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GOAL

• Develop a comprehensive understanding of border security and management challenges and needs, in terms of national authorities and communities.
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

• Assess the level of confidence between different actors and identify the source of community tensions in border areas
• Assess the relationships, attitudes and perceptions of authorities and communities regarding each other, as well as across the border, and identify the factors which influence these relations
• Identify the key factors which influence cross-border travel and the movement of goods (licit and illicit) in border areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODOLOGY</th>
<th>KEY POINTS</th>
<th>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDY OBJECTIVES</strong></td>
<td><strong>KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS</strong></td>
<td><strong>FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National authorities</td>
<td>• Communities</td>
<td>• Border posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 individual interviews conducted with government authorities at national and sub-national level</td>
<td>53 focus group discussions were facilitated; 9 with women only, 10 with traders, 8 with traditional leaders/chiefs and 8 with youth</td>
<td>2 assessments were carried out of the border posts in Koro and Labezzanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Border personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 individual interviews conducted with security providers at the borders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS**

- **Communities**
  - 53 focus group discussions were facilitated
  - 9 with women only
  - 10 with traders
  - 8 with traditional leaders/chiefs
  - 8 with youth

**BORDER POST ASSESSMENTS**

- **Border posts**
  - 2 assessments were carried out in Koro and Labezzanga

**HOUSEHOLD INTERVIEWS**

- **Communities**
  - 659 household questionnaires were completed
  - Men represented 72% (476) of the respondents
Key study limitations:

- Availability of official statistics (post crisis) on the communities
- Logistical constraints
- Cultural norms
- Level of insecurity in some areas
- Lack of participation on the part of the Gendarmerie in Burkina Faso
SITUATION IN THE LIPTAKO-GOURMA BORDER REGION

- 58% of households surveyed cross the border regularly
- Men cross the border more frequently than women
- Business and family visits are the reasons most frequently cited for cross-border traffic
- According to those surveyed, the majority of goods that cross the borders are food (70%) and animals (39%). There is a strong trade in petrol (20%) and cigarettes (17%)
- The majority of information is transmitted by word of mouth (68%). Radios are also used (51%)
WHAT SECURITY ISSUES ARE PRIORITISED?

- 23% of households and 65% of security providers based at the borders cited natural resource-related conflicts as a source of tension.
- Armed violence is also a key problem facing communities and security providers.
- 21% of households and 11% of focus group discussion participants identified corruption as a risk to their security.
- Security providers in border areas cited arms and drug trafficking as potential security risks.
WHAT IS THE SECURITY SITUATION?

- In general, the majority of communities (63%) feel more secure today (compared to before the crisis).
- Sentiment towards Serval and MINUSMA is mixed, with only 42% of households feeling more secure since their intervention.
WHICH FACTORS INFLUENCE CONFIDENCE IN SECURITY PROVIDERS?

Factors which contribute to confidence
- Regular presence/patrols
- Sharing of information

Factors that undermine confidence
- Lack of responsiveness
- Fear of reprisals
CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED BY SECURITY PROVIDERS

**Lack of resources**
- Weak systems of communication
- Lack of logistical means
- Lack of arms

**Insufficient remuneration**
- Lack of adequate housing
- Low salaries for border personnel
- Need to develop career plans
CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED BY SECURITY PROVIDERS

**Lack of training**
- Those that received basic training in border management and security (32%)
- Communication/IT training (18%)
- Human rights training (18%)
- Basic management training (15%)
CHALLENGES FACING SECURITY PROVIDERS

Mandates and protocols
- Need to harmonise mandates and protocols of agencies in different countries, and between governments and communities

Lack of staff
- Need to increase presence/forces in border areas to better respond to needs
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INFORMAL SECURITY PROVIDERS

• Community leaders
• Religious leaders
• Elected leaders
• Marabouts
• Self-defence groups
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CONCLUSIONS

• Communities and authorities share similar security priorities
• The security situation for communities living in border areas has improved since the start of the 2011 crisis
• Foreign security forces (Serval and MINUSMA) are viewed with caution
• Communities have considerable confidence in state security forces, but this is weakening
CONCLUSIONS

• The authorities face a number of constraints, partly due to the lack of equipment, training and staff.
• Communities use traditional mechanisms to resolve conflicts; but these mechanisms do not necessarily provide an effective and appropriate response to the changing security situation.
RECOMMENDATIONS

For Danish Demining Group

- Establish mechanisms to improve relations between security providers and communities
- Initiate pilot activities against community-based corruption
- Strengthen the capacity of local authorities through the provision of training in the area of border management and community engagement
- Strengthen traditional conflict prevention mechanisms
- Educate communities about the dangers and risks associated with the use and trafficking of arms
RECOMMENDATIONS

For Danish Demining Group

- Support and facilitate border security, training, service delivery and community relations on both sides of the border
- Work with communities to manage and resolve local conflicts, particularly those related to natural resources
For national authorities:

- Increase the visibility of security providers in border areas, including through more frequent border patrols.
- Appoint a focal point in each unit operating at the border, who is in charge of communication and community liaison.
- Establish a system of border communication, information exchange and coordination between security providers and civil authorities.
RECOMMENDATIONS

For national authorities
- Develop, in an integrated manner, modules for ongoing capacity building / training
- Deliver training for security providers, which includes refresher training and the establishment of border management modules
- Secure budgetary resources to ensure the provision of training, equipment and infrastructure, based on identified needs
RECOMMENDATIONS

For international cooperation agencies

- Harmonise the mandates of agencies operating at the border. If not possible, clearly communicate the mandates of different forces, as well as the context and constraints they face.
- Support cross-border cooperation initiatives focused on trade and commerce, to promote positive relationships between countries.
- Consider establishing rapid response units that can deploy in border areas, in case of community emergencies or other needs.
RECOMMENDATIONS

For donors

• Support government actors in developing clear mandates and terms of reference for security providers
• Provide technical and financial support to improve communication among security providers and with community members
• Provide funding and support for initiatives aimed at stemming the flow of arms
• Provide support towards programs to strengthen conflict resolution mechanisms
Recommendations

For donors

• Provide support for the infrastructure and equipment of security providers
• Provide technical support to HR systems and administration of security providers
• Ensure rational and coordinated programming, to avoid duplication. Intervene through co-financing, if appropriate