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1 Executive Summary

The Government of the United Republic of Tanzania (GoT) has a decades-long history in welcoming and assisting large numbers of refugees, including recent influxes from Burundi and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Major influxes of refugees have included (in approximate terms): (a) 160,000 refugees from Burundi in 1972; (b) 340,000 refugees from Burundi in 1992/3; (c) over half a million refugees from Rwanda in 1994; (d) 276,000 refugees fleeing violence in Burundi in 1996 and 1997; (e) 190,000 refugees fleeing instability in DRC between 1996 and 1999; (f) 140,000 Burundian refugees who arrived in 1999 and 2000; and (g) 240,000 Burundian refugees who have arrived since April 2015.

This report is one of three complimentary documents that the World Bank and UNHCR have jointly developed in support of national and sub-national authorities, donors as well as development and humanitarian actors responding to the refugee influx in the hosting regions of Tanzania. 1) An excel-based mapping tool that captures 293 existing projects, both humanitarian and development, in Kigoma (specifically Kasulu, Kibondo and Kakonko districts), Tabora and Katavi regions; 2) a desk review providing analysis of the impact of past refugees influxes on host populations in Tanzania, including a summary of lessons learned and accompanying policy recommendations that can be applied to contemporary contexts and 3) this report which includes, a) a brief summary of Tanzania’s displacement history and current context b) an analysis of national, regional and district development priorities and challenges faced in Kigoma, Katavi and Tabora, and c) a synthesis of humanitarian and development responses in terms of sectoral focus, project objectives, geographic coverage, beneficiaries targeted etc., based on the mapping tool which captures existing responses of 34 implementing agencies and 16 donors. In Annex 2 of this report, a summary of lessons learned and policy recommendations from the desk review is also included.

Although the mapping and this report provide a useful source of information for various actors working on or in the refugee-hosting regions, it does not cover all humanitarian and development projects and associated funds in these regions. This is in part due to budget and time constraints. The mapping does not capture a comprehensive assessment of the flow of development and humanitarian funding to refugee-hosting regions and districts, nor any related analysis. Information has been shared by many of the relevant actors, but not all. However, alongside other data, these documents can be collectively used for improved planning and coordination between relevant actors, and further, towards better targeted and evidence-based interventions that enable the self-reliance of refugees and resilience of host communities.

Drawing on national, regional and district strategic development plans, national surveys and statistics, we provide highlights of the development priorities and challenges identified in Kigoma, Katavi and Tabora, along 6 priority sectors, Education, Health, Water & Sanitation (WASH), Livelihoods and the Environment and Energy.

In Education, the second Government of Tanzania Five-Year Development Plan (FYDP II) includes a set of targets aimed at increasing both enrolment and the quality of education. Net enrollment rates in primary school are lower in refugee-hosting than national average, with Kigoma and Kagera
8

showing among the lowest rates in the country. Only 73 percent of primary-school age children in Kigoma and Kagera are enrolled in school compared to a national average of 86 percent. Education services (infrastructure, human resources, capacity building) are significantly under-resourced both in close vicinity to camps and in refugee hosting districts more broadly. For refugees in Kigoma, current education provision in camps is below standards and unsustainable from a financial and policy perspective.

In Health, the implementation of the FYDP II emphasis will be on strengthening the health service delivery system with service delivery geared toward the health of mothers and children, addressing commonly preventable diseases such as malaria, HIV/AIDS and non-communicable diseases, as well as addressing the “human resources crisis” which constrains provisions of adequate health care. Due to the current encampment policy, primary and secondary care for refugees in Kigoma is provided in parallel to the national system at high operational cost. UNHCR, through the Tanzanian Red Cross Society, operates two hospitals, two health centers, one maternal health center and seven health posts in Nyarugusu and Mtendeli camps, while the medical facilities (one hospital and six health posts) in Nduta camp are operated by Médecins Sans Frontières. The host communities surrounding the camp can access these health services free of charge. Similarly, in Katavi and Tabora, districts and old settlements in Katavi and Tabora regions highlight the challenges on the health system caused by critical shortages of human resources, distance to district and regional hospitals, the need to rehabilitate and upgrade existing health centers and to invest in ambulances, equipment and medical supplies.

For Livelihoods, the overarching objective of the FYDP II is to build a base for transforming Tanzania into a semi-industrialized nation by 2025. Priorities for the Kigoma region (2016-2020) include raising agricultural productivity and supporting women and youth economic empowerment through provision of entrepreneurial skills and access to finance. A main challenge is low agricultural productivity (production per unit area) for various crops and inadequate application of modern agricultural methods. Refugees’ livelihood opportunities are limited by their lack of freedom of movement, right to work, and access to financial services. UNHCR and partners are providing vocational and business skills training, supporting access to informal financial services such as saving groups, and encouraging businesses through marketplaces that are accessible to the refugees and the host community. For Tabora and Katavi, recent assessments of socioeconomic priorities stressed the importance of land use planning, which is either absent (Katavi) or dated (Tabora). These plans are also key to the socioeconomic integration of new Tanzanians (1972 Burundians).

With regard to WASH, the FYDP II sets ambitious targets for access to water. It aims to raise the share of the population accessing clean and safe water to 85% in rural areas and to 95% in urban areas by year 2021. Scarcity of water is a key challenge in both refugee and host communities. Lack of sustainable water supply arrangements (use of river catchment areas, drilling, etc.) combined with effects of climate change further affects shortages. Competition over limited resources such as water contributes to conflict between refugees and host communities, and between humanitarian sector at large and host communities. The need for water permeates most needs assessments also in Katavi
and Tabora. Sector priorities in these two regions include increasing access to clean and safe water and maintaining sustainability of available water sources.

**For Environment and Energy**, the second FYDP II outlines national priorities in natural resource management, environment and climate change, and sets a target of 50% of energy derived from renewable green energy by 2020 as well as for number of trees planted country wide (100 million). The influx of refugees in refugee-hosting regions and districts has contributed to the depletion of water resources, deforestation and environmental degradation in areas close to the camps and settlements, due to increased demand for firewood and water. Estimated use of firewood across the three refugee camps is close to 650 tons per day. Yet, alternative sources such as Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) is too costly for the humanitarian response.

In terms of the mapping exercise, the following are findings from the analysis. **In the Kigoma region**, there are 248 projects that can be categorized according to 7 different primary sectors and 32 related sectors. In addition to the six priority sectors identified by the GoT above, Capacity Building, that is defined here as training largely targeted towards improving the skills of local authorities, was included as a priority sector in this analysis since such projects were identified in relatively high numbers, especially in Kigoma. Because of their targeting of mostly local authorities, or in some cases locals to improve issues of social cohesion and governance, these projects are classified as distinct from Livelihoods projects. Further, given that a significant number of projects are cross-sectoral, the category “related sector” is included, to better capture the multiplicity of sectoral foci of projects.

The primary sector that most projects are associated with in Kigoma is Livelihoods (86) followed by Water and Sanitation (33) and subsequently by the Education sector (30). Of the 76 Livelihoods projects of which targeted beneficiaries were identified, 39 projects target *only* refugees, 16 projects target *only* host communities, while 21 projects target *both* refugees and host communities. With regard to government counterparts, many of the projects in the Kigoma region mention collaborating or being in active contact with one government contact. Seventy-three projects in the Kigoma region have a direct government counterpart. Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) is the government counterpart that is most commonly listed, with 27 projects in Kigoma region listing it as a government counterpart. Of the three refugee-hosting districts - Kakonko, Kasulu, and Kibondo - most of the activities are being implemented in Kibondo. There are 57 projects being implemented in Kibondo district, 49 in Kasulu and in contrast, Kakonko, has far less activities being implemented, with 13 projects on the ground.

In terms of the targeting of more vulnerable groups, there are 49 projects across Kigoma that list women as the target beneficiaries, and 45 projects that list youth as the relevant affected target group. Women and youth are simultaneously targeted in 28 of the Kigoma projects, and, in turn, 14 of these projects take place specifically in camps.

---

1 The government counterparts that are most often cited across projects, are national government counterparts, including the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MoEST); the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA); the Ministry of Energy; the President’s Office-Regional Administration and Local Government (Po-RALG); the Ministry of Labor; and the Ministry of Health.
In the region of Katavi, there are 20 projects dedicated to 5 different primary sectors and 13 related sectors. There are 8 projects in Katavi with Livelihoods as the primary sector, followed by 6 projects with Capacity Building as the primary sector. Most projects in Katavi are developmental in nature, that is they cover both hosts and refugees. Out of 20 total projects in Katavi, 17 are development-focused, and the remaining 3 projects are humanitarian.

In Tabora, there are 25 projects that cover 6 primary sectors and 12 related sectors, which differ slightly in number and content from those mentioned in Kigoma. Tabora breaks the trend in terms of having Livelihoods as a dominant sector covered in projects; instead, in Tabora, Health is the primary sector with the most projects mapped, followed by Environment and Energy. In Tabora, 12 of the 25 projects are listed as having host communities as the target beneficiaries, while 3 projects mention having refugees as the target beneficiaries. Both refugees and host communities are simultaneously listed as the target beneficiaries on 9 different projects.

Most donors represented in this tool cover the sector of Education, with the sectors of Livelihoods and Health equally in second place. Of the 16 donors captured, there are 12 Education related investments and 11 Livelihoods. These higher number of projects funded within Education and Livelihoods sectors largely mirrors the regional analysis, which shows that livelihoods are, in particular, a significant humanitarian and development focus.

Overall this analysis reveals that the continued support by development and humanitarian actors in the refugee-hosting regions of Tanzania is helping to achieve identified national and sub-regional development priorities. A significant number of projects across regions cover both refugees and host despite the challenges of implementing such responses with encampment policies and no right to work and no access to financial services for refugees. Further, the overwhelming number of Livelihood projects shows the prioritization, by many actors, of ensuring the self-reliance of refugees in the wake of protracted situations, as well as the need to protect and enhance host community livelihoods.

