PEACE AND CONFLICT IMPACT ASSESSMENT

OF

THE MUTUAL AND INTER-RELATED RESILIENCE PROGRAMME

Submitted to:
Act Church of Sweden,
C/o ICCO Muyenga,
Kironde Road,
P.O Box 33 333
Kampala

Submitted by:
Center for Conflict Resolution,
Plot 1040 Soya (Factory) Road,
P.O BOX 5211, Kampala, Uganda.
Telephone: +256 414 255033/2344405
Email:cecore795@gmail.com
WWW.cecore.or.ug

October 2020

Contents

ABREVIATIONS

ACF	Action Against Hunger
CECORE	Center for Conflict Resolution
CoS	Act Church of Sweden
COVID	Corona Virus Disease
CSA	Conflict Sensitive Approaches
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DR Congo	Democratic Republic of Congo
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
GBV	Gender Based Violence
ICCO	Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation
KII	Key Informant Interviews
LC	Local Council
LG	Local Government
LWF	Lutheran World Federation
MIRP	Mutual Inter-Related Resilience Programme
MoH	Ministry of Health
NGOs	Non Governmental Organisations
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
PCIA	Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment
SACCO	Saving and Credit Cooperative Society
SLR	Secondary Literature Review
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
SRHR	Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CECORE was contracted by Act Church of Sweden, hosted by ICCO, to conduct a Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) of its MIRP programme in Kyangwali Refugee Settlement and the refugee hosting communities; as part of support to inform ongoing and future programming focused on building the resilience of vulnerable communities. The PCIA focused on community and household level conflict within the settlement and host communities.

The PCIA seeks to understand the impact of conflict on MIRP ongoing and future programmes; and to identify potential opportunities for peace building initiatives within the programmes. It conducted an organizational capacity needs assessment for MIRP partners with the aim of developing a capacity development plan for its staff, core programme beneficiaries, as well as a training needs analysis for design and delivery of conflict sensitive programming.

The assessment was conducted using qualitative methodologies in which data collection tools were developed and applied to achieve in-depth examination of the causes of tensions and conflict; its characteristics and dynamics. The tools included: Secondary Literature Review, Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions. Case Studies, Consensus Panel and observation methods were also applied across the study*.*

Summary of findings
- The relationship between host communities and refugees is generally good, but tension exists on issues relating to natural resources especially land.
- Inter and intra refugee relations in the settlement are generally good, but tribal tensions based on conflict dynamics in the country of origin for some refugee communities exist.
- Land and GBV are the most common conflicts within the settlemnt and in the host communities. GBV has recently worsened since the outset of the COVID- 19 pandemic.
- COVID-19 has impacted on all aspects of life in and outside the settlement. The host communities perceive refugees to be infected with the corona virus, so they have reduced interaction with them. On the other hand, refugees feel generally isolated since they can no longer freely interact and trade with nationals.
- There is intermarriage between nationals and refugees but the further one goes from the settlement, there is little or no contact/interaction between nationals and refugees.
- Within the settlement, some refugees feel that they are excluded by village leaders who belong to other nationalities.
- There are perceptions among host communities that refugees in the settlement are better off in terms of access to social services, although this is not perceived as a source of tension.
- The situation in the settlement and host communities is generally safe with adequate security. However, community level violence for example petty crime, murder and defilement are rampant.
- Issues of inadquate clean water, poor education, livelihood challenges, and trauma are pontential catalysts for conflict. However, community members suggested that urgent focus should be put on the environment due to pressure on natural forests for fuel (firewood and construction materials).

- More awareness about COVID-19 is needed to help communities manage it in a way that does not cause tension or conflict.
- **Overall MIRP will improve community relations within the refugees in the settlement and between refugees and host communities.**

Summary of recommendations

- There is need to encourage dialogue within the settlement and between refugees in the settlement and host communities. This is because there seems to be information gaps on how refugees and host communities perceive each other. This will further promote co-existence between the refugees and host communities
- There is need to construct more boreholes, or the non-functional ones be repaired; to address water shortage and the long-distance women travel to fetch water. This is because some villages experience acute shortage of water and yet long distances sometimes turn out to be unsafe. It also takes away a lot of productive time.
- MIRP partners should integrate basic peacebuilding and conflict transformation skills and conflict sensitivity approaches in their programming so as to be able to address potential negative impacts at household and community level.
- Coordination of MIRP activities should be encouraged through monthly meetings as this was pointed out as an important platform for information sharing and joint planning.
- There is need to promote peace education in the refugee settlement especially in schools. NRC is best placed to lead in such an activity since it already has a niche working with schools and children.
- Encourage vocational/hands-on skills building among refugees for the youth and women - particularly skills in livelihoods which are tailor-made to their needs in the settlement but also applicable to their communities upon return to their countries of origin. Those skills will help them build and sustain sources of household income.

INTRODUCTION

In 2020, CECORE was contracted by Act Church of Sweden, hosted by ICCO , to conduct a PCIA of its MIRP programme. The study aimed at supporting MIRP consortium members, namely; Act Church of Sweden (CoS), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), Action Against Hunger (ACF) and Lutheran World Federation (LWF) to contribute to the resilience building of vulnerable communities by building on the current body of knowledge to inform future MIRP programmes, and other like-minded organizations seeking to work in these communities. The PCIA was also informed by the experiences of ongoing and previous interventions in the area.

The assessment was conducted in Kikuube District, specifically at Kyangwali Refugee Settlement and the neighborhood within 80km range. The outset of COVID- 19 pandemic also provided an important scenario, so there was need to understand how household and community relations have changed in light of the fact that social and economic relations have been impacted as a result.

Uganda currently has an overwhelming influx of refugees. This heightens tensions and competition for resources with the host population which is already experiencing shortage of resources such as land, water, food, and services such as health, judiciary and education. The large influx of refugees has stimulated encroachment on natural vegetation and fragile ecosystem, massive soil degradation, deforestation, depletion of natural habitat for the fauna, disturbance of hydrological cycle causing huge human related conflicts and natural disasters in the area alongside the global impacts of climate change.

In Kyangwali Refugee Settlement, MIRP[1] is working to provide a range of locally relevant, multi-sectoral interventions across the humanitarian-development continuum with which to address long term development needs.

The PCIA was commissioned to inform the MIRP nexus and its achievements in relation to the programme goal focusing on: rights-holders to achieve resilient communities and experience increased economic self-reliance and psychosocial well-being. The MIRP nexus focuses on three thematic niches: development, humanitarian and peace building - as an approach to addressing exclusion from social, political, humanitarian and economic opportunities, with a particular focus on refugee-hosting communities.

