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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is about the trends in the cross-border trafficking of small arms and light weapons (SALW) along the border of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Burundi. The assessment took place along the River Rusizi/Ruzizi and Lake Tanganyika, the two main geographic features that demarcate the border between the two countries.

The assessment established that there was rampant trafficking of SALW and ammunition across the border. The main conclusions of the assessment were:

1. There are many more unofficial (unmonitored) border points than official (monitored) ones. At the time of the assessment, between 80% and 90% of the crossing points assessed had no security monitoring, which denotes the porosity of the border between the two States.

2. Young men are the group most commonly involved in arms trafficking, and especially ex-combatants.

3. The trafficking is most intensive during the closure of the hydroelectric dams located on the Rusizi/Ruzizi; during market days when people cross the border to trade; and at night time, between 23h00 and 04h00.

4. The arms and ammunition are often concealed in sacks containing raw material for the manufacture of Kanyanga, in the luggage of people swimming across the Rusizi/Ruzizi, or on the bellies of canoes.

5. Assault rifles, especially AK-47s, are the main type of weapons trafficked.

6. Trafficking is more prevalent across the Rusizi/Ruzizi River than Lake Tanganyika.

7. Trafficking is facilitated by the lack of capacity among official border personnel to intercept illicit trade and police the border. There is a lack of adequate border management skills among border officials, a lack of appropriate detection equipment, weak cross-border information exchange and a tendency towards corruption by the low-paid border staff.

8. The high prevalence of land conflicts and armed groups in the border region fuel the demand for SALW, as does poverty which forces people to seek incomes from highly profitable but risky alternative livelihoods.

This assessment report gives recommendations to combat the trafficking of SALW between Burundi and the DRC which has formed the basis of a bilateral action plan agreed by the two countries.

---

1 In DRC the river is called Ruzizi, while in Burundi it is called Rusizi. Both names are used in this report simultaneously.

2 Kanyanga refers to an alcoholic brew commonly made and consumed locally not only in Burundi and DRC, but in the entire Great Lakes region. Sometimes it has different names in different countries/communities.
INTRODUCTION

This assessment was the first of its kind to be conducted along the border of Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and its findings bring to the fore the complex characteristics of the borders and the factors which favour the illicit trafficking of SALW.

The border between Burundi and the DRC stretches from Kamanyola in Walungu Territory to Baraka in Fizi Territory on the Congo side, and from Cibitoke Province to Makamba Province in Burundi. The border regions of the two countries have a number of physical similarities between them. They are divided by water bodies – River Rusizi/Ruzizi to the north and Lake Tanganyika to the south. River Rusizi/Ruzizi flows from Lake Kivu and drains in Lake Tanganyika on the outskirts of Bujumbura and Uvira. Both countries have national roads running parallel to the river and the lake at varying distances. They have both experienced recurring cycles of armed conflict in the recent past along their common borders, particularly along River Rusizi/Ruzizi (in the plains and in the adjacent Rukoko forest). This has led to extensive use and possession of SALW by civilians inhabiting the border area.

Whereas the DRC and Burundi can achieve a lot in combating illicit trafficking of SALW at the national level within their own territories, the same is not easy to achieve along their borders without cross-border co-operation due to the international nature of the problem. This calls for a mutual acknowledgement of the problem and the fact that it requires combined effort by affected countries to succeed. It was this realization that brought both Burundi and the DRC to implement a study along their common border.

This report has six sections. The first and second present the rationale for the assessment and analyse the international relevance of conducting this assessment respectively. The third section comprises the methodology and the findings of the assessment. The fourth section makes recommendations based on the findings; these are further developed in the action plan. The fifth section is the conclusion. The sixth section contains relevant annexes.

---

RATIONALE FOR THE ASSESSMENT

The DRC-Burundi border is one of the most porous borders in the Great Lakes region. The region’s history of internecine conflicts has led to widespread trafficking of SALW from one side of the border to the other. Arms traffickers have often taken advantage of the unsupervised riverine borders of the two countries to conceal their nefarious trade.

Concerned by these long-standing challenges, the governments of the two countries decided to jointly assess the extent of this threat with the aim of developing a joint initiative to address the problem. It is believed that if the spread and use of SALW along the borders of the DRC and Burundi is controlled, this will result in a more peaceful, stable and secure environment for communities living in the border regions, but also contribute to peace and security in the two countries and the Great Lakes region as a whole.

Several factors motivated the governments of Burundi and the DRC to support and engage in this highly valuable joint border assessment. Firstly, the regional context and history of conflict within the Great Lakes region has created a situation where non-state actors continue to exploit the porosity and uncontrolled sections of the countries’ borders to smuggle SALW from one country to another depending on the demand. The border between Burundi and the DRC is largely demarcated by water bodies. The northern border is divided by River Rusizi/Ruzizi and its tributaries while the southern border is demarcated by Lake Tanganyika. The heavily forested and mountainous environment accompanying these features makes it even more challenging for both countries to effectively secure their common border. An in-depth understanding of the prevailing situation was therefore fundamental in establishing a common approach on how to manage this challenge.

Secondly, the prevailing cordial relationship between Burundi and the DRC and their commitment to the objectives promoted by the Regional Centre on Small Arms in the Great Lakes Region, the Horn of Africa and Bordering States (RECSA) formed the backbone on which this activity took place. Thirdly, both countries have developed active national structures charged with the implementation of SALW policies, and therefore both countries have the capacity and willingness to undertake such an endeavour. Burundi has the Commission Nationale permanente de lutte contre la Prolifération des Armes Légères et de Petit Calibre (CNAP) and in the DRC, the Commission nationale de contrôle des armes légères et de petit calibre et de réduction de la violence armée (CNC-ALPC).

And lastly, the technical and logistical support that Action on Armed Violence (AOAV) offered the two national structures played a major role in the success of the exercise. The implementation of a field assessment, undertaken on the border points between the two countries in March 2015, allowed the identification of several characteristics and factors favouring cross-border trafficking of SALW.
THE INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK

The threats that the illicit proliferation of SALW pose on security and development is of global concern. At the international level, the United Nations (UN) has put in place international instruments aimed at helping countries to effectively manage this challenge. For instance, the initiative to develop the International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS) came from UN agencies that participate in the United Nations Coordinating Action on Small Arms (CASA) mechanism. UN Member States frequently call upon these agencies to provide advice and support on issues related to SALW control — including legislative, programmatic and operational issues. CASA partners agreed that the best way to ensure that the UN as a whole could consistently deliver high quality advice and support in response to such requests was to develop international standards on SALW control, similar to the standards the UN has developed in the areas of mine action (the International Mine Action Standards) and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (the Integrated DDR Standards).

