



SUMMARY
REPORT

**UNICEF & UNHCR REGIONAL MEETING ON
THE GLOBAL COMPACT ON REFUGEES (GCR)
AND APPLICATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE
REFUGEE RESPONSE FRAMEWORK (CRRF)
IN EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICA:**

What we have learned and what we can do better

**16-17 April 2019
NAIROBI, KENYA**

Organized by UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa Office (ESARO) &
UNHCR Regional Support Centre (RSC)

INTRODUCTION

On 16-17 April 2019, UNCEF East and Southern Africa Office (ESARO), UNHCR Regional Coordination Offices (RRCs) for the South Sudan and Burundi situations and UNHCR Regional Support Centre (RSC), organized a workshop with senior representatives from UNHCR and UNICEF from Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda, Tanzania and Zambia country offices, and Headquarters with the following objectives:

1. To share good practices and identify joint priorities to operationalize the GCR and reinforce the application of the CRRF in the East and Southern Africa Region
2. To identify ways to enhance collaboration between UNICEF and UNHCR in the context of implementing the GCR
3. To explore opportunities to work together in advocating with governments, and in mobilizing resources for comprehensive responses and refugee inclusion

The report provides a summary of the main issues discussed and recommendations. The recommendations that concern both Agencies, have been further summarized below.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Refugee children are at the core of the CRRF and GCR agendas

Children have great potential to open avenues for effective advocacy towards refugee inclusion in national systems. Children are at the center of the agenda not only because of numbers -with close to 60 per cent of the refugees of the region being children, or because of the length of the displacement - which last often the equivalent of a childhood. They are because failure to invest in children and refugee communities undermines the equity and human rights base approach, will prevent the achievement of SDGs, and will avoid millions of children attaining their full potential.

Yielding results for children

The application of CRRF has already yielded tangible results for refugee and host children. This has been possible, among others, by the fact that all governments CRRF pledges and related roadmaps have prioritized sectors concerning children, including health and nutrition, education, child protection and WASH. Some of the areas where progress has been made are:

- i. **Inclusion of refugee children in national education and health systems.** For example, 86% of refugee children in Rwanda are integrated in the national education system. Uganda costed Education Response Plan is set to include 277,293 refugee children by 2021 in the national education system¹.
- ii. **Accreditation of health and education facilities for refugees as national institutions so that can serve to refugees and host alike.** For example, 72% of permanent health facilities in refugee settlements in Uganda have been nationally accredited. In Kenya, registration of schools in refugee areas as public learning institutions and allocation of Government officials is in progress.
- iii. **Investments in WASH infrastructure that benefit both refugees and host communities and that use national utility models,** like the Itang Water scheme in Ethiopia that benefits 230,000 people from both host and refugee communities.
- iv. **Strengthening child protection and social welfare systems in refugee hosting areas,** especially in Tanzania, Ethiopia and Uganda. Given that national child protection and case management systems are very incipient in these countries, both Agencies are supporting increased allocation of government social workers and building their capacities in these areas in an integrated manner.

¹ In addition to the current 621,038 currently reached within the refugees and the host communities.

- v. **Expansion of birth registration systems in refugee hosting areas**, particularly Ethiopia, Uganda and Tanzania, including a major legal reform conducted in Ethiopia to allow refugee children to have access to vital events' registration.

The list above is not an exhaustive but rather an attempt to illustrate some examples in some of the areas presented during the workshop.

From children from a jurisdiction to children in a jurisdiction

To materialize the paradigm shift from 'children from a jurisdiction' to 'children in a jurisdiction', some of the key priorities identified are:

- i. **Strengthen a whole-government approach**, for which is important to identify government 'champions' that can exert political leadership, and increase engagement of Line Ministries in coordination structures, including not only sector Ministries but also others such as the ones dealing with governance and finance.
- ii. **Work towards progressive harmonization and alignment of standards of service delivery**, including on the area of workforce and monitoring schemes, recognizing that the level of ambition may be different depending on whether the country have a parallel system for service delivery for refugees, (i.e Ethiopia), or where the level of integration is higher (i.e Uganda).
- iii. **Anchor the CRRF vision in national policies and development plans**, especially when considering the vulnerability of this agenda to the political environment.
- iv. **Strengthen the focus on local capacities**, by channelling additional investments to refugee hosting districts, recognizing that policies and frameworks will not automatically translate into an increase in absorption capacity at the local level. The 'area-based programmes' (such as Kalobeyei in Kenya, Kigoma Tanzania, Mantapala Zambia), are deemed as a good practise to ensure prioritization of investment at the local level.
- v. **Make refugee children count**, by including refugees in national data and information management systems and invest in evidence generation.
- vi. **Exploring opportunities for refugee inclusion into national planning and budget cycles.** Uganda is a model for this, refugees are included in the National Development Plan II under the Settlement Transformative Agenda (STA) and 2019 is the year to include refugees across sectors in the next 5-year national plan and District plans. In many contexts of the region, efforts should start by working towards the inclusion of financial flows of refugee government structures into the national public finance system, improve transparency of international investments in refugee hosting areas, costing the funding required for refugee inclusion, and increasing capacities and expertise within UN Agencies to provide more effective support to governments in this area.

Towards a stronger and more predictable partnership

The comparative advantages and perceived value of UNHCR and UNICEF partnership has been substantially reinforced thanks to CRRF and GCR. In general, participants highlighted the improvement in the mutual understanding, the complementarity of interventions, and in the convening power resulting from joint advocacy of both agencies. While UNHCR continue to provide overall leadership in the materialization of the GCR/CRRF vision, UNICEF is playing a pivotal role in the engagement of line Ministries and in incorporating refugees into national policies, systems and plans. A key lesson learned is the importance of finding channels to structure the dialogue among both Agencies, to shape a common strategic vision, and to ensure commitments are shielded from management changes. For that, participants agreed on the importance of using 'vehicles', such as the Letters of Understanding (LoUs) and the Framework for Collaboration at the regional level, to crystalize and materialize these priorities.

Reinforce regionally

Regional platforms (such as IGAD and EAC) can be very useful venues to build consensus at a political level, provide analysis and understanding of common challenges, and complement UN agencies' engagement. At the same time, the discussion highlighted the importance of ensuring that the different regional bodies are well coordinated to avoid overlap, that regional processes have an impact on the ground, and the role UNHCR and UNICEF can play to build regional bodies' capacities to ensure this happens.

Strengthening the international responsibility sharing

Materializing the local solutions and local integration agenda of CRRF will not succeed if this is not accompanied by an increase in international support. Participants expressed concern about the consequences of unmet expectations of support from countries that have endorsed CRRF, and the potential consequences of an unbalance between the calls on countries of asylum to increase national ownership, without an increase of international support.

Going forward it is important both Agencies enhance the dialogue and information sharing with Member States, to support them to further consolidate a more robust and unified approach around this agenda. This is particularly important in the run up of the first Global Refugee Forum (GRC).

Both Agencies should also work with donors to explore more innovative, longer term and flexible ways of funding GCR and CRRF, following some good examples like the Dutch Partnership. Both Agencies should seek ways to engage in the donors' planning cycles and strategic discussion, to advocate for the expansion of opportunities for programmes in refugee hosting areas.

From vulnerability to productivity

While the equity and human rights argument has been formulated and is understood, it is important that both Agencies work together on building the economic argument, to show that investing in refugee hosting areas can be not only an opportunity to leverage international support, but also to reinvigorate local economies. Children can be a good entry point for this, as supporting children can yield a high return in investment. UNHCR and UNICEF cannot do this alone, and will have to bring on board other partners, specially the World Bank and other IFIs, to support evidence building around these areas.