Kyangwali refugee settlement was established in 1960, and is located in Western Uganda near the border with the Democratic Republic of Congo. It has refugees from: South Sudan, DR Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, Somalia, and Kenya. It has a total of 96,047[2] registered refugees as of April 2019 an increase from 83,558 in 2018, and accounts for about 12% of the district population.[3] The majority of the nationalities in Kyangwali are South Sudanese.[4] In addition, Kiswahili is the most popular language within and outside the settlement.[5] Armed conflict is the major reason and cause for refugees displacement from their countries of origin especially DR Congo.[6]

Focus and scope

The PCIA examined the potential drivers of conflict and exclusion in the settlement and host communities in order to inform tailor-made interventions that strengthen the resilience and self-reliance, psychosocial well-being and social cohesion of target communities. The target groups within each of these communities were the host and refugee communities, but it was extended to broadly include other key stakeholders such as: the leadership of Kikuube District; the leadership at Kyangwali settlement/Office of the Prime Minister (OPM); the MIRP consortium partners; Security agencies; CSOs working on refugee and host community issues, local/community leaders, among others.

Purpose and objectives

The purpose of this PCIA was to conduct an in-depth examination of the causes of tensions and conflict at community level, its characteristics, causes and dynamics. It also sought to understand conflict impacts on MIRP programmes and its target groups, and to identify potential opportunities for peace building initiatives within the planned programs. The PCIA also aimed at conducting organizational capacity needs assessment for MIRP partners and develop a capacity development plan for its staff, core programme beneficiaries, as well as a training needs analysis for design and delivery of conflict sensitive programming. The analysis was carried out both in relation to refugees in Kyangwali Refugee Settlement and host population in the neighborhood populations in Kikuube district. The specific objectives of the study were:

---

[1] Kyangwali Refugee Settlement is found in Kikube District which was recently created from Hoima District and the MIRP is a consortium of humanitarian peace building and development nexus initiative focused on refugees and host population in Kikuube and Hoima Districts (2020 to 2023).

[2] UNHCR (2019), Uganda, Refugee Statistics, April 2019, Kyangwali

[3] UNHCR (2018), Uganda Refugee Response Monitoring, Settlement Fact Sheet: Kyangwali

[4] UNHCR, Uganda, Refugee Statistics, April 2019, Kyangwali

[5] ACF (2019), Barrier analysis study on two Water, Sanitation and Hygiene behaviors in Kyangwali refugee settlements in Hoima District in south Western Uganda, P.10

[6] Kigali Walter and Wachiaya Catherine (2018), Refugees flee fresh fighting in Congo to Uganda

- To identify the ways in which the MIRP initiative could create or worsen conflicts or contribute to peace building.
- To propose mitigation measures relating to potential or identified risks.
- To map the current capacities and assess training needs of MIRP partners´ staff and core programme beneficiaries for conflict sensitive program delivery that can impact positively on current tensions and conflicts.
- To identify the best practices, resources and tools for making conflict sensitive analysis an on-going process within reasonable frequency as per needs and requirements of the partners.

Methodology

CECORE carried out the assessment according to the Terms of Reference and included necessary tools and exercises to meet assessment objectives. The assessment was targeted in approach. It used the literature review, consultations and interviews as the basis for data collection. In the context of COVID-19 the study ensured adherence to the Ministry of Health guidelines and standard operating procedures. The following methods were used:

Secondary Literature Review (SLR) was conducted by reviewing existing data from CECORE's previous works, works of partners and stakeholders, and other relevant literature available. This was assessed and analyzed in relation to the existing situation. The review was important in identifying what has been written and existing gaps. The literature review report was produced as a separate document in May 2020 (see attached).

Key Informant Interviews (KII) were conducted purposefully through semi- structured interviews among stakeholders. They were conducted through face to face interviews with selected actors knowledgeable and experienced in the area of study. This tool enabled the research team to gain deeper understanding of the contextual issues and generate recommendations. (*See list of KIIs attached*).

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were applied to collect qualitative data and examine proxy indicators by using a semi-structured interview guide. It was an effective approach because it enabled the collection of many ideas in a short time. Due to the COVID-19 limitations, the target audience comprised of 6-10 respondents. However, many FGDs were conducted to reach scientifically representative views. In total 11 FDGs were held involving 119 participants *(see FDG list attached).*

The enumerators were identified and supported the team in data collection. These were selected based on their knowledge of the community, ability to speak the local languages and capacity to conduct community based studies. In addition, participants to the FGD were mainly selected based on their responsibility in the community e.g: local leader, teacher, health worker, social worker, etc. They had to be members who live and work within or near the community where the study was conducted.

Subcounties or villages where FGDs were conducted were selected on the basis that they are: neighboring a settlement, they had a mixed composition of tribes, they were rural but accessible, their proximity to the border, peri urban and urban sub counties, dominated by a tribe and experienced violence.

The composition of FGDs included: members of a community / refugees, (segragated by nationalities, ethnic groups and variables) Women, Men, Youth (boys and girls), LC1, Persons abled differently and Elderly. This was important because it generated information on the nature of tensions and conflicts at various community levels and categories.

Case studies. This approach was applied as a cross-cutting in order to identify experiences that provide concrete examples. It was embedded during the application of FGDs and KIIs.

Consensus Panel. Consensus Panel as an approach was used to triangulate FGDs and KIIs. It was generated from key participants in KII and FGDs to further probe key findings from KIIs and FGDs. Members of the panel were selected on the basis of their knowledge of the issues so as to form consensus on key preliminary findings of the assessment.

FINDINGS

Focus Group Disscussion in Kagoma Market

Nature, characteristics and dynamics of the current conflicts as they relate to the MIRP thematic interventions

The PCIA administered the FGD tool (annex) to understand the nature, characteristics and dynamics of current conflicts as they relate to MIRP thematic interventions.

Majority of refugees understand peace in relation to the situation of their country of origin which they characterise as insecure. Most respondents undertand peace to be the ability to live without experiencing armed violence or war; not hearing gun shots, being treated well with respect, not experiencing humiliation, and ability to access basic needs of life such as receiving food items on time.

However, the understanding of peace varies according to the categories of people; the youth for instance, are inclined towards peace being "freedom to do what one wants.' They feel that even when they are safe in the settlement, there is no peace if they are not allowed to do what they

want.[7] On the other hand, conflict is broadly perceived as inability to adequately meet the basic needs of life like education, health services, food and freedom from gender based violence.

Causes of conflicts and tensions

Respondents indicated that causes of conflict are mainly rooted in the negative historical past and experiences which are characterised by trauma, anger, desire for revenge, and bitterness. They reported that some tribes in the settlement always want to dominate positions of leadership,[8] a practice that generates similar social tensions in their countries of origin. At family and community level, it is perceived that, alcohol abuse and tribal tensions are key causes of conflict.

Land conflicts among refugees and the host communities were also reported to be rampant - especially tensions linked to boundaries. At the time of conducting the assessment, it was widely perceived by the hosts that their land is being reduced and given to refugees.

