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**PBF PROJECT TERMINAL report**

*February 2023*

**COUNTRY:** RWANDA

**TYPE OF REPORT: semi-annual, annual OR FINAL:** Final REPORT

**YEAR of report:** 2023

**Project overview**

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Title:** DRC – RWANDA CROSS-BORDER PROJECT: CREATING PEACE DIVIDENDS FOR WOMEN AND YOUTH THROUGH INCREASED CROSS-BORDER TRADE AND STRENGTHENED FOOD SECURITY**Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway:** IRFDRC: 00122834, Rwanda: 00122835 |
| **If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund:** [ ]  Country Trust Fund[ ]  Regional Trust Fund**Name of Recipient Fund:**       | **Type and name of recipient organizations:**  **UNDP (Convening Agency)** **FAO** **WFP**  |
| **Date of first transfer:** 9 July 2020**Project end date:** 8 January 2023 **Has this project received a cost or no cost extension?** Received a no cost extension for 6 months**Is the current project end date within 6 months?** No |
| **Check if the project falls under one or more PBF priority windows:**[ ]  Gender promotion initiative[ ]  Youth promotion initiative[ ]  Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions[x]  Cross-border or regional project |
| **Total PBF approved project budget (by recipient organization):** * *Please enter the total amounts in US dollars allocated to each recipient organization*
* *Please enter the original budget amount, amount transferred to date and estimated expenditure by recipient.*
* *For cross-border projects, group the amounts by agency, even where transfers are made to different country offices. You can provide the detail in the attached budget.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recipient organisation** | **Budget Allocated ($)** | **Amount Transferred to date ($)** | **Amount spent to date ($)** |
| **UNDP** | **1548682.69** | **1548682.69** | **1238248.96** |
| **FAO** | **737883.77** | **737883.77** | **518117.00** |
| **WFP** | **712423.23** | **711711.42** | **673039.00** |
| **TOTAL** | **2998991** | **2998277.88** | **2429404.96** |

Approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget: 81%\*ATTACH PROJECT EXCEL BUDGET SHOWING CURRENT APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE\***The budget templates are available** [here](https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/content/application-guidelines)**Implementing partners**To how many implementing partners has the project transferred money to date? 10Please list all of the project’s implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each to date

