



**PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)  
END OF PROJECT REPORT  
COUNTRY:**

**CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC (CAR)  
REPORTING PERIOD: 15/05/2014 - 30-06-2015**

<b>Programme Title &amp; Project Number</b>
Programme Title: Projet d'appui au retour des combattants de l'ex-Seleka dans les communautés (Assisting ex-Seleka to Return to the Communities) Programme Number (if applicable) n/a MPTF Office Project Reference Number: <sup>1</sup>

<b>Recipient UN Organizations</b>
List the organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme: MINUSCA through International Organization for Migration (IOM) (Central African Republic)

<b>Implementing Partners</b>
List the national counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations: International Organization for Migration (IOM) (type: Intergovernmental Organization/IO)

<b>Programme/Project Budget (US\$)</b>
PBF contribution (by RUNO) <b>USD 2,502,516</b>
Government Contribution (if applicable) <b>n/a</b>
Other Contributions (donors) (if applicable) <b>n/a</b>
<b>TOTAL:</b>
<b>USD 2,502,516</b>

<b>Programme Duration</b>
Overall Duration (months) 13.5
Start Date <sup>2</sup> (dd.mm.yyyy) 15/05/2014
Original End Date <sup>3</sup> (dd.mm.yyyy) 15/11/2014
Final End date <sup>4</sup> (dd.mm.yyyy) 30/06/2015

<sup>1</sup> The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to "Project ID" on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

<sup>2</sup> The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

<sup>3</sup> As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

<sup>4</sup> If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed.

**Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.**

Mid-Term Evaluation / Review - if applicable *please attach*

Yes     No    Date:

End of project Evaluation- *if applicable please attach*

Yes     No    Date:

ANNEXES: 1. Ex-Seleka Profiling Report, 2/3. Maps of Convoys & Final Destinations, 4. Information Management System, 5/6. Summaries of Reinsertion & Infrastructure Rehabilitation Projects, 7. Financial Report

**Report Submitted By**

Name: Torsten Haschenz

Title: Chief of Mission

Participating Organization (Lead): IOM

Email address: [thaschenz@iom.int](mailto:thaschenz@iom.int)

**PART 1 – RESULTS PROGRESS**

**1.1 Assessment of the project implementation status and results**

**For PRF projects, please identify Priority Plan outcome and indicators to which this project has contributed:**

<i>Priority Plan Outcome to which the project has contributed. n/a</i>
<i>Priority Plan Outcome indicator(s) to which project has contributed. n/a</i>

**For both IRF and PRF projects, please rate this project’s overall achievement of results to date:** on track

**For both IRF and PRF projects, outline progress against each project outcome, using the format below. The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes.**

**Outcome Statement 1:** Registration and Profiling of the ex-Seleka combatants

**Rate the current status of the outcome:** on track

Indicator 1: # of ex-combattants registered	Baseline: 0 Target: 2,696 Progress: 2,087 (27% female; 73% male) = 77.4%
Indicator 2: # of dependants	Baseline: N/A Target: N/A Progress: 392
Indicator 3: # of ex-combattants profiled and socioeconomic data inserted in the database	Baseline: 0 Target: 2,696 Progress: 2,087 (27% female; 73% male) = 77.4%

**Output progress at the end of project**

*List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.*

The project activities started in early June 2014 with a preliminary registration exercise that allowed IOM and its partners to plan and design the activities: 2,114 individuals were counted, including 206 dependants. Subsequently, IOM conducted a detailed individual registration and socioeconomic profiling. 2,479 persons (2,087 ex-combatants and 392 dependants) in the RDOT, Beal and BSS cantonment sites were registered for return to the destination of their choice and further reinsertion assistance, and received an ID card. A project database and information system was designed and established, including the individual socioeconomic profiles of the ex-combatants for follow-up and planning purposes for potential future DDR, SSR and CVR programming.

**Outcome progress at the end of project**

*Describe progress made toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?*

The IOM information management system (IMS) facilitated the following priority requirements:

- Identification and registration of ex-combatants by means of a code, photo and issuance of an individual ID card.
- Organization and planning of return, issuance of manifests and travel cards by House-Holds (HH), final destinations, and drop-off points.
- Recording of medical travel categories – according to IOM SOPs.
- Recording of protection requirements of special categories.
- Registration of benefits received pre-departure (i.e. civilian clothes, take home kits, cash for travel).
- Registration of changes to final destination and any other relevant change that may occur during transportation.
- Information on individual and group profiles for planning and implementation of future SSR, DDR, CVR and community stabilization programmes.

