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Executive Summary

Project Background

Between May 2016 and September 2017, Search for Common Ground (Search), in partnership with Trade Mark East Africa (TMEA) has implemented a regional project targeting small cross-border traders operating on the Goma/Gisenyi and Bukavu/Rusizi borders. The overall aim of this project was to support peace through economic development and improved citizen-government relations in the area of cross-border trade, supporting enhanced confidence in traded goods and services between Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Specifically, the project sought to achieve three outcomes: (1) to improve relations and collaboration on border regulations between customs officials and small traders; (2) enhance stakeholders’ research-based awareness on issues related to cross-border trade (CBT) related issues faced by small traders (petty traders, local CSOs/PSOs, border officials, government officials, and other relevant parties); and (3) to empower petty traders, cooperatives/associations, and related CSOs to work together to improve livelihoods for petty traders. The project was implemented in collaboration with local radio stations, state and border officials, as well as local CSOs and microcredit institutions.

Methodology

The project’s final evaluation was conducted in September 2017, with the overall objective to capture change brought about by the project in the transformation of relations between border officials and petty traders, in the awareness of petty traders on CBT issues, and on their economic empowerment. Specifically, the evaluation had three objectives: (1) conduct an updated context analysis; (2) measure progress towards expected outcomes; and (3) identify lessons learned and recommendations. The evaluation was articulated around three evaluation criteria: effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

The evaluation was led by Search’s Project Coordinator, with technical support from its Design, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist for East Africa. The methodology combined a quantitative and qualitative approach: a survey was carried out with 406 respondents in the two border towns of Bukavu in the DRC and Rubavu in Rwanda, and as for the qualitative part of the evaluation, 9 key informant interviews and 6 focus group discussions with a total of 60 people were conducted. The research team interviewed micro-credit recipients, border and State officials, the directors of the radio stations that aired our programs, and the directors of our partnering micro-credit institutions. While the baseline study was conducted in all four locations, due to time constraints, the final evaluation was carried out in two of the four border towns: Bukavu and Gisenyi. This has permitted the evaluation team to collect data on both sides of the border, thus providing a good overview and analysis of the project outcomes.

Summary of key findings

The research highlighted the following key findings:
Effectiveness

The study found that the project had effectively contributed to its overall goal to support peace through economic development and improved citizen-government relations in the area of cross-border trade. This was measured through the achievement of the project’s expected outcomes:

- **Outcome 1 to improve relations between petty-traders and border officials** was successfully achieved in Rwanda, but saw slower progress in the DRC. While 74% of the surveyed petty traders reported a straightforward improvement in their relations with the Rwandan border officials and a greater ease to cross the border with their goods on the Rwandan side, on the Congolese side only 43% of respondents claimed that the situation improved, while 44% said that there was no change. According to the FGDs, while there is less harassment on the Congolese side than there was a year ago, the practice of asking for illegal taxes still persists on that side of the border, hence the persisting dissatisfaction by petty traders. Overall, 61% of the respondents of our survey reported having less conflicts compared to last year when crossing the border. The above demonstrated improvement of relations between the traders and the border officials supports the overall aim of the project, fostering peaceful relations in the region.

- **Outcome 2, that is the awareness-raising component of the project**, obtained very positive results. Radio Maendeleo in Bukavu and RBA Community Radio in Rubavu both reported having reached their target audience, and 76% of listeners have found the quality of the information disseminated through them very relevant and useful. Furthermore, the town hall meetings and trade fairs have managed to bring together petty traders from both sides of the border, helping them to start sharing information and working together for advocating their rights. The surveys show, that knowledge on CBT regulations and laws has improved: Only 19%, compared to 33% have reported their knowledge on CBT to be very bad or bad, and a big majority (75%) reported sharing their knowledge on CBT with a fellow trader or someone else. Disseminating the information on CBT regulations will on the long term equally contribute to fostering peace between the actors, since it will make the border crossing more transparent.

- **Outcome 3, the microcredit program set up by Search in collaboration with three local civil society partners** has greatly contributed to enhancing the welfare of its petty trader participants. The program was particularly successful in Bukavu, where the beneficiaries were not only able to pay back their loan before the required deadline but were also able to generate a capital from it, which they could use for further investment in their businesses. This success can be attributed to the regular follow-up and accompaniment that Search and its civil society partners provided to the beneficiaries of these micro-credits. This component of the project aimed to foster peace through enhancing the economic welfare of the petty traders of the region.
Impact

The evaluation team found the longer term impact of the project to be:

- The project has managed to **fill a gap in the public discourse**, in the sense that there was a lack of discussion on CBT issues and the right of petty traders before its implementation. The traders, border officials and radio directors have all greeted this initiative, recognizing the importance of maintaining open spaces of discussion between traders and border officials.

- The project has triggered a **behavioral change** at the border points, where customs officers and border officials are treating petty traders with more respect and are more willing to respond to their questions regarding taxes and regulations. Thanks to the new knowledge gained, the traders are also less willing to pay bribes and are more prone to standing up for their rights. This behavioral change has appeared more strongly on the Rwandan side, while traders reported persisting harassment issues on the Congolese side. The observed change has contributed to setting up a more peaceful environment on the border posts.

- The project has created a **greater efficiency in the way institutions operate** on the Rwandan side, where the border services have become quicker and more organized. On the Congolese side, at the Bukavu/Rusizi border point, the tokens\(^1\) are now distributed for free which also shows an improvement in the functioning of their border institutions. A greater efficiency on the border posts has the potential in both fostering a more peaceful environment on the border posts, and enhancing the welfare of petty traders, who – since they can cross the border easier – can engage more dynamically in cross-border trade.

- The microcredit program, reaching 226 people with a total amount of 24,675.34$ has greatly contributed to the **improvement in the economic welfare** of the participating petty traders. The collected data shows that the traders who received a micro-credit were able to spend more on everyday nutrition, on schooling and clothing their children and on developing their businesses. As an indicator of success, the majority of them were able to pay back the loan on time while expanding their business capitals.

- The partner radio stations and local CSOs have equally benefitted from the program and have internalized some of its tools. The training given to the radio stations’ journalists has boosted their expertise on CBT issues, motivating them to continue broadcasting on the issue. As for the local partner CSOs they have learned an efficient way to accompany and help the micro-credit recipients, to develop small businesses that respond to their specific needs.

Sustainability

The findings of our evaluation suggest that the results achieved through the project are sustainable in the following ways:

---

\(^1\) A “jeton” or token is a daily authorisation paper allowing an individual to move within the municipal limits of the border towns of Rubavu/Goma and Rusizi/Bukavu
The petty traders, microcredit beneficiaries, radio stations and border officials demonstrate ownership of the new knowledge on border regulations and their rights developed during the project implementation. Additionally, Through establishing platforms of discussion the project has enabled to build up a better, more peaceful collaboration between border officials and petty traders. The change was especially noticeable on the Rwandan side of the border, where both the quantitative and the qualitative data show an improvement in the quality of collaboration. The sustainability of this behavioural change could be ensured through the training of new border officials. A greater institutional efficiency on the Congolese side will also contribute to sustaining the positive improvements in the collaboration.

As for sustaining the advocacy work, the project has reached its objective of bringing petty traders together in associations and initiating a successful collaboration between them. Through the solidarity of the social network of these associations, they will be able to continue advocating for their own rights and keep themselves up to date with the CBT rules and regulations.

The radio stations and local CSOs have equally expressed their wish to continue the work of dissemination information on CBT, keeping the radio programs running and continuing to provide the petty traders with advice and guidance.

**Summary of key recommendations**

Based on these findings, the evaluation team is making the following recommendations:

- Continue disseminating information and raise awareness on CBT issues. Build on the new expertise of the staff of the radio stations to design new radio programs, continuing the thematic of the ones that were broadcasted during the project.

- Maintain and promote a space for discussion between border officials and petty traders. Supporting the creation of formal collaboration mechanisms between petty traders and border officials would ensure the continuous improvement of relations.

- Involve border officials in all of the steps of any project regarding CBT issues. This facilitates a closer follow-up of the activities and ensures a smooth collaboration with the officials.

- Set up a lasting framework of collaboration between the Rwandan and Congolese government authorities so as to address CBT issues more efficiently and collectively decide on customs regulations.

- Encourage and support the establishment of traders associations and cooperatives and make them available for a wider public.

- Publish and circulate a list of the customs regulations so as to keep cross-border trade transparent and accessible for all petty traders.

- Address the persisting issues of harassment and bribe-taking on the Congolese side of the border by introducing a stricter surveillance of the border officials.
Maintain and further develop the microcredit program, as this gives an opportunity to the petty traders of the border towns to access small credits that they could not have had before.

1. Background information

Small trade between the province of North and South Kivu in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and the western province of Rwanda is a very important source of revenue for local populations. In 2010, International Alert estimated that at least 22,000 people were surviving on revenue made through sales revenue between Goma and Gisenyi, many of them women. Limited access to financial capital reinforces competition, making trading conditions very difficult for small traders, and women in particular. Finally, and despite tracing mechanisms and initiatives developed locally and internationally, the persistence of illegal trade (including undeclared trade and smuggling of minerals) often triggers a confrontation between authorities and operators. This constitutes an additional source of insecurity which further hinders trade and prospects for economic development in the region.

Cross-border trade between the DRC and Rwanda amounts to $17 million per year, which shows the economic interdependence in this region. This interdependence is an important factor in economic growth and opens the possibility of building closer ties between the peoples of the two countries in order to achieve greater regional cooperation. Thus, if this regional trade was carried out in compliance with national and international laws, it could serve as a driving force for the growth and economic development of the two countries, while contributing to regional peace and stability. In this context, Search for Common Ground (Search), implemented a regional project financed by Trade Mark East Africa (TMEA) targeting small traders crossing the borders between Rwanda and the DRC (Goma / Gisenyi and Bukavu / Rusizi) and officials working at these border points. The project was implemented over the period of 16 months, from May 2016 through September 2017. The overall objective of this project was to support peace through economic development and improved citizen-government relations in the field of cross-border trade. The project expected to reach three outcomes:

1. Improve relations and collaboration on border regulation between customs officials and small traders;
2. Increase research-based awareness on issues related to cross-border trade (CBT) to small traders (petty traders, local CSOs/PSOs, border officials, government officials, and other relevant parties); and
3. Empower petty traders, cooperatives/associations, and related CSOs to work together to improve livelihoods for petty traders.

To achieve these objectives, the project brought together small traders and border officials from both Rwanda and the DRC, organizing town hall meetings, producing and broadcasting radio programs on cross-border trade and building the entrepreneurial capacities of small traders. The project’s main target group were small traders, with a particular emphasis on
women, as well as customs officers. The project indirectly targeted others through the radio programs produced and broadcasted.

2. Methodology

2.1 Evaluation objectives

The main objective of this final evaluation was to assess the outcome of the project’s activities and report on the change in the observed behavior of the target population, the change in regulations and in the general environment around targeted border points, isolating the impact of Search’s intervention so as to define its actual influence.

Specifically, the study had three objectives:

1. Conduct an updated context analysis
2. Measure progress towards expected outcomes
3. Identify lessons learned and recommendations

2.2 Evaluation criteria and research questions

The evaluation criteria and research questions were developed jointly by the program team, the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation (DM&E) Coordinator in Rwanda and in the DRC as well as the Regional DM&E team, based on the research questions and tools used for the baseline study.

The study was articulated around three of the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria.

- **Effectiveness**: To measure if the implemented activities have reached their target;
- **Impact**: To show the positive and negative change achieved through the program (directly or indirectly);
- **Sustainability**: To see whether the results reached through the project will continue to have an impact after the end of the project;

The general research questions were:

To measure the effectiveness of the project:

- To what extent have the project activities been successfully implemented and their targets reached? Have the project outcomes been reached?
- Has the target population been reached by the implemented activities?

