PBF PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT
COUNTRY: Burundi
TYPE OF REPORT: SEMI-ANNUAL, ANNUAL OR FINAL Semi-annual
DATE OF REPORT: 14 June, 2018

Project Title: Preventing conflict and building peace through addressing the drivers of conflict and instability associated with forced displacement between Burundi and Tanzania	
Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway: 00108194	

PBF project modality:	**If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund:**
☒ IRF	☐ Country Trust Fund
☐ PRF	☐ Regional Trust Fund
	Name of Recipient Fund:

List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed type of organization (UN, CSO etc):
UNDP, IOM, UNHCR (Burundi&Tanzania)
List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental:
COPED, ACCORD, Burundi Scouts Association, BAR Association, ZOA International

Project commencement date[1]: 15/12/2017
Project duration in months:[2] 12

Does the project fall under one of the specific PBF priority windows below:
☐ Gender promotion initiative
☐ Youth promotion initiative
☐ Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions
☒ Cross-border or regional project

Total PBF approved project budget* (by recipient organization):
UNDP Burundi: $ 745 041

UNDP Tanzania   : $ 100 243

UNHCR Burundi   : $ 169 359

UNHCR Tanzania   : $ 424 908
IOM Burundi   :USD 140 000
IOM tanzania   : USD 420 431

Total: USD 1999 981
> *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*

How many tranches have been received so far: One(1)

Report preparation:
Project report prepared by: Cyriaque NDAYISENGA
Project report approved by: Matteo FRONTINI
Did PBF Secretariat clear the report: YES
Any comments from PBF Secretariat on the report:

---

[1] Note: commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer.
[2] 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: No

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):
In Tanzania UNHCR continues to disseminate voluntary repatriation information to Burundian refugees in the camps to enable them make informed decisions and UNDP finalized the recruitment of a consultant to implement the assessment and mapping of the existing conflict resolution/prevention and peacebuilding capacity of Community Based Organizations and Civil Society Organizations in the project areas. As part of the preliminary preparations UNDP has recruited an officer who will be based in the Kigoma region to follow up the overall project implementation. IOM and UNHCR activities at border points have been delayed but both agencies are currently discussing with authorities and plan to resume the work. In Burundi UNHCR has implemented border monitoring missions in Ruyigi and Makamba provinces as well as protection monitoring and data collection of protection needs and incidents faced by returnees. The Reintegration components, implemented by IOM and UNDP, is on track. Beneficiaries have been selected and cash for work activities started. Finally, Rule of Law and Conflict Resolution activities started in May. UNDP partners have identified community spaces for dialogue and exchange between host and returnee communities, and offices to offer legal and administrative support to people in need have been set up.

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 contexts and dynamics that led to the creation of the project have changed with Tanzania pulling out of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework and the referendum now past and a relatively more secure environment slowly shaping up in Burundi. These changes however make the reintegration context potentially more complex than before. The risk that the Government of Tanzania, following its withdrawal from the CRRF, asks for a return of all refugees back to a "peaceful" Burundi is a reality and it would result in a massive return of refugees to areas of pre-displacement with consequent increased tensions with host communities. It is for this reason that it is important to use this project to pilot the relevance of the approach used toward the creation of conditions for a peaceful and successful return and reintegration of refugees.

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 working together offers a unique opportunity to shade light - and a practical example - on the humanitarian and development nexus. This collaboration allows for a shift from initial humanitarian responses, to a more development oriented approach consisting in an sustainable economic recovery of

vulnerable categories of population and durable transformation of conflicts, within the lifespan of a single project. On a more technical level this project takes an innovative approach in putting people at the center of action. A Community Dialogue strategy is used to identify beneficiaries and community structures to rehabilitate (Outcome 2). The dialogues are an open and free space that provide community members - returnees, IDPs and host populations - and their representatives a platform to identify the most vulnerable families and express the common needs. This approach fosters the engagement and the ownership of the community on major and sensitive decisions; the list of beneficiaries of the cash for work activities (and future Income Generating Activities) and the identification of the infrastructures to rehabilitate. It is a practical means to address the socio-economic needs of the most vulnerable by also furthering the building of peace.