Nevertheless, the humanitarian response to the refugee situation remains severely underfunded. The Tanzania portion of the Burundi Regional Refugee Response Plan (RRRP) for 2017 only received dedicated funds to cover 27 per cent of needs in 2017. In total, USD 61.7 million was dedicated to the response to the Burundian situation in 2017. Further, although positive signs are noted in the investment of Livelihoods projects, other priority sectors appear in need of further investments; chiefly Environment & Energy and Health. These are two key sectors, for which limited research on the long-term effects of refugee presence have been conducted, as evidenced in the desk review.

An important opportunity lies ahead for partners, as a newly synthesized evidence base of Tanzania’s historical experience with large and sudden influxes of refugees, can be utilized to develop substantiated refugee responses that also protect the livelihoods of affected hosts. The evidence points to some important insights, including but not limited to, 1) the gendered implications for host

---

2 2017 Burundi Regional Refugee Response Plan, Funding Snapshot (final 2017)
communities; 2) the timing and type of aid, where and to whom its targeted and its implications for the food security and resilience of the host community, 3) poorer households will likely benefit more from public goods (e.g. hospitals/health centers) and services, however, they will likely not do well in terms of market-related economic opportunities that arise from an increased number of refugees, and 4) pre-existing socio-economic conditions in host communities as well as the capacity of local authorities, mediates the extent to which these communities can benefit from refugee presence.

This report is intended to provide not only useful analysis for more targeted planning and coordination among partners working the refugee-hosting regions, but also provides further impetus for developmental projects that will have long lasting positive impacts on refugees and host communities.
2 Purpose, Scope and Limitations of Report

2.1 Purpose and Scope

The Government of the United Republic of Tanzania (Tanzania) has a decades-long history in welcoming and assisting large numbers of refugees, including recent influxes from Burundi and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). In support of especially local district authorities, donors as well as development and humanitarian actors responding to the refugee influx and the host communities, the World Bank and UNHCR have jointly undertaken a mapping exercise of existing development and humanitarian responses in the three refugee hosting regions of Kigoma (with a focus on Kasulu, Kibondo and Kakonko districts), Tabora and Katavi.

The mapping exercise is captured in an excel-based “mapping tool”, which has now been finalized following a verification period where organizations and donors referenced in the tool had an opportunity to verify the information in it. The tool documents existing projects categorized primarily by lead agencies and further captures 1) response type (humanitarian or development), 2) primary sector3 (e.g. health), 3) related sector (e.g. private sector), 4) project/program name, 5) project/program objective, 6) project/program components, 7) target beneficiaries (e.g. women), 8) number of beneficiaries, 9) geographical focus (e.g. Kasulu district) 10) financials (including allocated budget, funding channel and implementation period), 11) stakeholders (including, funding source, government counterpart, M&E partner), 12) implementation and coordination (including, implementing agency, M&E arrangement, partners and implementation mechanism), and 13) comments.

Using the excel filter function, the tool can help various actors determine who is working in which sectors and in what district/camp(s). Other sub-categories can also be utilized for analysis, planning and coordination. For instance, projects are also categorized according to "related sector", since several projects are multi-sectoral in nature. As such, a project may have a primarily educational focus, but is however implemented with the "private sector" as a related sector. As such, one can filter according to "private sector", for instance, to identify all projects that involve private sector partners.

Using the mapping tool as the basis for analysis, the primary objective of this report is to provide a synthesis of existing interventions in the refugee-hosting regions. The synthesis provides a sense of what primary sector projects cover in the respective regions, and in Kigoma, at the district level. Critically, as the need for more developmental approaches to forced displacement become increasingly important in protracted situations, the synthesis highlights the proportion of humanitarian and development projects. Other issues, such as which target groups are prioritized in projects is also analyzed.

Further, the report provides an overview of existing development challenges and priorities in the refugee hosting regions, per priority sector, drawing on national, regional and district strategic development plans, national surveys and statistics such as the Demographic and Health Survey 2015-

---

3 The following are considered primary sectors: health, education, water and sanitation, livelihoods and energy and environment.
16 as well as project and planning documents such as the Kigoma Joint Program project document. For Katavi and Tabora, the overview also relies heavily on previous assessments carried out in the interest of supporting local integration of New Tanzanians (1972 Burundians), including the “Local Integration Analysis: Naturalized Tanzanians” by ReDSS, as well as assessments carried out for the Solutions Alliance in 2016 and for the development of the Tanzania Strategy for the Local Integration Program for New Citizens (TANSPLI) with support from the World Bank in 2015.4

If considered alongside other sources of data, the mapping tool and this report, can be used to assist humanitarian, development and local government actors plan and coordinate their work. As such, the mapping tool and this report will be shared with local government authorities, and development and humanitarian actors alike.

2.2 A Desk Review of the Impact of Refugee Presence on Host Populations in Tanzania

As a compliment to the mapping tool and report, a desk review of the impact of refugee presence on host populations in Tanzania has been conducted. Several quantitative studies have been carried out on the impact of forced displacement on host populations, however, until recently, this area of study has largely been neglected by economists in particular.5 Only a few studies rely on empirical data and they are typically focused on short-term impacts.6

Tanzania however is an exception in this regard, partly because of its location (surrounded by countries periodically affected by conflict) and its decades-long history in welcoming and assisting large numbers of refugees. Unlike several other hosting countries, there exists a considerable body of qualitative, mixed-methods and empirical literature, mostly analyzing the impact of refugee inflows from Burundi (1993) and Rwanda (1994) on host districts in northwestern Tanzania. This literature covers a range of impacts including on the labor market, environment, health and other areas.

As part of this mapping exercise, the World Bank and UNHCR have jointly published a desk review which documents the following:

I. A brief history of refugee policy and practice in Tanzania;
II. An overview of the impacts/outcomes along different variables (e.g. jobs, health etc.);

---

III. A list of lessons learned and policy recommendations that can be gleaned from an analysis of the studies’ findings both in terms of refugee impact and humanitarian/development impact/response; and

IV. A brief taxonomy of areas for possible further research and understanding.

A summary of the lessons learned and policy recommendations is included in Annex 2.

2.3 Limitations of Mapping and Report

This section discusses the limitations of the scope of the mapping exercise and report.

Although the mapping provides a useful source of information for local government, development and humanitarian actors; given limited time and budget, this mapping does not cover all humanitarian and development projects and associated funds in the refugee-hosting regions. The mapping does not enable a comprehensive assessment of the flow of development and humanitarian funding to refugee-hosting regions and districts, nor any related analysis. Information has been shared by many of the relevant actors, but not all.

Furthermore, the following limitations should be noted:

1) in some cases, funding might be counted multiple times since it could be reported by a donor, a flow-through organization (e.g. UNHCR) and a local/international implementing partner;
2) for multi-year interventions, disaggregated project budgets are not provided, instead total budgets are provided for the full duration of the project life or for a given period of time depending on planning cycles.
3) the report does not account for the bulk of expenditures that flows through government, which should be noted when considering overall investment in the regions.
4) to the extent possible budget allocation of projects are documented in USD. However, given that donors articulate their provision of funds in varied currencies, the currency provided by participants in the mapping is the one used, if not provided in USD.

Given these limitations, the tool should be considered alongside other sources of data that can collectively be used to assist humanitarian, development and local government actors plan and coordinated their work. Used as an aide along with other sources of data and information, this report seeks to contribute to laying the groundwork for multi-year planning of development response (medium- and long-term) in accordance with national, regional and district plans and facilitate area-based approaches in the covered regions

2.3.1 Limitations associated with the term ‘host community’

For the purposes of the mapping and report, ‘host community’ is defined as the three districts within which Nyarugusu, Nduta and Mtendeli camps are located; that is, Kasulu, Kibondo and Kakonko districts respectively. The regions of Katavi and Tabora were also defined as host communities, although where information on districts was provided - that is, districts in which naturalized Tanzanians reside – such as Mlele, Nsimbo, Mpanda and Tanganyika for Katavi; and Kaliua in Tabora, they were documented.
It is well understood however, that the definition of ‘host community’, is contentious and has important implications for analysis. Research indicates that how ‘hosts’ are defined, may mask or highlight differentiated impacts that are mediated by several factors, including but not limited to, settlement pattern, government policies, sector under analysis, pre-existing livelihood strategies, degree of interaction between host-refugee etc.⁷ In other words, the impacts experienced in Kasanda village in Kakonko, will necessarily differ from those experienced by communities in Kagera. These impacts may differ because of proximity to a camp, or if there is no encampment policy at all. They may further differ when impacts are disaggregated in terms of sector and the pre-existing socio-economic conditions in those locations.⁸

Critically, there are several major and minor entry points in two regions of Tanzania known for receiving persons of concern from Burundi and the DR Congo. Both Burundians and Congolese enter Tanzania through points across the two regions, depending on the areas from where they originate in their respective countries of origin. Apart from locations listed as Formal (i.e., Government established/recognized) Entry Points, the rest are informal points (villages) where locals receive and record arrivals on behalf of border authorities. These entry points are listed in Table 1 and 2 below.

### Table 1: Kigoma Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kigoma District</th>
<th>Buhigwe District</th>
<th>Kibondo District</th>
<th>Kakonko District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiribizi (formal entry point – harbor town along Lake Tanganyika)</td>
<td>Manyovu (formal entry point)</td>
<td>Mabamba (formal entry point)</td>
<td>Gwarama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karago</td>
<td>Biharu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutanga</td>
<td>Migongo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigunga</td>
<td>Kilelema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunuka</td>
<td>Kitanga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubengera</td>
<td>Kigadje</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagunga (formal entry point – along Lake Tanganyika)</td>
<td>Heru-Ushingo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitambucka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mnan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Kagera Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ngara District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabanga (formal entry point)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


⁸ World Bank and UNHCR, 2018
Given the interaction between host and refugees in the above-mentioned districts, they could also be considered “host communities”.

It is within this context that this report acknowledges that the geographical scope for host communities chosen for this mapping exercise does not negate that impacts of refugee presence as well as that of humanitarian and development actors, can be felt beyond the chosen scope.