To measure the impact of the project:

- What difference did the project make to its participants?
- What were the expected and unexpected results of the project as of practical and behavioral changes?
To the petty traders
To the border officials;
To the cooperatives of petty traders?
To the local partner NGOs;
To the partnering radio stations;

- What were the secondary or undesired secondary effects of the implemented project?

To measure the sustainability of the project:

- Has the project permitted the setup of a sustainable collaboration between the border officials and the petty traders crossing the border?
- Are the results sustainable and will they continue to have an impact after the end of the project?

2.3 Target areas and target groups

Data collection was conducted from September 18 through 22, 2017. While the baseline study was conducted in all four locations, due to time constraints, the final evaluation was carried out in two of the four border towns: Bukavu and Gisenyi. While addressing the time constraints this has permitted the evaluation team to collect data on both sides of the border, thus providing a good overview and analysis of the project outcome. The data was collected from:

- Small traders crossing the border between Rwanda and the DRC, (Goma / Gisenyi and Bukavu / Rusizi); including the beneficiaries of the microcredit initiative;
- State officials working at the border (Goma/Gisenyi and Bukavu/Rusizi);
- The partner micro-credit CSOs in those two locations, Tous pour le Genre et le Development (TGD) in Bukavu, and Action pour le Development du Peuple (ADEPE) in Bukavu;
- The Director of Rubavu District Business Development and Employment;
- The radio stations contracted to broadcast the awareness-raising programs on CBT: Radio Maendeleo in Bukavu and RBA Community Radio Rubavu

The data was collected through a mixed approach: a survey (quantitative) and semi-structured focus discussion groups (FGDs) and interviews with key informants (KII) (qualitative).

Quantitative

The survey consisted of an individual questionnaire with closed and semi-open questions in order to collect statistical data on small traders in Rwanda and the DRC. A sample size of 200 respondents per location was established based on the size of the population of Ruvabu and Bukavu. The sample held a 95% confidence level with an error margin of plus or minus 0.05% and was distributed on all two borders in equal quantities. In total 406 people – 300 women (73.9%) and 106 men (26.1%) were surveyed in two locations, Rubavu and Bukavu. The larger number of women respondents aimed to match baseline proportions and reflect the
greater number of women among small cross-border traders. The age of respondents ranged from 15 to 67, with an average of 34 years old. The table below provides data on the sociological characteristics of the respondents, such as their mean age, the average number of their children and the most common level of education reached amongst them.
Table 1: Survey Respondents, disaggregated by location and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total reached</th>
<th>Total planned</th>
<th>Average age</th>
<th>Average number of children (&lt;18)</th>
<th>Most common level of education reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bukavu</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Secondary school cycle 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubavu</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents were selected randomly in the locations where the small cross-border merchants engage in trade (market, border, etc.). Quantitative data was collected by five enumerators in Rwanda and five in the DRC, were recruited and trained before completing the research. Quantitative data was then analyzed by Search Rwanda. The data was all collected in an Excel file, then was first analyzed separately, according to the location, then merged together to see the combined results of the evaluation. Next, the results were compared to the baseline indicators and graphs were set up.

**Qualitative**

The qualitative component included focus groups and individual interviews for which interview guides were developed. A total of 6 focus groups were conducted with 60 people, and 9 Key Informant Interviews were held. For the FGDs the participants were selected by Search’s program team in collaboration with the partner organizations and taking into account the category of participants in the project. The participants were selected among the beneficiaries of the project, meaning that they have either participated in some of the activities, such as the town hall meetings the conferences or have benefitted from the microcredit grant. 3 FGDs were carried out in each site (Rubavu and Bukavu):

- 1 FG with men cross-border traders;
- 1 FG with cross-border young women traders;
- 1 FG with adult cross-border women traders.

The research team held semi-structured interviews with the following key informants:

- Grégoire Rucamumihigo, the national coordinator of ADEPE in Rubavu and Esperence Hendwa, the national coordinator of TGD (*Tous pour le Genre et le Development*) in Bukavu;
- The representatives of the State services working at the Gisenyi/Goma and the Rusizi/Bukavu border. Concretely, LémonNsengimana COMESA staff member and Jean Berquimas Nkubito, MINEACOM staff member at the border of Gisenyi/Goma, Jean-Pierre Mumbala, financial inspector at *Hygiene services* and
Jules Luendo, head of division in charge of the border police in the Rusizi/Bukavu border;

- The directors of two of the radio stations contracted to broadcast the radio programs produced on CBT. Thais Bagula, director of Radio Maendeleo in Bukavu and Steven Kalisa, the director of Rubavu RBA Community radio;
- Bénoit Rukabu, the Rubavu District Business Development and Employment Director.

Group-specific discussion guides and individual interview guides were developed and translated in local languages. The survey provided statistical data while respondents’ opinions in focus groups and semi-structured individual interviews allowed for more in-depth qualitative information and better clarification of quantitative data. All the tools are available in Annexes to this report.

**Table 2: FGD and KII Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Key Informant Interviews</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubavu</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukavu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A moderator accompanied by a note-taker conducted the FGDs and KIIIs at each border. After data entry, the qualitative data was also analyzed and triangulated with our quantitative data by our Search Rwanda team. The data was also disaggregated by country and by border, allowing for a comparison between the DRC and Rwanda.

### 2.4. Limitations

During the collection of qualitative data, the evaluation team was not able to interview the border officials at the Rubavu/Goma border, since the Migration Office refused. Instead, the evaluation team interviewed COMESA staff members and the Rubavu District Business Development and Employment Director.

Furthermore, as mentioned above, due to the time constraints we were only able to collect data from two locations out of the four targeted in the baseline and throughout the project implementation, meaning that comparing the baseline data to the evaluation data has its natural limits. Additionally, due to the size of Gisenyi and volume of trade going through there, our quantitative survey has not reached a high number of people who were effectively involved in our programs, so we had to rely solely on our FGDs to evaluate some components of the project.

### 3. Key Findings

In this chapter, the results are organized in three sub-chapters, following the OECD-DAC criteria and the research questions.
3.1 Effectiveness

This sub-section measures whether the implemented activities have successfully reached their target. The section is structured following the desired project outcomes (Outcome one to three).

*Table 3: Summary of key outcome indicators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved in the Project</th>
<th>Project Target</th>
<th>Comments on % of Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Goal:</strong> to <em>support peace through economic development and improved citizen-government relations in the field of cross-border trade.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1:</strong> Improve relations and collaboration on border regulation between customs officials and small traders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.: % of petty traders who report an enhancement of the collaboration with customs officers</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Reduced border crossing times for small scale traders to trade between Rwanda and DRC</td>
<td>Average of 27 minutes</td>
<td>Average of 15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2:</strong> Increase research-based awareness on issues related to cross-border trade (CBT) to small traders (petty traders, local CSOs/PSOs, border officials, government officials, and other relevant parties)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 % of participants declaring awareness of CBT regulations has benefitted their business</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 % of participants who restituted their knowledge on CBT regulations to others</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3:</strong> Empower petty traders, cooperatives/associations, and related CSOs to work together to improve livelihoods for petty traders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 % of participants who accessed</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
microloans who say to be able to maintain their commercial activities

important divergences between different target locations. In Bukavu 95% paid back their credits and reported even having generated capital that they will continue using in the years to come. In Rubavu, not all traders had been able to reimburse yet at the time of the evaluation, so we could not yet determine if their businesses will continue.

### 3.1.1 Improving relations and collaborations on border regulation between customs officials and small traders

- Reducing the time spent at the border

The survey gathered data on the perception of time spent on each side of the border by small traders. Unlike in the baseline study, where two-thirds of small traders surveyed (from both countries) had reported spending more time at the Congolese border than at the Rwandan side of the border, the end line evaluation showed that the opinions now diverge (see Graph 1). On the Rwandan side, in the Rubavu district, 74% of the respondents said they pass more time on the Rwandan side of the border, whereas in Bukavu 93% of the respondents reported spending more time on the Congolese side.

*Graph 1 and 2: Perception of time spent on each side of the border, by location, baseline compared to final evaluation results*
The respondents were asked to estimate how many minutes they usually spend at the border. While the most common answer was 30 minutes, the average time spent at the border proved to be around 27 minutes. Similarly to the data discussed above, respondents in Bukavu reported spending less time crossing the border (around 23 minutes), while those in Rubavu reported an average of 33 minutes. This result is surprising, since the baseline study reported an average time of 21 minutes. The focus group discussions confirm this finding, shedding more light on the reasons behind the delays: the Congolese side is said to be slower because the border officials employ only two ways: tokens, and passports or laissez-passer, without differentiating between the people who are carrying products and those who simply wish to pass. This, in addition to the fact that the Congolese officials do not use offices, causing traders to crowd on the open path slows down the process. On the other hand, those who are willing to pay high bribes or have a personal acquaintance at the border can pass quickly and smoothly. The Rwandan side is said to be different: here the reasons for delaying are a meticulous search from the part of the Rwandan border officials, often leading to the confiscation of certain goods. Respondents in Gisenyi faced the problem of Rwandan authorities confiscating their goods more often than their Bukavu counterparts. On the other hand, our respondents in Bukavu have talked more on the problems of corruption and inefficiency encountered on the Congolese side.

To measure the relationship and collaboration on border regulations between custom officials and small traders crossing the border between Rwanda and the DRC, the following points were discussed:

- The level of satisfaction with the relationship between customs officials and small traders at borders and their reasons;
- The sources of information for all questions / problems at the border, relating to the activities of small traders; and
- The level of interaction with customs officers.

The majority of small traders surveyed (58%) said they were still not satisfied with their relations with Congolese officials at the border (see Graph 2). However, here we can already notice an improvement, since the baseline study suggested that 72.9% of petty traders were dissatisfied with the Congolese border service. Participants in all focus groups in the DRC reported some improvement in their relations with the Congolese border officials saying that there was less beating and that the tokens required for petty traders to cross the border were now distributed for free. However, they complained that the taxes went up and that they were constantly asked to pay bribes by more than one border official. Since they did not receive receipts for their payments they were obliged to pay each and every border official who asked them for money. While some said that there was less harassment and fewer beatings than before, unfortunately there were still some reported cases of abuses. As one woman from a focus group in Rubavu explained: “We cannot dare to quarrel or debate/discuss, they can break our heads; we instead kneel to tell them ‘Father or Mother, I beg your pardon, forgive me, take this cash!’” Contributing to conflicts was also the fact that chicken, fish and eggs were refused to cross the Congolese border, as the Congolese state feared from the outbreak.
of bird flu. The chicken and eggs traders did not know about the recent ban, leaving them surprised and helpless when they arrived to the border only to see their goods confiscated.

Graph 3: Satisfaction with the services of the Congolese state at the border, aggregated, baseline compared to final evaluation results

![Graph showing satisfaction with the services of the Congolese state at the border.](image)

Both the focus group discussions and the survey respondents in both locations reported a positive change on the Rwandan side, saying that the border officials are more willing to communicate and that there are less body searches and beatings. On the other hand they complained that the confiscation of products is very common in Rwanda. This might be due to some new regulations on the Rwandan side, such as the ban on the import of second-hand textile products that the traders do not know of yet. As seen here and in other examples, the slow spread of information, or in the worst case the complete stop of information flow is at the root of a lot of problems and conflicts between the traders and the border officials. Other common cases of confiscation on the Rwandan side included women traders wishing to enter with small quantities of food destined for domestic consumption (for example a kilo of rice). Since they could not prove that the product was only intended for their household and did not want to pay a tax, their products were often taken away by the Rwandan border officials.