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Name of Implementing Partner*** | ***Type of Organisation (ex. Govt, civil society, etc.)*** | ***What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner to date*** | ***Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner*** |
| ***CORDAID***  | ***International NGO***  | ***54,506.15*** | Trained farmers beneficiaries on financial literacy and savings groups approach and supported them to establish 79 farmer saving groups that include 1,405 members. These Farmers saving groups have been linked to financial institutions. Farmers being members of saving groups is positively impacting on their wellbeing as members are getting loans to solve financial needs, including buying agri-inputs and on social cohesion between members of a small group of 10-20 people.  |
| Rwanda National Police | Government entity | 90,000 | Trained cross-border traders, with a focus on young women, and local authorities, particularly police, customs and border officials on Human Rights, Sexual and Gender Based Violence and harassment.Conducted Human Rights and Anti-Harassment awareness campaigns and organize sensitization campaigns to increase awareness on rights and obligations as well as peaceful exchanges for cross-border traders, develop and disseminate behavior change communication materials with messages targeting men and women involved in legal and illegal cross-border tradeCapacity building of a number of cooperatives in the recommended management practicesThis capacity building was accompanied by financial grants as seed money to grow their businesses |
| Rwanda Bar Association | Other (Professional Bar Association) | **103,000** | Train smallholder farmers, their organizations, and small-scale traders, in commercial negotiation, cross border trade administrative procedures, regulations, gender awareness, business management and access to finance with a focus on women traders and border officials.Conduct an awareness campaign in the border area around existing taxation and border laws and advocate particularly for COMESA rules to be more consistently appliedReview and strengthen harassment and corruption reporting mechanisms at the Goma-Rubavu border with a focus on small-scale traders, particularly women, to provide legal aid with cases of HR violations, commercial law violations and administrative harassment – building on existing national complaint reporting mechanism. Establish a survey based “client satisfaction barometer” to monitor satisfaction with reporting mechanism. |
| Ministry of Youth and Culture | Government entity | **187,000** | Provide technical and financial support to the organization of two youth entrepreneurship bootcamps, one in Rwanda and one in DRC, aimed at supporting the development of businesses led by youth with a high potential of DRC - Rwanda cross border trade to create decent job opportunities, improve contextual understanding, and strengthen capacity on conflict resolution, gender, and cross-cultural skills. This activity is conducted in partnership with Youth Connekt which is a multi-dimensional programme which aims at connecting youth to their role models, peers, resources, technologies, skills and economic opportunities by filling the gap between youth and opportunities for an economically empowering environment. |
| l’Université libre des pays Grands Lacs (ULPGL), DRC | Other (Academia) | 54339,95 | Activity 1.1 (Multi-stakeholder mapping and Gender assessment) and the perception survey |
| Search for Common Ground, DRC | International NGO | 177000 | Activities 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 and 1.10 (Training on GBV, HR and administrative procedures, Raising awareness on HR and COMESA rules, Strengthening reporting mechanisms, Organisation of a cross-border fair) |
| Youth Connekt DRC | National youth CSO | 60000 | Activities 1.8 and 1.9 (Cross-border Bootcamp and Award young Congolese entrepreneurs) |
| BIFERD, DRC | Other subnational CSO | 205360 | Structuring of 14 farmers' organisations (FOs) and 1 Union of FOs; setting up of management committees in collaboration with the Rural Development Institute; drafting of statutes and internal regulations to facilitate the legalisation of structures; facilitation of obtaining recognition acts at the level of the chieftaincy; reinforcement of the FOs' capacities through specific training and granting of office automation equipment to facilitate their functioning |
| Provincial Inspectorate of Agriculture (IPAPEL), DRC | Government entity | 27532 | Supervision and monitoring of agricultural activities, distribution of agricultural inputs. |
| La Coopérative Centrale du Nord-Kivu (COOCENKI), DRC | Other subnational CSO | 22922 | Technical supervision of beneficiary households and close accompaniment in the implementation of activities |

**Gender-responsive Budgeting:**Indicate what percentage (%) of the budget contributes gender equality or women's empowerment (GEWE)? 30.13%Indicate dollar amount from the project document to contribute to gender equality or women’s empowerment: $903,751.55Amount expended to date on efforts contributing to gender equality or women’s empowerment: $236005.21(WFP RW $ 127,692) |
| **Project Gender Marker: GM2****Project Risk Marker: Medium****Project PBF focus area:**  |
| **Steering Committee and Government engagement**Does the project have an active steering committee?YesIf yes, please indicate how many times the Project Steering Committee has met over the last 6 months? During the project life implementation 0Please provide a brief description of any engagement that the project has had with the government over the last 6 months? Please indicate what level of government the project has been engaging with? (188/275 words max.)This project has three structures. The cross-border steering committee at the ministerial level and the cross-border technical committee. In addition, there is the national joint steering committee of the PBF portfolio in the DRC. The cross-border steering committee was scheduled online in February 2022 but postponed to a later date following the agenda conflict of the Minister of Planning (DRC). The request to organize the cross-border steering committee has been communicated with the two governments, but it was challenging to determine the date. The cross-border technical committee was organized in December 2022 pending the organisation of the cross-border steering committee. The last meeting of the national joint steering committee of the PBF portfolio in the DRC took place in December 2022. Exchanges with governments at ministerial level (the Ministry of Planning in the DRC and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry in Rwanda) were ensured for important steps such as the approval of the annual work plan and the request for the no-cost extension. Information on implementation has been shared at the technical level of the governments.  |
| **Report preparation:**Project report prepared by: UNDP, FAO and WFPProject report approved by: M. Ozonnia Ojielo, UN Resident Coordinator, RwandaDid PBF Secretariat review the report: Yes. (DRC) |

