



Desk Review

On Urban Reintegration

OSTS/DOS, UNHCR
August 2009

Acknowledgements

The Operational Solutions and Transition Section (OSTS) in the UNHCR Division of Operational Services, presents the desk review on urban reintegration. This review was conducted to improve the understanding of the reintegration in urban contexts.

First of all, I would like to thank Milena Robotham, OSTs Intern, for her excellent work researching this document. This study was the first review of its kind, and consequently obtaining from existing documents information on return in urban areas was not an easy task. Nevertheless, she conducted exhaustive research from broad ranges of resources and thorough analysis on the collected information. PDES Head of Service, Jeff Crisp and PDES Senior Policy Officer Vicky Tennant must be thanked for their ongoing advice, as well as all interviewees for their cooperation and valuable information that they provided. I would also like to acknowledge, Yasuko Shimizu, OSTs Snr. Operations Officer, for her contributions to this review exercise.

Sajjad Malik,
August 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	4
2	BACKGROUND: DEFINITIONS	5
2.1	URBAN REINTEGRATION	5
2.2	REINTEGRATION	5
2.3	URBAN	6
3	PROFILE OF RETURNEES AND PATTERNS OF RETURN TO URBAN AREAS	6
3.1	ATTAINING INFORMATION ON PATTERNS OF RETURN.....	6
3.2	PROFILE OF RETURNEES	7
4	CHALLENGES FACED BY RETURNEES IN URBAN AREAS.....	7
4.1	SOCIAL NETWORKS AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT	8
4.2	HOUSING/LAND/PROPERTY ISSUES.....	8
4.3	LIVELIHOODS AND SELF RELIANCE	9
4.4	EDUCATION.....	9
5	UNHCR OPERATIONAL RESPONSE: THE APPROACH TO URBAN REINTEGRATION.....	10
5.1	UNHCR POLICY REGARDING URBAN REINTEGRATION.....	10
5.2	COST.....	11
5.3	IDENTIFICATION OF BENEFICIARIES	11
5.4	RETURNEE MONITORING IN URBAN AREAS.....	12
5.5	OTHER PROTECTION RELATED ACTIVITIES.....	12
5.6	SHELTER	13
5.7	CO-EXISTENCE AND PEACEBUILDING	13
5.8	LIVELIHOODS	14
5.9	EDUCATION.....	14
5.10	ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE	15
5.11	WATER.....	15
6	RATIONALISATION OF MINIMAL OPERATIONAL RESPONSE	15
6.1	LACK OF PERCEIVED NEED.....	16
6.2	URBAN REINTEGRATION ACTIVITIES ENHANCE URBANISATION	16
6.3	OUTSIDE THE MANDATE DUE TO DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONS THAT ARISE	17
7	PARTNERSHIPS AND COOPERATION	17
8	CONCLUSION	18
9	CASE STUDIES	19
9.1	LIBERIA CASE STUDY	19
9.2	SUDAN CASE STUDY.....	22
9.3	AFGHANISTAN CASE STUDY	27
10	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	33

1 Introduction

The purpose of this desk review is to enhance UNHCR's understanding of the process of reintegration in urban contexts, and draw some lessons which could inform a future policy and implementation strategy. In recent years, more displaced persons are returning to urban areas and more displaced persons live in urban areas. In principle, where there are persons of concern, so should there be a role for UNHCR to play. The UNHCR reintegration policy acknowledges the fact that there is an increasing number of beneficiaries in urban areas but does not expand upon what (if anything) needs to be done to address how the Office can form its operational response to the needs of this group.¹ Consequently, there appears to be no clear position on the extent of the agency's involvement and the resource implications for operating in urban areas and thus, UNHCR's position on its engagement in reintegration activities in urban areas is somewhat undefined.

Despite this lack of policy definition regarding this subject matter, greater attention is being turned toward the situation of beneficiaries in urban areas more generally. Studies are being conducted within several sectoral delimitations; livelihoods in urban areas, education and shelter in urban areas, and urban displacement as a whole, are coming under scrutiny in order to establish what is being done by the Office and how the UNHCR can proceed to achieve the maximum assistance to the beneficiaries in urban areas. Within this context of related and ongoing reviews, the scope of this study does not encompass all of these fields in depth, neither does it delve into the root causes of displacement, or seek to address the entire rural-urban migration phenomenon. Rather, the objective is to focus more firmly on highlighting what type of information on urban reintegration is available and to highlight where the UNHCR has made strategic efforts to address the needs of returnees in urban areas. Where gaps have been identified, this has been highlighted, in the hope that recommendations as to whether or for how these gaps can be filled will be formulated. Ultimately, it is hoped that this desk review can contribute to a broader study on the challenges faced by beneficiaries in urban areas and the ideal UNHCR responses thereto.

