participation in the Access to Justice project. Furthermore, these respondents generally found individual reparation more important than collective reparation, and their expectations for individual reparations ranged from receiving money to having a house built or receiving cattle. At the time when they answered the survey, almost half of the respondents in this group expected to receive individual reparations. Even though some of the respondents in this group also supported collective reparation, the qualitative interview data demonstrates a concern among these respondents that many of them would not benefit from collective reparation, and also that those who are not victims of Ongwen's crimes will argue for collective reparation in order to benefit themselves. Moreover, in interviews, some victims of Ongwen's crimes emphasized that it is important that individual reparation is made proportional to the crimes suffered, so that those who suffered the most will receive the most. Some respondents from Group 1 also expressed a concern that some people from Group 2 will attempt to falsely present themselves as victims of these crimes in order to receive individual reparations.

Results for Group 2

The quantitative data analysis shows that among the respondents, who are not victims of Ongwen's crimes, there were more people who had lower expectations regarding reparation, than people who had increased expectations, because of their participation in the Access to Justice project. In addition, according to the quantitative data, most of these respondents neither thought that individual nor collective reparation is important. This finding stands in contrast to the idea, mentioned in the section above, that many people who are not victims of Ongwen's crimes think collective reparation is important because they may benefit from this type of reparation themselves. In Group 2, a little less than one out of ten expected to receive individual reparations even though they are not victims of Ongwen's crimes, suggesting that they may not have understood how the ICC reparation system works. Besides, some respondents from Group 2 found this system to be unfair because it only helps a small group of victims, though there are victims of the war all over Northern Uganda who have suffered serious crimes.

In the following, I will first present the methods of data collection, and how the data was analysed. Subsequently, the findings will be presented in more detail in Section 3.

2. Methods and analysis

2.1. Methods

The impact assessment was a mixed-methods study that combined quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative source base was 3,000 survey responses from people who had participated in at least one activity in the Access to Justice project. Out of these responses, 2,915 responses are included in the analysis for this paper, as explained in Table 1 (all tables are found in the appendix). The project activities in the Access to Justice project included screenings of videos from the trial, the radio programme *Ask the Court*, radio listening clubs, and feedback meetings with people from Northern Uganda who had visited the ICC in The Hague (for details about the respondents' project participation, see Gade 2021: 23-25). The survey data was collected from 21 November 2019 to 21 January 2021, i.e., in the period before the verdict, and it consisted of 500 survey responses from each of the six main sites where the Access to Justice project was conducted: Pajule/Lapul, Odek, Lukodi, Abok, Coorom, and Gulu. In January 2020, focus group interviews were carried out in Pajule, Lukodi, Odek, Abok, and Coorom with a total of fifty people who had all previously answered the survey (at that point, we did not have survey data from Gulu). Later, in May and June 2021, another round of focus group interviews was conducted with a total of 60 survey respondents in all of the six main data collection sites. Both rounds of focus group interviews aimed to get a deeper understanding of the quantitative survey data by asking follow-up questions (for details, see Gade 2021: 13-18).

Concerning the sampling of survey data, I would have preferred the sample to be a simple random sample of all participants in the Access to Justice project, in order to make it possible to statistically calculate how likely it is that the sample is representative of this group. However, constructing such a sample would require that I knew the identity of all the participants in the Access to Justice project, and the ICC Field Office did not register who the participants were. Therefore, it was not possible to create a simple random sample. As an alternative, I decided to use a form of convenience sampling, where the aim was to collect an equal amount of quantitative survey data from each of the six main data collection sites, and to have as much gender and age diversity within each geographical area as possible. As mentioned above, we ended up with 500 respondents from each of the six main sites, and the samples from the different sites turned out to be very similar in regard to gender and age due to the ongoing data monitoring process (for details, see Gade 2021: 13-18). In all six sites, there were between 47.6% and 50.9% female respondents, and the mean age of the respondents was between 34.2 and 39.5 years. The high number of survey respondents, combined with the diversity among the respondents with respect to geography, gender and age, may have contributed positively to the external validity of the results. However, since we do not have a random sample, it is impossible to know for sure to what extent the results are representative of all the participants in the Access to

Justice project, nor how representative they are of the part of the local population that did not participate in the Access to Justice project.