Overall though the level of satisfaction with the Rwandan border officials is satisfactory (64% in Rubavu and as high as 93% in Bukavu) and it is more on the Congolese side that the problem seems to persist.

“On the Rwandan side we have noticed the diminution of the waiting time, - it is decreasing gradually because we confront them in the meetings. For example, the staff in charge no longer use their phones while at work, they have been provided with other communication tools than telephones so as to discourage delays, because they used to be distracted by their phones. The only people who are delayed on the Rwandan side are those who have banned products, because these products will be confiscated.”

Woman participating in the focus group of Rubavu, Rwanda
Similarly to the baseline, if the data is broken down according to the nationality of the respondents, it is observable that the small traders who are the most dissatisfied with their relationships with the Congolese border officials are the Congolese traders, although the survey found improvement compared with the baseline situation (64%, compared to 83.7% in the baseline). There is also some dissatisfaction among small traders in Rwanda with the Congolese officers (52%, compared to 62.6% in the baseline). The data shows that both these indicators have improved over the past year.

The top two reasons for dissatisfaction the traders mentioned were the amount of taxes (44%) and the harassment by the border officials (47%), as illustrated in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Reasons for dissatisfaction with the services of the Congolese State at the border

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for dissatisfaction with the services of the Congolese State at the border</th>
<th>reason 1</th>
<th>reason 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I did not have access to information about my rights and duties and those of border agents</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot easily have a discussion with officials at the border</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many taxes</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lot of harassment / corruption</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lot of violence</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As said above the FGDs have confirmed these findings saying that there are many illegal taxes on the DRC side of the border, that the traders are obliged to pay to more than one border official. In extreme cases, up to 30 border officials can ask for an unofficial bribe from one trader, whom – not having received a receipt from any of the transactions before – have little choice but to pay up. The border officials also demand a higher tax than before, meaning that in that sense the situation worsened on the Congolese side.

_In DRC we are charged a lot of unjustifiable taxes so that when you present the officials legal documents permitting you to work, they tell you ‘Will we eat these papers?’ You are then obliged to pay 1000 Congolese francs, or 1000 Rwandan francs when you don’t have Congolese ones. A worse problem is that you can’t pay to one person only; the minimal number of people we give the money to is six or seven and the maximum is fifteen, to each of whom you give at least 500 francs._

Woman participating in the focus group of Rubavu, Rwanda

Finally, 58% percent of respondents of the survey reported having less conflicts on the border (52% said the situation improved on the Congolese side, and 64% said the
situation improved on the Rwandan side). See Graph 3 below for more details, as well as the breakdown of results by nationality.

Graph 3: Perception on the amount of conflicts related to CBT, by border service

To be able to understand more in depth the evaluation team asked the respondents whether the quality of their collaboration with the border officials has improved, and if they could rate the quality of their relations with the border officials. While the data shows an improvement in the collaboration, the relations are still not flawless between border officials and petty traders. While 74% of petty traders’ respondents reported an improvement of relations with the Rwandan border officials, the opinions diverge more on the collaboration with the Congolese border officials: 43% of respondents claim that the situation improved, while 44% say that there was no change.

It is also noteworthy that in this particular question the respondents from the two different border locations (Rubavu/Goma and Bukavu/Rusizi) have answered very similarly, meaning that the same tendency can be observed on both border posts. The FGDs confirmed the improvements in relations with the Rwandan border officials, with one participant mentioning the concrete example of having brought in a huge quantity of sorghum, with which the border officials were very helpful. She stated: “In May 2017 we imported such a big quantity of sorghum that all border staff members—those working in offices and outside, those in charge of security, the Rwanda Revenue Authority personnel, etc. all intervened to accelerate the service. We didn’t exceed 30 minutes while it could have taken us more than one month in normal conditions.” The focus groups’ participants also mentioned that the Rwandan border is much more orderly and transparent now.
In order to be able to understand the perception of the petty traders better, they were equally asked to rate their relations with the customs officials (ranging from very good to very bad). 47% of traders reported having neutral relations (compared to 21% in the baseline), and 26.5% reported good relations with the customs officials (compared to 42% in the baseline evaluation), so there is no clear trend as to whether the relations improved or deteriorated globally. On the other hand, the FGDs and KIIIs have reported an improvement in the collaboration between border officials and petty traders. For example, one of the interviewed border officials in Bukavu noted that due to the SFCG programs the traders are more informed, less inclined to cheat and more open to turning to the border officials for help.

**3.1.2 Increasing research-based awareness on issues related to cross-border trade (CBT) to small traders (petty traders, local CSOs/PSOs, border officials, government officials, and other relevant parties)**

This sub-section examines the extent to which regional trade stakeholders, including small traders and vulnerable groups, are sensitized and informed about CBT issues thanks to the implemented program. Research participants were asked questions about the payment of informal taxes, knowledge of the laws and regulations governing CBT and the sharing of information acquired on the activities of small traders crossing the border. First, respondents were asked about their opinions on informal fees and receipts.
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Graph 5: Opinions on informal fees, aggregated, baseline compared to final evaluation results

![Bar graph showing opinions on informal fees.](image)

This graph shows that the vast majority of respondents (80%) do not agree with the payment of an informal tax even if it would permit them to pass through the border quicker. This tax is perceived as corruption. Compared to the baseline results, where 30% of respondents would have rather paid an informal tax to pass through the border quicker there is an improvement in this aspect. The FGDs conducted in Bukavu reinforced this observation, as the participants stated that since having participated in the meetings and having listened to the radio programs produced by SFCG they stopped bribing, knowing who to turn to for help.

Graph 6: Opinions on receipts, aggregated, baseline compared to final evaluation results

![Bar graph showing opinions on receipts.](image)
A similar improvement can be observed in the awareness on receipts. The baseline results suggest that 74% of petty traders knew that they should receive a receipt when paying, whereas the final evaluation shows an improvement of 4 percentage points, putting the proportion of traders demanding a receipt to 78%. This is exceptionally important when taking into account the behavior of Congolese customs officer mentioned and described above, who continue to ask for many illegal taxes without giving a receipt. In order to achieve change, the traders need to know that such behavior is not legal.

**Graph 7: Knowledge on CBT, aggregated, baseline compared to final evaluation results**

![Graph showing knowledge on laws and regulations governing cross-border trade]

Similarly, when asked to qualify their knowledge of laws and regulations governing cross-border trade more favorable results have been obtained compared to the baseline study. Only 19%, compared to 33% have reported their knowledge on CBT regulations and laws to be very bad or bad. Similarly to the baseline results, amongst those who claimed to have a good or very good knowledge on CBT issues, 75% of them shared this knowledge with someone else, the majority of them (88%) with their fellow traders. In the final evaluation 85% of the traders said that this information was very useful for their businesses, benefiting them. This shows a progress compared to the baseline results, as only 64% reported at the beginning of the year that the information on CBT issues benefits their businesses. As explained above a lot of the conflicts on the border arise from lack of information on taxes and new regulations (for example the new law on the importation of second-hand clothing on the Rwandan side, or the fear of bird flu on the Congolese side), so it is vital that the traders recognize the interest in keeping themselves and their fellows up to date on rules and regulations.
In order to know whether this positive change has happened due to SFCG’s activities and which components have contributed most to the spread of information questions on the radio programs, town hall meetings, trade fair and other awareness-raising activities were included in both the surveys and the focus group discussions.

- **The role of town hall meetings and trade fairs in raising awareness**  
The FGDs show that the town hall meetings have greatly contributed to raising awareness on CBT issues. One of the indirect channels in which this change has been achieved was through bringing Congolese and Rwandan traders’ associations together. Through these meetings (i.e. at the trade fair and at the town hall discussions) the traders exchanged a lot of information, and realized that they were not alone with their problems.

> “The SFCG trainings and town hall meetings have allowed us to know institutions to which we can express our problems. Cross-border trade has been given a value thanks to these forums”

-Man participating in the focus group of Bukavu, DRC

The FGDs conducted in Rubavu have emphasized that knowing traders from the other side of the border has greatly contributed to their knowledge, and in fact it has worked as a social networking forum, the success of which is shown by the fact that the traders even report visiting each other in their respective homes. Furthermore, when facing issues at the border “we are assisted by Congolese traders to secure solutions“,- reported one of the participants of a FGD, showing that the personal relations established via the projects help the traders in their professional activity. As seen later in the report, this component of the project is very important, as it ensures a continuity and sustainability to the project.

- **The role of the radio programs in raising awareness**  
A major component of the project was the radio programming, produced by Search and broadcasted on four different radio stations covering the targeted border points. In order to assess the success of these programs, participants in the survey and in the FGDs were asked whether they had listened to them, and whether the information disseminated thought them was useful. Furthermore, the evaluation team conducted KIIs with the directors of the two radio stations, Radio Maendeleo in Bukavu and RBA Community Radio in Rubavu.

Amongst the respondents of the survey, 50.5% had listened to the radio programs on CBT issues (53% of women and 47% of men). As seen on the graph below, the show was more popular in Rubavu than in Bukavu.
Out of those who did listen to the radio program, 76% have found the quality of the information very relevant and useful. *I have personally listed to the program for more than one time. The programs have generated a strong impact since they have performed advocacy in such an interesting way that the Minister having commerce in duties himself followed the broadcast and called me myself to tell me what we had to follow up for a solution.* - noted the COMESA staff member we have interviewed in Rubavu. The FDGs have also shown that the radio programs were well designed to address the specific concerns of petty traders, they were understandable and useful.

“The listeners understood the themes and messages because they asked questions around them and suggested issues to be discussed in the next program; you can’t ask questions on a topic you have not comprehended.”

Steven Kalisa, Community Radio Station Director at Rubavu RBA

The KIIs conducted with the directors of the radio stations showed us similarly positive results. Both directors mentioned that the radio programs were useful, well adapted to the reality of traders (using simple language and addressing the core problems) and both mentioned success stories linked to the radio programs.

Additionally, confirming the success of the outreach to the target population, both radio stations had traders coming into their studios, sending a text message or calling to react to the emission, ask more questions, or report on the issues they observe on the field. The Director of Radio Maendeleo mentioned that the programs were so known that even the *Fédération des Entreprises du Congo*(Federation of Congolese Enterprises-FEC) has discussed with them, showing that this was truly the first time that a lot of people’s attention was brought to CBT issues. Furthermore, the journalists hosting the programs have now become real experts on the topic, meaning that they could continue their work as advocates for the petty traders, thus ensuring the sustainability of the project. In Bukavu, the Director of Radio Maendeleo reported that before this project, they never addressed the topic on CBT but now things have changed and they’re more sensitive to CBT issues.
Finally, the directors of both radio stations mentioned that in order to reach a maximal impact the radio programs should continue to be repeated and rebroadcasted, so as to make sure that everyone understood the message and will remember it later on.

From the feedback received on the radio programs it can be concluded that it indeed has been the appropriate tool for reaching out to the targeted population, that the emissions were well phrased and thought of, and that there is a need to rebroadcast the emissions many more times in order to reach a higher level of awareness on CBT issues.

3.1.3 Empowering petty traders, cooperatives/associations, and related CSOs to work together to improve livelihoods for petty traders.

This section analyzes the extent to which the economic viability and resilience of small traders crossing the border between Rwanda and the DRC, especially women, has been strengthened through the project. The section assesses the success of the microcredit component of the program and the impact of the new associations created through the microcredit initiative.

- The microcredit program’s effect on increasing the economic viability of petty traders

As established during the baseline study, petty traders have difficulty working with conventional financial institutions because of their small business capital and because many of them do not use banks. For this reason the project team decided to implement a microcredit program, with the help of local partners in each location. 226 micro-credits for a total of 24,675.34$ were distributed throughout the project, and those receiving the credit benefited from a close follow-up from the part of Search and the partner organizations (Adepe, TGD, ADPD) who have given them advice on how to use the credit to be able to reach the maximum benefit for their businesses.