This IMS allowed the relocation and reinsertion programme to maintain contact with the beneficiaries, to monitor the impact of the returns and to implement and monitor the reinsertion initiatives.

100 % of the ex-combatants and dependants certified by the commanders and present in the camps during registration were identified and registered. The registered ex-combatants received an ID card that will allow them to be considered for participation in future pre-DDR, DDR, SSR or CVR initiatives. The same applies to those beneficiaries who still remain in RDOT, BSS and Beal.

The registration and profiling of ex-combatants and dependents provided the first step towards restoring a climate of security in Bangui. It enabled the provision of immediate and tailored assistance to ex-combatants and their dependents, confirming that a process, agreed on by all parties, was taking place, and thereby contributing to their engagement and buy-in in these interim measures and reducing their (re)engagement in fighting. This outcome equally provided key information for planning and implementation of future peacebuilding programming, such as SSR, DDR, CVR and stabilization programmes.

### **Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?*

Ex-Seleka leadership, government and international partners (MISCA and Sangaris) preliminarily estimated that between 2,500 and 2,650 beneficiaries would be eligible for relocation assistance across the three sites of RDOT, BSS and Beal.

For the first two relocation convoys (from July to September 2014), the registration and profiling of the beneficiaries were done immediately after the acceptance into the transit/departure centre established by IOM at the RDOT site. Due to delays in the implementation of the movements (see outcome 3) and in order to speed up the process, the

remaining registration was done at the three camps, starting from remaining caseload in RDOT, for the totality of the beneficiaries of each site. However, all the targets related to this outcome were achieved. Only an estimated 50 ex-combatants from Beal claimed they were not included in the registration exercise, with the allegation that they had been excluded by the commanders of the camp for being Christians. Indeed it was revealed that they were not included in the list of the combatants cleared by the commander of the sites of BSS and Beal.

Therefore, IOM put them on a separate list as pending cases, waiting for further investigations on their status. However, the violent strikes and demonstrations of the former combatants of BSS and Beal in November 2014 and the following withdrawal of IOM from the camps did not allow the project to reach a conclusion on this matter.

**Outcome Statement 2:** Establishment and maintenance of a transit center and food assistance to the three gathering sites

**Rate the current status of the outcome: on track**

<p>Indicator 1: # of transit center established &amp; maintained, according to SPHERE standards, with sufficient capacity for the organization of return movements within the schedule for operations</p>	<p>Baseline: 0 Target: 1 transit center Progress: 1 transit center established with capacity for 300 individuals = 100%</p>
<p>Indicator 2: # of individuals admitted and controlled, number of weapons and other military equipment confiscated by MINUSCA prior to the admittance to the IOM transit/departure center</p>	<p>Baseline: 0 Target: 2,479 former combatants &amp; dependants to be admitted Progress: 1,006 (41%) admitted</p>
<p>Indicator 3: # of cantonment sites provided with clean water and food assistance for the beneficiaries for the duration of the registration &amp; relocation process.</p>	<p>Baseline: 0 Target: 3 sites Progress: 3 sites, during which 2,479 beneficiaries were assisted for 4 months = 100%</p>

**Output progress at the end of project**

*List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.*

Based on the data of the pre-registration and the workplan elaborated accordingly, a departure centre was established according to SPHERE standards at the RDOT site. The centre had a capacity for 250 people for 10-day departure rotations that had been envisaged by IOM and its partners at that stage. Due to delays in the implementation of the return convoys, the capacity of the RDOT site was subsequently increased to 300 people and its structure strengthened.

The beneficiaries at the transit centre were provided with meals, water, psychosocial support, medical assistance and other support services. All 1,006 beneficiaries who entered the centre were controlled and disarmed by MINUSCA forces. All the weapons and military materials were confiscated and stocked in a container under the direct control of MINUSCA. In total, MINUSCA confiscated 74 war guns, 17 other weapons, 66 grenades and rockets and over 10,000 rounds of hand gun ammunitions.