Communicate better on progress

Both Agencies reflected on the importance to work together to communicate better on progress towards the realization of the GCR CRRF vision. Generally, there was a sense that a lot of progress and important achievements have been made, but that the CRRF agenda is a complex and abstract one, difficult to effectively communicate on. Globally, UNHCR and UNICEF HQs are working together on a set of indicators to measure progress against GCR and CRRF, which would be good to adopt for the region. Additionally, both Agencies agreed on the importance of working on joint communication efforts.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Work towards a more predictable and efficient partnership, by strengthening mechanisms for structured dialogue and for identification of joint priorities within CRRF/GCR**
 - a. UNHCR/UNICEF COs to develop or adjust in-country LoUs to incorporate CRRF/GCR areas of work, based on identified priorities and comparative advantages of both Agencies.
 - b. UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO to facilitate exchange visits upon request from country offices, and/or conduct joint support regional missions as required.
- 2. Harness learning and enhance cross fertilization**
 - a. UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO to continue sharing good practices across the region. A package of available documentation of key documents will be shared with participants.
 - b. UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO to explore conducting a joint workshop before end of 2020, going deeper on specific thematic areas, potentially on public finance.
- 3. Include refugee children into national agendas**
 - a. UNHCR and UNICEF COs to consider developing a joint strategy, which identifies priorities with Government for policy reform, entry points for inclusion of refugees in national plans, among others, as an attachment to the LoU².
 - b. UNICEF and UNHCR COs to prioritize progressive alignment of standards of service delivery, including on issues related to access, and workforce, monitoring and information management systems standards.
 - c. UNHCR and UNICEF COs to work towards the inclusion of refugees in national information management systems, with priority on health and education, child protection.
- 4. Reinforce locally**
 - a. UNHCR and UNICEF COs and ROs to prioritize capacity building and support for local integrated service delivery, including through inclusion of refugees into national contingency and district plans, and document the lessons learned of these experiences for further replication in the region.
- 5. Expand engagement in the areas of public finance, planning, and social protection**
 - a. UNHCR and UNICEF COs to strengthen coordination, information sharing, and alignment of approaches between ourselves and others on social protection interventions in refugee hosting areas, at the country and regional level.
 - b. UNHCR and UNICEF COs to continue exploring opportunities and advocating for refugee inclusion into national planning and budget cycles, in coordination with key UNCT and other stakeholders.
- 6. Maximize the potential of regional platforms**
 - a. UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO to work with the EAC for the inclusion of refugee child protection priority areas (including documentation, access to education and other basic services), in the EAC Refugee Management Policy.
 - b. UNICEF RSC UNHCR ESARO to involve more closely country operations in the preparation and follow up of the key agreed action points related to the IGAD Djibouti Declaration on

² As indicated above, Ethiopia example can be used.

Regional Conference on Refugee Education ³, especially the implementation of the Action Plans.

- c. UNICEF ESARO to share the mapping of all regional mechanisms and entry points for advocacy in relation to Children on the Move Agenda.

7. Work on ways to measure and communicate progress

- a. UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO, together with other stakeholders, to monitor selected indicators from the global GCR M&E framework, document progress, and enhance dialogue and information sharing with Member States/donors, particularly in preparation of the GRF.
- b. UNHCR and UNICEF ROs and COs to explore developing investment case analysis aligned with the CRRF vision in selected countries.

8. Fostering international responsibility sharing

- a. UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO, together with other partners, to work towards improving information sharing and increasing dialogue with donors around CRRF/GCR, particularly in preparation of the GRF.
- b. UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO to organize a webinar with the World Bank to reflect on opportunities for better collaboration in the area of forced displacement
- c. UNHCR and UNICEF, at HQ, regional and country level, to conduct complementary -and explore joint- resource mobilization, and increase dialogue with donors to advocate for unearmarked, multiyear and flexible funding, including in the area of research, for the materialization of the GCR in the region.

³ <https://igad.int/attachments/article/1725/Djibouti%20Declaration%20on%20Refugee%20Education.pdf>

SESSION I: WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW

Speakers: Catherine Wiesner, RRC Burundi and CRRF Champion; Verena Knaus, UNICEF HQ Senior Children on the Move Advisor; Johannes Tarvainen, UNHCR HQ Senior CRRF Officer. *Moderator:* Arnould Akodjenou, RRC South Sudan situation.

Understanding the Global Compact on Refugees and CRRF

The 'Leave no one behind' concept is important for UNHCR and the inclusion of people of concern. The GCR is a consensus document with two main components: the Programme of Action and the CRRF (annex of the New York Declaration) and the Programme of Action. It aims at strengthening the application of comprehensive responses led by Governments, built on a multi-stakeholder response, including the engagement of host communities. The most obvious collaboration with UNICEF is the inclusion of refugees into local economies and social services and for which the support of the international community is needed to achieve this. An overview of progress on the application of the CRRF is summarised in the *Two Year Progress Assessment of the CRRF Approach September 2016 - September 2018: Evaluation Report, December 2018*⁴.

GCR/CRRF: what it means for children and for UNICEF

The children on the move or uprooted children terminology is used to ensure that all children - trafficked, asylum seekers and refugees, internally displaced, stateless children – are being considered, visible, and receive assistance and have their rights recognized. UNICEF's focus through the *six-point Agenda for Action* is to:

1. Protect uprooted children from exploitation and violence
2. End the detention of refugee and migrant children by creating practical alternatives
3. Keep families together and give children legal status (ending childhood statelessness)
4. Help uprooted children stay in school (realization of the right to education and health)
5. Press for action on the causes that uproot children (including climate change etc)
6. Combat xenophobia and discrimination

UNICEF looks beyond labels at the most vulnerable, including host communities, as well as refugees and IDP settings. The question is to see how UNHCR can maximize UNICEF's potential within the refugee realm, and how UNICEF can bring UNHCR into the development sphere. There is a need to come together, working across agencies and within agencies (across sectors). For UNICEF globally but also at country level, UNICEF is committed to implement GCR commitments ('access to age and gender-responsive care and essential services for all'). Key priorities are to i) strengthen national service delivery and absorption capacity for all children; ii) avoid fragmentation through harmonization & progressive alignment of access, service and workforce standards, monitoring and planning systems, information management systems; iii) the equity approach: focus on most vulnerable regardless of status. Highlighted opportunities for 2019 include:

- Moving the needle: enable effective access to education for all (IGAD); cross border collaboration mechanism (SOPs); reintegration/integration (prevention – durable solutions, circular approach); ending child immigration detention.
- Doing it better together: UN-system wide response, whole-of-society engagement, whole of government approach and new partnerships (e.g. Dutch partnership).
- From vulnerability to productivity: building a positive message focused on aspirations & opportunities.

GCR and arrangements for responsibility sharing: global outlook and opportunities for collaboration in the region

⁴ <https://www.unhcr.org/5c63ff144.pdf>

Arrangements for responsibility sharing that aim to support comprehensive responses include:

- *National arrangements*, which are established by host countries to coordinate and facilitate efforts of all relevant stakeholders under national leadership (Whole of government, multi-stakeholder approach). It could take the form of three-tier model (e.g. Uganda) and should be context adaptable, building on existing planning and coordination structures (which include refugees). It could also translate into national CRR roadmaps and/or sector response plans.
- *Support platforms* are state-led coalitions of like-minded support, non-operational, not permanent, meant to leverage support (financial, material, technical assistance) such as regional and sub-regional approaches. This region has been at the forefront, examples of which are the 2019 IGAD Kampala declaration on livelihoods, the 2017 Djibouti Declaration on education, and the joint IGAD-Office of the Special Envoy of the Great Lakes Region High-level Ministerial meeting on displacement in the Great Lakes.

This region features very strongly in the highlights of progress towards the CRRF⁵ – good practices by country and sectors will be uploaded in the lead-up to the Global Refugee Forum (GRF) on the global CRRF portal⁶. The next steps are about shaping the first GRF (focusing pledges and contributions; good practices; stocktaking of progress) to create, develop, and strengthen the architecture and arrangements needed to operationalize the GCR over the longer term; and translate principles of increased solidarity and more equitable burden- and responsibility-sharing into concrete action.

Plenary discussion

Discussion revolved around what the next steps should be for the implementation of the CRRF, what GCR means for both Agencies and how both can collaborate better together, considering that Governments approaches (and openness) are not homogenous in the region. Linked to that is the issue on how to make a convincing argument to Governments that by improving refugees' lives, host communities' lives are also improved, and that a comprehensive and robust business case is still lacking to show that investing in refugee hosting areas is a public good. All participants acknowledged that the issue of resource mobilization is at the core of this discussion, that innovation in the area of financing is needed, and that it is important to discuss with donors about capacity or adaptability and additionality of funding. Finally, participants shared reflections around the importance of avoiding dividing agendas with regards to the terminology used when referring to people of concern, and the need to put equity-based approaches at the centre, including through area-based programmes.

Action Points and Recommendations

- UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO, together with other stakeholders, to exchange on how best to monitor selected indicators from the global GCR M&E framework (under development), document progress, and enhance dialogue and information sharing with Member States/donors, particularly in preparation of the GCR.
- UNHCR and UNICEF regional and COs to explore developing investment case analysis aligned with CRRF vision in selected countries.

SESSION II: WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED

Speakers: UNHCR and UNICEF participants from country offices. Moderators: Soledad Herrero, UNICEF& Celine Mersch, UNHCR.

