



Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees

Asia Regional Workshop Report

MaryBeth Morand, PDES

Claudia Cruz Leo - Research Assistant

Table of Contents

Findings and Highlights	3
Partnerships	5
Expanding Protection Space.....	7
Community Based Protection: Ways to Reach Hard to Reach Communities	11
Community Based Protection: Supporting Refugee Autonomy	13
Community Based Protection: Addressing Heightened Vulnerability	15
Community Based Protection: Expanding and Exchanging Refugee Resources .	19
Accessing National Health Care Systems	21
Accessing National Education Systems	23
Livelihoods.....	25
Annexes	29
Annex 1: Agenda	29
Annex 2: Participant List	33
Annex 3: Action Plans.....	37
Annex 4: Participant Feedback Summary	57

FINDINGS AND HIGHLIGHTS

Overview of the *Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees* Workshops Series

This paper is the first in a series of five reports on workshops designed to broadcast and replicate good practices for urban refugee programmes. The workshops are a product of the *Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees* project funded by the U.S. Department of State's Bureau for Population, Refugees, and Migration (BPRM). There will be a workshop in each of the five geographic regions. In addition to the workshops there will be a roundtable event in a particular city in each region.

The *Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees* project is managed by UNHCR's Policy Development and Evaluation Service (PDES). PDES was selected to coordinate the events and report on them on the basis of the service's evaluation series on the implementation of UNHCR's Policy on refugee protection and solutions in urban areas, (the Urban Refugee Policy). The inputs and findings from the workshops and roundtable build upon this body of knowledge as well as other documents reviewed in ongoing literature reviews by PDES. PDES coordinates with UNHCR's Division of International Protection, Division of Programme Support Management, and the Regional Bureaus in the planning and hosting of the roundtables and workshops. The reports are shared with the Divisions and Bureaus with the aim of providing new insights and perspectives on programming and protection responses in urban areas.

The workshops are an opportunity for UNHCR staff and their partners in each region to learn from each other through sharing their good practice examples, as well as the challenges and lessons learnt along the way. The *Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees* project will deepen and expand upon regional networks of professionals working with refugees and asylum seekers in cities through this exchange. Most importantly, the workshops provide practitioners with real, detailed, and tested ways of implementing the Urban Refugee Policy. A review of the literature of the past three years shows that there is a growing body of evidence on the specifics of the challenges faced by urban refugees and asylum seekers as well as the organizations that serve them. Many of these documents make general recommendations on what organizations should do; yet the recommendations lack precision on how guidelines could be implemented. A forum where service providers to urban refugees and asylum seekers can meet and describe in detail their ongoing programmes, and where they can ask questions about the specifics of each other's programmes, fills the gap of "how to" in the collective knowledge base and provides an expanded evidence-base. In addition to sharing the specifics of how best to implement these activities, the workshops and roundtables advance interagency discussions for how to collaborate on advocacy, innovations, new partnerships and refugee relations.

The *Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees* Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand

This *Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees* Workshop hosted 42 participants (23 UNHCR staff, 19 partners) from 13 countries. There were nine panels on urban refugee related topics including partnerships, expanding protection space, livelihoods, accessing national systems for education and health, legal assistance, safe houses, social assistance and mapping services. Each of these panels consisted of presentations of good practice activities followed by questions from the plenary and then the grounding of the discussion by a subject matter expert.

Additionally, there was a Host Panel that included the UNHCR Assistant Regional Representative for Programmes, the Executive Director of the Asia Pacific Refugee Rights Network, and the BPRM's Deputy Regional Refugee Coordinator from Nepal. They described the regional context and shared observations on the direction of urban refugee programming in the area. The keynote speaker was the Director of the Division of Programme Support Management (DPSM) who commented on UNHCR's recent strategies and policies including the UNHCR Policy on Alternatives to Camps.

The **overall findings from the workshop's good practice presentations** point to: 1) the importance of UNHCR's role in supporting networks and connecting civil society to the government on refugee issues; 2) the criticality of ongoing assessments that map the human capital in the refugee community as well as opportunities and services that may be available to them in the host communities; 3) how investments in refugee groups, community based organizations and other small or newly formed organisations need to be sustained and monitored especially if they are serving vulnerable segments in society; 4) opportunities for capacity exchange between the refugee and host community should be analysed as well as areas for capacity building of refugee communities; 5) where possible, accessing national systems provides a level of social protection, yet requires a dedicated, continuous advocacy strategy, and, 6) access to work is a highly nuanced discussion that involves a wide variety of stakeholders.

PARTNERSHIPS – New roles and empowerment through local networks

- 1. Horizontal partnerships in the form of networks or other collaborative structures provide a better platform for service provision and information dissemination.*
- 2. UNHCR can play a key role connecting governments to civil society organizations to elaborate on vertical networks in countries.*
- 3. The socio-political environment needs to be assessed constantly.*

The partnerships presentations explored two different ways that NGOs in Bangkok and Seoul expanded upon their role and reach into refugee communities. In Bangkok it was a horizontal expansion that occurred by self-organizing and in Seoul it was a vertical expansion that occurred when one NGO took on an unprecedented role. The first example, the Bangkok Asylum Seeker and Refugee Network (BASRAN), is a traditional network of NGOs, faith-based organizations, independent schools and individuals that started five years ago and now meets every two months. For the most part, the membership is at grassroots level. Members share a common interest in improving the lives of refugees and were overwhelmed by the desperate level of need within the urban refugee community in Bangkok and the limited resources available to them to address these needs. The three main themes BASRAN addresses are livelihoods, education and health. They gather to discuss issues pertinent to the subjects and to map the services partners can provide to refugees.

Although BASRAN remains a relatively loosely structured organization it did develop governance protocols as it matured. We learned from the BASRAN presentation the importance of establishing an identity and setting boundaries early on in the formation of an association or network. When a member of the immigration police wanted to join the network BASRAN had to reject that application to protect the best interests of refugee communities. It spurred BASRAN to create Terms of Reference (ToRs) so each new applicant is now briefed on what the network is and how it works. Published ToRs have enabled BASRAN to say “no” in order to maintain its integrity. For example, and somewhat controversially, BASRAN does not accept refugee leaders as members because they did not want the network to become divided amongst refugee groups and thus be forced to take a position on internal refugee community issues. Nevertheless, refugees are central to decision-making for the individual livelihoods, health and education programs. Yet, the dialogical space that BASRAN has carved out for itself to discuss broader issues aside from the implementation of programmes is one of the keys to the success of the network.

In the second example, the NGO pNan started a livelihoods programme that brought favorable attention from the Government of Korea and prompted them to reconsider the roles of NGOs. In 2013, UNHCR in the Republic of Korea was deeply involved in individual cases of refugees and often provided counseling on livelihoods through this individual basis. Altogether, it was deemed to be ineffective. At the same time, UNHCR lacked the financial means and personnel to support a broad-based refugee livelihoods programme. This analysis was going on in a climate where NGOs were

capable but not empowered and not respected or utilized by the Government as there is a high level of distrust of human rights defenders and civil rights activists. UNHCR realized that it should be a catalyst for NGO empowerment and capacity building as well as improved relations between the Government and NGOs. UNHCR sought to increase coordination amongst civil society organizations and the Government through a livelihoods programme that supported refugees and asylum seekers while maximizing existing assistance schemes available to them through the Republic of Korea.

Thus, in 2014, UNHCR saved money from its budget and picked an NGO partner, pNan, to implement a 70,000 USD livelihood support programme to refugees and asylum seekers. The Government liked this partnership, realizing the potential of outsourcing its own service provision via grants. Although UNHCR cannot fund NGOs in the Republic of Korea indefinitely, and questioned its role in doing so in G20 countries, UNHCR expects the process to become self-sustainable eventually through NGO fundraising or government funding and will, at that stage, subsequently phase out its own support. UNHCR hopes that this collaboration and future ones that allow the Government to share its assistance role with NGOs will enhance its dialogue with civil society actors and allow them to become a more integral part of the national protection and assistance system in the Republic of Korea by 2017.

The conclusions of this panel are three-fold: horizontal partnerships in the form of networks or other collaborative structures provide a better platform for service provision and information dissemination; UNHCR can play a key role connecting governments to civil society organizations to elaborate on vertical networks in countries, and in all cases, the socio-political environment needs to be assessed constantly to find new and effective ways for civil society to promote refugee access to national services.

EXPANDING PROTECTION SPACE – An expansion of communications at all levels is required

- 1. Protection space has been expanded through ongoing and systematic communication with refugees and strong links with partners.*
- 2. The use of and integration into national systems is essential to carve out legally protected space for refugees.*

The Expanding Protection Space panel had three speakers from Bangkok, Hong Kong, and Beijing. Asylum Access in Bangkok and UNHCR in Beijing described how to promote refugee agency through new communication pathways and UNHCR Hong Kong told the story of how they forged better links with the government through negotiating a new system and training. Another example of how bilateral communications with the government resulted in improved access for refugees came from a participant from UNHCR Iran. All examples yielded improved access to national systems.

Asylum Access Thailand (AAT) promotes refugee agency by teaching asylum seekers how to navigate systems in Thailand through their “Know Your Situation” and “Know Your Rights” training. The training includes information on how to access services such as health and education for children, how to reduce the risk of arrest and exploitation as well as tips on general safety. There are different sections on living in Thailand, Thai culture and useful phrases in Thai, as well as tips on finding housing and information on working in Thailand. AAT also discusses the basics of the refugee status determination process and addresses common questions related to this process. As a result of this information-sharing programme, asylum seekers are better able to make informed decisions and are more empowered because they have a greater understanding of the situation they find themselves in. The clear information from AAT, a credible and impartial source, serves to deter rumours and decrease opportunities for exploitation within their own communities.

