

**SECRETARY-GENERAL'S PEACEBUILDING FUND  
PBF PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT TEMPLATE**



**PBF PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT**

**COUNTRY:** Burundi, Tanzania

**TYPE OF REPORT:** SEMI-ANNUAL, ANNUAL OR FINAL FINAL REPORT

**DATE OF REPORT:** 20/12/2019

<p><b>Project Title:</b> Preventing conflict and building peace through addressing the drivers of conflict and instability associated with forced displacement between Burundi and Tanzania</p> <p><b>Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway:</b></p>	
<p><b>PBF project modality:</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IRF</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PRF</p>	<p><b>If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Country Trust Fund</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regional Trust Fund</p> <p><b>Name of Recipient Fund:</b></p>
<p><b>List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed type of organization (UN, CSO etc):</b> UNDP, IOM, UNHCR (Burundi &amp; Tanzania)</p> <p><b>List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental:</b> COPED, ACCORD, Burundi Scouts Association, BAR Association, ZOA International</p>	
<p><b>Project commencement date<sup>1</sup>:</b> 15.12.2017</p> <p><b>Project duration in months:<sup>2</sup></b> 15</p>	
<p><b>Does the project fall under one of the specific PBF priority windows below:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Gender promotion initiative</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Youth promotion initiative</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cross-border or regional project</p>	
<p><b>Total PBF approved project budget* (by recipient organization):</b></p> <p>UNDP Burundi: \$ 745 041</p> <p>UNDP Tanzania : \$ 100 243</p> <p>UNHCR Burundi : \$ 169 359</p> <p>UNHCR Tanzania : \$ 424 908</p> <p>IOM Burundi : \$ 140 000</p> <p>IOM Tanzania : \$ 420 431</p> <p>Total: USD 1 999 981</p> <p><i>*The overall approved budget and the release of the second and any subsequent tranche are conditional and subject to PBSO's approval and subject to availability of funds in the PBF account</i></p> <p><b>How many tranches have been received so far:</b></p>	
<p><b>Report preparation:</b></p> <p>Project report prepared by: UNHCR, UNDP, IOM Burundi and Tanzania</p> <p>Project report approved by: Mads Knudsen</p> <p>Did PBF Secretariat clear the report: Yes</p> <p>Any comments from PBF Secretariat on the report: No</p>	

<sup>1</sup> Note: commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer.

<sup>2</sup> Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months.

Has the project undertaken any evaluation exercises? Please specify and attach:

An independent evaluation was undertaken October - December 2020 by independent evaluator Christian Bugnion de Moreta.

The evaluation finds that Outcome and 2 and 3 were achieved, but that the project period was too short for assessment of longer term peacebuilding impact. Outcome 1 was partially achieved as changes in the peacebuilding context and humanitarian access in the border areas changed during project implementation. The independent evaluation recommends the development of a scaled-up phase 2 of the project with a longer time frame and larger budget.

Based in the findings, the independent evaluation recommends that partners scale-up the project targeted the most successful components, with new donors. It is recommended that a such phase 2 should have an increased budget, a wider geographical scope and longer implementation period and focus on the following thematic areas of work:

- 1) Protection of human rights (for both refugees and mixed migrants) through the development of enhanced socio-economic reintegration schemes with mixed population groups (returnees, IDPs and host communities) in Burundi. Develop socio-economic protection of host communities in Tanzania to ensure fair and equitable attention to socio-economically vulnerable individuals, regardless of their legal status, as conflict prevention measure.
- 2) Expand and consolidate the conflict resolution and CBCR approaches on both sides of the border. Increase the number of committees trained; Ensure a visible commitment to peace by the PBF, through construction of “peace houses” that can be built by community members themselves using cash for work modalities and equipped with the necessary material to hold meetings; Keep the statistics and ensure the necessary support in order to develop a strong data monitoring system that provides evidence about the usefulness of the conflict resolution approaches. recommends to target such a project towards the most successful identified in the evaluation, including

The evaluation is based in 34 individual and group interviews with beneficiaries, implementing partners and UN agencies in UNHCR, IOM, UNDP at local, national and regional level. Field data collection was undertaken in Makamba and Ruyigi provinces, Burundi and Kibondo and Kakonko districts, Tanzania undertaken in October 2020. The report finds the

## **NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:**

- *Avoid acronyms and UN jargon, use general / common language.*
- *Be as concrete as possible. Avoid theoretical, vague or conceptual discourse.*
- *Ensure the analysis and project progress assessment is gender and age sensitive.*

## **PART 1: RESULTS PROGRESS**

### **1.1 Overall project progress to date**

Briefly explain the **status of the project** in terms of its implementation cycle, including whether all preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (1500 character limit): All components of the programme were implemented by UNDP, UNHCR and IOM in Burundi and Tanzania and completed in March 2019.