Uganda: Evidence generation and policy development for refugee hosting areas

⁵ <https://www.unhcr.org/events/conferences/5b8d1ad34/commitment-action-highlights-progress-towards-comprehensive-refugee-responses.html>

⁶ <http://www.globalcrrf.org/>

With 1.2 million mostly South Sudanese (65%) and Congolese refugees (27%) hosted in 12 Districts, Uganda is one the largest host of refugees in Africa. Strategic CRRF shifts in Uganda happened with the inclusion of refugees into development planning and budgeting (Refugee Response Plans for Education and health, and preparation for inclusion in the next 5-year National Development Plan across sectors), adjustment of the refugee coordination model to link it to development processes and reduce fragmented programming, innovative approaches to financing, the broadening of the multi-stakeholder approach and increased political commitment and improving accountability to affected populations (e.g. the Refugee Engagement Forum informs the CRRF Steering Group). Regarding the joint partnership, the Letter of Understanding (LoU) clarifies ways of working. UNICEF and UNHCR advocate for the inclusion of refugees into national policies and systems in the sectors of education, social policy, child protection, health and nutrition and WASH. On next steps, work will focus on supporting evidence generation that can inform inclusive policies and public investments benefitting refugees and their hosts; advocating for the inclusion of refugees across sectors in new NDPIII, District Plans and sector strategies; supporting coordination by Districts; translating new integrated Education and health plans into District Plans and implementation of the Uganda National Plan of Action in line with the GCR.

Kenya: Strengthening engagement of Line Ministries in service delivery in refugee hosting areas

With 473,314 refugees and asylum-seekers, in October 2017 Kenya announced the application of the CRRF. Contributions to the CRRF/GCR on education include: i) joint UNHCR-UNICEF advocacy and complementary technical support to line Ministries (mainstreaming of refugees into the National Education Sector Strategic Plan 2018-2022, the County Integrated Development Plans for Turkana/Garissa); ii) collaborative efforts to support Ministries to extend governance and management the inclusion of camp-based refugee learners in the National Education Management Information System (NEMIS), registration of schools as public learning institutions, placement of Teacher Service Commission (TSC) registered headteachers; iii) expansion of services in refugee hosting areas in line with Government priorities, regulations and standards (establishment of additional secondary schools catering for both refugees and host community children that supports the Ministry of Education's goal for 100% transition rate to secondary school).

Good practices comprise the inclusion of refugees in UNDAF (socio-economic pillar), increasing a developmental approach to refugee issues; joint fundraising/programming (e.g. the EUTF, the Dutch Partnership); complementary coordination roles (bringing together partners and engaging in collaborative planning with a view to more predictable funding for refugees under the leadership of the line ministries. Challenges raised were uncertainties on the closure of Dadaab Refugee Camp making planning and fundraising unclear, challenges in keeping 'One Voice' in the context of 'One UN' (e.g. UNDAF), inadequate funding especially in EiE preparedness and resilience building.

Lessons learned include: i) joint missions by line ministries useful to explore opportunities for inclusion of refugees in national systems; ii) understanding UNHCR and UNICEF's complementary mandates and positions (nationally and at the field level) including relationship with Government and the engagement in the host communities; iii) benefits of an area-based approach based on socio-economic integration supporting joint planning, and an opportunity to showcase/ advocate for the expansion of these approaches to other refugee-hosting areas; iii) importance of working on evidence generation to influence policy dialogue and budget allocation.

Rwanda: Local system integrated service delivery

With 149,602 persons of concern, Rwanda acceded to the CRRF in February 2018. UNICEF-UNHCR collaboration started before to CRRF with the inclusion of refugees into the national education system, but was enhanced with its adoption. Main contributions to the GCR include refugee integration in national primary: 86%; in secondary education: 78%, enhancing teacher capacity through training and mentorship program for national and refugee teachers, infrastructure and material support (IT equipment and construction of classrooms, furniture, ECD tool kits in all camp, the consultative workshop on child

protection with National Commission for Children, the mentorship programs for teachers, joint missions/assessments.

Lessons learned are around harnessing agencies comparative advantages: UNICEF has experience in both humanitarian and development setting, can easily reach out to line ministries has strong community-based networks and interventions, while UNHCR is leading the refugee response (protracted and emergency), including coordination and fund raising and has a close relationship with the refugee agency. When UNICEF and UNHCR jointly raise a voice, authorities listen and take action. Further collaboration will focus on exploring opportunities to advocate for refugee inclusion into national planning and budget cycles; jointly engage development actors and donors to incorporate refugees in their programs; build evidence and analysis to inform policy and resource allocation; strengthen local/districts' capacity and coordination role for integrated service delivery in refugee hosting districts, as first-line service providers and responders to refugee crises; strengthening social protection schemes to benefit the most vulnerable; advocating for the Government and other partners to look beyond the four commitments and explore opportunities for a comprehensive definition of each commitment.

Tanzania: Towards equitable and sustainable services and systems in refugee hosting areas

With 325,796 Burundi and Congolese refugees, and the withdrawal from CRRF in 2018, the current context in Tanzania has become increasingly challenging, with an enforced encampment policy where inclusion is difficult, and parallel systems are used. Still, the implementation of the vision of GCR is possible. Through the area-based approach (through Kigoma Joint Programme KJP), inclusion of refugees in some national services is taking place, particularly related to health and social services (social welfare officers, refugee inclusion in national malaria campaigns, etc.)

The three main areas of cooperation with UNICEF are birth registration, integration of refugee education in the national systems and deployment of government staff (social welfare officers) to camps. On birth registration, the roll out of a simplified birth certification in Kigoma, which will include refugee children, is under discussion. The new birth registration system will allow for birth registration at ward level or medical facility, reducing barriers to registration. Once the birth registration system is put into place and equipment procured, it will be largely self-sustaining and requires limited financial inputs.

On education, the implementation of the country of origin's curriculum exacerbates challenges. For example, exams for Burundian refugees are administered by NECTA (national exam council) with financial support received from UNICEF. Still there is progress in integration, with urban refugees allowed to access national education facilities. Lessons learned are that inclusion enables more refugee and host community children to access education at different levels and at a lesser cost. There is a need to explore solutions for children not likely to return in short term (i.e. Congolese). Way forward is to focus on continuous advocacy with the inclusion of refugees into national systems, including through area-based programmes; strengthen multi-stakeholder engagement; alignment of services, through sector plans, by involving relevant ministries.

Ethiopia: Towards equitable and sustainable services and systems in refugee hosting areas

With 905,831 refugees, the Government adhered to the CRRF in September 2016 and recently adopted the Refugee Proclamation, which will now need to be translated into action. As a good joint collaboration, the Itang water supply system was presented. Part of the challenge was to align with the National WASH Strategy and delivery model with CRRF vision. A cost recovery model was developed establishing bulk meters for camps, paid by UNHCR and tariffs for host communities. Some of the challenges were shifting the NGO management model, keep all stakeholders on board (ARRA and REB); manage the complex political economy in Gambella and build ownership. Lessons learned include the need for a skilled provider to operate the system, a water system that is adapted and easy to maintain reflecting local capacities, the buy-in of the authorities and long-term engagement that goes beyond just implementation.

Another example of good joint collaboration is the Vital Events Registration (VER), which provides refugees with the necessary birth registration certificates. Some challenges include the ongoing backlog of unregistered children, demand creation for the IDs, payment required for some host communities and that the nationality determined by VER officials is based on consensus of parents rather than laws. Lessons learned include the importance of relationships and building on comparative advantage (UNICEF: development agency and national policy, and UNHCR: refugee agency and emergency context), understanding the political economy and leveraging joint convening power with Government to strengthen coordination in line with CRRF vision.

Zambia: Towards equitable and sustainable services and systems in refugee hosting areas

With a long history of welcoming refugees, in 2017 Zambia requested to become a CRRF pilot roll out country and established the Mantapala settlement for both refugees and host community. UNICEF and UNHCR closely collaborated on response planning, implementation and coordination of the settlement. Challenges to the collaboration are that the planning processes of both Agencies are not the same. This is not intractable, but requires inter-personal commitment to make it work. Also, piloting CRRF under extreme resource constraints, requires new, innovative resource mobilization to support national partners in predictable manner (beyond the initial emergency phase). Positively, CRRF is an opportunity to improve living conditions of both refugee and host populations. The leveraging of comparative sector technical capacities in the sector coordination forum has helped as well as common advocacy with donors in country and with Government to allocate resources for integrated host community/refugee response. The key lesson learned is the importance of creating a shared vision and learning from each other. There is a need for joint advocacy for the integration into the national development planning process and in the UNDAF. The Zambia refugee caseload, while small when compared to other countries, offers an opportunity to showcase CRRF if adequately funded. Next steps include joint advocacy to operationalize CRRF/GCR with a road-map and action plan and active joint resource mobilization/advocacy for the inclusion of refugee development needs in national development planning processes and national programmes and lastly build a more collaborative spirit at inter-personal level through potential staff exchanges.

Plenary discussion

Participants exchanged views and discussed how line ministries were involved in the CRRF agenda, how policies and plans were developed, and how different coordination mechanisms function. In Uganda, the First Lady supported the Education Response Plan (ERP), showing that political leadership is critical. At the same time, there are concerns about a possible mismatch of expectations vis a vis the ERP, with Government expecting international funding to materialize for the implementation of the ERP.