The information for this desk review was predominantly gleaned from UNHCR literature and through interviews conducted with UNHCR staff. The members of staff interviewed had the experience of implementing, supervising, and planning the reintegration strategies and operations of the UNHCR in a range of different country situations. The literature referenced included UNHCR returnee monitoring reports, briefing notes, operational summaries and annual protection reports as well as external documents. The information gathered from the documents and the interviews conducted was focused mainly on the reintegration activities in the situations of Afghanistan, Southern Sudan, and Liberia, but through the research process, some information on reintegration in Burundi, Georgia, Angola and Somalia also came to the fore. There was a notable dearth of UNHCR literature as well as a relatively low operational awareness reflected through the interviews,² relating to issues and activities specifically on urban reintegration, which suggests that urban reintegration is in its nascent stages as a topic to which operational focus and importance, within the broader context of UNHCR's activities, has been attributed.

Nevertheless, it would appear that issues concerning persons of concern in urban areas more generally, are gradually gaining ground as a current UNHCR policy focus. This is reflected by the fact that challenges faced by persons of UNHCR's concern in urban areas will be the central focus of the High Commissioner's Dialogue on Protection Challenges in December 2009. The motivation behind having this topic for the upcoming Dialogue is primarily that 'the longstanding assumption that populations of concern to UNHCR (refugees, internally displaced persons, returnees and stateless

¹ UNHCR (2008) *Policy Framework and Implementation Strategy: UNHCR's Role in Support of the Return and Reintegration of Displaced Populations*. Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/48c628d42.html>

² At the outset of the interview, several of the interviewees stated that they did not notice any issues specific to urban returnees. More often than not, however, it was gleaned further throughout the course of the interview that certain reintegration challenges either specific to or heightened in urban areas were recalled.

persons) principally originate from, and reside in, mainly rural areas is increasingly at odds with the reality.³

This awakening policy focus corresponds to growing awareness of trends of global urbanization as an issue to be considered by the humanitarian community.⁴ Urban displacement as a special area of operational focus arose in the context of urban refugees, who have been highlighted as a group to which special attention should be paid by UNHCR since as early as 1999.⁵ Policies and approaches to assisting this group of beneficiaries are still developing. Similarly, the needs of the urban displaced and the challenges in assisting them have also begun to be explored. It seems to be a natural progression that there would be acceptance of the fact that it is appropriate for UNHCR to begin more probing explorations into the needs of returnees in urban areas. This review will begin with some definitions of the relevant terms before expanding upon some of these needs of returnees in urban areas, and the activities implemented in response to these needs by UNHCR operations, as indicated through the findings.

2 Background: Definitions

2.1 Urban Reintegration

Urban reintegration refers to the reintegration of returnees in urban contexts. The group 'urban returnees' includes, therefore, all returnees residing in urban areas within their country of origin regardless of whether they resided in urban or rural areas during the period of asylum, or whether they originated from (the same or different) urban areas within their country of origin.

2.2 Reintegration

Reintegration is the preferred durable solution of the UNHCR and is set out in the 2008 UNHCR policy, defined as being "equated with the achievement of a sustainable return – in other words the ability of returning refugees to secure the political, economic [legal] and social conditions needed to maintain life, livelihood and dignity".⁶ Regarding the existing strategy development and programme design, the guidance for repatriation and reintegration activities is contained in the Repatriation and Reintegration Handbook. The Handbook outlines the key attributes of the returnees and the country of origin to which they are returning that will determine how to approach reintegration activities.⁷

Although there is a clear definition of reintegration which has been incorporated into the UNHCR literature, the propagation of reintegration as a durable solution and its employment in execution of the UNHCR mandate occurred in conjunction with variegated perceptions of UNHCR's ideal role in relation to reintegration activities which may be more efficiently tackled by development actors.⁸ In the context of the Foreword to the Global Appeal 2009 Update the High Commissioner comments that the UNHCR does not have the capacity and resources to provide all the essential elements to make return and reintegration sustainable.⁹ For this reason, the organization has been actively

³ Concept Paper for High Commissioner's Dialogue

⁴ UNHABITAT Harmonized Cities

⁵ UNHCR 1999 Global Appeal: 'Inspection, Investigation and Evaluation'

⁶ Macrae, Joanna, *Aiding Peace... and War: UNHCR, Returnee Reintegration and the Relief/Development Debate* (December 1999) in Handbook for Repatriation and Reintegration _____ UNHCR (2004) *Handbook for Repatriation and Reintegration Activities*. Geneva: UNHCR.