> *We get worried when more refugees arrive in this area because when they come, we are also evicted fom our land.*[9]

On the other hand refugees reported that they are allocated small potions of land where they can hardly farm. It is perceived by refugees that nationals are now unwelcoming to them because they are competing over resources. For instance in Bukinda, it is reported that some nationals nolonger want to associate with refugees because they were evicted from the land.[10] At the same time, some people in Bukinda wish that the refugees should occupy the land they were evicted from and not any other person.

Social conflicts between refugees and host communities are few. Infact, it is widely suggested that their social relations are good except that refugees are perceived to be better off than the host communities. Host communities feel ignored and noted that refugees are provided with all the amenities that are better than those provided to them by government. In addition, refugees are percieved to be economically better off. A bussiness man thus said:

> *refugees inflate commodity prices in host communities,which makes the cost of living expensive…I am a butcher and the normal price of a Kilogram of beef is Uganda Shillings 12,000;but when refugees come to buy, they offer Uganda Shillings 14,000.[11]*

Many nationals cannot afford such price increaments because their household incomes are low.

In addition, drug abuse and alcoholism were reported to be key factors that contribute to conflict especially during times when cash distribution has been conducted. For instance, when cash has been distributed, men tend to spend their money on alcohol. Sometimes there are fights in drinking places. This puts pressure on the household and it is women who usually are left to care for families. This is excerbated by tribalism and domestic violence especially within the settlement.[12]

---

[7] FGD with Youth in Kasonga, 14th September 2020
[8] FGD with Youth in Kasonga, 14th September 2020
[9] FGD with Women in Mukarange, 14th September 2020
[10] FGD Kagoma, 15th September 2020
[11] FGD with Women in Mukarange, 14th September 2020
[12] FGD, Kagoma Market, 15th September 2020

Conflict resolution mechanisms

The existing conflict resolution mechanisms are both formal and informal but the prefered method used depends on the nature of the case.

At the village level, conflicts are resolved through local leadership structures which include: elders, ward leaders, bloc LCs and refugee welfare committees. These are the immediate points that refugees go to when they experience tensions and conflicts because they live within communities; so they are perceived to be knowlegable of the context.

For instance, South Sudanese refugees prefer to use elders to resolve conflicts. However, for the host communities the immediate conflict resolution mechanism is the GBV protection committee which works closely with the LC structures. Complex cases are refered to police. Furthermore, in addition to these mechanisms, NGOs support conflict resoultion initiatives within the settlement and the host communities. LWF for example has established a pool of 30 peace promoters who act as agents of peace in communities through sensitisations and counselling. They support communities to peacefully co-exist and build stronger relationships.

FGD with mixed nationalities in Kasonga

Experiences of exclusion

Exclusion is experienced differently by different nationalities and categories of people within the settlement. It is influeced by factors such as age, gender and the population numbers to which a category of people belong. The youth for instance feel that they are excluded from decision making and service delivery on the bassis that they are young and do not have the experience needed to perform certain roles and they perceive this as discrimination. They noted that:

> *'Most organisations operating in the settlement discriminate us in employment especially for job opportunities within the settlemnet. Some organisations employ nationals for casual jobs that can be done by refugees'[13]*

The youth feel that they should be considered for job opportunities within the settlement. Even then, they suggest that refugees need LC letters as supporting documentation to apply for the few existing opportunities. It was mentioned that:

> *is the fee required by the LCs to process letters as supporting documents for employment. It was indicated that LCs ask between Uganda Shillings 5000 -10,000, which often times they can't afford.[14]*

---

[13] FGD with Youth in Nyampindu, 16th September 2020.
[14] FGD with South Sudanese women in Nyampindu, 16th September 2020.

Other forms of exclusion are experienced through difficulty to access opportunities like vocational skills training. For instance the South Sudanese feel excluded in vocational skills training opportunities because they are a minority in villages dominated by Congolese.

The idea behind this perception is that certain groups of people are disadvantaged because of numbers. In areas where the majority nationality dominates other nationalities, they also tend to dominate the local council leadership which agencies rely on in identifying and selecting beneficiaries for training opportunities. They pointed out that often times the chairpersons select vocational skills training beneficeries along tribal lines.

Some groups feel excluded when it comes to resettlement in outside countries. South Sudanese feel that IOM only resettles Congolese to outside countries and deny them the chance because they are dark-skinned. Some of them claim that they have been living in the settlement much longer, yet those who came recently were resettled. [15] Those claiming this kind of exclusion however admitted that they did not know the criteria for this kind of resettlement – although they look at it as a good opportunity.

Another form of exclusion expressed is in the way local leaders respond and resolve conflicts among refugees. The South Sudanese group pointed out that:

> *'When a south Sudanese child and Congolese child fight, and a South Sudanese injures a Congolese, the South Sudanese is forced to pay a heavy punishment. When a South Sudanese child is injured, nothing is done.'[16]*

There was concern raised from various FGDs that partners poviding services in the settlement tend to focus on new arrivals (refugees) and ignore the issues affecting the old refugees even when they have more serious problems.

> *'Look at how they are focusing on Maratatu with new arrivals yet we are also still facing similar o sometime more challenges'[17]*

Community relationship between MIRP thematic result areas.

FGD in Kasonga

---

[15] FGD with Women in Nyampindu, 16th September 2020. [it was not establihed by the research team to what extent this statement was factual as the team has not been able to verify this information by IOM]
[16] FGD with South Sudanese Women in Nyampindu, 16th September 2020.
[17] FGD with South Sudanese Women in Nyampindu, 16th September 2020.

Water

Water is a major issue affecting the community. In most cases, it is not in addition to beieng far. It was reported that women spend up to 5 hours at water sources because they are crowded. Some boreholes broke down and even that the refugees sometimes have to bear the repair costs. This means that they have less time to care for children and other productive activities at home. For instance in Nyampindu, there are 5 boreholes but only 1 is functional. In addition, there are several fights at water sources, which increases the risk of transiting or acquiring COVID-19.[18] Since the pandemic started, they have been encouraged to frequently wash hands yet they have limited supply of clean water. Some agencies have provided public hand washing places, but communities still appeal for more water points because those that are avilable are not enough.

It has been noted that there is increased open defecation in places like Nyambogo, which presents a health threat especially in contracting diseases like cholera because when it rains natural water sources can get contaminated. Even though some refugees have constructed latrines, building material and labour costs are high beyond their means.[19]

Health

The major issue relating to healthcare and health centers is that, they are poorly facilitated with medication. Refugees feel that they are given only basic medication for sometimes complicated medical conditions. In Kasonga for instance, they said that they are given 'only pain killers' and yet when they are refered to Hoima they find difficulty accessing services.[20] During the COVID-19 pandemic, referal cases have not been able to go to Hoima because movement was restricted during. They are not allowed to move even with boda bodas. On the other hand, host communities decried that refugees have better health services – even some locals are allowed to access them. However, since the pandemic started there is minimal interaction with refugees in the settlement.

