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Abstract:

Over the last decade, two key trends on forced displacement policy and practice have been observed in the East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes Region (EHGLR): a growing interest in refugee inclusion and some signs of diminishing asylum space. The experiences of Uganda, Ethiopia and Rwanda set a good example for the former. The IGAD-led Nairobi Process highlights how regional blocks can support and promote initiatives like this. Diminishing asylum space is manifested in the practices of Kenya and Tanzania - two of the countries in the region with a long tradition of generous hospitality to refugees. Kenya’s threat to close the Dadaab refugee camp and Tanzania’s increasing push of Burundian refugees to return home are some of the related developments observed. Both countries cite the lack of adequate support from the international community to justify their actions. Other than these isolated incidents, countries in the region generally continue to uphold an exemplary asylum policy, with their borders remaining open to those seeking protection.
INTRODUCTION

This paper provides an overview of forced displacement trends, policy developments and operational responses of the last decade, 2010 – 2019 in the East and Horn of Africa and the Great Lakes Region (EHAGLR). The paper is made up of four sections. The first section discusses forced displacement trends and highlights some of the major pertinent policies and practices over the last decade. This is followed by a discussion of pre-Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) policies and practices that promote the inclusion of refugees as well as ongoing implementation of the Compact. The third section covers implementation of solutions in the last decade including alternatives to camps. The paper concludes by reflecting on future trends.

The paper is informed by expert interviews and analyses of literature and policy documents in the area. 19 key informants, representing a wide range of stakeholders, including representatives of refugees, host country governments, civil society organisations, regional inter-governmental organisations, international organisations and donors were interviewed.

This paper will form the Regional Bureau’s contribution to the ‘People Forced to Flee: History, Change and Challenge’ Report to be published in 2022 to commemorate the 70th anniversary of UNHCR’s mandate related to refugees, stateless people and internally displaced persons.

1. FORCED DISPLACEMENT TRENDS

Over the last decade, the number of the forcibly displaced, including refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) grew by more than three-fold in the East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes Region (EHGLR). Consisting of 11 countries, i.e., Burundi, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda, the Region hosted 1 million refugees and 3.6 million IDPs in 2010. A decade later, at the end of 2019, the Region is home to the majority of the refugees and IDPs in Sub-Saharan Africa, hosting 4.3 million of the 6.3 million refugees and 9.5 million of the 18.5 million IDPs in Sub-Saharan Africa.¹

At the end of 2019, Uganda hosted the highest number of refugees in the region and the continent i.e., 1.3 million. The Sudan, Ethiopia and Kenya followed Uganda, hosting 1 million, 733,125, 438, 901 refugees respectively.
Much of the increase has been due to South Sudanese refugees fleeing conflict that first broke out in South Sudan in late 2013, and again in mid-2016. There was also a major increase of refugees from Somalia, following famine in the country in 2011 as well as protracted conflict and recurrent climate shocks, though there has been a decrease towards the end of the decade as some Somali refugees have returned home. Steady growth in the refugee population from Eritrea has also contributed to the increase. Another major cause of international displacement into the region was the post-election violence in Burundi in April 2015 and protracted conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Smaller numbers of refugees and asylum seekers have also arrived in the region since the outbreak of conflict in Syria (since 2011, with biggest increase in this region recorded in 2018) and Yemen (since 2015).

Accordingly, some of the leading refugee producing countries in the world are located in the region. In 2010, three of the top 10 refugee origin countries were located in the region, with Somalia, Sudan and Eritrea ranking 3rd, 7th and 9th with 770,200, 387,300 and 222,500 refugees, respectively.ii At the end of 2019, not only have the three countries continued to be in the list with increased numbers of refugees but the number of countries has grown to four with the addition of South Sudan.iii South Sudan, which attained its independence in 2011, has become the 4th largest refugee origin country in the world with 2.2 million refugees, after Syria, Venezuela, and Afghanistan. Somalia, Sudan and Eritrea are 6th, 8th and 10th with 905,100; 734,900 and 505,100 refugees respectively.iv At the end of 2019, South Sudan and Eritrea were also placed the 2nd and 3rd top countries with the greatest proportion of
the national population who are refugees with 16,800 and 12,500 per 100,000 inhabitants, respectively.vi

The internal displacement situation in Ethiopia since 2018 have been among the major displacement trends of the last decade.vi The continued conflict in Somalia, South Sudan and Sudan also contributed towards the high increase in the number of IDPs. At the end of 2019, Ethiopia hosted the highest IDPs in the region, close to 3.2 million, followed by Somalia (2.64 million); Sudan (1.86 million) and South Sudan (1.82 million).

**Routes**

A mixed group of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants from the region continue to move to other parts of Africa and outside the continent using three major routes: eastern route that goes to the Middle East and Gulf via Yemen; southern route to countries in Southern Africa, and the Central Mediterranean Route leading to Italy and the rest of Europe after crossing the sea from Libya.

The eastern route is the largest route for mixed flows of refugees and migrants out of East Africa.vii In 2019, it was the busiest maritime migration route, used by over 138 000 migrants from the Horn of Africa to reach Yemen.viii Between 2006 – 2016, over 800,000 migrants, refugees and asylum seekers mainly from Ethiopia and Somalia crossed to Yemen.ix The fact that the crossing has
increased despite continuation of the Yemen conflict since 2015 underscored the desperation of those on the move.

It is known that a number of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants also head to Southern African countries, particularly South Africa, a leading destination of migrants in Africa. In 2019, approximately 4 million international migrants lived in South Africa including those from the region.x

In 2016, in the wake of Europe’s declaration of a migration crisis, Eritrea and Sudan were among the top five countries of origin that arrived through the central Mediterranean route. 20,718 Eritreans and 9,327 Sudanese arrived in Italy in 2016xi, which declined to 3,300 and 1,600 respectively in 2018.xii The main reason behind the decline is Europe’s enhancement of its border control including through Frontex Operations in the Mediterranean and strengthening its partnership with Libya to stem African refugees and migrants heading to Europe.xiii

The human rights abuses against refugees, asylum seekers and migrants in the central Mediterranean route has been intensified in the last decade. The media disclosure of the slavery of refugees and migrants in Libya in 2017, which impacted including those originated from the EHAGLR region highlighted the level of human rights abuses refugees, asylum seekers and migrants endure in the hands of merciless human traffickers. The 2015 beheading of mostly Ethiopian migrants/refugees by the Islamic State of Iraq and Greater Syria (ISIS) in Libya is another example of a human right abuses, against the civilian and humanitarian character of asylum.

Drivers of displacement

Conflict remains to be the leading driver of forced displacement in the region, with the EHAGLR having “one of the world’s highest occurrences of conflict, featuring seven clusters of distinct but interrelated conflict systems” that involve Somalia, (ii) Sudan and South Sudan, (iii) South Sudan, (iv) Sudan, (v) Ethiopia, and (vi) the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA).xiv There have also been armed cattle-raiding between South Sudan and Ethiopia.xv In 2019, Somalia and Kenya were involved in active conflict in relation to al-Shabaabxvi and other disagreements.

Although concrete outcomes are yet to be seen, efforts have been made to mitigate the impact of conflicts in the region mainly through deployment of
peacekeeping forces. Particularly, since the establishment of the African Union (AU)’s Africa Peace and Security Architecture (APSA), the region has been home to various peacekeeping missions by the African Union, the UN and sub-regional actors. These include the AU Mission in Burundi (AMIB) later transferred to a UN Mission; the AU mission in Sudan (also later re-hatted to African Union – UN Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID); the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM); and the United Nation Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) and the United Nation Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS). The region has also witnessed the deployment of a range of mediation and other peacemaking efforts by regional and global actors including AU led mediation effort to resolve Kenya’s political and security crisis in the wake of the contested 2008 election as well as the IGAD-led mediation processes on South Sudan’s conflict, and the attempts of the East African Community (EAC) to mediate a dialogue on the Burundi political crisis, to mention a few.

Aimed at addressing root causes of conflicts and promote conflict prevention and resolution of on-going conflicts, the African Union has also adopted the ‘Silencing of the Guns in Africa by 2020’ in 2013. The continental body’s 2020 theme of the year is also focused on ‘Silencing the Guns: Creating Conducive Conditions for Africa’s Development.’ However, it is yet to show tangible outcomes on the ground.

In the past decade, the region has also seen a humanitarian disaster and mass displacement of people due to the combined effects of conflict and climate change as manifested in the exodus of Somali refugees to neighbouring countries in 2011-12. In 2011, monthly arrivals of Somali refugees to Kenya and Ethiopia was 13,600 and 8,400 respectively, fleeing insecurity and famine.

Ongoing conflicts and its combination with climate related natural disasters exacerbate major reasons forcing people to flee - violence, persecution, and severe human rights violations.

**Refugees participation in political and peace processes**

In the past decade, the region has also seen some degree of participation of refugees in political processes and peace processes.