2.2. Groups in the analysis

The quantitative data has been analysed by means of descriptive statistics, and—as already mentioned in the introduction—results are presented for two main groups: first, those respondents who answered that they considered themselves to be victims of the crimes that were investigated by the ICC in the Ongwen case (Group 1), and second, those who answered that they did not consider themselves to be victims of these crimes (Group 2).

Group 1

As seen in Table 1 in the appendix, Group 1 consists of 1,813 respondents, which is 62.2% of all the respondents in the analysis. As many as 95.7% of the respondents in Group 1 stated that they did not only consider themselves to be victims of crimes investigated by the ICC in the Ongwen case, but that they also considered themselves to be victims of other crimes committed during the war in Northern Uganda.

Most of the respondents in Group 1 answered the survey in Pajule, Odek, Lukodi or Abok (see Table 2), i.e., in the areas where Ongwen carried out attacks on IDP camps according to the ICC verdict. Of the respondents in Group 1, 7.8% answered the survey in Gulu, and when these respondents were asked where the crimes took place, most of them wrote that it was in Lukodi IDP Camp.³ As seen in Table 2, Group 1 also includes a few respondents from Coorom, which is the birthplace of Ongwen. Some of the respondents from Coorom stated that the crimes happened in the Sinia Brigade or Lukodi IDP Camp.⁴

Group 1 includes 47.7% female respondents (Table 3), and the mean age of the respondents was 36.9 years (Table 4). Concerning ethnicity, 71.1% of the respondents in Group 1 were Acholi, while 28.8% were Langi (Table 5).

Group 2

Group 2 consists of 1,102 respondents, which is 37.8% of all the respondents in the analysis (see Table 1). About three out of four of the respondents in Group 2 (76.0%) considered themselves to be victims of crimes that happened in the war in Northern Uganda, but which were not investigated by

³ Total count (N): 134; missing: 7 (5.0%); Lukodi IDP Camp: 95 (70.9%); Pajule IDP Camp: 4 (3.0%); Odek IDP Camp: 10 (7.5%); Abok IDP Camp: 0 (0%); Sinia Brigade: 16 (11.9%); other: 16 (11.9%).

⁴ Total count (N): 26; missing: 18 (40.9%); Lukodi IDP Camp: 7 (26.9%); Pajule IDP Camp: 1 (3.8%); Odek IDP Camp: 0 (0%); Abok IDP Camp: 0 (0%); Sinia Brigade: 13 (50.0%); other: 5 (19.2%).

the ICC, and only 24.0% of the respondents in Group 2 did not consider themselves to be victims of any crimes committed during the war.

In contrast to Group 1, most of the respondents from Group 2 (71.3%) answered the survey in Coorom (39.8%) or Gulu (31.5%) (Table 2). Thus, most of the respondents in Group 2 are not from the areas that were attacked by Ongwen. Furthermore, it is important to keep in mind that Ongwen is from Coorom, which—of course—has affected how the respondents from Coorom think about the trial and the issue of reparation.

Group 2 is rather similar to Group 1 in regard to gender and age, with 53.1% female respondents, and their mean age being 34.9 years (Table 4). Concerning ethnicity, 92.0% of the respondents in Group 2 were Acholi, while only 7.9% were Langi (Table 5). There is a higher percentage of Acholi respondents in Group 2 than in Group 1, which may be explained by the fact that almost all of the 609 Lango respondents answered the survey in Abok and Odek: two of the sites that were attacked by Ongwen.⁵ As many as 85.7% of the Lango respondents belonged to Group 1.

3. Results on reparation

In the following, the results on reparation, which were briefly outlined in the introduction, will be presented in greater detail. I will start by presenting the results for the group of respondents who considered themselves to be victims of crimes that were investigated by the ICC in the Ongwen case (Group 1), before I present the results for the respondents who did not consider themselves to be victims of these crimes (Group 2).