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

*- Avoid acronyms and UN jargon, use general /common language.*

*- Report on what has been achieved in the reporting period, not what the project aims to do.*

*- Be as concrete as possible. Avoid theoretical, vague or conceptual discourse.*

*- Ensure the analysis and project progress assessment is gender and age sensitive.*

*- In the results table, please be concise, you will have 3000 characters, including blank spaces to provide your responses*

**PART 1: OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENTS**

**Please rate the implementation status of the following preliminary/preparatory activities** *(Not Started, Initiated, partially Completed, Completed, Not Applicable):*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contracting of Partners | Completed |
| Staff Recruitment | Completed |
| Collection of baselines | Partially completed |
| Identification of beneficiaries | Completed |

Provide any additional descriptive information relating to the status of the project, including whether preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (i.e. contracting of partners, staff recruitment, etc.) (232/250 word limit)

* Some cross-border activities such as training on entrepreneurship and cross-border trade rules, dialogue on assessing the role of women in cross-border trade and exchange of experiences between farmers were organised. Other cross-border activities could not be implemented because of no improvement of the political situation between the two countries until the end of the project. This did not allow the exceptional no-cost extension of the said project, the final evaluation of which is in progress. The activities by UNDP and WFP in the DRC were implemented by the end of the project period. Some activities planned as cross-border, such as the COMESA dialogue and the fair, were implemented at the national level due to the tension between the two countries. However, agricultural activities by FAO-DRC such as the installation of a cold storage room took time to be carried out due to the unstable security situation leading to displacement of beneficiaries. Nevertheless, some of them had returned to their respective areas. Most of the activities in Rwanda were implemented, in particular by WFP. For instance, training materials were provided to farmer groups in farmer field schools while personal protective equipment was distributed to Farmer Field School facilitators. Joint capacity development trainings and workshops brought farmers and traders together. To foster collaboration and sustainability of engagements, FAO and MINICOM linked traders and farmers associations with chambers of commerce in DRC and Rwanda. The connections are expected to enhance mutual support and joint problem solving along the value-chain for more resilient and peaceful communities.

The report on the challenges faced by cross-border cooperatives was produced. Some training and workshops on production, e-commerce, organizational governance and the creation of savings groups were organized. However, some activities were not completed by the end of the project.

FOR PROJECTS WITHIN SIX MONTHS OF COMPLETION: summarize **the main structural, institutional or societal level change the project has contributed to**. This is not anecdotal evidence or a list of individual outputs, but a description of progress made toward the main purpose of the project. (157/550 word limit)

Support for collaborative dynamics between cross-border populations whose integration into trade circuits helps to highlight non-institutional networks of solidarity despite the tensions between the institutional levels of the two governments. Linkages with cross border farmer’s cooperatives/ associations and trader cooperatives of Goma/DRC have been created through joint meetings with chambers of commerce in DRC and Rwanda. Access to justice continues to be at the center of the project, The populations or communities have become aware of the need to seek justice, 116 people in Rwanda have benefited from free legal assistance. 59 farmers and agricultural extension workers in Rwanda and Congolese beneficiaries of ten small cross-border trader associations and 16 farmers’ associations acquired e-commerce knowledge and skills such as the concept of business development, sustainability and market through value chains. Market information systems/e-commerce platforms used by farmers have enabled farmers to connect with e-commerce platform owners through e-commerce, leading to increased income and livelihoods.