⁷ Whether the returnees are residing in urban or rural areas is not one of the factors which will determine the approach to reintegration... (see recommendations below).

⁸ Crisp, Jeff *Mind the Gap*

⁹ Foreword by the High Commissioner to the Global Appeal 2009 Update

seeking for partnership with development actors in attaining sustainable reintegration, such that return and reintegration can be incorporated into national recovery strategies, development frameworks and peacebuilding processes.¹⁰

2.3 Urban

UNHCR has no consistently applied definition of 'urban'. Criteria for determining what qualifies as urban are loosely based on the 1997 Comprehensive Policy Document on Urban Refugees, (for which an update is expected in the near future). "Urban", for the purposes of this desk review will include national capitals, provincial capitals and district centers. Also to be included in this category, are localities which can be observed to be of such character of administrative and/or commercial importance such that they can be objectively classified as 'urban'. It is recognized that in some national capitals (and certainly in some provincial capitals) opportunities for both agricultural and non-agricultural livelihoods will exist, and indeed in some urban areas the former may even be more prevalent.¹¹ This should not preclude their classification as 'urban'. Reintegration activities taking place in areas that would more readily be categorized as rural will be considered in this study if they are largely, non-agriculture based. A nuanced approach to the definition of urban will allow for the broadest possible review of UNHCR's operations in post-conflict areas, with consideration of both developed and developing country contexts.

3 Profile of Returnees and Patterns of Return to Urban Areas

3.1 Attaining information on Patterns of Return

UNHCR internal as well as external literature suggests that returning refugees increasingly choose to return to urban centers. This was found to take place amongst urbanized returnees who fled rural areas to urban centers abroad, and would thus find it difficult to reintegrate in their original agricultural community. For example, Hargeisa town in Somalia hosts about 60% of the returnee population, most of whom repatriated spontaneously between 1991 and 1997. Similarly, a large proportion of the millions of returning Afghan refugees have returned to urban areas such as Kabul, Nangarhar and Kunduz (c. 42%). Apart from these facts, the information available on the number of urban returns was usually not concrete, but indicated that there were trends suggesting that returns to urban areas were very high.

The most recently published Statistical Yearbook and annexes include a table giving statistics for the 'Population of concern to UNHCR by type of location'. This table indicates whether the population of concern to UNHCR resides in camps/centers, urban areas, rural or dispersed areas, or in unknown areas. The data on population of concern is not presented in such a way that the percentage of these inhabitants as *returnees* can be gleaned. Also, discussions with personnel in the Field Information and Camp Coordination Support Section (hereinafter referred to as FICCS), highlighted the fact that no unified definition of urban was used in compiling or sourcing this data on persons of concern in 'urban' areas.¹² It was suggested that the determinations on whether a location was deemed urban were loosely based on a 1997 Comprehensive Policy Document¹³ but that the criteria are largely

¹⁰ Foreword by the High Commissioner to the Global Appeal 2009 Update

¹¹ For example, in Southern Sudan there is a location near the border with DRC called Yei which is not necessarily urban according to development terminology. It is not a village but neither is it really a town. Despite this, Toshiya Abe characterizes this location as urban and estimates that it could be the third largest urban area in Southern Sudan.

¹² Spoke to FICCS April 28, 2009 (Tarek Abou Chabake)

¹³ 1997 Comprehensive Policy Document on Urban Refugees (UNHCR)

based in the perceptions of the field officers charged with providing the information by filling out the relevant questionnaire issued from headquarters.

The standards and indicators used for gathering and presenting information on the status of the persons of concern to the UNHCR have been recently revised to incorporate both urban and returnee issues, albeit, as distinct categories. Also, the definition of “Returnee Area” used as one of the parameters for the standards and indicators, does not depend on specifically determined geographic criteria. Often, the ‘returnee area’ will refer to the second administrative level in the country (“district”). Given these two characteristics, it is exceedingly difficult to gather accurate statistical information regarding the number of returnees residing in urban areas.