Results for Group 1

Among the respondents who considered themselves to be victims of crimes investigated by the ICC in the Ongwen case, there were more respondents who had increased expectations for reparation, than respondents who had lower expectations, because of their participation in the Access to Justice project. More specifically, regarding individual reparation, for 46.2% of the respondents expectations increased, while expectations lowered for 27.8% of the respondents (see Table 6). Regarding collective reparation, expectations increased for 42.5% of the respondents, while only 22.5% of the respondents had their expectations lowered (Tables 7). Almost half of the respondents in Group 1 (49.3%) expected to receive individual reparations themselves (Table 8), next to 42.9% who expected that the trial would lead to collective reparation.

⁵ Total count (N): 609; missing: 0 (0%); Pajule/Lapul: 3 (0.5%); Abok: 488 (80.1%); Odek: 113 (18.6%); Lukodi: 1 (0.2%); Coorom: 1 (0.2%); Gulu: 3 (0.5%).

The respondents in Group 1 found individual reparation more important than collective reparation. In this group, 62.9% agreed or strongly agreed that individual reparation is important, while 49.0% agreed or strongly agreed that collective reparation is important. Moreover, among the 49.3% of the respondents in Group 1 who expected to receive individual reparations, as many as 92.5% agreed or strongly agreed that individual reparation is important.⁶ In this group, a much smaller portion, more specifically 42.1%, agreed or strongly agreed that collective reparation is important.⁷

In Group 1, the respondents' expectations for individual reparations ranged from receiving money, to having a house built or receiving cattle. The expectations were diverse as emphasized by an interviewee in Abok: "They [the victims of Ongwen's crimes] want to be compensated with money but they don't know the strength of the Trust Fund for Victims, they don't know if the money available is small or big. Some say a house should be built for them; others say they should be given 10 million shillings each, and others 20 million shillings each" (03.06.2021). An interviewee in Lukodi explained: "In Acholi, there is a way people's deaths are compensated, and I wish that culture is maintained, e.g., each death should be compensated with 10 million shillings and 5 cows" (31.05.2021). An interviewee in Odek said: "I lost my brother during the attack, and he left me with a child that I don't have the capacity to bring up well, so I need to take care of this child and also pay him at school, so I expect to be given at least three million shillings" (08.06.2021). In Pajule, an interviewee said: "These people [the victims of Ongwen's crimes] have so many problems. Some lost their lives, others like this son of mine lost his hand, and he will be disabled for the rest of his life. There is also my daughter in law who had only one child, and he was taken and killed from the bush on that day [when the attack happened]. I think 10 million shillings is reasonable to the victims as it can help them buy things like cows to help them with farming, and also they can milk the cows and sell the milk to support them for a longer period of time" (10.06.2021).

Though collective reparation was perceived as less important than individual reparation by the respondents in Group 1, 49.0% of the respondents from Group 1 still agreed or strongly agreed that collective reparation is important, as mentioned above. An interviewee in Abok said: "I also agree with others that we should be paid [individually], but some compensation should also help the community. For example, building a hospital or upgrading the level of the health centre to a better standard. This will be for our grandchildren to remember in the future: that this hospital was built or improved to this standard because of crimes committed against your grandfathers" (03.06.2021). However, there was a concern among the respondents from Group 1 that many of them would not

⁶ Total count (N): 871; missing: 3 (0.3%); strongly disagree: 25 (2.9%); disagree: 12 (1.4%); neither agree nor disagree: 28 (3.2%); agree: 269 (30.9%); strongly agree: 537 (61.7%).

⁷ Total count (N): 871; missing: 3 (0.3%); strongly disagree: 124 (14.2%); disagree: 138 (15.8%); neither agree nor disagree: 242 (27.8%); agree: 174 (20.0%); strongly agree: 193 (22.2%).

benefit from collective reparation. An interviewee from Abok explained: “I think individual reparations is good for me. Collective reparation is fine, but it will not help me much. For example, say if a hospital is built, personally I won’t even get the smallest job of sweeping around the hospital or even working as an office messenger. Instead, it will be helping those who did not suffer” (03.06.2021). An interviewee in Odek provided further elaborations: “There are so many schools around here. Even if they decide to build a school or a hospital here, someone who lost his children and doesn’t have a child will look at that development as being a foolery to them because they do not have children to go to this schools, so at least something should be given directly to them” (08.06.2021).