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):
Real impact on peacebuilding progress cannot be measured at this stage of implementation. However the positive engagement of both Governments and particularly the Burundian Government is instrumental for the success of the project. The Burundian Government engagement resulted in a total acceptance and commitment from the Governors and administrators of the two targeted provinces to support project implementation. Also, the Community-based approach used in the identification of beneficiaries and selection of cash for work activities is a fundamental first step toward building peace.

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):
n/a

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).
Following the withdrawal from the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework the government of Tanzania closed all reception and transit centers at border points. The subsequent delay in the implementation of the planned activities was the result of a misunderstanding that the capacity building of border police was directed at improving the management of new Burundian refugees arrivals. Discussions have clarified that the capacity building exercise was still relevant for the management of border crossing returnees. Finally the activity is now back on track.
In Burundi the main challenge was represented by the tensions leading to the constitutional referendum of May 17, 2018. Movements along the border areas were restricted and this impacted on the planned schedule of both UNDP and IOM activities in support of livelihood recovery, peace building and rule of law. During that time however meetings have taken place between the two agencies to harmonize approaches and discuss technicalities of project implementation. With the referendum now past and the security situation improving the activities are now back on schedule and no delays are foreseen.

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):

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.
1. Link to article on the launch of UNDP activities in the Makamba province
2. Photos (with captions) of project introduction to authorities and community based beneficiaries selection.

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, refugees, asylum-seekers, and internally displaced persons 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)?*
Preliminary preparations for the implementation of the assessment and the identification of training modules to be used to build capacity of border police in both countries have been completed. UNHCR implemented border monitoring missions at the official border posts of Ruyigi and Makamba provinces and protection monitoring activities were implemented through community monitors' data collection on the protection needs of the refugee returnees coming back to Burundi through the facilitated voluntary repatriation process and on protection incidents affecting them. UNHCR also conducted interviews to key informers (including local authorities and stakeholders) on the current capacity of basic support services in the targeted areas of return.

Outcome 2: Displaced persons and members of host communities, with specific attention to youth and women, have increased access to livelihood and employement 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)*
IOM and UNDP are both engaged on implementing outcome 2 activities. Meetings between the two agencies have taken place to harmonize approaches. Both agencies have implemented inception meetings in their respective targeted provinces; Ruygi for IOM and Makamba for UNDP. The meetings were as inclusive as possible and saw the participation of local

authorities, representatives of civil society organizations, implementing partners and representatives of local population including representatives of host communities, returnees and IDPs communitites. These have been important milestones toward achieving national and local ownership of the project.

IOM, through meetings and quick assessment exercises and case studies has so far identified locations for its interventions, determined types of community infrastructures to be rehabilitated through three Quick Impact Projects (QIPs) and implemented a preliminary beneficiary selection for the 105 Cash for Work participants in accordance with the UNDP/IOM harmonized beneficiary selection approach. Also, to mainstream gender and ensure the project reaches both women and youth, the selection criteria has been finalized to include 60% of women in all activities, and to ensure that 60% of the total are below the age of 30. IOM has also conducted multiple meetings to determine the modalities to create business incubators and discussed how to link the 10 established microbusinesses (Income Generating Associations) to the market. In Rukobe hill, Gisuru commune, a female beneficiary has expressed during the quick assessment visit in 14 March, 2018: "We are very excited for the start of the project. There is so much that could be improved in our community and could help our youth earn some income."

UNDP has contracted two implementing partners, namely COPED to work in the Makamba commune and The Burundi Scout Association to work in Kayogoro. Both organizations are local and therefore familiar with working in the two communes. Both organizations have selected, through a community based approach agreed upon with IOM, 260 vulnerable individuals each for a total of 520 participants to the Cash for Work activities. UNDP stressed the importance to focus on women and youths and therefore 40% of participants are women, 40% youths and 20% men. To achieve the goal to reinforce social cohesion, groups of workers include representatives of the three categories of population namely host communities, returnees and IDPs. Some of the cash for work activities have already started. A recent UNDP mission aiming at verifying the implementation status of livelihood and social cohesion activities visited two rehabilitation sites. All participants have been well informed about the different phases of the project and are thankful for the opportunity they have been given.