UNHCR Beijing decided to improve communications with individual asylum seekers through a more systematic process for e-mail communications. Since asylum seekers in China are mostly located in urban areas and have access to the internet, including through their smart phones, UNHCR China established an email communication system which allows for constant contact and vigilance through the use of a specific email address dedicated to this purpose. This email address is widely shared and actively disseminated in the asylum seeking community through UNHCR pamphlets. Despite the high volume of emails received UNHCR Beijing’s protocols allow the Community Services staff to code, filter, target and track follow-up on individual protection or assistance cases. The system still needs to be monitored for any cases that “slipped between the cracks” and the office needs to remain mindful of the “Confidentiality Guidelines” on exchanges on the internet. Nevertheless, this system does offer improved insight for action and allows for follow-up and pre-arranging the appropriate interpreters. For straightforward matters, the follow-up is often done through email. Other matters are dealt with by telephone or by appointment. In addition, UNHCR Beijing also offers a “telephone counseling day” on Wednesdays. By handling straightforward

matters through these dependable email and phone systems, the UNHCR Beijing Office has saved refugees the money and time it would have taken them to travel across vast distances.

UNHCR Hong Kong expanded protection space for refugees by using the persecution aspects of the Convention Against Torture to improve the integrity of screening for asylum seekers. Although China is a signatory, Hong Kong is not a signatory of the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees however UNHCR, with the help of NGOs and legislative counsels, lobbied to use the Convention Against Torture to gain leverage in the Government's own judicial review process and successfully influence the Government's policy. As a result, the Government proposed the Unified Screening Mechanism (USM) process to evaluate asylum requests and the USM was launched shortly thereafter. Upon the launch of the USM, UNHCR discontinued their own internal, parallel refugee status determination processes.

The USM process is as follows: upon arrival and after filing the required application with the Immigration Department, refugees and asylum seekers can apply for publicly funded legal assistance. They are accompanied by a duty lawyer from the first stage, through the interview and RSD process. In the meantime, they have access to material assistance and access to education and health care, including pre-natal care for new mothers and anti-retroviral therapy for HIV positive individuals. If an asylum seeker's claim is rejected by the Immigration Department under USM, the individual can obtain legal assistance to appeal the Immigration Department's decision and even if the appeal is dismissed, a judicial review remains an option. UNHCR also reviews USM substantiated claims and refers claims that do not meet refugee determination criteria back to the USM process.

UNHCR Hong Kong was afraid that its interventions in individual cases would erode its relationship with the Government but engaged it anyway while reiterating UNHCR's mandate. In doing so, the dialogue remains positive and open. When gaps are found, a small number of community based organizations provide support and advocacy, such as by briefing new arrivals on the asylum system in Hong Kong. UNHCR's interventions mainly target those who encounter problems accessing the national system and assistance programmes.

In response to the three panelists, the delegate from UNHCR Iran brought forward the story of how the increased issuance of work permits expanded protection space, notably for women. She described how the Government of Iran undertakes annual re-registration of refugees under the Amayesh Scheme (currently Amayesh IX), through which refugees are provided with Amayesh cards that enable their access to basic services and facilitate the issuance of work permits to refugees.

In all four of the examples above, the protection space has been expanded through ongoing and systematic communication with refugees and strong links with partners. In Thailand the coaching of refugee communities through seminars helps to keep them safe from detention and fraud. In Iran and Hong

Kong, respectively, joint advocacy efforts resulted in the Governments providing enhanced legitimacy for individual refugees through documentation issued and incorporating them into national legal processes. Three of the four examples also emphasize the use of and integration into national systems to carve out legally protected space for refugees.

COMMUNITY BASED PROTECTION – Ways to reach hard to reach communities

- 1. Training CBOs to map services for refugee communities works well especially if they are a credible organization in the urban area.*
- 2. For CBOs to remain viable, UN and INGO agencies need to invest in them beyond and after initial mapping exercises.*

This panel on Community Based Protection focused on ways to get to know refugee communities better and improve communications with them through local partners. This is of particular importance since refugees often live far from UNHCR and NGO offices and keeping up with their demographics and, more importantly, their issues of concern are priorities in being able to offer protection and assistance. Through its partner, Don Bosco (BOSCO), the UNHCR Office in New Delhi sponsors crèches and youth groups with which they not only help keep refugee children safe but also maintain links to the refugee community. The UNHCR Sub-Office in Peshawar works with its partner, SACH in three satellite offices to spread information about UNHCR and partner activities that refugees can avail themselves of regarding legal issues, and voluntary repatriation, and at the same time to map services available to refugees in the sprawling peri-urban places around Peshawar. UNHCR in Iran is also using a local partner to reach communities that they cannot access for administrative reasons.

UNHCR India has partnered with BOSCO to create clubs for refugee youth above the age of 14 in New Delhi since 2005. UNHCR/BOSCO worked to build these youth clubs with the aims of engaging refugee youth in productive activities and reducing conflict between refugees and local communities. UNHCR/BOSCO created 12 youth clubs with nearly 1,000 members. Thirty percent of the members are Indian nationals who help bridge the gap between refugees and the host community, enhancing cooperation and understanding between the two. The clubs have gradually evolved into a community outreach initiative. They motivate refugee youth to be positively engaged with community issues and support one another. They also encourage refugees to enjoy their lives in asylum and make the most of the opportunities available to them in India by capitalizing on educational opportunities. Through the youth clubs, refugee youth engage in health, education, SGBV campaigns and other initiatives to raise awareness and serve as messengers for UNHCR/BOSCO in their communities.

In another UNHCR/BOSCO collaboration, refugee leaders from the Chin Refugee Committee (CRC), an umbrella organization representing different Chin ethnic groups of the Myanmar community in New Delhi, came forward in 2012 to request daycare services that were needed in order to provide a safe space for young children with working parents in the community. UNHCR/BOSCO worked with the refugee leaders to begin two crèches in West Delhi to empower the community to run a community based project. The crèches are located in places where UNHCR/BOSCO services are not available, increasing their reach into refugee communities. The refugee staffed and managed daycare centers also serve to reinforce the refugee leadership's accountability to their community. Moving forward,

UNHCR/BOSCO is working to link the crèches with existing government daycare facilities, where children from ages 1 to 3 attend the community-run crèches and those from ages 3 to 5 are linked with the government crèches. The goal is to facilitate the ultimate mainstreaming of refugee children into national primary schools.

In another attempt toward mainstreaming refugees into national services, the Sub-Office in Peshawar started mapping services through a local partner. In addition to mapping the 4Ws – Who is doing What Where and When, they are tracking changes in demographics, access to health, education and gainful livelihoods, as well as child protection, SGBV and protection concerns for the most vulnerable, and existing community structures, the security situation, available legal assistance and identifying any other additional information on gaps that need to be addressed. Mapping services and gaps is a pre-requisite to developing referral pathways to integrate refugees into national services. Security, access, and the dearth of partners that can accompany protracted situations are all compelling reasons for assessing not only refugee needs but the services that are available to meet them in the community.

In 2014, UNHCR in Iran was compelled to change its outreach model because they were concerned that they were not reaching the most vulnerable people in the communities, many of which they did not have access to. The revised Outreach Programme moves progressively away from direct assistance and implementation by UNHCR toward a stronger and broader networking strategy in which partners reach persons of concern requiring assistance, while UNHCR focuses its individual interventions on the basis of protection needs and solutions. UNHCR facilitates the tripartite relationship between the government and the partner(s).

These three examples show that the use of community based organizations (CBOs) as partners to penetrate communities is not only a good idea to inform and understand refugee communities, but it is a necessity in urban areas where access is restricted for logistical, security, or administrative reasons. With the right level of training, the smaller CBOs can accurately report the existence, quality and accessibility of resources available to refugees. CBOs who have a credible reputation in the locality may also prove to be the best advocates for getting refugees into state run services. However, for CBOs to be sustainable, humanitarian organizations need to invest in them and value them beyond the initial mapping exercises.

COMMUNITY BASED PROTECTION – Supporting refugee autonomy

- 1. An important role for UNHCR is to facilitate access for refugees to existing government services and the municipality.*
- 2. Augmenting pre-existing coping strategies within the refugee community by training young adults on how to provide psychosocial support is a way to strengthen the community.*

The following three examples are about empowering refugee communities. The first example is from Japan. It is the story of a refugee community approaching UNHCR to explain what they could do for themselves and what they needed UNHCR to do for them. The second example is about refugee community leaders trained to tackle their own mental health and psychosocial support needs. And the third example is a new way for refugees to access legal services. All three programs rely on refugees being the agents of change or at least their own destinies.

In the greater Tokyo region, there are several hundred Kurdish-Turkish asylum seekers. Most of them are long-time pending cases or repeat applicants who have been in Japan for a long time with ambiguous legal status. Those who apply for RSD can get a work permit in six months' time. The first six months are difficult for asylum seekers and even afterward, not all of them are able to access the services they are eligible for through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs since public services are run at the municipal level. As undocumented persons, they were not counted in the statistics that include local residents and their voices were not heard by the municipalities. Over the course of years and with guidance from UNHCR, the community self-organized as the Kurdish Japanese Friendship Organization. When the organization brought up their inability to access the municipality and its services during a participatory assessment exercise, UNHCR contacted municipal officials to initiate a dialogue.

The dialogue enabled the municipality to discuss their concerns about the Kurdish community and their compliance with Japanese behavioral norms such as trash removal and noise levels. This dialogue resulted in the inclusion of the refugees and asylum seekers, even those with ambiguous status, in the municipal policy on foreign resident affairs. The Kurdish-Turkish community is now part of the statistics and their concerns are shared by the municipality. This particular success was due in large part to the personality of one municipal official and thus it is recommended that UNHCR systematize its approaches to municipal officials in order to promote continuity in the dialogue with refugee communities.