There was also a concern among the respondents from Group 1 that those who are not victims of Ongwen’s crimes will argue for collective reparation in order to benefit. An interviewee in Abok said: “They [who are not victims of Ongwen’s crimes] are the kind of people supporting collective reparation simply because they know that they will also benefit from it” (03.06.2021). In Lukodi, an interviewee said: “There are these people who really suffered, the victims, and then these other ones who also had their relatives who suffered, they are the ones who answered that we need individual reparation. But then, there are also these other people who did not suffer that much from this, Ongwen’s case, these are the people who answered that it [reparation] should be for the community, maybe a hospital or a school, so that they could also have some benefits out of it, because they know that if people are individually compensated or given money, they will not benefit from it” (31.05.2021). An interviewee in Odek also said: “Someone who did not lose anything will benefit from it [collective reparation] in the same way as someone who lost something. It implies that people who lost their lives and properties brought good luck to even the ones who did not lose anything as they would all benefit through collective reparation” (08.06.2021).

Several victims of Ongwen’s crimes emphasized that people ought to receive reparations that are proportionate to the crimes that they suffered. For example, an interviewee in Odek stated that: “This payment cannot be flat rate, people should be paid according to what they lost. Some lost lives, others pigs or cows, so they cannot be compensated equally. One should be paid an equivalent of what he/she lost” (08.06.2021). In Pajule, an interviewee explained: “This is an international court that has a big hand to support us, but as humans we know almost everyone was affected here, and we thought at least the people who suffered physically, and also those who lost their lives, should be considered first if there is any reparation. But if there is enough help, then everyone should be considered because, like I said earlier, everyone suffered” (10.06.2021). An interviewee in Lukodi suggested that the best way forward might be for the communities to distribute reparations themselves: “The LC 1 should gather people, and we should come up with one solid agreement on how compensation should be done” (31.05.2021).

Some respondents from Group 1 expressed a concern that people, who are not victims of Ongwen's crimes, will attempt to falsely present themselves as victims of these crimes in order to receive individual reparations. In this regard, an interviewee in Lukodi stated that: "Actually they [those who are not victims of Ongwen's crimes] are jealous to see us being compensated, and they are also trying to get close so that they also benefit from the reparation scheme" (31.05.2021). An interviewee in Pajule said: "If there is any writing of names of the victims [in connection with the reparation process], the paper will be full of the names of people who are not victims, which will annoy the real victims a lot, and I think if the victims are to be compensated as they are expecting, they [who manage the reparation process] should come here and meet the area LCs and also the clan leaders who know these victims very well" (10.06.2021). Another interviewee in Pajule explained that it had happened before that reparation did not reach the right people: "Like the victims of the cattle raids that happened here in Acholi some time back, the real victims had few cows given to them and others did not receive anything at all, but the people who are not victims were given so many cattle as a result of corruption" (10.06.2021).

Results for Group 2

The quantitative data analysis shows that among the respondents, who are not victims of Ongwen's crimes, there were more people who had lower expectations regarding reparation, than people who had increased expectations, because of their participation in the Access to Justice project. As presented above, the opposite was the case for the respondents in Group 1.

With respect to individual reparation, 29.5% of the respondents in Group 2 had their expectations lowered, while 18.5% had their expectations increased (Table 6), and regarding collective reparation, the numbers were 27.9% (lowered) vs. 17.1% (increased), respectively (see Table 7). In Group 2, only 8.2% expected to receive individual reparations themselves (Table 8), while 6.8% expected that the trial would lead to collective reparation (Table 9). As seen in the tables 8 and 9, these numbers are much lower than the corresponding numbers for Group 1.