3.2 Profile of Returnees

Despite the difficulties in obtaining data on the number of returnees in urban areas, there is some information available which seeks to explain the tendencies of returnees to head towards these areas. Firstly, after many years of exile, the younger generation may not be willing to return to their parents’ place of origin in remote areas (they may lack farming skills) and may try to move to urban areas.¹⁴ Also, returnees, like other rural-to-urban migrants, gravitate towards urban areas to take advantage of the opportunities and amenities that cities appear to offer.¹⁵ Urban centers are perceived to be locations which will generate employment, especially in the service sectors; and they potentially provide significant opportunities for private sector investment. There may be a perception that service provision will be of a higher standard than in rural areas. Furthermore, cities are generally the focal points for social and cultural development.¹⁶ In some country situations the prospect of returning to urban areas is preferred, especially by women and youth, due to there being a less restrictive and conservative environment than in more traditional, rural areas.¹⁷ Returnees who fled their rural areas of origin for reasons of security in the first instance may perceive that the security situation may be better in urban areas.¹⁸

As will be elaborated on below, these expectations are not always met.¹⁹ This influx of returnees to urban areas occurs in parallel with trends of general urban growth, which are becoming commonplace in the international community. Indeed, the trend of urban growth puts additional pressure on already stretched services in (post-conflict) urban areas, leaving returning refugees, urban IDPs and the urban poor in precarious situations.²⁰

4 Challenges Faced by Returnees in Urban Areas

The findings related to the challenges faced by returnees in urban areas suggest that there is a high correlation to the problems associated more widely with urbanization, which include²¹: overcrowding and concurrent housing, land and property issues, high competition on the job market, and with unemployment potentially rife; high crime rates, increasing or sudden heterogeneity of population and lack of traditional social networks, compounded by added pressure on services and

¹⁴ Handbook on Repatriation and Reintegration pg. ONE-23.

¹⁵ Cities alliance

¹⁶ Urban development in Kabul: an overview of challenges and strategies, by dr. Annette Ittig, <http://www.institute-for-afghan-studies.org/contributions/projects/dr-ittig/urbandev.htm> accessed April 27th, 2009 at 10:04.

¹⁷ Afghanistan example.

¹⁸ Cities alliance

¹⁹ In Juba, for example, “services have not expanded significantly, and the quality of many existing services has actually deteriorated, with Primary Health Care Units (PHCUs) and schools barely functioning due to a lack of maintenance, qualified staff, equipment and drugs.

²⁰ Research Paper no. 161 (New Issues in Refugee Research) Ignored Displaced Persons: The Plight Of IDPs In Urban Areas, Alexandra Fielden (PDES) July 2008

²¹ UN -Habitat and the other sources for Urbanization

infrastructure, often in a post-conflict context. Returnees originating from rural areas may also be affected by lack of knowledge or skills required to survive in a city. Like other displaced persons, they might also be without capital or identity documents which are required to access public services.

4.1 Social Networks and Community Support

A rapidly growing urban population may contribute to a more heterogeneous society and the blurring of more traditional community power structures, with the result that returnees may find themselves in an environment lacking in a familiar social network. Family or tribal connections which may be readily found in rural areas are often not at play in urban ones. Indeed, it is the social network in rural areas which may facilitate, even temporarily, some form of relief for returnees. This may come in the form of shelter provided by family or community members. Also, in rural contexts, neighbours or old community leaders might be able to verify land ownership of returnees to some extent, even without the existence of property conveyancing and registration mechanisms, thereby facilitating the reintegration process somewhat.²²

The difficulties regarding absence of social network in urban areas may affect women returning alone or as head of households in particular. The UN-Habitat 'Harmonious Cities' report indicates that women-headed households suffer from more shelter deprivations than others.

4.2 Housing/Land/Property Issues

Housing, land and property issues were consistently presented by interviewees as those which they perceived as posing the most serious challenges for returnees to urban areas. With rapidly growing urban populations, problems of non-durable housing and insecure tenure can be rife, particularly for the more vulnerable and asset poor urban dwellers. In urban areas, it was gleaned that residents are more likely to be taking up residence under lease agreements as opposed to living in their own homes, than is the case in rural areas. Returnees, who were renting prior to their exile, have no de facto (let alone *de jure*) access to their prior home and therefore face extreme difficulty in finding shelter upon their return. They are pressed to live in often overcrowded conditions with extended family members, in settlements at the outskirts of the cities, or pay extortionate rates for new leases.²³ With returnees to urban areas seeking to acquire new lease agreements and high competition among rising numbers of urban dwellers for shelter, the extortionate levels of rent payments have become a critical issue. Indeed, rents, as well as bribes, are noted as being the primary costs faced by returnees in urban areas.²⁴ If returnees cannot meet the higher rates or rent payments, or have not family with whom to share living space, they then run the risk of being homeless or taking up tenuous existence in slum dwelling scenarios.