On political processes, Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda were among the eight countries that supported the out-of-country voting (OCV) for South Sudanese
refugees during South Sudan’s referendum in 2011.xx “This was a defining historical moment for the region that paved the way for millions to return.”xxi

The involvement of refugees in peace processes, albeit to a limited scale, is another encouraging step observed in the region over the last decade. Even though their participation was limited to observer status, representatives of South Sudanese refugees in the region were invited to the 2017 and 2018 IGAD led High Level Revitalization Forum of South Sudan.xxii The refugees had their voices heard through their representative. As refugees carry the brunt of the conflict-driven displacement situations in the region, peace-making efforts that exclude the forcibly displaced may not lead to the expected outcomes.

**Women and Children’s displacement**

Women, girls and children continue to be the majority of the forcibly displaced, a trend that has continued to be seen in the region over the past decade. In 2010, Kenya hosted the highest number of refugees in Sub Saharan Africa and in the region with 402,905 refugees. 51% of them were children of whom 48% were girls. Again, 51% of the refugees aged between 18-59 years were women.xxiii At the end of 2019, Uganda, Sudan and Ethiopia hosted the highest number of refugees in the region in descending order. The proportion of children constituted 61%, 50%, and 56% in Uganda, Sudan, and Ethiopia, respectively. xxiv The proportion of women accounted for 55%, 52%, and 52% respectively, while girls made up 49%, 50%, and 48% of the refugee populations respectively.xxv At the end of 2019, 57% of the IDPs in Sudan were women, putting the country among the countries with the highest proportion of women among IDPs.xxvi

![Figure 2: Age and Sex breakdown of refugees in Uganda, 2019](image)
Societal division of labour along gender lines is one of the factors contributing to it. Women and children are often sent ahead while men stay behind in their communities of origin to look after their property including cattle, farms or to fight in the conflict. As a result, disproportionately high numbers of female-headed households is often the characteristic of the first outflow of the refugee population in the region.

Sexual violence in conflict, a distinct feature of most of the conflicts in the region, has also pushed women and girls to seek protection. Rape has been used as a weapon of war including in South Sudan and Sudan’s Darfur region. According to the 2019 UN Secretary General’s report, 1 in 5 refugees and displaced women worldwide are estimated to have experienced sexual violence.

The rampant of child recruitment by armed groups is the other reason that led to increased displacement of minors. In the case of South Sudan, for example, children were forced to be displaced ahead of adults to avoid forced recruitment by state or non-state actors and for the continuation of their education in some situations. The disproportionate number of children among the displaced earned the South Sudan situation the reputation of one of the world’s children’s emergencies.

1.1 Overview of forced displacement policy and practice in EHAGLR

Despite the pressure exerted by this large-scale refugee influx, countries in the region have continued to uphold an exemplary asylum policy with their borders remaining open for those seeking protection. In the past decade, there have been no recorded mass deportation of refugees from countries in the region. Rather, they have continued to show willingness to receive, host and protect refugees from neighbouring countries. This is how Uganda, Sudan and Ethiopia have become among the leading nations receiving and hosting large numbers of refugees in the continent.

Adoption and implementation of various important global and regional frameworks has also been observed by countries in the region. “The 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol have been acceded to by nearly all States in the region with the exception of Eritrea.” 9 countries in the region have enacted national laws to give effect to the provisions of the 1951 Convention and 1967 Protocol.
Further, countries in the region have been reviewing existing legislations to bring it into compliance with relevant international instruments or address contemporary forced displacement challenges. The revisions aim to adopt directives or implement whole of government approaches to refugee management involving different line Ministries.

In 2014, Rwanda adopted a national legislation that grants refugees the rights and liberties provided for by international instruments on refugees. Ethiopia also adopted a revised refugee proclamation in 2019 that grants refugees the right to work, access social services, register their vital events and integrate with the host communities. Somalia is the latest country to revise its Refugee Act with its law expected to be tabled for adoption in parliament before end of 2020. The significance of the revised draft Refugee Act lies in enabling Somali national authorities to take lead on Refugee Status Determination (RSD) instead of UNHCR, which is currently in charge. The domestication of refugee legislation is key to ensuring consistency of the best standards of policy and practice in refugee status determination and management across the region.

**Regional policies/frameworks on forced displacement**

The presence of active regional organisations with strong interest in forced displacement policy and practice contributes to the adoption of inclusive policies. Here, the African Union (AU) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) play a very important role.

**African Union**

The Organisation of African Unity (OAU) Convention Governing the Specific Aspect of Refugee Problems in Africa turned 50 in 2019. Adopted in 1969, the Convention is the first regional instrument on refugees in the world. Its 50th anniversary partly informed the AU’s declaration of 2019 the year of Refugees, Returnees and IDPs. The convention has been ratified by 47 of the 55 AU member states; seven of them are located in the EHAGLR. It is also widely domesticated in national refugee laws and policies of including Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, South Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda. The Convention contributed to the use of *prima facie* approach to refugee status determination. “The definition of a refugee in the Convention has also influenced the wider definition UNHCR uses when conducting refugee status determination within its mandate.”
The decade has also seen the entry into force of AU’s Convention on the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (known as the Kampala Convention) in 2012. Djibouti, Rwanda, Somalia, South Sudan and Uganda are among the 31 African states that ratified the convention. South Sudan and Somalia’s ratification of the convention is partly due to the popularization effort of AU’s instruments on forced displacement linked to AU’s 2019 theme of the year on ‘Refugees, Returnees and IDPs.’ Ethiopia ratified the Convention in 2020 and is expected to deposit it.

Although it has not ratified the Kampala Convention yet, Kenya has adopted a very comprehensive legislation on the prevention, protection and assistance to IDPs in 2012. Burundi has also adopted a national Socio-Economic Reintegration Strategy for Disaster Impacted Persons in 2017, while Uganda adopted a National IDPs Policy in 2014. Sudan adopted a National Policy for Internally Displaced Persons in 2009. Somalia is working on a draft legislation which is expected to be tabled for experts’ discussion soon. Further to adopting a Durable Solution Strategy for IDPs in 2019, Ethiopia is working towards domesticating the Kampala convention.

With IDPs making up more than half of the forcibly displaced in the region, the Kampala Convention provides a very good platform to facilitate response.

**The Intergovernmental Authority for Development**

The Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD)’s unique role on forced displacement policy is one major development of the decade. The regional block adopted a Regional Migration Policy Framework in 2012 aimed at providing a comprehensive regional approach to dealing with migration and forced displacement issues. To facilitate durable solutions to the forcibly displaced in the region, IGAD led a regional political process known as the Nairobi Process that comprises three declarations: Nairobi Declaration (2017), the Djibouti Declaration on Education (2017) and Kampala Declaration on Jobs and Livelihood (2019). A representative of an international organisation reflected, “these are important political commitments by the seven IGAD member states towards an inclusive approach especially on education and livelihood.” A Declaration on health is under development and is expected to be adopted by the end of 2020.
The 2017 Nairobi Declaration and Plan of Action on durable solutions is aimed at pursuing “a comprehensive regional approach to deliver durable solutions for Somali refugees, whilst maintaining protection and promoting self-reliance in the countries of asylum.”

Addressing the protracted Somali refugee situation is central to the Declaration. At the time of adoption of the declaration, there were two million Somali refugees and a million IDPs in the region. As of August 2020, the number of Somali refugees in the region has significantly dropped to 780,823, while that of IDPs has increased exponentially to 2.65 million. Since December 2014, more than 90,000 Somali refugees were also assisted to return, mainly from Kenya.

Adopting the Djibouti Declaration on Education, the IGAD member states agreed to “ensure that every refugees, returnee and members of host communities have access to quality education.” Integrating “education for refugees and returnees into National Education Sector Plans by 2020” is part of the plan.

The Kampala Declaration on Jobs, Livelihoods and Self-Reliance aims to “advance livelihood opportunities and economic inclusion to improve self-reliance of refugees, returnees and host communities” through adopting implementation roadmaps.

Further in 2017, UNHCR and the East Africa Community (EAC) agreed to revitalize previous collaboration in the promotion of the rights of refugees, including the protection of forcibly displaced people and regulatory regimes affecting the movement of persons, immigration and refugee management as well as regional integration of refugees.

Refugee policy and practice trends in EHAGLR

In the past decade, on forced displacement policy and practice, the region has seen two key trends: refugees’ inclusion and diminishing asylum space. While cash based interventions (CBIs) proved to be an important mechanism to respond to the needs of the displaced with dignity, the primary use of camp based model in the region pauses challenges to advance self-reliance of refugees.

Refugees’ inclusion
On the inclusion of refugees in national systems, the experiences of Uganda, Ethiopia and Rwanda provide good examples. In 2010, Uganda hosted 135,801 refugees. This figure has seen a ten-fold increase over the last decade, reaching to 1,359,464 in 2019. Uganda has managed to accommodate these refugees due to its inclusive refugee policy. Its Refugee and Host Population Empowerment (ReHoPe Strategy) is one of the major policy milestones in the region over the past decade. Adopted in 2017, the strategy intends to define the nexus between humanitarian assistance needed in emergency settings and the country’s long-term transformational directions towards development. ReHoPe updated Uganda’s Self-Reliance Strategy (SRS), adopted in 1999.