According to the quantitative data, most of the respondents from Group 2 neither thought that individual nor collective reparation is important. In fact, it was only 24.6% who agreed or strongly agreed that individual reparation is important (Table 10), while 25.1% agreed or strongly agreed that collective reparation is important (Table 11). Again, these numbers are much lower than the corresponding numbers for Group 1 as seen in tables 10 and 11.

One might expect that the relatively low importance that was ascribed to reparation by the respondents in Group 2 was caused by the fact that most of these respondents are from Coorom and

Gulu. However, if we look at the 316 individuals from Group 2 who answered the survey in Pajule, Odek, Lukodi, and Abok, then it was actually an even smaller proportion who agreed or strongly agreed that collective reparation is important—in fact only 18.3%⁸—while the proportion of people who agreed or strongly agreed that individual reparation is important was a little bit higher—33.2%⁹—but still a lot lower than the corresponding number for Group 1. These findings stand in contrast to the idea, presented by some of Ongwen’s victims in focus group interviews, that many people who are not victims of Ongwen’s crimes think collective reparation is important because they may benefit from this type of reparation.

As mentioned above, 8.2% of the respondents in Group 2 expected to receive individual reparations even though they did not consider themselves to be victims of crimes investigated by the ICC in the Ongwen case. This suggests that some respondents in Group 2 may not have understood that it is only victims of Ongwen’s crimes who may potentially receive individual reparations. In addition, focus group interviews demonstrate that some of the people, who understood the ICC reparation system, found it to be unfair. An interviewee from Coorom said: “These killings, mass killings that happened in Lukodi, in Abok, in Pajule, and in Odek, also happened in Amuru district, about four, about three or four places in Amuru district, so they should also bring any form of reparation to Coorom or to Amuru district because all these killings were the same. The same killing that happened in these other places also happened here, so they also deserve to receive reparation. They also went through a lot of difficulties, so many problems as in other places, so they should also receive reparation” (16.06.2021).

4. Final remarks

This working paper has demonstrated that the respondents who considered themselves to be victims of crimes investigated by the ICC in the Ongwen case had quite different perspectives on reparation compared to those who did not consider themselves to be victims of these crimes. Within the first-mentioned group, there were more respondents whose expectations increased regarding reparation, than respondents whose expectations lowered, because of their participation in the Access to Justice project. Furthermore, these respondents found individual reparation to be more important than collective reparation.

Due to the high expectations that many victims have for reparation, there is a risk that many victims will be disappointed if the ICC and the Trust Fund for Victims do not deliver what is expected. This could have negative effects on the perception of the court as explained by an interviewee in Abok: “If

⁸ Total count (N): 312; missing: 4 (1.3%); strongly disagree: 66 (21.2%); disagree: 84 (26.9%); neither agree nor disagree: 106 (34.0%); agree: 36 (11.5%); strongly agree: 21 (6.7%).

⁹ Total count (N): 313; missing 3 (0.9%); strongly disagree: 66 (21.1%); disagree: 65 (20.8%); neither agree nor disagree: 79 (25.2%); agree: 46 (14.7%); strongly agree: 58 (18.5%).

Ongwen is found guilty and no reparation is done, then this will make people look at this court as being useless, and in the future such things that Ongwen has done will keep on happening” (14.01.2020). An interviewee from Lukodi was even more vocal saying: “We are going to despise the ICC court if reparation does not happen” (10.01.2020).

I want to end this working paper by re-emphasizing that even though this study is based on a high number of informants, it is impossible to know for sure to what extent the results are representative of all the participants in the Access to Justice project, neither to what extent they are representative of the part of the local population that did not participate in this project. However, this may be the biggest survey study that is available on reparation in Northern Uganda, and I hope that the working paper will make a modest contribution in assisting the ICC to make sound decisions on reparation in the Ongwen case.

Reference

Gade, C. B. N. (2021). *Impact assessment of the International Criminal Court’s Access to Justice project in Uganda: Preliminary report*. Aarhus: Aarhus University. Available here: https://pure.au.dk/portal/files/213191010/Access_to_justice_preliminary_report.pdf.