While one of the key areas of success cited was the involvement with the line ministries, there was a recognition of the importance of involving Ministries of Finance. The sensitization/advocacy for CRRF should also integrate local communities, to facilitate their understanding and support as they are the constituencies electing governments and those affected by the inclusion of refugees. Another question was to know if there were any specific entry points in terms of financing for CRRF-type projects. It was recognized that for some governments, regardless of their commitments and willingness to develop proclamations and declarations, such as Kenya, implementation will be challenging as it is not anchored in the current legislation and policy architecture.

Action Points and Recommendations

- UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO to continue sharing best practices, facilitate exchange visits on demand by country offices, and/or conduct joint support regional missions as required

SESSION III: HOW TO ENAGE BETTER WITH PARTNERS⁷

Moderator: Yonatan Araya

How to enhance engagement with the World Bank

Forced displacement is not only a humanitarian challenge but also a development challenge. Social-economic needs in displacement can therefore be addressed effectively through targeted development investments in under-developed marginalized districts. Through its dual mandate of poverty reduction and promoting shared prosperity, the World Bank has adjusted its financial instruments to Governments to address development concerns in forced displacement situations. This actually means that refugee host countries, which are eligible for World Bank IDA funds, can actually obtain extra IDA funding at concessional terms purposed for the benefit of refugees and their host communities. Efforts to influence other development actors to support refugee operations have to be anchored in data and evidence demonstrating long term benefits for local economies. Protection and solutions dividends could possibly also influence development actors in sustaining the development investment course.

Kenya experience: The Kalobeyei Integrated Social & Economic Development Program (KISED), championed by UNHCR and the Government of Kenya, focuses on the potential of promoting the self-reliance of refugees and host communities by providing them with better livelihood opportunities and enhanced service delivery. It is worth noting that this is a 14 year - vision which is very much in line with Kenya's Vision 2030 economic blue print. The project is also seen as a success because it is anchored in IFC's research which shows how the presence of refugees can benefit the local economy because there has always been an informal economy around refugee hosting areas in Turkana. Working closely with the government at both local and national levels who own the project, has really been a key success factor of the Kalobeyei project.

Uganda experience: Uganda is eligible for the World Bank IDA 18 refugee sub-window and benefits from 200 million USD through the Development Response to Displacement Impact Project (DRDIP) and other allocations which sum up to 500 million USD. UNHCR and the World Bank have worked closely to promote support and developed the interventions. These investments prioritize access to services, expand economic opportunities, enhance environmental management under DRDIP, secondary education, water and municipal infrastructure.

Action Points and Recommendations

- UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO to organise a webinar with the World Bank to reflect on opportunities for better collaboration in the area of forced displacement

How to enhance engagement with Member States & Donors

Guests: Denmark, European Union, Germany, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Sweden, Spain, Switzerland and USA; Moderators: Catherine Wiesner, RRC Burundi and CRRF Champion, and Pete Manfield, REA UNICEF ESARO.

This session discussed how Member states can contribute towards the CRRF agenda, and seek feedback on UNHCR and UNICEF collaboration. Moderators shared an overview of the objectives and structure of the workshop, as well as key issues discussed in the morning session. UNHCR and UNICEF clarified that while the workshop focused on both agencies' collaboration, the criticality of the multi-stakeholders' approach was recognized. The following key issues were highlighted: i) the importance of common messaging on the benefits of refugee inclusion into national systems and economies, especially in preparation of the GRF; and ii) the urgent need to have candid discussions on different ways of funding a, in the light of the evolution from the traditional emergency response to a humanitarian-development nexus response.

⁷ Due to poor connection, World Bank participants could not join the conversation, and thus the session was conducted base on experiences shared by the participants on their engagement with the World Bank.

Interventions and plenary discussion

The Representative of Denmark noted that endeavors to promote successful roll-out of CRRF should be seen as joint efforts by all organizations that have interest, rather than disjointed or disintegrated piecemeal approaches. Denmark is taking a frontline role through Donors Group in advocating for the successful roll-out of CRRF in Kenya and has been supporting the KISED in Kenya's Turkana County. Denmark particularly likes initiatives where local governments are involved, closest to the people and who understand better the needs that should be most prioritized. Denmark is continually exploring flexible means to funding that can allow organizations to meet the needs of the humanitarian-development nexus. UN agencies however need to play their part by changing their models of responses to formats that are more adaptable to new funding realities; for instance, strengthening ways of engaging communities. Refugee responses should no longer be seen as a humanitarian issue but rather a development issue.

The Representative of DFID expressed his concern of tendencies within some governments being welcoming to some refugees and hostile to others. Also, highlighted the challenges of asking refugee hosting governments to embrace the Compact when resettlement numbers in most donor countries are continually dwindling. It also does not augur well with refugee hosting governments when some donor advocate for CRRF approaches against the backdrop of migration challenges in Europe. DFID Kenya has established Kenya Integrated Refugee and Host Community Support program (PAMOJA), a platform that invites multisector partnerships that promote social and economic integration between approximately 400,000 refugees and 60,000 people living in host communities in Kenya by supporting the provision of basic humanitarian assistance and livelihoods. The UK is supporting the use of cash rather than goods in kind during the humanitarian response because cash promotes a sense of empowerment. While DFID favours cash-based interventions, there are concerns about the effect cash can have, and therefore candid discussions on how innovative approaches may affect children are encouraged.

The Representative of Bureau of Population, Refugee and Migration (BPRM) mentioned that as a result of efforts by the donor refugee groups, there has been a level of success in donor advocacy for CRRF in Kenya and Ethiopia. The practice of working closely with regional governmental bodies including the EAC and IGAD has also given advocacy on CRRF an amplification. The US wants to see coherence from UN agencies and their NGO partners on response planning, messaging and protection solutions. The US through its humanitarian partner, USAID is making progress in developing mechanisms that will promote flexibility in funding projects that go beyond emergencies.

The Representative of Switzerland appreciated efforts to have coherent messaging from UN agencies. For a donor country, it is sometimes tough to advocate for inclusion of refugees in communities within refugee hosting countries, when in their home countries, there is little being done to integrate refugees. Switzerland highlighted its efforts nonetheless to advocate through donor groups, and the importance of working with local governments and authorities.

The Representative of Sweden noted the structural changes and reforms being undertaken by some UN agencies hoping that they will yield good practices. Though UNHCR and UNICEF are among the strongest advocates for CRRF thus far, Sweden highlighted the importance of making deliberate efforts to bring other partners on board. In terms of communicating with donors, Sweden has continuously called for total accountability, transparency, and consistency and meticulously, and expressed concerns for the disintegrated kind of reporting from UN agencies that appears to be conflicting and with little detail. Sweden also recognize that donors often time contribute for the agenda to remain fragmented.

The Representative of ECHO mentioned that the European Union is quite advanced on advocating the application of CRRF. In September 2017, EU Ministries requested the operationalisation of the humanitarian-development nexus in Uganda, as one of six pilot countries along with Chad, Iraq, Myanmar, Nigeria and Sudan. The adopted EU framework has six axis, somewhat similar to the structures in CRRF that aim to increase the effectiveness of EU's contribution to the CRRF roll-out. The CRRF should not be narrowed down to refugees, but its approach should encompass IDPs and stateless people, so as to be appreciated by governments and be incorporated into national plans. UN agencies are good at sharing messages, but they need to pay attention to transparency and accountability in terms of messaging. There has not been any change in the ECHO funding structure, but it is pursuing dialogue to increase funding flexibility.

Plenary discussions

Participants highlighted the importance of creating an atmosphere where UN and partners can generate public support away from politics and focuses on directing funds to where they are most needed. Concerns were raised about the fact that the international community may be asking for too much from African governments - who are bearing the brunt (and footing the bill) for hosting refugees. Also, some flagged the importance to close the gap between the GCR and the Global Compact on Migration (GCM).

An idea that was discussed is the contribution that donors can make to do away with incentives that encourage unnecessary competition among UN agencies in resource mobilization, and the idea of creating a CRRF global fund was put forward. Other participants stressed the importance of stronger joint appeals from UN agencies. A donor recognized that the biggest challenge to donors in responding to UN needs is the lack of flexibility within their own structures and financing systems, but that efforts are ongoing to change this.

Given the 'unknowns' around these approaches and models of responding to refugees, some participants highlighted the contribution donors can do in supporting is towards the research agenda to provide better evidence to deal with emerging realities. Some donors like Switzerland and DFID indicated that are ready to fund research that is geared towards improving service delivery and response to the vulnerable, and to bridge the humanitarian and development divide. ECHO highlighted their interest for potential joint studies, such as the recent supported joint assessment in Cameroon on how to move away from camp-based assistance to vulnerability-based assistance.

DFID shared its effort to strengthen the regional approach to their programmes: for example, DFID is studying and analyzing spontaneous returns of refugees to South Sudan by looking at trends in refugee hosting countries.