Below the components;

Outcome 1: Support to humanitarian border management (HBM) was delivered by UNHCR and IOM. UNHCR Tanzania conducted a total of 28 border monitoring activities while IOM completed several assessments at border points. The two agencies coordinated and carried out joint capacity building trainings for border officials of both countries. In addition, UNHCR conducted 2 trainings with local authorities to strengthen working relations and capacitate participants with a basic understanding on refugee matters

Outcome 2: The socioeconomic reintegration component was implemented by IOM and UNDP in Burundi. IOM Cash for Work and Quick Impact Projects activities were finalized and an Agricultural Vocational Training scheme was implemented by IOM in Ruyigi. UNDP delivered Income Generating Activities and supported 37 producer associations in Makamba.

Outcome 3: Conflict analysis and capacity assessment of existing conflict resolution/prevention and peacebuilding capacities as well as 3 toolkits for training on Community Based Conflict Resolution (CBCR) were developed in Tanzania by UNDP used for 8 trainings and workshops for refugee & host community members. UNHCR undertook border monitoring missions in the borderlands as well as protection monitoring. Conflict Resolution and Access to Justice activities reached over 5000 beneficiaries.

Given the recent/current political/peacebuilding/ transition situation/ needs in the country, has the project been/ does it continue to be **relevant** and well placed to address potential conflict factors/ sources of tensions/ risks to country's sustaining peace progress? Please illustrate. If project is still ongoing, are any adjustments required? (1500 character limit)

The context and dynamics that led to the creation of the project changed during project implementation as Tanzania pulled out of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework and closed refugee reception centres. This led to additional needs in terms of planning for a large number of returns and supporting reintegration. A large number of refugees returning from Tanzania to Burundi in 2018 coupled with a forecast of further significant returnee movement in 2019 made the project even more relevant, as demand for resilience and peacebuilding interventions at community level was high. In the lead-up to presidential elections in early 2020, there is a significant need for continued and strong sustaining peace efforts.

In the start of 2019 lessons from the project as such supported the formulation of a Joint UN Refugee Return and Reintegration Plan in Burundi, in line with the National Strategy for the Reintegration of Disaster Affected People and the National Development Plan.

In a few sentences, summarize **what is unique/ innovative/ interesting** about what this project is trying/ has tried to achieve or its approach (rather than listing activity progress) (1500 character limit).

The comparative advantage of having UNHCR, IOM and UNDP from Burundi and Tanzania working jointly offered an opportunity to realize the humanitarian - development – peace nexus - to sustain and build peace across the border. The three agencies were able to deliver jointly across the Triple Nexis reaching integrated peacebuilding results:

The collaboration allowed for planning a transitional shift from initial humanitarian responses, to a development-oriented and peace-building focused approach shared jointly by the agencies. This approach was based in solid coordination to ensure sustainable livelihood recovery of vulnerable groups and durable transformation of local and cross-border conflicts.

The project placed people at the centre of action across the three outcomes:

1. In terms of prohibition of refolement, respecting the right to return as well as protecting vulnerable individuals through referrals to local services, ensuring security in both countries, under Outcome 1
2. A people-centred approach laid behind socio-economic reintegration of returnees and IDP's in to Burundian host communities, using community-based, community driven and community led approaches, under Outcome 2
3. The people-centered approach underpinned the work with governments to fully comply with their humanitarian obligations for a protection-sensitive management of population cross-border movements, and with regards to local conflict resolution, under Outcome 3.

Considering the project's implementation cycle, please **rate this project's overall progress towards results to date:**  
on track

In a few sentences summarize **major project peacebuilding progress/results** (with evidence), which PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit):

Key Achievements include;

- i) Peace-making community based conflict resolution systems established helped ensure that 300 cases were peacefully resolved
- ii) Resilience of border communities improved by socio-economic reintegration of returnees and IDPs through short-term employment and job training for 625 persons,
- iii) Legal and conflict mediation support to 5000 returnees, IDP's and host community members