### **Outcome progress at the end of project**

*Describe progress made toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?*

In early July 2014, following the Ministry of Defence decision to relocate the beneficiaries to their destinations of choice directly from Bangui, instead of from the originally planned transit centre in Sibut, IOM was requested to change the overall planning and to urgently establish a transit/departure centre in Bangui. The centre was established in the former barracks of RDOT, already adapted as a cantonment site, following discussions involving partners and beneficiaries.

IOM quickly established the basic infrastructure and services of the departure centre, according to SPHERE standards. The area of the centre was isolated from the other parts of RDOT by perimeter fencing and its access controlled by MINUSCA forces.

On 18 July, the transit centre was inaugurated by the CAR Interim Prime Minister. Security support was provided by MINUSCA, in cooperation with Sangaris and EUFOR, in order to ensure the security and safety of the beneficiaries and IOM staff at both the transit centre and during the preparation of the relocation convoys. MINUSCA forces were also tasked to control the effective disarmament of the ex-combatants prior to their admittance to the RDOT transit centre.

Following the identification and registration process, and after disarmament checks and clearance by MISCA/MINUSCA, the beneficiaries were admitted to the transit centre and received pre-departure assistance as per IOM contractual obligations and SOPs such as two daily meals, water, pre-departure information and orientation on the overall process and on the services offered by the project in areas of return/relocation. The beneficiaries also received regular medical assistance by a dedicated Ministry of Health and IOM medical team.

For almost four months, IOM provided food following the WFP emergency standards, covering emergency requirement of clean water to the total population present in the three cantonments.

The Transitional Government and international community feared the possibility of mutinies and acts of banditry against neighbouring communities due to the previously sub-standard living conditions (lack of infrastructure, poor hygienic and health environment and total lack of humanitarian assistance). However, the project outputs outlined above contributed to improvements in the security environment in Bangui, notably in critical areas of the city, decreasing the risks of confrontation between

opposing armed groups, as the camps were surrounded by pro Anti-Balaka populations.

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?*

The overall implementation of this outcome was not delayed, with the exception of a protracted decision-making process in the initial review of the workplan and the subsequent organization of activities and operations. However, the implementation of the preliminary activities was then accelerated, notably the registration and profiling of the beneficiaries and the establishment of the transit centre. The first group of 257 beneficiaries was admitted to the transit centre 70 days after the signature of project agreement (25 July).

While the project had envisaged to relocate all 2,479 ex-Seleka and dependents from the three cantonment sites that had been registered by IOM, only 1,006 arrived at the transit centre, approximately 41 % of the target.

Regarding the beneficiaries located at the BSS and Beal sites, IOM had faced difficulties since September 2014, due to a lack of commitment to the relocation project by the ex-Seleka leadership at the camps.

Upon the violent uprising by elements of BSS and Beal on 11 November 2014, and the subsequent failure of negotiations with the Transitional Government, the relocation convoys were suspended. With no agreement reached on onward relocation, no more beneficiaries moved to the transit center from that moment.

**Outcome Statement 3:** Awareness and orientation campaigns, assisted transport, medical assistance and security for an informed and safe return of fighters and dependents to communities of choice

**Rate the current status of the outcome: on track**

<p>Indicator 1: # of former combatants and dependents assisted in the transit centres (information, medical screening, health assistance, protection, etc.) and prepared for their return/relocation to their communities of choice</p>	<p>Baseline: 0 Target: 2,087 ex-combatants + 392 dependents = 2,479 beneficiaries Progress: 1,006 beneficiaries = 41%</p>
<p>Indicator 2: # of former combatants and dependents relocated to communities of choice</p>	<p>Baseline: 0 Target: 2,087 ex-combatants + 392 dependents = 2,479 beneficiaries Progress: 740 ex-combatants + 136 dependents = 876 beneficiaries = 35%</p>
<p>Indicator 3: # of medical cases travelling under medical control</p>	<p>Baseline: N/A</p>

and special transportation provisions	Target: N/A Progress: 118
---------------------------------------	------------------------------

### Output progress at the end of project

*List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.*

Between 1 September and 9 November, 2015, a total of five convoys departed RDOT. A total of 876 beneficiaries (740 combatants and 136 dependents) travelled, of which only 14 (13 combatants and 1 dependent) actually originated from BSS and Beal.

Apart from security, basic services, and meals, all 1,006 beneficiaries admitted to the transit center received medical assistance, fit-for-travel medical checks, medical referral to clinics as required, health and hygiene information and counseling, including on HIV/AIDS, orientation and information sessions on return and reinsertion, mainstreaming gender issues. The day before the departure, the former combatants received the reinsertion benefits which included civilian clothes, take-home kits composed of domestic tools and the cash for travel from drop-off points to final destinations.