Responding to the question on not having an ECHO presence in Zambia, ECHO clarified that it has recently been shifting to longer contracts with partners in the Southern African region, which has allowed them to have a more strategic eye view for activities in Zambia through the regional prism.

Action Points and Recommendations

- UNICEF and UNHCR at HQ, regional and country level, together with other partners, to work towards improving information sharing and dialogue with donors around CRRF and GCR.
- As per Member states' request, UNHCR RSC to organize a donor session with more partners on the CRRF/GCR agenda.
- Member States and donors to continue exploring opportunities for more unearmarked, multiyear and flexible funding, including in the area of research.

SESSION IV: ACT LOCALLY BUT REINFORCE REGIONALLY

Role of the regional bodies in the CRRF agenda

Guests: Kebede Kassa Tsegaye, Senior Advisor on social development/ Coordinator of IGAD Programs (Djibouti Declaration – Education); Morris Tayebwa, EAC (Child Protection policy); *Moderator:* Catherine Wiesner

Role of the EAC in the CRRF agenda

The EAC has taken significant steps to engage with the CRRF agenda. The 6th meeting of the Chiefs of Refugee Management Entities, 15-17 May 2018, reaffirmed the development of a common refugee management policy. Following this meeting, a Technical Working Group on Refugee Management commissioned the preparation of an inception report to guide national consultations, which were conducted in March 2019. A Regional Validation Meeting is planned for May 2019 to finalise the draft EAC Refugee Management Policy. This is an opportunity to move CRRF agenda and position refugee children issues.

The EAC has a Child Policy, which underscores the need to strengthen national child protection systems, to include refugee children. It also supports States to achieve Africa's Agenda for Children 2040, which aspires to ensure that "every child is free from the impact of armed conflicts and other disasters or emergency situations". EAC is also working on the development of an M&E Framework for the EAC Child Policy.

On April 24-25 April 2018, an EAC-led Round table on the Protection of Refugee Children was organized in Arusha, with the support of UNICEF and UNHCR, and participation of EAC countries. The roundtable identified entry points on how to most effectively integrate refugees into national systems, and was informed by the UNICEF-UNHCR publications on Mapping of Good Practices and Guidances for Inclusion of Refugees in National Systems⁸. The EAC has developed also a Framework for Strengthening Child Protection Systems.

Role of the IGAD in the CRRF agenda

The Nairobi Summit of IGAD Heads of State and Government in March 2017 adopted the Nairobi Declaration and Plan of Action. The Declaration and action plan covered three major areas: i) durable solutions for Somali refugees; ii) access to quality education; iii) jobs, livelihoods and self-reliance. The commitments on education were further expanded through the adoption of the Djibouti Declaration for the Inclusion of Refugees in National Education Systems, adopted in December 2017⁹, and subsequent consultations and meetings that have taken place on the Declaration.

The regional approach to a refugee situation, has proved an added value by mobilizing high level political will and commitment; providing vital platforms for consultation and consensus building; building partnerships and mobilizing resources for regional and national interventions; joint monitoring and tracking of progress; sharing of experiences and best practices in the region.

Plenary discussion

⁸ See Mapping of Good Practices: <https://www.globalcrrf.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Briding-hum-dev-divide-for-refugee-children-in-East-Africa-and-Great-Lakes.pdf>; and Guidance for Inclusion of Refugees in National Protection Systems: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/5b0ea9de4.html>

⁹ <https://igad.int/attachments/article/1725/Djibouti%20Declaration%20on%20Refugee%20Education.pdf>

Overall, it was concluded that regional mechanisms can be particularly useful to build consensus at a political level, provide analysis and understanding of common challenges, and complement UN agencies engagement. The discussion also highlighted the importance of ensuring that the different regional bodies are well coordinated and complement each other and avoid overlap. Particularly important is to link sub-regional processes with others supported by the African Union, especially in 2019 -, Year of Refugees, Returnees and Internally Displaced People.

Another point emphasized was the need to make sure the various declarations are having an impact on the ground and are actually being implemented, acknowledging that regional mechanisms have capacity challenges. In this context, regional bodies and UN Agencies should strengthen collaboration to ensure these processes yield results on the ground.

Action Points or Recommendations

- UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO to work with the EAC for the inclusion of refugee child protection as a priority area (including documentation, access to education and other basic services), in the EAC Refugee Management Policy.
- UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO to involve more closely country operations in the preparation and follow up of the key agreed action points related to Education-Djibouti Declaration, especially the implementation of the Action Plans.
- UNICEF ESARO to share the mapping of all regional mechanisms and entry points for advocacy in relation to Children on the Move Agenda.

SESSION V: WHAT WE CAN DO DIFFERENTLY

Planning, finance and budget cycles: opportunities for refugee inclusion

Guests: Ewen Macleod, Deputy Director, UNHCR HQ/DRS; Benjamin Reese, UNICEF Ethiopia;
Moderator: Pete Manfield

Refugee inclusion in planning and finance cycles: global perspective

Displacement is difficult to manage because of the context in which it occurs - in countries confronted with conflict, instability and inequality. As a consequence, governments are often unable to manage these crises effectively. When we think about displacement emergencies, the impact on receiving states is similar to what happens during natural disaster, and the impact on social/economic infrastructure may be greater. At the same time, the impact at the macro level is not massive: in the vast majority of refugee crisis, refugees represent less than 3% of national populations.

A number of pre-existing factors have to be taken into consideration: what is the size of displacement relative to the local economy, or what is the ethnic, religious makeup of the local populations. All these factors determine the likelihood of integration and inclusion. The Rohingya refugee crisis is an example of enormous impact locally, but not at the macro-level for Bangladesh. In contrast, there is Lebanon with one quarter of the population of Lebanon being refugees but whom have largely been absorbed within and distributed around the country. These factors impact a government's decision to make adjustments to the health budget or infrastructure or the resonance of the call for international assistance.

A serious concern related to these preexisting conditions and political climate, is the treatment of refugee populations as security or political risks who need to be kept away from the rest of the population in camp settings. Uganda and Lebanon are positive examples of doing things differently.

Further, the Constitution, legal and policy framework are important in determining how refugees are dealt with. It often depends on local governance structures, and how resources are managed across a country.

The poorer the country the less budget can be allocated in support of refugees. There should be realistic expectations on governments' budget allocation in countries where there is a struggle to provide for their own citizens. In these contexts, international solidarity should accompany this process. Donors often look closely at budget execution rings, which are a challenge in many of the countries of asylum. Key issues to work towards inclusion of refugees in planning and financing systems are: i) having institutional arrangements in place; ii) mechanisms to transfer resources central to periphery; and iii) availability of data to planners to advocate for refugee inclusion into population census.

Opportunities to strengthen public financial management in Ethiopia

The CRRF is allowing the development of linkages between separate government systems, managed by line Ministries, and Agency for Refugees and Returnees Affairs (ARRA). This, however, is taking place in a context where the CRRF agenda is competing against major political reforms.

The presentation focused on the experience of Ethiopia's General Education Quality Improvement Plan and performance-based school grants, to address quality needs and teaching gaps. UNICEF and UNHCR worked to get school grants for refugee schools. For that, funding had to pass through Ministry of Education. However, the different sub-national structures and accountabilities make the transfer of funds really challenging. Some of the steps taken by UNICEF to strengthen public finance management and accountabilities are: i) alignment of refugee Education Management Information Management System (EMIS) data into national systems; ii) advocate and support an MoU between ARRA and Ministry of Education; iii) align coordination mechanisms; iv) ARRA became a signatory to UNICEF's Annual Work Plans and Budgets with UNICEF and Regional Education Bureaus; v) refugee schools developed school improvement plans with Regional Education Bureau support; vi) conduct school inspections by Regional Education Bureau.

UNHCR and UNICEF will continue to support the pilot, but the required institutional change is ultimately a Government issue and demands broader cultural change from more senior parts of Government. As experience in education shows, financial flows are the biggest challenge. The CRRF National Coordination Office is planning to undertake a consultancy to look into financial management issues.

Plenary discussion

Regarding the concerns about the political profile of the refugee crises, reflections were made about the importance of shifting these approaches so that the presence of refugees is seen as an opportunity to leverage international support and reinvigorate local economies. Investing in refugee children can be a way to do this, particularly when presented as a cost-effective investment.

On Ethiopia, moving from humanitarian to development requires greater transparency, monitoring and fiscal flow oversight. ARRA financial systems are not clear or transparent, and it will take time for both systems to talk to each other. ARRA financial flows are largely outside the national public finance system, which is a challenge.

It was noted that we need a better picture of what is being invested by both governments and donors. We should be encouraging donor funds to flow through, or at least be communicated to Ministries. UNICEF reflected on the challenges on budget execution, based on the draft meta-study in Eastern and Southern Africa region, which shows that there are important gaps between what is received by line Ministries and actual expenditure. Another concern raised was avoiding draining of human resources and overloading of financial systems, especially when specific donor requirements may lead to the creation of parallel systems. Despite the challenges, there was a consensus that working in the space of public finance and planning is paramount if the CRRF vision is to be fully realized, and much more needs to be done, including on internal

capacity building. UNICEF's experience in this area of planning and public finance was highlighted as an important asset.