**PART II: RESULT PROGRESS BY PROJECT OUTCOME**

*Describe overall progress under each Outcome made during the reporting period (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration). Do not list 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.*

* *“On track” refers to the timely completion of outputs as indicated in the workplan.*
* *“On track with peacebuilding results” refers to higher-level changes in the conflict or peace factors that the project is meant to contribute to. These effects are more likely in mature projects than in newer ones.*

**How many outcomes does the project have?** The project has only one outcome.

**Outcome 1:** Social cohesion and peace dividends in the Goma – Rubavu border area strengthened through increased cross-border trade, enhanced food security and increased livelihood and income opportunities, particularly for women and youth

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

**Progress summary:** *(251/350-word limit)*

Thanks to the bootcamp in March 2022, the knowledge of 99 young Congolese and Rwandan entrepreneurs was reinforced on cross-border trade. 49 small traders participated in a dialogue on the assessment of women's place in cross-border trade with the cross-border trade. 67 Congolese and Rwandan farmers, small traders and entrepreneurs improved their knowledge of cross-border trade rules between the DRC and Rwanda on both sides through training. 24 Congolese and Rwandan farmers strengthened the relationship and understanding of agricultural product management through experience exchange and visit. These cross-border activities are intended to facilitate social cohesion in the two countries through direct interaction between the project beneficiaries. However, the tension between two countries has deteriorated since June 2022 causing the suspension of some activities. In the DRC, the knowledge of the members of 10 associations of small-scale cross-border traders and 14 farmers' organisations and the capacity of 500 farmers on agricultural techniques and the distribution of agricultural inputs has been strengthened and enabled them to increase their confidence.58 Farmer Field School Facilitators graduated as Facilitators in horticulture in Rwanda. 1,553 farmers have increased and improved their production, nutritional status, hygiene practices and health status. Farmers were equipped in agri-inputs and tools. Beneficiaries were equipped with knowledge on the concept of business development and sustainable market through value chains and online mobile applications. 81 cooperative members improved capacity to develop business plans and implement the plan through training on legal cross-border trade. 3,521 beneficiaries strengthened their knowledge on post-harvest handling and storage through training sessions.

**Indicate any additional analysis on how Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment and/or Youth Inclusion and Responsiveness has been ensured under this Outcome:** *(350-word limit)* Limit 269/310 words)

The selection of participants for activities in both countries is always gender and age sensitive. The cross-border gender assessment was conducted in both countries. The cross-border dialogue was organised virtually with the women representatives of small cross-border trader associations in November 2022. In the DRC, the first selection criterion was the age of youth (18-35 years) among the entrepreneur applications, and the balance between women 50% and men 50% was ensured. The legal expert who accompanied small cross-border traders, the majority of whom are women, was a woman. When selecting the beneficiary members of the participating farmers' organizations, an effort was made to target women. As a result, 75% of project participants were women (Rusayo 86% and Buhumba 58%). Production activities involving 75% women focused on the agricultural input needs of women and youth to support the improvement of the quality of agricultural products in cross-border trade. The project helped to promote inclusive development by focusing on traditionally excluded groups such as women in Rwanda. Women's cooperatives were supported. One of the three lawyers is a woman who provides legal assistance to cross-border traders facing justice in cross-border activities. 47% of the members of the FFS groups (Farmers) trained are women and 57% are men, while 53% of the 58 FFS facilitators (F28, M30) are young people. 3,521 farmers (1,848 women and 782young people) were trained in post-harvest management and storage of horticultural crops and Irish potatoes. 109 cooperative leaders (40 women and 32 young people) were trained on cooperative governance and management, and 1,405 farmers (605 women and 226 young people) were supported to create 79 savings groups.