2.4 Methodology of Mapping

Overall, the mapping exercise is built on existing work by different actors, across regions and sectors—including mapping exercises, needs assessments and situational analyses. The mapping exercise consists of compiling existing knowledge, updating information where needed and complementing with additional data and analysis to ensure, to the extent possible, a systematic overview of responses.

The mapping process has consisted of the following steps:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A desk/literature review which included a review and documentation of existing projects, mapping exercises, needs assessments and situational analyses and online research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cover letter/email, including an interview guide, sent by UNHCR representatives to donors and implementing agencies to introduce the mapping exercise and request inputs from, and/or a meeting with, relevant representatives to gather information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Field visits in Dar es Salaam and Kigoma facilitated by UNHCR, including bilateral meetings and phone calls with donors, implementing agencies, and team leaders of other mapping exercises in other countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Team debriefing to the UNHCR Country Representative, MHA representatives, and the World Bank Tanzania Office on field visit activities and progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Updating information in the tool based on inputs sent from organizations and field interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A verification of the mapping tool by organizations included in the mapping, as well as an inclusion of few additional organizations from which information was not initially received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Finalization of the tool based on the verification process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Drafting of the report based on the final version of the tool, field interviews and secondary documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Examples include (among others) assessments carried out by the World Bank, ReDSS, UNDP and the Solutions Alliance, and as part of the preparation of a UN Joint Program in Kigoma.
3 Background

3.1 Tanzania displacement context

Since the early 1960s, Tanzania has provided a haven for refugees fleeing conflict-affected countries in the region, mainly Burundi, Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Major influxes of refugees have included (in approximate terms): (a) 160,000 refugees from Burundi in 1972; (b) 340,000 refugees from Burundi in 1992/3; (c) over half a million refugees from Rwanda in 1994; (d) 276,000 refugees from Burundi in 1996 and 1997; (e) 190,000 refugees fleeing instability in DRC between 1996 and 1999; (f) 140,000 Burundian refugees who arrived in 1999 and 2000; and (g) 240,000 Burundian refugees who have arrived since April 2015.

For decades, Tanzania has also shown leadership in supporting durable solutions for refugees in protracted situations, as when it granted citizenship in 2014 to over 162,000 refugees who fled Burundi in 1972. Its strategy for durable solutions has over the past decades consisted of a mix of repatriation (Rwandans in 1996, Burundians in 1994 and again from mid-2000s onwards), resettlement to third countries (13,000 mostly Congolese resettled since 2012) and local integration.

Early refugee policies in Tanzania were guided by an Open-Door Policy that was influenced by the domestic economic incentives and political formations of the time. President Nyerere's vision for Tanzania's development was guided by the principles of *ujamaa na kujitegema* (socialism and self-reliance); principles that were nationally adopted in 1967 through the Arusha Declaration. A significant element of the Declaration necessitated the establishment of “farming collectives to encourage self-reliance.” In this sense refugee settlements were instrumental in the development of remote regions of the country both in terms of subsistence crops and export-earning crops that provided the Tanzanian government with invaluable foreign currency.

However, the 1990s ushered in a significant shift in Tanzania's posture towards refugees, from one of “self-sufficiency and local settlement” to one focused on repatriation (Milner, 2003). Current legal and regulatory frameworks are set out in the Refugee Act (1998) and Refugee Policy (2003). These frameworks prohibit refugees from travelling more than 4kms from the camps and controls on economic activity.

---

11 Milner, 2003
Figure 1: Refugees and Asylum-seekers Hosted in Tanzania from 1973 to 2015

Source: UNHCR Online Population Statistics Database (accessed on March 1, 2018). Note: In 1972 approximately 160,000 Burundian refugees fled to Tanzania but UNHCR data only records 90,000. It was common for Burundians to cross the border into Tanzania.

3.2 Recent Displacement

Tanzania currently hosts close to 360,000 refugees and asylum seekers, including over 275,000 from Burundi and over 80,000 from DRC. Since April 2015, when unrest broke out in Burundi, close to 243,180 Burundians have entered the country, making Tanzania the largest host to Burundian refugees in the region. During the same period 12,919 Congolese refugees also arrived. Fig. 2 below shows annual arrivals over the last 3 years, from Burundi and DR Congo.

Figure 2: Annual arrivals 2015 -2017 (Burundi and DR Congo Situations)

Source: UNHCR Refugee Situation in Northwest Tanzania Statistical Report 31 December 2017

Most refugees are hosted in three refugee camps in the Kigoma region near the border with Burundi: Nyarugusu, Nduta and Mtendeli. The camp-based population makes up nearly 90% of all persons of concerns.

- **Nyarugusu camp** in Kasulu district was established in November 1996, initially to host Congolese refugees. Before the start of the current crisis in Burundi, the camp hosted 65,000 Congolese refugees and 2,440 Burundian refugees. Currently, there are over 150,000 refugees and asylum seekers in Nyarugusu. 55 percent of the camp residents are Congolese and 45 percent are Burundian (from the Hutu ethnic group).

- **Nduta camp** in Kibondo district was reopened in October 2015. Currently all new refugee arrivals are directed to Nduta Camp. The capacity of the camp has been revised, and currently it hosts close to 120,000 refugees (more than twice its initial capacity; there is insufficient groundwater to accommodate larger numbers). With a few exceptions, refugees hosted in Nduta are from Burundi.

- **Mtendeli camp** in Kakonko district was reopened in January 2016 and reached its full capacity of 50,000 in mid-October 2016. By January 2018, the camp held about 45,000 refugees, all from Burundi.

As noted in Table 3 below, smaller numbers of refugees are living in Kigoma villages, old settlements in Katavi and Tabor and as urban refugees in Dar es Salaam.

### Table 3: Refugee Population in Tanzania – by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Share of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mtendeli Camp (Kakonko, Kigoma)</td>
<td>46,161</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nduta Camp (Kibondo, Kigoma)</td>
<td>119,089</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyarugusu Camp (Kasulu, Kigoma)</td>
<td>149,894</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kigoma villages</td>
<td>23,047</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old settlements (Katavi, Tabora)</td>
<td>19,337</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumasi Transit (Kagera)</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar es Salaam – urban</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UNHCR Refugee Situation in Northwest Tanzania Statistical Report 31 December 2017*

Refugee camps in the northwest are approaching or exceeding their capacity. With the recent influx of Burundian refugees, the camp-based population increased from just over 65,000 in April 2015 to over 160,000 in October 2016. This prompted the Government to reopen two former refugee camps (Nduta and Mtendeli) to decongest the only remaining camp, Nyarugusu, and accommodate
new influxes of Burundian refugees. While these camps are approaching or exceeding their capacity, the GoT has yet to identify a location for a fourth refugee camp with adequate water supply.\textsuperscript{15}

**Voluntary repatriation of Burundian refugees from the camps in Northwestern Tanzania started in September 2017.** On 31 August 2017 at the 19th Tripartite Commission meeting between the GoT, Burundi and UNHCR, a Joint Communiqué was adopted that included an affirmation to respect the core principles of voluntary repatriation, based on a free and informed choice, and included a work plan to assist the voluntary repatriation in safety and dignity of Burundian refugees who had indicated a desire to return. The Tripartite Commission also acknowledged that while some refugees may opt to return now, others may still have well-founded reasons for not seeking to return immediately and will continue to need international protection and assistance. The Voluntary Repatriation operation began in September 2017 and as of end of January 2018, close to 14,000 refugees had been assisted to voluntarily repatriate to Burundi.

**Local integration of new Tanzanians (former 1972 Burundi refugees) still require support in Katavi and Tabora.** As an outstanding measure in responding to the need for durable solutions to the plight of refugees, the Government of Tanzania in 2014 granted citizenship to more than 162,000 Burundian refugees who fled to Tanzania in 1972. An overall strategy to facilitate the economic integration of this population into Tanzania has been developed by Government, although not yet launched. Suffice it to say that local integration activities are still in progress and require support. In addition, approximately 60,000 Burundian refugees from the 1972 influx (in Old Settlements and villages in Kigoma) remain without durable solutions.

### 3.3 Refugee-Hosting Regions and Host Communities

The definition of what constitutes a host community may vary. As noted in the section 2.3.1 above, this report will focus on regional and, where feasible, district-level information and data.

#### 3.3.1 Kigoma and Kagera

**The population of Kigoma is about 2.4 million, and the three-main refugee-hosting districts in Kigoma account for about 960,000 inhabitants. The region is hosting close to 319,000 refugees located in camps in Kibondo, Kasulu and Kakonko districts.** Kibondo has the highest concentration of refugees relative to the host population (40 percent), followed by Kasulu (31 percent) and Kakonko (24 percent). Together these three districts have a local population of approximately 960,000. Overall, the concentration of refugees of Kigoma region relative to the host population of 2.4 million people stands at 13 percent.

**The population of Kagera is about 2.9 million people and the region has a long history of hosting refugees.** The first refugees arrived in the early 1960s, when refugees came from Rwanda following that country’s independence. Ngara district received several hundred thousand refugees from Burundi and Rwanda in the 1990s.

\textsuperscript{15}Karago was suggested as a fourth camp however inadequate water supply makes it unsuitable to host large numbers of refugees (UNHCR 2016).
Table 4: Host and Refugee Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Camp-based Refugee population</th>
<th>District Population 2017 Projection</th>
<th>Refugees relative to host population</th>
<th>Regional Population 2017 Projection</th>
<th>Refugees relative to regional population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kigoma</td>
<td>Kibondo</td>
<td>119,358</td>
<td>294,636</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2,399,121</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kasulu</td>
<td>153,659</td>
<td>480,059</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kakonko</td>
<td>45,463</td>
<td>188,909</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagera</td>
<td>Ngara</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>374,909</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,879,231</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sub-Divisional Population Projection for Year 2017 Based on 2012 Population and Housing Census. Note: District population figures exclude refugees.