In a needs assessment that JRS was conducting in Bangkok, they noted three important points: 1) NGOs and UNHCR are not first responders to distress and trauma faced by the refugee and asylum seeking community. Neighbors, families and community leaders are the first responders and they wanted to learn how to respond more effectively; 2) There was a large group of young adults whose education had been interrupted who were responsive, appropriate and available for taking on the role of community work; and, 3) There was a clear need for mental health services in the refugee community.

By way of example, in 2014, more than 80 referrals were made to just one JRS Psychosocial Counselor alone. JRS felt it needed a way to respond to refugees who needed stress reduction and basic psychosocial support in a timely and community-based manner. JRS targeted and trained young English-speaking community leaders. Training the community's under-employed young adults to play this role built mental health and psychosocial support capacity in the community through their natural help-seeking mechanisms and provided a transferable skill to the young adults through 27 hours of training over nine weeks. The training helped the participants to help each other and to cope with their own feelings of separation, loss and anxiety.

Although there is a strong legal framework in the Philippines for refugees and UNHCR plays a supervisory role in collaborating with its dedicated government counterpart to address identification and protection issues, a gap remained for refugees in obtaining legal assistance. To address this gap, UNHCR established a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the state public legal aid arm to provide free legal aid to refugees, stateless persons and asylum seekers. The state legal aid is supplemented by a network of university and law school based legal aid clinics. UNHCR provides training for the law school students in order to sensitize them to protection issues. At the same time, the connection to state public aid gives the government insights into the refugee community and their issues.

In the Philippines and Japan respectively, UNHCR facilitated access for refugees to existing government services and the municipality. In Thailand, JRS augmented pre-existing coping strategies within the refugee community by training young adults on how to provide psychosocial support. In all three cases, the autonomy of refugees to solve problems for themselves was built upon.

COMMUNITY BASED PROTECTION – Addressing heightened vulnerability

- 1. When community based protection addresses the most vulnerable people in the community, it requires a responsibly sustained investment.*
- 2. Maximizing the use of the host country government's networks for child protection and sexual and gender based violence, including domestic violence is a good entry point for services to urban refugees as well as a good platform for collaborative advocacy.*
- 3. Keeping refugee outreach workers motivated is crucial and depends on their sense of responsibility and ownership of the programmes.*

Discussions about urban refugees often center on the economic independence and social integration of refugees in cities. However, there is always a portion amongst the refugee communities who are extremely vulnerable and need special support before they can live independently or integrate even into their own communities. The next three examples explore ways to assist women and children who are sexual and gender based violence (SGBV) survivors as well as HIV positive members of the community. The first example illustrates the collaboration with the Government of Indonesia and partners to provide shelter services for both unaccompanied minors (UAMs) and SGBV survivors. The second example describes how a network of refugee social workers has been formed to provide support to SGBV survivors before and during their shelter stay. And, the third example illustrates how a refugee community can support its HIV positive members. All three of the case studies, demonstrate how responses to critical vulnerability require the strategic participation of various stakeholders including the host country government, international organizations and, not least, the refugee community itself.

In Indonesia, UNHCR engaged the Government's Ministry of Social Affairs to incorporate vulnerable women and children from the refugee and asylum seeking communities into government run shelters. Indonesia is a signatory of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and therefore, protection of refugee children is covered by the Indonesian Law on Child Protection No. 23/2002, and in particular through Article 60 on the special protection of refugee children. Thus, in this case, UNHCR made the most of a legal framework other than the 1951 Refugee Convention in order to augment protection for refugee children.

UNHCR and its operational partner, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), negotiated with local officials from the Ministry of Social Affairs in Medan, North Sumatra to raise awareness of the problem of unaccompanied minors (UAMs) in detention. IOM and the local ministry officials agreed to remove the children from detention and place them in a government run shelter for children on the condition that IOM would cover the costs associated with the care of the children. IOM supports the ministry to cover the costs of meals, medical care, psychosocial support, and sports activities, while the ministry provides facilities to accommodate the children as well as trained government social workers to provide care and support to the

children. At the time of the workshop, 44 children had been placed in the shelter. Discussions are currently underway for the establishment of similar arrangements in other provinces: Yogyakarta, Central Java, and Bali.

In a similar arrangement, UNHCR and its implementing partner, Church World Service, reached an agreement with the Ministry of Social Affairs in the capital city of Jakarta to allow access to shelters to temporarily accommodate women and children who are survivors of SGBV. UNHCR and CWS held a series of meetings with Ministry of Social Affairs to bring to their attention the issues faced by refugee women and children and others at risk. They also invited staff from the Ministry of Social Affairs to monitor the situation of refugee children living in the two CWS-run shelters for unaccompanied minors in Jakarta. An agreement was reached whereby when a survivor of SGBV or child at risk is identified, UNHCR will bring the child to the attention of the shelter manager from the Ministry of Social Affairs and make a formal referral for the individual to be accommodated in the facility.

In turn, UNHCR contributed to the capacity building of social workers from the Ministry of Social Affairs in 2012 and 2013, which strengthened the good relationship with the ministry. The arrangements with the Ministry of Social Affairs relies on constant awareness raising and capacity building since there is a high rate of turnover amongst their staff and despite negotiations, the treatment of refugees remains *ad hoc* and relationship driven. Ongoing, joint monitoring of the shelters is another way to stay in contact and keep the dialogue constructive. Including interested parties from civil society such as national child protection agencies and other UN agencies, especially UNICEF, in contributing to the capacity of the shelter arrangements would be another way to monitor the quality and care they provide.

In Malaysia where refugees are not able to access government run shelters, ICMC runs a shelter, yet perhaps the more important work ICMC has done in addressing the root causes of SGBV is the community group they formed, the Refugee Women's Protection Corps (RWPC). ICMC recruited and trained a group of 18 RWPC members from various Burmese refugee ethnicities to conduct awareness raising sessions in refugees' homes, communities and religious centres. Some members of the RWPC are men and they facilitate sessions for all-male groups. The RWPC response network entails an investment in careful recruiting, a phased training programme, and regular debriefing and meetings.

The RWPC also conducts Personal Safety Programmes at refugee schools and learning centres for children between the ages 8 to 12 years old as well as a specific SGBV programme for teenagers below the age of 18 in order to safely sensitize young people to the manifestations of abuse and how to respond to SGBV. To strengthen responses to SGBV, ICMC has set up two hotlines manned by a team of 18-20 women refugee volunteers, 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. Escort services to shelters and interpretation services are also provided through this network. The RWPC grassroots run network aims to prevent and reduce violence within their own community social systems, increase reporting of SGBV, and provide victims with culturally and

linguistically appropriate services. In turn, the RWPC takes pride in running an essential service in their own community.

Another programme in Malaysia turned to the refugee community to provide much needed support for its HIV positive members. When UNHCR realized that the adherence to HIV treatment protocols was far lower amongst the refugee community than the host country patients (30% versus 70% adherence), UNHCR recognized that this was the result of a poor understanding of the disease itself and treatment requirements. In response, UNHCR identified doctors and nurses and other health care professionals in the refugee community and trained them to provide individual patient support to HIV positive refugees on anti-retroviral therapy (ART) regimens. Malaysian doctors who are administering the ART can contact the health worker when getting in touch with the patient is impossible for language or other reasons. Besides providing knowledge and support, the trained health workers also help identify refugees and asylum seekers who may need further medical attention or extra support, whether it be in terms of short term financial assistance, nutritional supplements, or family planning methods. This HIV Support Programme is another example of how refugees can manage vulnerability within their own communities.

In conclusion, community based protection, especially when it addresses the most vulnerable people in the community, requires a sustained investment since it would be irresponsible to withdraw services once this set of community members starts using them. Thus, the example from Indonesia is indeed a good practice since it links unaccompanied minors and sexual gender based violence survivors to the Government's shelters through a collaborative advocacy approach that not only engendered sympathy from the Government but also repaid it with supporting the provincial institutions with capacity building. Maximizing the use of the host country government's networks for child protection and sexually gender based violence, including domestic violence is a good entry point for services to urban refugees as well as a good platform for collaborative advocacy platforms that include NGOs, civil society, and other UN agencies, particularly UNICEF, all of whom can provide expertise or other forms of support to the government officials and service providers at many levels. Relationship building with the Government can also extend to inviting them to participate in UNHCR and partners activities including Participatory Assessments, and the development of Standard Operating Procedures. The same is true for building networks of providers in the refugee communities. Keeping refugee outreach workers motivated is crucial and depends by and large on a genuine sense of responsibility and ownership among all the members for the programmes they run.

COMMUNITY BASED PROTECTION – Expanding and exchanging refugee resources

- 1. Well organized, small investments in refugee led initiatives can contribute to strategic goals, yet listening to the community and keeping sight of institutional goals needs to be relentless.*
- 2. Capacity building can turn into capacity exchange with the host community in some circumstances.*

UNHCR Malaysia's Social Protection Fund (SPF) was established as a way to provide financial capital specifically to address the general needs of the community by funding development projects generated by the community itself. The SPF programme provides grants of up to 4,000 USD to these community-based refugee groups to implement projects that range from income-generation projects, to skills training (computer, tailoring, handicraft, English, etc.), to community services (day care centres, recreation activities, and peaceful coexistence programmes). Through a pilot in 2014, individual women were also provided with business grants of up to 1,000 USD. A Steering Committee of UNHCR staff reviews all project applications and those for additional funding of existing projects. About 70-90 projects have been implemented each year since 2009.

Although the grants addressed a wide variety of community development activities, a 2014 evaluation commissioned by UNHCR Malaysia found that SPF's financial and operational scale did not exactly match its mandate and its interventions were mostly micro-level activity-based and lacked a strategic and transformative intervention. As a result, UNHCR Malaysia will expand SPF's mandate to conform to an overarching framework of livelihood creation that promotes self-reliance.