**Using the Project Results Framework as per the approved project document or any amendments- provide an update on the achievement of key outcome indicators for Outcome 1 in the table below**

* If the outcome has more than 3 indicators, select the 3 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. (3000 characters max per entry)

| **Outcome Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | **Indicator progress to Date** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay****(if any)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 1.1**The proportion of small-scale traders who feel more confident to officially cross the border has improved. | DRC: 26,5 % Congolese and Rwandese Small scale traders and farmers feel more confident to officially cross the border.Rwanda:  | DRC: 30% (TBC)Rwanda: | DRC: 60% of beneficiaries crossing the border and doing trade say they notice a reduction in insecurity, i.e. 51.4% of men and 60% of women | Political and security events/incidents would have negatively affected the feeling of security,The closing of the border on the Congolese side at 3 p.m. would also have impacted the feeling of security. |
| Indicator 1.2Confidence in doing business with communities across the border has improved. | DRC: 53% Congolese and Rwandese Small traders, small scale farmers said that confidence in doing business across the border has improved.Rwanda : | DRC: 60%Rwanda:  | 42.1% of cross-border traders say the business environment has improved. | Political and security events/incidents would have negatively affected the feeling of security,The feeling of security when coming across some agents (border police, soldiers, etc.) has noticeably decreased. |

**How many Outputs does Outcome 1 have?** 2

Please list up to 5 of most relevant outputs for outcome 1 and for each output, and using the project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against 3 most relevant output indicators

Output 1.1: Promote cross-border trade to strengthen income-generating activities, food security and dialogue between border communities, with a focus on women and young entrepreneurs.

Output 1.2: Agricultural production and productivity of small-scale farmers, especially women and youth, are developed to enhance food security and livelihoods.

**Output 1.1: Promote cross-border trade to enhance income generating activities, food security and dialogue between border communities, with a focus on women and youth entrepreneurs**

| **Output Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | **Indicator progress to Date** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay****(if any)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator 1.1.1Number of beneficiaries (men/women) who trained through Youth Connekt bootcamps | Total 1,174(437 women, 737 men)DRC: 0 (0 woman, 0 man),Rwanda 1.174 (437 women, 737 men) | Total : 1.274,DRC: 50 (25 women at least, 25 men)Rwanda : 1.274 | DRC: 49 (24 women, 25 men)Rwanda : 50, 1174 Youth trained by YouthConnekt on 20 March 2020. | DRC: 50 (25 women, 25 men) were selected as participants. The difficulty of being and remaining in permanent contact with some candidates in Nyiragongo territory. One candidate could not be reached before the departure to Rubavu |
| Indicator 1.1.2Number of youth-led businesses with a high potential of DRC-Rwanda cross-border trade supported through seed capital | Total: 0, DRC : 0,Rwanda: 0 | Total: 8, DRC : 4,Rwanda: 4 | Total : 79, DRC: 10 (5 women, 5 men),Rwanda : 69 (10 (women, 59 Men) and 58 facilitators de FFS (F28 , M30)) | DRC: The budget reallocation was made to increase the number of winners and the amount of prize money. The increase in the number of winners was also the recommendation of the Ministry of Planning.Rwanda:  |
| **Indicateur** 1.1.3Number of Youth participating in cross border trade fair | Total : 0,DRC: 0 (0 woman, 0 man)Rwanda: 0 (0 woman, 0 man) | Total : 1000DRC: 500 (250 women at least, 250 men)Rwanda : 500 | DRC: 151 (89 women, 62 men),Rwanda : 0 | DRC: Due to the absence of participants from Rwanda (the organisation of a national fair instead of a cross-border one) and strict security measures, the number of guests/participants decreased.Rwanda: Rwanda : A fair could not be organised by the end of the project due to the suspension of cross-border activity. |