A key element of ISACS⁴ is the call on States to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in SALW by putting in place effective controls to deter, detect and intercept illicit movements across their borders. It recognises that the co-operation among States to prevent illicit cross-border movements of SALW is a complex and multi-faceted task, especially in cases where a border is long, porous, remote or difficult to access, or if government agencies responsible for border management lack the required capacity and resources.⁵

With regard to border management, ISACS provides a broader approach that includes a description and assessment of the situation on the border crossing points with specific emphasis on:

a) The physical characteristics of the border;
b) Extent of physical demarcation of the borderline on the ground;
c) Extent of agreement by bordering States on the exact location of their common border;
d) List of (official) border crossing points;
e) Location and description of other routes (e.g. paved and unpaved roads, tracks, etc.) that cross the border between (official) border crossing points;
f) Occupations, economic situation and sources of income of border communities; and
g) Involvement of border communities in cross-border smuggling (petty and organized), including the commodities involved.⁶

On the other hand, for States with limited resources and limited access to international assistance, ISACS recommends that at a minimum, in the short term and as a first step only, States should implement the basic provisions in securing their borders. These include:

---

⁴ In general, the framework within which ISACS fits is provided by global agreements and international law that aim to prevent the illicit trade, destabilizing accumulation and misuse of SALW, in particular: the UN Programme of Action against the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons; the International Tracing Instrument; the Firearms Protocol supplementing the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime; and the Arms Trade Treaty. See, http://www.poa-iss.org/InternationalTracing/InternationalTracing.aspx.
⁵ See, Border controls and law enforcement cooperation (ISACS 05.60:2012(E)V1.0). At: http://www.smallarmsstandards.org/isacs/0560-en.pdf
⁶ See, Border controls and law enforcement cooperation (ISACS 05.60:2012(E)V1.0), ibid, section 8.3.
(a) Ensuring that the National Authority on SALW, through a national coordinating mechanism, sensitizes all border control agencies, as well as all forces and services operating at the border, to the need to prevent illicit cross-border movements of SALW; (b) Training armed forces deployed at the border on border surveillance and border security management; (c) Planning and creating a border guard force; (d) Enforcing existing bilateral cross-border agreements and intra-services cooperation agreements; and e) Further integrating national border services and processes by drafting, issuing and enforcing additional cooperation agreements and memoranda of understanding.  

Regionally, both Burundi and the DRC are members of RECSA, the inter-State body that coordinates activities relating to SALW in the Great Lakes region and horn of Africa.

---

7 The priority agencies recommended by ISACS include the customs service, border guards, coastguards, police, armed forces (land and sea), intelligence services and national park wardens. See Section 7.3 of ISACS 05.60:2012(E)V1.0.  
OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY OF THE ASSESSMENT

The main aim of this assessment was to understand the status quo of the Burundi-DRC border in relation to the trafficking of SALW, and to provide recommendations that would contribute to reducing the illicit cross-border trade so as to improve security for the inhabitants of the border regions. A bilateral action plan was subsequently developed from the findings of the assessment. The action plan is to be implemented jointly by the two countries with the support of partners such as AOAV. The two countries conceptualized and conducted the study according to the methodology defined below.

The success of this process was a combined effort of the CNC-ALPC\textsuperscript{9} and CNAP\textsuperscript{10}. The two are national structures mandated by the governments of the DRC and Burundi respectively to manage matters relating to SALW. In the context of the DRC, CNC-ALPC was represented by the South Kivu branch (CNC-ALPC/SK) due to the fact that South-Kivu is the province that neighbours Burundi. The two structures partnered with AOAV in this initiative with financial support from the UN Trust Facility Supporting Cooperation on Arms Regulation (UNSCAR). The mission of AOAV is to reduce the incidence and impact of armed violence. It does this by supporting fieldwork, research and advocacy aimed at reducing harm and rebuilding lives affected by armed violence.\textsuperscript{11} The three partners were instrumental in developing a methodology that would be suitable for assessing the illicit trafficking of SALW along the Burundi-DRC border.

The three parties recognised the sensitivity of discussing SALW within the Great Lakes region, not least along the border of the two countries, because of the suffering that easy access to SALW has caused in local communities. It would practically be impossible to collect data on such a sensitive subject without the full awareness of the local administrative and security apparatus of both countries. The process that led to the border assessment was therefore divided into three stages.

The first stage was the planning, followed by the border assessment exercise and finally the validation of the final document. A consultant with a wide knowledge and experience on illicit trafficking of SALW in the Great Lakes region was engaged to guide the process from the start.

At the preparatory stage, in February 2015, 100 administrative and border security officials as well as civil society representatives from Burundi and the DRC held a consultative workshop in Bujumbura organized by AOAV. The participants of the workshop came from civil society, police, military, customs, intelligence, immigration and national park wardens. The aim of the workshop was to enrich the study by the valuable contribution of the participants, who hold a wealth of experience as practitioners at the border. It was also important to build consensus among them on a common methodological approach since they were potential participants in the exercise. This was vital too because it was their involvement from this conceptual stage that would lead to the ownership of the process by all parties.

The 16 experts that eventually conducted the study were selected from participants of this initial workshop and this facilitated the ease with which the assessment team gained acceptability and authorization in data collection. At the conclusion of the

\textsuperscript{9}http://www.cd.undp.org/content/rdc/fr/home/operations/projects/democratic_governance/alpc_co.htm
\textsuperscript{10}http://www.cnaphburundi.bi/index.php/fr/presentation/a-propos-de-la-cnap
\textsuperscript{11}http://aoav.org.uk/about-aoav
workshop the participants agreed that the border assessment should cover both formal (official) and non-formal (unofficial) border points along the entire border of both countries. They agreed on a common method of selecting the 16 experts, 8 from each country. They further agreed that on the DRC side of the assessment would be limited to the territories that border Burundi. These are Walungu, Uvira and Fizi (See Annex I). On the Burundi side the focus of the assessment would be the six provinces that share the border with the DRC. These were Cibitoke, Bubanza, Bujumbura Rural, Bujumbura Mairie, Bururi\textsuperscript{12} and Makamba (See Annex II).

The assessment exercise was preceded by a two-day training for the assessment team (hereinafter referred to as “team”). The focus was on data collection and analysis and the team was trained on data collection methods such as structured and unstructured interviews, focus group discussions, observations, photography as well as the use of questionnaire. At the end of the training the team developed the questionnaire that was used in the assessment, aiming to cover the elements suggested by ISACS when conducting a border assessment.