Education

Education is generally relatively good in the settlement with some primary schools. The main challenge pointed out is the issue of one secondary school in the whole settlement (Kyangwali Secondary School). It was reported that the OPM is in the process of establishing a second secondary school.

Furthermore, vocational skills schools are few and even then, admission is based on avilability of slots which means that only a few youth from the community can be absorbed. Related to this is the challenge of transitioning from primary school to secondary and higher levels. Senior 4 leavers from the settlement have to go to Hoima for next level of education yet they cannot afford the school fees. However, some organisations like Windle International - Uganda are helping candidates to enrole in higher institutions of learning but only reportedly absorb around 20 students per year.

The other issue identified by the respondents is the use of English and Runyoro as the language of instruction at primary level yet most of the refugees do not understand the languages. The language gap is being addressed by education focused organisations; for instance NRC is recruiting teacing assistants who are able to communicate in the languages spoken by refugees.

Livelihood

The livelihood challenge that was consistently mentioned by refugees, was the reduction in cash payments from Uganda Shillings 31,000 to 22,000. This is perceived as problematic especially during

---

[18] FGD with South Sudanese Women in Nyampindu, 16th September 2020.
[19] FGD with South Sudanese Women in Nyampindu, 16th September 2020.
[20] FGD in Kasonga

the COVID-19 period because MoH guidelines limit some transactional activities which has affected household income. The refugees also noted that the limited pieces of land allocated to them makes livelihood complicated since the space for cultivation is small.

In addition, the youth feel that they have limited opportunities for employment and other forms of income generation. That is why they end up in non productive activities and drug abuse. They also compete with nationals for opportunities for work within the settlement. As such, they suggest to be supported with income generation activities like hair dressing, tailoring and restaurants.[21]

Environment

The demand for scarce wood-fuel is the greatest threat to the enviroment within the settlement. Although tree planting programmes have been initiated by some NGOs, they are shunned because refugees feel that they do not benefit from tree planting. Respondents suggested that when they plant trees, they are prohibited from cutting them for firewood or construction and yet they cannot afford to buy them from host communities. Related to this is that refugees are alocated limited land which they instead would prefer to be used for crop agriculture.

As such they experience acute shortage of firewood, which inturn cause an overwhelming demand for firewood. Due to scarcity of fuel wood, women are forced to walk about 10 kilometers, sometimes up to Lake Albert. In Mkarange, some households have resorted to the use of plastic bottles to cook food. The use of energy saving stoves is encoraged but it is claimed that at Uganda Shillings 10,000 they are expensive. Even so, they claim that the stoves are inefficient because of poor workmanship.[22]

Connectors

A number of peace connectors were identified mainly because they enable refugees to interact internally but also externally with the host communities. They enhance solidarity and mutual respect and are a good fit with the nexus framework. As such, "the nexus approach is good because MIRP partners are able to build on each other's work in a way that provides a basis for refugees and the host community to enhance peace in the community. For example NRC trains youth groups and ACF picks them up and provide them with materials for start-up. LWF on the other hand is empowering host communities to address conflicts at family and community levels."[23] Infact, it was mentioned that LWF is the first and only organisation focused on refugees that has engaged host community on issues related to peace and conflict resolution"[24]

As such, water sources, schools, places of worship, markets, gardens, casual work, saving groups were identified as the key peace connectors within the settlement but also between the refugees and host communities because they provide spaces where different people meet and get to interact.

Dividers

There exists several dividers some based on reality and others on perception of refugees and host communities. Refugees pointed out that the settlement is experiencing increased open defecation because there are few latrines. Even so, some organisations asked households to excavate pit latrines and promised to provide construction materials. However, these have not been delivered

---

[21] FGD with Women in Rwenyawawa, 16th September 2020
[22] FGD with Youth in Nyampindu, 16th September 2020
[23] FGD with Youth in Kasonga
[24] FGD with host communities in Kituti

and yet the pits were already excavated. Refugees now fear that they might experience outbreak of diseases such as cholera; in adition to the fact that the pits are a danger to children.

Refugees feel that organisations with operations in the settlement can provide them casual employment instead of giving those jobs to nationals whom they perceive to be better off because they have better sources of livelihood. So they see nationals taking away job opportunities even when they are willing to work for much less than what nationals are paid.

In the settlement, refugees feel that organisations tend to focus on new arrivals because they have more urgent needs, yet some of them that have been in the settlemnet for several months and years equally still have similar or even more needs. This causes tension because 'old refugees' treat the new arrivals as competitors to resources thereby blaming them for their prolonged suffering.

Mitigation of existing or perceived sources of conflict

It was reported that regular communication and dialogue with communities (both within refugees and host communities) will help in addressing some of the tensions and conflicts. While refugees come from different backgrounds, they often experience challenges with co-existing among themselves especially when they are settled near those who are seen as enemies in their country of origin. In addition, host communities also have their negative perception of refugees which in some instances causes tension. They feel that more communication and dialogue will be helpful in creating better understanding within refugees and between refugees and host communities. [25]

Refugee hosting communities such as Kiziranfumbi need more farming related support for sustainability. They also need to benefit from employment opportunities such as teaching and other activities which can bridge the gap between them and refugees. They say they can also provide services to the refugees in the settlement.

It is important that the knowledge gap between refugees and host communities be reduced so that they can get to appreciate the need for co-existance without necessarilly generating tension.

Impact of COVID-19

Since its outset, COVID-19 has affected the daily routines and lives of both the refugees as well as host communities. Social services have been impacted especially schools and churches which connect refugees and with host communities. It was indicated that gender based violence had increased since Ministry of Health COVID-19 restrictions were instituted.

Generally, COVID-19 has limited the mobility of people and increased redundancy leading to moral decay and an increase in teenage pregnancy. The other aspect of this is that livelihood at family level has been affected since the youth and women who largely earn thier living from the informal sector could nolonger earn.

MIRP partners have also been affected in terms of programming because community interaction is limited. It has made implementation expensive because for activities like training; activities which require many participants yet there is need to observe social distancing. Therefore, MIRP partners have either halted some programme activities or adjusted by, for example, training fewer participants but increased the frequency which becomes costly and time consuming.

---

[25] FGD with mixed nationalities of refugees, Nyanbongo, 16th September 2020

The continued observation of the Ministry of Health COVID-19 guidelines has meant that communities are cut off from some of the essential services and those activities that enable community interaction like churches. Busissnesses like boda boda, hair dressing (salons) and other economic activities on which many youth depend for livelihood were halted.

Faith is looked at as vital in society for moral rehabilitation and couselling. Praying is seen as a point of healing of the heart and redresss, this also forms part of their definition of peace. For instance, 'peace means being able to praise God.'[26] Hoewver, COVID-19 has at the moment limited worship.