### Outcome progress at the end of project

*Describe progress made toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?*

Due to the violent uprising by elements of BSS and Beal on 11 November 2014, and the failure of the negotiations with the Transitional Government, the relocation convoys were suspended. This decision was taken by the Government on 27 November 2014, and IOM withdrew from the RDOT transit centre on 29 November, escorted by MINUSCA.

In the case of RDOT, following the departure of the majority of its residents, a total of 514 individuals remained on site. Of this group, 415 individuals (324 ex-combatants and 91 dependents) had opted to relocate to Bangui and its suburbs Bégoua and Bimbo, while 99 aimed for other destinations. Of these, a majority could not travel with the first five convoys or changed their intentions. All were waiting for the scheduled second round of convoys to the same destinations to be organized for BSS and Beal.

Until the last minute, the RDOT residents seemed to accept leaving the camp under the project's conditions, but due to political manipulations, rumors on compensation and other DDR benefits, the remaining ex-combatant population of RDOT joined the protests.

Concerning the BSS and Beal sites, IOM had faced difficulties since September 2014, due to a lack of clear commitment to the agreement and to the relocation project by the ex-Seleka leadership at the camps. Only after several additional meetings, IOM was allowed to start with the overall registration and profiling exercise in these two camps on 18 October 2014.

However, the representatives of Ex-Seleka reiterated that this concession would not imply the acceptance of the conditions of the project and that they would open new negotiations with the Transitional Government. While commanders failed to prepare the lists of the beneficiaries, IOM conducted the registration exercise from 20 to 22 October 2014. Several beneficiaries of the two sites declared their interest in joining the 4th and 5th convoys, but due to internal pressures and threats, only 14 travelled. A total number of 982 combatants and 107 dependents remained at the two camps.

The outputs achieved under this outcome, despite the challenges faced, contributed towards preparing the former combatants and their dependents for their voluntary return/relocation, and facilitating their actual movement, paving the way for the next steps for reinsertion into their communities of choice. This outcome contributes towards contributing to the overall objective of creating a positive momentum for future DDR and peacebuilding processes in CAR.

### **Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?*

While IOM's initial planning had envisaged an average of three convoys per month, there were various delays in the implementation of the movements generated by external factors. This included the refusal to travel by some beneficiaries and their commanders also demanding disarmament and demobilization benefits, the unavailability or delays in providing dedicated MISCA/MINUSCA escorts to convoys, and the volatile and unpredictable security environment, among others.

The delays in the implementation of the movements obliged IOM to adapt its timeframe, based on the availability of security escorts and the operational and security context. Consequently, onward activities such as the reinsertion components, including tracking and monitoring of the returnees, were also delayed because of these constraints. Furthermore, the infrastructure of the transit centre was strained and needed improvements and the humanitarian assistance at the sites was required for a longer period than originally expected.

Despite these constraints that were not envisaged, the project initially remained on track, with the workplan being adjusted by a time extension. However, the unforeseen risk of beneficiaries refusing to relocate caused the suspension of the return operation at a point when only 34% of returns had been completed, representing over 84% of the long distance returns outside Bangui.

**Outcome Statement 4:** Support to reinsertion and community recovery at the communities of destination

**Rate the current status of the outcome: on track with significant peacebuilding results**

<p>Indicator 1: # of communities of return benefitting from short-term employment creation and improved socioeconomic infrastructure</p>	<p>Baseline: 0 Target: N/A Progress: 9 localities</p>
<p>Indicator 2: # of returned former combatants and vulnerable community members earning income through engagement in cash for work and basic socioeconomic infrastructures rehabilitation</p>	<p>Baseline: 0 Target: N/A Progress: CfW: 546 ex-combatant (74 % of returned ex-combatants; 10.3% women and 89.7% men); 1,110 vulnerable community members (1.3% women; 98.7%) Rehabilitation works: 126 ex-combatants (17% of returned ex-combatants); 240 vulnerable community members</p>
<p>Indicator 3: # of socioeconomic infrastructures rehabilitated</p>	<p>Baseline: 0 Target: N/A Progress: 13 heavy infrastructure rehabilitations and 16 light rehabilitation works</p>

**Output progress at the end of project**

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Quick impact, short-term, cash-for-work initiatives aimed to reconcile ex-combatants with their communities of return, improve social cohesion and inject financial resources into the local economy. In the nine locations of Sibut, Damara, Kabo, Kaga Bandoro, Ngoumbélé, N'délé, Bria, Carnot and Bouar, 546 ex-combatants and 1,110 vulnerable members of the target communities were temporarily employed. On average, ex-combatants worked 26 days and vulnerable community members worked 11 days.