The team adopted the following approach in its data collection:

i) The 16 members of the team were divided into groups of four. The emphasis was not only on having two Congolese and two Burundians in every group, but also a mix of state officials as well as civil society members from each country in all the four groups.

ii) The team would first assess the Burundi side of the border for a period of one week before doing the same on the DRC side of the border.

iii) Two groups assessed the provinces north of Bujumbura city, namely Cibitoke, Bubanza and Bujumbura Rural, while two other groups assessed Makamba, Bururi, Bujumbura Mairie and the southern part of Bujumbura Rural. The same matrix was adopted when the team went into the DRC. For consistence and ease of analysing the findings, the groups that assessed the border points along the provinces of Cibitoke, Bubanza and parts of Bujumbura Rural were also the groups that assessed the corresponding borders on the DRC side. These were the border points in the territories of Uvira (north of Uvira town) and Walungu. In the same way, the groups that assessed border points on the other half of Uvira territory (south of Uvira town) as well as Fizi Territory are the same groups that assessed the corresponding provinces in Burundi, namely Bujumbura Mairie, Bururi, Makamba and parts of Bujumbura Rural. Through this arrangement the team found it easier to confirm and crosscheck some of the information collected on the opposite side of the border.

iv) Every group had a group leader. For convenience, the Burundians led the groups during the assessment in Burundi, while the Congolese did the same when assessing the DRC side.

The data collection processes involved one-on-one interviews, focus group discussions, questionnaires, observation and document analysis. The residents interviewed were more open in disclosing specific cases when interviewed one-on-one in private as opposed to in a group. There was often fear within the communities about speaking openly about arms and ammunition.

\textsuperscript{12} The province of Rumonge was created on 26 March 2015, encompassing parts of Bujumbura rural and Bururi provinces (including all of the Bururi communes which border Lake Tanganyika). The assessment was conducted before its creation and as such the document refers to the province of Bururi.
GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BORDER POINTS

The Burundi-DRC border plays a major and historical role in promoting social and economic co-existence between residents of the two countries. However, the advantages provided by the border have sometimes been exploited negatively by armed criminals and illegal traffickers of SALW and other contraband goods. In general, the porosity of the border poses a major security threat to the internal stability of the two countries. This has transformed the border into a source of instability and an obstacle to development in most communities living in the border regions.

The border between Burundi and the DRC stretches from Kamanyola in Walungu Territory to Baraka in Fizi Territory on the Congo side, and from Cibitoke Province to Makamba Province in Burundi. The border regions of the two countries have a number of physical similarities between them. They are divided by water bodies – River Rusizi/Ruzizi to the north and Lake Tanganyika to the south. River Rusizi/Ruzizi flows from Lake Kivu and drains in Lake Tanganyika on the outskirts of Bujumbura and Uvira. Both countries have national roads running parallel to the river and the lake at varying distances. They have both experienced cycles of armed conflict in the recent past along their common borders, particularly along River Rusizi/Ruzizi (in the plains and in the adjacent Rukoko forest). Communities on both sides of the border are generally poor, though comparatively, the basic living standards of the communities along the lake are better than those of the communities along the river. Similarly, the fishermen and traders along the lake derive more profits than those depending on the river.

The plains of the river, which corresponds with the provinces of Bubanza and Cibitoke in Burundi and Uvira and Walungu territories in DRC experience the highest level of insecurity along the border. The residents of border regions on both sides of River Rusizi/Ruzizi live in constant fear, hence the tendency for many of them to possess arms for self-defence. The Rukoko forest, located in the plain, is an area inhabited with armed groups from Burundi and Congolese armed militias which operate in coordination with each other. Some of the recent tragedies relating to armed attacks in Mutarule13 (in DRC) and Cibitoke14 (in Burundi), would attest to that.

The civilian possession of arms along the common border of the two countries is as endemic as the conflicts that have raged in the region. As one elder of Sange’s Kabaregule localité put it, “... arms are not spoken about in times of peace, they are only heard at the time of their need – when a conflict occurs. We cannot do away with them because they are our source of security...” This statement captures the centrality of arms to the sense of security of communities in the border regions. While an outsider may see the presence of arms within these communities as a negative aspect that undermines development, the residents largely value the gun – they see it as a source of security in times of war. It is perceived as a safety tool.

There are seven officially recognised border crossing points between Burundi and DRC. The most frequently used is the Gatumba/Kamvimvira border, which links the two major towns of Bujumbura (Burundi) and Uvira (DRC). However, like the other six, this border post lacks basic border control facilities such as scanners for people and cargo crossing the border.

Border officials (police, customs, immigration and health workers) cited a lack of specific training on border issues as a significant challenge to their work. This, according to the officials, has made them less effective in combating trafficking not only of SALW, but also of minerals and other contraband goods.

The Burundi-DRC border is therefore an epitome of the risks that a porous border portends.
FINDINGS OF THE ASSESSMENT

i.) Border points between Burundi and the DRC

Official borders in the context of this assessment means borders that are monitored by government security agents as established crossing points. The team was able to assess only accessible border points at the time. The team was therefore able to assess seven official border-crossing points in each country, as well as 60 unofficial border crossings in DRC and 31 in Burundi (see Annex I and II for the list of the border points assessed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of official border points assessed</th>
<th>No. of unofficial border points assessed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most unofficial borders correspond with the communities they serve. The border points often are historical crossings points that existed and were operational before independence of these countries. In fact, most official borders also started unofficially in this way. This historical reality makes it very difficult for State authorities to impose restrictions on the use of crossing points along borders, more so where rivers and lakes are concerned, because they also serve as a source of livelihoods for communities living on both sides. Based on this natural and historical reality and attachment between residents of both sides, there is a sense of deep entitlement among the border residents to cross the river and the lake when and where they please.

The gradual growth in population among communities living along the border has directly contributed to an exponential demand for goods and services offered by the traditional cross-border markets. So while trade has expanded leading to an increase in the number of people crossing the borders, efforts by the two countries to secure these border points have remained low. The lack of monitoring along most stretches of the border, even as trade levels increased, has had a corresponding increase in the level of criminality, particularly in trafficking of arms and the level of insecurity and criminality across the unofficial points is of great concern.

The assessment noted that where official borders are located remotely, especially where River Rusizi/Ruzizi passes several kilometres from the main road or passes through dense forest, borders were either not monitored, or were monitored for a very limited duration (opening at 11h00 and closing at 15h00). In such locations the residents expressed concern that they are not allowed sufficient time to carry out their economic activities across the river. Residents also disclosed how they are forced to use unauthorized crossing points whenever authorized crossing points are opened late or closed early. In practice the tendency for residents to explore alternative options has the potential of attracting illegal trafficking of arms and contraband goods because of the absence of security agents to monitor those crossing. This increases the opportunities for SALW traffickers and other criminals to engage in illegal activities under the cover of ongoing legal cross-border trade activities.