Kigoma is one of the poorest regions in Tanzania. Nearly half of the region’s population live in poverty (48%) and human development indicators mirror the high levels of economic deprivation. Development indicators for Kigoma show the pressing needs of the local population: The region has the highest concentration of poverty in the country, with refugee camps located in the poorest districts within the region. It has the second highest Malaria prevalence in the country (38 percent compared to a national average of 14 percent) and nutrition is poor with 38% of children under 5 affected by stunting.

The presence of refugees has placed considerable pressure on already over-stretched natural resources; this has negative effects on host communities, which if not carefully managed can generate tensions amongst communities. The use of natural resources, including water and fuel wood for cooking not only impacts the environment, but also gives rise to serious protection risks and increased tension between refugee and surrounding communities (UNHCR 2016).

3.3.2 Katavi and Tabora

In 1972, Tanzania received over 200,000 refugees from Burundi and settled them in the three settlements Katumba and Mishamo and Ulyankulu, commonly known as the ‘Old Settlements’. Two of the settlements--Katumba and Mishamo--are in Katavi, while Ulyankulu is in Tabora.

In 2007, the Government of Tanzania in collaboration with UNHCR, developed the Tanzania Comprehensive Solutions Strategy (TANCOSS) aimed at finding durable solutions for the 1972 Burundian refugees in the country. It had three pillars: Voluntary Repatriation (Pillar 1), Application for Naturalization (Pillar 2) and Final Local Integration in Tanzania (Pillar 3). By the end of 2009, implementation of the first and second pillar had resulted in the voluntary repatriation and naturalization of 53,000 and 162,156 individuals respectively. A National Strategy for Community Integration Programme (NaSCIP) was developed in 2010, to guide local integration of naturalized Burundians with a focus on distributing certificates and relocation of New Tanzanian Citizens from the Old settlements to designated regions in Tanzania, but was later amended to enable local

---

16 National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) and Research on Poverty Alleviation (REPOA) estimates based on 2011/12 Harvard Business School (HBS) data
17 Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey 2015-16
18 A smaller number of 1972 Burundian refugees were also settled in Kigoma
integration in the long-term settlements. In 2014, certificates were distributed to naturalized individuals.

The Tanzania Strategy for the Local Integration Programme for New Citizens (TANSPLI) was developed by the Government of Tanzania in 2016 with the support of UNHCR and the World Bank. It is based on the following pillars: Legal Integration (Pillar 1), Social and Economic Integration (Pillar 2) and Governance and Administration (Pillar 3). TANSPLI was the intended framework for the engagement of all stakeholders with the New Tanzanian Citizens, however by time of writing it has not yet been launched by Government. Consequently, the response by humanitarian and development actors has been very low, particularly for the socio-economic/government and administration pillars.

Table 5 provides an overview of the target population for local integration activities. By end of 2017, there were 17,000 Burundian refugees living in the three Old Settlements, alongside 162,000 New Citizens (naturalized 1972 Burundian refugees). There are nearly 130,000 refugees and New Citizens living in the old Settlements of Katumba and Mishamo (Katavi region), and 52,000 in Ulyankulu (Tabora region). Total population in hosting districts are estimated at 412,000 in Katavi and 442,000 in Tabora.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katavi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlele, Nsimbo/Katumba</td>
<td>10,831</td>
<td>62,538</td>
<td>201,937</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>663,685</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpanda/Mishamo</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>52,636</td>
<td>210,572</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaliua District/Ulyankulu</td>
<td>5,068</td>
<td>46,982</td>
<td>442,180</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2,652,51</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17,251</td>
<td>162,156</td>
<td>854,689</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sub-Divisional Population Projection for Year 2017 Based on 2012 Population and Housing Census

3.4 Humanitarian and Development Support in Tanzania

Humanitarian support accounted for 4% of total Overseas Development Aid (ODA) to Tanzania in 2015-16 (see Annex 1). The larger portion of traditional and largely humanitarian support directed at refugees is funneled through UNHCR and WFP. There is however increasing financing being provided to other partners, such as other parts of the UN system and NGOs. UNHCR and WFP combined accounted for 56% of total funding for the Tanzania portion of the Burundi Regional Refugee Response Plan (RRRP) for 2017.
The humanitarian response to the refugee situations is severely underfunded. The Tanzania portion of the Burundi RRRP for 2017 only received dedicated funds to cover 27 per cent of needs in 2017. In total, USD 61.7 million was dedicated to the response to the Burundian situation in 2017.\(^\text{19}\) The impacts of underfunding are severe and can “be found in all sectors, including food cuts, dilapidated shelters, overcrowded classrooms, limited capacity to respond to SGBV, insufficient investment in integrated social services, minimal livelihood opportunities, limited support to environmental protection and restoration, and inability to carry out population verifications, provide documentation, and train government officials on refugee status determination”\(^\text{20}\).

Total Overseas Development Aid (ODA) to Tanzania was in 2016 measured by OECD at 2,450 million USD.\(^\text{21}\) In terms of distribution of aid across sectors, the largest shares are captured by Health and Population (36%), other Social Infrastructure and Services (18%) and Economic infrastructure and services (15%). Humanitarian aid accounted for 4% of total ODA to Tanzania in 2015-16. The report is not able to establish the amount of ODA going to host regions and districts. The report also does not look at public expenditure from own resources directed to these areas. Chapter 4 however, provides a cursory look at the development challenges and priorities in host regions and districts.

4 Humanitarian and Development Challenges and Priorities

This section draws on a range of sources including national, regional and district development plans, national surveys and statistics such as the Demographic and Health Survey 2015-16 as well as project and planning documents such as the Kigoma Joint Program project document. For Katavi and Tabora, this section also relies heavily on previous assessments carried out in the interest of supporting local integration of New Tanzanians (1972 Burundians), including the “Local Integration Analysis: Naturalized Tanzanians” by ReDSS, as well as assessments carried out for the Solutions Alliance in 2016 and for the development of the TANSPLI with support from the World Bank in 2015\(^\text{22}\). Similarly, reports and assessments from UNHCR and other humanitarian responders have been used to give an overview of the needs in the humanitarian response in Kigoma.

4.1 Education

The Government of Tanzania’s second Five-Year Development Plan (FYDP II) includes a set of targets aimed at increasing both enrolment and the quality of education. The Plan aims for a 95 per cent net enrolment ratio in early learning and a 100 per cent net enrolment ratio in primary education by 2025. Furthermore, ambitious targets are set for standards such as pupil to teacher (40:1), pupils to classroom (40:1) and pupils to latrines (20:1 for girls) in primary school.

\(^{19}\) 2017 Burundi Regional Refugee Response Plan, Funding Snapshot (final 2017)
\(^{20}\) Burundi Regional Refugee Response Plan 2018.
The latest national Education Sector Development Plans (ESDP) covers the five-year period from 2016-17 to 2020-21, and sets out two key policy initiatives: (1) a commitment to providing eleven years of free and compulsory Basic Education to the entire population, leaving no one behind; and (2) the progressive expansion of Technical and Vocational Education and Training to provide Tanzania with the pool of skilled human resources needed to advance to becoming a semi-industrialized middle-income country by 2025. The ESDP also sets out the need for an enhanced effort on improving the quality of education at all levels.

Net enrollment rates in primary school are lower in refugee-hosting than national average, with Kigoma and Kagera showing among the lowest rates in the country (see table 6). Only 73 percent of primary-school age children in Kigoma and Kagera are enrolled in school compared to a national average of 86 percent. While steadily improving over time, the percentage of pupils who passed the Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE) in 2015 again shows regional disparities, this time with Tabora coming out worse with barely half of students who sat for the Examination passing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Select Education Indicators, 2015-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kagera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school net enrolment rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% passed Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE), 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PO-RALG, BEST 2016 Regional Data

District authorities note severe shortfalls in infrastructure and poor quality of education as key challenges. Education services (infrastructure, human resources, capacity building) are significantly under-resourced both in close vicinity to camps and in refugee hosting districts more broadly. Local government officials are particularly concerned about students’ poor performance and high drop-out rates, and the lack of secondary schools and vocational training options. In terms of factors affecting quality of education, districts such as Kibondo in Kigoma also highlights the lack of skilled science and mathematics teachers and inadequate teacher-student ratios.

For refugees in Kigoma, current education provision in camps is below standards and unsustainable from a financial and policy perspective. Country of origin curriculums operating for both DRC and Burundian refugees create parallel systems. Across all three refugee camps, there is a lack of classrooms and teachers, particularly for Burundian students. The gap is currently being filled by double shifts of classes and many classes held outside under the shade of trees.

Recent camp specific enrollment statistics are as follows. As at the end of second school term in March 2018, there was a total of 64,141 (32,742 boys and 31,399 girls) Burundian learners enrolled for fundamental (Primary and Lower Secondary) and upper secondary education in the three refugees’ camps. Eight one per cent (23,234 boys and 23,118 girls) were enrolled within the appropriate age-range for primary: a) Nyarugusu 14,303 (7,173 boys; 7,130 girls); b) Mtendeli 10,546 (5,321 boys and 5,225 girls) and c) Nduta Camp 21,503 (10,740 boys and 10,763 girls).
Upper Secondary school had 1,916 (1,362 boys and 554 girls) of which 2% (289 boys and 144 girls) were enrolled within the age range for upper secondary school: a) Nyarugusu 144 (88 boys and 56 girls); b) Mtendeli 106 (74 boys and 32 girls) and, c) Nduta Camp 183 (127 boys and 56 Girls). 5,076 (2,568 boys and 2,508 girls) accessed preschool. Additionally, there were 31,830 (16,743 boys and 15,087 girls) Congolese learners enrolled in primary and secondary schools in Nyarugusu camp. Nighty six per cent (9,649 boys and 9,384 girls) were enrolled within appropriate age range for primary and 58% (2,716 boys and 2,152 girls) secondary education. There were 3,650 (1,829 boys and 1,821 girls) accessing pre-primary education. The 2018 annual school enrollment target for fundamental and upper secondary education is 80% and 15% (Burundian Refugees) and 96% and 65% (Congolese Refugees) respectively.