Durable rehabilitation of social and economic infrastructures aimed to support community resilience and the reinsertion of ex-combatants in their communities. Thirteen infrastructures were rehabilitated in eight locations. Education was prioritized in Sibut, Bria, Kabo, Bouar, Kaga Bandoro, and Bouar. In Carnot and N'délé, priority was given to economic recovery. Among the 366 labourers employed for the infrastructure projects, 126 were ex-combatants.

### **Outcome progress at the end of project**

*Describe progress made toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?*

IOM carried out initial assessment missions to the main destinations of Damara, Fere, Sibut, Kaga Bandoro, Kabo, N'délé, Bambari and Bria in the northern and central regions of the country, and Bouar, Carnot and Berberati in the western region to assess accessibility, overall security, and existing reinsertion constraints, gaps, and opportunities.

In the course of the assessments at the destination sites, IOM collected information on communities' priority requirements directly impacted by the return of former combatants and received project proposals submitted by beneficiaries, local committees and municipal administrations. The areas of return were identified during the profiling exercise, and confirmed following travel, in the IOM information system and database.

The rate of returns was the main criterion for selecting the communities where reinsertion and stabilization initiatives would be undertaken. However, IOM also considered other localities to be prioritized based on the potential for intercommunal conflict, and/or for the purposes of social cohesion and reconciliation like Carnot and Bouar in the western area of the country, dominated by Anti-Balaka groups.

IOM actively engaged the project's beneficiaries in the identification and realization of these initiatives, such as through the cash-for-work initiatives in order to inject purchasing power across the target communities in a more equal manner and to promote community reconciliation and resilience.

In close coordination with the local administrations of each locality and under the direct supervision of local IOM facilitators, the beneficiaries undertook actions to improve sanitation, including garbage collection and disposal. In some localities like Bouar, beneficiaries rehabilitated the drainage network and conducted limited road maintenance.

The implementation methodology and eligibility criteria were well explained to and understood by the beneficiaries. They were also welcomed by the host communities. There were cases of other combatants requesting to be considered for the reinsertion component of the project in some localities (i.e. Sibut and Kaga Bandoro).

Work groups included both ex-combatants and community members, creating an environment for increased dialogue and interaction among the two groups. The cash-for-work and infrastructure projects proved to be a powerful means of socialization and acceptance of the ex-combatants by the receiving communities. Based on information from facilitators at the community level and ad hoc interviews with local leaders – IOM learned that the ex-combatants faced initial scepticism from the communities in some areas, but were later accepted. However, the ex-combatants are now considered as part of the community and many of them engaged in other communal rehabilitation activities. A few beneficiaries used the income they earned with project activities to start their own small businesses.

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?*

The delays in the implementation of the movements obliged IOM to adapt its timeframe based on the availability of security escorts provided by MINUSCA convoys. Other operational difficulties such as renting suitable trucks, poor road conditions, heavy rains, and the overall security context – including frequent strikes by the ex-combatants – caused delays. Consequently, subsequent activities such as the reinsertion components were also postponed.

The first reinsertion initiatives were only launched in late November 2014, almost at the end of the originally envisaged project timeframe of six months.

The extension of the project and the sizable increase of resources available for the community-based reinsertion component (over double the allotted amount in the original budget) then allowed the implementing partners to properly achieve the outcomes as expected and stated by the project. (See project document, result matrix outcomes 2 and 3). The extended timeframe facilitated finding solutions to the organizational and logistical problems posed by the vast geographical areas of intervention (nine localities scattered within the northern, central, and western regions), limited telecommunications, poor road conditions, lack of transportation, expensive supplies, and other complex logistical conditions. An extensive review of the planning and management followed and a flexible and decentralized implementation approach was adopted.