15 Accessible border points were considered those that had an obvious and passable route to it and that were safe (from rebel activities and banditry) for the team to visit.
Communities living in close proximity to border points that authorities have closed due to various reasons expressed the desire to have them reopened. In all the cases where the border points had been “closed”, this seemed to be only on paper, as generally cross-border activities went on uncontrolled through alternative crossings in the vicinity of the “closed” one. The closure was therefore more about the “absence of border authorities” than was about the cessation of cross-border activities – residents continue to cross informally.

ii.) Cross-border transport options

Often people depend on dilapidated boats and canoes to cross River Rusizi/Ruzizi, leading to accidents. This is a trend that is most prevalent in Walungu and Uvira territories of the DRC, which correspond to Cibitoke province in Burundi and Bugarama town in Rwanda. The three countries converge at a tripoint on the Ruhwa River16 and this convergence attracts significant levels of trade from the three countries, often necessitating that traders cross the rivers to reach markets which alternate from one country to another on different days. This tripoint was inaccessible on the Burundian side at the time of this assessment because the border was closed due to insecurity. The difficulty related to crossing the River Rusizi/Ruzizi is similar along the entire length of the River, and not necessarily just at the Tripoint. With such long distances to cover in order to reach the authorised crossing areas, many residents living near closed border points in Burundi and their counterparts in DRC opt to use “bidons”17 for crossing the river. In order not to be accused of violating closed borders, residents often opt to cross through alternative areas adjacent to closed official borders. They use “bidons” which are less conspicuous, and also due to the scarcity and high costs of boats and canoes18. Some barges used for crossing the River are locked by authorities when borders are

---

17 A “bidon” is the name given used by local communities living along the Rusizi/Ruzizi to refer to tightly sealed plastic jerry containers commonly used by households for fetching and storing water and which can also be used for floating across the river in an attempt to cross the border.
18 The cheapest canoe, with a capacity of four passengers, costs between $80 and $100, depending on the quality of a tree that it is carved from (focus group discussion, Katogota). Bidons cost between $0.5 and $1 on local markets. This is reflected in hiring costs.
closed, further reducing transport options.\textsuperscript{19}

The lack of safe alternatives for crossing the river has created a feeling of neglect among the residents on both sides of the border – that their welfare is not a priority for the authorities. This disaffection is worsened by increasing losses of life by community members trying to cross the river on “bidons” or overloaded canoes. The hostility with which they expressed themselves during group discussions epitomized their sense of discontent. Further downstream at Katogota, the assessment team witnessed a “passenger” being ferried across the Rusizi/Ruzizi on a “bidon” in a bid to access a market in Burundi because the closest border point in Burundi had been closed. Community members indicated that there was generally limited cross-border coordination between Burundi and the DRC on closure of borders. Often one side would close its border while the other side remained operational. According to residents of both countries, unilateral closures of this kind mean a large number of people cross the River by unauthorised routes. This creates a security risk since the already limited border monitoring is further reduced, attracting traffickers of SALW and other contraband goods. Trafficking is predominant at night between 23h00 and 04h00 when general river activities are at the lowest and monitoring (almost) completely absent.

The situation on Lake Tanganyika is a bit different, with many fishing boats in use. Wide distances wouldn’t allow for makeshift means of crossing. The Gatumba/Kamvimvira border has a bridge that allows for vehicle crossings, the only one along the whole border.

\textbf{iii.) Cross-border communication, policing and control}

The assessment established that in a few cases formal border points, such as Gatumba/Kamvimvira, had coherent cross-border communication between officials on both sides of the border, but this was not the case for the majority of the border points. Information sharing on criminal activities was very limited and SALW traffickers exploited this to their advantage. Generally, whenever DRC authorities pursue a suspect,\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{19} See “Rugombo, le joyau au mille atouts” At: http://www.iwacu-burundi.org/rugombo-le-joyau-aux-mille-atouts/
the pursuit ends once the suspect crosses into Burundi due to the lack of established cross-border communication between the authorities of both countries and vice-versa.

ISACS’ integrated border management (IBM) guidelines underscore the need for cross-border communication between security forces by providing standard elements to be applied. These include:

(a) designated, official contact points or liaison officers for cross-border security issues;
(b) direct radio communication between domestic border agencies at the regional level;
(c) direct lines of communication between border agencies on opposite sides of the border;
(d) early warning procedures that allow for the sharing across borders of new developments requiring immediate counter-measures;
(e) joint contingency exercises, joint planning, regular meetings, and associated training/exercises;
(f) coordination of border patrols in order to exercise surveillance over as much of the border as possible, making maximum use of resources available on both sides of the border;
(g) rapid intervention border guard units authorized to support the neighbouring State on its territory; and
(h) authorization for cross-border hot pursuit.20

None of the border points along the river or the lake have the capacity to scan or detect bulky cargo. Often they depend on the owner of the merchandise to voluntarily disclose the details of his/her cargo. In suspicious cases, the only option is to physically search through the cargo and this is not only ineffective in detecting contraband which can be hidden or disguised but also poses a risk to border personnel. The residents of Sange in DRC and Cibitoke in Burundi recounted instances in which grenades concealed in sacks of cereals exploded unexpectedly during manual searches by security agents at the crossing points of Rusizi/Ruzizi.

The high level and nature of corruption among border officials as well as among local administrative authorities responsible for the border points between Burundi and the DRC is largely as a result of the rampant poverty that ensues from insecurity, coupled by poor remuneration of border security agents. The official fee for crossing River Rusizi/Ruzizi from the DRC to Burundi is 1,500 FC while Burundians pay 3,200 BIF. The crossing is for a maximum period of three days and the trips are intended to facilitate trade between the two countries. However, even in cases where border points are monitored, just by paying a fee slightly higher than the official fee one is allowed to cross with his cargo un-inspected. Asked why some individuals would rather pay a higher fee to avoid inspection, one of the border officials explained, “...they do so, so as not to waste time at the border, just in case they are forced to spew their cargo on the ground for inspection. Sometimes the border agents poke through their sacks with wires thereby tearing them, so one would rather pay something small and pass.” In this context, inspections are seen as a bother and not as a security requirement. The team witnessed a number of people cross the border points on Ruzizi/Rusizi from both sides with their cargo un-inspected.