**Output 1.2:** Expanded agricultural production and productivity for smallholder farmers, particularly women and young people, to strengthen food security and livelihoods

| **Output Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | **Indicator progress to Date** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay****(if any)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator 1.2.1Volume and value of cross-border trade in target value chains | DRC: TBDRwanda : 65,80% | DRC: TBCRwanda: 80% | Rwanda : 65.80% increase informal cross border trade in agricultural products from Rwanda to DRC. | DRC: The study to assess the achievement of the target was planned at the end of the project but was not carried out before the end of the project. |
| Indicator 1.2.2.Increase in formal trade of value-added agricultural products in target value chains | DRC: TBDRwanda | DRC: TBCRwanda | Rwanda: E- Commerce training courses on agriculture market information system have been organized and smart phones with internet bundles are being used for online trading | DRC: The study to assess the achievement of the target was planned at the end of the project but was not carried out before the end of the project.Rwanda: There is a plan to conduct a study at the end of the project. Impact assessment study  |
| Indicator 1.2.3Increase of number of women and youth engaged in formal cross-border trade in targeted value chains | DRC : TBDRwanda : 0 | DRC: TBCRwanda: 1553 Farmers (827 Men and Youth (53%) and 726 Women and Youth (47%)  | Rwanda: The value chain analysis was cancelled due to the limited time line before the ending of the project | DRC: The study to assess the achievement of the target was planned at the end of the project but was not carried out before the end of the project.Rwanda: Delayed due to late disbursement of funds, he FAO has no longer recruited a consultant for the analysis of value chains |

**PART III: CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**

Is the project planning any significant events in the next 6 months (eg. national dialogues, youth congresses, film screenings, etc.) No

If yes, please state how many, and for each, provide the approximate date of the event and a brief description, including its key objectives, target audience and location (if known)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Event Description*** | ***Tentative Date*** | ***Location*** | ***Target Audience*** | ***Event Objectives (150 word limit)*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Human Impact**

This section is about the human impact of the project. Please state the number of key stakeholders of the project, and for each, please briefly describe:

1. The challenges/problem they faced prior to the project implementation
2. The impact of the project on their lives
3. Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from a representative of each stakeholder group

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Key stakeholder | What were the challenges/problem they faced prior to the project implementation? (350 words max) | What has been the impact of the project on their lives (350 words max) | Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from a representative of each stakeholder group (350 words max) |
| Farmers associations/cooperatives, PSF and farmer traders platforms among others | Issues of food insecurity, limited knowledge and technical capacity for better horticulture production, nutrition, use of agricultural inputs, family planning and gender market orientation and linkages, post harvest and value chain management, lack of agricultural inputs, among others;  | The project has contributed to farmers increased income generation and livelihoods, knowledge and technical capacity to increase food production, market linkages, better nutrition and better life focusing on women and young people through FFS programme. | One of the FFS Facilitator Mr. Maniriho Elise from Icyerekezo Cooperative in Bugeshi sector said that the provision of a smart phone and internet bundles for 9 months and e-commerce trainings provided allowed him to link up with online traders platforms to sell his vegetables online. He added that his knowledge and technical skills on sustainable horticulture have significantly increased through provided trainings |
| Members of associations of small cross-border traders and farmers' organizations in the DRC | Limited knowledge of cross-border trade, especially Simplified Trade Regime (RECOS) | Enhanced knowledge of cross-border trade gives them confidence in their business | A member of the Famer Organization “The activity has produced fruits in the sense that it makes it possible to improve knowledge and to discover what we did not know, especially in the law on RECOS. It requires a good mastery and a good predisposition of mind to be able to clear your goods yourself without fear. » |
| Border officials and other agencies in DRC | Limited opportunity to sensitize small traders and farmers by border officials and others | The participants (officials and small traders and farmers) agreed to organize sensitization sessions once the border becomes operational again. They also resolved to set up an exchange framework to regularly assess cases of harassment perpetrated by unauthorized agents and asked Search to continue its activities which bring together these two categories of participants. | A police officer at the Border"We thank Search for this workshop and it would be better, once the border opens, to organize a a special desk of popular expression to improve relations between traders and border services agents in BUHUMBA and this can benefit the surrounding population"N.B. This border post was not operational due to the crisis caused by M23 Armed group |
| Members of the platform of traders in Rwanda (through cross-border workshops, exchange of experience between DRC and Rwanda) | Lack of appropriate information to make sales on both sides of the border without customs hassles. | The mastery of appropriate taxes and customs regulations has enabled them to expand their markets to two neighbouring countries. | Mrs. RUSI KANZENZE (trader from Rwanda, seller of pulses) in Gisenyi."I have been a member of the Rwanda small traders' association COPIYU for three years now, but our exchanges are limited to the national zones only in Rwanda because we are less informed about the DRC-Rwanda cross-border exchanges in terms of taxations and related rules. Through cross-border workshops, exchanges with our DRC partners and the knowledge/information received, I extend my activities to the Congolese (DRC) markets. What I lacked was information on the procedure to use without being mishandled at the border as one should avoid at all costs losses due to multiple taxes. Through these activities mentioned above, which I appreciated very much, the economic operators of Rwanda and DRC living on the border have strengthened the bonds of peaceful cohabitation. |
| Small-scale producers in the DRC at the Rusayo grouping | Lack of knowledge and application of the clauses of the Territorial Pact signed between landowners and small-scale producers for the Nyiragongo territory in Rusayo. Lack of a monitoring committee for this Pact in Rusayo | Installation of the monitoring committee for the implementation of the clauses of this Pact, which enabled small producers to benefit from secure access to land. | Mrs. Aline MATUNGULU of the OP ADECOR in Rusayo testified: "Thanks to this project, we members of the OP in Rusayo have become aware of the existence of the Territorial Pact of Understanding between small producers and land concessionaires. I thank the DRC-Rwanda cross-border project for having made it possible to popularise this Pact and to set up a committee to monitor it in Rusayo (which did not exist before). |