In another community development initiative in Malaysia, ICMC funds activities designed to prevent GBV or to improve service response to GBV survivors in refugee communities. For example, ICMC has funded livelihoods project for GBV survivors, a support centre for Rohingya women and other projects. To date, the biggest challenge to the opening of the centres was obtaining refugee buy-in from the community's male leadership structure. In response to this challenge, ICMC opened a smaller centre in a smaller municipality. The centre in the larger city was later welcomed by the refugee leadership.

The next example tells the tale of how refugees provided services to the host community in a time of crisis. In the wake of the "triple disaster" in Japan, the refugees in northern Kanto, felt forgotten and isolated because of a lack of information they received in its aftermath. Many foreigners were evacuated from Japan, but refugees had no option of leaving. In response to this situation, the Japanese Association for Refugees (JAR) provided multi-language information on the disaster response along with preparedness training. An outcome of the JAR activity is that the refugees pointed out that the disaster reminded many of them of their own experiences in their home countries and declared that they could contribute effectively to the triple disaster's relief work, and they did. Refugee groups not only participated in

the municipally organized clean-up activities, they also cooked meals for Japanese clean-up crews. JAR oriented the media toward these activities and the resultant media coverage was helpful in not only portraying refugees in a positive, productive light but also in creating a connection between the exile of refugees with the displacement that many disaster-affected Japanese were enduring.

Contributing to relief and disaster preparedness efforts also helped refugees to start to see themselves as a part of the Japanese community. Since natural disasters are frequent and severe in Japan, preparedness programmes funded by the city, prefectural and national government bodies continue for refugees and Japanese citizens alike. In parallel, JAR has also continued to work with refugee community leaders in order to enable them to be the community point person for the city officials working on disaster preparedness in Japan.

The examples from Japan and Malaysia describe capacity exchanges. Through small, financial investments in the refugee communities in Malaysia, they were able to expand their social and livelihood activities. The expansion of social and economic opportunities helped to stabilize life within these communities by augmenting financial and social capital. The disaster relief and preparedness training for refugees in Japan provided an opportunity for recognition and enhanced integration for that community. Ideally, investing in refugee community capacity will lead to ways for refugee communities to bridge with and contribute to the host community.

ACCESSING NATIONAL HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS – Enrolling refugees in national insurance systems as a form of social protection

- 1. Access to health insurance can protect refugees and access to ongoing, national health insurance schemes is usually the preferred option.*
- 2. Financial, legal, administrative and social factors have to be assessed in the inclusion into insurance schemes.*
- 3. Providing access to health insurance is not the same as promoting health insurance schemes.*

Social protection is defined as public policy, and its related actions, that is designed to address income poverty, and its associated economic shocks, as well as the resultant social vulnerability and exclusion. Increasing access to services such as health, education and nutrition is a form of social protection that can help refugees and asylum seekers avoid further vulnerability due to adverse economic shocks and deeper poverty. The following examples show how three different countries enrolled refugees in health insurance schemes to promote social protection and mitigate vulnerability.

UNHCR Thailand and the Bangkok based NGO, Catholic Office of Emergency Relief and Refugees (COERR), have negotiated persistently with the Government of Thailand to include refugees in an ongoing health insurance programme for migrant workers from Myanmar, Laos and Cambodia. Registered migrants pay 87USD per year for the health insurance coverage. Successive negotiations with directors of public hospitals on the extension of the health insurance scheme to include refugees and asylum seekers resulted in the enrolment of 295 refugees in Thailand's health insurance scheme at two public hospitals. However, refugees' enrolment in the Thai health insurance scheme has been suspended as of 4 July 2014 due to the current political situation.

In 2012, the UNHCR Office in Kuala Lumpur hired a consultant to review the costs and options for providing health insurance coverage to the refugee community. Although the Ministry of Health in Malaysia provides a 50% discount on the "foreigner rate" to refugees for secondary care, it is still unaffordable for them. Secondary care is the care provided by medical specialists and other health professionals who generally do not have first contact with patients, for example, cardiologists, urologists and dermatologists. In a country where many refugees face risks of industrial or traffic accidents, or a prevalence of conditions such as hypertension and diabetes, secondary care is important. The consultant reviewed the many medical claims that UNHCR Kuala Lumpur has covered in the past and what was feasible for secondary care insurance and compliant within Malaysian law.

UNHCR Kuala Lumpur settled on a scheme (REMEDI, Refugee Medical Insurance) that provides such coverage at the rate of 38-43 USD per annum, with a ceiling coverage of 3,125-3,750 USD depending on the package purchased. They learned invaluable lessons along the way: refugees may need coaching on how insurance works and why it is a good investment; the

Government needs to be engaged consistently and consulted on how administrative issues will be solved including whether or not a bank guarantee is required; contracting a private health insurance company requires compliance with UNHCR's internal procurement and legal processes as well as coordination with the agency's health experts; and, insurance carriers are for-profit businesses.

Similarly, UNHCR Iran has worked over the years with the Ministry of Interior's Bureau for Aliens and Foreign Immigrants Affairs (BAFIA) and private insurance companies to provide secondary care health insurance services to 220,200 vulnerable refugees, including up to 2,000 refugees who suffer from the following five diseases: hemophilia, thalassemia, renal failure, cancer and multiple sclerosis. (The Government of Iran, with the support of UNHCR, has been able to address the most urgent and critical needs of refugees through the provision of primary preventive and curative health care). In 2013, the Ministry of Health publicly announced that they wanted refugees to be part of a national scheme. The current Health Insurance Scheme (HISE) began on 16 September 2013 and runs through 31 December 2014. The negotiation for the 2015 insurance scheme is currently underway, and hopes to include all refugees in Iran, by requiring a mandatory contribution from all of them to ensure cheaper and more widely enjoyed coverage.

Providing access to health insurance, especially nationally managed plans, is an effective social protection tool when refugee communities are well informed and financial and health care coverage decisions are managed carefully. In many cases, UNHCR offices are asked to underwrite the costs of the health insurance coverage in order to enable this access. Ideally negotiations with government ministries, insurance companies, hospitals and other health care providers, and humanitarian actors will include refugee leaders in order to ascertain the most viable and affordable levels of coverage. Of course, health care access of the host country population also needs to be taken into account in measuring the effective level of insurance.

ACCESSING NATIONAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS – Finding access for children and youth wherever possible

- 1. Creating access to national education systems for refugee children requires strategic, multi-party advocacy platforms.*
- 2. Linking access to pre-existing child protection and education programmes can be effective.*
- 3. Access to national systems often requires UNHCR and other donors to invest in the capacity of the systems.*
- 4. Access is not the only issue for refugee children; acculturation and curriculum bridging also need to be addressed.*

Refugee children in Malaysia do not have access to government schools. Thus refugee children attend private schools or those run by NGOs. The Tzu Chi Foundation is currently running five schools for 549 refugee children from the Rohingya community. Due to cross-cultural sensitivities, the establishment and staffing of these schools have entailed intensive negotiations and information sessions with refugee parents and a significant investment in teacher training. To promote parental engagement, Tzu Chi assisted parents in establishing their own school committees and has regularly held parent-teacher meetings as well as monthly teacher meetings to address any pressing needs. Despite the cultural issues that continue to present challenges in running the schools - a high level of absenteeism on Fridays, a high drop-out rate of adolescent girls – and other issues that destabilize attendance such as families moving frequently, the Tzu Chi foundation is providing a basic curriculum that includes English language courses and computer classes.

Thailand is another country where refugee children did not have access to state run school until very recently when a small number were included under a programme that was set up for migrants. The “Education for All” campaign, which was supported by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), was adopted in Thailand in 1990. The Thai Ministry of Education recognized the right to education for all children of migrant workers, displaced persons and other illegal migrants, regardless of their nationality or status and the Government of Thailand accordingly established the legal and policy frameworks to integrate them into the national education system. UNHCR Thailand and COERR negotiated with the Government to extend the educational access for migrant children to refugees and asylum seekers. As a result, the Ministry of Education accredited 51 schools in 2014. Thus, 343 refugee and asylum seeker children aged 6-17 years have newfound access to the national Thai education system.

The scope of inclusion is wider in Iran. In Iran, UNHCR’s strategic approach with the Ministry of Education and the Bureau for Aliens and Foreign Immigrants Affairs (BAFIA) has led to more favourable conditions for refugee children. In the 2012-2013 school year, seven thousand refugee children in the settlements were exempted from school fees. In 2014, the government further reported that 330,000 foreign children are attending primary and secondary schools, at similar rates and conditions as for Iranian children. In turn, UNHCR Iran contributes to the government’s efforts by supporting the

construction of schools in areas with large concentrations of refugees. UNHCR Iran also provides support to vulnerable populations with school-related materials, e.g. uniforms or school kits. UNHCR Iran is currently advocating with UNICEF and other agencies for the inclusion of Afghan asylum seeker children who are not registered to be enrolled in national schools. Accessing tertiary education is more complicated for refugee youth yet they are attending colleges in Iran in significant numbers.

However, access does not always mean that children have integrated into the schools. In Japan, refugees have access to basic education practically for free of charge in the public school systems. While there are many refugee students performing well in the studies, there are majority of others who are not doing well for various reasons. Some have problems following the class due to language barriers, and others have problems due to lack of support from their parents and family members. In order to support their studies, a group of university student volunteers, initially organized by UNHCR Tokyo, provide weekly study support sessions free of charge targeting refugee children. Most of the refugee students reported that they are performing in the classes considerably better as a result of the tutoring.