The availability of land in rural areas may also be scarce, unregistered, or be the subject of contested ownership, as is the case in rural areas of Central Equatoria, Jonglei and Southern Kordofan where the arrival of returnees has exacerbated long-running tensions between land users.²⁵ Nevertheless, land allocation may also be much clearer, with returnees being able to reclaim ownership after exile through community awareness of inherited property or community acceptance of land delineations.²⁶ This is the case in most parts of rural Southern Sudan where land is still owned communally and rights are administered by traditional leaders.²⁷

²² Afghanistan interviews -

²³ Chamatla for example is home to many Afghan returnees. 16 miles from Jalalabad.

²⁴ Cities alliance speech

²⁵ Find Afghanistan example.

²⁶ Int..

²⁷ ODI report

The land in and around urban areas, is a highly desired commodity, particularly in newly recovering, post-conflict societies. It was found that governments seek to reclaim parcels of land either to expand the boundaries of the town for investment, government offices and infrastructure, services, or newer residential plots.²⁸ These reclamations are often to the detriment of the most vulnerable people, who are residing in dwellings of which ownership is contested as a result of prolonged displacement and ambiguous or absent land documentation.²⁹ In the worst cases, the reclamations by the government may result in arbitrary evictions. For example, a Returnee Monitoring report revealed that in 2007 the Government of Central Equatoria State started evicting people and demolishing houses in Jebel Kujur, a squatter area along the Juba – Yei road and the Juba – Kajo Keji road, affecting primarily IDPs and returnees.³⁰

4.3 Livelihoods and Self Reliance

It became apparent that the ability of returnees in urban areas to integrate themselves and become competitive on the job market depends strongly on their experience in exile and whether they lived in urban areas prior to or during exile. Suggestions in interviews were that it is often the case that those who were residing in urban areas during exile, may indeed be in an advantaged position upon return to the urban areas within the country of origin since they may have acquired assets or skills which can be put to use for self-reliance purposes.

On the other hand, those who are residing in urban areas for the first time, and/or have only a low level of education, may present significant vulnerabilities, particularly in urban areas where there is little or no opportunity for agriculture. The position of these vulnerable persons is exacerbated by the tendency for prices to be substantially higher in urban areas than in rural areas. Returnees who find it difficult to become self-reliant may fall into unstable and casual labour markets, or run the risk of resorting to negative coping mechanisms such as taking children out of school to work, engaging in transactional sex, and selling household goods.³¹

It was noted however that in some instances, positive strategies can also be adopted, and that returnees with low levels of education, who are perhaps also unskilled in agriculture, or unaccustomed to rural living could find ways to get by in urban areas. Certain coping mechanisms were identified by interviewees such as; the tendency for women in Kabul city, for example, in who had no access to education to pick up bottles and cans to sell on for small amounts of money. Despite these slim indications of self-reliance, it was found that positive strategies appear to be more common in rural areas where there is more opportunity for strategies such as starting or increasing home-based vegetable or small-scale crop production.”³²

4.4 Education

Access to education is identified as the primary area of concern of returnees regarding the success and sustainability of their reintegration.³³ Although there was no concrete indication as to whether the challenges to accessing education were specific to urban or rural areas, (or even specific to returnees as opposed to other UNHCR beneficiaries), there are some general challenges highlighted in the evidence. These challenges include: insufficient infrastructure, a lack of qualified teachers both at primary and even more at secondary level, as well as insufficient teaching and learning material and a lack of salaries for teachers. In some situations where a country receives returnees from several

²⁸ ODI This is the case in Juba – the reclaiming of land (or seizing of land gazetted during the conflict

²⁹ ODI Reintegration report pg. 4

³⁰ Returnee and Protection Monitoring Central Equatoria 25 May 2007 Report 6/2007: Thematic Report Evictions Of Idps In Juba – And Its Effect On Returnees

³¹ Afghanistan Monthly Operational Summary (April)

³² Global Appeal Update 2009: Policy Priorities: pg. 7 of 7

³³ Eva Ahlen Education Mission to Southern Sudan Sources.

different countries, (as is the case Southern Sudan where the country received returnees from CAR, Kenya and Uganda), there is also the problem of making education accessible without barriers regarding the curricula and language of instruction. Additionally, it was identified by a UNHCR (OSTS – Education) mission to Southern Sudan that there is a distinct lack of a coordinated approach among education stakeholders in terms of teachers training and locations.