In addition to the stakeholder specific impact described above, please use this space to describe any additional human impact that the project has had. (650 word limit):

According to the declarations of Mrs. MAGAYANE LIBERATRICE, mother of three girls and a boy, aged 48, president of OP COOPABU and UOP Tuafidike, Advisor to the COCEDEBU/DRC Cooperative, thanks to the PBF-cross-border project, her organization has improved its administrative management, since before the project, its organization was operating illegally, now it has all official documents, including notarized statutes and other related documents.

In addition, through the capacity building sessions received, the organization is now able to function properly in compliance with legal standards, they draw up meeting minutes after each meeting with signed attendance lists. Thanks to these official documents, they can sell their products outside their villages and even in neighboring countries. The project has also provided them with office supplies for the proper functioning of their organization. Thanks to the various training courses on grouped selling, operating costs, etc. They realized that they have great opportunities in front of them and must know how to exploit them well: so, they planned to focus solidly on their commercial activities between the 2 countries DRC-Rwanda.

The project realized a documentary film to show case project achievement in Rwanda. This film focus on project impact to beneficiaries (Highlight : <https://we.tl/t-ot9UdANDiP>, Full video : <https://we.tl/t-iZXV9BkaXd>)

You can also upload upto 3 ﬁles in various formats (picture ﬁles, powerpoint, pdf, video, etc..) to illustrate the human impact of the project and 3 links to online resources (OPTIONAL)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring: Please list monitoring activities undertaken in the reporting period (350 word limit)In December 2021, the project team from DRC and Rwanda visited the cooperatives supported by the project in Rubavu district, to assess progress and share experiences. UNDP partner Youth Connekt-DRC visited 10 Congolese businesses run by the young winners, shortly after they received their awards. The joint visit to Rusayo (FAO, UNDP and WFP) was carried out to verify the restitution of the training, the training invitation and to identify the strengths, weaknesses and difficulties within the selected associations. The donor/PBSO mission was conducted to monitor the implementation of activities through exchanges with farmers in Rusayo and with young winning entrepreneurs and the presentation on the studies. WFP-Rwanda visited training sites to ensure post-harvest feedback from trained farmers among members of their cooperatives. WFP also ensured the quality and quantity of materials during the distribution of equipment. FAO in collaboration with Ministry of Agriculture through Rwanda Agriculture Board conducted several field monitoring missions and technical support to 59 FFS groups and followed up on technical issues of pre-installed Smartphones and provided advice to facilitate e-commerce. | Do outcome indicators have baselines? If yes, please provide a brief descriptionThe study was conducted in the DRC in April 2022.Has the project launched perception surveys or other community-based data collection? If yes, please provide a brief description (350 word limit) The perception study in the DRC was done in April 2022 on the Congolese side. The perception study is planned at the end of the project as part of the final evaluation. |
| **Evaluation:** Has an evaluation been conducted during the reporting period? | Evaluation budget (response required): 65000If project will end in next six months, describe the evaluation preparations *(350 word limit)*: The procurement process in ongoing. |