LIVELIHOODS – Shaping access to work through new partnerships and focused training of refugees

- 1. Sustainable employment depends on more than just technical skills, physical access to the workplace, language and cross-cultural work-issues all need to be invested in.*
- 2. Job placement services for refugees need to include sensitization training for both refugees and future employers.*
- 3. Entrepreneur training can be effective if it is linked to an accessible funding stream and coaching is extended beyond the initial training.*
- 4. Access to work should be examined through many lenses including gender and job profiles.*
- 5. Continuous dialogue with national and municipal authorities is key for expanding access.*

Four livelihoods programmes describing how UNHCR and partners connected with the private sector to facilitate employment for refugees in the Philippines, Japan and Cambodia were shared during the workshop. An example from Iran presenting the expansion of work permits was also shared. All of these presentations focused on expanding access to work, not the right to work. Nevertheless, government agencies were involved in the negotiation of the programmes.

After many consultations with the businesses in the area, UNHCR Philippines and its partner, Community and Family Services International (CFSI), arranged for refugees and asylum seekers to have access to employment in the Freeport Area of Bataan. This is a region of the country that has independent regulatory functions, a “free-trade zone”. The agreements allow for residency and other amenities in addition to access to employment. These arrangements were coordinated with the national and local authorities and with the regulatory agency of the Authority of Freeport Area of Bataan (AFAB). The programme is slowly expanding but since 2010 has only served 16 refugees, who are working with two companies. UNHCR and CFSI are currently building relationships with other companies in AFAB to employ more refugees. The recruitment agency that places refugees was created in collaboration with UNHCR; they also hire Filipino nationals, other nationals and refugees interested in benefiting from this arrangement.

JAR also started a job placement service for refugees, and their programme also includes job counseling, interview coaching and on-the-job training. Through their “New Employment Programme”, JAR calls on companies to encourage them to hire refugees, and provides an orientation on refugee issues for the company as well. In turn, they offer refugees socio-cultural preparation for employment, Japanese lessons, company tours and on-the-job training. The programme is successful thanks to its two-fold outreach and orientation, which are aimed at both refugees and employers. Needs and expectations are assessed and matched, but are also addressed through counselling and orientation programs. The programme helps to manage refugee expectations, acculturate them to the Japanese job market, and assure employers that refugees are fully equipped to enter the Japanese

workplace. As a result, employers tell other employer friends about the programme, so employer engagement is growing.

UNHCR Japan set up a programme for internships in the private sector for refugee students. In partnership with three universities, UNHCR started the “Refugee Higher Education Programme” to provide scholarships for up to six refugees annually to allow them to attend university in Japan. The programme is not just for recent graduates from secondary school, but also for returning students. It includes refugees who had to give up their studies prematurely or who graduated from a university in their country of origin but whose qualifications are not recognized by Japanese authorities. By partnering with private companies such as UNIQLO, refugee students and recent graduates in the programme can also engage in internships, which ultimately improve their employability.

UNHCR Cambodia, through its partner organization, HAGAR, has also tried to expand access to employment through their “Economic Empowerment Programme”. Like JAR in Japan, they are using vocational training and job placement services, and they offer specialized training for small business entrepreneurs who want to be self-employed. By tracking the programme graduates, an interesting discovery was made: while several refugees followed one or more vocational trainings, none were able to remain employed over a long period of time. The reasons for this attrition rate were the following: perceived racism at work; the deteriorating mental state of some refugees; and their dependence on monthly financial assistance.

Thus it was determined that the programme was more effective in the training of small business entrepreneurs via the Community Based Enterprise Development (C-BED) programme. Through C-BED, several refugees were assisted in creating a business plan to either set up or improve their businesses. In order to access startup funds for small businesses, UNHCR and HAGAR approached micro-finance institutions to secure loans. Microfinance institutions provide an alternative to banks who require government issued documentation and income guarantees that most urban refugees cannot provide. One micro-finance institution, Maxima, linked to crowd-funder Kiva.org, agreed to give loans to refugees. UNHCR and HAGAR work together to draft business plans and repayment schedules for each refugee that is accepted by Maxima.

In another form of access, to employment, the Government of Iran authorized the issuance of 270,000 temporary work permits to refugees. In 2012, partly as a result of UNHCR’s advocacy, the Government authorized refugee women heads of household to apply for and obtain these temporary work permits; and, in 2014, the number of jobs in which refugees are authorized to work increased from 51 to 87. All of this has been accomplished in the face of concerns that entrenched livelihoods in Iran would prevent refugees from returning home.

In conclusion, the livelihoods presentations explored what supports are needed for some refugee communities in order to access sustainable

employment. The solutions involve much more than the “right to work”. Access to the “right work” proves to be just as important. Dedicated negotiations amongst local governments, including their licensing and regulatory entities, and private sector partners, including recruitment agencies, underpin all successful programmes. Of equal importance is a pragmatic and measured assessment of the hard skills (academic degrees, technical skills, languages) in refugee communities and what soft skills need to be introduced to make refugee talents more marketable.

ANNEX 1
The Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand Agenda

Tuesday 2 December	
09:00-09:30	Welcome, Agenda & Practical Info <i>Co-Facilitators</i>
09:30-10:30	Participant Introductions
10:30-11:15	<u>Host Panel</u> 1. Bureau of Population, Refugees & Migration - Palden Schmidt (Nepal) 2. Asia Pacific Refugee Rights Network - Anoop Sukurman 3. UNHCR Regional Office - Kazutoshi Nagasaka
11:15-11:30	<i>COFFEE BREAK</i>
11:30-12:15	<u>Keynote Address</u> Steven Corliss <i>Director of the Division of Programme Support & Management (DPSM), UNHCR Geneva</i>
12:15-13:30	<i>LUNCH</i>
13:30-14:30	<u>Partnerships Panel</u> 1. John Murray OSA (THAILAND, Caritas) - BASRAN 2. Dirk Hebecker (KOREA, UNHCR) - Building NGO & Government Relations
14:30-15:00	<u>UNHCR's Urban Refugee Policy & Guidance</u> <i>MaryBeth Morand, UNHCR Geneva</i>
15:00-15:30	<i>COFFEE BREAK</i>
15:30-17:00	<u>Expanding Protection Space Panel</u> 1. Ron Lo (HONG KONG, UNHCR) - Unified Screening Mechanism 2. Francis Teoh (CHINA, UNHCR) - Email Communication System 3. Sharonne Broadhead (THAILAND, Asylum Access) - Asylum Seeker Training Programme
17:00-17:30	Learning Summary Preparation for Next Day

Wednesday 3 December	
09:00-09:30	Day 2 Network Exercise
09:30-09:45	Facilitator's Round-Up
09:45-11:00	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Community Based Protection #1</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vinita Mehra (INDIA, UNHCR) & K.B. Linto (Don Bosco) - From Creche to Youth 2. Jeanette Zuefle (PAKISTAN, UNHCR) - Service Mapping & Awareness Raising 3. Annheli Aldhammar (IRAN, UNHCR) - Assistance, Networking and Outreach Programme
11:00-11:15	<i>COFFEE BREAK</i>
11:15-12:30	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Community Based Protection #2</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lindsey Atienza & Ermina Gallardo (PHILIPPINES, UNHCR) - National Universities Provide Legal Aid 2. Satoru Miyazawa (JAPAN, UNHCR) - Involving Municipalities in Protection 3. Krista Marie Senden (THAILAND, JRS) - Refugee-Led MHPSS
12:30-13:30	<i>LUNCH</i>
13:30-14:45	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Community Based Protection #3</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Madhav Belbase, Keith Jordan (INDONESIA, UNHCR) & Siti Fahrudita (CWS) - Shelter & Safe Houses for Detained Refugees and Minors 2. Jackie Loo (MALAYSIA, ICMC) - Shelter for GBV Survivors & Children 3. Susheela Balasundaram (MALAYSIA, UNHCR) - HIV Support Programme
14:45-15:15	<i>COFFEE BREAK</i>
15:15-16:45	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Community Based Protection #4</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Letchimi Doraisamy (MALAYSIA, UNHCR) - Social Protection Fund 2. Jackie Loo (MALAYSIA, ICMC) - Mini-Grants for CBP 3. Brian Barbour (JAPAN, JAR) - Disaster Preparedness & Response
16:45-17:30	Learning Summary Preparation for Next Day

Thursday 4 December	
09:00-09:30	Day 3 Network Exercise
09:30-09:45	Facilitator's Round-Up
09:45-11:00	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Accessing National Systems - Health</u> <i>Facilitated by Herve Isambert, UNHCR</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Juventino (Ben) Mendoza (THAILAND, COERR) - Health Schemes for Migrants and Refugees 2. Annheli Aldhammar (IRAN, UNHCR) - Health Care for Most Vulnerable 3. Susheela Balasundaram (MALAYSIA, UNHCR) - REMEDI, Refugee Medical Insurance
11:00-11:15	<i>COFFEE BREAK</i>
11:15-12:15	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Accessing National Systems - Education</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annheli Aldhammar (IRAN, UNHCR) - Making Schools Accessible to Refugee Children 2. Juventino (Ben) Mendoza (THAILAND, COERR) - Education for All 3. Danny Lee (MALAYSIA, Tzu Chi Foundation) - Education for Rohingya
12:15-13:15	<i>LUNCH</i>
13:15-14:45	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Livelihoods</u> <i>Facilitated by Gaela Roudy-Fraser, UNHCR</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nessie Cory Bolen (PHILIPPINES, CFSI) - Employment in a Free Trade Area 2. Brian Barbour (JAPAN, JAR) - Employment Programme & On-the-Job Training 3. Satoru Miyazawa (JAPAN, UNHCR) - Job Placement for Recent Graduates 4. Michel Huyghe (CAMBODIA, UNHCR) - Economic Empowerment Programme
14:45-15:15	<i>COFFEE BREAK</i>
15:15-16:00	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Investing in Protection Space & Promoting Self-Reliance</u> <i>Preeta Law, UNHCR Geneva</i></p>
16:00-16:45	Wrap-Up: Roundtables, After Workshop Assignments