**1.2 Assessment of project evidence base, risk, catalytic effects, gender at the end of the project**

<p><u>Evidence base</u>: What was the evidence base for this report and for project progress? What consultation/validation process has taken place on this report (1000 character limit)?</p>	<p>The reports by programme assistants and officers, local project facilitators (at least one per each location) and information collected through interviews with beneficiary representatives and commanders at the cantonment sites, as well as with local leaders and administrators in the communities of return. The information was validated through IOM staff visits to the areas of operation. The IMS has been a critical source of statistics and detailed information on the demographic and socioeconomic structure of the beneficiaries (see statistical report in annex),</p>
---	--

	<p>returns, reinsertion benefits, rehabilitation initiatives, and beneficiary participation. Additionally, joint monthly reports to the Desk Office were produced by the IOM project management in cooperation with the MINUSCA DDR Team. The interim and the final report have been shared and validated by MINUSCA DDR Team.</p>
<p><u>Funding gaps:</u> Did the project fill critical funding gaps in peacebuilding in the country? Briefly describe. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The project’s focus on interim measures in the early transitional period following the 2013 conflict in CAR also functioned to fill funding gaps in three main post crisis areas of concern to the Transitional Government, the international community, and forces deployed with peacebuilding mandates. Funding, with the exception of a few short-term emergency initiatives, was not available for: 1) providing sustainable options to Ex-Seleka combatants cantoned since December 2013 and without a clear exit strategy, 2) providing and sustaining a minimum of humanitarian assistance at the cantonment three sites, and 3) supporting any possible option for their relocation, return and reinsertion in the communities of choice. This project has been the first comprehensive initiative in the field of community-based reinsertion of former combatants through community stabilisation in CAR, with a focus on reducing community violence and promoting reconciliation. Notably, the reinsertion component of the project was implemented outside Bangui, in mostly remote and violence affected communities.</p>
<p><u>Catalytic effects:</u> Did the project achieve any catalytic effects, either through attracting additional funding commitments or creating immediate conditions to unblock/accelerate peace relevant processes? Briefly describe. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The support provided to the former combatants and their dependents to return or relocate and transition towards civilian life, combined with the assessments and sensitizations made prior to their return/relocation, contributed comprehensively to creating strong momentum and a conducive environment for community cohesion, reconciliation and trust building. Engagement with local authorities and community members in the reinsertion and recovery process was also key to creating this overall positive environment.</p> <p>The project also contributed to improving security and stability in Bangui itself as well as in the areas of return/relocation. The positive momentum and impact of the project can be clearly noted, as host communities, local authorities, and beneficiaries generally welcomed the project. IOM also received several requests for further interventions supporting disarmament and reintegration of the combatants within a community-based resilience and stabilization, intercommunal reconciliation and social cohesion framework. Cases of other combatants requesting to be considered for the reinsertion component of the project occurred in some localities such as Sibut and Kaga Bandoro.</p>
<p><u>Risk taking/ innovation:</u> Did the</p>	<p>The project activities at the cantonment sites, transit centre and</p>

<p>project support any innovative or risky activities to achieve peacebuilding results? What were they and what was the result? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>in the communities of return allowed IOM to be recognised as the main interlocutor by the former combatants. This confidence in the project also facilitated IOM's access to the camps during security crises and other periods of high tension, thereby allowing the project to continue to provide assistance and maintain ongoing activities, even under difficult security circumstances concerning the overall area of Bangui. In the return areas, the implementation of the project was done without permanent IOM presence in the localities, but successfully managed to provide proper organization and follow-up to the rehabilitation projects, to track returnees, and monitor their reinsertion and impact on local communities. The entire project did contribute to encouraging other armed groups/individuals dispersed in the country to adhere to identification and profiling exercises in view of future DDR and/or "second generation DDR," and SSR.</p>
<p><u>Gender marker:</u> How have gender considerations been mainstreamed in the project to the extent possible? Is the original gender marker for the project still the right one? Briefly justify. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Gender considerations were mainstreamed throughout the implementation of the project including registration, profiling, transit, and return for both former combatants (nearly 20% female) and their dependents. IOM conducted sensitization efforts to promote a respectful, gender-sensitive environment at the cantonment and transit sites. This included ensuring the availability of gender-segregated sleeping quarters as well as a congregation tent where families could meet. Before return convoys were conducted, IOM held focus group discussions that gave beneficiaries the opportunity to express their concerns, including gender-related issues, regarding the return/relocation movements. Female beneficiaries raised concerns regarding sharing trucks with male beneficiaries during the return convoys. IOM responded by ensuring that truck passengers were separated by gender.</p>
<p><u>Other issues:</u> Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that should be shared with PBSO? This can include any cross-cutting issues or other issues which have not been included in the report so far. (1500 character limit)</p>	