In the case of Lake Tanganyika, the traders are taxed upon docking both on the Burundi side as well as the DRC side. The tax is determined according to the nature of the merchandise ferried. Normally habitual users of the lake such as fishermen are not

20 ISACS’ section 10.5.6 provides the conditions under which hot pursuit should be conducted. It states that customs officials or border police officers of one State pursuing in their country an individual observed in the act of committing an extraditable offence should be authorised, according to mutual agreement, to continue pursuit across the border and into the territory of the neighbouring State without specific prior authorisation where, given the particular urgency of the situation, a) it is not possible to notify the competent authorities of the neighbouring State prior to entry into that territory; or b) the authorities of the neighbouring State are unable to reach the scene in time to take over the pursuit.
taxed, but this category fluctuates to include individuals with the capacity to bribe border officials, just as in the case along the River Ruzizi/Rusizi. Canoes and boats belonging to such individuals are seldom inspected and often some border officials are known to benefit directly from the proceeds of whichever business they would be condoning on the lake. Arms and bulky minerals are easily trafficked in this manner on the lake, and also on the river.

Although the question of competency and skills development was not one of those consistently posed to border agents, whenever the issue arose the respondents expressed the desire to be equipped with modern/advanced skills relevant to their areas of specialization. The majority of officials have not received any further training following pre-deployment training.

During the assessment, it was notable that there was no physical presence of security forces (police or military) in the Plaines de la Rusizi/Ruzizi, except on the main road where the military occasionally conduct security patrols. These locations are prone to arms trafficking particularly because of the presence of Burundian and Congolese armed groups. In Cibitoke, Bubanza and Bujumbura Mairie, residents cited numerous cases of armed militia crossing into Burundi from the DRC to distribute arms to their comrades. They named a number of armed groups including Front du Peuple Murundi-Abatabazi (FPM-Abatabazi) and Force auto-défense légitime (FAL). In January 2015, another undisclosed armed group launched an attack in Cibitoke Province.

The main road leading from Bujumbura and Uvira southwards on each side of the border is located only a few meters from the shores of Lake Tanganyika. This has a dual impact – on the one hand it opens up even unofficial borders (often docking points for canoes of local fishermen) to a major road network, making it attractive to smugglers. But at the same time, the proximity of the lake to the road made the communities more easily accessible to local authorities thereby contributing to better policing of lake-side communities compared to those living along the river. Proximity with the main road also provided the communities living along the lake with more diverse opportunities. Communities living along Lake Tanganyika on both sides of the border have more access to basic infrastructure and social services, like a main road, clinics, schools, public administration and bigger market centers, than those living in the vicinity of River Rusizi/Ruzizi.

iv.) Cross-border trade

The context of cross-border trade on the lake and on the river differ in several ways. The main economic activity (fishing) on Lake Tanganyika has a higher profit margin than fishing on River Rusizi/Ruzizi. This is partly attributable to the advantages brought by the close proximity of both the Uvira-Baraka main road (on the DRC side) and the Bujumbura - Nyanza-Lac main road (on the Burundi side) that facilitates access to markets.

On the contrary, the main road parallel to River Rusizi/Ruzizi both on the DRC side as well as on the Burundian side of the border is located much further away (in some cases

several kilometres) from the river. Communities lining the river on both sides find it much more convenient therefore to trade with their counter-parts across the river, than endure several kilometres to get to the main road so as to transport goods to the nearest trading centres in their own territory. This is the case between the residents of Sange (in the DRC) and Mirambo (in Burundi). Both trading centres are located in close proximity to each other across River Rusizi/Ruzizi, thereby attracting traders from both sides of the borders with relative ease.

The challenge however is the lack of established means of crossing the river (as discussed above). This has impacted negatively on the improvement of the general livelihoods of the communities living along the river as opposed to those living along the lake. The risks are even higher for traders plying the river, as they are forced to cross the river on "bidons," an extremely dangerous method.

Unofficial border crossing points are used for trade purposes by both inhabitants of the area as well as those from elsewhere. As would be expected, cross-border market days attract more traders as opposed to non-market days. In the latter case communities living along the border interact and trade regularly with their counterparts across the border. This is the reality along River Rusizi/Ruzizi as well as Lake Tanganyika. While cross-border market trade is authorized by both countries, the traders exploit the opportunity to deal in contraband goods, while criminals take advantage of market days to traffic illegal goods such as arms and ammunition.

The assessment noted numerous accounts of uncontrolled flows of goods from both sides of the border. Specific examples include the trade in products such as timber, charcoal, beer, bread, soft drinks, maize, sorghum and cassava flour through the numerous beaches on both sides of the Lake Tanganyika and among the communities living along River Rusizi/Ruzizi. The trade is between corresponding villages on both sides of the lake and the river. The trade occurs mostly through unmonitored informal border points.

While the thriving cross-border economic activities of this nature should be encouraged because they promote harmonious co-existence and economic sustainability, the assessment documented an average of two cases per month of suspected arms trafficking across the river and the lake within every border point assessed, which totals to about 200 cases per month of suspected arms trafficking across all (the 105) borders assessed in this study. Across River Rusizi/Ruzizi, the most prevalent form of merchandise in which arms are frequently concealed are sacks containing raw materials used in the brewing of kanyanga, a local brew consumed by residents of both countries. Although both countries have banned the brewing and consumption of kanyanga, the communities along the border in Burundi find it easier to have it brewed in the DRC and have the finished product "re-exported" into Burundi for consumption23. Across Lake Tanganyika, the most common concealment method is the belly of the canoes used by local fishermen, who mostly dock at unmonitored beaches.

Interestingly however, the assessment established that traffickers of minerals that are easily portable and easier to hide (such as gold and diamonds) prefer to use official border points due to the high risk of being robbed along unofficial border points – precious mineral traffickers thrive on bribing border officials whenever possible rather than risk the bush. However, those dealing in bulky minerals such as coltan and cassiterite prefer the use of water bodies where bulky sacks containing the minerals are ferried alongside cereals on canoes. The assessment did not investigate if there was a

23 The assessment team did not investigate why the brewing was done in DRC and not in Burundi.
relationship between the trafficking of arms and minerals across the border, although the narrative on trends of how the two are trafficked was similar.

v.) **Cross-border armed crime and arms trafficking**

Border officials in neither country keep a clear record of the statistics of arms trafficking at the border. Both sides treat such occurrences with the same severity as "any other crime of smuggling". The assessment team were therefore unable to get clear statistics of the magnitude of the trafficking problem due to a lack of record keeping. Most respondents interviewed indicated an average of two seizures per month on the lake and the river. However, about a third of the respondents along the lake (particularly in a few of the southernmost crossing points of Burundi and the DRC) indicated an average of five interceptions of AK-47 rifles every month. Since the majority of the sources stated an average of two seizures per month per crossing point on both the lake and the river, the team settled for this figure as the average per crossing point. It is important to note though that it is not as common for interceptions to take place on the river because of the porosity of the river border and the fact that very little official monitoring takes place. The high frequency of monthly average seizures in a few southernmost crossing points on the lake may require a further study to determine its severity.