**Education infrastructure remains, however, the greatest physical barrier to access.** Classroom to pupil ratios remain high, especially in Nyarugusu and Mtendeli. The overall situation is summarized below:

**Table 7: Teaching and Learning Environment, per camp**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Learning Environment</th>
<th>Nyarugusu</th>
<th>Nduta</th>
<th>Mtendeli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congoles</td>
<td>Burundian</td>
<td>Burundian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Pupil Ratio</td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>1:67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Qualified Teachers</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/Pupil Ratio</td>
<td>1:111</td>
<td>1:186</td>
<td><strong>1:553</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNHCR Tanzania, March 2018

### 4.2 Health

In the implementation of the GoT FYDP II emphasis will be on strengthening the health service delivery system with service delivery geared toward the health of mothers and children, addressing commonly preventable diseases such as malaria, HIV/AIDS and non-communicable diseases, as well as addressing the “human resources crisis” which constrains provisions of adequate health care.

The national health sector is guided by the fourth Health Sector Strategic Plan (2015-2020) which aims to improve equitable access to services in the country by focusing on geographic areas with higher disease burdens and by focusing on vulnerable groups in the population with higher risks. Underserved populations will be targeted. It includes strategic objectives to ensure adequate staffing
of all health facilities, extend maternal and newborn services to underserved areas, and to maintain high level of quality of HIV/Aids programs, prevention and control of malaria.

Across regions, targeted support is needed to tackle poor outcomes on maternal and newborn health and nutrition, and to respond to infectious and waterborne diseases (malaria, HIV/Aids, tuberculosis, typhoid, cholera). Inadequate financial allocation and human resources remain primary challenges in the provision of health services. Other challenges include dilapidated and/or insufficient infrastructure and shortage of medical supplies.

Table 8: Select Health Indicators, 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kagera</th>
<th>Katavi</th>
<th>Kigoma</th>
<th>Tabora</th>
<th>Mainland Tanzania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional delivery¹</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage childbearing²</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet need for family planning³</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage for all basic vaccinations</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stunting (low height-for-age)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria prevalence in children under 5</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tanzania DHS 2015/16

¹Percentage of births taking place in health facilities
²Share of women age 15-19 who have given birth or are pregnant with first child
³Share of women who want to space or limit births but are not currently using contraception

Kigoma: Health is a key development priority in refugee hosting districts, according to regional and district plans as well as consultations with regional and district authorities. At the same time, the capacity of the national health care system is low. Services included in the national health strategy are only partially rolled-out in Kigoma due to funding deficits and hence the capacity remains limited.

Due to the current encampment policy, primary and secondary care for refugees is provided in parallel to the national system at high operational cost. UNHCR, through the Tanzanian Red Cross Society, operates two hospitals, two health centers, one maternal health center and seven health posts in Nyarugusu and Mtendeli camps, while the medical facilities (one hospital and six health posts) in Nduta camp are operated by Médecins Sans Frontières. The host communities surrounding the camp are able to access these health services free of charge. Referrals to national hospitals at full cost coverage are made in a limited number of secondary and all tertiary cases, if services are not available within the camp. There are serious challenges in providing essential medicine and medical supplies due to supply chain constraints. The leading causes of morbidity in the camps are Malaria (31%), Upper Respiratory Tract Infection (18%), Lower Respiratory Tract Infection (10%), Urinary Tract Infection (5%), Watery diarrhea (4%) and others (32%).

Katavi/Tabora: Similarly, districts and old settlements in Katavi and Tabora regions highlight the challenges on the health system caused by critical shortages of human resources, shortage of and
distance to district and regional hospitals, the need to rehabilitate and upgrade existing health centers and to invest in ambulances, equipment and medical supplies. Districts also note that they are lagging in implementing the National health care policy and that access to health services currently fall behind national standards. Increased access to clean water would also bring significant health benefits to the regions, given the prevalence of waterborne diseases and infections. Maternal and child health is a priority as women and children are especially vulnerable within the current health care system.

4.3 Livelihoods

The overarching objective of the FYDP II is to build a base for transforming Tanzania into a semi-industrialized nation by 2025. The Plan seeks to promote value addition through processing and manufacturing, including through establishment of Special Economic Zones (SEZ) and industrial park (Kigoma hosts one of eight identified SEZs). Key interventions in agriculture include: increased use of modern technologies and extension services; lengthening and deepening value chains; and commercialization and improved infrastructure (transport, energy, water supply and irrigation etc.). Interventions to promote employable skills are highlighted throughout, particularly for youth, women and people living with disabilities.

Kigoma depends on agriculture, natural resources (forestry, fishing, wildlife and beekeeping), tourism, trade and industries. In refugee-hosting districts such as Kibondo more than 97% of residents are engaged in agriculture according to 2012 census. Priorities for the Kigoma region (2016-2020) include raising agricultural productivity and supporting women and youth economic empowerment through provision of entrepreneurial skills and access to finance. A main challenge is low agricultural productivity (production per unit area) for various crops and inadequate application of modern agricultural methods. Productivity is also increasingly affected by adverse effects of climate change causing erratic and short rainfall patterns and long dry spells.

Refugees’ livelihood opportunities are limited by their lack of freedom of movement, right to work, and access to financial services. Whilst dialogue for policy change continues, UNHCR and partners are providing vocational and business skills training, supporting access to informal financial services such as saving groups, and encouraging businesses through marketplaces that are accessible to the refugees and the host community. Livelihoods interventions strive to address the needs of the Tanzanians and refugee communities, and support interaction between the two, such as creation of common markets, and skills training and business support programmes that involve both communities.

Tabora/Katavi: In recent assessments of socioeconomic priorities in Katavi and Tabora, local authorities stressed the importance of land use planning, which is either absent (Katavi) or dated (Tabora). These plans are also key to the socioeconomic integration of new Tanzanians (1972 Burundians). Earlier assessments find that while there are few interventions from the government and NGOs on sustainable livelihood at the regional and district level in the Katavi and Tabora, there
are many efforts at the community-level to form groups on income generating activities, entrepreneurship and livelihood enhancement. However, these efforts lack support.

4.4 Water and Sanitation

The second FYDP II sets ambitious targets for access to water. It aims to raise the share of the population accessing clean and safe water to 85% in rural areas and to 95% in urban areas by year 2022. Ongoing national initiatives to support this includes the Water Sector Development Programme.

**Kigoma**: Scarcity of water is a key challenge in both refugee and host communities. Lack of sustainable water supply arrangements (use of river catchment areas, drilling, etc.) combined with effects of climate change further affects shortages. Current coverage in the three refugee-hosting districts fall significantly below the FYDP II targets, with Kibondo at 69%, Kasulu at 62% and Kakonko at 50%. Coverage in urban areas are similarly low.

Local government face challenges in extending access to clean and safe water, including ranging from insufficient funding for capital investments in new water infrastructures and rehabilitation/extension of aged infrastructures and for supervision and monitoring to shortage of water experts and technicians and capacity constraints of Regional Water Supply and Sanitation Teams (RWST) and Council Water and Sanitation teams (CWST). Competition over limited resources such as water contributes to conflict between refugees and host communities, and between humanitarian sector at large and host communities. There is also a risk of disease outbreaks in camps and host communities due to low sanitation standards.

**Kigoma camps**: The WASH context in the refugee camps is also challenging. Although all refugees have access to a latrine, whether communal emergency latrines shared by 4 families or individual family latrines constructed at T-Shelters, the shared latrines fill-up quickly and require constant decommissioning and replacement. Only 38% of the population have access to individual family latrines and the bulk of the population must endure the complexities of sharing latrines between families. Further, continually replacing shared latrines comes at a high cost, which the UNHCR bears.

As of March 2018, water supply was adequate at all camps however the reliability of the distribution networks and solarisation of the pumping systems is a key need for this upcoming year. WASH conditions at schools are particularly dire. In particular, needs could be addressed by constructing additional latrines to meet the standards of 50 pupils/latrine drop-hole; currently at some schools there can be up to 200-400 pupils/drop-hole. Further, hygiene continues to be a challenge. Currently the amount of soap provided is inadequate; only 250g per person per month is distributed while the basic standard is 450g per person per month. Hygiene promotion using student-led WASH/Health clubs also requires improvement, and soap-making projects could be a means to address this gap.

---

Critically, there is increasing agricultural activity in the rivers surrounding camps. This is in turn disturbing the natural balance of the rivers and thus whether these rivers can be sustainably used in the future as a potential source of water for refugees and hosts. Both hosts and refugee communities farm in the river beds and use them as an improvised irrigation scheme. Innovative and sustainable responses will be required to dissuade refugees and hosts from using the rivers in this manner, possibly by providing alternative livelihood opportunities that do not require the use of the river in an unsustainable manner.

**Katavi/Tabora: The need for water permeates most needs assessments also in Katavi and Tabora, and was mentioned also in discussions around health, education, environment and livelihoods.** For instance, in Kaliua district, water is universally stated as the number one priority at all levels, by both authorities and residents, including in the old settlement of Ulyankulu. Many districts also note the lack of ready access to clean water in health and education facilities. Sector priorities in these two regions include increasing access to clean and safe water and maintaining sustainability of available water sources.

### 4.5 Energy and Environment

The second FYDP II outlines national priorities in the area of natural resource management, environment and climate change, and sets a target of 50% of energy derived from renewable green energy by 2020 as well as for number of trees planted country wide (100 million). Interventions to prevent environmental degradation range from promotion of renewable energy sources such as liquefied petroleum gas (LPG), biogas and solar energy to enforcement of environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and other environmental laws.

The influx of refugees in refugee-hosting regions and districts has contributed to the depletion of water resources, deforestation and environmental degradation in areas close to the camps and settlements, due to increased demand for firewood and water. This additional burden to host communities gives rise to serious protection risks and increased tension between refugees and surrounding communities. Environmental impacts are exacerbated by the effects of climate change. Demand for firewood is unsustainable. Estimated use of firewood across the three refugee camps is close to 650 tons per day. Yet, alternative sources such as LPG is too costly for the humanitarian response.