- iv) Crisis management guide designed and new SOP's for humanitarian border management contributed to more sustainable cross-border collaboration
- v) Joint trainings between immigration and border police officers increased knowledge in protection sensitive humanitarian border management
- vi) Improved facilities at points of entry to adequately manage a crisis situation and support border police with relevant equipment including vehicles and IT/office items
- vii) Promoting and strengthening of coordination between local administration, police services, health services, civil protection help prevent and strengthen preparedness for crisis involving population flows across the border
- viii) Monitoring of protection situation of refugee returnees and facilitating access to basic services, including health, education, administrative documentation, justice and legal assistance, including related to GBV, child protection and land disputes' resolution
- ix) Better contingency plan for disaster management at the national, provincial and municipal levels improved resilience

In a few sentences, explain how the project has made **real human impact**, that is, how did it affect the lives of any people in the country – where possible, use direct quotes that PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit):

The project positively affected to improved co-existence between refugees, returnees, IDP's and host communities in target border areas highly affected by population movements. The established peace-building and conflict resolution systems combined with livelihood activities and legal and mediation support contributed to building social cohesion and reducing pressure on target areas of return. The result being easing of social tensions which arise between host communities, returnees and IDP's sharing scarce resources. Working together on infrastructure rehabilitation through short-term employment of members of the three groups improved the sense of unity and togetherness. As an example, Antoine Gahungu, a returnee from Ruyigi and father of six, temporarily employed on the Quick Impact Project of the Rukobe inter-communal bridge rehabilitation said; "This bridge which connects Gahinga and Rukobe hills is very important for the community. The bridge used to be made of wooden logs and would get destroyed every rainy season." He added, "It was very difficult to walk across the bridge with our merchandise to reach the market or with a sick person that needs to get to the health centre in Gisuru." Gahungu was employed in one of the short-term jobs that the project created;" I have been able to work and earn some money. This allowed me to prepare my children for the new school year".

If the project progress assessment is **on-track**, please explain what the key **challenges** (if any) have been and which measures were taken to address them (1500 character limit).

Changes in the political environment led to delays in the implementation of some aspects of the project. On the Burundi side, the referendum and temporary suspension of International Non-Governmental Organizations caused delays to delivery of some activities.

On the Tanzania side, implementing partners were confronted with a shrinking protection environment, including lack of access for the UN and implementing partners to areas hosting refugees from Burundi and DRC, as well as limited access to border areas for humanitarian

actors. This situation hampered UNHCR's ability to document protection needs for newly arrived refugees, including persons with specific needs and vulnerabilities. It also limited the ability to assess the extent to which border authorities implemented the legal framework governing humanitarian border management. In January 2018, the Government of Tanzania withdrew from the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework, which was followed by measures to restrict livelihood opportunities for refugees, such as the closure of common markets. Since, the Government of Tanzania has articulated in several instances the wish for all Burundian refugees to return, before the end of 2019, most recently in End August 2019, laying out a plan to return all refugees by the end of the year from October 1st.

If the assessment is **off-track**, please list main reasons/ **challenges** and explain what impact this has had/will have on project duration or strategy and what **measures** have been taken/ will be taken to address the challenges/ rectify project progress (1500 character limit):

The challenges faced by the project were exogenous, but participating UN agencies used different fora and advocacy opportunities to ensure that as many project's activities as possible were carried out in a timely manner. The no-cost extension until 31 March 2019 by PBF was very helpful in this context as it allowed for finalisation of the remaining activities, thus strengthening results within and between the three Outcomes. The extension also allowed project partners to consolidate results of activities already concluded in the original project period, as sustainability and ownership could be built through handover to local stakeholders and workshops focused on lessons learned.

Please attach as a separate document(s) any materials highlighting or providing more evidence for project progress (for example: publications, photos, videos, monitoring reports, evaluation reports etc.). List below what has been attached to the report, including purpose and audience.

Annex 1 Monitoring Mission Report, September 2018 (Tanzania and Burundi)

Annex 2 Humanitarian Border Management Assessment Reports

Annex 3 Progress photos of Quick Impact Projects and Agricultural Income Generating Activities

Annex 4 Annual report, 15 November 2018

## 1.2 Result progress by project outcome

*The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes. If your project has more approved outcomes, contact PBSO for template modification.*

**Outcome 1:** The instability at the Tanzania-Burundi border is reduced, and the rights of stranded, vulnerable migrants, internally displaced persons, and asylum seekers are better protected by immigration officials and other relevant authorities.

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

**Progress summary:** Describe main progress under this Outcome made during the reporting period (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration), including major output progress (not all individual activities). If the project is starting to make/ has made a difference at the outcome level, provide specific evidence for the progress (quantitative and qualitative) and explain how it impacts the broader political and peacebuilding context. Where possible, provide specific examples of change the project has supported/ contributed to as well as, where available and relevant, quotes from partners or beneficiaries about the project and their experience. (3000 character limit)?