The quantitative survey only had 8% of its respondents receiving a microloan: 5 in Rwanda and 28 in DRC. Therefore for the assessment of the program the evaluation team relied more on the qualitative data.

The FGDs allowed assessing the effectiveness of the microcredit component more clearly. The participants in the FGDs (all of them beneficiaries of the microcredit component of the project) were all very satisfied with the microcredit initiative. Participants of the FDG with young girls (under the age of 35) in Rubavu reported:

“The microcredit has helped us since it has strengthened our capital so that the profit has been increased; consequently, we are able to satisfy our necessities. One of our members easily got school uniforms for her children, two obtained a health insurance scheme for their families, another one managed to provide secondary school necessities and fees for her child without difficulty, another one comfortably payed a rental house, another easily managed to get clothes for her children and they eat well, while another easily bought kitchen tools and
has undertaken a saving system which will enable her three children to be school fees. In a nutshell each has stories to tell.”

The FGDs in Bukavu have also emphasized the welfare-enhancing impact of the microcredit initiative. In fact, our KII with our local partner, TGD in Bukavu showed that the microcredit program was surprisingly successful in the sense that not only everyone has managed to pay back their credits but they have even managed to generate some capital from the past year’s activities that they will continue to use in the years to come. At the same time, both local partners, TGD in Bukavu and Adepe in Rubavu pointed out the necessity to continue the microcredit program in order to support the women and reach a meaningful impact. As the representative of Adepe in Rubavu pointed out: “Providing women with a support lacking the financial assistance is like asking a wife to cook while you haven’t given her the food products to prepare into a food.”

- **The effect of the creation of associations on increasing economic viability**

As part of the eligibility criteria to apply for the microcredit, traders were asked to accept to join newly founded trader’s associations that would help them cope with the challenges of CBT, discuss amongst themselves and give advice. Six associations of ten people each were set up in each location in the end, totaling up to 24 new associations created in the framework of this project. The associations proved to be a very useful forum for sharing problems, providing support and advocating for the petty trader’s rights. Their participants have expressed their will to continue working in their framework after the end of the project. As one participant of a FGD pointed out: “We have now comprehended the management of cooperatives, the way bookkeeping, management and accounting works.”

This is a very important outcome of the project, as it will ensure continuity and independence from the donors of the project.

“Before giving us the credit, we have received a training. They taught us that we should not want to take a loan without having a concrete objective and that in order to succeed we have to limit our expenses and make sure that we pay back our loan on time. All in all, we are very happy because our businesses have evolved a lot, for example he [pointing at another member of the FDG] has 50 chicken today, and he only had 20 before. Most importantly, we have managed to pay back our loans and now are working from our own capital.”

Man participating in the focus group of Bukavu, DRC).

### 3.2. Impact

From its research, the evaluation team observed changes in practices and behavior, institutional changes, and changes in economic welfare and viability for petty traders. The section is structured following the research questions established in the methodology section of the report.
The significance of the project to its participants

According the collected data, the project managed to address a gap, giving a voice to the petty traders and mediating between the traders and the border officials. The issues of petty traders engaged in cross-border trade was not much discussed before, and there weren’t any platforms to bring border officials and traders together. As Steven Kalisa, the director of the RBA Community Radio put it:

“The radio program focusing on cross-border trade has inspired us to make advocacy stories around issues faced by petty cross-border traders. The radio station has been the Voice of the Voiceless and it is an essential issue since the petty traders have been provided with room to articulate their concerns.”

Steven Kalisa, the director of the RBA Community Radio

The participants of the FGDs also expressed their gratitude for having someone supporting their cause, as well as for the possibility of having a microcredit. In short, the project has opened up a lot of doors for petty traders, by setting up platforms of discussions and support groups and addressing some of the issues they were facing via the radio programs.

In addition, the microcredit program, reaching 226 people with a total amount of 24,675.34$ has greatly contributed to the welfare improvement of those involved. As detailed above (Section 3.3) the participants of the program saw a direct welfare improvement as well as a growth of capital in their businesses. In Goma and Rusizi, all of the beneficiaries have payed back their loans by the end of the reporting period. In Bukavu at the end of the reporting period all but three people payed back their loans. In Rubavu, the micro-credit program started in the month of July and the beneficiaries receive the loan for a period of four months. The beneficiaries reimburse the loan on a monthly basis, and all of them have done so for the period of July-October.

The expected and unexpected results of the project in behavior change

- For the petty traders and border officials

One of the main aims of this project was to ease tensions between border officials, customs officers and petty traders crossing the border every day. As seen above, the two parties had many conflicts, ranging from illicit taxes, to harassment, smuggling and the confiscation of goods. To address the bad climate between the agents, Search has set up forums of discussion (town hall meetings, trade fair) to bring together petty traders and border officials, to generate mutual understanding, settle the ongoing conflicts and reach a change in behavior for the future. The forums have helped the two parties understand each other’s point of views and discuss some of the pressing issues. As a result of these meetings, the qualitative evaluation has established that there is less harassment and violence, less smuggling and a better cooperation on the borders. As one border official put it:
As stated above and seen in Graphs 3 and 4, the improvement has mostly happened on the Rwandan side, leaving more work to be done on the Congolese side. The impact of the program and the improvement seems to be bigger in the Rusizi/Bukavu border compared to the Rubavu/Goma border.

Some of the problems identified in the CBT relations were directly related to the institutional framework of the borders. The baseline study established that the Congolese side of the border does not have a very clear taxation system, leaving room for many officials taking bribes. Similarly, the border institutions failed to inform many of the traders on the amount of taxes they were supposed to pay, which led to more tensions and disputes. Some change have already been achieved on this level: the tokens on the Congolese side of the border are now distributed for free, and are making the process of crossing the border somewhat faster for small traders. On the Rwandan side, the survey showed an improvement of the border services both in efficiency and in the cooperation between border officials and petty traders. Even though a list of taxes for each product has still not been published and put up at the border, many traders know more about the amount of tax they are supposed to pay and dare to approach border officials with their questions.

- To the cooperatives of the petty traders

Another institutional deficiency identified at the beginning of the project was the lack of organized cooperation between petty traders. This left them powerless against harassment and bribe-taking officials and badly informed on CBT issues.

Fortunately the project evaluation has seen a real improvement in this aspect. The small traders could now turn to the local organizations contracted by Search (Adepe in Rubavu and TGD in Bukavu) for advice and for representation. Moreover, as mentioned above, the newly established associations have provided a real framework for sharing information and advice on CBT issues and on confrontations with the border officials. The petty traders got to understand that they are not alone with their problems and that they can make a substantial change by cooperating with their fellow traders. This has also given them confidence to stand up against harassment on the borders and to advocate for their rights. The platforms have also permitted a start of a cooperation between Congolese and Rwandan traders. However, so far these associations only include those who have benefited from the microcredit. To reach a maximal impact, it would be necessary to expand the circle and include all petty traders.

- For the local CSOs who led the micro-credit component of the project

Both TGD in Bukavu and ADEPE in Rubavu have reported a positive impact of the project on their organizations. Both said that thanks to the project they have learned how to closely follow and help the recipients of the micro-credits. This has at first been challenging for both
of them, since the majority of the recipients could neither write nor read, and had only a very basic knowledge of business affairs. So both organizations had to provide a full-scale support to their participants, which they successfully managed to do. In addition, the project coordinator at TGD in Bukavu, Esperence Hendwa also emphasized that they have learned about the necessity to advocate for the rights of petty traders.

- **For the partner radio stations**

The partnering radio stations were affected both by the trainings held for their journalists, and by the actual implementation and broadcasting of the radio programs. “*Issues of CBT were not discussed at all on our channel, and this has changed thanks to this project*” said Thais Bagula, the director of Radio Mandeleo. Both directors of the two radio stations reported their staff having more extensive knowledge on CBT issues, thus being able to produce higher quality emissions. In addition, their interest has been drawn to CBT issues that they hope to continue talking about in later programs.

### 3.3 Sustainability

This section examines the sustainability of the achieved outcomes of the project, by looking at the cooperation between the border officials and the petty traders and the concrete results of the project. The section is structured according to the research questions stated in the methodology section of this study.

In general, the petty traders, microcredit beneficiaries, radio stations and border officials demonstrate ownership of the capacities developed during project implementation. There is an increased sensitivity on CBT issues and the resolution of the conflicts between the petty traders and the border officials.

**The sustainability collaboration between border officials and petty traders**

Through establishing platforms of discussion the project has enabled to build up a better, more peaceful collaboration between border officials and petty traders. The change was especially noticeable on the Rwandan side of the border, where both the quantitative and the qualitative data show an improvement in the quality of collaboration. The sustainability of this behavioral change could be ensured through the training of new border officials. Moreover, the institutional changes mentioned above will continue to ensure a smoother service on the border. On the other hand there is still a need to set up some lasting frameworks to ensure that the platform of discussion between petty traders and border officials would stay open.

**The sustainability of the results of the project**

According to our evaluation on the awareness-raising component of the project (see section 3.1), the targeted population of the radio programs and trainings has internalized the information on CBT issues and regulations. At the same time, as noted when discussing the efficacy of the radio programs there is still a need to rebroadcast the radio programs so that the information would soak in and have a lasting impact. A continued advocacy would also
be desirable to maintain the results of the project, and fortunately a willingness from the part of the radio stations and the CSOs is noticeable in this aspect.

As stated above, both directors of the radio stations consulted in the KII's pointed out that thanks to the project their workers have received training on CBT issues and have become experts on the topic, meaning that they would be able to continue designing similar radio programs. They have equally emphasized the need to continue with the radio programs in order to reach more people and ensure that the information has been internalized.

The newly created associations also provide an appropriate framework for continuing the advocacy and addressing the issues of CBT. In these frameworks, the petty traders will be able to cooperate without the help of an outside leading actor such as SFCG. A sincere cooperation between the traders will help them discuss their problems and stand up against illegal taxes and harassment. As seen in section 3.1.3, the cooperatives are already stable and well-functioning.

Lastly, the contracted local CSOs SFCG has worked with during the implementation of the project will be able to lend a helping hand to those traders who, having heard about them during the project – will turn to them for help and guidance.

Elements endangering the sustainability of the project

The qualitative research has equally pointed out some of the factors that might endanger the sustainability of the project. As stated above, the local CSOs emphasized the importance of continuing the microcredit program in order to have a real meaningful impact, fearing that those who benefitted from the funds this year might not be able to sustain an equal level of economic activity the next year. For example, the participants of the FDG in Bukavu said the amount of credits were too small, and thought it would be important in the future to increase the amount of the loan and get an average of $ 250 and reimburse it in 6 months. Also, as the directors of the radio stations pointed out there is a need to continue the broadcasting of the radio programs in order to reach everyone and in order to make sure that the information has been fully internalized.
4. Conclusion

“Improving the Cross Border Trade Environment through Improved Research and Advocacy on Cross Border Trade Issues” was successfully carried out between May 2016 and September 2017. The regional project, implemented by Search for Common Ground (Search), in partnership with Trade Mark East Africa (TMEA) targeted small cross-border traders operating on the Goma/Gisenyi and Bukavu/Rusizi borders. The overall aim of the project was to support peace through economic development and improved citizen-government relations in the area of cross-border trade, supporting enhanced confidence in traded goods and services between Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). The final evaluation was carried out in September, 2017 with the aim to assess the effectiveness, the impact and the sustainability of the project.