### 5 Overview of Humanitarian and Development Responses

This mapping of existing humanitarian and development responses to the refugee crises in Tanzania was prepared based on information provided from 34 implementing agencies and 16 donors. A list of the organizations covered in the mapping tool is in Annex 4, and, while local NGOs working in Kigoma were not mapped, a list of contacts is provided in the tool too.

---

The mapping covers 293 projects that are taking place in Tanzania’s three regions of Kigoma, Tabora, and Katavi.

5.1 Responses by region

5.1.1 Kigoma

In Kigoma region, there are 248 projects that can be categorized according to 7 different primary sectors and 32 related sectors. The primary sector that most projects are categorized as is Livelihoods (86) followed by Water and Sanitation (33) and subsequently by the Education sector (30). Many of the projects have related secondary sectors, for example the lead agency of one of the Livelihoods project is the International Labor Organization (ILO), for a development project entitled ‘UN Integrated Approach to Productive Employment and Decent Work for Youth’. According to its objective, this project is designed, in part, to put global and national policy recommendations on youth employment into practice and test longitudinal interventions. As such, for this project, Youth and Women’s Economic Empowerment, is identified as its related sector.

The WASH and Education sectors feature prominently too. An example of a WASH project is led by Oxfam International. The project’s objective is the “construction of swamp-well equipped with a solar and distribution network of 1.5kms”. It targets host communities in the Maloregwa village in Kibondo district and aims to target approximately 5214 villagers. An example of an Education project is led by the IRC, who is the lead agency for a development project entitled ‘Education Quality Improvement Programme in Tanzania’ (Equip-Tanzania). This project has Capacity Building as a related sector and its stated project objective is to “facilitate improvement in the quality of education through the mentioned project components of teacher training, peer-to-peer support, and visits from district-level education officers.”

While the examples of interventions mentioned above – led by the ILO, Oxfam International and the IRC - target only host communities, the mapping tool does categorize projects in terms of three major target groups, those only focused on refugees, only hosts or both refugees and hosts. For example, verified data was received on targeted beneficiaries for 76 of the 86 livelihoods projects in Kigoma. Out of these 76 livelihoods projects, 39 projects target only refugees, 16 projects target only host communities, 21 projects target refugees and host communities.

---

25 We have identified the following Primary and Related sectors in Kigoma Region; the related sectors differ from region to region. Primary Sectors: Capacity Building; Education; Environment and Energy; Health; Livelihoods; Protection; Water and Sanitation. Related Sectors: Access to Finance; Access to Finance/Persons with Special Needs; Camp Infrastructure; Camp Management/Non-Food Items; Capacity-Building; Child Protection; Durable Solutions – Resettlement, Repatriation, Integration; Education; Environment/Disaster Risk Reduction; Family Planning; Food Security; Health; Health/Nutrition; Health/Reproductive Health; ICT; ICT/Governance; Legal Services; Livelihoods; Livelihood – Agriculture; Livelihood – Nutrition; Livelihood/Self-reliance/Economic Development; Persons with Special Needs (PSN); Private Sector; Protection – Women & Children; Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV) & Children; Sustainable Environment/Energy; Urban Development; WASH; Youth and Women’s Economic Empowerment.
An example of a Livelihoods project that targets only refugees, is led by WFP. The project is entitled “Food and Nutrition Assistance to Refugees in North Western Tanzania” and has Food Security as a related sector. Its stated objective is “providing basic food and nutrition assistance to refugees and asylum-seekers in emergency and protracted situations through both in-kind and cash-based modalities.”

JhPiego, an organization focused on interventions in the Health sector is also active in Kigoma and focuses on host communities. One of their projects, known as “USAID Boresha Afya” has Reproductive Health as its related sector, while its objective is to “improve the health status of all Tanzanians – with an emphasis on women and children in targeted regions – and to support the Government of Tanzania to increase access to high-quality, comprehensive and integrated health services, focusing on maternal, newborn, child, and reproductive health outcomes.”

Livelihoods leads as a dominant primary project focus in Kigoma, it similarly is represented highly as a related sector. Out of 241 projects in Kigoma where a related sector is documented, 65 of those projects mentioned are identified as also being related to Livelihoods. For example, the Community Environmental Management and Development Organization (CEMDO) is the lead agency of a project titled “Provision of Assistance and Protection to Refugees in Nyarugusu Camp” with “Livelihood: Agriculture” identified as its related sector. The project aims to “provide livelihoods and promote agricultural production” by “providing land, seeds and water cans in Zone two and six along the river, however with the plan to relocate away from the river to avoid contamination with chemical fertilizer” in the future. Aimed at refugees, the project was recently completed (December 2017) in Nyarugusu Camp in Kasulu District with MHA as CEMDO’s identified government counterpart for the project.

Capacity Building is the fourth highest represented sector in Kigoma, following Livelihoods, WASH, and Education respectively. There are 27 projects where Capacity Building is identified as the primary sector. Twenty four out of these 27 Capacity Building projects are development projects;
only 3 of the Capacity Building projects have a humanitarian focus. UNESCO leads one of these Capacity Building development projects entitled ‘Empowering Communities and Local Radios for the Promotion of Good Citizenship and the Adoption of Inclusive Practices.’ According to the project components, the intervention, which has a related sector focused on persons with special needs, will provide “technical and financial assistance to media practitioners to develop programs on issues of local concern, particularly those related to discriminatory and harmful practices against groups and persons with special needs, such as people with Albinism, people with disabilities, and girls threatened by female genital mutilation (FGM).”

Regarding government counterparts, many of the projects in the Kigoma region mention collaborating or being in active contact with one government contact. Seventy-three projects in the Kigoma region have a direct government counterpart. MHA is the government counterpart that is most commonly listed, with 27 projects in Kigoma region listing it as a government counterpart. One such project that has MHA as the government counterpart is led by Plan, with Protection as the primary sector and Youth and Women’s Economic Empowerment as the related sector. The project, has the stated objective of “ensuring that Burundian refugee children have improved access to child protection services specifically in the Mtendeli refugee camp.”

With regard to other government counterparts, the President’s Office-Regional Administration and Local Government (Po-RALG) is mentioned in 6 projects. For example, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is the lead agency for an Education project which aims to “enhance learning opportunities for girls and young women through both school and out-of-school interventions, adopting a holistic approach whereby education, health, and law enforcement entities collaborate in creating a conducive environment for girls’ education.” Sponsored by the Korean International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) and covering all three districts of Kasulu, Kibondo and Kakonko, the project’s overall objective is “Empowering Adolescent girls and Young Women through Education” and as such, its related sector is Youth and Women’s Economic Empowerment.

In addition to considering the sectors and government counterparts as important elements of this analysis, the districts of Kigoma also provide interesting insights about responses. Of the three refugee-hosting districts - Kakonko, Kasulu, and Kibondo - and among projects that identify a district of focus, the majority of the activities are being implemented in Kibondo. There are 57 projects being implemented in Kibondo district, 49 in Kasulu and in contrast, Kakonko, has far less activities being implemented, with 13 projects on the ground. These number of projects may reflect that Nduta camp, in Kibondo district, was reopened in October 2015 and therefore an increased need is required there.

---

26 The government counterparts that are most often cited across projects, are national government counterparts, including the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (moEST); the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA); the Ministry of Energy; the President’s Office-Regional Administration and Local Government (Po-RALG); the Ministry of Labor; and the Ministry of Health.
Interestingly, there is a fairly even distribution of projects taking place in these districts (117) as there are in the camps (131). However, since this mapping is not comprehensive, this is not an accurate representation of the division of projects between in and out of camp activities, as government activities, in particular, are not captured. It does however, point to an increased effort by partners to engage in projects outside of camps, despite policy conditions that make area-based programming a challenge. UN Women is the lead agency of one such out-of-camp project, titled “Supporting Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) Engagement in Campaigns Against Violence Against Women and Children”. The components of this project are advocacy and awareness raising initiatives focused on violence against women.

Another example of an out-of-camp project is the Environment and Energy focused project, led by Stichting Nederlandse Vrijwilligers (SNV) – the Netherlands Development Organization. The project covers the Kigoma Region and is entitled “Energizing Development - Results Based Financing (RBF) for Rural Market Development of Pico-PV Solar”. Its objective is to “improve market access to, and use of, quality pre-electrification pico-solar devices for poor rural and off-grid households in six Regions of the Lake Zone and three Regions of the Central Zone via strengthened import supplier to end retailer distribution.” This project focuses on the vulnerable groups of youth and, more generally, vulnerable households and aims to collaborate with the private sector.

In terms of targeting vulnerable groups such as women, youth and children, there are 49 projects across Kigoma that list women as the target beneficiaries, and 45 projects that list youth as the relevant affected target group. Women and youth are simultaneously targeted in 28 of the Kigoma projects, and, in turn, 14 of these projects take place specifically in camps.
The category of ‘related sectors’ reveals that there are at least 47 projects that related to gendered targeting, such as 9 projects that are specifically focused on the prevention of SGBV and in some cases, note building the capacity of local communities and authorities to promote improved gender relations within the community.

5.1.2 Katavi & Tabora

In the region of Katavi, there are 20 projects dedicated to five different primary sectors and 13 related sectors. While there are fewer projects operating in Katavi than in Kigoma, the two regions share a prioritization of the Livelihoods sector by actors. There are eight projects in Katavi with Livelihoods as the primary sector, followed by 6 projects with Capacity Building as the primary sector. One such Livelihoods project is led by JICA. The project aims to provide training on “rice cultivation technologies; irrigation scheme management; gender, marketing and post-harvest.”

The highest number of projects in Katavi are geared towards development projects. Out of 20 total projects in Katavi, 17 are development-focused, and the remaining 3 projects are humanitarian-focused. Two out of the three humanitarian-focused projects are specifically concentrated on the primary sector of Capacity Building. The development projects are predominantly concentrated in the primary sectors of Livelihoods (8) and Capacity Building (4).
SNV-Netherlands Development Organization leads one such Livelihoods development project and the related sectoral focus is Livelihood: Agriculture. The project name is 'Inclusive Business in the Sunflower Business Chain' and the objective is to “increase the sustainable income of smallholder sunflower farmers and employment of poor men, women and youth through increased access to services, markets and inputs enabled by structural and behavioral change triggered among the actors in the sunflower market system.” The government counterpart mentioned is the Ministry of Agriculture.