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)*
The assessment and mapping of the existing conflict resolution/prevention and peacebuilding capacity of local leaders and youths and of Community Based Organizations and Civil Society Organizations in the project areas is ongoing and should be finalized by end of June. In Burundi UNDP has contracted two partners: ACCORD for the component focusing on dialogue and conflict resolution techniques, conflict prevention and social cohesion activities and the BAR association that will work on the Rule of Law component.
Both organizations have already identified locations and facilities to set up the offices and community spaces for the implementation of activities.

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

National ownership: How has the national government demonstrated ownership/ commitment to the project results and activities? Give specific examples. (1500 character limit)	The engagement of National and Local authorities in both countries has been consistent. Meetings with authorities have shown the acceptance and interest for the implementation of activities planned. In Burundi local authorities have expressed their support and have provided valuable collaboration including sharing of detailed information regarding number of returnees (both of those who have returned through the UNHCR Voluntary Repatriation Program, and spontaneous returnees) and number of IDPs. The Governor of the Ruyigi province proposed to a UNDP implementing partner to use, free of charge, an available administrative building to set up 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.
Monitoring: Is the project M&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)?*	Although the project has its specific M&E plan agencies use their own methods and sources of collecting evidence. Methodologies vary from satisfaction surveys and Focus Group Discussion, forms to assess beneficiary satisfaction, Project Monitoring Visit Checklists to follow up with the Implementing Partner. Also more traditional reports and visits to visually appreciate progresses will be used.
Evaluation: 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)*	N/a
Catalytic effects (financial): Did the project lead to any specific non-PBF funding commitments? If yes, from 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)*	Both Country teams as well as the Great lakes strategic framework secretariat is constantly providing advocacy and resource mobilization in view to increase funding's therefore increase zones of intervention within the border areas between Burundi and Tanzania. A joint proposal has been developed and presented to KOICA (Chair of the Peace Building commission) and a formal letter was sent by the Office of the Special envoy for the Great Lakes to the Korean ambassador, we are waiting for feedback. The GLRSF is planning for a joint field mission to Kigoma with the Swiss Ambassador as well as USAID early September, the main objective of the mission is to show concrete results of the PBF Cross Border project therefore

	advocate for additional support.
Catalytic effects (non-financial): Did the project create favourable conditions for additional peacebuilding activities by Government/ other donors? If yes, please specify. *(1500 character limit)*	The Government of Tanzania contributes to the project outcomes in terms of human and financial resources. This is embedded in annual budgets. In Burundi authorities of target provinces contribute by seconding personnel to participate to missions and by availing admistrative offices to support the setting up on implementing partners activities. A Ministry of Interior representative is always engaged in missions as the Burundi components of the project (Livelihood and Rule of Law) are part of the National Reintegration Strategy and therefore under the government coordination and responsibility.
Exit strategy/ sustainability: 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)*	The success of the project will be measured by the level of sustainability we will be able to offer to livelihood and economic reintegration and rule of law activities. A proper exit strategy will have to be developed once and when results and challenges will be clearer.
Risk taking: 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)*	Constant dialogue between agencies and Tanzanian authorities helped clarify the objectives of the activities planned to be implemented at border areas that were initially suspended due to Tanzania's withdrawal from the CRRF. In Burundi the main risks were associated with the constitutional referendum. Agencies had to limit movements and strictly follow UNDSS regulations and warnings.
Gender equality: 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)*	Livelihood and economic recovery activities implemented in Burundi by IOM and UNDP have a strong focus on gender. Participation of women selected for the implemenetation of those activities is above 50%.
Other: Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations? *(1500 character limit)*	There is a very urgent and important need to reinforce inter-agencies partnership

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)