To strengthen the capacity of border police in both countries, needs assessment and designing of training modules in consultation of governmental counterparts were conducted. UNHCR Burundi conducted border monitoring missions at border posts of Ruyigi and Makamba provinces and protection monitoring activities were implemented through community monitors' data collection on protection needs of refugee returnees.

UNHCR conducted 28 border monitoring activities at four border entry points in Kabanga, Kasange, Bugarama and Murusagamba. UNHCR also conducted key information interviews (including with local authorities) on the capacity of basic support services in the targeted areas of return.

IOM identified relevant Humanitarian Border Management (HBM) focal points in Burundi and in Tanzania (IOM) who possessed specialized and extensive knowledge on border management in general and humanitarian and border management in particular. These Government officials were valuable sources of information and contributed to the delivery of activities related to HBM in both countries.

Technical working meetings with HBM focal points in Burundi were organized out, as part of the HBM border assessments in July 2018, and at Manyovu and Mabamba in July 2018 for Tanzania to understand the existing national procedures and measure in both countries, taking into account regional and national political stability economic indicators, development and exposure to natural disasters.

Humanitarian border assessments were also conducted by IOM at Mugina (Makamba province) and at Gisuru (Ruyigi province) in 2018 for Burundi, and at Manyovu and Makamba for Tanzania in July 2018. The assessments identified concerns, challenges and needs (trainings, equipment, etc.) faced by police officers of border management operating at the entry points targeted by the project. The border missions identified existing mechanisms (committees, meetings and ad hoc meetings with authorities, security services and communities, also with Tanzania) aimed at strengthening border security and cooperation.

All information collected during these two above mentioned activities are compiled on the two HBM assessment reports (Annex).

Additionally, IOM carried out a technical border assessment on infrastructure and equipment needs in September 2018, identifying specific needs and guiding future activities, such as purchase of needed equipment. Following this assessment, donation of IT equipment and solar electricity connection were done. Joint trainings on HBM best practices in Burundi and Tanzania and coordination meetings were organized bringing together the immigration services from both countries and setting grounds for SOPs development on HBM to enhance and promote sustainable cross-border collaboration, especially on HBM issues. Finally, those assessments have allowed UNHCR and IOM carry out Capacity Building on Humanitarian Border Management for border officials.

**Outcome 2:** Displaced persons and members of host communities, with specific attention to youth and women, have increased access to livelihood and employment and become key actors of peace and development in cross-border areas.

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

**Progress summary:** *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*

To enhance access to livelihood and employment for the returnees, IDP's and vulnerable host communities, UNDP and IOM implemented Cash for Work and Income Generating Activities in Mabanda and Kayogoro (Makamba province) and Gisuru (Ruyigi province) in Burundi. Through its implementing partners COPED and Burundi Scouts Association, UNDP cash for work activities assisted 520 people (260 beneficiaries in Mabanda and 260 in Kayogoro) while IOM worked with 105 beneficiaries in Ruyigi. Beneficiary selection was community based and at least 50% of beneficiaries were women. Moreover, as a way to foster social cohesion, Cash for Work groups in all areas of work included returnees, IDP's and host community members. Identification of projects was done through community dialogues, which created an open exchange to collectively determine and prioritize Quick Impact Projects (QIP) that would increase the capacity of host communities to absorb returnees and internally displaced population. Community representatives in the area of UNDP work (Mabanda and Kayogoro, Makamba province) chose the rehabilitation of feeder roads as a way to improve access to markets and schools.

Communities supported by IOM in Munyinya and Niyabitaka Hills, (Ruyigi province) prioritized the rehabilitation of 15 water sources that were partially or completely damaged, or newly constructed after capping water springs, and the community in Rukobe Hill selected rehabilitation of an inter-communal bridge. Engineering studies were conducted to design and build solid and long-lasting infrastructure structures. The structures were built with the support and inclusion of local QIP Maintenance Committees to ensure sustainability through ownership and maintenance.

IOM and UNDP also supported income-generating associations by providing trainings and business support packages and then linking them to local markets. Members of the associations supported by IOM, received a training focused on modern and sustainable agricultural techniques in Niyabitaka Hill. These new skills supported micro-businesses, which in turn were designed to provide livelihood activities. IOM also delivered Income Generating Activities to secure parcels of land so beneficiaries could immediately put their skills to use. Further, agricultural tool-kits were distributed, comprised of two hoes, a shovel, a watering can and fertilizer. Each of the 250 members of the IGAs also received a goat as part of their kits.