ANNEX 2

The *Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees* Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand Participant List

I. UNHCR STAFF				
	Participant Name	Title	Country	Email
1	Viniti Mehra	Protection Associate	India	mehra@unhcr.org
2	Ipshita Sengupta	Policy Associate	India	sengupti@unhcr.org
3	Cecile Fradot	Senior Protection Officer	Nepal	fradot@unhcr.org
4	Yukiko Koyama	Durable Solutions Officer	Nepal	koyama@unhcr.org
5	Bhagi Maya Dhungel	Senior Community Services Associate	Nepal	dhungel@unhcr.org
6	Maria Ermina Valdeavilla-Gallardo	Protection Associate	Philippines	gallardo@unhcr.org
7	Lindsey Atienza	Protection Associate	Philippines	atienza@unhcr.org
8	Madhav Belbase	Associate Community Services Officer	Indonesia	belbase@unhcr.org
9	Keith Jordan	Associate RSD Officer	Indonesia	jordank@unhcr.org
10	Susheela Balasundaram	Associate Programme Officer (Health)	Malaysia	balasund@unhcr.org
11	Letchimi Doraisamy	Assistant Programme Officer	Malaysia	doraisam@unhcr.org
12	Francois Marrillet	Senior Programme Officer	Thailand, BO	marrille@unhcr.org
13	Katsunori Koike	Associate Protection Officer	Thailand, BO	koike@unhcr.org
14	Yodtad Panswad ("Ted")	Programme Associate	Thailand, BO	panswad@unhcr.org
15	Suda Virakananont	Community Services Associate	Thailand, BO	virakana@unhcr.org
16	Yoko Iwasa	Senior Regional Durable Solutions Officer	Thailand, RO	iwasa@unhcr.org
17	Michel Huyghe	Associate Protection Officer	Cambodia	huyghe@unhcr.org
18	Satoru Miyazawa	Protection Associate	Japan	miyazawa@unhcr.org

19	Jeanette Zuefle	Assistant Representative for Protection	Pakistan	zuefle@unhcr.org
20	Roza Minasyan	Associate Regional Community Services Officer	Kazakhstan	minasyan@unhcr.org
21	Annheli Aldhammar	Senior Field Officer	Iran	aldhamma@unhcr.org
22	Ron Lo	Associate Admin/Programme Officer	Hong Kong	lor@unhcr.org
23	Francis Teoh	Senior Protection Officer	China	teohf@unhcr.org
24	Dirk Hebecker	Representative	Korea	hebecker@unhcr.org

II. REGIONAL PARTNERS				
	Participant Name	Title	Organization	Email
1	Nessie Cory Bolen	Senior Counselor	Community and Family Services International (CFSI)	nbolen@cfsi.ph
2	Lee Mun Keat (Danny)	General Affairs Administrator	Tzu Chi Foundation	leejison@gmail.com
3	Brian Barbour	Director of External Relations	Japan Association for Refugees (JAR)	barbour@refugee.or.jp
4	Siti Fahradata	Deputy Programme Manager	Church World Service (CWS)	siti_fhradita@cwsindonesia.or.id
5	Jackie Loo	National Programme Manager	ICMC Malaysia	loo@icmc.net
6	K. B. Linto	Deputy Project Manager	Don Bosco	kblintos@yahoo.co.in

III. PARTNERS FROM THAILAND				
	Participant Name	Title	Organization	Email
1	John Murray, OSA	Director of NCCM	Caritas Thailand	fjyogi@yahoo.com.au
2	Juventino (Ben) Mendoza	Programme Director	Catholic Office for Emergency Relief and Refugees (COERR)	ben@coerr.org
3	Charatkorn Mankhatitham	General Manager	COERR	charatkorn@coerr.org

4	Aumphornpun Buavirat	Programme Manager	COERR	aumphornpun@brcthai.org
5	Krista Marie Senden	Psychosocial Counselor	Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS)	psychosocial.counselor@jrs.or.th
6	Sharonne Broadhead	Community Outreach Coordinator	Asylum Access Thailand (AAT)	sharonne.b@asylumaccess.org
7	Rana Refahi	Legal Director	AAT	rana.refahi@asylumaccess.org
8	Julia Mayerhofer	Programme Manager	Asia Pacific Refugee Rights Network (APRRN)	julia@aprrn.info
9	David Claussenius	Country Representative	American Refugee Committee (ARC)	davidc@ksc.th.com
10	Rebecca H. Vo	Regional Focal Point (Asia)	Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP)	asia@cashlearning.org
11	Dr. Jamie Munn	Regional Representative	ICVA	jamie.munn@icvanetwork.org

IV. BPRM COORDINATORS

	Participant Name	Title	Organization	Email
1	Anusha Seneviratne	Deputy Regional Refugee Coordinator	BPRM	SeneviraAE@state.gov
2	Palden A. Schmidt	Deputy Regional Refugee Coordinator	BPRM	SchmidtPA@state.gov

V. FACILITATORS AND COORDINATORS

	Participant Name	Title	Organization	Email
1	Preeta Law	Senior Protection Coordinator, Pillar II - Protection Operational Support	UNHCR	law@unhcr.org
2	Anoop Sukumaran	Executive Director	APRNN	anoop@aprrn.info
3	MaryBeth Morand	Senior Policy & Evaluation Officer	UNHCR	morand@unhcr.org
4	Claudia Cruz Leo	Research Assistant	UNHCR	cruzleo@unhcr.org
5	Steven Corliss	Director, DPSM	UNHCR	corliss@unhcr.org
6	Hervé Isambert	Senior Regional Public Health & HIV Coordinator	UNHCR	isambert@unhcr.org

7	Gaela Roudy-Fraser	Senior Livelihoods Officer	UNHCR	roudyfra@unhcr.org
8	Kazutoshi Nagasaka	Assistant Regional Representative	Thailand, RO	nagasak@unhcr.org

ANNEX 3

The *Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees* Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand Action Plans

Summary

In an effort to promote participant engagement after the *Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees* Workshop for the Asia region that took place in Bangkok, Thailand from 2 to 4 December 2014, participants were asked to develop an “Action Plan” stating at least one specific activity they plan to implement to improve urban protection and programming in their duty stations.

The following pages list the Action Plans received from the participants, organized by country and organization, based on an Action Plan template provided (see below).

Urban Programming Action Plan

Participant Name:

Organization Name:

City:

What are you planning to do?	
How are you planning to do it?	
Who are you going to do it in partnership with?	
How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?	

Action Plans

China

UNHCR Beijing

1. What are you planning to do?

Provide gift cards to vulnerable individuals for winterization program.

2. How are you planning to do it?

- A report will be generated from the ProGres database of all refugees and extremely vulnerable asylum seekers.
- A Refugee Assistance Review Committee (RARC) comprising of colleagues from Programme, Protection and Community Services will discuss and assess the needs of the individuals and provide a recommendation.
- Using the email communication tool, the Office will be in contact with vulnerable refugees to arrange for meetings in the respective cities (or closest to) where they live.
- A field mission will be undertaken to meet, verify, and explain how and where to use the gift card as well as for the distribution of the gift cards to refugees.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

As UNHCR is not allowed to have any implementing partners in China, the project is a direct implementation but the office will work closely with self-selected refugee community leaders or 'volunteers' from some religious affiliates or 'friends of UNHCR' in the various cities across China.

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

Monitoring of the one-time gift card will be done through the email communication system, to facilitate any follow-up or problems encountered.

There may likely be vulnerable refugees that may have been omitted from the process and whereby their requests can be assessed and deliberated through the RARC for any follow up.

India

Don Bosco, New Delhi

Activity #1

1. Objective

To strengthen community mobilisation and promote peaceful co-existence with local communities in a creative manner by showcasing the cultural values of persons of concern for the benefit of the host community as well.

2. Target

We plan to prepare a Cooking Recipe Book in the local language with a brief history of the area from where particular food items come from. The history would include the present political and social situation of the area.

3. Target Date

30 May 2015

4. Progress

BOSCO's youth clubs have begun the process of collecting recipes and preparing the write-up for the Recipe Book.

Activity #2

1. Objective

To enhance the protection of children by fostering a safe learning environment.

2. Target

Develop peer education and learning programmes for children through the "Finding My Friend Campaign" in the government school.

3. Target Date

1 April 2015

4. Progress

At the moment the children are preparing for their examinations. However, the concept is being shared with the school principals and teachers.

1. What are you planning to do?

A. Immediate plans

- 1) Mapping of protection services providers including civil society, NGOs and intergovernmental agencies and other groups active in Jakarta, Makassar, Medan and other key urban areas in establishing a network toward more effective delivery of protection services to urban refugees.
- 2) Undertaking a mapping project for unaccompanied minors (UAMs) to identify their specific needs, particularly those of homeless younger minors, which will then inform planning for specific projects and interventions with the authorities and partners.
- 3) Identifying of National Celebrity toward eventual Goodwill Ambassador to raise profile of refugees and to help in our advocacy work.

B. Medium term plans

- 1) Establishing Youth Centre(s) where various activities, both educational (including skill-based training, such as language or computer) and recreational (such as sports and cultural), are provided to both refugees and host community youths.
- 2) Establishing, in coordination with government counterparts, a system by which urban refugees are included in national health insurance schemes, appealing to the government to include refugees in national health security policy.
- 3) Advocating for limited local integration for refugees married to Indonesians.