Ethiopia is another country that has shown increased openness towards refugees, implementing an out of camp policy for Eritrean refugees since 2010 and offering scholarship opportunities for refugees. In 2010, Ethiopia hosted 154,295 refugees, which reached 733,125 at the end of 2019. The country hosted 903,226 refugees at the end of 2018, representing its peak during the decade. Ethiopia was one of the countries who made substantial pledges at the Leaders’ Summit on Refugees in 2016, showing a high degree of openness towards the protection of refugees. Ethiopia subsequently revised its 2004 Refugee Proclamation by incorporating many of the elements contained in its nine pledges made in 2016. It was also one of the co-conveners of the first Global Refugee Forum (GRF), organised in December 2019, where it made additional pledges.

As per its 2014 national refugee legislation, the government of Rwanda has taken significant steps to address issues related to national ID cards, hoping to ease refugees’ access to jobs and services and to encourage more mobility, as part of its commitments under the CRRF. Possessing valid refugee ID is key to employment and entrepreneurship, besides being essential to a life in safety and dignity.

Both Rwanda and Ethiopia have put in place various policy measures to include refugees in the national health, water, education and child protection sectors to ensure more cost-effective investments in national systems that will also benefit host communities through expanded quality services.

**Diminishing asylum Space**
Diminishing asylum space is another trend observed in the region as seen in the experiences of Kenya and Tanzania. In 2010, Kenya hosted 40% of the refugees in the region (402,905 of the 1,087,208 refugees). A decade later, at the end of 2019, Kenya hosted 10 percent of the overall refugee population in the region (438,901 of the 4,388,716 refugees). This is due to Kenya’s tightening its generous policy towards refugees spanning over four decades at different points in time over the last decade.

Similarly, Tanzania’s asylum space has started to narrow down. Tanzania has moved from a country that viewed refugees as contributors and an economic asset during the Nyerere period (1964–1985) to one that sees refugees as a threat to its national security. Since 2017 the government of Tanzania has put heavy pressure on Burundian refugees to return, including announcing various deadlines, drastically restricting freedom of movement and the pursuit of economic/livelihood activities, ceasing registration of new arrivals, and in some cases denying access to assistance. More than 90,000 Burundian refugees were repatriated from Tanzania between January 2017 to August 2020. These developments are contrary to the 2014 decision of Tanzania to facilitate one of the most prominent durable solutions in the decade, offering citizenship to 162,156 former Burundian refugees.

Not getting enough support from the international community is cited as a key reason by both governments. In the case of Kenya, the government started feeling that it was receiving little support from the international community despite hosting the largest number of refugees for the longest time. Like Kenya, Tanzania’s actions were seen as a reaction to what the Government saw as incommensurate support from the international community.

Further in the context of Kenya, the issue of refugees and asylum has increasingly been seen through the security lens following the 2014 Westgate Mall shootings and 2015 Garissa University attacks. Subsequently, the issue of refugees started to be politicized and the discussions around refugees has changed from asylum to facilitating returns, including through threats to shut down the Dadaab refugee camps.

Since 2017 the government of Tanzania has put heavy pressure on Burundian refugees to return involuntarily and when conditions at home were not conducive for returns. This led to the repatriation of 90,000 of them between January 2017 and August 2020 under less optimal conditions.
Cash Based Interventions and Community based approach

Cash Based Interventions (CBIs) is one of the major policy developments and practice that has been seen in the region. CBIs entails substitution of in-kind distribution of aid by cash and it was introduced by UNHCR through its 2016 policy on Cash-Based Interventions that builds on its experience in the area since mid-1980’s. Providing recipients with cash, albeit with associated risks, allows them to meet their needs as they best see fit, and has allowed them to set a foundation towards entrepreneurship. CBIs, including cash and vouchers, have especially enabled refugees and IDPs to meet their needs with dignity, while also supporting local markets and host community economic systems. CBIs have also helped in the reduction of negative coping mechanisms such as transactional sex, child labour and early marriage.

Inclusion of refugee protection as a wider community-based approach that includes returnees, refugees, IDPs and host communities towards peaceful coexistence is another major practice observed during the decade. This has been adopted by UNHCR and the Government of Sudan, for example, specifically in the case of North Darfur. In Sudan, given the dearth of basic services in rural areas, the overall approach was to match the support given to communities in area of return with the services provided to refugees in the country of asylum. A wide range of community-based trainings on livelihood support and peaceful coexistence were envisaged and undertaken. Reintegration measures included the construction or rehabilitation of schools, medical facilities and community boreholes that benefitted the returnees, IDPs and host communities.

Challenges: Camp based model in focus

The region has also seen different challenges related to refugee response. The fact that most countries in the region primarily followed a camp-based protection and assistance model is one of the challenges. 82 percent of the refugees live in camps. This has led countries of asylum to assume that the refugees will eventually return. As a result, they do not put in place mechanisms that consider the needs of refugees for a longer-term. Most of the refugees are also living in remote and less developed areas, close to border areas of the countries of origin, where there is little investment in infrastructure and other key amenities. This requires a shift in thinking from the governments’ side to develop the peripheral areas and include refugees in
the national system through finding the necessary resources. Such an approach will also help the host communities in the region.\textsuperscript{lxxxviii}

Linked to the camp setting, environmental degradation is a key challenge facing the region since “most refugees rely on their surrounding natural environment for food, water, livelihoods, shelter and fuel.”\textsuperscript{lxxxix} To address the issue, different initiatives have been implemented in the region as part of UNHCR’s Global Strategy for Safe Access to Fuel and Energy (SAFE). Some of these include a carbon financing project in Rwanda and a renewable energy project in Ethiopia as part of the IKEA Foundation’s Brighter Lives for Refugees campaign.\textsuperscript{xc}

2. POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN EHAGLR ON REFUGEE INCLUSION PRE-DATING THE GCR

Refugee protection, burden and responsibility sharing have been promoted by African inter-governmental organisations for long time. Specially policies adopted by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and pursued by its successor the African Union (AU), actively promoted the concept of burden and responsibility sharing, a key component of the GCR. Most prominent among them is the 1969 OAU Refugee Convention. Article II (4) of the OAU Convention states, ‘where a Member State finds difficulty in continuing to grant asylum to refugees, such Member State may appeal directly to other Member States and through the OAU, and such other Member States shall in the spirit of African solidarity and international co-operation take appropriate measures to lighten the burden of the Member State granting asylum.’\textsuperscript{xcii} This is very much in line with the GCR’s goal of promoting, ‘predictable and equitable burden and responsibly sharing’ providing the basis for the principle of ‘African solidarity and international cooperation.’\textsuperscript{xcii} All of the GCR roll-out countries in the region are parties to the convention, with the exception of Somalia and Djibouti.

Most of the countries in the region have also been implementing some policies that could lead to refugee inclusion even prior to the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR).\textsuperscript{xciii} Specially, such policies began to evolve after the adoption of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), the implementation framework of the GCR in 2016.
In 1999, Uganda already adopted a Self-Reliance Strategy (SRS) with objectives that directly speak to the GCR: “empowerment of refugees and nationals in the area to the extent that they would be able to support themselves; and to establish mechanisms that will ensure integration of services for the refugees with those of the nationals.” This policy provided the basis for Uganda’s settlement model of response that offers refugees the freedom of movement and the right to work prior to the GCR. Under the settlement approach, the government grants farmland to refugees in the Southern and Western part of the country, while refugees in West Nile Region have access to community land since there is no government owned land in West Nile.

Then, in 2016 Uganda adopted its ReHoPE Strategy that updated the SRS. The ReHoPE Strategy supports Uganda’s “integration of refugees into the National Development Plan II (NDPII, 2015/16–2019/20), through the Settlement Transformation Agenda (STA).” STA is “part of Uganda’s National Development Plan (2016 – 2020) and recognizes that refugee-hosting areas are in need of special attention due to the added demands of hosting displaced populations, and aims to integrate refugee services structures with government structures.”

ReHoPE strategy lets refugees work and choose their place of residence, while its assistance model allocates plots of land for refugees to cultivate within its rural settlements, which goes along the lines of the GCR. This approach seeks development assistance to improve integrated service delivery to refugees and local communities.

Ethiopia is another country that has started implementing projects on refugees’ self-reliance prior to the roll out of the GCR. Starting from 2012, Ethiopia, supported by the IKEA Foundation, has been working to transform the lives of refugees and host communities in the five Dollo Ado camps in the country’s Somali region. The vision of this intervention goes along the line of the GCR, “addressing needs goes beyond care and maintenance, considering self-reliance from the beginning, to prevent dependence on aid, and looking to long-term sustainability, where refugees and their hosts thrive side-by-side, where refugee inclusion stimulates peaceful co-existence.”