UNDP partners facilitated the creation of 37 cooperatives and producer associations (Income generating Association) initiated by beneficiaries. At the end of the project, in February 2019 a workshop focused on exchange of experience between older and newer cooperatives and associations took place in Makamba. This allowed successful beneficiaries to share testimonies to new ones on their experience with different entrepreneurship strategies. As an outcome, a Platform for Entrepreneurs was created.



**Outcome 3:** Refugee and returnee populations and members of their respective host communities, supported by alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, engage in peaceful ways to resolve conflicts and address grievances

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

**Progress summary:** *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*

Based on a mapping of conflict resolution, prevention and peacebuilding capacity of local leaders, youth, community-based organizations and CSO's in the project areas, UNDP Burundi, through its implementing partner ACCORD, delivered dialogue and conflict resolution trainings as well as conflict prevention and social cohesion activities in Mabanda and Kayogoro communes in Makamba Province and Gisuru commune of Ruyigi province.

Through 3 offices providing free legal support, the Burundi BAR Association handled for UNDP 270 cases related to land conflicts, 81 of which involved returnees (180 female and 90 male). 115 of cases were judged by the time of project closure. 1200 persons, half of which were women, were supported with legal assistance and support to obtain administrative documents. 5415 people were reached by information and sensitization workshops of which 2552 were women.

UNDP Tanzania undertook a mapping of conflict resolution / prevention and peacebuilding capacity of local leaders, youths and of community-based organizations and CSO's in the project areas as well as a regional conflict analysis. Findings were used to inform design of trainings and capacity development, leading to the development of 3 toolkits on Community-Based Conflict Resolution (CBCR).

14 trainings were done targeting community-based organizations, religious leaders, regional and district authorities from Kakonko, Kibondo and Kigoma. The objective was to strengthen capacity on community-based conflict prevention and enable participants to facilitate dialogues as well as strengthen social and gender integration, cooperation and coordination among actors. Following training of trainers, 5 CBCR training sessions with 201 participants for leaders and community members of both host communities and refugee camps were conducted. 2 in Nduta's and in Mtendeli's refugee camps and 3 in host communities in Kibondo and Kakonko districts. Participants were equipped with skills on effective participation in community-based conflict resolution, community dialogues, articulation of gender issues and appreciation of their important roles in mitigating tensions and violence in societies.

Participants were required to prepare action plans on how to use the acquired knowledge and skills in conflict resolution. The 6 CBCR trainings culminated in two districts stakeholders' training workshops (86 participants) in which existing approaches were reviewed and the principles of Community Dialogues for Sustainable Peace (CDSP) model were integrated. In Kibondo; 45 sub-villages CBCR committees, 5 Village CBCR Committees and 3 Ward CBCR committees were formed. In Kakonko 32 sub-village CBCR committees and 5 village committees.

In Mtendeli Camp local leaders attributed the decline in the number of conflicts from 7 to 3 to the trainings. The approach has inspired other partners, including local government and CSO's to continue to apply this approach, hence making results sustainable.

## **Outcome 4:**

**Rate the current status of the outcome progress: Please select one**

**Progress summary:** (see guiding questions under Outcome 1)

### **1.3 Cross-cutting issues**

<p><b><u>National ownership:</u></b> How has the national government demonstrated ownership/ commitment to the project results and activities? Give specific examples. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>National and local authorities in both countries consistently expressed their acceptance of project's activities. In a public meeting between Governor of Ruyigi province and District Commissioner of Kibondo (26 October 2018) with UN presence, the provincial officials expressed support and commendment of the project and called for its expansion, given the large and growing needs, stemming from an increasing number of returnees and IDP's in Burundi and tensions between refugees and hoset communities on the Tanzania side of the border. During other meetings with authorities, government has shown support and offered office spaces to implementing partners.</p> <p>In Tanzania local community leaders openly supported peacebuilding and conflict resolution in their areas. In Burundi, local authorities expressed their support and provided valuable collaboration. In Gisuru commune, Ruyigi province, UNDP's implementing partner used and worked in communal offices. In the same province, local authorities collaborated with IOM for the identification of areas with the highest number of vulnerable populations. The local authorities also accompanied IOM during various field missions to conduct quick needs assessments and case studies.</p>
<p><b><u>Monitoring:</u></b> Is the project M&amp;E plan on track? What monitoring methods and sources of evidence are being/ have been used? Please attach any monitoring-related reports for the reporting period. (1500 character limit)?</p>	<p>Although the project had a specific M&amp;E framework developed at the beginning of the project, agencies used their own plans and modalities. Methods and sources of collecting evidence varied across activities from satisfaction surveys and Focus Group Discussions to assess beneficiary satisfaction. o follow up with the implementing partner. Furthermore progress reports and visits to visually appreciate progress was used.</p>
<p><b><u>Evaluation:</u></b> Provide an update on the preparations for the external evaluation for the project, especially if within last 6 months of implementation or final report. Confirm available budget for evaluation. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The evaluation process is currently ongoing.</p>
<p><b><u>Catalytic effects (financial):</u></b> Did the project lead to any specific non-PBF funding commitments? If yes, from</p>	<p>Both country teams, as well as the Great Lakes Regional Strategic Framework Secretariat constantly provided advocacy and resource mobilization support in view to</p>