It is probable that the river experiences a higher intensity of trafficking compared to the lake, overall. Firstly, the span of the lake separating the two countries increases gradually southwards, making it less attractive for potential traffickers of SALW as that would be much more conspicuous to authorities monitoring the lake, which is also more accessible than the river. Secondly, crossing the lake can sometimes take several hours, while crossing the river takes only a couple of minutes, making the river more attractive to illegal activities. Thirdly, sometimes the water levels in the river drops necessitating the authorities manning the two hydroelectric power stations at Rusizi/Ruzizi I and Rusizi/Ruzizi II to block the flow of the river downstream. Whenever this occurs illegal traffickers of SALW, contraband goods, drugs (especially marijuana) and cattle raiders take the advantage to conduct illegal activities across the river. The assessment team documented these instances in the majority of communities along the river.

Residents and fishermen operating between Fizi and Nyanza-Lac across Lake Tanganyika described an example of how network of criminals involving Congolese and Burundians sometimes move arms and ammunition across the lake on behalf of individual traders. According to residents, the trafficking commonly takes place at night between 11h00 and 04h00. At this time armed groups descend from the plateau to the shores of the lake with arms and ammunition, where they meet their contacts who load them on motorized canoes. Once on the water they offload their cargo onto the canoe of their Burundian counterparts. Often the Burundian boat docks on un-monitored shores southwards (in Nyanza-lac), close to the border with Tanzania. This is but one of the various trends that networks operating along the borders of Walungu and Uvira territories (in the DRC) and in the corresponding provinces of Cibitoke and Bururi (in Burundi) use to traffic arms and ammunition.

The trafficking of arms and ammunition is more complex on the lake than on the river because of its link to violent armed crime as described above. Trafficking is conducted by a network of cross-border criminals from DRC and Burundi, acting in coordination with one another on the waters of the lake. Always operating as a network, Burundian pirates could, for instance pass information to their Congolese counterparts about a newly acquired motorboat operating on the waters of the lake. Depending on which
side of the border the new boat belongs, once the motorboat gets onto the lake, the crew would be attacked by armed gangs from the opposite country riding an ordinary canoe. The pirates would threaten to shoot if the motorboat captain attempts to flee. Once captured, the armed pirates would transfer the captain into their un-motorised canoe and ride away the motorized one. The fear brought by this rampant armed crime has been a limiting factor for the development of communities living along the lake as most fear investing in major fishing ventures.

In almost all cases, the direction of arms and ammunition flows and the fluctuation in their prices is dependent on the variation in demand on either side of the border. All the respondents indicated that AK-47 rifle was the most commonly trafficked. As expected there is a close link between the occurrence of armed conflict and the demand for arms. As tension starts building, parties in conflict embark on an arming spree, which in turn escalates the demand for arms and ammunition.

Whereas the prevalence of armed crime is a sign of a high prevalence of SALW in an area, according to the residents of the Plaines de la Ruzizi, a peak in the intensity of illicit trafficking would be an indication of an armed group in the area preparing for an assault.24 At the time of the assessment, there was no indication of abnormal intensity in trafficking, though by all estimates the practice was rampant. In about 80% of official border points and 90% of unofficial border points that were assessed, border officials as well as community members recounted instances where arms were found in sacks of cereals, of individuals swimming (across Rusizi/Ruzizi) with luggage containing rifles, or of a canoe with rifles strapped on its belly crossing Rusizi/Ruzizi or Lake Tanganyika. Specific incidents of organized crime involving Burundian and Congolese criminals were cited.

vi.) Opportunities for trafficking

Trafficking of arms and contraband goods is most prevalent in three major instances –

24 Focus group discussion, localité de Mutarule, Plaines de la Ruzizi (DRC).
during the closure of the hydroelectric dams on Rusizi/Ruzizi when the river is low; at night; and on market days.

As discussed above, the times when the dam is closed upstream presents a key opportunity for traffickers. This practice is often unexpected by the downstream border authorities so whenever it happens, arms traffickers, cattle rustlers and other criminals on both sides take advantage of the low waters in order to smuggle their merchandise across the border.

Most trafficking on the river and the lake takes places during night-time hours when there is little or no form of monitoring of the border points and the beaches. Residents living close to these water bodies reported that trafficking activities were most prevalent between 23h00 and 04h00.

Similarly, market days attract a heavy flow of goods and persons both ways across the border, thereby providing a potential opportunity for arms traffickers to conceal their trade within the crowds. Middlemen acting on behalf of armed groups thrive on the wide range of activities that occur on market days to also traffic arms and ammunition. In this way the market place is used to camouflage such illegal activities.

vii.) Persons involved in trafficking

Youth25, especially young men, are the most likely to be involved in cross-border arms trafficking, both along the lake as well as the river, and are also the key operators of the arms trade within their communities. Young men from both sides of the border reportedly operate in a syndicate- or mafia-like manner threatening anyone who discloses details of their operations. A number of these young people are demobilized combatants from successive wars who are well skilled in militia activities but remain jobless. They are commonly affiliated with armed groups operating in or nearby their communities and hence become involved in the arms trade, as well as other contraband goods such as marijuana and minerals, as both a source of income for themselves and to support the activities of the armed group to which they have links. This practice is most prevalent in the territories north of Uvira town (Walungu and Uvira) and the provinces north of Bujumbura Mairie (Cibitoke and Bubanza as well as Bujumbura Rural).

Although in general youth are the most likely to be involved in trafficking activities, it was apparent from discussions with community members in certain areas that the practice is prevalent among the majority of men, particularly in communities along River Rusizi/Ruzizi. The history of violent conflict in these communities, and the ongoing presence of armed groups, creates a cycle whereby the practice of trafficking is continually passed on to the next generation. Many men that the team spoke to during the assessment nostalgically recounted their feats in past wars going as far back as the Mulele rebellion26 and in this way the trafficking of arms has become more of a culture than opportunistic in nature, involving not just (former) combatants. Civilians are also involved in the trade, buying weapons as a tool to protect the community against external attacks by armed groups.

25 The term ‘youth’ in this report refers to those between the ages of 15 and 35 years old
26 The Mulele rebellion was the first large-scale war in post-independence Congo (DRC). It encompassed the entire eastern DRC, with deep social, economic and political consequences. For more details, see, Ypeij, A et.al. 2014. Gender Conflict: Embodiments, Discourses and Symbolic Practices. Netherlands: Ashgate Publishers.
The weapon of choice – AK-47 rifle

The most commonly trafficked small arm across the border of the two countries is the AK-47 rifle. This weapon is used widely by the national security forces of both countries as well as by civilians and can be purchased for $25 - $35 depending on its condition and demand. In all the meetings held during the assessment, the respondents cited the AK-47 as the most common weapon in their midst. The second most commonly reported weapon was the hand-held grenade.