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
Outcome 1 Outcomes 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	Indicator 1.1 % of trained personnel that can point to concrete cases that demonstrate that information disseminated during trainings have improved the efficacy of their service delivery and the way displaced persons are dealt with 6 months after the received trai	# of personnel trained	100% of officials in the region have improved efficacy of service delivery	0	The delay emanates from ongoing voluntary repatriation in which most of the government officials who were to be trained are supporting the exercise.	n/a
	Indicator 1.2 # of protection issues recorded in the border area.	n/a	reduction by 50%	0	The delays in the assessment have affected the implementation of this activity. Also most of entry points for new arrivals were closed.	n/a

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
officials and other relevant authorities.	Indicator 1.3 # of vulnerable persons crossing the border who are identified and referred to assistance mechanisms per quarter.	n/a	100%	0	The delays in the commencement of the assessment affected the implementation of this activity.	
Output 1.1 Humanitarian Border Management mechanisms are strengthened through direct support and training of national security	Indicator 1.1.1 # of Humanitarian border management assessment conducted	1	2	1	Preliminary preparations for the assessment have been completed. There were some delays initially mainly in getting permission from the Government which has now been granted.	n/a
	Indicator 1.1.2 # Security committee members, immigration and police officers from both	0	60	0		n/a

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
forces (IOM).	countries at the Tz-Burundi border 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	Indicator 1.2.1 # of border monitoring visits conducted and recorded	0	1	0		
	Indicator 1.2.2 # of protection training workshops carried out	0	2	0		

	Performance Indicators	**Indicator Baseline**	**End of project Indicator Target**	**Current indicator progress**	**Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)**	**Adjustment of target (if any)**
Burundi;						
Output 1.3	Indicator 1.3.1					
	Indicator 1.3.2					
Outcome 2 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 infrastructures	0	105	0	As IOM is directly implementing, extensive field presence is required; as such, all UNDSS security measures must be strictly adhered to during the execution of all activities. Security concerns during April and May 2018 have significanlty limited IOM staff movement and implementation in the field	
	Indicator 2.2 Number vulnerable displaced, returnees and members of host communities, disaggregated by age and sex, in Mabanda and Kayogoro	0	520	520		

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
	benefiting from strengthened livelihoods					
	Indicator 2.3 # of community based professional associations composed of 20-25 persons each created and provided support through business incubators	0	10	0	as above	
Output 2.1 Returnees, IDPs and vulnerable members of host communities, with a specific attention to women and young	Indicator 2.1.1 # of rehabilitated community infrastructures	0	3	0		
	Indicator 2.1.2 Number of mixed associations created and supported to diversify livelihood opportunities in	0	15	0		

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
people, have access to both short 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					
	Indicator 2.3.1					

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
Output 2.3	Indicator 2.3.2					
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.	Indicator 3.1 Number of cases peacefully resolved by created or strengthened conflict resolution mechanisms	0	tbc	0		
	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	0	tbc	0		
	Indicator 3.3 % of returnees and displaced persons, disagreggated by	0	tbc	0		

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
	age and sex, who participate into community based organizations (including cultural associations, womens' 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	Indicator 3.1.1 Number of paralegals trained and on board. Data disaggregated by sex.	0	tbc	0		
	Indicator 3.1.2 % of displacement related conflict and land conflict solved. Data disaggregated by sex and age.	0	tbc	0		

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
in a peaceful way						
Output 3.2 Community based conflict resolutions mechanisms are developed and strengthened in places of return and return areas.	Indicator 3.2.1 Number of toolkits/ training curriculums developed to train peace committees	0	3	0		
	Indicator 3.2.2 Number of partipicants 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 50%	0		
Output 3.3	Indicator 3.3.1					
	Indicator 3.3.2					
Outcome 4	Indicator 4.1					
	Indicator 4.2					

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
	Indicator 4.3					
Output 4.1	Indicator 4.1.1					
	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): The total budget has been transferred and received by all agencies in Burundi and Tanzania and is under emplementation .
On the date of repport, the level of expenditure is 35% of the global budget

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

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

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.