<p>whom and how much? If not, have any specific attempts been made to attract additional financial contributions to the project and beyond? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>increase funding to cover for increased needs and population caseload in both Burundi and Tanzania. A mission from US embassy in Dar es Salaam was carried out to project areas in Tanzania. There were also discussions with ECHO, the EU Conflict and Stability Instrument, the Burundi US embassy and DFID Tanzania to develop a follow up project</p>
<p><b>Catalytic effects (non-financial):</b> Did the project create favourable conditions for additional peacebuilding activities by Government/ other donors? If yes, please specify. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The Governments of Tanzania and Burundi contributed to project outcomes in terms of human resources (border monitoring officers). In Burundi authorities of targeted provinces contributed by seconding personnel to participate to missions and by availing administrative offices to support the setting up of implementing partners activities. A Ministry of Interiors and Justice representative were always engaged to missions and livelihood and Rule of Law activities are part of the National Reintegration Strategy and therefore under the government coordination and responsibility.</p> <p>The changing and evolving contexts in both Tanzania and Burundi, during the project, called for strengthened and coordinated inter-agency efforts to support peaceful reintegration.</p> <p>In Tanzania, the Community Based Conflict Resolution model was adopted and applied by the Danish Refugee Council.</p> <p>The project approach demonstrated its worth and was supported by government representatives in the different targeted provinces. Additional peacebuilding interventions adapted to the evolved context needed to ensure the sustainability of the success achieved through this project.</p>
<p><b>Exit strategy/ sustainability:</b> What steps have been taken to prepare for end of project and help ensure sustainability of the project results beyond PBF support for this project? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Alignment of project activities with National and Local Development Plans have facilitated the handover of the project components to local authorities and government agencies. Collaboration with existing local administrative offices and hiring of local paralegals have ensured that the capacity will remain in the provinces after the end of the project. Strengthened focus on the capacity development of local administration was created to ensure a smooth exit and sustainability of the achieved results.</p>
<p><b>Risk taking:</b> Describe how the project has responded to risks that threatened the achievement of results. Identify any new risks that have emerged since the last report. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Constant dialogue between agencies and Tanzanian authorities helped clarify the objectives of the planned activities that were to be implemented at border areas (Humanitarian Border Management training), which were initially suspended due to Tanzania's withdrawal from CRRF and of the closure of entry points. In Burundi many different situations did put project elements at risk: the presidential referendum and suspension of INGO's in the</p>

	last quarter of 2018, being key examples. Negotiations and compliance with government requests facilitated the resumption of activities.
<b>Gender equality:</b> In the reporting period, which activities have taken place with a specific focus on addressing issues of gender equality or women's empowerment? (1500 character limit)	This project is Gender Marker 2. Livelihood and Economic Recovery and Rule of Law activities implemented in Burundi by IOM and UNDP had a strong focus on gender. Participation of selected women for the implementation of those activities were above 50%. In Tanzania capacity building for border officials and local communities on peacebuilding were adhering to gender equality principle by ensuring at least 50% of beneficiaries were women.
<b>Other:</b> Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations? (1500 character limit)	The implementation of this cross-border project was instrumental in highlighting the added value and comparative advantage of inter-agency collaboration. Several elements of coordination were tested, and they offered important lessons for future similar projects. One of the central aspects learnt is the importance of regular and improved communication as a tool for project quality.