| **Catalytic effects (financial):** Indicate name of funding agent and amount of additional non-PBF funding support that has been leveraged by the project since it started. | Name of funder: Amount:                                  |
| **Catalytic Eﬀect (non-ﬁnancial):** Has the project enabled or created a larger or longer‐term peacebuilding change to occur?***Please select***[ ] No catalytic eﬀect[x] Some catalytic eﬀect [ ] Signiﬁcant catalytic eﬀect [ ] Very Signiﬁcant catalytic eﬀect [ ] Don't Know[ ] Too early to tell | If relevant, please describe how the project has had a (non-ﬁnancial) catalytic eﬀect i.e. ways in which the project has supported the expansion or creation of programs and policies supporting peace, both within and outside the UN system (*Please limit your response to 350 words)*The young people and women solicited by this project have indirectly developed a dynamic of interest and on both sides of borders, a possible common interest is in the process of being put in place, since beyond the institutional, cross-border populations tend to strengthen ties to share the benefits and dividends resulting from their common commercial activities in the Great Lakes Region.Trainings on good agriculture practices have helped on mind set change on practicing agriculture and more and more farmers are imitating neighbours who are improving their life using revenue from agriculture production and cross-border trade.  |
| **Sustainability:** Does the project have an explicit exit strategy? Please describe any steps that have been taken to ensure the sustainability of peacebuilding gains beyond the duration of the project (350 word limit)Relevant local authorities and partners in cross-border trade were invited to the project activities in the DRC. For the young Congolese entrepreneurs, the workshop had a session to network with actors from other countries to learn about their experiences in e-commerce using the existing platform by the International Trade Centre. Capacity building for FFS facilitators living in the communities in Rwanda was one of the ways of availing agriculture extensionist available and ready to support rural areas for a long time. |
| **Other:** Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations? *(350 word limit)* The implementation rate reached 75% on the first tranche in mid-September 2022 due to the slow start with the COVID19 pandemic and the Nyiragongo volcano eruption. Three offices were unable to accelerate implementation until the second tranche arrived in early November 2022 due to lack of budget. In addition, the project faced the difficulty of mobilizing beneficiaries and stakeholders between the two countries due to political and diplomatic tension and the instability of the security situation in Goma and Buhumba division in the DRC where most beneficiaries were displaced. In particular because of the early closure of the border between the two countries (3:00 p.m.), clashes between the armed forces of the DRC and the armed group M23 which is approaching Goma as well as the restrictions of movement by the anti-MONUSCO movement. On October 29, 2022, the Congolese government took restrictive measures and dismissed the Ambassador of Rwanda. The project has already benefited from a cost-free extension for a maximum period of six months. However, the project wanted an exceptional cost-free extension and the change in the outcome of the project due to the restrictive movement of staff from United Nations agencies to Goma, the difficulty of implementing cross-border activities and achieving the outcome of the project in this situation with the tension between two countries. The exceptional extension was not granted, and the project team regretted that not all activities could be implemented during the project period to achieve some planned results due to the many challenges. The project team would recommend the implementation of this type of project as soon as relations between the two countries improve. |