Residents and local authorities in 53 of the 60 unofficial borders in the DRC, and in 18 out of 31 unofficial border points in Burundi confirmed that they had heard of individuals seeking to buy “kalach,” (i.e. AK-47 rifles) in their communities. The buying of AK-47 rifles is most prevalent in the territories north of Uvira town (Walungu and Uvira), the provinces north of Bujumbura Mairie (Cibitoke and Bubanza) and Bujumbura Rural. The team received information that arms traffickers were operating as far as the communes of Bukinanyana and Murwi (specifically in the Colline of Kigazi). The most affected localities on the DRC side are Luberizi, Luvungi, Sange and Mutarule.27

Contributing factors to trafficking

In many communities in the DRC and Burundi, poverty is a major contributing factor to insecurity. Poverty drives local communities to seek alternative sources of livelihood to survive, including illicit trade or participation in armed groups. Limited job opportunities often drive youth in particular towards criminal activity, and in communities which are underdeveloped, have a history of violent conflict and have a limited State presence, armed groups find a fertile ground for recruitment. The presence of armed groups increases the demand for weapons both for themselves to conduct their illicit activities, but also for communities, which feel the need to protect themselves. Arms trafficking therefore becomes an easy and viable option for young people without other opportunities, and in this way poverty is a contributing factor to the prevalence of arms trafficking.

The insecurity bred by the presence of armed groups and the trafficking of weapons in turn exacerbates poverty and so the phenomenon is cyclic and hard to break. Insecurity prevents communities from fully exploiting their land to increase their incomes; prevents local development, which in turn has an impact on health and education; and is a disincentive for investment in the region. Although this assessment did not put an emphasis on the question of education or health infrastructure, it is evident that these are limited, and where they exist, over-burdened. The endemic poverty of the border regions means people are often left with little choice but to exploit the opportunities that are available to them, regardless of how dangerous or counter-productive that opportunity is.

The ownership and use of land is a very emotive and controversial issue on both sides of the border and conflicts over land are a key factor in the demand for SALW. Most land conflicts relate to the way land is acquired and used. This is a complex issue that is (mis)-interpreted in different ways. The most volatile area is the localités de Rugenge in Walungu territory, in the neighborhood of the Kamanyola border point, but is just one example of the many violent land conflicts that exist in the border regions.

Rugenge is a low-lying fertile flatland adjacent to River Ruzizi. Most landowners live in Sange, Kamanyola and other nearby trading centres, leaving the farms to agriculture. The fertility of localité de Rugenge and its location close to the tripoint of DRC, Rwanda and Burundi, makes it attractive to citizens of both Rwanda and Burundi in two ways.

First, laborers come to Rugenge as casual workers on the farms. However, rather than cross the river daily most casual workers opt to rent houses in Rugenge, or stay with friends while they work on the farms. Second, foreigners come as investors in the farms. The Congolese in the area are increasingly renting out their farms to willing investors. Usually the lease period is between three months (for $25 - $30) and nine months (for $60 - $70). This arrangement has therefore increased the presence of foreign laborers and investors causing tension with the original inhabitants of Rugenge whom reportedly see this trend as an invasion by Rwandans and Burundians. Local residents disclosed during interviews in Kaberagule that land was also available for sale to any buyer with money. A span of 25 square meters costs between $1500 and $2000. In a different setting another individual blamed local leaders for fraudulently supporting foreigners to acquire Congolese identification documents that allow them to stay in the DRC as “citizens.” Such leaders would subsequently assist the “naturalized” individual to acquire land.

The line dividing the reality and perception has gradually narrowed down to a level where the Congolese now view the presence of foreigners as a form of invasion. The name “Rugenge” and the adjacent “Kamenge” bear a Burundian connotation, which in turn worsens the situation. If left unresolved, the situation is potentially explosive as the area also has a high prevalence of armed groups. The Rugenge example serves to illustrate the vulnerability of the border regions where these land conflicts turn increasingly violent and fuel the demand for SALW.
RECOMMENDATIONS

With improved management, border points between Burundi and the DRC can be an extremely profitable source of revenue and development for communities and local and national governments. If implemented, the recommendations outlined here and contained in the corresponding action plan stand to contribute positively in improving the security and economic situation of communities living along the border, the countries of Burundi and the DRC, and the entire Great Lakes region. A similar assessment should be undertaken between these two countries and the rest of their neighbours, especially with Rwanda, Uganda and Tanzania due to the close relationships (in trade, diplomacy and cross-border ethnic linkages) that the countries share. It is therefore recommended that both countries should:

1. Formalize a bilateral policy on the issue of illicit trafficking of arms and ammunition across their border.

2. Build the capacity of security agents deployed along the border by providing regular training on modern techniques of border management. This should be accompanied by provision of modern tools for border management.

3. Train local administrators and community leaders on the dangers of illicit trade and the benefits of proper border management.

4. Establish a bilateral system of information exchange that would allow security agents to share crime-related information in real time, and grant either side the right of pursuit in case of cross-border criminal acts.

5. Create a system in which security agents from both countries undertake joint cross-border investigations on matters of common concern.

6. Undertake joint border patrols and reinforce border controls.

7. Fight against corruption, and especially, put into place a system in which border officials are periodically transferred so as to prevent a situation in which border agents get too familiar with local communities to an extent in which the border security agents is compromised.

8. Create a framework of cooperation between the management of the Rusizi/Ruzizi hydroelectric power stations and the border security agents that allows the two to communicate whenever the closure of the dam is imminent.

9. Organize simultaneous public campaigns for communities living along the border to sensitize them to the dangers of trafficking in SALW.

10. Open more formal border crossing points, in coordination with one another.
CONCLUSION

Border crossing points that are weakly controlled, as is the case in many areas along the Burundi-DRC border, remain prone to abuse by individuals and groups involved in trafficking of SALW as well as other contraband goods. This not only poses a danger to communities living along the borders, but also leads to losses of revenue to governments in the form of customs duties, especially because traders take advantage of the porosity of the borders to evade paying state tax. If well managed, borders are an ideal source of livelihoods for the communities living in their vicinity and a source of revenue for local and national governments.

The findings derived from this assessment indicate that criminals regularly exploit the lack of controls along the DRC-Burundi border to smuggle illegal merchandise, including arms. This practice is most rampant along River Rusizi/Ruzizi due to the ease of crossing it and the harsh and remote terrain it runs through, as opposed to Lake Tanganyika, which is vast and better supervised.