The first phase of the project (2012-2014), which aimed at providing basic services and lifesaving assistance, underscored the need for embracing ‘broader approach for the long-term care of refugees.’ In 2014, the IKEA
foundation together with the government of Ethiopia and UNHCR started implementing projects on livelihood and energy. The projects focused on providing “the conditions necessary for refugees to lift themselves out of poverty, decrease dependency on aid and strengthen self-reliance.” Between 2015 and 2018, the project established 40 cooperatives to enhance the livelihoods of refugees and host communities focusing on agriculture and energy related issues. 

In the two project cycles, IKEA foundation invested USD$100 million and a number of positive impacts have been observed including increase in income and consumption among cooperative members, and improved refugee-host community relations.

Kenya’s Kalobeyei Integrated Social and Economic Development Programme (KISEDP) also pre-dates the GCR. KISEDP, which started in 2015 in the Turkana county of Kenya, is aimed at facilitating integrated self-reliance for refugees and host communities. The Kalobeyei Settlement is designed to cater for subsistence agriculture and establish designated business areas. Innovative interventions have been included under KISEDP such as “cash-based food assistance called Bamba Chakula (‘get your food’ in Swahili) and...‘cash for shelter’ project, giving money to allow refugees to be involved in the design and construction of their shelters.” As of August 2020, 39,594 refugees were living the Kalobeyei Settlement.

Rwanda’s 2014 refugee legislation includes “critical provisions of international refugee law...namely: non-refoulement, cessation, exclusion, revocation, naturalization, family unity, and references to socio-economic rights as per the 1951 Convention.” The fact that “many Rwandese themselves had been refugees in neighbouring countries created a generous spirit to receive and care for refugees who came to Rwanda for safety, hence their smooth inclusion in Rwandan society.” These personalized experiences have influenced the Government’s policy in terms of allowing refugees free movement and promotion of socio economic inclusion of refugees to improve their livelihoods, prior to the GCR.

Tanzania is another country that has long years of experience in refugee inclusion. Since the early 1970s, Tanzania allocated land to Burundian refugees to allow them to farm and sustain themselves. The country granted citizenship to 162,156 former Burundian refugees in 2014, although this
tendency towards inclusion has shifted significantly in the last decade as indicated on page 12-13 of this paper.

This trend shows that the region has the willingness and the requisite experience to implement the GCR and transform the way refugees are protected. Most governments followed inclusive approaches and practices which could be further systematized and enhanced using the GCR as a vehicle and the necessary financial and technical investment to promote the same.

2.1 GCR Implementation Progresses in the EHAGLR

Implementation of the GCR in the EHAGLR region has to date focused mainly on two of the GCR’s four objectives: easing pressure on host countries and enhancing refugees’ self-reliance. Along this line, progress has been seen in the following four key areas: a shift in thinking (government level) from encampment to refugee inclusion, policy changes towards refugee inclusion, steps towards institutionalization of the GCR, and expansion of stakeholders’ platform. Practical implementation of projects has also started in different countries located in the region, where education stands out as the most prominent sector.

*Shift in thinking from encampment to refugee inclusion*

The fact that six of the eight African GCR roll-out countries/situations, namely Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda and the Somalia situation are located in the region, shows the positive shift in thinking that led to the countries’ willingness to embrace the new way of working.

This shift in thinking from encampment to local integration apparently emanates from recognising the fact that refugee response is not only a humanitarian issue but also a development concern. It is a clear sign that governments of the region have started to appreciate both the developmental needs of host communities and the potential of refugees to contribute to the economic development of their host communities. In this respect, the experience of the Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISED) shows that a shift in thinking among local political leaders contributed towards its evolvement. Senior local political leaders’ change of “…perception of refugees from vulnerable people requiring external assistance, to productive members of a broader community” played a critical role towards KISED’s strong focus on refugee inclusion.
Such a shift in thinking has brought ‘inclusion’ to the fore as an important step towards durable solutions as opposed to excessive reliance on the elusive voluntary repatriation or diminishing resettlement situation. Prior to the GCR, refugee inclusion was a rare topic of discussion in the region.

**Development of policies on refugee inclusion**

The shift in thinking was followed by the development of enabling policies by countries of the region in the last five years. For example, Uganda’s Settlement Transformation Transformation Agenda (STA) that was adopted in 2015 is aimed at achieving “...self-reliance to refugees and bring social development to Ugandan nationals in refugee hosting areas.” STA and related policies of Uganda are discussed on page 16 of this paper.

These policies in Uganda have also led to the development and implementation of different projects on GCR. For example, projects worth $540 million have been implemented under Uganda’s STA as part of NDP II supported by the World Bank. These include Development Response to Displacement Impact Project (DRDIP), Support to Municipal Infrastructure Development Programme Project, Integrated Water Management and Development Project and Roads and Bridges in the Refugee and Hosting Districts Project where $50 million, $60 million, $280 million and $150 million have been allocated respectively. The experience of DRDIP is also discussed on page 29 – 30 of this paper.

Further, the European Union is also implementing a project worth €20 million for Response to increased demand on Government Service and creation of economic opportunities in Uganda (RISE), which is discussed on page 28 of this paper.

Similarly, Ethiopia revised its 2004 refugee proclamation in 2019, affording refugees freedom of movement, the right to work and documentation. While the proclamation’s derivative directives and implementation guidelines are being put in place, Ethiopia has already started implementing some of its key provisions, most notably, the issuance of various types of civil documentation to refugees, which is seen as an important step forward in the implementation of the GCR. In fact, after the 2016 UN Summit on refugees, Ethiopia started civil registration of refugees in October 2017, a couple of years before the adoption of its refugee proclamation. Refugees in Ethiopia are now
registering their essential life events including birth, marriage, divorce and death. So far, 79% of refugees had received an individual identity document. Access to banking and telecom services is also being granted to refugees.

Further, Ethiopia has demonstrated progress in refugees’ inclusion in provision of basic and essential social services, including in Health, Nutrition, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene. Positive ongoing practices in refugee hosting areas include allowing refugees access to national referral hospitals and health posts and serving host communities at camp health facilities. Vaccination campaigns, RH, HIV and TB services continue to serve refugees and hosts as part of the same system and will provide a solid foundation as inclusion in national health services progresses over time.

Kenya’s draft Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework and Action Plan is currently being considered at policy level. This is further to the country’s application of an integrated approach that provides services to refugees in the communities they live in, particularly in education, healthcare and business. In this respect, a limited number of refugees are provided with work permits while access to the National Hospital Insurance Funds is granted to urban refugees in particular Kenya’s 2019 national census was also extended to refugees and asylum seekers who were also part of the National Integrated Refugee Management enrolment (Huduma Number) that seeks to harmonize government data collection and storage.

Rwanda issued its national strategy on the economic inclusion of refugees in 2016. As part of this, in 2018, the Government of Rwanda has started issuing Machine Readable Convention Travel Documents to refugees in Rwanda. As of September 2020, “all refugees are in possession of valid Refugee Identity cards and those in need have applied and received Refugee Travel documents.” Travel documents ensure safe and free cross border movement for purposes of business, study, medical treatment, resettlement, and family reunification.

The government of Rwanda has also undertaken awareness campaigns to inform refugees, nationals and potential employers that refugees have the right to work and are entitled to open bank accounts. Health insurance benefits have been extended to urban refugees. 13,000 urban refugees have been enrolled. Refugee businesses have been included in the country’s COVID-19 recovery plan.
The government of Rwanda also launched the Jyambere project in 2019, which aims to “improve access to basic services and expand economic opportunities for both refugees and host communities who live in the six districts hosting refugees” such as Gatsibo, Gicumbi, Gisagara. The project is expected to benefit an estimated host community population of 2,164,799 and camp-based refugee population of 135,123. The World Bank is providing $60 million USD to finance the project, of which $25 million is on grant terms. As part of this, the project received a $9 million funding from the World Bank in November 2020. The funding agreement of the project between the government of Rwanda and the World Bank indicates that the Development Bank of Rwanda “will provide matching grants through Participating Financial Institutions (PFIs) to viable projects from entrepreneurs among the refugees or host communities as individuals, Micro-Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (MSMEs) or as Cooperatives.”

Somalia is also in the process of adoption of six draft policies including “the National Policy for Refugees, Returnees and IDPs (Federal Government of Somalia, 2019); the Interim Protocol on Housing, Land and Property (HLP) (Federal Government of Somalia, 2019c); National Eviction Guidelines (Federal Government of Somalia, 2019d); Social Protection Policy (Federal Government of Somalia, 2019e); Banadir Regional Administration (BRA) Internally Displaced Persons and Refugee Returnees Policy (BRA 2019); and Land Law for South West State.” The drafting of the frameworks were aimed at providing solution to the growing number of IDPs that was “compounded by the evictions in cities such as Mogadishu.”