## PART 2: LESSONS LEARNED AND SUCCESS STORY

### 2.1 Lessons learned

*Provide at least three key lessons learned from the implementation of the project. These can include lessons on the themes supported by the project or the project processes and management.*

<p>Lesson 1 (1000 character limit)</p>	<p>The establishment of the concrete objectives as well as the planning of the activities and operational aspects should be discussed and agreed with the proactive participation of the beneficiaries and not only with partners and former combatant leadership. Consensus should be reached among the direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders on the conditions, benefits and opportunities offered by the project. The standards and procedures for the implementation of the activities should be further disseminated among concerned communities to ensure total transparency and avoid creating misunderstandings or false expectations. Furthermore, sharing standards and procedures will hedge against risk of instability and further violence and offer opportunities to prevent possible political manipulations.</p>
<p>Lesson 2 (1000 character limit)</p>	<p>In the course of implementation of the project, the reinsertion and rehabilitation component proved critical for the achievement of the short term objectives (reinsertion of the beneficiaries in a programmatic context of community resilience) and for creating the base for longer term durable solutions (further reintegration and community stabilisation and recovery). This component should be defined in an earlier stage of the project design and planning (participatory planning and design) and receive important financial allocations in the context of the overall project cost estimates. The cash-for-work activities should be designed and tailored in order to allow the beneficiaries to receive, in the community context, re-socialisation training, to proactively participate in reconciliation efforts, and to earn an initial income that could contribute to further durable reintegration opportunities and solutions.</p>
<p>Lesson 3 (1000 character limit)</p>	<p>It is necessary to ensure the timely implementation of preparatory activities, transit operations and returns in order to minimize the risk of external influences and political manipulations creating conditions for beneficiaries to change their return intentions, which may jeopardize to some extent or entirely the planned achievements. The factors that can cause delays in implementation should be evaluated in detail, and the measures that can minimize these risks considered. The latter may include improving the capacities of procurement of supplies and transport, and in case of shared responsibilities evaluate the real capacities of project partners. This is deemed useful to ensure the full understanding and commitment to each partner's responsibilities and tasks by all concerned stakeholders, and to improve the institutional and operational coordination mechanisms during project implementation.</p>

Lesson 4 (1000 character limit)	
Lesson 5 (1000 character limit)	

## 2.2 Success story (OPTIONAL)

*Provide one success story from the project implementation which can be shared on the PBSO website and Newsletter as well as the Annual Report on Fund performance. Please include key facts and figures and any citations (3000 character limit).*

Among all the cases of successful reinsertion, the case of ‘Jean’ (name changed) is very significant. Jean returned to Sibut with the first organized convoy on 1 September 2014. Since his arrival, he tried to find a job, but without success. When the cash-for-work activities were launched in Sibut on 27 November 2014, He was among the selected beneficiaries who participated in the sanitation and garbage collection activities undertaken by the project in Sibut. He participated in all five cash-fo-work rotations that were implemented in Sibut. This allowed him to earn a total amount of 100,000 XAF (approximately 170 USD) as the beneficiaries received 20,000 XAF (approximately 34 USD) for each rotation of 10 working days .With his total income earned, Jean opened a coffee shop in the main bus station of Sibut.

The activity was well developed and Jean was able to earn sufficient income to meet the basic needs of his family. Based on the success of his new activity and observing that his coffee business was busiest in the morning and evenings, Jean decided to use his free time during of the day to work with two other fellow Ex Séléka, also returned with the support of the project, to start up a small vegetable garden near the Tomi River in Sibut. The three Ex-Seleka are now working together to supply the local market with vegetables, addressing the existing high demand of these products in Sibut’s market. With the income generated by both these activities, Jean is now financially autonomous and has the ambition to expand and diversify his business. He is planning to hire other unemployed people. Any temptation to return to violence or get involved in criminal activity is now far away. Jean’s only real ambition is how to grow his business.

Jean has now been fully accepted by his community, as is reflected by frequent attendance of his coffee shop. As business has been picking up and earning him a steady income, he is considering the hiring of some of his former comrades in order to expand his shop.