Action Points and Recommendations

- UNHCR and UNICEF country operations to continue to explore opportunities and advocate for refugee inclusion into national planning and budget cycles, in coordination with other key stakeholders.
- UNICEF and UNHCR to explore conducting a dedicated workshop in the area of public finance in 2020.

Social protection: the state of social protection in the region and opportunities for refugee inclusion

Guests: Pamela Dale, Social Protection Specialist, UNICEF ESAR Nairobi; Andrew Mitchell, Social Protection consultant, UNHCR; Moderator: Verena Knaus

The state of social protection

In Sub-Saharan Africa, there is a strong focus on social transfers, but social protection (SP) is much broader. Schemes of cash transfers (CT) targeting children (child grants, school feeding, education fee waivers) or households more broadly, are among the most common in the region: 29% and 31% respectively. Other target populations are working age population (19%), elderly (6%), and others (14%).

However, this is only part of the picture. Coverage remains very low, with HCT covering approximately 6%. Programmes for the elderly reach the highest percentage of their target population. In total, programmes targeting children reach just 15% of children aged 0-14 – despite a much higher risk of poverty, vulnerability, and deprivation. Programmes are often inefficient and suffer from implementation challenges. Transfer values are often too low to cover the poverty gap, and their effectiveness is further eroded by inflation.

Developing countries in sub-Saharan Africa spend on average 1.5% of GDP on SP, in line with the global average. But there is a lot of heterogeneity. The picture on who funds SP is also mixed in the region. On average, development partners fund about 55%, versus 45% funded by governments. But as shown in the graph (see presentation), substantial variation exists. Most countries do not come close to reaching their own poor populations, and thus are far from considering the inclusion of refugees.

Harnessing social protection to manage emergencies and protracted displacement

The CRRF supports three SP objectives: i) for protracted displacement, support the transition from humanitarian assistance to national social protection systems and development programmes; ii) before displacement and disaster occurs, build scalable social protection mechanisms; iii) support government capacity for the scale up of social protection coverage for all, working alongside development actors.

There are, however, challenges to move forward SP schemes for refugees, including the competition over resources; lack of a formalized forum/working group at global and regional levels; lack of multiagency business case process; lack of coherence between preparation (before) and longer-term actions (after) emergency operations; and fragmented approach to economic inclusion and contributory SP schemes.

However, there are also success factors in joint work, such as the common rights-based and protection vision, and the complementarity, convening power, and capacity to join forces on external advocacy and lobbying by both Agencies. There are new opportunities to support CRRF in countries, including the UNHCR-UNICEF LoU guidelines and the Grand Bargain social protection workstream; the IDA 18 funding and WB portfolio linked to other flagship donor programmes; and some broader joint agency programmes, such as the Dutch Partnership Initiative, and the SDG Global Fund Social Protection Window.

Plenary discussion

The plenary discussed the importance of understanding the differences between cash-based interventions and SP: not all cash-based interventions contribute to a SP vision, and not all SP interventions should be cash-based. Also, given the uncertainty of the length of stay of refugee population, the 'political hard-sale' that the inclusion of refugees in SP schemes can be, and the cost of inclusion of new population in cash-based intervention schemes, it is important to look at other modalities, and consider focusing in social services' adaptability and scalability in the light of fluctuating populations (and not necessarily only on cash).

There was some discussions around transition strategies and graduation models, and to which extent they are relevant to refugee hosting areas. Tanzania for example has used a graduation model, and Iraq a transition strategy. However, there should be realistic expectations on 'graduation', as in most cases, there is graduation from the programme but not necessarily from poverty - especially when considering that we are dealing with some of the most remote and deprived (border land) areas of the continent.

Participants stressed the importance of SP contributing to refugee self-reliance, so that refugees can start 'paying back' to the local economy. Therefore, it is very important to link up efforts with development actors, to provide long term incentives for inclusion. Participants discussed challenges of implementing humanitarian CT, which are often transferred through parallel existing systems, with a lack of coordination, and significant differences in amounts even among beneficiaries of the same communities. Ideally, donors and other actors should support expanded models, based on national systems. If the system is parallel, alignment and coherence between different cash-based interventions should be done. It is important that key stakeholders agree on parameters for humanitarian cash before disasters, which donors can top up as national cash transfers. Malawi's preparedness efforts was highlighted as a positive example. UNICEF and UNHCR should support these efforts to bring coherence and alignment and avoid competition, and push for a sustainable approach to SP in refugee hosting areas.

Recommendations and Action Points

- UNHCR and UNICEF COs to strengthen coordination, information sharing, and alignment of approaches on SP interventions in refugee hosting areas, at the country and regional level.

Group Work – Thinking next steps together

Guests: all participants in groups; Moderator: Soledad Herrero

Looking inside: obstacles and success factors in joint work, suggestions to improve work

The discussion highlighted the importance of understanding each other's differences regarding systems and structures, particularly in the area of coordination, resource mobilization, planning process, financial systems, partnership base, and mandates. By understanding each other's *modus operandi*, both Agencies will have realistic expectations over what and where the partnership can deliver the most. A key lesson learned is the importance of finding channels to structure the dialogue, which should shape the strategic vision of the partnership. Some of the 'vehicles' that have allowed for a more predictable partnership have been the development of joint Letters of Understanding (LoU); the Regional Collaboration Framework; the Joint Advocacy strategies; and the secondment of UNICEF staff to UNHCR, particularly in Ethiopia as well as regionally.

There was a large recognition on the better understanding of strengths and comparative advantages of both Agencies. The partnership has been strengthened particularly with the paradigm shift of the CRRF/GCR, which requires bringing on board development partners as a priority. Given UNICEF's mandate across the humanitarian and development spectrum, the engagement has been expanded and increasingly focuses on issues related to systems and policies, and longer-term interventions. In this

context, UNICEF is playing a pivotal role in connecting with line Ministries, while UNHCR continues to provide overall leadership in the materialization of the CRRF. There are increasing examples of both Agencies' joint work to influence and advocate for legal and policy reforms and development of national plans, which should be further expanded.

Finally, participants reflected on the importance of avoiding a sense of competition over resources, and the importance of strengthening efforts to increase advocacy, communication, and resource mobilization efforts. Given the ambition and complexity of this Agenda, it is important that both Agencies, along with other partners, work with donors towards a more predictable, and longer-term funding model. Both Agencies reiterated that the utmost priority is mobilizing resources *for* refugees and host communities, and *for* children, regardless of whether the resources are channeled or not through both Agencies. Resource mobilization with traditional and non-traditional donors is another priority.

Recommendations and Action Points

- UNHCR and UNICEF COs to adjust LoUs to incorporate CRRF visions, based on priorities and comparative advantages.
- UNHCR RSC and UNICEF ESARO to continue sharing good practices across the region regularly. A package of available documentation of key guidance and lessons learned will be prepared and shared with participants.

Looking outside: supporting national ownership

Participants highlighted the importance of anchoring the CRRF vision in refugee national and development legal and policy frameworks, considering how the inclusion of refugees in national systems is highly vulnerable to political shifts. Good progress has been achieved, such as legal reform in Ethiopia, and the Refugee Policy Education in Kenya..

At the same time, if these policies and plans are not costed, they will lack adequate resources and means to be implemented. The costed sectorial response plans in Uganda (for Education and Health), are good models that could be used elsewhere. However, the question of 'who pays the bill' remains. Moreover, participants raised the concern of these costing exercises raising expectations on funding that are often not met, as it is currently happening in Uganda.

Different contexts have different challenges. In some, there are two parallel systems managed by two parallel structures (like in Ethiopia), while in others, like Uganda and to some extent Rwanda, the level of integration is higher. Even in the first case, both Agencies should focus on the progressive alignment of standards of service delivery, including in issues related to workforce, monitoring and information management standards.

The economic argument of refugee inclusion also needs to be made. Participants stressed the importance of developing investment cases and bringing other partners (such as IFIs including the World Bank), to support evidence building around these areas. With the Dutch Partnership, for example, UNICEF is preparing investment cases for child protection for the Garissa and Turkana counties.

The other critical issue highlighted is 'making refugees count' in the development indicators, including the achievement of SDGs. For this to happen, it is critical to build evidence, and to ensure that refugees are somehow included in national data and information management systems. Some progress has been made especially in the area of education and health, with many national systems now capturing refugee data (or at least refugee IM systems aligned with national standards).