Effectiveness

The study found that the project had effectively contributed to its overall goal to support peace through economic development and improved citizen-government relations in the area of cross-border trade. This was measured through the achievement of the project’s expected outcomes:

- **Outcome 1 to improve relations between petty-traders and border officials** was successfully achieved in Rwanda, but saw slower progress in the DRC. While 74% of the surveyed petty traders reported a straightforward improvement in their relations with the Rwandan border officials and a greater ease to cross the border with their goods on the Rwandan side, on the Congolese side only 43% of respondents claimed that the situation improved, while 44% said that there was no change. According to the FGDs, while there is less harassment on the Congolese side than there was a year ago, the practice of asking for illegal taxes still persists on that side of the border, hence the persisting dissatisfaction by petty traders. Overall, 61% of the respondents of the survey reported having less conflicts compared to last year when crossing the border. The above demonstrated improvement of relations between the traders and the border officials supports the overall aim of the project, fostering peaceful relations in the region.

- **Outcome 2, that is the awareness-raising component of the project**, obtained very positive results. Radio Maendeleo in Bukavu and RBA Community Radio in Rubavu both reported having reached their target audience, and 76% of listeners have found the quality of the information disseminated through them very relevant and useful. Furthermore, the town hall meetings and trade fairs have managed to bring together petty traders from both sides of the border, helping them to start sharing information and working together for advocating their rights. The surveys show, that knowledge on CBT regulations and laws has improved: Only 19%, compared to 33% have reported their knowledge on CBT to be very bad or bad, and a big majority (75%) reported sharing their knowledge on CBT with a fellow trader or someone else. Disseminating the information on CBT regulations will on the long term equally
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contribute to fostering peace between the actors, since it will make the border crossing more transparent.

- **Outcome 3, the microcredit program set up by Search in collaboration with three local civil society partners** has greatly contributed to enhancing the welfare of its petty traders’ participants. The program was particularly successful in Bukavu, where the beneficiaries were not only able to pay back their loan before the required deadline but were also able to generate a capital from it, which they could use for further investment in their businesses. This success can be attributed to the regular follow-up and accompaniment that Search and its civil society partners provided to the beneficiaries of these micro-credits. This component of the project aimed to foster peace through enhancing the economic welfare of the petty traders of the region.

**Impact**

The evaluation found the longer term impact of the project to be:

- The project has managed to fill a gap in the public discourse, in the sense that there was a lack of discussion on CBT issues and the right of petty traders before its implementation. The traders, border officials and radio directors have all greeted this initiative, recognizing the importance of maintaining open spaces of discussion between traders and border officials.

- **The project has triggered a behavioral change** at the border points, where customs officers and border officials are treating petty traders with more respect and are more willing to respond to their questions regarding taxes and regulations. Thanks to the new knowledge gained, the traders are also less willing to pay bribes and are more prone to standing up for their rights. This behavioral change has appeared more strongly on the Rwandan side, while traders reported persisting harassment issues on the Congolese side. The observed change has contributed to setting up a more peaceful environment on the border posts.

- **The project has created a greater efficiency in the way institutions operate** on the Rwandan side, where the border services have become quicker and more organized. On the Congolese side, at the Bukavu/Rusizi border point, the tokens are now distributed for free which also shows an improvement in the functioning of their border institutions. A greater efficiency on the border posts has the potential in both fostering a more peaceful environment on the border posts, and enhancing the welfare of petty traders, who – since they can cross the border easier – can engage more dynamically in cross-border trade.

- The microcredit program, reaching 226 people with a total amount of 24,675.34$ has greatly contributed to **the improvement in the economic welfare** of the participating petty traders. The collected data shows that the traders who received a microgrant were able to spend more on everyday nutrition, on schooling and clothing their children and on developing their businesses. As an indicator of success, the majority
of them were able to pay back the loan on time while expanding their business capitals.

- The partnering radio stations and local CSOs have equally benefitted from the program and have internalized some of its tools. The training given to the journalists of the radio stations has boosted their expertise on CBT issues, motivating them to continue broadcasting on the issue. As for the local partner CSOs they have learned an efficient way to accompany and help the microcredit recipients, who had specific needs.

**Sustainability**

The findings of the valuation suggest that the results achieved through the project are sustainable in the following ways:

- The petty traders, microcredit beneficiaries, radio stations and border officials demonstrate ownership of the new knowledge on border regulations and their rights developed during the project implementation. Through establishing platforms of discussion the project has enabled to build up a better, more peaceful collaboration between border officials and petty traders. The change was especially noticeable on the Rwandan side of the border, where both the quantitative and the qualitative data show an improvement in the quality of collaboration. The sustainability of this behavioural change could be ensured through the training of new border officials. A greater institutional efficiency on the Congolese side will also contribute to sustaining the positive improvements in the collaboration.

- As for sustaining the advocacy work, the project has reached its objective of bringing petty traders together in associations and initiating a successful collaboration between them. Through the solidarity of the social network of these associations, they will be able to continue advocating for their own rights and keep themselves up to date with the CBT rules and regulations.

- The radio stations and local CSOs have equally expressed their wish to continue the advocacy work, keeping the radio programs running and continuing to provide the petty traders with advice and guidance.
5. Key Recommendations

Based on the analysis and conclusions presented above, the evaluation team would like to provide the following recommendations to TMEA, in order to guide the development and the implementation of similar interventions in the future.

As a general remark, the findings have confirmed that a two year project would yield higher results when it comes to the dissemination of the information on CBT issues, the empowerment of the petty traders through the microcredit program as well as the establishment of better relations with the border officials.

To ensure the sustainability and lasting impact of the project the evaluation team recommends:

- Continue disseminating information on CBT issues and raise awareness. The collected data shows that the radio has proven to be the right channel to reach the target population, therefore we suggest the radio programs to be rebroadcasted and radio to be used as the main channel of dissemination. Build on the new expertise of the staff of the radio stations to design the new radio programs. For example, as seen above one of the factors contributing to the conflict was that the chicken and eggs traders did not know about the recent ban the Congolese state introduced, leaving them surprised and helpless when they arrived to the border only to see their goods confiscated. This disputes arising from this could have been avoided with the right communication policy.

- Maintain and promote a space of discussion between border officials and petty traders. The town hall format has proven to be an excellent way in bringing the actors together and the dialogue has contributed largely to achieving more peaceful relations in the region, as it has permitted them to sympathize, however no lasting forum has been set up yet to ensure the continuity of the consulting process. Supporting the creation of formal collaboration mechanisms between petty traders and border officials would ensure the continuous improvement of relations.

- Involve border officials in all of the steps of any project regarding CBT issues. This facilitates a closer follow-up of the activities and ensures a smooth collaboration with the officials.

- Engage the representants of both States in the discussion and the implementation. The Rwandan Ministry of Commerce has expressed his appreciation for having been given a chance to exchange with the Congolese side through this project, as there was no regular contact between them before. Set up a lasting framework of collaboration between the two states so as to address CBT issues more efficiently and collectively decide on customs regulations.

- Encourage the establishment of traders associations and cooperatives. The project has seen these associations as excellent tools for socio-economic support and continuous advocacy for petty traders rights CBT. However, only those benefiting from the microcredit program have been so far able to join such associations, so this should be made available for a wider audience of petty traders in the border towns.
• Publish and circulate a list of the customs regulations so as to keep cross-border trade transparent and accessible for all petty traders. This could help avoid a lot of conflict, for example a lot of traders were not aware of the chicken and eggs ban of the Congolese side, causing them to resist the border officials when they arrived at the border. Informing them beforehand could have helped mitigate the conflict.

• Address the persisting issues of harassment and bribe-taking on the Congolese side of the border. As the findings show, in extreme cases, up to 30 border officials can ask for an unofficial bribe from one trader, whom – not having received a receipt from any of the transactions before – have little choice but to pay up. A stricter surveillance system of border officials should be introduced to stop the abuse of power of the border officials. Behavioral change could also be encouraged by informing the border and customs officials on petty traders’ rights and obligations.

• Maintain the microcredit program, as this gives an opportunity to the petty traders of the border towns to access small credits that they could not have before. Some of the traders also recommended credit amount be increased to an average of $250 and have asked for a longer reimbursement period of 6 months in order to generate more profit.
6. Annexes

6.1 The survey used for the final evaluation (in French)

**Questionnaire Evaluation Finale TME Project Juin 2017**

**PARTIE 1 : INFORMATION ENQUETEUR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Réponses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Nom de l’enquêteur:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Pays</td>
<td>(1) Rwanda (2) RDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Frontière</td>
<td>1) Goma 2) Gisenyi (Rubavu) 3) Bukavu 4) Rusizi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTIE 2: CONSENTEMENT INFORME**

*L’enquêteur doit lire à haute voix la partie 2.1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Réponses et Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Bonjour. Mon nom est ____________ et je travaille pour Search for Common Ground/Centre Lokole, une organisation non gouvernementale qui travaille dans la transformation des conflits. Nous menons une enquête sur les résultats d’un projet que nous avons mis en œuvre dans la région qui avait pour objectif la promotion de la paix à travers le commerce transfrontalier par les petits commerçants du Rwanda et de la RD Congo. La participation à l’enquête est volontaire et tous les résultats seront gardés confidentiels et anonymes. Vous êtes libre de refuser de répondre à une ou toutes les questions, et vous pouvez choisir d’arrêter l’enquête à tout moment. Vous ne serez pas payé pour répondre à ces questions, mais en participant vous contribuerez au développement de votre région. Les résultats de cette enquête seront uniquement utilisés pour aider Search for Common Ground à évaluer la réalisation de ce projet. Cette enquête prendra environ 20-30 minutes. Êtes-vous d’accord de participer ?</td>
<td>(1) Oui (2) Non Si oui commencer l'entretien, si non remercier la personne et passer au prochain enquêté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Signature de l’enquêteur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Instruction Générale pour l’enquêteur:*
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- *Ne lisez pas les réponses aux questions posées à moins que cela ne soit spécifiquement écrit dans la colonne « Instruction ».*
- *Entourez la réponse qui correspond le mieux à ce que la personne interrogée a répondu.*