5 UNHCR Operational Response: The Approach to Urban Reintegration

5.1 UNHCR Policy Regarding Urban Reintegration

Policy documents, particularly the more recent ones, acknowledge that there are more persons of concern residing in urban areas and enunciate that there is potentially a need or operational space for a difference in approach between reintegration in urban and rural areas. This matter was presented as one of the key challenges faced by the UNHCR in the 2009 Global Appeal Update:

“Increasingly, the Office is obliged to protect and meet the needs of refugees, internally displaced persons (IDPs), returnees and stateless people who live in a city or town, rather than a camp or rural area. ... An important challenge for UNHCR in 2009 will be to reassess its role in urban areas to determine how protection, assistance and solutions can be most effectively and efficiently delivered to people of concern in such contexts. In camp situations, there is logic in establishing services for the beneficiaries. In urban areas, however, it will be necessary to strengthen existing systems and reinforce the capacity of national and local actors responsible for the welfare of poor and vulnerable sections of the community.”³⁴

The 2003 Policy document setting out UNHCR’s approach to reintegration (and the 4Rs) makes no mention of urban contexts in particular. The Reintegration policy statement of 2008, which is to be implemented this year, reflects conceptual reconsiderations of reintegration and an acceptance of the topic of ‘urban reintegration’ in so far as acknowledging that returnees may not always go back to their place of origin but may, especially those ‘who have experienced urban or semi-urban lifestyles during their period of displacement’, choose to move to towns and cities upon their return.³⁵

Notably, policy statements specific to the UNHCR approach to reintegration activities in particular country situations, do not indicate that there is (or is not) a plan to implement responses in urban areas. It was suggested widely by interviewees speaking about the Afghanistan situation, that such a UNHCR policy of non-engagement in urban areas (regarding reintegration activities_) did not exist. However, two interviewees were indeed aware of a UNHCR policy decision *not* to engage in reintegration activities in urban areas, partially as a response to the request of (what was then), the Afghan Interim Administration. One of the sources clarified that this policy was never explicit or written since this policy stance had a certain degree of political sensitivity. The result of this policy however, is manifest as de facto, which is illustrated by the minimal operational response in urban areas in Afghanistan.³⁶ The lack of awareness about one such country situation policy, suggests that there may be similar policies pertaining to other country situations. At any rate, it is appropriate here to outline the information that it *was* possible to find about the UNHCR operational response in urban areas.

³⁴ Global Appeal Update 2009 Key Challenges

³⁵ EC/59/SC/CRP.5 pg. 5-6. n.b <http://www.unhcr.org/excom/EXCOM/47b06de42.pdf> accessed April 30, 2009 at 9:48.

³⁶ Please Refer to Case study.

5.2 Cost

There were two consistently identified considerations which interviewees suggested had to be made before putatively considering UNHCR engagement in reintegration activities in urban areas. These are; the cost of operations in urban areas, and identification of beneficiaries therein.

Firstly, in rural areas of post-conflict societies, as one of the interviewees put it; 'everyone is starting from scratch'; therefore the initial input is far greater. By this it was meant that in some rural areas there may be no (or little) crops, infrastructure, services or shelter available. Thus, even where preliminary cash assistance is provided to the returnees in these areas, for example, there may be nothing to purchase or invest the funds in. In urban areas on the other hand, (at least theoretically), the initial output and cost may be supported by a higher concentration of donors and perhaps also increased government support.

On the other hand, another factor which interviewees thought would be necessary to consider is that funding projects or cash assistance on an individual basis (which is more often the case in urban areas) is far more time consuming and costly than working with larger groups. The costing difficulties of providing assistance for beneficiaries in urban areas, given the lack of physical concentration of beneficiaries and the challenges to implementing community level reintegration activities when returnee locations are fragmented – if at all known, is exemplified by comments made in a discussion paper regarding UNHCR policy and practice regarding urban refugees; 'whilst constituting less than 2% of UNHCR's refugee caseload (and less than 1% of the total caseload of concern to the High Commissioner), urban refugees demand a disproportionate amount (estimated at between 10-15%) of the organization's human and financial resources.'³⁷

5.3 Identification of Beneficiaries

Identification of beneficiaries is an obvious prerequisite to conducting an operational response to their needs and challenges. Social networks, or explicit community power structures into which returnees can be integrated, may be considered a facilitating factor in the implementation of the reintegration activities by providing support and centralities of power and communication which can be made use of to glean information as to the whereabouts and protection status of beneficiaries, especially when the returnees are not within a concentrated area. As explored briefly above, with accelerated urban growth, the social network and community structure which is more commonly found in rural areas is not as readily found in urban centres and thus, identification of beneficiaries in urban areas in order to organize reintegration activities may be significantly more challenging.