Lastly, in terms of the targeting of vulnerable sub-groups, four of the 17 development projects have a simultaneous focus on women/girls/GBV and youth.
Population Services International (PSI) is the lead agency for a Health project that aims to focus primarily on women and youth within the host community. The stated objective is, in part, “to improve sexual and reproductive health and rights.” The project components are as follows: (i) increase opportunity for women and couples of reproductive age to access high quality health services through the public and private sector; (ii) increase the distribution of high-quality and affordable contraceptive products in the private sector; and (iii) increase access to affordable integrated health care through social franchising.

UNESCO also leads one of the projects that simultaneously targets women and youth. In this case, the stated objective of the project is to “empower local radios with information and communications technology for the promotion of rural citizens participation in democratic discourse and development.” No government counterpart is mentioned as a part of this project.

The Tabora region of Tanzania is also represented in this tool. In Tabora, there are 25 projects that cover six primary sectors and 12 related sectors, which differ slightly in number and content from those mentioned in Kigoma. Tabora breaks the trend of having Livelihoods and Capacity Building as the most dominant primary sectors for projects. Instead, in Tabora, Health is the primary sector with the most projects mapped, followed by Environment and Energy. There are eight Health projects and five Environment and Energy projects out of 25 total projects in Tabora. These combined 13 projects covering Health and Environment and Energy, are all development responses.

JhPiego leads one such project, with a related sector of Reproductive Health. The name of the project is ‘More and Better Midwives for Rural Tanzania Project’ and the objective of the project is to “strengthen health-training institutions, support increased recruitment of nurse-midwives, and strengthen midwifery.” The project focuses on host communities as the target beneficiaries, although the government counterpart is not identified.

World Vision is the lead agency on another development-oriented project in Tabora region. This project is entitled ‘Integrated Food and Nutrition Security’ (IFaNS), with Health as its primary sector and Environment and Energy as its related sector. The objective of the IFaNS program is, in part, to “ensure free malnutrition to communities in Tanzania through increased production and productivity while promoting sustainable use of natural resources.” The target beneficiaries are host communities and this project also specifies that women, girls and those affected by GBV, as well as youth and vulnerable households are beneficiary sub-groups.

While the sectors, both primary and related, help to indicate the broad objectives of projects, the target beneficiaries also provide some more specificity in the orientation of the projects - development or humanitarian. In Tabora, 12 of the 25 projects focus exclusively on host communities as the target beneficiaries, while 3 projects on refugees. Refugees and host communities are simultaneously listed as the target beneficiaries on 9 different projects.
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27 The Related Sectors are: Capacity Building; Child Protection; Education; Environment and Energy; Environment/Disaster Risk Reduction; Nutrition; Health/Reproductive Health; Livelihood; Livelihood-Agriculture; Private Sector; Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV) & Children; and Youth and Women’s Economic Empowerment.
5.1.3 Donors

Donors are key actors in the supporting the responses in the refugee-hosting regions. Sixteen donors are presented in the mapping tool, most of which are European. The vast majority of the donor’s cover interventions at a national level – including the Kigoma region. Some donors, such as Belgium, Germany/GiZ and Denmark, mention district-level targeting in Kasulu, Kibondo and Kakonko. Some, such as a Danish Governance project, will “support paralegal organizations established by the Women’s Legal Aid Centre (WLAC) in all three refugee-hosting districts.” An Environment and Energy GiZ project in the pipeline, for instance, aims to “increase the use of sustainable energy by refugees and host communities” in “all camps and surrounding communities”. The proposed project will focus on “energy saving cook stoves and renewable energy (solar) home systems for refugees and the host communities”.

Most donors represented in this tool cover the sector of Education, with the sectors of Livelihoods and Health equally in second place. Establishing the range of the funding envelope is challenging, as most amounts indicated by donors are not disaggregated by region, if they are nationally earmarked, and further, funding allocation is provided in Dollars, Pounds, Euros and Tanzanian shillings.

However, one of the larger projects that multiple donors have invested in, including the World Bank, the Department for International Development (DFID) and Belgium, among others, is the project titled ‘Productive Social Safety Net Project’; directed towards certain categories of host communities nationally. The objective of the now third phase of the project is “to enable poor households to increase incomes and opportunities while improving consumption” through the provision of cash transfers. Otherwise known as TASAF III, the project targets people living under the basic needs...
poverty line (currently 33.6% of the population). The project is government led through the Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF).

A closer look at the sectoral investments of some of the donors reveals that DFID is investing in the sectors of Water, Livelihoods, Education, and Health; Germany in WASH and Environment and Energy; Belgium in WASH, Environment and Energy and Livelihoods; JICA in Livelihoods; Canada in Health and Education, just to mention a few. Among the projects that the AfDB is investing in, is the USD 22.4 Million project called the Regional Rumoso Falls Hydropower Project. Focused on the sector of Environment and Energy, its objective is to “enhance power generation and transmission capacity for Burundi, Rwanda, and Tanzania, and contribute to regional economics, stability, and integration.” The AfDB is not only engaged in development projects of a regional nature, but humanitarian ones too. AfDB has also earmarked funds for engagement in the Burundi RRRP, including funds earmarked for the Education and WASH sectors.

With these varying sectors in mind, it is important to note that there are two sectors that donors have mainly invested in, in terms of number of projects/programs: Education and Livelihoods. There are 12 Education and 11 Livelihoods projects that donors are investing in. These higher number of projects funded within these two sectors largely mirrors the regional analysis, which shows that Livelihoods are, in particular, a significant humanitarian and development focus.

![FIGURE 9: DONOR INVESTMENT BY # OF PROJECTS AND SECTOR](image)

In terms of the investment periods that donors commit to, they tend to be fairly long term, with many at least five-year commitments while some exceed ten years. There are numerous long-term projects that are due to close soon, including two urban WASH projects funded by the German development bank *Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau* (KfW) that began in 2012 and are due to be completed in 2018.
Working closely with government counterparts, both nation and sub-national, is key for sustainability of projects. In analyzing which government counterparts are working with donors, eight (50%) of the 16 donors covered in this tool identified a direct government counterpart. These government counterparts include, but are not limited to, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Water and Irrigation, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Po-RALG, and TASAF. For example, Belgium listed the Ministry of Agriculture as a government counterpart on its ‘Sustainable Agriculture Kigoma Regional Project (SAKiRP)’. The objective of which is to “develop the local economy and improve the wellbeing of smallholders in Kigoma region through sustainable agriculture development.” Further, Belgium lists women and girls as the relevant affected target group, and this project is being implemented in all Kigoma districts.
6 Conclusions

This analysis shows that the continued financial and technical support by development and humanitarian actors in the refugee-hosting regions of Tanzania is helping to achieve identified national and sub-regional development priorities. A significant number of projects across regions cover both refugees and hosts, despite the challenges of implementing such responses with encampment policies and no right to work or access to financial services for refugees. Further, the overwhelming number of Livelihood projects show the prioritization, by many actors, of ensuring the self-reliance of refugees in the wake of protracted situations, as well as the livelihoods of hosts, as evidenced by the significant number of projects that are developmental in nature.

Nevertheless, the humanitarian response to the refugee situation remains severely underfunded. The Tanzania portion of the Burundi RRRP for 2017 only received dedicated funds to cover 27 per cent of needs in 2017. In total, USD 61.7 million was dedicated to the response to the Burundian situation in 2017. Further, although positive signs are noted in the investment of Livelihoods projects, other priority sectors appear in need of further investments; chiefly Environment & Energy and Health. Although several donors such as Belgium and the AfDB on the one hand, and Canada, DFID and JICA, on the other, are investing significantly in these sectors, our mapping indicates that more needs to be done. In terms of health, primary and secondary care for refugees in Kigoma is provided in parallel to the national system at high operational cost. More development projects are required to address the host community needs, in the absence of less restrictive refugee policies. Environmental challenges will continue to be faced in the context of camp structures and environmentally unfriendly resource sharing between hosts and refugees, especially in the case of water resources, deforestation and environmental degradation. Further, literature indicates that for these two key sectors – Health and the Environment - limited research exists on the long-term effects in host countries.

An important opportunity lies ahead for partners, as newly synthesized research, based on Tanzania’s historical experience with large and sudden influxes of refugees, can be utilized to develop evidence-based interventions. The research points to some important insights, including but not limited to, 1) the gendered implications for host communities; 2) the timing and type of aid, where and to whom its targeted and its implications for the food security and resilience of the host community, 3) poorer households will likely benefit more from public goods (e.g. hospitals/health centers) and services, however, they will likely not do well in terms of market-related economic opportunities that arise from an increased number of refugees, and 4) pre-existing socio-economic conditions in a host communities as well as the capacity of local authorities, mediates the extent to which these communities can benefit from refugee presence. Therefore, development responses need to be more gendered, with consideration for the poorest and least skilled in those communities, while also considering seriously the socio-economic pre-conditions of communities, and how this should shape the timing and type of response formulated.

Finally, it is hoped this report provides not only useful analysis for more targeted planning and coordination among partners working the refugee-hosting regions, but also provides further impetus
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28 2017 Burundi Regional Refugee Response Plan, Funding Snapshot (final 2017)
for developmental projects that will have long lasting positive impacts on refugees and host communities.
Annex 1. Overseas Development Aid (ODA) to Tanzania

Total Overseas Development Aid (ODA) to Tanzania (gross) was in 2016 measured by OECD at 2,450 million USD\(^{29}\). In terms of distribution of aid across sectors, the largest shares are captured by Health and Population (36%), other Social Infrastructure and Services (18%) and Economic infrastructure and services (15%). Humanitarian aid accounted for a 4% of total ODA to Tanzania in 2015-16.