**PARTIE 3: Profil de l’enquêté**

*Enquêteur: “J’aimerai commencer par en savoir un peu plus sur vous. Rappelez-vous que vos réponses resteront totalement confidentielles.”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Réponses et Codes</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>............................</td>
<td>(years/Année)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Sexe</td>
<td>(1) Homme</td>
<td>Ne posez pas la question. Observez et entourez la bonne réponse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Femme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Etat Civil</td>
<td>1. Marié(e)</td>
<td>Une seule réponse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Célibataire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Veuf (ve)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Union libre / Concubinage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Divorcé(e) Séparé(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Nombre d’enfant</td>
<td>............................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1. Sans instruction</td>
<td>Une seule réponse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Primaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Secondaire Cycle1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Secondaire Cycle2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Université</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Pays de résidence</td>
<td>(1) Rwanda</td>
<td>Une seule réponse possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) République Démocratique du Congo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Etes-vous un commerçant transfrontalier ?</td>
<td>(1) Oui</td>
<td>Une seule réponse possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Non</td>
<td>Si la réponse est (2) Non. Alors le questionnaire est terminé. N’oubliez pas de remercier la personne.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Réponses et Codes</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Si oui, quels produits vous achetez au Rwanda pour les vendre en RDC</td>
<td>(1) Produits alimentaires (fruits, haricots, maïs, etc)</td>
<td>Une seule réponse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Bétails/viande/poissons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Habits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Matériels de construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Pièces de rechanges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Autres (à préciser)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Si oui, quels produits vous achetez en RDC pour les vendre au Rwanda</td>
<td>(1) Produits alimentaires (fruits, haricots, maïs, etc)</td>
<td>Une seule réponse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Bétails/viande/poissons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Habits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Matériels de construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Pièces de rechanges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Autres (à préciser)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Combien de fois par semaine traversez-vous la frontière dans le cadre de votre commerce?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mettre le chiffre/nombre dans la case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Généralement combien de temps cela vous prend pour traverser d’un coté à l’autre de la frontière ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mettre le temps en minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Sur quelle frontière passez-vous le plus de temps</td>
<td>(1) Côté Rwandais</td>
<td>Une seule réponse possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Côté Congolais</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTIE 4: Pour améliorer les relations et la collaboration en matière de réglementation aux frontières entre les officiels et les petits commerçants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Réponses et Codes</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Est-ce que vous êtes satisfait de vos relations avec les services de l’Etat rwandais à la frontière?</td>
<td>(1) Oui</td>
<td>Une seule réponse possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Non</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Pas de réponse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ici par service de l’Etat rwandais à la frontière on parle de : la police des</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Réponses et Codes</td>
<td>Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frontières, REMA - RRA - RSB - Magerwa – Comesa Les agents du Comesa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.2 | (Si oui), pouvez-vous nous donner 2 raisons principales qui expliquent pourquoi les relations sont satisfaisantes ?  
**Ne lisez pas les réponses.** | (1) J’ai eu accès à l’information sur mes droits et devoirs et sur ceux des agents à la frontière  
(2) Je peux discuter maintenant sans problème avec les fonctionnaires à la frontière  
(3) Il y a moins de taxes  
(4) Il y a moins de tracasserie/corruption  
(5) Il y a moins de violence  
(6) Autre : ..........................................  
(7) Pas de réponse | Ne lisez pas les réponses et entourez celles qui correspondent le mieux à la réponse de la personne interrogée.  
Entourez les deux premières réponses données à la question posée. |
| 4.3 | (Si non), pouvez-vous nous donner les raisons principales qui expliquent pourquoi les relations ne sont pas satisfaisantes? | (1) Je n’ai pas eu accès à de l’information sur mes droits et devoirs et sur ceux des agents à la frontière  
(2) Je ne peux pas facilement discuter avec les fonctionnaires à la frontière  
(3) Il y a beaucoup de taxes  
(4) Il y a beaucoup de tracasserie/corruption  
(5) Il y a beaucoup de violence  
(6) Autre : ..........................................  
(7) Pas de réponse | 2 réponses |
| 4.4 | Pensez-vous que les conflits liés au commerce transfrontalier au côté rwandais ont diminué depuis l’année passée | 1. Ils ont diminués  
2. Ils ont augmentés  
3. Pas de changement |  |
| 4.5 | Pensez-vous que la collaboration entre les petits commerçants et les agents de douanes au côté Rwandais a changé depuis l’année passée? | 1. Oui  
2. Non  
3. Pas de réponse |  |
| 4.6 | Si oui comment ? | 1. Elle a augmenté/amélioré  
2. Elle a diminué/détérioré  
3. Pas de changement |  |
| 4.7 | Est-ce que vous êtes satisfait de vos relations avec les services de l’État congolais à la frontière? | (1) Oui  
(2) Non  
(3) Pas de réponse | Une seule réponse possible. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Réponses et Codes</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ici par service de l'Etat congolais à la frontière on parle de:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DGDA, OCC, Service de l'Hygiène, Police des frontières.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.8 | (Si oui), pouvez-vous nous donner 2 raisons principales qui expliquent pourquoi les relations sont meilleures?  | (1) J’ai eu accès à l’information sur mes droits et devoirs et sur ceux des agents à la frontière  
(2) Je peux discuter maintenant sans problème avec les fonctionnaires à la frontière  
(3) Il y a moins de taxes  
(4) Il y a moins de tracasserie/corruption  
(5) Il y a moins de violence  
(6) Autre : .................................  
(7) Pas de réponse | Ne lisez pas les réponses et entourez celles qui correspondent le mieux à la réponse de la personne interrogée. Ne prenez que les deux réponses qu’il/elle a données en premier. Plusieurs réponses possibles |
| 4.9 | (Si non), pouvez-vous nous donner des raisons principales qui expliquent pourquoi les relations ne sont satisfaisantes ? | (1) Je n’ai pas eu accès à de l’information sur mes droits et devoirs et sur ceux des agents à la frontière  
(2) Je ne peux pas facilement discuter avec les fonctionnaires à la frontière  
(3) Il y a beaucoup de taxes  
(4) Il y a beaucoup de tracasserie/corruption  
(5) Il y a beaucoup de violence  
(6) Autre : .................................  
(7) Pas de réponse | Ne lisez pas les réponses et entourez celles qui correspondent le mieux à la réponse de la personne interrogée. Ne prenez que les deux réponses qu’il/elle a données en premier. Plusieurs réponses possibles |
| 4.10| Pensez-vous que les conflits liés au commerce transfrontalier au côté congolais ont diminué depuis l'année passée ? (juillet 2016-sept 2017) | 1. Sont diminués  
2. Sont augmentés  
3. Pas de changement |  1. Sont diminués  
2. Sont augmentés  
3. Pas de changement |
| 4.11| Pensez-vous que la collaboration entre les petits commerçants et les agents de douanes au côté congolais a augmenté depuis l'année passée ? (Juillet 2016-Sept 2017) | 1. A augmenté/ amélioré  
2. S’est détérioré  
3. Pas de changement |  1. A augmenté/ amélioré  
2. S’est détérioré  
3. Pas de changement |
| 4.12| Pour tout problème relatif à votre activité commerciale à la frontière, qui est-ce que vous consultez en premier | (1) La police des frontières  
(2) Le bureau de migration (DGM)  
(3) Les agents de la DGDA | Ne lisez pas les réponses et entourez celle |
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### PARTIE 5: dans quelle mesure, les intervenants commerciaux régionaux, y compris les petits commerçants et les groupes vulnérables, sont sensibilisés et informés sur les questions liées au CBT (Commerce transfrontalier)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Category/Question</th>
<th>Answers and Coding</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1 | Etes-vous d’accord avec la phrase suivante ? : Si une autorité des frontières me demande de l’argent, il doit me donner un reçu. | (1) Oui  
(2) Non  
(3) Ne sait pas plutôt | Une seule réponse possible |
# Category/Question | Answers and Coding | Instructions
--- | --- | ---
5.2 | Etes-vous d’accord avec la phrase suivante : C’est mieux de payer une taxe informelle pour passer la frontière plus vite | (1) Oui  
(2) Non  
(99) Pas de réponse | Une seule réponse possible |
5.3 | Comment qualifiez-vous votre connaissance en lois et règlements régissant le commerce transfrontalier ? | (1) Très bonne  
(2) Bonne  
(3) Ni bonne, ni mauvaise  
(3) Mauvaise  
(5) Très mauvaise  
(99) Pas de réponse | Une seule réponse possible |
5.4 | (Si bonne ou très bonne) est-ce que vous avez partagé les informations sur les lois et règlements régissant le commerce transfrontalier reçues avec d’autres personnes ? | (1) Oui  
(2) Non  
(99) Pas de réponse | Une seule réponse |
5.5 | Si oui, avec qui ? | (1) Avec autres commerçants  
(2) Autres à préciser………………………………………  
99 Pas de réponse | Une seule réponse |
5.6 | Est-ce que vous pensez que ces informations sur le commerce transfrontalier sont bénéfiques pour votre commerce ? | (1) Oui  
(2) Non  
(99) Pas de réponse | Une seule réponse |
5.7 | Si oui (question 5.6), pouvez-vous donner des exemples de comment votre commerce en a bénéficié ? | 1. J’ai payé moins de taxes  
2. Mes marchandises ne sont pas confisquées  
3. J’ai augmenté mon profit  
4. Autre (à préciser) | 2 réponses |

**PARTIE 6**: dans quelle mesure la viabilité économique et la résilience des petits commerçants, notamment les femmes, se sont renforcées et les quels sont les effets du projet sur cette amélioration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Réponse et Code</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
6.1 | Est-ce que vous avez reçu un micro-crédit donné par SFCG (Microloan) ? | (1) Oui  
(2) Non  
(99) Pas de réponse |  |
## Questions de l'enquête

### 6.2 Si oui, est-ce que ce micro-crédit (Microloan) a affecté votre activité commerciale?

Reponses et Code:
1) Oui  
2) Non  
(99) Pas de réponse

Instructions: Une seule réponse possible

### 6.3 Si oui, vous pouvez donner un exemple ?

1. J’ai ouvert un compte bancaire  
2. J’ai augmenté mon capital  
3. Autre (à préciser)

Instructions: 2 exemples

### 6.4 Êtes-vous d’accord avec la phrase suivante :

« Le prêt reçu m’a permis de ne pas perdre mon petit commerce (de continuer mon activité commerciale ?) »

Reponses et Code:
1) Tout à fait d’accord  
2) D’accord  
3) Ni d’accord, ni pas d’accord  
4) Pas d’accord  
5) Pas d’accord du tout  
(99) Pas de réponse

Instructions: Une seule réponse

### Questions de programmation et popularité SFCG

#### 7.1 Avez-vous écouté les émissions radio sur le commerce transfrontalier ?

Reponses:
1) Oui  
2) Non  
(3) Pas de réponse/Je ne sais pas

Instructions: Si réponse est non alors passer à la question suivante

#### 7.2 Si oui, à quelle radio?

Options:
1) RTNC Goma,  
2) RTNC Bukavu,  
3) Okapi,  
4) Digital Congo,  
5) Kivu one,  
6) Radio Sauti ya Injili,  
7) Pole FM,  
8) RTCT,  
9) Radio Maendeleo,  
10) Radio Sauti ya Rehema,  
11) Radio Rusizi,  
12) Radio Rubavu,  
13) Radio Rwanda,  
14) Je ne sais pas/ pas de réponse,  
15) Autres à préciser……………………………

Instructions: Une seule réponse possible.

#### 7.3 Si oui pensez-vous que les informations sur le commerce transfrontalier diffusées étaient utiles pour vous ?

Reponses:
1. Oui  
2. Non  
3. Pas de réponse

Instructions: Une seule réponse

#### 7.4 Comment appréciez-vous d’une manière générale, la qualité

Options:
1. Très Satisfaisant  
2. Moyennement satisfaisant  
3. Moins satisfaisant  
4. Insatisfaisant

Instructions: Une seule réponse
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>Si oui (question 7.1) quelles sont vos heures préférées pour écouter la radio ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Entre 4h00 et 6h00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Entre 6h00 et 8h00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Entre 8h00 et 10h00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Entre 10h00 et 12h00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Entre 12h00 et 14h00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Entre 14h00 et 16h00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Entre 16h00 et 18h00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Entre 18h00 et 20h00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Entre 20h00 et 22h00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Entre 22h00 et 24h00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Entre 24h00 et 4h00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Une seule réponse possible**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.6</th>
<th>Avez-vous déjà participé ou entendu parler de SFCG/Centre lokole ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Oui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Je ne sais pas, pas de réponse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Une seule réponse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.7</th>
<th>Si oui, comment ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. J’ai bénéficié d’une formation de SFCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. J’ai écouté une émission produite par SFCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. J’ai assisté à une projection de cinéma mobile organisé par SFCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. J’ai assisté à une performance de théâtre participatif organisé par SFCG.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pas de réponses/ Je ne sais pas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Autre à préciser………………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plusieurs réponses possibles.**
6.2. The TOR of the final evaluation (in French)

Improving the Cross Border Trade Environment through Improved Research and Advocacy on Cross Border Trade Issues

Terms of reference – Final Evaluation

April 2017
Contexte du projet


Cependant, si des deux côtés des milliers des personnes à la frontière - la majorité d'entre elles étant des femmes - gagnent leur vie grâce à ce commerce transfrontalier, une forte concurrence commerciale existe entre eux, aggravée par une méfiance liée aux conflits récents. L'accès limité au capital financier renforce cette compétition, rendant les conditions commerciales pour les petits commerçants, et les femmes en particulier, très difficile. Enfin, et malgré les mécanismes et les initiatives de traçabilité développé au niveau local et international, la persistance du commerce illicite (y compris le commerce non-déclaré et la contrebande des minerais) déclenche souvent la confrontation entre les autorités et les opérateurs. Cela constitue une source supplémentaire d'insécurité qui entrave également le commerce et les perspectives de développement économique dans la région.