Djibouti has shown significant progress in advancing the education of refugees. Access to national education is made possible for refugees through “the passage of the National Refugee Law in January 2017, and the subsequent decree guaranteeing access to social services including education.” The 2017 law grants refugees “better access to social services like healthcare, education, and employment opportunities.”

**Education**

Education is the single most important sector through which practical inclusion of refugees in national systems has been observed throughout the region. Inclusion of refugees in national education systems was initiated by the Nairobi Process. IGAD’s Djibouti Declaration on education has played a significant role in ensuring the inclusion of refugees in national education systems.
Prior to the Nairobi Process and the Education Declaration, refugee education was not part of IGAD member states costed plans. To support the implementation of the Declaration, IGAD facilitated a costed plan exercise through a multi stakeholder approach in its member states, supported by UNHCR. The Declaration also commits to working towards recognition of prior learning and certificates for both refugees and citizens within the IGAD region. In this respect, IGAD member states are developing a Regional Qualifications Framework.

The Djibouti Declaration goes along the lines of the Global Refugee Forum education pledges.

Progress of implementation of the Declaration can be broadly categorized in three areas: development of a policy framework, development of multi-year national education costed plans for refugees and hosting community; and integration of refugees in education systems.

In terms of development of policy frameworks, Djibouti has adopted a policy that supports refugee inclusion in its national education system, while Kenya is drafting a Refugee Education Policy that provides for broader inclusion of refugee learners is at an advanced stage. Kenya’s draft policy is “…one of the first globally – seeking to include refugees and asylum seekers in the national education system.” This further enhances refugees’ access to education in Kenya, a country that has given education opportunities for refugees for decades. Urban refugees have access to national schools in par with nationals. Kenya’s experience reveals that urban refugees are totally integrated in the national education system.

For a long time, Kenyan universities have also been offering education opportunities to large numbers of refugees at par with local students. Refugees also have access to public education for primary and secondary education.

Ethiopia, Somalia, South Sudan and Sudan are among the countries that have developed multi-year national education cost plans for refugees and host communities. Uganda is also currently reviewing its Education Response Plan for Refugees and Host Communities that was adopted in 2018.
The new policies together with existing efforts have led to an increase in enrolment of refugee students in the different countries. Rwanda has integrated all refugee students.

In Ethiopia, in 2017, 116,566 of the 344,330 school aged refugees were enrolled. Three years later, in 2020, 213,921 of the 315,411 school aged refugees were enrolled. This means the enrolment rate has significantly increased from 34% to 67.6%.

Similarly, in Uganda enrolment rate of refugee students has increased. In 2017, 43.4% of school aged refugees were enrolled in schools i.e., 267,337 of 616,523. The percentage has reached 57.6% in 2020 with the enrolment of 349,356 of the 606,401 refugees.

To advance inclusion of refugees, host governments make contributions to implement the education plans. In this respect, the government of Uganda allocated $42.3 million to the country’s 2019 Education Response Plan for Refugees and Host Communities (ERP); on top of $42.1 million from donors. Since 2010, Ethiopia has also been offering university level scholarships to refugees, where the government covers 75% of the cost, at par with the nationals, while UNHCR contributes the balance. This means Ethiopian tax payers are contributing to the expenses of refugee education.

Targeted education programmes to enhance employment prospects of refugees and host communities are also being run. In this respect, supported by GIZ, Ethiopia is implementing a Qualifications and Employment Perspectives for Refugees and Host Communities Programme (QEP), a vocational training programme, which is meant to improve employment prospects in Ethiopia for both refugees and Ethiopians alike. QEP is being implemented in the capital Addis Ababa and in four refugee-hosting regions, namely Somali, Benishangul-Gumuz, Gambella and Tigray. To facilitate attainment of job experiences for graduates of the programme, QEP cooperates with 40 companies to facilitate initial work experience for 150 refugees and Ethiopians.

The attention given by the GCR rollout countries to refugee education can facilitate the socio-economic inclusion of refugees and enhance the employability of refugees and nationals alike. It will also prepare refugees to contribute to the development of their countries of origin upon repatriation since it opens the door to recognise the education and skills of refugees.
Institutionalizing the GCR

Institutionalizing the GCR structure is another positive trend observed across the region. In this respect, Uganda established a CRRF Secretariat and a Steering Committee in 2017 and launched its CRRF roadmap in 2018. Co-chaired by the Minister for Disaster Preparedness, Relief and Refugees and Minister of Local Government, Uganda’s CRRF Steering Group consists of Government entities, representatives of refugees, UN agencies, donors, International and National non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the Private Sector and International Financial Institutions.¹⁸⁴

Djibouti has also put in place CRRF coordination structures including a steering committee that is “led by the Ministry of Interior, ONARS and UNHCR with the support of key humanitarian and development actors.”¹⁸⁵ Djibouti also adopted a CRRF National Action Plan.¹⁸⁶ Similarly, Ethiopia developed a CRRF roadmap and has established national and regional coordination mechanisms, including a national Steering Committee chaired by the Office of the Prime Minister and co-chaired by ARRA, UNHCR and Ministry of Finance. The country has also drafted a 10-year National Comprehensive Refugee Response Strategy, providing a clear vision of where the country will be in 10 years in terms of transforming the refugee protection model.

The process of institutionalization of the GCR requires institutional reform that goes along the specific country’s governance structures. Strengthening of the capacity of local governance structures is central here. This involves lots of processes and stakeholders, could not have come at a better time than this when the reformed United Nations has started to deliver as one under the leadership of the Resident Coordinators in each of the countries. This will allow the UN, a major stakeholder in this whole process, to bring together its resources and expertise towards supporting national processes of institutionalising the GCR.¹⁸⁷

Expansion of stakeholders platform

Expansion of the stakeholders’ platform is another important achievement of the GCR in the region. In this respect, the involvement of development actors and financial institution on the refugee agenda in the last five years is one major shift observed in the region.¹⁸⁸ These include inter-governmental organisations, development organisations, the private sector, international and...
regional financial institutions, in addition to local government, UN agencies and civil society.\textsuperscript{clxix}

In this respect, IGAD is a prominent actor, being the first Regional Economic Community (RECs) in Africa to embark on facilitating regional discussions on implementation of longer-term actions and comprehensive responses as outlined by the GCR.\textsuperscript{clxx} Its 2017 Nairobi Declaration and Action Plan takes a central stage, as it emphasises the need for a regional approach to negotiate local integration, returns and resettlement.\textsuperscript{clxxi} The Nairobi Action Plan comprises a wholistic set of policies developed by the governments and multiple stockholders together with UNHCR, civil society, the private sector and the academia in the region.\textsuperscript{clxxii} The Declaration has since been translated into a results framework that includes all of the New York Declaration commitments made by its member states.\textsuperscript{clxxiii}

During the Global Refugee Forum held in December 2019, an IGAD Support Platform was launched, which aims to galvanize political, technical and financial support to countries hosting refugees in the region.\textsuperscript{clxxiv}

KISEDPS’s attracting 40 partners\textsuperscript{clxxv} including from the humanitarian and development sectors as well as financial institutions confirms the actual potential of the GCR in expanding stakeholders platform.

Financial support

The expanded stakeholders’ platform has led to additional financial support such as the World Bank’s IDA-18 and IDA-19 regional sub-window for refugees and host communities (IDA 18 RSW). IDA-18 RSW provides $2 billion from 2017–2020.\textsuperscript{clxxvi}

Five of the 14 IDA 18 RSW eligible countries are in the region: Djibouti, Ethiopia, Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda. These countries are accessing $907 million from IDA 18 RSW and 17 projects are approved by the WBG Board for the region. As of 12 May 2020, IDA 18 Country Allocations in the EHAGLR region, $1,313 million have so far been approved, of which the Refugee Sub-window (RSW) component was $542.67 million, representing 41% of the total.

$2.2 has also been allocated through Window for Host communities and Refugees (IDA 19 WHR) from 2020 - 2022\textsuperscript{clxxvii} to support low-income countries hosting large numbers of refugees.\textsuperscript{clxxviii} Part of the dedicated money for IDA-19
is used for responses related to COVID-19. GCR roll out countries in the region are among the beneficiaries of the IDA-18 RSW and IDA-19 WHR.

The EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa (EUTF) also supports different projects in the region. The Resilience Building and Creation of Economic Opportunities in Ethiopia (RESET II) in Ethiopia is one of them. The objective of the project is “strengthening economic opportunities and resilience of the most vulnerable communities to human-induced and natural disaster crises, through measures that will increase livelihoods and employment, and better access to basic services.” So far the project created close to 9,000 jobs and assisted over 16,000 people to develop economic income-generating activities.

Further, EUTF supports projects in North-Western Kenya to promote “better economic integration and self-reliance of refugees and host communities in the Kakuma and Kalobeyei area through supporting market-led solutions that strengthen and deepen local markets and respond to key development challenges.” Between 2016 – 2019/20, EUTF also allocated 15 million Euros to support the KISEDIP.