There is also the additional difficulty of dealing with fraudulent claims, which may potentially unbalance the 'equation' of assistance.³⁸ This was the experience described by one of the interviewees who was involved in reintegration activities in Angola.³⁹ The problem of fraudulent claims, may reflect the fact that, as was written of urban refugees, the beneficiaries as well as other members of the urban poor may 'include opportunistic and dynamic individuals as well as those who have failed to survive as part of the normal migration (or refugee) flow - the mal-adjusted, the social outcasts, etc. - a factor which can make status determination particularly difficult.'⁴⁰

³⁷ UNHCR's Policy and Practice Regarding Urban Refugees, A Discussion Paper, <http://www.unhcr.org/research/RESEARCH/3bd4254e7.html> accessed April 28th, 2009 at 15:28

³⁸ UNHCR's Policy and Practice Regarding Urban Refugees, A Discussion Paper, <http://www.unhcr.org/research/RESEARCH/3bd4254e7.html> accessed April 28th, 2009 at 15:28

³⁹ Interview with Tammi Sharpe

⁴⁰ UNHCR's Policy and Practice Regarding Urban Refugees, A Discussion Paper, <http://www.unhcr.org/research/RESEARCH/3bd4254e7.html> accessed April 28th, 2009 at 15:28

5.4 Returnee Monitoring in Urban Areas

In most of the country situations examined, it was reported that there was returnee monitoring ongoing in urban areas, however, occasional disparities are notable (for example, it was gleaned that for an undetermined number of years in the early part of the Afghan repatriation operation, there was no monitoring ongoing in Jalalabad city.⁴¹ This also appeared to be the case relative to the repatriation in parts of Abkhazia.⁴² In other cases, registration was well enforced but tended to fall off in the later years. Despite these exceptions, returnee monitoring was noted as being an intrinsic part of the UNHCR operational response in repatriation activities across both urban and rural areas, where beneficiaries presented themselves, or could be located.⁴³

One of the interviewees highlighted that one of the challenges to returnee monitoring is that the registration procedure was based on places of origin but not necessarily engaged with whether their actual intent was to return that place. This calls into question the content of the registration procedures in place for returnees, and the levels of questions that were asked to each family group or individual. There are varying levels of interview questions, the first of which is mandatory at the first opportunity for interview, the second of which is prescribed to follow and then the third level is to glean 'additional data' which may be collected as part of the offices protection and durable solutions strategy. It is only at the third that questions regarding the residence of extended family members, intentions upon return, reasons for flight, property status in country of origin among other probing inquires, are eventually asked.

Of course, the questions asked in the first level are necessary for more immediate protection activities which indeed, relate to the UNHCR's core mandate and are therefore prioritized. However, the non-mandatory nature of the third level of registration questioning may benefit from revision, in order to buttress information regarding how many returnees foresee a possibility of settling in urban areas - either as opposed to their area of origin or indeed, as a secondary movement, after having stayed in the area of origin for sometime.

Returnee Monitoring Reports tend to provide information with respect to district or provincial level activities but not relative to cities or specific villages. This may be indicative of inherent difficulties in attaining information at the city level, perhaps because of low visibility of beneficiaries in urban areas, or because the information would be too detailed to present in this manner.

5.5 Other Protection Related Activities

UNHCR reintegration activities in specific urban areas of Afghanistan, for example, did aim to provide protection to some of the extremely vulnerable individuals (EVIs), identified through the preliminary monitoring processes for returnees. An EVI project, aimed primarily at assisting returnees and IDPs, was funded by the UNHCR and implemented in Kabul city by INTERSOS from 2002 to 2004. The project consisted of providing EVIs with monetary assistance and making referrals to NGOs in the event that further medical, vocational training, employment, or other assistance was necessary. The project was expanded in 2007 to cover a total of 17 provinces in Afghanistan.⁴⁴

A further example of protection related reintegration activities engaged in by the UNHCR are the networks and shelters established for women at risk in several urban areas in Afghanistan; Herat, Kabul, and Mazar Sharif. These programs were implemented through partners but supported by the Office. The facility in Herat city in particular was described by an interviewee as being a particular

⁴¹ Mentioned by Vicky Tennant

⁴² Tammi Sharpe

⁴³ Bernard doyle and Tammi Sharpe

⁴⁴ UNHCR to sign partnership agreement with Ministry to help extremely vulnerable returnees in 2007 Date: 26 Mar 2007 | AFGHANCRISIS

necessity in that city, because Herat was a 'staging point' or rather, a high traffic city for different categories of migration through which most returnees passed at some point.