Ceci étant, ces liens commerciaux transfrontaliers entre la RDC et le Rwanda représente 17 million USD par année ce qui fournit une preuve visible de l'interdépendance économique qui existe dans cette région. Cette interdépendance constitue un facteur important de croissance économique et la possibilité de construire des liens plus étroits entre la population des deux pays afin d’atteindre une plus grande coopération régionale. Ainsi, si ce commerce régional était réalisé dans le respect des lois nationales et internationales, il pourrait servir de moteur pour la croissance positif et le développement économique des deux pays, tout en contribuant à la paix et la stabilité régionales.


L’objectif global de ce projet est de soutenir la paix par le développement économique et l'amélioration des relations citoyen-gouvernement dans le domaine du commerce transfrontalier. Cet objectif sera atteint grâce à la réalisation de trois objectifs spécifiques:

Améliorer les relations et la collaboration en matière de réglementation aux frontières entre les officiels de douanes et les petits commerçants;

Accroître la sensibilisation basée sur la recherche sur des questions CBT aux petits commerçants, les OSC locales / OSP, les autorités frontalières, les représentants du gouvernement et d'autres parties concernées; et
Appuyer financièrement les petits commerçants, coopératives / associations, opérant sur les frontières Goma/Gisenyi et Bukavu/Rusizi

Afin d’atteindre ces objectifs, le projet a réalisé des activités de rapprochement entre les petits commerçants des deux pays, l’organisation de Town hall meetings, la production et la diffusion d’un programme radiophonique sur le commerce transfrontalier et le renforcement des capacités entrepreneuriales des petits commerçants.

Les cibles principales de projets étaient les petits commerçants, avec un accent particulier sur les femmes, ainsi que les agents des douanes. Indirectement, le projet a touché les auditeurs des programmes radios produites et diffusées dans le cadre de ce projet.

Objectifs de l’évaluation finale

Cette évaluation a trois objectifs globaux:

Analyse du contexte

Avancement vers l’attente des résultats

Leçons apprises et récommandations

Les critères de l’évaluation seront :

Efficacité: Pour mesurer dans quelle mesure des activités ont atteint les objectifs;

Impact: Pour montrer les changements positifs et négatifs produits par la mise en œuvre de ce projet, directement ou indirectement

Durabilité: Pour déterminer si les avantages des activités sont susceptibles de se poursuivre après la fin du projet

Innovation: Mesurer l’utilisation de ICT et autres innovations dans le projet.

Questions d’évaluation

Les questions d’évaluation vont porter sur les objectives fixés au cours de ce projet:

Efficacité

Dans quelle mesure les activités du projet ont été réalisées et les cibles atteintes?
Dans quelle mesure les bénéficiaires ciblés ont été atteints par ces activités?
Dans quelle mesure les bénéficiaires cibles ont reçu le message qu’ils attendaient dans ces activités?

Impact
Quelle différence le projet a-t-il fait aux bénéficiaires?

Quels ont été les résultats attendus et inattendus du projet au niveau des changements des pratiques?

Pour les partenaires radio?

Pour les agents des douanes ?

Pour les associations locales partenaires?

Pour les associations des petits commerçants traversant la frontière?

Qu'est-ce que les gens font différemment à la suite du programme?

Les participants sont-ils satisfaits de ce qu'ils ont gagné du projet?

Quelles sont les forces et les faiblesses du projet?

Quelles activités contribuent le plus? Le moins?

Quels sont les effets secondaires ou négatif indésirables?

**Durabilité**

Le projet a-t-il permis la mise en place du systèmes de collaboration *durable* entre les agents de douanes et les petits commerçants traversant la frontière? Lesquelles ?

Dans quelle mesure les résultats du projet pourraient-ils continuer après le projet?

L'engagement des parties prenantes devrait-il continuer, être étendu, répliqué ou institutionnalisé?

Après le financement externe? *Innovation et utilisation d’ICT*

Dans quelle mesure le projet a introduit les nouvelles technologies de l’information ?

Les radios partenaires vont-ils continuer à utiliser les nouvelles technologies de l’information introduite par le projet ?

**Zone et population cible**

Les populations ciblées par l’étude sont :

les petits commerçants traversant la frontière entre le Rwanda et la RDC, (Goma/Gisenyi et Bukavu/Rusizi)

les agents de l’Etat travaillant à la frontière, (Goma/Gisenyi et Bukavu/Rusizi)

les organisations partenaires du projet

Les répondants aux questionnaires de cette évaluation seront sélectionnés au hasard dans les lieux regroupant les petits commerçants transfrontaliers (marché, frontière, etc.). Ainsi, au Rwanda, l’enquête sera menée dans le district de Rubavu et Rusizi, district auprès des petits commerçants tout
autour des frontières et où les petits commerçants habitent. En RD Congo, l’enquête sera menée dans la ville de Goma (spécifiquement dans et aux alentours des frontières et dans les marchés de Birere, Marché de Virunga, Marché cinquantenaire (BDGL), Kahembe et au port de la ville), et de Bukavu (aux alentours de la frontière) afin de pouvoir rencontrer plus facilement les petits commerçants transfrontaliers.

4. Méthodologie, collecte des données et outils

4.1 Méthodologie

Les données seront collectées à travers une approche mixte comprenant : le sondage par enquête (approche quantitative), des entretiens à travers des Focus Group et des entretiens semi-structurés avec des informateurs clés (approche qualitative).

4.2 Outils de collecte des données

Comme signalé précédemment, les données seront collectées à travers une approche mixte : au moyen de questionnaires individuels (approche quantitative), d’entretien en Focus Groups et d’entretiens semi-structurés avec des informateurs clés (approche qualitative). Les outils seront identiques pour les deux pays. Ces deux approches sont décrites ci-dessous :

**Etude quantitative: sondages**

L’approche quantitative permettra de mener un sondage pour récolter des données quantitatives auprès des petits commerçants transfrontaliers du Rwanda et de la RD. Un questionnaire va être développé par les départements de Suivi et Evaluation de SFCG-Rwanda et de SFCG-RDC avec l’appui technique de la spécialiste régionale du Suivi Evaluation de SFCG basée à Bujumbura et des équipes programmes des deux pays.

Pour cette évaluation finale, nous allons la même taille de l’échantillon que celle utilisé dans l’étude de base. Dans chaque pays la taille de l’échantillon est estimée à 700, soit 1400 personnes pour l’ensemble de l’évaluation finale. Les femmes devront constituer 75% de cet échantillon et les hommes 25% étant donné la surreprésentation des femmes parmi les petits commerçants transfrontaliers.

La répartition du nombre des répondants par site se présente comme suit :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pays</th>
<th>Catégories de répondants</th>
<th>Nombre des répondants par pays</th>
<th>Proportion par sexe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homme (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Femme (75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>Commerçants</th>
<th>700</th>
<th>176</th>
<th>524</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Commerçants</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (pour les deux pays)</strong> : 1400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Etude qualitative : Focus groups et entretiens individuels auprès d’informateurs clés**

L’approche qualitative sera basée sur des focus groups avec les femmes et les hommes petits commerçants traversant la frontière.

Grâce aux focus groupes, les opinions des répondants seront données pour approfondir les informations quantitatives. Les données qualitatives issues des focus groups permettront d’éclairer mieux les indicateurs quantitatifs. Des guides de discussions spécifiques à chaque groupe vont être développés également.

Au total 12 FGD vont être tenus, c’est-à-dire 3 FGD par site: Nous avons 4 sites (Goma, Rubavu, Bukavu, Rusizi)

1 FG avec les jeune femmes transfrontalières (célibataires de moins de 35 ans)
1 FGD avec les femmes adultes (âgées plus de 35 ans)
1 FG avec les hommes commerçants transfrontaliers (jeunes et adultes combinés, puisqu’il y a peu d’hommes commerçants transfrontaliers)

Enfin, l’équipe de recherche va tenir en tout 29 entretiens semi structurés avec les informateurs clés :
les responsables des ONG partenaires de SFCG dans le cadre de ce projet (3 interviews)

le point focal des productions radiophoniques des radios partenaires (4)

Les coopératives et associations bénéficiaires (2 représentants de 2 coopératives par site)

les représentants des services de l’État travaillant à la frontière : i.e. le représentant de la Direction Générale des Migrations (DGM) (1 à Goma et 1 à Bukavu), le représentant de la Direction Générale des Douanes et Assises (DGDA) (1 à Goma et 1 à Bukavu), le représentant de la Police des frontières (1 a chacun des 4 frontières), le représentant de l’office Congolais de contrôle (OCC) (1à Goma et 1 a Bukavu), le représentant des Services d’hygiène aux frontières en RDC (1 a Goma et 1 Bukavu) AU Rwanda, le représentant des services de la migration au district (1 a Rubavu et 1 a Rusizi), le JADF (1 a Rubavu et 1 à Rusizi), le coordinateur de BDA (1a Rubavu et 1 a Rusizi), le gérant de l’institution financière ou l’argent pour appuyer les petits commerçants a été déposé (1a Rusizi).

Un guide d’entretiens différents pour chaque interlocuteur sera développé pour conduire ces entretiens.
5. Analyse des données

Les données collectées seront analysées d’une manière descriptive et d’une manière comparative.

Par ailleurs, les données seront désagrégées par pays, par genre et par frontière, ce qui permettra d’effectuer une comparaison entre la RDC et le Rwanda, et les femmes et les hommes.

Enfin, l’ensemble des données récoltées feront l’objet d’une triangulation et seront croisées avec d’autres données collectées, par exemple entre plusieurs focus groups et/ou avec des données collectées par le biais de méthodes différentes (quantitatives, qualitatives). Le coordinateur de suivi et évaluation au Rwanda sera responsable de l’analyse des données.

Les logiciels Excel sera utilisé dans la saisie et le SPSS dans le traitement des données

6. L’assurance de la qualité des données

Les experts de suivi et évaluation régionales vont faire un revu de la méthodologie et des outils ainsi que l’analyse et le rapport de cette évaluation. Ressources humaines et planning

Dans chaque pays 6 enquêteurs réaliseront 700 sondages dans les 10 jours. Un rapporteur accompagné du responsable de la récolte de données réalisera les FGD et les interviews avec les informateurs clés.

Les enquêteurs et rapporteurs seront formés tous ensemble à Gisenyi lors d’un atelier de 2 jours. La deuxième journée sera consacrée sur l’étude pilote pour tester les outils et la traduction des outils dans les langues locales.

Quatre personnes formées dans la saisie sur Excel à Kigali et à Goma encoderont les données dans un masque de saisie préalablement préparé après la validation finale des outils. La saisie va durer 4 jours. Après l’encodage le masque de saisie sera envoyé au Rwanda pour en faire une analyse et écrire le rapport.

Les rapports de FGD et d’interviews seront intégralement saisies sur Word et traduit en anglais ou en français.

L’encodage et la saisie des données qualitatives seront terminés en même temps que la saisie des données quantitatives.
Le coordinateur de DME au Rwanda va assurer la coordination des activités de cette évaluation finale et va superviser la collecte et la saisie des données au Rwanda. L’assistant DME de SFCG RDC (TBD) va superviser les activités de collecte et de saisie à Goma et à Bukavu.

7. Livrable

Un premier draft du rapport (d’environ 40 pages, inclus les annexes) sera rendu disponible en anglais au 30 Juin 2017.