C. Longer term plans

- 1) Promoting and fostering self-reliance and sustainable Livelihoods among persons of concern (PoCs).
 - a. Advocacy with government to seek necessary permission for urban refugees to engage in enterprise schemes.
 - b. Seek out joint entrepreneurship models to maximize sympathy and support among host communities (small scale partnerships between urban refugees + local economically active citizens) - establishing joint cottage industry in making Afghan bread (which are otherwise imported from Australia or Malaysia).

2. How are you planning to do it?

- 1) Create a matrix on mapping of protection service providers has been drafted and shared with colleagues to complete with details of actors known to them. Once the details of partner activities are compiled, the office will systematically approach them to discuss the possibility of their engagement in refugee protection and assistance and setting up a forum, to result in regular subsequent meetings.
- 2) A project proposal will be prepared after mapping skills and resources within refugee community. The office will discuss the proposal with the authorities to advocate for the liberalization of the existing policy against refugees' right to work or engage in any income-generating activities. A pilot project will be established upon government's approval which involves refugees and local youths.
- 3) We want to focus on only a few (one or two) projects initially and then build on their success.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

- a) Government, UN Agencies
- b) NGOs, civil society organizations
- c) Faith-based organizations
- d) Refugee community leaders
- e) Refugees and local youth

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

- 1) The aim is to establish multi-sectoral groups to empower urban refugee communities by becoming self-reliant and also provide various types of assistance to urban refugees and increase the harmonious relations between the refugee and host communities. Regular coordination meetings will be organized to monitor the activities.
- 2) UNHCR and partners involved will organize meetings and also request for the regular updates and reports on the activities in addition to monitoring visits.

Impact assessment will be done through the assessment and collection of qualitative and quantitative data and other information, such as through:

- a) Network of actors expand to new partners hitherto unidentified
- b) Surveys among partners in network to gauge impact among partners
- a) Numbers of PoCs and local people engaged in the project
- c) Participatory assessments with beneficiaries to assess impact among communities of urban refugees

Church World Service (CWS), Jakarta

1. What are you planning to do?

CWS Indonesia plans to replicate JRS Thailand's Psychosocial Program: *Refugee Led Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS)* where a Psychosocial Officer trains refugee on psychosocial and mental health so they can be empowered and give support to their compatriots within their community in their own language and in accordance with their culture and tradition.

2. How are you planning to do it?

- CWS will train 20 refugee representatives from different nationalities and 4 unaccompanied minor (UAM) representatives on MHPSS.
- The training consists of psycho-education, psychosocial support and empowerment that will raise awareness of problems like trauma, mourning, stress and acculturation and teach refugees and asylum seekers to cope with these problems and rediscover their strength.
- The trained refugees are then expected to have confidence to support their community who have language barriers in accessing the professional psychologist or recommend cases that need further psychological treatment.

Schedule:

- Understanding Psychosocial and Mental Health Issues (Psychology 101, Mental Health 101, stress, trauma, etc.): March 2015
- Self-Care and Care for Survivors of Violence (psychological first aid, positive coping mechanism, etc.): April 2015
- Basic Counselling: May 2015
- Review training and community based intervention: June 2015

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

CWS plans to counsel JRS Thailand and UNHCR Jakarta Community Services and professional psychologists.

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

We will monitor the impact periodically by consulting the refugee and UAM representatives on the management of psychosocial problems within their communities and form a psychosocial report log.

Japan

UNHCR Tokyo

1. What are you planning to do?

As a first step, the Branch Office in Tokyo (BOT) Protection Unit is going to have a discussion session on 10 December on the Bangkok workshop. A more technical session involving protection staff working on community outreach is scheduled on 12 December.

BOT organizes regular monthly meetings with all IPs in Japan. The plan is to have a special session on urban refugees at the next session in January 2015.

BOT plans to have special sessions with refugee representation groups, including the group of refugees that are benefitting from the Refugee Higher Education Program (RHEP). The meeting with RHEP refugees is scheduled in March 2015.

2. How are you planning to do it?

The discussion sessions will take a form of briefing/free discussion, but the special session involving IPs will take more of a presentation style.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

We will partner with implementing partners (IPs) first, and then with a refugee representation group.

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

IPs will monitor through SPMR monitoring visits, and refugee representation groups will do so through meetings.

Japan Association for Refugees (JAR), Tokyo

1. What are you planning to do?

A comprehensive and detailed referrals guide will be created documenting each service provider, their services, points of contact, and how to make a referral to their organization.

2. How are you planning to do it?

In assessing the collaboration currently taking place, the project will seek to catalogue the range of stakeholders involved in refugee protection and assistance, factors that promote and hinder coordination, and how best to ensure the right actors are engaged at the right time in the right way to respond to refugee needs. There will be an agreed format and each stakeholder will contribute to produce a referrals guide, by setting out exactly

how they would like referrals to be made to their offices and with what considerations.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

The first step of the exercise will be to identify all relevant stakeholders providing services to refugees including: governmental and non-governmental stakeholders, CBOs, NGOs, lawyers, hospitals, and other relevant stakeholders. We hope that this process will also improve dialogue between these stakeholders and address any fragmented service delivery, incomplete information and misinformation, and better address actual refugee needs and priorities.

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

A completed referrals guide itself will be produced. All relevant stakeholders will track referrals by asking, “How did you hear about us?” There will be an annual review by the Forum for Refugees Japan (FRJ) as the core coordination mechanism documenting usefulness, challenges, gaps, and ongoing barriers for refugee clients.

1. What are you planning to do?

- Continue advocacy for close collaboration between the government (including local/municipal authorities) and civil society actors
- Provide support to livelihoods solutions for refugees and asylum-seekers

2. How are you planning to do it?

- 1) Offer support (financially and through capacity-building) to UNHCR's partner NGO pNan; promoting the positive, constructive work by NGOs (not just pNan) in support of refugees and asylum-seekers vis-à-vis the government to eliminate prejudice and the hostility or aversion by government officials towards NGOs and for the government to realize that they can capitalize and utilize NGOs informally and formally for a better implementation of the Refugee Act.
- 2) Finalize pNan's livelihoods research and survey; then lead technical meetings and brainstorming sessions, interact with refugees and asylum-seekers to identify core areas of possible intervention, discuss with government, local and municipal authorities, potential employers, and employment agencies to stimulate creation of small businesses.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

- NGOs (many but especially UNHCR's implementing partner since 2014, pNan)
- Government: Ministry of Justice, Refugee Division
- Local and municipal authorities

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

Both 1 and 2 are at the core of UNHCR's partnership agreement with pNAN and will be monitored on a regular basis to evaluate progress/shortcomings. In addition, the two issues will figure prominently in the Representative's day-to-day work with the Protection Unit to review progress, problems, etc., and to see how the team can move forward.

Malaysia

UNHCR Kuala Lumpur

1. What are you planning to do?

Create livelihood opportunities for refugee artisans through cooperation with the host community as both will have economic gain.
Draft a concept paper that will give more specific information.

2. How are you planning to do it?

Identify individuals and entities involved in crafts business while identifying craftsmen among refugees to link them up.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

UNHCR Kuala Lumpur is planning to work with NAWEM (the National Association of Women Entrepreneurs Malaysia). Since they are a group of women involved in various businesses in Malaysia, they have the network and capability to assist.

We will also target refugee organizations involved in crafts production.

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

Objective:

- (i) Create job opportunities
- (ii) Enhance quality of the product in line with market needs

Monitoring will be done through regular dialogue and visits to check on the processes and work progress. The impact will be measured based on the number of refugee artisans that get jobs in a related field.

International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC), Kuala Lumpur

1. What are you planning to do?

Share the URLP link with all colleagues in Malaysia and Geneva.

2. How are you planning to do it?

I plan to mandate all national staff to complete the URLP program.
I plan to share the link with ICMC HQ and encourage other field offices to complete the programme.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

I also plan to share with ICMC's implementing partners (NGOs) who are interested in learning more about urban refugees' needs and challenges. I

may liaise with managers and directors of each implementing partners in order to achieve this.

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

It is certainly easier to monitor if my staff completed the URLP program. As for partners, I will follow up with them via emails and phone calls to get their feedback on this programme.

1. What are you planning to do?

Strengthening strategic planning for livelihoods.

2. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

- Mapping out informal job market through available information with UN agencies, NGOs and INGOs and CBOs.
- Provide skill development trainings (such as web- designing, advance cooking /baking, advance tailoring, electrician) and language classes (English and Nepali) to refugees to facilitate their access to the labour market and increase their capacity to find job opportunities.
- Analysis of existing database (ProGres) of refugees in order to identify previously engaged occupation in COO and existing skills gained in COA.
- -Linkage with faith based organisations (Muslim and Christian) to see possibility of available services for refugees including cash grant provision, education services and other activities.
- Provide leadership and empowerment training to youth in order to mobilise them as change maker of communities and address issues related to protection and identifying possible livelihood options.
- Continue to provide information to refugees on graduation approach and mobilise them to reduce dependency on UNHCR. Organise structural dialogue with refugees in order to increase their understanding of the office policy on gradual reduction of SA.
- Utilise regional expertise (from India) in order to share good practices and seek guidance on best to carry out livelihood opportunities in Nepal.

3. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

The Government of Nepal (GoN) considers urban refugees illegal migrants and due to this context there is less possibility to make formal partnership with NGOs and INGOs to run activities on livelihoods (GoN is not granting the required permit from the Social Welfare Council). However, UNHCR Nepal will continue its efforts to link up with UN agencies and possible NGOs/INGOs/CBOs/faith based organisations in order to work on available livelihood options.

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

Visit local institutes and get updates on skill development trainings and language training and how effectively refugees are involved and identify possible internship provisions from each local institute.