- COVID-19 remains a key issue that requires more sensitization efforts in and around the settlement. Its multiple effects like the escalation of Gender Based Violence also need to be responded to. MIRP and other partners can respond through community sensitizations, radio spot messages, and community dialogues involving communities and relevant leaders. Such interventions can minimize the threat of COVID-19, its resultant effects like GBV, and existing/possible misconceptions.
- In regard to the language of communication, most of the sensitizations/sensitization materials observed are in English. As such, the involvement of local leaders who can speak in Kiswahili, local language in the host community and common languages spoken in the settlement to do community sensitizations can be of an added value. This will also minimize the tendencies of information/messages misinterpretation.

- The GVB task force and LCIs provide a good community peace infrastructure to work with as these are key entry points at community level. In regard to COVID-19, the COVID-19 Task Force and the District Health Officer (DHO) specifically are also key duty bearers who need to be actively involved.
- The progress/changes of the interventions can be monitored by project staff - with the active participation of community leaders like LCIs and bloc leaders. Active participation of community members through dialogues (that discuss the key issues and way forward), and in the assessment of progress is also key as it promotes community ownership. Issues that need to be addressed by higher authorities can be forwarded by the community leaders to respective stakeholders/duty bearers.

ANALYSIS

Ways in which MIRP could create or worsen conflicts or contribute to peace building.

The most pronounced conflicts in the settlement and host communities are land conflicts and domestic violence of which the latter spikes during cash distribution periods and most recently because of the COVID-19 lockdown. Land administration within the settlement is under OPM. None of the MIRP partners is directly involved in addressing land conflicts. However, they do play a supporting role, where by some of their activities empower communities to peacefully co-exist in dignity and also utilise the land.

As such MIRP partners have expressed the need to build their capacity in conflict sensitive approaches which will enable their work not to cause conflict; and not to worsen existing conflicts but rather help them to address the context that leads to conflicts.

---

[26] FGD with Women in Mkarange, 17th September 2020

While land-related tensions have not turned violent, it still remains a potential source of conflict because the majority of host community members rely on land for agriculture. In addition, there seems to be less communication between refugees and host communities. Therefore, one way in which MIRP can contribute to peacebuilding is by promoting communication and dialogue between refugees in the settlement but also promote more contact and engagement of host communities with refugees.

Even though social relations between refugees and host communities are good; the existing communication gap especially where hosts have been evicted is a risk factor. The host communities seem not to fully appreciate the settlement because it is perceived as one taking away their land; and yet they perceive refugees as being better taken care of than nationals when it comes to social services. This gap can be reduced through sensitisation of both the refugees and host communities.

The other strategy is to encourage joint activities, for example refugees and host communities can jointly plant trees. This will build on already existing peace connectors such as sharing markets, going to the same schools, hospitals and churches.

> *Overall MIRP will contribute by having a positive impact because it is tackling the environment, and social services like education. That means that schools will be able to enrol more children. Focus on WASH will improve hygiene and in terms of livelihoods, it will support value addition to produce and access to better market.[27]*

Mitigation measures relating to potential or identified risks

One of the potential risks identified is misinformation relating to pit latrines. The refugees attribute open defecation to lack of support to construct latrines. However, it has not been explained to them the reasons for delays and as such they feel that they have not been supported enough.

The sector lead partner working on latrine construction indicated that the materials for latrine construction have been procured but had delays in delivery which were caused by COVID-19 lockdown[28]. In order to address the looming misinformation relating to pit latrines, there is need for ACF to inform households which were asked to excavate pit latrines so that they are aware of the cause of delay.

In regards to local labour, agencies seem not to consider refugees for small jobs in the settlement leading to refugees to perceive themselves as being discriminated and excluded. Engaging them in small jobs further improves relations between agency staff and refugees which intern motivates refugees to fully participate and appreciate MIRP.

From the outset of COVID-19, refugees have been perceived as a threat by the host communities because they say that Kwangwali refugee settlement is a hotspot for COVID-19. And yet host communities feel that refugees are treated better than them. There is need to promote more information on COVID-19, so that people are aware and knowledgeable about it.

In terms of land conflicts, there is need to engage the settlement leadership so that there is proper communication regarding land management issues.

---

[27] Interview with CAO, Kikuube District, 14th September 2020
[28] Interview with ACF staff, 17th September 2020

The GBV committees in the host communities need to be strengthened because they are reference points for household tension and conflict. They have been critical in creating awareness among in villages during the COVID- 19 pandemic.

Some of the key sensitive issues and how they can be handled by MIRP partners.

Generally MIRP partners are implementing their activities in a manner that minimizes risks. However, in the fragile context of Kwangwali refugee settlement and host communities, here are some of the ideas that can support in maximizing the positive outcomes and minimizing risk issues.

Outcome area	Issue and what makes it fragile	Possible strategy
Improved quality of literacy, numeracy and skills development in Kyangwali resettlement and surrounding districts	**Lack of a clear transition plan:** Whereas MIRP partners are promoting education (which a vital) there is no clear transition plan for the students. For example, after completing senior 4 class, it can create high levels of unemployment in the settlement – something that can create tensions among the "semi-educated" (middle level) youth as this tends to create a sense of frustration.	MIRP partner like NRC can engage the relevant education institutions and actors working in the settlement to develop a clear transition plan to absorb the refugee students after completion of Ordinary and Advanced levels (senior 4 & 6).

Improved Livelihood and food security for both hosts and refugees.	Land: Land remains a very contentious issue marred with mistrust and fear. For example the refugees claim the portions allocated to them are too small to sustain their livelihood. There is also fear that the arrival of new refugees forces more sub-divisions of the portions already allocated. On the other hand the government refutes all such allegations. Furthermore, the host communities have strong emotional attachments to the land as "our land" and the recent relocations of the host communities from Bukinda escalates the emotions.	Land interventions need to be "traded with care". In the short-term, MIRP can concentrate on addressing the driving factors for land conflicts. For example food security interventions by ACF can result in increasing productivity per-acre. This will reduce the amount of land needed to sustain a family – hence reducing land conflicts arising from the desire for more land for cultivation. MIRP partners should build the capacity of local leaders (both hosts and refugees) in peace building, conflict resolution, dialogue and mediation. Land issues (such as those over boundaries) can then be addressed at community level. This does not only enhance community ownership and capacity but also enables the partners not to directly get involved in settling cases with perceived "imposition of outsider solutions". Encourage partners to utilize local labour (both refugees and hosts) in casual labour and other services where that can be obtained from within the settlement and host communities.
Environmental protection and sustainable energy for both host and refugees.	Tree planting is not something that is well appreciated yet by the refugees– much as the need for firewood in high. This is because it is attributed to the fact that their stay in the settlement is temporal and the tricky balance of using the little pieces of land to either cultivate crops or plant trees. This makes environmental protection not to be in the best interest of some refugees	Engage in dialogues with refugees to identify best means of protecting the environment and planting trees – for example along road reserves It would also be good to introduce to and educate the community on efficient energy saving stoves. Slowly it will be appreciated by the community
WASH and Protection (Including gender justice, fight against GBV) and SRH services	Fragility of the context and trauma: "The nature of community we are dealing with is not a normal one. Being a refugee is the worst situation one would wish for. We need a psychological angle to the interventions" – Deputy Settlement commandant. "These people still have bitterness in their hearts. This	There is need for staff to understand the context they are working in. This can be done though conflict sensitive analysis. Psycho-social support to communities is key. Similarly staff capacity enhancement to deal with psychosocial issues of the