Annex Table 9: Bilateral ODA by Sector for Tanzania, 2015-16 average, USD million

Source: OECD-DAC

The largest donor of ODA to Tanzania is the World Bank IDA which accounted for USD 516 million in 2015-16, followed by the United States (USD 477 million) and the UK (USD 283 million). Annex Table X shows the top ten donors of ODA for Tanzania.

Annex Figure 10: Top ten donors of Gross ODA for Tanzania, 2015-16 average, USD million

Source: OECD-DAC
8 Annex 2: The Impact of Refugee Presence on Host Populations in Tanzania: Summary of lessons learned and policy recommendations

The following are some lessons that can be learned from studies that have assessed refugee impact on Tanzanian host populations and that could inform future responses. They are accompanied by related policy or practice recommendations. See “Ogude, H. The Impact of Refugee Presence on Host Populations in Tanzania: A Desk Review. World Bank and UNHCR, 2018” for the full review.

Table 10: Lessons Learned and Policy/Practice Recommendations on the Impact of Refugee Presence on Host Populations in Tanzania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Policy/Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1.</strong> Lesson (L1): The developmental needs and challenges of a host country are instrumental in framing how the host government may understand the value of refugees. This was evident from the previous Open-Door Policy which was framed in a context where refugees were understood as critical to the development of peripheral regions in Tanzania.</td>
<td><strong>P1.</strong> Policy/Practice (P1): To the extent possible, development actors should pragmatically, identify how refugee’s socio-economic integration can contribute to, and align with, the host country’s developmental objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L2</strong> The sustainability of development responses to protracted forced displacement situations are highly contingent on the political will of the government, sustained technical assistance and financial resources. The Tripartite Partnership Model between the UNHCR, GoT and TCRS is an example of this.</td>
<td><strong>P2</strong> Development and humanitarian actors, should to the extent possible, devise responses in collaboration with host governments, and ensure their local political backing. In the best cases, the responses should involve local actors (such as NGOs) and the use of government systems to ensure the sustainability of the interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L3</strong> Government policies targeted towards refugees, can inadvertently have negative implications for host communities. For instance, limitations on refugee engagement in agricultural production left some refugees with little choice but to engage in village crop theft.</td>
<td><strong>P3</strong> Government policies devised in response to the arrival of refugees, should carefully consider the implications these may have for hosts, both positive and negative. Policies should be devised in a manner that both groups benefit, with consideration for short terms costs and long-term benefits. Some of these include:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- P3.a: If a camp policy exists, smaller camps that are relatively near to villages, allow for hosts to take social
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L4</th>
<th>The most vulnerable in host communities are disproportionately affected by refugee presence, those tend to include women, the elderly, the disabled, the already poor and unskilled.</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>Protect the most vulnerable with an emphasis on labor market outcomes, gender and youth since impacts have distributional effects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L4a</td>
<td>Consequences of hosting refugees are not gender-neutral. Evidence showed that host women were less likely to engage in outside employment and more likely to engage in household chores (i.e. water fetching and firewood collection) relative to men. Further, literate women were more likely to engage in outside employment in response to the shock, while illiterate women were likely to engage in farming and collecting firewood/fetching water.</td>
<td>P4a:</td>
<td>Programs and interventions should not only be tailored to consider the gendered impacts on the labor market and household tasks, but also the differentiated impacts between higher skilled and lower skilled women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4b</td>
<td>Research indicates that poorer households will likely benefit from more public goods (e.g. hospitals/health centers) and services, however, they will likely not fare well in terms of market-related economic opportunities that arise from an increased number of refugees (Mabiso et al.). This differentiated effect in terms of social and economic impacts, will likely result in wealthier households being rewarded economically (e.g. new businesses or jobs in the humanitarian sector), while less off households will find themselves in precarious conditions (e.g. casual farm workers competing with the cheap labor of refugees).</td>
<td>P4b:</td>
<td>Interventions should differentiate between “social and economic distributional effects” (Mabiso et al.). To protect vulnerable groups (e.g. poor households, casual workers) from the likely initial negative economic effects, actors should identify the groups who may require support, evaluate their vulnerabilities and their coping strategies, and develop responses accordingly. Targeted social safety nets can potentially have ameliorating impacts. Further, impact evaluations should be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Refugees also occupy other roles and identities, such as students, consumers, businesswomen etc. Therefore, their livelihoods are certainly shaped by protection policies and practices, but are not exclusively framed by protection concerns.

Humanitarian and development actors should be as concerned with refugee policies and practices as they are with policies and practices that pertain to housing, health, education etc., particularly in contexts of non-encampment. It is also these policy areas that most intersect with the lives of host communities (Landau and Achuime, 2017).

Humanitarian and development organizations should try to mitigate the depletion of labor from public institutions. This could be done, for instance, through labor and skills exchange agreements between public and humanitarian agencies to protect from the depletion of skills, and ensure skills transfers to public institutions that will be of use after the humanitarian organizations have left.

Labor and goods markets as adaptation mechanisms are vital in refugee situations. These markets can provide mechanisms for positive outcomes on food security and in some cases, negative outcomes for some subgroups of the host community. These factors “depend on preexisting conditions such as infrastructure, labor skill levels, land availability, and agricultural potential, but likely also on refugee policy (for example, refugee work regulation, refugees’ access to land, restrictions on trade and refugee mobility, and so on)” (Mabiso et al., 2014).

Investments and responses should be geared towards building the skills and capacity of local producers to respond to increased demand in food.

Program design should consider pre-existing socio-economic conditions and policies that constrain and enable host adaptation mechanisms – such as road infrastructure and encampment policies.

The “timing, source and type of aid, as well as where and to whom it is targeted, have significant implications for the food security and resilience of the host community, especially if food and other goods can be purchased at affordable prices from local markets” (Barrett and Maxwell, 2005 in Mabiso et al., 2014).

Humanitarian actors, to the extent possible, should “substitute food aid for cash transfers or vouchers to both refugees and poor households in the host community” (Mabiso et al., 2014). However, assessments of their impact should be periodically conducted to ensure positive impacts.

Environmental degradation is a critical mechanism through which refugees impact the food security of host communities, in both the short and the long run (Mabiso et al., 2014). Further, environmental degradation can be used as a political tool to justify restrictive policies on refugees, that are in fact contradictory with environmentally sustainable solutions in protracted situations.

Food security of host communities could be protected by 1) no encampment policies 2) using a settlement structure, 3) in the case of encampment policies, careful selection of camp location and 4) environmental programs such as reforestation and soil conservation (Mabiso et al., 2014).
| L10 | Interdependencies between refugees and their hosts, last beyond the period after refugees have left the host areas. Therefore, households and communities may require time and support to adjust to not only population shocks associated with the sudden arrival of refugees, but also with the gradual or sudden departure of refugees (Mabiso et al., 2014). |
| P10 | Development and humanitarian actors should carefully consider how they frame environmental challenges in the face of a refugee shock as this may have implications for wider protection needs of refugees. |
| L11 | Improvements in road infrastructure has a decreasing effect on the prices of traded goods (Casaburi et al. 2013). Improvements in transportation is especially important in areas where remoteness is a critical factor that hinders community’s ability to escape poverty (De Weerdt, 2006). Road infrastructure has been shown to be a key driver of persistent positive changes in hosts welfare (Maystadt and Duranton, 2014). |
| P11 | Local governments and development actors should prioritize road provision and maintenance to support the reduction in the cost of traded goods and transport costs. |
9  Annex 3: Interview guide

i.  Program/Project information
   a.  Name of the program/ project being implemented or planned to be implemented in
        the next one or so year
   b.  Objective(s) of the program/project
   c.  Implementation start date and end date
   d.  Number of beneficiaries by gender and host and refugee community;

ii.  Program/project scope
   a.  Sector in which the program/ project falls, e.g., Education, agriculture, etc.
   b.  Districts covered by the project/program
   c.  Program/project components and their objectives
   d.  Program/project components for scale-up in case of additional funding (to refugees,
        host population or new district)

iii. Implementation arrangements
   a.  Implementing agency; e.g., Government, NGO, etc.
   b.  M&E and reporting arrangement
   c.  Implementation arrangement-e.g. whether mainstreamed in the structures of
        Government or has an independent PIU

iv.  Funding
    a.  Funding sources (World Bank; UN, Government, etc.)
    b.  Total program/project cost

v.  Alignment and coordination
   a.  Alignment of program/project with national, regional and district-level development
        plans and priorities
   b.  Coordination mechanism/collaboration arrangement with other sectors/ actors at
        national, regional and district level
10  **Annex 4: List of Organizations Covered**

African Development Bank (AfDB)
Agence Française de Développement (AfD)
African Initiatives for Relief and Development (AIRD)
Canada
Caritas Tanzania
Church World Service (CWS)
Community Environmental Management and Development Organization (CEMDO)
Belgium Development Agency (BTC)
Denmark (DK)
Department of International Development (DFID)
Danish Refugee Council (DRC)
European Union (EU)
Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO)
Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GiZ)
Good Neighbors Tanzania (GNT / GNTZ)
HelpAge International
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
International Labour Organization (ILO)
International Organization for Migration (IOM)
International Rescue Committee (IRC)
Ireland (IRL)
Italy (IT)
International Trade Centre (ITC)
Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
JhPiego
JICA
Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW/GER)
Médecins Sans Frontières International (MSF)
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
Oxfam International
Plan International
Population Services International (PSI)
Relief to Development Society (REDESO)
Save the Children
Netherlands Development Organization (SNV)
Sweden (SW)
Tanganyika Christian Refugee Services (TCRS)
Tanzania Red Cross Society (TRCS)
UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF)
UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF)
UN Development Programme (UNDP)
UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
UN Population Fund (UNFPA)
UN Habitat
UN Joint Programme for Kigoma – World Food Programme (WFP)
UN Joint Programme for Kigoma – UNESCO
UN Joint Programme for Kigoma – UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
UN Joint Programme for Kigoma – UNICEF
UN Joint Program for Kigoma – UNCDF
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
UN Women
USAID
Water Mission
World Bank
World Food Programme
World Vision