The Philippines

UNHCR Manila

Activity #1

1. What are you planning to do?

Inclusion of the Urban Refugee Learning Programme in the training program for the Philippine Government, in particular, the Department of Justice - Refugees and Stateless Persons Protection Unit (DOJ-RSPPU) and UNHCR's implementing partner, Community and Family Services International (CFSI).

2. How are you planning to do it?

This will have to be discussed during the Strategic Planning with DOJ and Case Management Meeting with CFSI.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

This will have to be in partnership with the DOJ-RSPPU and CFSI.

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

- This will have to be initiated by UNHCR.
- Inclusion of the feedback mechanism in the training module.
- Implementation of this training will have to be conducted in the event of new membership of the DOJ-RSPP or newly hired CFSI social worker.

Activity #2

1. What are you planning to do?

Establishing links with the private sector in order to increase employment opportunities for the asylum seekers and Convention refugees in the Philippines.

2. How are you planning to do it?

UNHCR will have to conduct advocacy meetings with the private sector, initially with the Business Processing Outsourcing companies in the Philippines.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

This will have to be initiated in partnership with the Philippine Government Department of Justice - Refugees and Stateless Persons Protection Unit and the implementing partner of UNHCR, Community and Family Services International (CFSI).

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

The monitoring will be through the periodic case management meetings with the CFSI and DOJ.

Thailand

UNHCR BO Thailand

1. What are you planning to do?

Start community based approach to tackle SGBV related issues. Due to the dramatic increase in the number of asylum seekers, the past strategies to SGBV related issues, including random training to everyone and limited focus group discussion to survivors, no longer makes sense. It is imperative that we start to engage with refugee communities to tackle the issue of SGBV in Bangkok.

2. How are you planning to do it?

Identify community leaders and designate SGBV focal persons in each community in the urban setting. Familiarize them with SGBV through monthly training and feedback sessions and build capacity of each community to tackle the issue by itself.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

- IPs and OPs: JRS, AAT, BPSOS and BRC
- Refugees: community leaders and SGBV focal persons

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

The issue now is underreporting; not many cases are reported while UNHCR and the civil society feel that SGBV, particularly DV, has been rampant. The impact of this activity can be, therefore, gauged against the number of reported cases at least for the initial year.

Asia Pacific Refugee Rights Network (APRRN)

1. What are you planning to do?

- National roundtables in Thailand, Indonesia and Nepal: These roundtables will be a multi-stakeholder engagement around key issues in relation to urban refugees.
- A pilot study on existing good practices in the Asia Pacific, focusing on practices by refugees, CBOs and NGOs as well as successful examples engaging with government and UNHCR.
- On-going support towards national networks and consortia focusing on urban refugees (Indonesia, Thailand, Pakistan and Nepal)

2. How are you planning to do it?

- APRRN will work closely with APRRN members, national NGO consortia and other relevant partners.
- The Thailand and Indonesian roundtables will be in February. The Nepal roundtable will be in early March.

- The pilot study report on good practices is being finalised and will be published in quarter 1 of 2015.
3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?
- For the roundtables, we are working closely with the National Human Rights Commissions, UNHCR and NGO partners.
 - The good practice study was done in collaboration with NGOs and APRRN members.
4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?
- Action plans will be drawn up for follow-up of the roundtables. Implementation will be monitored by APRRN comparing it to the goals set in the action plans.
 - The best practice report will contribute to the APRRN Vision on regional protection, the other aspects of the vision being identifying research and service gaps.

Asylum Access, Thailand

1. What are you planning to do?

Make a Tool Kit or “Do it Yourself” template on how to create your own Know Your Situation (KYS) trainings, for any country.

Include the following points:

- Information about the laws in the country, especially immigration law and laws that will pertain to urban refugees such as the right to work.
- Information on staying safe and reducing the risk of arrest (in non-signatory countries).
- Information on living in the area, how to find housing, use transport, access services such as schools and medical assistance.
- Information on how to best fit in with the local native culture that will help them in all facets of their lives from safety, to finding jobs, or living cheaply.
- Information on the RSD process with the UNHCR or government. Basic information about the process, what to expect and useful information that pertains to each nationality.

Finally, information on how to live to the fullest in a difficult situation, try to reduce stress, and avoid negativity such as rumours and scams.

2. How are you planning to do it?

Make a step by step Tool Kit that can be easily shared.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

We don't need to necessarily partner with other organizations to create this tool kit, but we can reach out and gather some more in-depth material on topics that are not our specialty, such as offering psychosocial services, direct assistance, and accessing healthcare and education in different contexts.

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

Following up on if other organizations adopt the KYS training into their programs and if they are finding through their participant evaluations if it is impacting the population they are serving.

Bangkok Asylum Seeker Refugee Assistance Network (BASRAN)

1. What are you planning to do?

Given the nature of this network as a free association among UNHCR, NGOs, faith based communities, independent schools and individuals actively helping urban refugees, experience has shown that BASRAN best works by allowing it to develop itself. Its life has been an evolution generated by the passion and life within the network. This is not a programme driven entity and there has been no great specific action planning along the way. To do so may even be counter-productive. So any action plan is best based on allowing the group to act for itself.

So what is the plan? It is the lack of a plan to apply. Rather the aim is to listen to the group and thus see how to help it best evolve in facilitating effective help offered to urban refugees.

The plan is to partake in further pro-active listening that aims to bring together the needs of the urban refugee population and the skills, resources and desires of those helping them.

2. How are you planning to do it?

BASRAN has a core leadership that facilitates the regular meetings and activities taken on by the whole group.

This leadership will actively engage a process for pro-active listening through

- participating at meetings in a purposeful way;
- discussing possible points noted with membership and raising them at meetings;
- facilitate action as judged possible and appropriate.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

The core leadership will act with members of BASRAN and with representative members of the refugee community.

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

Regular meetings of the leadership will consult membership. These meetings will include discussion and assessment around the life and activity of BASRAN.

BASRAN has shared focus groups and activities in supporting the refugee community in areas of education, health and livelihood. Their approach is inclusive with open membership of both refugee and BASRAN communities where all work together as equals. It is here that it can best be assessed if BASRAN is listening effectively as shown by its activities with the refugee community.

Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS), Thailand

1. What are you planning to do?

- There is a clear need for better coordination between NGOs and UNHCR who are treating refugees and asylum seekers who are struggling with mental health and psychosocial problems.
- Improved communication, idea sharing, and therapeutic planning for clients who are being seen for counselling or assessment by more than one agency will allow for improved treatment outcomes.
- In response to this need, JRS will call a bi-monthly clinical coordination meeting between psychologist, counsellors, and UNHCR staff will allow for better clinical coordination.

2. How are you planning to do it?

- The need has been identified since 2014, however scheduling between service providers has proved difficult. The NGO psychologists and counsellors need buy-in from their supervisors in order to prioritize these meetings.
- The first meeting was successfully called in February 2015 and involved supervisors along with mental health staff in order to identify the needs and goals of the meetings.
- JRS has taken a lead in creating the agenda, calling the next meetings, and ensuring these meetings happen.

3. Who are you going to do it in partnership with?

The initiative will include UNHCR's protection team, UNHCR psychologists, Bangkok Refugee Center Psychologists, and Jesuit Refugee Service Counsellors.

4. How will you monitor the activity and know if it had an impact?

Monitoring with empirical data would be challenging given that clients are being seen across several service providers. However, monitoring improved

well-being of clients and perceived coordination of services could show the group is having an impact.

Questions such as “do you feel like there is good communication between JRS counsellors and BRC psychologist for your medication?” could be asked of clients to assess if coordination has improved.

Participants Who Did Not Submit an Action Plan Due To Outstanding Circumstances

The following UNHCR office and organizations did not or were not able to submit Action Plans for the reasons enumerated below:

- The Peshawar Office had to focus their efforts on rebuilding relationships with the government and counteracting the negative perceptions of Afghan refugees in that province following the terrorist attack on an army school in Peshawar on 16 February 2014 during which 150 people died, including 132 children.
- The participant from the Regional Office in Almaty oversees the regional programmes and is not involved in the direct implementation of programmes. However, the participant was planning to take the learning from the workshop and share it during a regional protection and community services meeting in March where urban practices and plans of action would be discussed. The resulting action plans per office will be shared with UNHCR upon completion.

ANNEX 4

The *Building Communities of Practice for Urban Refugees* Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand Participant Feedback Summary

In an effort to learn from this first experience and improve on the subsequent regional workshops, participants from the Asia regional workshop were asked to evaluate their experience and give feedback on the workshop by answering the following two questions:

1. What do you think worked well?
2. What do you think could be improved?

Overall, the feedback from the Asia regional workshop was overwhelmingly positive.

There was a general consensus amongst the participants that what worked well was:

- The variety in participants, e.g. having UNHCR, BPRM, and NGOs present.
- The buy-in of senior level staff from HQ, namely the Director of the Division of Programme Support and Management (DPSM), Mr. Steven Corliss. *“Steve’s presence and engagement is invaluable.”*
- The opportunities to network and meet other practitioners from the region.
- The format of the workshop, e.g. panel presentations followed by question and answer sessions with plenary discussions, and the dual UNHCR and partner facilitation model. *“Excellent facilitation (and balanced).”*

Nonetheless, participants felt that the workshop could have also featured:

- A more varied format, not limited to panel discussions solely.
- More partners and private sector employers to give concrete feedback on livelihood ideas and initiatives. *“What about inviting employers? Expanding the partnership? Especially on livelihoods discussions.”*
- Other issues not mentioned during the workshop, e.g. xenophobia, and provide concrete good practice examples for those.
- The inclusion of refugees or refugee leaders. *“Would it have been possible to invite a few refugees to listen directly to their successes and challenges?”*
- A set of conclusions and recommendations agreed upon by the Bureau at HQ.
- More information on data assessment and gathering, e.g. the use of surveys, online and offline tools, quantitative and qualitative data.