	triggers anger in them" – Police CID Officer. Such statements affirm that MIRP partners are working in fragile contexts.	refugees is important.
	Negative historical past - especially among refugees from same country has a big bearing on the tensions/relations among them in the settlement.	Need to understand the historical relationships of different groups before interventions to ensure that the intervention does not spark the deep-seated grievances but rather minimise their negative impact.
	GBV: The refugee communities have a strong social construction characterized by GBV. This scales up to the level of adaptive preference where even women perceive GBV as "normal". Remarks by one of the women participants like "In Congo we used to be beaten by our husbands but they would buy for us meat. But here they beat us, yet they do not even buy meant" affirms the assertion.	There is need for a conflict sensitive approach to handling GBV issues in the community. This needs to start not with condemning GBV but making communities appreciate where it is not good. The approach needs to involve men as well as key change agents There is need for enhancing the capacity of partner staff, security agents (police) and community structure leaders in peacebuilding and conflict transformation to include mediation, negotiation and reconciliation.

PARTNER CAPACITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT.

ACF

At Kyangwali, it is focused on livelihoods, food security and nutrition sector; and its programming more on transition from humanitarian delivery to development mode but less on peacebuilding. However, its food security programming is nutrition sensitive, implying that it empowers refugees to have sustainable supply of food that is nutritious.

Much as it is not focused on peacebuilding, it indirectly works on and encoutnter peace and conflict issues, therefore, it is imperative that ACF staff be equiped with conflict sensitivity skills so that their work does not impact negatively by worsening existing conflicts or causing tensions.

For instance, considering the example in Bukinda, conflict sensitivity skills would have been appropriate in resolving any misunderstanding the staff had with community members because it would have enabled ACF to conduct its activities in a manner that does not result into suspcion since the community perceived them as working for government to evict them from land.

It was indicated that ACF staff have been trained in Do-No-Harm approaches. They are oriented in core humanitarian principles, conflict of interest, staff regulations, mandatory online training on Sphere policies, conflict resolution and management. These trainings are also a basis for assessing staff performance and appraisal.

Therefore, it seems that if the do-no-harm application is inclined towards humanitarian action and not systematically reflecting the need to prevent or solve conflicts or tensions even if they don't directly seem to emerge as a result of its programming. Therefore, it is important that they gain more training in Conflict Sensitive Approaches because it is broader than do-no-harm. As indicated, 'we need to grow more into peace building…at the moment aspects of peacebuilding and conflict resolution issues are hidden in organisation project activities and programming'.[29] There is need for more capacity training in conflict sensitive programming since their work is directly informed by data assessment which is usually collected by interacting with refugees and host communities.

Case two for CSA

One of the challenges faced in the education sector is the issue that there is only one secondary school in the whole settlement. By the tme of this assessment, it was indiicated that OPM is already addreessing this gap. Already, land has been identified in Maratatu B. Interestingly, it is not clear how this location was decided. It was not possible to establish whether the school is located in such that it will be easily accessible by learners.

Case one for CSA

In Bukinda, as part of its MIRP work, ACF was profiling host community members in which it was capturing household details including: unique identifiers (ID) numbers of household members and passport photgraphs. At the same time OPM was relocating the members in the same community. The community perceived ACF as though helping government to evict members from 'their land'.

N**RC**

NRC is focused on education and is a strong sector lead in the settlement. It is suggested that the MIRP approach has improved interagency cooperation and coordination through the monthly meetings. It has created synergy for instance gender and education activities can jointly use the same school to conduct activities.

---

[29] Interview with ACF staff, 17th September 2020

NRC works with bloc leaders to access the settlements because they are most authentic gate keepers and have influence at community level. Moreso, it is implementing 50/50 programme coverage in the settlement and host communities. This implies that they are able to interact with refugees and host communities and are better placed to support a knowledge and information sharing role.

The secondary school issue further shows that CSA training is relevant to the MIRP partners, since they also suggested that,

> *'there is need to be conscious on what would make the programme fail, and one of the ways of doing this is by training in conflict sensitive approaches.'[30]*

Furthermore, it is importnat to support community events such as international refugee days, cultural days, peace education, etc. The assessment finds that these mean alot to the refugees and can improve interaction between refugees and host communities. Other key education and peace related issues NRC could be best placed to work on include peace education, sports for peace activities, managing transition from P7 and S.4 , enhancing vocational training and creating opportunity for absorption by trainees.

LWF

LWF focused on water provsion and by the time of the assessment, it was implementing a piped water scheme to six villages intended for both refugees and host communities. MIRP creates synery and joint action between partners and other organisations interlinked with their activities. Its structure is applauded for enabling regular coordination.

LWF noted that the MIRP nexus approach brings on board key postive elements and value addition because, 'a beneficiary is able to get a full package for services that are essential for peace, for example: water, education, trees and basic awareness in GBV.[31]

LWF has basic skills in peace building. It has focal persons on peacebuiding. The satff have basic understanding of conflict sensitivity but its application is inclined toward Do No Harm. The application of CSA mainly seems to be apppplied as a good practice but not as a systematic application.[32] The staff who participated in the assessment appreciated the need for peace building skills, and the need to integrate CSA in their programming including the community structures it works with. This can be achieved through ToT to ensure other stakeholders are also trained afterwards.

---

[30] Interview with NRC staff, 17th September 2020

[31] Interview with LWF staff, 14th September 2020

[32] Interview with LWF staff, 14th September 2020

The current capacities and training needs of MIRP partners for peacebuilding

Programmatically, MIRP partners are well staffed and operationally capable to deliver on their respective projects. They have the capacities to work with communities and are in good professional and working relationship with OPM, the UN agencies and the Local Government.

However, it is evident that they are programming in fragile communities impacted by conflict, given that most of the refugees have resettled because of armed and tribal conflicts in their countries of origin. At the same time, host communities also experience a certain level of intra community conflict such as GBV and inter community conflict such as land conflicts. As such, there is need for MIRP partners to gain more training in conflict sensitive approaches so that their work does not cause or worsen existing conflict. Conflict Sensitive Approaches integration and programming will enable MIRP partners to apply strategies that will strengthen refugee relations in the settlement and with host communities.