8. Calendrier des activités

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activité</th>
<th>Deadline/Estimated Time</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Développement des TdRs</td>
<td>Fin Avril 2017</td>
<td>Mugisha et DME regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Développement des outils de collecte des données</td>
<td>23 Mai 2017</td>
<td>Mugisha et DME regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation des enquêteurs</td>
<td>29 et 30 Mai 2017</td>
<td>Mugisha et DME DRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecte des données</td>
<td>31 Mai – 13 Juin 2017</td>
<td>Mugisha et DME DRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saisie des données quantitatives et qualitatives</td>
<td>15-20 Juin 2017</td>
<td>Mugisha et DME DRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse et production de premier rapport (Draft 1)</td>
<td>28 Juin 2017</td>
<td>Mugisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport final</td>
<td>30 Juin 2017</td>
<td>Mugisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TIME ESTIMATED</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 jours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantité</th>
<th>Fréquence</th>
<th>Prix Unitaire Estimatif</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdiem DME a Goma</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdiem DME a Bukavu</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraire consultants a Goma</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraire consultants a Bukavu</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location salle FG a Goma et Bukavu</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frais de transport pour FG a Goma et Bukavu</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frais d'impression questionnaire</td>
<td>730.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>131.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encodage des fiches d'enquetes sur terrain</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>630.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication pour Goma et Bukavu</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprevu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total RDC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,236.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rwanda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdiem for Driver</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for enumerators</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for FGD facilitators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food for enumerators and FGD facilitators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notebook and plastic folders and pens</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation for enumerators and FGD facilitators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>transport for FGD participants</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print of questionnaires</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>131.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>payment for data entry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire room for training for enumerators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdiem for DME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation for DME and driver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Rwanda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4721.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Rwanda et RDC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,957.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Annex

Logframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project logic</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator definition</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target end of project</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Support peace through economic development and improved citizen-government relations in the area of cross-border trade, supporting enhanced confidence in traded goods and services between Rwanda and DRC</td>
<td>% of petty traders who say that conflicts related to cross-border trade have decreased since the beginning of the project</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>By sex, age, category, location</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td>Baseline, midterm (to be confirmed upon funds) and final evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of reported incidents between petty-traders and border officials in the intervention zone</td>
<td>Incidents are cases of confrontation and violence between petty traders and border officials.</td>
<td>Decrease of 25%</td>
<td>Decrease of 50%</td>
<td>By type</td>
<td>KII, FGD?</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td>Baseline, midterm (to be confirmed upon funds) and final evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project logic

Improving the Cross Border Trade Environment through Improved Research and Advocacy on Cross Border Trade Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project logic</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator definition</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Year 1</th>
<th>Target end of project</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This indicator will be reported by borders official and petty traders crossing the border</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome 1

To improve relations and collaboration on border regulations between border officials and petty traders

#### % of participants who report an enhancement of the collaboration with customs officers and/or petty traders

**Numerator:** # of respondents who say yes

**Denominator:** # of total respondents

- **Baseline:** 50%
- **Target:** 70%
- **Means of verification:** Survey
- **Responsible:** DME
- **Frequency:** Final evaluation

#### % of petty traders who say that customs agents from both sides ensure border regulations’ implementation at the border

**Numerator:** # of respondents who say yes

**Denominator:** # of total respondents

- **Baseline:** 60%
- **Target:** 80%
- **Means of verification:** Survey, FGD
- **Responsible:** DME
- **Frequency:** Baseline, midterm (to be confirmed upon funds) and final evaluation

#### Reduced border crossing times for small scale traders to trade between Rwanda and

**Average (mean, mode, median) of the time petty**
### Project logic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator definition</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Year 1</th>
<th>Target end of project</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>traders use to cross the border</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>By category, area</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Short-term Outcome

| Activity 1.1 | # of meetings | N/A | 5   | 10 | By category, area | Community activity tool | Project staff | Each time the activity is implemented |

| Activity 1.1 | # of participants | N/A | At least 5 | At least 10 | By sex, age, category, location | Community activity tool | Project staff | Each time the activity is implemented |

| Activity 1.1 | % of participants satisfied of their participation to the meeting | Satisfaction = we consider the sum of the overall good and excellent appreciations received divided by the total number of appreciations received for each activity | N/A | > 70% | > 70% | By category, area | Community activity tool | Project staff | Each time the activity is implemented |

| Activity 1.1 | # of forums held | N/A | 8   | 16 | By location, category | Community activity tool | Project staff | Each time the activity is implemented |
### Activity 1.2
8 forums with petty traders and 8 forums with border officials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Year 1</th>
<th>Target end of project</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of participants satisfied of their participation to the forum</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&gt; 70 %</td>
<td>&gt; 70 %</td>
<td>By category, area</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>By location</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project logic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Year 1</th>
<th>Target end of project</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meetings/sessions held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>By sex, age, category, location</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of participants satisfied of their participation to the meeting/session</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&gt; 70%</td>
<td>&gt; 70%</td>
<td>By area</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of festivals organized</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>By area</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of radio which broadcasted the festivals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>By location and radio</td>
<td>Radio broadcast tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity 1.3**
6 meetings/sessions at each of the border crossing

**Activity 1.4**
2 festivals (1 at each border crossing) broadcast live on 3 radio stations
# Final Evaluation
## Improving the Cross Border Trade Environment through Improved Research and Advocacy on Cross Border Trade Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project logic</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator definition</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Year</th>
<th>Target end of project</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>By sex, area, function, age, category</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project coordinator</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of listeners having provided a feedback on the broadcast who declared that it made them want to act towards peaceful solutions for CBT issues</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&gt; 60%</td>
<td>&gt; 60%</td>
<td>Sex, age, location</td>
<td>Monthly listener reports</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of border officials declaring to have the knowledge needed to be able to support petty traders facing CBT issues</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&gt; 60%</td>
<td>&gt; 80%</td>
<td>By sex, age, category, location</td>
<td>Survey, FG and KII</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td>Baseline, midterm (to be confirmed upon funds) and final evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome 2

To enhance stakeholders’ research-based awareness of CBT related issues faced by small traders (petty traders, local CSOs/PSOs, border officials, government officials, and other relevant

| % of participants declaring awareness of CBT regulations has benefitted their business | N/A | > 50% | > 70% | By sex, age, category, location | Survey | DME | Baseline, midterm (to be confirmed upon funds) and final evaluation |
| % of participants who restituted their knowledge on CBT regulations to | N/A | 70% | 90% | By sex, age, category, location | Survey | DME | Baseline, midterm (to be confirmed upon funds) and final evaluation |
## Project logic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 2.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One A mid-term case study conducted and documented at the middle of 1 baseline survey conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One A baseline study conducted and documented at the beginning of the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Year 1</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baseline study report</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the baseline study will allow to gather information at the beginning of the project on all the indicators (outcomes 1, 2 and 3), it will also provide some more in-depth information on CBT issues faced by small traders which will feed in the content of this outcome’s next activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project logic</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator definition</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Year 1</th>
<th>Target end of project</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the project</td>
<td>specific CBT issues identified as at stake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2.2</strong></td>
<td><strong># of conferences</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>By location</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Case study conducted</td>
<td><strong># of participants</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>By sex, age, category, location</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>% of participants satisfied of their participation in the conference</strong></td>
<td>Satisfaction= we consider the sum of the overall good and excellent appreciations received divided by the total number of appreciations received for each activity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&gt; 70 %</td>
<td>&gt; 70 %</td>
<td>By category, area</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 midterm conferences, one for each target area; 4 final conferences, one for each target area</td>
<td><strong># of trainings</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>By location</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Activity 2.4
3 trainings, one for each partner station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator definition</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Year 1</th>
<th>Target end of project</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>Satisfied with their participation in the training</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>By sex, age, category, location</td>
<td>Comm unity activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activity 2.5
Approximately 4 radio programs per month (2 new programs and 2 rebroadcasts), 60 programs total, aired on 4 radio stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator definition</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Year 1</th>
<th>Target end of project</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of radio programs broadcasted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>By type</td>
<td>Media production tool</td>
<td>Media department</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator definition</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Year 1</th>
<th>Target end of project</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of listeners having provided a feedback on the broadcast who declared that it made them</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&gt; 60%</td>
<td>&gt; 60%</td>
<td>Sex, age, location</td>
<td>Monthly listener's report</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Final Evaluation

### Improving the Cross Border Trade Environment through Improved Research and Advocacy on Cross Border Trade Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project logic</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator definition</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target Year 1</th>
<th>Target end of project</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>want to act towards peaceful solutions for CBT issues</td>
<td># of sets produced</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 at the beginning of trainings and 1 after the collection of project findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Activity 2.6
2 sets of InfoCards produced – 1000 copies of each (half in Kiswahili and half in Kinyarwanda)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of copies distributed</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Distribution tool</th>
<th>Project staff</th>
<th>During activity implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Activity 2.7
5 different posters created; 60 copies of each type printed and posted at the 4 border points and in the markets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of copies distributed</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>Theme, location</th>
<th>Distribution tool</th>
<th>Project staff</th>
<th>During activity implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A final evaluation conducted and documented</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Evaluation report</th>
<th>DME</th>
<th>End of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Outcome 3
To empower petty traders, cooperatives/associations, and related CSOs to work together to improve livelihoods for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of participants who accessed microloans who say to be able to maintain their commercial activities</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>By sex, age, category, location</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>DME</th>
<th>Baseline, midterm (to be confirmed upon funds) and final evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project logic</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Indicator definition</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Target Year 1</td>
<td>Target end of project</td>
<td>Disaggregation</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>petty traders</td>
<td># of meetings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Type and location</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.1</td>
<td># of partnerships contracted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Type and location</td>
<td>Partnership contract</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 cooperative/association development</td>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>By sex, age, category, location</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO partnerships confirmed and 4 planning meetings throughout the project; and 4 radio station partnerships contracted</td>
<td># of radio station partnership contracted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Type, location</td>
<td>Partnership contract</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of trainings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Type, location</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>Each time the activity is implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.2</td>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>By sex, age, category, location</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Training on Financial Management addressing also regulations, rights, and roles with gender sensitivity.</td>
<td>% of participants satisfied</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&gt; 70%</td>
<td>&gt; 70%</td>
<td>Type of training</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project logic</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Indicator definition</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Target Year 1</td>
<td>Target end of project</td>
<td>Disaggregation</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the total number of appreciations received for each activity</td>
<td>% of improvement in participants skills and/or knowledge</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Type of training</td>
<td>Pre &amp; post tests</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of VSLAs created</td>
<td># of VSLAs created</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Type and location</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of cooperative/associations created</td>
<td># of cooperative/associations created</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Type and location</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of supports provided</td>
<td># of supports provided</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type and location</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By sex, age, category, location and type of association/cooperative</td>
<td>Lists of registration</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of participants satisfied</td>
<td>% of participants satisfied</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&gt; 70%</td>
<td>&gt; 70%</td>
<td>Type of support</td>
<td>Community activity tool</td>
<td>Project staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project logic** | **Indicator** | **Indicator definition** | **Baseline** | **Target Year 1** | **Target end of project** | **Disaggregation** | **Means of verification** | **Responsible** | **Frequency**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| excellent appreciations received divided by the total number of appreciations received for each activity | | | | | | | | | |
| Amount of microcredit grants given | N/A | Location, type of beneficiaries, type of microcredit, amount granted | Activity report | Financial report | Project staff | Each time the microcredit is granted |
| Activity 3.4 | # of beneficiaries | N/A | At least 200 | At least 400 | By sex, age, category, location and type of association/co-operative | Distribution lists | Project staff | Each time the activity is implemented |

Provide microcredit grants valuing from $25 to $100 to 100-200 petty traders per target site (400-800 total) with 75% women beneficiaries
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