Appendix

Note: Out of the 3,000 survey responses collected for the impact assessment of the Access to Justice project, 85 responses (2.8%) are not included in the data analysis presented in the tables below because the respondents did not answer both questions in Table 1. Furthermore, it should be noted that I do not report separate results for Group 1a and Group 1b, the reason being that Group 1b is very small compared to the other groups. Finally, it should be noticed that some numbers in the tables do not add up, which is always because some respondents checked more than one option (for example, one respondent checked both the female and male option in Table 3).

Table 1. Groups in the analysis

	Total count (N)	Do you consider yourself to be a victim of crimes that are being investigated by the ICC in the Ongwen case?		Do you consider yourself to be a victim of crimes that were committed as part of the war in Northern Uganda, but which are not being investigated by the ICC?	
		“Yes” checked	“No” checked	“Yes” checked	“No” checked
Group 1 (1a & 1b)	1,813 (62.2%)				
Group 1a	1,735 (95.7%)	Yes	No	Yes	No
Group 1b	78 (4.3%)	Yes	No	No	Yes
Group 2 (2a & 2b)	1,102 (37.8%)				
Group 2a	838 (76.0%)	No	Yes	Yes	No
Group 2b	264 (24.0%)	No	Yes	No	Yes
All	2,915				

Table 2. Data collection sites

	Total count (N)	Missing	Pajule/Lapul	Odek	Lukodi	Abok	Coorom	Gulu
Group 1	1,813	0 (0%)	389 (21.5%)	329 (18.1%)	439 (24.2%)	471 (26.0%)	44 (2.4%)	141 (7.8%)
Group 2	1,102	0 (0%)	96 (8.7%)	152 (13.8%)	46 (4.2%)	22 (2.0%)	439 (39.8%)	347 (31.5%)
Group 2a	838	0 (0%)	46 (5.5%)	99 (11.8%)	39 (4.7%)	16 (1.9%)	355 (42.4%)	283 (33.8%)
Group 2b	264	0 (0%)	50 (18.9%)	53 (20.1%)	7 (2.7%)	6 (2.3%)	84 (31.8%)	64 (24.2%)
All	2,915	0 (0%)	485 (16.6%)	481 (16.5%)	485 (16.6%)	493 (16.9%)	483 (16.6%)	488 (16.7%)

Table 3. Gender

	Total count (N)	Missing	Female	Male
Group 1	1,806	7 (0.4%)	861 (47.7%)	946 (52.4%)
Group 2	1,100	2 (0.2%)	584 (53.1%)	516 (46.9%)
Group 2a	837	1 (0.1%)	434 (51.9%)	403 (48.1%)
Group 2b	263	1 (0.4%)	150 (57.0%)	113 (43.0%)
All	2,906	9 (0.3%)	1,445 (49.7%)	1,462 (50.3%)

Table 4. Age

	Total count (N)	Missing	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation	Median
Group 1	1,786	27 (1.5%)	17	90	36.9	11.4	36
Group 2	1,090	12 (1.1%)	16	87	34.9	11.7	33
Group 2a	829	9 (1.1%)	16	85	35.1	10.9	33
Group 2b	261	3 (1.1%)	16	87	34.5	14.2	30
All	2,876	39 (1.4%)	16	90	36.1	11.6	34

Table 5. Ethnicity

	Total count (N)	Missing	Acholi	Langi	Other
Group 1	1,811	2 (0.1%)	1,287 (71.1%)	522 (28.8%)	2 (0.1%)
Group 2	1,101	1 (0.1%)	1,013 (92.0%)	87 (7.9%)	1 (0.1%)
Group 2a	837	1 (0.1%)	790 (94.4%)	47 (5.6%)	0 (0%)
Group 2b	264	0 (0%)	223 (84.5%)	40 (15.2%)	1 (0.4%)
All	2,912	3 (0.1%)	2,300 (79.0%)	609 (20.9%)	3 (0.1%)

Table 6. How has your participation in the Access to Justice project affected your expectations regarding individual reparations?