The EU Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP) in the Horn of Africa is another project supported by EUTF. Launched in 2015 as part of the Valletta Action Plan, RDPP aims to improve “protection and enhance development prospects of refugees, IDPs and local communities, aiming to offer an alternative to risks of irregular migration.” It is implemented in Ethiopia, Sudan, Kenya, Somalia and Uganda.

In Ethiopia, Sudan and Kenya, the RDPP aims to provide improved prospects for refugees as well as host communities with a view to allow beneficiaries to be able to provide for their own livelihood. Actions in Somalia are tailored to reach durable solutions by improving migration management, addressing state fragility in areas of return, and enabling and facilitating voluntary repatriation of Somali refugees from Kenyan refugee camps.

EUTF also supports the Integrating refugees and host communities in the Urban Productive Safety Net Program (UPSNP). The UPSNP aims to help counties in the Horn of Africa address the dual challenge of the rising number of displaced people being hosted in urban areas (urban displacement) and wider urbanization. Increasing the safety and well-being of displaced populations and their host communities living in urban or peri-urban settings and reduce inequalities between these groups is part of its overall objective.
UPSNP will be implemented in Uganda’s municipality of Koboko and in Ethiopia’s Assosa town which is located in the Benishangul Gumuz region. Euro 8.2 million is allocated for these projects.

Main beneficiaries of these projects are refugees in the respective urban settings and their immediate host communities. Local authority officials and members of local organisations (e.g. women's organizations, NGOs, philanthropic groups, community groups) engaged in local development and migration and refugee issues are also part of the beneficiaries.

The successful implementation of the UPSNP is expected to feed into the implementation of the GCR especially in promotion of alternatives to camps.

**Private Sector**

The region has also exerted a strong effort to mobilise and involve the private sector both at the international and local levels. Along this line, the International Financial Corporation has launched the Kakuma Kalobeyei Challenge Fund (KKCF) in 2020. KKCF aims to attract the private sector to support local entrepreneurs to expand job opportunities and improve services. During the Global Refugee Forum, the Amahoro Coalition was also launched, with the aim to mobilize “the African Private sector to be a key driver in the socio-economic transformation of refugees and host communities around the continent by promoting education and livelihoods.” The Coalition was launched with the support of the Botho Emerging Markets Group and UNHCR Office of the Special Envoy for the Horn of Africa.

There has been a good start in improving the multi-agency partnership. Linked to this, Partnership for improving Prospects for Forcibly Displaced Persons and Host Communities (PROSPECTS) provides a good example. Spearheaded by the Government of the Netherlands, PROSPECTs brings together the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the World Bank. PROSPECTS aims to achieve: “fostering an enabling environment for socio-economic inclusion; improving access to education and protection for vulnerable children on the move; and strengthening the resilience of host communities” Supporting refugees’ inclusion in national governance systems of host countries is among its key considerations. Countries covered under the PROSPECTs project include Ethiopia, Kenya,
Sudan and Uganda. $558 million is allocated for PROSPECTs between 2019 – 2023; 33 percent of the budget ($184.14 million) is allocated for countries in the region.

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ) is another partner. The Response to Increased Demand on Government Service and Creation of Economic Opportunities in Uganda (RISE) in Moyo and Obongi District, in West Nile Region of Uganda, is one of the projects supported by GIZ. The major goal of the RISE project is to strengthen the capacity of local governments through training and financial support. In this respect, the RISE project works towards enhancing the capacity of local governments to deliver “…government services to all people in the refugee-hosting districts in Northern Uganda and to enable greater resilience and self-reliance among both refugee and host communities by creating economic opportunities.”

This is important as the district is rolling out the World Bank financed Development Response to Displacement Impacts Project (DRDIP), which “is aimed at supporting and developing refugee hosting communities in districts experiencing a high burden of refugees.”

**Local Government support to refugee inclusion**

Across the countries in the region, local administrations have shown stronger commitment to refugee inclusion, even where political will from their capitals is not that strong. The local administrators’ perspectives can be informed by stronger solidarity towards refugees due to geographical proximity and first-hand experiences of the benefits of integrating refugees.

Most of the refugee camps are located close to border areas which has led to a stronger sense of solidarity with refugees across borders.

First hand experiences of benefits from integrating refugees includes jobs and markets created for the host community including through implementation of the CBIs. Explaining about the benefits of CBI’s, a representative of a donor country explained, “during my visit to Shagarab refugee camp in Sudan in December 2019, I observed that the whole food provision is purely cash based and refugees buy their food from the local market where the host community grew vegetables and sells them to the refugees.” Similarly in Kenya, the move towards CBIs has allowed refugees to be more in control of their wellbeing while improving self-reliance.
The experience of Obongi District of Uganda also clearly demonstrates the benefits refugees could bring to their host community. According to the 2014 census, the Obongi population was 50,000, while there were 123,000 registered refugees. It is located in remote location with insufficient infrastructure. Due to the presence of refugees, the district attracted actors that would normally not be in the area, which has brought both humanitarian and development resources that offered a good opportunity to develop the district. This includes improved access and quality education and health services for both refugees and the communities hosting them. The World Bank has offered a $130.8 million grant in 2020 to the Government of Uganda to improve the 105-kilometre Koboko-Yumbe-Moyo road, which is partly financed by the IDA-19 WHR.

**Practical implementation of the GCR: the case of DRDIP Uganda**

Development Response to Displacement Impact Project (DRDIP) in Uganda has practically demonstrated the benefits of the humanitarian – development nexus, a central concept to the GCR. Supported by the World Bank, DRDIP in Uganda aims to “improve access to services, expand economic opportunities and enhance environmental management in refugee hosting districts.” Since 2018, the project has been implemented in 15 refugee hosting districts including Arua, Koboko, Ymbe and Moyo with an investment of $50 million loaned from the World Bank.

DRDIP’s saving 1 million USD out of the initial 50 million World Bank Credit it received within 2 years a half of its existence is its significant success. This was achieved using two approaches: labour intensive public works and village revolving funds. The intensive public works put in community assets and individuals (both refugee and locals) earn a daily wage of 5,500 Ugandan Shillings (equivalent of $1.4); they save 1,500 Uganda Shillings daily. With respect to the village revolving funds, which provides $10,000 for a total of 30 people of 3 groups. To access this funding, individuals (both refugees and host community members) are required to graduate from a 3 months training that covers aspects including entrepreneurship and financial management.

DRDIP’s success in saving is also strongly linked to the completion of infrastructure projects it has been implementing in the area of health, education and roads. So far, 134 of 304 on-going projects implemented. These included the construction of 424 new classrooms, 156 water tanks, 960
latrine stances, five blocks of dormitories with 200 beds for secondary education, and 16 hospital wards. 279.8 KM of road was also paved and nine small bridges were constructed. The expansion of infrastructure has improved the quality of service delivery.

717 projects on sustainable environment and natural resources were also implemented, benefitting more than 62,000 people. 512 of the projects focused on integrated natural resource management and 205 on access to energy. These projects enabled the refugees and host communities to invest in a variety of areas including agro-forestry/tree planting, wetland, hills and river bank restorations. For example, 960,000 trees were planted, creating temporary employment for over 36,000 vulnerable members of the refugee and host communities. This will have long lasting positive impact on the environment including through magnifying the benefits of solar energy and energy saving technologies. It will also reverse the long standing challenge of the adverse impact of protracted refugee presence on host countries’ environment.

The completion of these projects led to two key benefits: improvement of quality of service and enhancement of government-host communities relations.

In terms of improving quality of service, the additional infrastructure led to a significant reduction in the pupil – classroom ratio from 1:114 to 1:71; an increase in the community’s health seeking behaviours and the resultant increase in the number of outpatients. It has also increased the number of women attending the maternity services. In this respect, inpatient numbers increased by 35% from 18,440 to 24,969 with more females (56%) being served.

The construction of the facilities and implementation of environment and natural resources projects enhanced government – host communities relations, serving as evidence of real investment in public interest. It enhances government’s credibility, assures host community members that government and development partners are sensitive to their pressures. It also stresses the fact that host communities are receiving such benefits due to their generosity to refugees. A cumulative of this has led to increased acceptability of refugees, hence expansion of asylum space.
The success of DRDIP is built on the application of a Community Demand Driven approach, which not only empowers the community but also promotes ownership, sustainability and accountably. This way, the community is an active participant and contributor rather than a passive receiver, including participation in the construction of the latrines and hand washing facilities.

In nutshell, the experience of the DRDIP in Uganda highlights the potential of the GCR for a gradual social transformation including easing the pressure on host communities. Its contribution towards enhancing host communities access to better education, health and road infrastructure is immense as most of the regions where refugees are hosted are peripheral with limited infrastructure. This in turn will enhance the asylum space for refugees and strengthen peaceful coexistence between refugees and communities hosting them.

2.2 GCR Implementation Challenges in EHAGLR

The GCR implementation has faced different challenges including the slow progress of the responsibility and burden sharing component, funding shortfalls, discrepancy between policy and practice, insufficient consultations, tendencies to view refugees as a security concern, and protracted conflicts.