Another key area discussed was the importance of supporting local governance, and the connection between CRRF and the devolution and decentralization process currently happening in countries of the region. It is important to take into account that even when policies and frameworks may be put in place, these do not guarantee that local structures (counties and districts), will have automatically the capacity to provide service delivery to a larger population. It is therefore important that capacity building investments focus on local level structures. The 'area based programmes' such the ones in Kalobeyei (Kenya), Kigoma (Tanzania), and Mantapala (Zambia), are good practices on how to prioritize investments at the local level, and show the benefits and incentives of adopting the CRRF approach.

Finally, both Agencies discussed the importance of conducting a 'One Voice' advocacy with Government towards the inclusion of refugees in the national systems, based on a prioritization of areas. Both Agencies can reinforce policy advocacy from two angles: while UNHCR is likely to take the lead on refugee specific refugee policies and plans, UNICEF can further support this efforts by also including refugees in national policies and development plans.

Action Points

- UNHCR and UNICEF COs consider developing a joint advocacy strategy (using the Ethiopia example, as an attachment of the LoU), which should identify priority legal and policy reforms for refugees; entry points for inclusion of refugees in national development plans; shifts in coordination structures.
- UNHCR and UNICEF at which level to strengthen prioritization of capacity building and support for planning and for integrated service delivery at the local level.
- UNHCR and UNICEF COs to work towards the inclusion of refugees in national information management systems, with priority on health and education, child protection.

Looking beyond: fostering international responsibility sharing

Materializing the local solutions and integration agenda of CRRF will not succeed if it is not accompanied by an increase in international support. It is also important to highlight that the engagement of Member States should not only revolve around funding, but also mobilize required advocacy to generate a climate in which refugee areas are not perceived as a political problem but an opportunity. This should be particularly doable when children's needs are put at the center of this advocacy.

UNHCR, supported by UNICEF and other Agencies, should provide more spaces for dialogue and joint analysis, which in turn should lead to increased Member States buy-in and enhanced coherence. Member States and donors can play a role in encouraging national development plans to include issues of force displacement. A key opportunity to further strengthen international engagement is the GCR. This can bring opportunities also for advocacy with larger number of countries (and not only CRRF countries), including those where the agenda is more sensitive. The example of Tanzania, where preparations are ongoing for a National Dialogue in preparation of the GRF, was given cited.

With regards to funding, it is important to engage with donors collectively and not only bilaterally, to ensure there is increasingly a homogenous vision of the role international financing can have UNHCR, UNICEF and other Agencies should find ways to engage in donors' planning cycles and strategic discussions, to advocate for the expansion of opportunities for programmes in refugee hosting areas and avoid approaching donors with 'shopping lists'. Costed plans are a step in the right direction, but it is important to ensure that quality and funding additionality in this agenda is further materialized, including through multiyear flexible funding. There are some good practices of funding models and joint programmes (such as the Joint Programmes in Kalobeyei and Kigoma), and in some contexts there have been discussions of possible Multi Trust Funds, for example to support the Education Response Plan in Uganda. Participants'

view was that, these ideas should be further explored with donors, including the creation of a CRRF global fund.

Both Agencies reflected on the importance to work together to communicate better on progress towards the realization of the CRRF vision. Generally, there was a sense that a lot of progress and important achievements have been made, but that the CRRF agenda is a complex and abstract one, difficult to effectively communicate on. UNHCR and partners are working together on a set of indicators to measure progress against GCR and CRRF, which would be good to adopt for the region. UNICEF is also globally trying to select key indicators for internal tracking based on the global GCR M&E framework.

Finally, while there is a strong focus on donor additionality, it is important not to forget 3^d country solutions as one of the key objectives of CRRF/GCR, where international actors have a role to play. It is particularly important to keep advocating for family reunification as a paramount principle of resettlement/3^d country solutions.

Recommendations and Action Points

- UNHCR supported by UNICEF and other stakeholders, to monitor selected indicators from the global GCR framework and communicate on progress at the GRFs.
- [For additional ones on resource mobilization see above]

ANNEX 1: AGENDA



AGENDA

UNICEF & UNHCR REGIONAL MEETING ON THE GLOBAL COMPACT ON REFUGEES (GCR) AND APPLICATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE REFUGEE RESPONSE FRAMEWORK (CRRF) IN EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICA

What we have learned and what we can do better

16-17 April 2019
NAIROBI, KENYA
Tribe Hotel

TUESDAY, 16 April

- 08:30 – 09:00** **Registration**
- 09:00 – 09:05** **Security briefing**
Richard Koros, UNHCR Kenya Security Officer
- 09:05 – 09:15** **Welcome and Introduction to Agenda**
Arnauld Akodjenou, Regional Refugee Coordinator for the South Sudan situation, UNHCR RRC Nairobi
Viktor Bo Nylund, Deputy Regional Director, UNICEF ESAR Nairobi
- Introduction to the agenda:** Soledad Herrero, Regional Emergency Specialist, UNICEF ESAR Nairobi; Céline Mersch, Senior CRRF Officer, UNHCR RRC Nairobi

SESSION I: WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW

Chair: Arnauld Akodjenou, RRC South Sudan, UNHCR

- 09:15 – 9:35** **Understanding the Global Compact on Refugees and CRRF**
Catherine Wiesner, RRC Burundi Situation/CRRF champion, UNHCR RRC Nairobi
- 09:35– 9:55** **GCR/CRRF: what it means for children and UNICEF**
Verena Knaus, Senior Children on the Move Advisor, UNICEF HQ
- 09:55 – 10:15** **GCR and arrangements for responsibility sharing: global outlook and opportunities for collaboration in the region**

Johannes Tarvainen, Senior CRRF Officer, UNHCR HQ/Division of Resilience and Solutions

10:15– 10:45 **Plenary discussion and Q&A**

10:45 – 11:00 **Tea / Coffee break**

SESSION II: WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED

Chair: Soledad Herrero, UNICEF; Céline Mersch, UNHCR

11:00 – 11:30 **Uganda:** Evidence generation and policy development for refugee hosting areas
UNICEF and UNHCR Uganda (*presentations and Q&A*)

11:30 – 12:00 **Kenya:** Strengthening engagement of Line Ministries in service delivery in refugee hosting areas
UNICEF and UNHCR Kenya (*presentations and Q&A*)

12:00– 12:30 **Rwanda:** Local system integrated service delivery
UNICEF and UNHCR Kenya (*presentations and Q&A*)

12:30 – 13:30 **Lunch**

13:30 – 14:00 **Tanzania:** Towards equitable and sustainable services and systems in refugee hosting areas – some experiences
UNICEF and UNHCR Ethiopia, Rwanda (*presentations and Q&A*)

14:00 – 14:30 **Ethiopia:** Towards equitable and sustainable services and systems in refugee hosting areas – some experiences
UNICEF and UNHCR Ethiopia, Rwanda (*presentations and Q&A*)

14:30 – 15:00 **Zambia:** Towards equitable and sustainable services and systems in refugee hosting areas – Mantapala experience
UNICEF and UNHCR Ethiopia, Rwanda (*presentations and Q&A*)

SESSION III: HOW TO ENAGE BETTER WITH PARTNERS

15:00 – 15:45 **How to enhance engagement with the World Bank**
Guests: Caroline Sergeant, FCV consultant, World Bank
 Rebecca Lacroix, FCV consultant, World Bank
Chair: Yonatan Araya, Senior Policy Advisor, UNHCR RSC Nairobi

15:45– 16:00 **Tea / Coffee break**

16:00– 17:00 **How to enhance engagement with Member States/Donors**
Guests: Member States/Donors

Chairs: Catherine Wiesner, RRC Burundi Situation, UNHCR RRC Nairobi

Pete Manfield, Regional Emergency Advisor, UNICEF ESAR

17:30 Onwards

Cocktail reception with Member States/Donors and Partners at Tribe (with refugee artisans)

WEDNESDAY, 17 April

08:30 – 09:00

Networking over coffee and tea

SESSION IV: ACT LOCALLY BUT REINFORCE REGIONALLY

Chair: Catherine Wiesner, RRC Burundi Situation, UNHCR

9:00 – 10:00

Role of the regional bodies in the CRRF agenda

Guests: Kebede Kassa Tsegaye, Senior Advisor on social development/ Coordinator of IGAD Programs (*Djibouti Declaration – Education*); Morris Tayebwa, EAC (*Child Protection policy*)

SESSION V: WHAT WE CAN DO DIFFERENTLY

10:00 – 11:00

Planning, finance and budget cycles: opportunities for refugee inclusion

Guests: Ewen Macleod, Deputy Director, UNHCR HQ/DRS UNICEF & UNHCR Ethiopia

Chair: Pete Manfield, Regional Emergency Advisor, UNICEF ESAR Nairobi

11:00 – 11:15

Tea / Coffee break

11:15 – 12:15

Social protection: the state of social protection in the region and opportunities for refugee inclusion

Guests: Pamela Dale, Social Protection Specialist, UNICEF ESAR Nairobi; Andrew Mitchell, Social Protection consultant, UNHCR Ethiopia

Chair: Verena Knaus, Senior Children on the Move Advisor, UNICEF HQ

12:15 – 13:15

Group work by country - Thinking next steps together:

Moderator: Soledad Herrero, UNICEF

A. Looking inside: i) obstacles to working better together; ii) success factors in joint work; iii) suggestions to improve work iv) including areas for RO/HQ support.

