**ANNEX 12–** **GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED (PROTECTION RESPONSE AND LIP)**

**GOOD PRACTICES IN PROTECTION RESPONSE.**

* Importance of granting complementary protection to asylum seekers whose refugee status is not recognised[[1]](#footnote-1).
* Identification of different scenarios in registration, based on the situation and contexts of origin, and on that basis, differentiated application processes were implemented (simplified, merged, accelerated procedures).
* Introduction of the Quality Assurance Initiative (QAI) as it has driven reviews and monitoring of RSD decisions to ensure the quality of processes.
* Creation of an ecosystem of actors to respond to protection and humanitarian assistance needs in partnership with civil society and other stakeholders.
* Establishment of a network of paralegals to provide information and legal assistance to people on the move so that they can make informed decisions.
* Design of a shelter strategy with a protection focus: the 2019-2022 shelter strategy aims to strengthen protection issues, networking, contingency preparedness, etc.
* Implementation of the "Alternatives to Detention Programme": important to combat detention standards contrary to international standards, especially with regard to juvenile detainees.
* Participation in the Commission for the Comprehensive Protection of Migrant and Refugee Children and Adolescents. Direct work with local prosecutors' offices in cases of children and adolescents and legal assistance to asylum-seeking and refugee children.
* Completion of participatory assessments with people on the move and host communities to better understand their needs, views and design joint action plans.

**GOOD PRACTICES IN LIP**

The LIP programme, although in an evolutive phase, offers elements that have been identified as practices that can strengthen an enabling environment for integration, be useful for local teams and for promoting the involvement of other relevant actors.

* Conduct community assessments and mapping of key actors relevant to the integration response that serve as tools to build accompaniment protocols adapted to each local context.
* Allow sufficient time for the establishment of accompaniment protocols prior to the relocation of PoC. Even with the challenges posed by COVID-19, the interruption that LIP experienced during COVID-19 provided an opportunity for localities that had not started the programme to better plan their operation.
* Identify partners specialising in protection needs that fill gaps in care (e.g. people with disabilities) or with broader geographic coverage. There have been cases where partners who had not included persons with international protection needs within their target population but, with UNHCR's support, they had positive experiences with an expansion of their services (e.g. Alternativas Pacíficas in Monterrey and Matamoros with women victims of violence).
* Adopt strategies to increase visibility to and raise awareness among host communities about refugees and asylum seekers allows for the creation of openness with key actors, particularly with government authorities.
* Seek strategies to institutionalise integration with a medium-term perspective, such as: inter-institutional and multi-level framework agreements, including the Ministry of the Interior and municipalities (Guadalajara case); agreements with areas with competencies in the promotion of human rights for people on the move (Guanajuato case); inclusion in cross-cutting government programmes on human rights (Saltillo case).
* Capitalise on and making visible the agreements and achievements in labour inclusion reached with medium-sized and large companies (e.g. with national presence, positive brand image, visibility) generates and attracts interest from other companies and leverage opportunities in other key areas for integration (e.g. acceptance of refugee status documentation for opening bank accounts, involvement of employment and vocational training authorities).

**LESSONS LEARNED IN LIP**

* Accompaniment protocols have mostly been established on an ad-hoc basis or through direct relationships established by UNHCR staff with key officials. While these strategies can be used in the initial phases of the LIP, they are depend individual relationships and are not established within an institutional alliance, which is a better option for building capacity at the local level and creating greater involvement of actors to reinforce sustainability.
* The accompaniment protocols are not static and require updating to adapt to the arrival of different PoC profiles, changes in public administrations and conjunctural situations, particularly with regard to accompaniment in legal inclusion. Given that the national and local contexts are constantly changing, this means that UNHCR staff are continually updating the accompaniment protocols. Consequently, efforts to plan and build an accompaniment strategy have to be contemplated within the work plans of local teams. Otherwise, the team may find itself regularly overwhelmed in responding to immediate needs, but without the time to review the efficiency and strategic components of accompaniment actions.
* Accompanying PoC to facilitate local integration is a process that makes it complex to find a balance between fostering people's resilience to achieve autonomy and self-sufficiency and offering holistic accompaniment that allows beneficiaries to have sufficient conditions to establish themselves. Reaching this balance is not so easy when planning the duration of intensive accompaniment, which can last for months and may require a quicker response to specific needs (e.g. CBI support that arrives late).
* The social protection system is weak for the national population where, for example, the right to health is conditioned to formal employment (IMSS medical coverage) or there is a lack of initiatives in the housing sector. Therefore, already integrated PoC continue to face vulnerabilities (e.g. unemployment due to cutbacks during a pandemic) and a lack of specific social support for people on the move. This explains the observation of cases of PoC already integrated and residing in Mexico for several years that continue to need support from UNHCR, with implications for the LIP to maintain a medium/long-term integration intervention.

1. Mexican Law on Refugees and Complementary Protection (2011): “Article 2.IV. Complementary Protection: Protection that the Ministry of the Interior grants to a foreigner who has not been recognized as a refugee under the terms of this Law, consists of non-refoulment to the territory of another country where his or her life would be threatened or would be in danger of being subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment”. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)