Practices, resources and tools for making conflict sensitive analysis an on-going process

The basis for best practices, resources and tools for making conflict sensitive analysis an on-going intervention and programming is to continuously conduct or embed conflict analysis so as to understand the changing context in which a project is implemented. This analysis enables the identification and communication of the issues that divide people and cause conflict, as well as the issues that bring people together and promote peace.

Case three for CSA

There was a request to extend piped water to 6 villages in Kyangwali. LWF secured funding and committed to provide a water supply system. Potential beneficiaries (mainly refugees) were informed about the project but host community members were not. They then threatened to cut the water pipes if they are not served water. Following exploration, the contractor did not find water in that area. LWF decided to relocate the project to Kizirafumbi (occupied by only nationals). The people in Kyangwali were not happy. LWF organised a conflict resolution meeting with the help of the district leadership and a decsion was made to rehabilitate non functional boreholes in Kyangwali. LWF activities were affected because they could not reach the target number of beneficiaries planned.

The CSA analysis in the operational context of a refugee settlement enables one to understand the interaction between the context and his/her interventions / work - recognising that the context/conflict impacts on MIRP programmme work and that MIRP work impacts on the context. This realization enables MIRP and other partners in designing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating the programme work to maximise positive impacts and minimise negative ones.

CSA in this context can enable partners (including those who think are not directly involved in peace building) to enhance their contribution to sustainable peace in the area by addressing the proximate causes of conflicts – tackling poverty, hunger, inequality, exclusion, illiteracy, psychological torture, promote-co-existence, avoid causing/escalating conflicts inadvertently, among others.

MIRP Capacity Development Plan

Capacity development in this context means the process by which MIRP partners/staff are able to improve their knowledge and skills in order to enhance the realization of their programme efforts and peace. The capacity needs assessment indicates that there exists basic knowledge about peace building among a number of staff. However, although elements of conflict sensitivity are manifested in the practice of MIRP partners, a systematic CSA programming approach needs to be strengthened.

This plan focuses on only one of the elements of capacity building (institutional development) as it is the most effective way of encouraging the practice of conflict sensitivity in the Kyangwali context. It also focuses on the context of capacity for peacebuilding and conflict transformation.

As MIRP, its focus can apply a 5 Cs principle of capacity development; the most central in the MIRP context would be the capacity to deliver on its objectives. This then requires the other 4 Cs; the capacity to act and commit, capacity to adapt and self- renew; capacity to relate to external stakeholders, and capacity to achieve coherence.

CAPACITY NEEDS	WHO (POTENTIAL TARGETS)	POTENTIAL STRATEGIES	EXPECTED OUTCOME (GENERATED FROM THE STUDY DISCUSSIONS)
Training in peacebuilding and conflict transformation	Local community leaders	3- 4 days TOT training for MIRP field staff. The TOT approach will then trickle down to training of target beneficiaries on the ground; Use of peace building focal persons within MIRP to facilitate the trainings	Enable staff across all levels to be equipped with peace building knowledge and skills and be able to apply it the field
Refresher training in peacebuilding and conflict transformation	MIRP field staff	2-4 days training workshop	Enhanced application of peace building skills in MIRP programme components
Training in CSA to development, peace building and humanitarian action	MIRP programme managers and field staff.	3-4 days training workshop	Enhanced CSA skills among MIRP staff
Integration of peacebuilding and CSA in organizational programming	Programme officers, project officers, M&E officers (basically all staff).	Incremental planning; Put in place peacebuilding focal person; Put in place systems/tools to capture; update, analyze information and respond accordingly.	Maximization of positive outcomes in MIRP programme and minimization of negative outcomes
Build on the good MIRP reputation and to community level ownership of project activities	MIRP partners, LG leaders; community leaders, community members	Information sharing with stakeholders; Joint community trust and confidence building activities – with communities; Community dialogues; Sports for peace activities.	Enhanced and sustainable relationship between MIRP partners and stakeholders

Enhance identification and utilization of existing resources	MIRP partners	Identify what connector for peace and resources are available - within and outside MIRP; Attention to both hardware and soft-ware. Sources of existing resources and connectors to build on could include; LG structures; Community leaders; traditional Alternative Dispute Resolution practices, existing groups, joint host and refugee collaboration practices, event celebrations, markets, places of worship, schools, joint community work, etc	Enhanced cohesion and co-existence within communities; Strengthened local structures able address and resolve conflicts at community level.

How it can be integrated in phases and parts of MIRP

- In order to effectively address the key issues in the findings and implement the recommendations suggested, capacity building enhancement for MIRP partners is important.
- To foster capacity building among the partners, capacity building needs to be integrated in the MIRP programme (in various phases and parts of MIRP).
- Capacity building needs to be considered at two levels; at event level and process level. The event level would involve activities like capacity building trainings for staff and community leaders. After the staff have been equipped with sufficient skills, they can then apply the skills acquired at a process level. The process level includes practices like integration in action plans, annual plans, projects and programmes.
- At process level, capacity building can also be mainstreamed in day-day activities and routine work. For example Gender sensitivity, conflict sensitivity and sensitivity to culture and conflict sensitive communication need to be promoted and observed in day to day operations/implementation
- Staff orientation, refresher courses, coordination meeting, and staff meetings also offer opportunities for capacity building. For example, it provides space to remind each other about core values, objectives, acting in a conflict sensitivity manner, and expected behavior, among others.

On the part of CECORE, it can provide accompaniment support by guiding and offering advice to the partners where need be, and offering skills building trainings in relevant areas – especially related to peacebuilding, conflict transformation and conflict sensitivity

Indicator matrix – with a peace lens

It is true that MIRP programmes contribute to building peace in communities. However, this contribution is to a large extent inadvertent and therefore un-intended. There is potential to realize

more results towards peace if there is a deliberate systematic effort that is planned for towards peace. This can be done through integrating and planning for results – especially with a peace lens. This means developing both programmatic and peace indicators. Below is a sample of possible peace indicators/indicators with a peace lens.

MIRP Programme Component	Possible action	Possible Peace indicator	Possible Proxy indicator /Indicator definition
WASH & Protection GBV, Gender Justice, SRHR	Provision of water (at a central/boundary points)	• No. of refugees and host community members accessing the water source • Level of interaction between the refugees and host community members	• Refugees freely interacting with locals and vice versa. • Water sources being used as a platform for counselling among women
Literacy, Numeracy & Skills Development	Recruitment of teachers	• No. of teaching assistants who are able to instruct lower level pupils in their local languages. • No. of teachers from host communities.	• Level of performance among the target pupils • No. of refugees who feel that their students are able to understand better at school because teachers mix the local languages as a language of instruction • Host communities feel they are benefiting from hosting refugees because they are able to get job opportunities
Environmental Protection and Sustainable Energy	Support youth groups with skills in making energy saving stoves	No. of youths working jointly as a group to make energy saving stoves	• Changes in the level of un-employment among the youth • No. of trees cut for wood fuel • Amount of time spent by women on collection of firewood
Livelihood and Food Security	Support the formation of SACCOs	No. of refugees who are members of at least one SACCO	• Refugees from different ethnic groups/ nationalities working together in same SACCO • Level of monetary and non-monetary benefits (friends, advise, saving cultures) • No. of personal business started as a result of being a member of a SACCO.