## PART 3 – FINANCIAL PROGRESS AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

### 3.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditure

*Please rate whether project financial expenditures were on track, slightly delayed, or off track: on track*

*If expenditure was delayed or off track, please provide a brief explanation (500 characters maximum):*

The financial expenditures of the project are in line with the budget proposal for ‘No Cost Extension’ submitted by IOM and MINUSCA DDR, and subsequently approved by PBSO, in accordance with the technical proposal and the modified timeframe.

Please provide an overview of project expensed budget by outcome and output as per the table below.<sup>5</sup>

Output number	Output name	RUNOs	Approved budget	Expensed budget	Any remarks on expenditure
Outcome 1: To have registered and profiled the ex-Seleka former combatants in the three cantonment sites of Beal, BSS and RDOT					
Output 1.1	Ex-combattants registered	IOM	21,791.66	22,131.66	
Output 1.2	Dependents registered	IOM	21,791.66	22,131.66	
Output 1.3	Ex-combattants profiled	IOM	21,791.67	22,131.67	
Outcome 2: To have established and maintained a transit center and food assistance to the three cantonment sites of Beal, BASS & RDOT					
Output 2.1	Transit center established	IOM	147,730.66	147,641.66	
Output 2.2	Beneficiaries admitted & controlled for weapons	IOM	147,730.66	147,641.66	
Output 2.3	Water & food assistance provided	IOM	147,730.67	147,641.67	
Outcome 3: To have relocated former Seleka combatants and their dependents to communities of choice, including awareness and orientation campaigns, assisted transport, while ensuring medical and security conditions for an informed and safe return					
Output 3.1	Ex-combatants admitted to transit centre	IOM	150,197.33	155,336.33	
Output 3.2	Former combatants relocated	IOM	150,197.33	155,336.33	
Output 3.3	Dependents admitted to transit centre	IOM	150,197.34	155,336.34	
Outcome 4: To have supported the reinsertion of ex-Seleke at their communities of return, including support to community revitalization					
Output 4.1	Cash for work & infrastructure	IOM	248,856.66	251,292.00	

<sup>5</sup> Please note that financial information is preliminary pending submission of annual financial report to the Administrative Agent.

	rehabilitation				
Output 4.2	Beneficiary share for CFW and infrastr. rehabilitation	IOM	248,856.66	251,292.00	
Output 4.3	Share of local populations in the benefits	IOM	248,856.67	251,292.00	
Total			1,705,730.00	1,729,205.00	

### 3.2 Comments on management and implementation arrangements

*Please comment on the management and implementation arrangements for the project, such as: the effectiveness of the implementation partnerships, coordination/coherence with other projects, any South-South cooperation, the modalities of support, any capacity building aspect, the use of partner country systems if any, the support by the PBF Secretariat and oversight by the Joint Steering Committee (for PRF only). Please also mention if there have been any changes to the project (what kind and when) (2000 character maximum):*

The strong coordination among partners and the flexibility to reorient activities in light of a fluid political and security context in CAR enabled the project to create positive momentum: for cohesion and trust-building between former combatants and community members, for assisting the transition of the beneficiaries into civilian life, for providing them with a temporary means of income, and for supporting community recovery processes.

It was recognized that the reinsertion component of the project was insufficient to cover the requirements of the returnees in the already fragile context of their communities. Given that the transition period to a formal DDR process was extended beyond initial expectations, the request for no-cost extension until June 2015 was submitted.

IOM proposed to channel the remaining unspent funds from return operations into the reinsertion component. With this measure, the focus of the project shifted to the communities that received the ex-combatants. In this transitional period, in line with the strategic approach of the UN SRSG in CAR for creating a positive reconciliation environment, as set forth by the Bangui Forum, the project could be a positive model to attract other elements of armed groups, contributing to enhanced security and to the prevention of new recruitments, particularly youth.

The lack of reliable information and of concrete examples of positive and successful (re)insertion and reconciliation initiatives is one potential cause for the mistrust among the project's beneficiaries and other war-affected populations, both combatants and victims, regarding peaceful solutions to the crisis. This pragmatic approach to concrete short-term reinsertion initiatives, even in a very short timeframe, has demonstrated positive results, as in Sibut and Kaga Bandoro where other Ex-Seleka groups requested to be considered for voluntary disarmament and for similar reinsertion activities.