Responsibly and burden sharing

There seems to be somehow a lack of a common ground between donors and host governments on the issue of responsibility and burden sharing. Donors are requesting host governments to translate pledges into action i.e., policy changes backed by institutional reforms that facilitate refugees’ inclusion. Donors are expected to show to their constituency that their money is leading to policy changes backed by institutional reform in host countries. Host governments, on the other hand, do not have enough resources to provide even for their own nationals as many of whom are very poor. According to a report of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), in April 2020, 22.5
million people were severely food insecure in Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan and Sudan. ccxxiii

Even their existing resources are also diminishing. For example, Uganda’s land-based self-reliance model has been challenged by land scarcity as the number of refugees in the country grew exponentially from 450,000 in 2015 to 1.3 million in 2019. The growth in the number of refugees has made “…the quantity and quality of land available to new arrivals is inadequate.” ccxxiv As a result, “80% of Congolese households who arrived in Nakivaleccxxv before 2012 have access to land compared with just 17% of those who arrived after 2012.” ccxxvi The fact that this development is leading to land disputesccxxvii stresses the importance of considering burden and responsibility sharing. Due to these, host countries feel that their countries are already providing a global public good by hosting refugees. ccxxviii

The lack of a common ground between donors and host governments on the issue of responsibility and burden sharing partly stems from the approach of “you host, I pay” by donor countries. ccxxix This approach assumes that the international community pays the bill of refugee inclusion and self-reliance, while the host countries facilitate the inclusion. However, there’s a feeling by host countries that the ‘I pay’ component of the deal is not fully materializing. The approach has faced a major flaw, not taking into account implications of the GCR related public policy changes on host countries. Most of the donors provide only very short-term support, while the GCR implementation requires long-term public financing changes. ccxxx

Lack of international responsibility sharing towards the region is a fundamental challenge facing the GCR implementationccxxi as “over two-thirds of all refugees and asylum seekers in Africa [3.5 million refugees] are hosted in Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda.” ccxxii

**Funding Shortfall**

Funding short-fall is another key challenge facing the GCR implementation. ccxxxiii The funding that is coming to the region is not sufficient enough to facilitate implementation of the planned GCR projects. Even projects like KISED P have been impacted. The KISED P received only 51% of funding in 2019, significantly less than in 2018, where it received 81% of funding. ccxxxiv Similarly, Uganda’s 2017 Solidarity Summit on Refugees generated $350 million, only 17.5 percent of its $2 billion target. ccxxxv
The absence of a clear path for predictable GCR funding despite donors signing up to the Compact’s principles is another challenge. The Global Refugee Forum, held in December 2019 was aimed at partly addressing the issue through galvanizing all rounded international support including financial. At the time, about $8 billion worth financial commitment was made by international financial institutions, the private sector, states and other actors, “the majority of these contributions are for Africa.” 64 pledges were also made from the East and Horn and Great Lakes Region, a majority of which by states.

**Discrepancies between policy and practice**

Discrepancies between policy and practice are among the key challenges. Implementation barriers continue to be a hindrance to inclusion of refugees. But even when “policy documents allow you [refugees] to access education, start a livelihood activity, access services but conditions on the ground may not be conducive to realize these rights.” This underscores the need for better coordination between the different branches of government that put up policies and those that are meant to implement them.

**Insufficient consultations**

Consultations held with refugees, host communities and NGOs working at grass roots level was not sufficient. While in Djibouti “NGOs complained that they had been excluded from the GCR process in spite of their years of experience of working with refugees and hosts and their knowledge of the local context,” in Kenya “refugees are still widely seen as “passive recipients and beneficiaries rather than actors or agents.” In some cases, insufficient consultations has led to misinformation. In February 2019, rallies against the adoption of Ethiopia’s revised proclamation were called in Addis Ababa and Gambella regional state of the country. This was driven by assumptions that the refugees in the Gambella region of Ethiopia were to be integrated automatically. This is despite the fact that integration was to be granted to refugees who lived in the country for 20 years and beyond.

The number of refugees who qualify for the local integration do not exceed 10% of the South Sudanese refugees in Gambella. The assumption may have emanated by the lack of adequate consultations at the grassroots level, a situation that may have been exacerbated by wrong media reports such as
those saying “close to 1 million refugees in Ethiopia will leave camps.” Conversely, refugee leaders in Kalobeyei integrated settlement in Kenya “...believed that living in the integrated settlement means they are now entitled to become Kenyan citizens.”

**Viewing refugees as a security concern**

The increasing tendency to view refugees as a security concern also puts its own shadow on the GCR implementation. In this respect, Kenya has repeatedly threatened to shut down the Dadaab refugee camp citing that it was serving as the launchpad for terrorist acts. Tanzania’s recent unwelcome attitude towards refugees may have been rooted in the mistaken notion of viewing refugees as a security threat. The application of a security perspective to the refugees issue shutters refugee inclusion in host country’s development plans, while it complicates aspects of refugee protection.

Linked with this, it is equally important to note that recruitment of refugees by non-state armed groups has been observed in the region, which strongly threatens the civilian and humanitarian aspect of refugees’ protection. In this respect, “the recruitment of Burundian refugees into non-state armed groups was noted by members of the international community in Rwanda in late May 2015.” Although this did not continue after 2016 due large outcry of the international community, such practices severely eroded the willingness of host countries to provide asylum and protection to refugees.

**Protracted Conflicts**

Protracted conflicts have impaired voluntary returns, the fourth objective of the GCR. Some of the conflicts in the region such as in Somalia and Sudan have passed two decades while additional devastating conflict has erupted in South Sudan in 2013 and a political and humanitarian crisis in Burundi in 2015. Further to creating additional displacements, conflicts impact the development of the necessary infrastructure that is needed to facilitate return such as healthcare facilities, roads, and schools.

3. **SOLUTIONS**
Local integration, voluntary repatriation and resettlement are the three traditional durable solutions for refugees promoted by UNHCR. Statelessness is another key challenge facing that region, which requires solution.

**Local Integration**

Local integration refers to “a means to ending exile by allowing refugees to become full members of their host community in their first country of asylum.” Local integration comprises three key interconnected aspects – legal, economic and social/cultural components. The legal aspect is the most critical that refers to “rights to employment, to engage in income-generating activities, to own property, have freedom of movement, and access to public services such as education and healthcare.” It can go as far as the right to permanent residence and acquisition of citizenship through naturalization. The legal aspect provides the basis for facilitating socio-economic integration of refugees.

The region has seen different experiences of local integration in the last decade as discussed in the previous section. The 2014 decision of the government of Tanzania to “grant citizenship to 162,156 former Burundian refugees” is one of the most prominent durable solution of the decade, and “the largest group in UNHCR’s history to which naturalization has been offered by a country of first asylum as a solution to decades in exile.” This decision was part of the 2007 Tanzania Comprehensive Solutions Strategy (TANCOSS), in which the Government of Tanzania and UNHCR agreed to facilitate durable solutions for Burundian refugees. However, the implementation of the strategy has stalled in recent years. By end of 2019, Tanzania hosted 271,729 refugees and asylum seekers. Many of them are confined to camps and are unable to work and sustain livelihoods activities.

Uganda’s settlement model whereby refugees are provided with plots of land to farm and support themselves is another shining example of putting refugees on the path to local integration. All refugees in Uganda have benefited from it, except those who choose to be in urban areas. However, Uganda’s model has faced limitations of availability linked to its land allocation model in rural settlements.

Kenya’s Kalobeyi Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISEDYP) which provides a chance for a progressive move from camps to settlements is
another example. A 2019 progress report of KISEDP indicates that significant progress has been made towards inclusion of refugees primarily in education and health policies. Strong community participation has also been demonstrated in construction of 2494 permanent shelters that benefited 6234 refugees and 200 host community members. Construction of the shelters “has ensured greater ownership in social and economic activities and better quality homes at a lower cost.” Increasing the circulation of cash in the local economy, CBI has also enhanced small scale businesses with positive impact on self-reliance.

Building of infrastructure and provision of additional trained man/woman power as well as equipment are areas where progress have been made. Between January 2018 to June 2019, “…6 schools and 3 health facilities were built, rehabilitated and/or equipped.” This has increased the total number of schools and health facilities in Turkana West country, where KISEDP is implemented to 122 and 52 respectively. Further, 675 teachers, 219 qualified health professionals and 416 community health workers were recruited by partners of KISEDP. The sum of this will enable the delivery of better education and health services to refugees and host communities.

Preparations are also on-going to facilitate local integration in Ethiopia as directives to the revised proclamation are underway. The fact that refugees and host communities speak same languages, share similar religion and culture in most refugee hosting regions of Ethiopia (such as in Afar, Tigray, and Somalia) provide substantial foundation for cultural integration. To enhance this, sporting competitions and culture events have taken place such as sports tournament in Assosa and a “Melkadida Talent’ show in 2019. Skills and entrepreneurial trainings and other activities around access to land for farming and efforts to promote peaceful coexistence will also help the process.