B. Supporting national responsibility: i) identification of successes in CRRF; ii) proposals to work better with Government; iii)

identification of key programmatic priorities in 2019 and 2020 (and beyond!) including iv) how RO/HQ can better support.

- C. Galvanizing international accountability:** identification of key opportunities for stakeholders' engagement, including in the areas of i) advocacy; ii) financing, and how can iii) RO/HQ better support.

13:15 – 14:15

Country Group work lunch

Country based discussion: identification of key take aways and key priorities going forward

14:15– 15:00

Presentation of 'Thinking Next Steps Together' in plenary
(5 minutes presentation per group, 30 minutes' discussion)

15:00– 16:00

Country Presentations (key take away and priorities) in plenary
(10 minutes per countries, including reactions and questions from the floor)

16:00– 16:15

Coffee/Tea break

16:15– 16:45

What it means for the region: summary of conclusions and next steps

Catherine Wiesner, RRC Burundi Situation, UNHCR RRC Nairobi
Pete Manfield, Regional Emergency Advisor, UNICEF ESAR Nairobi

16:45– 17:00

Closing remarks

Arnauld Akodjenou, Regional Refugee Coordinator for the South Sudan situation, UNHCR RRC Nairobi

Viktor Bo Nylund, Deputy Regional Director, UNICEF ESAR Nairobi

ANNEX 2: PARTICIPANTS LIST

ORGANIZATION (UNICEF)	COUNTRY	NAME	TITLE
UNICEF	Ethiopia	Benjamin Reese	Senior Programme Specialist Migration
UNICEF	Kenya	Daniel Baheta	Chief of Education
UNICEF	Kenya	Patrick Codjia	Chief of Nutrition
UNICEF	Kenya	Patrick Lavandhomme	Chief of Field Operations/Emergencies
UNICEF	Uganda	Noreen Prendiville	Deputy Representative
UNICEF	Uganda	Boiketho Murima	Emergency Specialist
UNICEF	Tanzania	Robert Carr	Chief of PPME/Emergencies
UNICEF	Rwanda	Nathalie Hamoudi	Deputy Representative
UNICEF	Zambia	Shadrack Omol	Deputy Representative
UNICEF	Zambia	Murtaza Malik	Chief of WASH/Emergencies Focal Point
UNICEF	HQ	Verena Knaus	Children on the Move Advisor
ORGANIZATION (UNHCR)	COUNTRY	NAME	TITLE
UNHCR	Zambia	Giulia Ricciarelli	Snr. Protection Officer
UNHCR	Zambia	Ancillah Manning	Snr. Programme Officer
UNHCR	Zambia	George Omondi	Livelihood Expert
UNHCR	Rwanda	Barbara Bentum-Williams Dotse	Deputy Representative
UNHCR	Rwanda	Jean-Paul Safari	Solutions Officer
UNHCR	Tanzania	Joan Allison	Deputy Representative
UNHCR	Tanzania	Julia Seevinck	Snr. Development officer
UNHCR	Ethiopia	Vincent Parker	Deputy Representative
UNHCR	Ethiopia	Enock Mambili	Snr. Education Officer
UNHCR	Ethiopia	Ronana Herve	WASH Officer
UNHCR	Uganda	Margaret Otieno	Assistanct Representative - Protection
UNHCR	Uganda	Stefanie Krause	CRRF Officer
UNHCR	South Sudan	Ketevan Kamashidze	Protection (CB) Officer
UNHCR	Kenya	Ivana Unluova	Deputy Representative Programmes
UNHCR	Kenya	Mans Felleson	Senior Solutions Advisor (CRRF)
UNHCR	Kenya-Kakuma	Mohammad Shoman	Senior Operations Manager
UNHCR	Kenya - Dadaab	Salwa Asmat	CRR Officer, Dadaab.
UNHCR	HQ	Johannes Tarvainen	Senior CRRF Officer
ORGANIZERS/SUPPORT TEAM		NAME	TITLE
UNHCR	RSC/RRC	Catherine Wiesner	Regional Refugee Coordinator Burundi
UNHCR	RSC/RRC	Celine Mersch	Senior CRRF Officer
UNHCR	RSC/RRC	Timothy Wanji	Secretary

UNICEF	ESARO	Pete Manfield	Regional Emergency Advisor
UNICEF	ESARO	Soledad Herrero	Regional Emergency Specialist
UNICEF	RSC	Emma Matano	Programme Associate
PARTICIPATION (some sessions)		NAME	TITLE
UNICEF	ESARO	Marie Ndeye	Child Protection Specialist
UNICEF	ESARO	Stephanie Egger Hay Smith	Partnership Specialist
UNICEF	ESARO	Evelyn Mbulo	Partnership Specialist
UNICEF	ESARO	Jessica Shaver	Education Specialist
UNICEF	ESARO	Hannah Scott	Emergency Specialist
UNICEF	ESARO	Matthew Cummis	Public Finance Specialist
UNICEF	HQ	Sofie Dobbelaere	Emergency Specialist
UNICEF	ESARO	Pamela Dale	Social Protection Specialist
UNHCR	RSC/RRC	Arnauld Akodjenou	Regional Refugee Coordinator South Sudan
UNHCR	HQ	Andrew Mitchell	Social Protection Expert
UNHCR	HQ	Johannes Tarvainen	Senior CRRF Officer
UNHCR	HQ	Ewen Macleoad	Deputy Director Division of Resilience & Solutions
UNHCR	RSC	Clara van Praag	Innovation Officer
UNHCR	RSC	Sandra Aluoch	Regional Innovation Officer
UNHCR	RSC	Emily Lugano	Senior Regional Education Officer
UNHCR	RSC	Alison Hutchinson	Senior Regional Registration Officer
UNHCR	RSC	Sanja Heric	Education Officer - Emergency
UNHCR	RSC	Kristoffer Ristinmaa	WASH Officer
UNHCR	RSC	Josiane Uwineza	Executive Assistant to the Head of RSC
UNHCR	RSC	Yonatan Araya	Senior Policy Officer
UNHCR	RSC	Geraud Devred	Senior Regional CBI Officer
UNHCR	RSC	Laura Jokinen	Associate Protection Officer
UNHCR	RSC	Duke Mwancha	Interagency Coordinator Associate
UNHCR	RSC	Lena Haap	Executive Assistant RRC
UNHCR	RSC	Daena Neto	Reporting Officer
UNHCR	RSC/RRC	Senai Terrefe	Senior Interagency Coordinator Officer

ANNEX 3: MEMBER STATES AND DONORS PARTICIPANTION LIST

	ORGANIZATION	NAME	TITLE	CONTACT
1	U.S. Embassy	Carl Jessica	Refugee Coordinator	CarlJA@state.gov
2	Embassy of Spain	Celia García Muñoz	Support staff	colaboradores.cgmu@maec.es
3	Embassy of Spain	Roberta Verbanac	Support staff	Verbanac, Roberta <colaboradores.rv@maec.es>
4	Netherlands Embassy	Ingeborg Ponne	Policy Officer Migration	ingeborg.ponne@minbuza.nl
5	ECHO	Kuhlke Sigrid	TA Kenya – Focal Point South Sudan Regional Refugee Crisis	Sigrid.Kuehlke@echofield.eu
6	German Embassy Nairobi	Nils Föll	Policy Officer for Development Cooperation with Kenya and Somalia	wz-10@nair.auswaertiges-amt.de
7	Danish Embassy Royal	Mette Knudsen	Ambassador	bilmai@um.dk (Bilha Maina)
8	Danish Embassy Royal	Christine Uyoga	Program Officer	
9	DFID	Martin Gichuru	Humanitarian Team Leader	Martin Gichuru <M-Gichuru@dfid.gov.uk>
10	Korean Embassy	Byongyoon Jeon	3rd Secretary	byjeon13@mofa.go.kr
11	Embassy of Switzerland	Weber Séverine EDA WEBSE	Deputy Head of Regional Cooperation Horn of Africa	severine.weber@eda.admin.ch
12	Canadian High Commission	Elisha Ogonji		Elisha.Ogonji@international.gc.ca
13	Swedish Embassy	Michael Hielmaker	Deputy Head of Mission	michael.hjelmaker@gov.se
14	Swedish Embassy	Anna Jardfelt	Ambassador	anna.jardfelt@gov.se
15	Swedish Embassy	Frederick Folkunger	Assistant	Fredrik.folkunger@gov.se