CONCLUSION

Generally, MIRP will positively impact the relations within the settlement (between different nationalities) and between refugees and host communities because its work is based on the nexus approach where partners can be able to build on each others' strength and work. In terms of peace and conflict, rebuilding relations is important.

Therefore, since most of the conflicts are resource based, relating to limited land it is improtant that more awareness on maximum land utilisation technologies is promoted so as to reduce land tension. Co-existance between host communities and refugees need to be strengthened considering that they already enjoy good relations.

In regrads to COVID- 19, more awareness on prevention and management needs to be enbedded as messages within MIRP project activities. This will help in preventing transmition and management. The host commnities have significantly minimised ties with refugees in the settlement majorly because of COVID- 19, therefore, once they are more aware of COVID- 19, it might improve the already good relations they have.

MIRP partners need to build their capacities to respond to risk factors. It has been indentified that CSA would be adequate to enable partner staff to deal with risks. This capacity can be built as part of organisational trainning or it can be embedded within project activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and analysis of the study there is need;

- To encourage dialogues within the settlement and between refugees in the settlement and host communities. This is because there seems to be information gaps on how refugees and host communities perceive each other. This will further promote co-existence between the refugees and host communities
- To construct more boreholes and the non-functional ones be repaired to address water shortage and the long distance women travel to fetch water. This is because some villages experience acute shortage of water.
- For MIRP and other actors to integrate capacity building programmes through training in basic peace building and conflict transformation skills to staff and stakeholders/structures at community level. This will help to promote sustainable solutions to tensions or potential conflicts and enable actors at community level be able to respond to them when they arise.
- For MIRP partners to systematically integrate conflict sensitivity in their programming. This will be key in maximising positive outcomes and preventing inadvertent conflicts. It can also be integrated into sectoral appraoches; and as institutional capacity for conflict sensitivity. This can be enhanced by a conflict sensitive training
- Encourage monthly MIRP coordination meeting – as this was pointed out by MIRP partners as an important platform for information sharing, coordination and joint planning.
- Promote Peace education in the refugee settlement – especially in schools. NRC could be based placed to lead in such a programme since it already has a niche. This is key in transforming the minds of communities – especially among children
- Enhance vocational / hands-on skills building among refugees – especially among youth and women. Specialised skills in livelihood also need to be tailor-made for men. Such skills are key in sustaining families even upon the return of the refugees in their respective countries of origin
- Awareness raising on peace and conflict transformation, and GBV, trauma/psycho-social support and COVID-19. MIRP could build on and supplement the work of existing

structures/actors like the police's child and family protection (in case of GBV) that seem overwhelmed and limited in capacity.

• Enhance provision of key MIRP partner focus areas (energy saving, water, education, livelihood food security) as key strategies to addressing the proximate causes of conflict and tension – among refugees and host communities

Possible action plan for implementation of recommendations

Outcome area (drawn from MIRP Log frame)	Recommendation issue	Possible action
Improved quality of literacy, numeracy and skills development in Kyangwali resettlement and surrounding districts	Promote Peace education in the refugee settlement – especially in schools.	Train teachers in peace education Develop placards with peacebuilding messages and erect them in school compounds
	Enhance vocational / hands-on skills building among refugees	Scale up more vocational skills trainings in the settlement - as requested by the youth
Improved Livelihood and food security for both host and refugees.	Capacity enhancement- two levels – event and process. Start with event like training and then process like integrating in action plans, annual plans and day to day processes, dialogues	Enhance interventions aimed at increasing productivity (yields) per acre – by educating communities better ways of cultivating fast growing and high quality yielding crops and intercropping.
Environmental protection and sustainable energy for both hosts and refugees	Encourage tree planting and environmental friendly cooking methods in the settlement	Engage the district natural resource officer and National Forest Authority to jointly work with communities to plant trees along road reserves. Sensitise and engage relevant government institutions to provide free seedling for host communities to plant (as a medium term investment) Introduce to and educate the community on efficient energy saving stoves. Slowly it will be appreciated by the community
WASH and Protection (Including gender justice, fight against GBV) and SRH services	Encourage dialogues within the settlement and between refugees in the settlement and host communities. Aimed at promoting peace, co-existence and oneness	Engage wiith community leaders and facilitate platforms for community dialogue of key issues (gender justice, fight against GBV and SRH services) in the community. Ensure active partipiation of

		women and youth in the implementation processes of projects/activities.
		Actively involve groups that feel less represented (minority) like South Sudanese in programme activities at community level.
		Encuarage recruitmnet of refugees for jobs like drivers without restricting to nationals.
		Also recruitmnet of qualified refugees as project staff would be an important move. This could start with engaging them as volunteers, translators during community meetings, interns, etc to build thier capacity and confidence
	Construct more boreholes and the repair of non-functional ones.	Priority can be based on the need and chances of such water points connecting communities for peace.
	Awareness raising on peace and conflict transformation, and GBV, trauma/psycho-social support and COVID-19.	Work with and strengthen the capacity of existing structures to play their role. For the police's child and family protection (in case of GBV), GBV task force, LCIs. Enhancing the capacity of partner staff, security agents (police) and community structure leaders in peacebuilding and conflict transformation to include mediation, negotiation and reconciliation
Other: Capacity enhancement	Integrate capacity building programmes through training in basic peace building and conflict transformation skills to staff and stakeholders/structures at community level.	Start with events and then process i.e training and then incorporation into implementation work
	Systematically integrate conflict sensitivity in programming.	Start with events and then process i.e training and then incorporation into implementation work

Service provision	Enhance provision of key MIRP partner focus areas (energy saving, water, education, livelihood food security) as key strategies to addressing the proximate causes of conflict and tension – among refugees and host communities	Scale up existing interventions within the community and host community not being served
Feedback and communication	Feedback to the community ongoing projects	Enhance information flow to communities through local leaders. This reduces elements of communities remaining in suspense and fear – for example on follow-ups on latrine materials.
Information sharing	Information sharing with Government officials. (Offices like that of the settlement commandant seem to have advisory and contextual information that the community and MIRP partners but which can only be shared if necessary platforms are organized.)	Ensure regular update/information sharing with Government institutions like OPM/settlement commandant's office, district and sub counties.
Integrated apporach	Develop an integrated approach that addresses specific thematic issues but also strategically contribute to broader peace in the community. For example provision of water leading to reduction in Gender based violence	*Can apply the example of the indicator matrix with a peace lens above*

Annexes:
- Terms of Reference
- Inception Report – including questionnaire
- Desk review report
- List of documents assessed
- List of persons interviewed