	Total count (N)	Missing	It has increased my expectations	It has not had any effects on my expectations	It has lowered my expectations
Group 1	1,793	20 (1.1%)	829 (46.2%)	467 (26.0%)	498 (27.8%)
Group 2	1,077	25 (2.3%)	199 (18.5%)	560 (52.0%)	318 (29.5%)
Group 2a	826	12 (1.4%)	142 (17.2%)	441 (53.4%)	243 (29.4%)
Group 2b	251	13 (4.9%)	57 (22.7%)	119 (47.4%)	75 (29.9%)
All	2,870	45 (1.5%)	1,028 (35.8%)	1,027 (35.8%)	816 (28.4%)

Table 7. How has your participation in the Access to Justice project affected your expectations regarding collective reparations?

	Total count (N)	Missing	It has increased my expectations	It has not had any effects on my expectations	It has lowered my expectations
Group 1	1,792	21 (1.2%)	762 (42.5%)	627 (35.0%)	404 (22.5%)
Group 2	1,081	21 (1.9%)	185 (17.1%)	605 (56.0%)	292 (27.0%)
Group 2a	827	11 (1.3%)	127 (15.4%)	485 (58.6%)	216 (26.1%)
Group 2b	254	10 (3.8%)	58 (22.8%)	120 (47.2%)	76 (29.9%)
All	2,873	42 (1.4%)	947 (33.0%)	1,232 (42.9%)	696 (24.2%)

Table 8. Do you expect to receive individual reparation yourself?

	Total count (N)	Missing	Yes	No
Group 1	1,773	40 (2.2%)	874 (49.3%)	899 (50.7%)
Group 2	1,066	36 (3.3%)	87 (8.2%)	979 (91.8%)
Group 2a	808	30 (3.6%)	77 (9.5%)	731 (90.5%)
Group 2b	258	6 (2.3%)	10 (3.9%)	248 (96.1%)
All	2,839	76 (2.6%)	961 (33.8%)	1,878 (66.2%)

Table 9. Do you expect that the Ongwen trial will lead to collective reparation?

	Total count (N)	Missing	Yes	No
Group 1	1,766	47 (2.6%)	757 (42.9%)	1,009 (57.1%)
Group 2	1,085	17 (1.5%)	74 (6.8%)	1,011 (93.2%)
Group 2a	825	13 (1.6%)	59 (7.2%)	766 (92.8%)
Group 2b	260	4 (1.5%)	15 (5.8%)	245 (94.2%)
All	2,851	64 (2.2%)	831 (29.1%)	2,020 (70.9%)

Table 10. It is important that there will be individual reparations

	Total count (N)	Missing	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Group 1	1,800	13 (0.7%)	180 (10.0%)	211 (11.7%)	276 (15.3%)	417 (23.2%)	716 (39.8%)
Group 2	1,088	14 (1.3%)	214 (19.7%)	209 (19.2%)	398 (36.6%)	126 (11.6%)	142 (13.1%)
Group 2a	829	9 (1.1%)	144 (17.4%)	131 (15.8%)	357 (43.1%)	74 (8.9%)	123 (14.8%)
Group 2b	259	5 (1.9%)	70 (27.0%)	78 (30.1%)	41 (15.8%)	52 (20.1%)	19 (7.3%)
All	2,888	27 (0.9%)	394 (13.6%)	420 (14.5%)	674 (23.3%)	543 (18.8%)	858 (29.7%)

Table 11. It is important that there will be collective reparations

	Total count (N)	Missing	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Group 1	1,803	10 (0.6%)	242 (13.4%)	262 (14.5%)	416 (23.1%)	414 (23.0%)	469 (26.0%)
Group 2	1,083	19 (1.7%)	119 (11.0%)	282 (26.0%)	412 (38.9%)	144 (13.3%)	128 (11.8%)
Group 2a	829	9 (1.1%)	63 (7.6%)	194 (23.4%)	366 (44.1%)	109 (13.1%)	98 (11.8%)
Group 2b	254	10 (3.8%)	56 (22.0%)	88 (34.6%)	46 (18.1%)	35 (13.8%)	30 (11.8%)
All	2,886	29 (1.0%)	361 (12.5%)	544 (18.8%)	828 (28.7%)	558 (19.3%)	597 (20.7%)