The visits that the assessment team undertook to the 105 border points and discussions the team held with border officials (in the case of formal border points) and with community members (in the case of informal border points) revealed the important role that both types of border points play in the daily lives of the communities living along them. The current system, or lack thereof, does a disservice to local people who rely on the border for their livelihoods and who should be allowed to live and work in a safe and secure environment.
## ANNEXES

### Annex I: Borders points assessed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAYS</th>
<th>PROVINCE</th>
<th>TERRITOIRE</th>
<th>CHEFFERIE/SECTEUR</th>
<th>FRONTIERE OFFICIELLE</th>
<th>FRONTIERE NON-OFFICIELLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RD Congo</td>
<td>SUD-KIVU</td>
<td>WALUNGU²⁸</td>
<td>NGWESHE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Deux-Porteaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mihoro (Kilira)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UVIRA</td>
<td>- PLAINE DE LA RUSIZI/RUZIZI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Katogota (Minoo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Kabonabarundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Rubenga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Kimanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Kebero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Munanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Mijabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Matama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Kigazura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- EPA Lubérizi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Mboga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Kiyangire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Masuza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Luholoholo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Ruhena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Ngendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Kaberagule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Ndunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Kimuka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Kagina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Nyamoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Nyango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Shishikaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Mwaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Kiruruma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Cuvette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Rusizi/Ruzizi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kiliba</td>
<td>- Bisanza</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Kahorohoro Piste II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Kahorohoro Piste III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kavimvira</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIZI²⁹</td>
<td>- MUTAMBALA</td>
<td>Port de Mushimbaki</td>
<td>³⁰</td>
<td>- Katanga</td>
<td>- Baraka Beach/Mwemezi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁸ Walungu Territory corresponds to the Province of Cibitoke in Burundi. See the corresponding official and unofficial borders.
²⁹ Fizi Territory corresponds to Makamab Province in Burundi. See the corresponding official and unofficial borders.
³⁰ Port de Mushimbaki corresponds to Port de Banda in Burundi.
| - | - | Plage Aebaz |
| - | - | Plage Kalundja |
| - | - | Plage Comwe/Lusenda |
| - | - | Plage Kenya/Nundu |
| - Beach Mboko | - Beach Swima |
| - | - | Plage Ngalula |
| - | - | Plage Kasekezi |
| - | - | Plage Kahama |
| - | - | Plage Munene |
| - | - | Plage Bangwe |
| - | - | Plage Makobola II |
| - BAVIRA | - | Plage Makobola I |
| - | - | Plage Kashombe |
| - | - | Plage Kigongo |
| - | - | Plage Katongo |
| - | - | Plage Kabimba |
| - | - | Plage Co-operative |
| - | - | Plage Kalungwe |
| - Port Kivovo | - |
| - Port Kalundu | - Port d'Or |
| - Beach Maendeleo | - Plage orthodoxe |
| - | - | Plage Mulongwe |
| - | - | Plage Kasenga Kivu |
| - | - | Plage Kasenga Kibondwe |
| - | - | Plage Kilomoni I |
| - | - | Plage Kilomoni II |

31 Beach Mboko corresponds to Port de Rumonge in Burundi.
32 Port Kalundu corresponds to Port de Gitaza in Burundi.
### Annex II: Borders points assessed in Burundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAYS</th>
<th>PROVINCE</th>
<th>COMMUNE</th>
<th>COLLINE</th>
<th>FRONTIERE OFFICIELE</th>
<th>FRONTIERE NON-OFFICIELE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURUNDI</td>
<td>CIBITOKE</td>
<td>RUGOMBO</td>
<td>RUKANA I[^34]</td>
<td>Ruhwa</td>
<td>- Rukana I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rukana II</td>
<td>- Mparambo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- TR 7 Kigazura</td>
<td>- Matama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- TR 10 Cibitoke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUGANDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>RUGOMBO</td>
<td>- RUHANGARIKA - GATERI</td>
<td>- TR 2 Ruhagarika-Mashuza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- TR 3 Gasenyi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- TR 4 Gasenyi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- TR 6 Kaburantwa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- TR 7 Kaburantwa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- TR 6 Ndaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- TR 5 Nyamitanga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUBANZA</td>
<td>GIHANGA</td>
<td></td>
<td>- KAGWEMA</td>
<td>- Kagina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Kiruruma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Chabiza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RUGOMBO</td>
<td>- MAGARA</td>
<td>Plage de Magara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NYARUHONGOKA</td>
<td>Plage de Nyaruhongoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RUGOMBO</td>
<td>- GITAZA</td>
<td>Port de Gitaza[^36]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plage Nyamugari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RUGOMBO</td>
<td>- RAMBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gatumba[^37]</td>
<td>Kajaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RUGOMBO</td>
<td>- GASHASHA</td>
<td>Port de Bujumbura[^38]</td>
<td>- Kadulac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plage Karonda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RUGOMBO</td>
<td>- MUTAMBARA</td>
<td>- Plage Mutambara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- CENTRE URBAIN DE RUMONGE</td>
<td>- Plage de Rumonge[^39]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Plage de Kizuka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Plage de Kagongo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Plage de Minago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RUGOMBO</td>
<td>- RUTOMO</td>
<td>- Plage de Rutomo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^33]: Commune Rugombo corresponds to Territoire Walungu in the DR Congo. See the corresponding official and unofficial borders.

[^34]: Colline Rukana I corresponds to Chefferie Nweshe in the DR Congo. See the corresponding official and unofficial borders.

[^35]: Vugizo border corresponds to Kiliba border in the DRC.

[^36]: Port de Gitaza corresponds to Port de Kalundu in the DRC.

[^37]: Gatumba border corresponds to Kavimvira border in the DRC.

[^38]: Port de Bujumbura corresponds to Port de Kalundu in the DRC.

[^39]: Port de Rumonge corresponds to Port de Mboko in the DRC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAKAMBA</th>
<th>NYANZA-LAC</th>
<th>- KABONGA</th>
<th>- Port de Banda&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- MWEGERAMA</td>
<td>- Plage Givuruzi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- MVUGO</td>
<td>- Plage Mvugo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- MUKUNGU</td>
<td>- Plage Muguruka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>40</sup> Port de Banda corresponds to Port de Mushimbaki.
Annex III: Maps showing border areas between the DRC and Burundi


Taken from: UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Map of IDPs Population and Location in North Kivu, South Kivu and Maniema, 15 April 2004, http://www.refworld.org/docid/4821c91cd.html
BURMACC (2006-2007), Carte administrative du Burundi