**1.3 INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT:** *Using the Project Results Framework as per the approved project document or any amendments- provide an update on the achievement of key indicators at both the outcome and output level in the table below (if your project has more indicators than provided in the table, select the most relevant ones with most relevant progress to highlight). Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation. Provide gender and age disaggregated data. (300 characters max per entry)*

	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Current indicator progress</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)</b>	<b>Adjustment of target (if any)</b>
<b>Outcome 1</b> The instability at the Tanzania-Burundi border was reduced, and the rights of stranded, vulnerable migrants, internally displaced persons, and asylum seekers are better protected by immigration officials and other	Indicator 1.1 % of trained personnel that can point to concrete cases that demonstrate that information disseminated during trainings improved the efficacy of their service delivery and the way displaced persons are dealt with 6 months after they received training	n/a	100 %	50%. 1 joint UNHCR/IOM training on Humanitarian Border Management (HBM) procedures for border officials took place from 12-15 November. In addition, UNHCR conducted 2 trainings with local authorities to strengthen working relations.	Pushback from the Government of Tanzania (GoT) with regard to border management-related activities: The GoT has closed reception and transit centers at border points with Burundi. No new arrivals have been recorded since May 2018.	
	Indicator 1.2 # of protection issues recorded in the border area.	1,362	Reduction by 50%.	Target achieved: In 2018, the refoulement of a total of 173	The restricted access to border areas hampered protection monitoring activities. UNHCR kept close collaboration with Partners on the ground	

	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Current indicator progress</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)</b>	<b>Adjustment of target (if any)</b>
relevant authorities.				individuals, 59 from Burundi and 114 from DRC, was recorded. While 2018 numbers constitute a significant decrease in relation to 2017. Note that it's difficult to compile records of incidents of refoulement as border points remained closed.	and intervened on occasions when there was information about arrivals from Burundi through unofficial border points and routes. UNHCR intervened to 96 cases	
	Indicator 1.3 of vulnerable persons crossing the border who are identified and referred to assistance mechanisms per quarter.	Below 100	n/a	In 2018, 1774 asylum seekers were registered in Tanzania, 1773 from DRC, 1 from Burundi. The new arrivals were provided with registration and	The lack of access to border areas due to official border points closed hampered protection activities.	

	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Current indicator progress</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)</b>	<b>Adjustment of target (if any)</b>
				assistance. UNHCR recorded the refoulement of 173 individuals, 59 from Burundi and 114 from DRC. UNHCR tried to intervene in at least 96 cases of refoulement.		
Output 1.1 Humanitarian Border Management mechanisms are strengthened through direct support and training of national security forces (IOM)	Indicator 1.1.1 # of Humanitarian border management assessment conducted	1	2	2		
	Indicator 1.1.2 Security committee members, immigration and police officers from both countries at the Tz-Burundi border	0	60	60		

	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Current indicator progress</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)</b>	<b>Adjustment of target (if any)</b>
	demonstrate increased knowledge in protection sensitive humanitarian border management, including GBV.					
Output 1.2 Effective and efficient protection monitoring and assessments are carried out and on both sides of the border between Tanzania and Burundi;	Indicator 1.2.1 # of border monitoring visits conducted and recorded.	0	1	134	Target reached:A joint (IOM TZA, UNHCR TZA,Commissioner of Immigration)border assessment mission took place in July. UNHCR conducted 29 border monitoring activities at the 4 border entry points; Kabanga, Kasange, Bugarama and Murusagamba from Jan.– May 2018. In Burundi 105 border monitoring visits.	
	Indicator 1.2.2 # of protection training workshops carried out	0	2	2	Target reached: UNHCR conducted 2 trainings with local authorities to strengthen working relations and capacitate the community with a basic understanding on refugees and asylum seekers.	
Output 1.3	Indicator 1.3.1					



	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Current indicator progress</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)</b>	<b>Adjustment of target (if any)</b>
	Indicator 1.3.2					
<b>Outcome 2</b> The resilience capacities of displaced persons and host communities are strengthened	Indicator 2.1 Number of Cash for Work beneficiaries working in the rehabilitation of communities' infrastructure.	0	105	105	Target reached	
	Indicator 2.2 Number vulnerable displaced, returnees and members of host communities, disaggregated by age and sex, in Mabanda and Kayogoro benefiting from strengthened livelihoods	0	520	520	Pilot emergency job creation through Cash for Work for the rehabilitation of community infrastructures benefiting the most vulnerable members of the displacement affected communities (IDPs, returned and host communities); 520 workers over 75 days (260 workers for each "commune" (Kayogoro and Maband)	