The out of camp schemes in Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda, allowing refugees to settle in urban locations provided that they sustain themselves economically, are all measures taken by countries of the region leading to eventual local integration.

Although not a solution by itself, the African Union’s Emergency Transit Mechanism scheme hosted by Rwanda to temporarily shelter refugees and asylum seekers stranded in Libya was another encouraging step taken in the decade to facilitate in-continent solutions and responsibility sharing.
date, Rwanda facilitated humanitarian evacuation of 306 stranded African refugees and asylum seekers from Libya.\textsuperscript{cclix}

**Voluntary Repatriation**

Voluntary repatriation refers to “…the return of refugees in safety and dignity to their countries of origin.”\textsuperscript{cclxx} Between 2010 to 2019, 956,965 refugees were returned voluntarily to their countries of origin across the region, with the highest number of returns recorded in 2018 with the return of 274,431 people, of which 136,155 were South Sudanese who returned in a self-organized fashion. In Somalia, one of the major refugee origin countries in the region, “UNHCR worked through the decade to provide a solutions framework, and this led to displacement solutions being included in National Development Plans and the establishment of relevant governance structures.”\textsuperscript{cclxxi} This partly encouraged the repatriation of 242,600 Somali refugees in the decade.\textsuperscript{cclxxii}

A total 4,162,421 IDPs also returned to their areas of origin in the region in the course of the decade. This includes the return of 752,261 internally displaced South Sudanese in 2016.

**Resettlement**

Resettlement is the other durable solution, which refers to “the transfer of refugees from an asylum country to another State that has agreed to admit them and ultimately grant them permanent settlement.”\textsuperscript{cclxxiii} It is one of the mechanisms that “can be used as an effective tool to achieve equitable burden and responsibility sharing.”\textsuperscript{cclxxiv} Between 2010 – 2019, 159,203 refugees were resettled to third countries, which represents 0.57 percent of the average number of refugees in the region in the past decade. The resettlement ratio has been below 1 percent of the refugee population in the region throughout the decade, except for 2010 where 1.1 percent of the refugees were resettled, 12,716 out of 1,087,208. The least resettlement 0.3 percent ratio was recorded in 2017, where 13,610 were resettled out of 4,438,217 refugees. This is due to President Trump’s 2017 executive order to cut the refugee resettlement ceiling to 50,000 from 110,000 under President Obama.\textsuperscript{cclxxv} The United States was the biggest country admitting refugees from the region.\textsuperscript{cclxxvi}
To improve this situation, expanding access to third-country solutions is included as the third objective of GCR. Further to resettlement, the Compact envisages legal migration pathways complementary pathways such as through humanitarian visa, family reunification and educational and employment opportunities. This includes facilitating complementary pathways for 2 million refugees, in addition to resettlement opportunities for 1 million refugees by 2028. Trends so far indicate that refugees from the region have not benefitted at equal pace with other refugees such as Syrians.

To enhance the potential for resettlement opportunities, an Asylum Capacity Support Group (ACSG) mechanism is also established under the GCR. The ACSG aims “to provide support to the concerned national authorities to strengthen their asylum systems with a view of increasing their efficiency, fairness, adaptability and integrity.” Further, this mechanism “will bring more coherence and consistency to asylum capacity support by matching support offered with needs” and “will help States adapt their asylum systems to major changes in the world, from climate change to COVID-19.” As part of the GRF implementation, the ACSG Secretariat is coordinating cross-regional matches.
Statelessness

Statelessness in the region is one of the challenges that needs an urgent solution. In 2010, there were an estimated over 21,000 stateless persons in the region, a figure that has shown a slight decrease over the past decade to get to over 19,400 at the end of 2019. 94.9 percent of them (18,500) lived in Kenya in 2019. The small decline was recorded “mainly due to the registration and provision of Kenyan citizenship to approximately 2,000 people of Makonde descent who had settled in Kenya (from Mozambique and Tanzania), initiated at the end of 2016.”

“Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan and Uganda each has committed to adopt national action plans to end statelessness by 2024 “during the Seventieth session, the Executive Committee of UNHCR’s Programme in October 2019. This is in line with UNHCR’s #IBelong campaign to end statelessness by 2024. As per its commitment, Rwanda has already adopted a National Action Plan to end Statelessness.

Efforts are also on-going to address statelessness at continental level. In this respect, the African Commission on Human and People’s Rights (ACHPR) submitted a draft ‘Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the Specific Aspects of the Right to a Nationality and the Eradication of Statelessness in Africa’ to the African Union in May 2017. The draft protocol was subsequently discussed by experts and adopted by the AU's STC on Migration, Refugees and IDPs in 2018. The AU is expected to adopt the protocol soon.

4. REFLECTIONS ON FUTURE TRENDS: 2020 – 2029

With countries of the region increasingly subscribing to the GCR principles, current trends indicate that the region’s forced displacement response could gradually but steadily move away from encampment in favour of the inclusion of refugees in national development plans for the benefit of both refugees and the communities hosting them. The initial gains of the implementation of the GCR, including a gradual ‘shift in thinking’ will lay a solid foundation leading to some discernible change in the way refugees are perceived and protected as well as their contribution to their countries of asylum. This is, of course contingent upon donor support for host countries to be able to pursue an area-based approach that entails investing in borderland and peripheral areas.
that host refugees. This will enable the host governments to implement inclusive development policies that address the developmental needs of host communities, allowing refugees to contribute to the same.

This in turn can enhance the resilience of communities in peripheral areas through facilitating sustainable livelihood opportunities and addressing environmental degradation. Such an inclusive model can improve the perception of refugees by host communities as agents of economic wellbeing rather than competitors, thereby dispelling some misconceptions contributing to viewing refugees as a security concern to their host communities.

Despite the general positive outlook, three major challenges will continue to hamper the potential progress to be made in refugee inclusion in the region: (i) continued conflicts and combined effect of conflict and climate change, (ii) increase in the number of forcibly displaced as a result of conflict and related drivers, and (iii) inability of host government and donors to reach an agreement on a common ground on the issue of responsibility and burden sharing.

Further to addressing these hindrances, interventions at the beginning of the coming decade should factor in the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The COVID-19 scourge is likely to aggravate the situation and take the attention away from the socio-economic inclusion of refugees due to the long-term economic impact of the pandemic. Refugees and other forcibly displaced people are already feeling the pinch due to the COVID-19 lockdowns which robbed mostly urban refugees their livelihoods, making them entirely dependent on humanitarian aid. The pandemic has also disrupted services such as access to documentation, cash and voucher systems, which are critical to facilitate socio-economic inclusion of refugees. Refugees and host communities’ education has also been impacted due to precautionary school closures, while Sexual and Gender Based Violence increases. Border closures due to the pandemic are also preventing refugees from accessing asylum. In some instances, there have been reports of refugees being stigmatized for allegedly spreading the virus.

The sum total of all these variables has already led and could further lead to complex refugee and IDP movements in the region, impacting humanitarian response. The fact that development partners show commitment to continue supporting humanitarian response in the region is good. Recent trends indicate
Level of humanitarian funding to refugee hosting countries globally remains steady. Between 2015-2017, $25.98 billion Official Development Assistance (ODA) was contributed to refugee hosting countries across the world by Development Assistance Committee (DAC) countries. 71.5 percent ($18.58 billion) was allocated for humanitarian response, while 28.5 percent of the funds ($7.4 billion) to development funds. African refugee hosting continent received 14% and 31% of development and humanitarian funding respectively. This development indicates the greater understanding by development partners on the significance of humanitarian aid towards the success of the development aspect.

Contrary to this, experiences in the EHAGLR indicate the growing needs of refugees driven by increased numbers have outpaced humanitarian aid. In some cases, this even led to decline in humanitarian aid. In April 2020, for example, the World Food Programme (WFP) was forced to cut food rations and cash based transfers to refugees in Uganda by 30 per cent due to funding shortfall. Such developments can negatively affect the attainment of the self-reliance component of the GCR, increasing pressure on host countries and economies. This can be reversed only through replicating successful projects that combine humanitarian aid and development and empower refugees and host communities such as DRDIP Uganda as explained page (29 - 30) of this paper.

Therefore, future policy and operations on forced displacement should intensify their efforts to address the root causes of forced displacement such as conflict and climate change related disasters as well as challenges linked to the implementation of the GCR including devising mechanisms on global responsibility sharing in support of the region. Regional approaches as rightly promoted by IGAD should continue to be central to the processes. If these points are genuinely considered by the relevant stakeholders including parties to conflict, host governments, CSOs, UN Agencies, regional organisations such as IGAD and AU, the region’s history of being an epicentre of forced displacement can change in the coming decade, 2020 – 2029.
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DRDIP is a regional project that is being implemented in the different refugee hosting countries in the region including in Ethiopia and Kenya.
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