	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Current indicator progress</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)</b>	<b>Adjustment of target (if any)</b>
	Indicator 2.3 #of community based professional associations composed 20-25 persons each created and provided support through business incubators.	0	10	10	as above	
Output 2.1 Returnees, IDPs and vulnerable members of host communities, with a specific attention to women and young people, have access to both short	Indicator 2.1.1 # of rehabilitated community infrastructures	0	3	3	These three projects were selected by the communities; Munyinya and Niyabitaka hill and Rukobe. Munyinya and Niyabitaka prioritized the rehabilitation of their water sources as Rukobe selected the rehabilitation of inter-communal bridge.	
	Indicator 2.1.2 Number of mixed associations created and supported to diversify livelihood opportunities in		15	37		

	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Current indicator progress</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)</b>	<b>Adjustment of target (if any)</b>
term employment and long-term livelihood opportunities contributing to strengthen the resilience of the communities and to reinforce social cohesion	host communities					
Output 2.2	Indicator 2.2.1					
	Indicator 2.2.2					
Output 2.3	Indicator 2.3.1					
	Indicator 2.3.2					
<b>Outcome 3</b> Refugee and	Indicator 3.1 Number of cases	0	tbc	300		

	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Current indicator progress</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)</b>	<b>Adjustment of target (if any)</b>
returnee populations and members of their respective host communities, supported by alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, engage in peaceful ways to resolve conflicts and address grievances.	peacefully resolved by created or strengthened conflict resolution mechanisms					
	Indicator 3.2 Level of trust of displaced and returnees disaggregated by age and sex in legal aid mechanisms set in place, disaggregated by age and sex.		1500	5415 2552 women 2863 men	The indicator shows how many benificarieis were reached in total by legal support, information and sentisization workshops in Burundi	
	Indicator 3.3 % of returnees and displaced persons, disaggregated by age and sex, who participate into community based organizations	0	tbc	0		

	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Current indicator progress</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)</b>	<b>Adjustment of target (if any)</b>
	(including cultural associations, women's' and youth groups, local meetings etc.)					
Output 3.1 Returnees and host communities have access to trust and efficient legal assistance, alternative resolutions of conflict to resolve displacement related issues and disputes in a peaceful way	Indicator 3.1.1 Number of paralegals trained and on board. Data disaggregated by sex	0	90	90	Target reached	
	Indicator 3.1.2 Number of displacement related conflict and land conflict solved. Data disaggregated by sex and age.	0	1500	2784 41% men 59% women		
Output 3.2 Community	Indicator 3.2.1 Number of toolkits	0	3	3		

	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Current indicator progress</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)</b>	<b>Adjustment of target (if any)</b>
based conflict resolutions mechanisms are developed and strengthened in places of return and return areas.	/training curriculums developed to train peace committees					
	Indicator 3.2.2 Number of participants successfully trained on conflict analysis, prevention & dialogue. Data disaggregated by sex.	Low levels of knowledge on conflict analysis, prevention & dialogue	Increased capacities on conflict analysis, prevention & dialogue by more than 50%	Total 213 ( 108 female and 105 male).	The trainings have brought positive results in changing the host community and refugees' knowledge on community-based conflict resolution through community dialogue in Kibando and Kakonko districts, Tanzania. The CDSP approach used, was inspirational to other partners involved.	
Output 3.3	Indicator 3.3.1					
	Indicator 3.3.2					
<b>Outcome 4</b>	Indicator 4.1					
	Indicator 4.2					
	Indicator 4.3					
Output 4.1	Indicator 4.1.1					

	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Current indicator progress</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)</b>	<b>Adjustment of target (if any)</b>
	Indicator 4.1.2					
Output 4.2	Indicator 4.2.1					
	Indicator 4.2.2					
Output 4.3	Indicator 4.3.1					
	Indicator 4.3.2					

## **PART 2: INDICATIVE PROJECT FINANCIAL PROGRESS**

### **2.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditures**

Please rate whether project financial expenditures are on track, delayed, or off track, vis-à-vis project plans and by recipient organization: *on track*

How many project budget tranches have been received to date and what is the overall level of expenditure against the total budget and against the tranche(s) received so far (500 characters limit):

When do you expect to seek the next tranche, if any tranches are outstanding:

If expenditure is delayed or off track, please provide a brief explanation (500 characters limit):

Please state what \$ amount was planned (in the project document) to be allocated to activities focussed on gender equality or women's empowerment and how much has been actually allocated to date:

Please fill out and attach Annex A on project financial progress **with detail on expenditures/ commitments to date using the original project budget table in Excel**, even though the \$ amounts are indicative only.