The immediate assistance given to returnees in the form of cash (in so far as returnees were identifiable, perhaps by having repatriated with the assistance of the UNHCR), was issued 'across the board', i.e. in both urban and rural areas, in all of the situations recounted by interviewees.

5.6 Shelter

Shelter is hailed as one of the most important sectoral dimensions of any reintegration programme and regarding UNHCR's urban reintegration activities, appears to fall short of what is necessary; the High Commissioner outlined that 'institutional responsibilities and programming arrangements for managing reintegration in the urban context need to be strengthened, especially low cost housing.'⁴⁵ The information gathered on the urban reintegration programs of the country situations focused on during this desk review, does indeed suggest that the Office's approach to shelter activities in urban areas is limited and at best, ad hoc.

With regard to the situation of returnees in Southern Sudan, although all returnees are eligible for a three-month assistance package on their arrival, including shelter (plastic sheeting), few spontaneous returnees in Juba town appear to have received this.⁴⁶ This may be due to low visibility of returnees. One of the approaches of the Office during the Afghan repatriation and reintegration operation was to adopt an advocacy role for land allocations from the government to landless people. This was seen as an appropriate 'next best' in the absence of a comprehensive shelter programme as part of the reintegration efforts in Kabul. That is not to say that no efforts under the theme of shelter have been made in urban areas whatsoever; an interviewee who had been based in Herat city suggested that a 'few hundred shelters' had been erected in the urban centre. This is relatively limited in comparison to the efforts being made by UNHCR in rural areas. Notably indeed, the lack of strong shelter programmes in and around urban centres drew media attention on more than one occasion.⁴⁷

5.7 Co-Existence and Peacebuilding

In some country situations the UNHCR implemented programmes to support peacebuilding and to encourage moves toward reconciliation. The intention of this type of project is to 'explore an approach to ensure the sustainable repatriation and reintegration of people returning to divided, and emotionally and economically strained communities.'⁴⁸ These projects take different manifestations depending on the country and community situation such as 'co-existence' (Afghanistan), 'community empowerment program' in Liberia, and 'the integrated rural villages' (Burundi), to name a few examples.

There are instances where co-existence activities were implemented in urban areas; for example in Drvar, Bosnia, a co-existence project took the form of birth preparation classes for groups of Croat and Serb women.⁴⁹ In October of 2008 UNHCR, as a recipient organization for the Peacebuilding Fund, began participation in a project for Fostering National Reconciliation and Conflict Management in Liberia through 'community empowerment'. This project is to be implemented by the Justice Peace

⁴⁵ <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=SUBSITES&id=4208f30c4> accessed May 15, 2009 at 12:03 pm.

⁴⁶ ODI report pg. 10

⁴⁷ BURUNDI: "Forgotten and unseen" on the edges of the city as well as Half A Million Are Left Homeless in Afghan Cities as Winter Bites, (Carlotta Gall, January 2, 2003)

⁴⁸ Quick Impact Projects (QIPs) A Provisional Guide, UNHCR Geneva, May 2004

⁴⁹ Municipal Profile for Drvar, Bosnia and Herzegovina

<http://www.unhcr.ba/updatemay07/Drvar%20update%20jan07.pdf> and QIP Provisional Guide:

<http://www.unhcr.org/partners/PARTNERS/41174ce94.pdf>

Commission in several locations ranging from small villages to large-size towns with targets of 15,000 beneficiaries over 500 workshops. In the larger urban areas, the intervention is concentrated in certain neighbourhoods.

Apart from these examples, it was usually unclear through the literature and reports whether the co-existence activities supported by the UNHCR are implemented in urban or rural areas, but one might infer that the focus was primarily on smaller villages, from the language of reports and description of activities.

5.8 Livelihoods

From the country situations analysed, one can conclude that the livelihoods and self-reliance programs implemented by UNHCR in urban areas are usually small scale. In Liberia, and in Southern Sudan, there was some level of vocational training and self-reliance work organized as part of the reintegration activities in urban areas. In urban areas of Southern Sudan, UNHCR was involved in sponsoring micro-finance programs and vocational training workshops. In Monrovia, notably some 500 returnees benefited from start-up kits, loans and skills training programs to promote management skills for small businesses.⁵⁰

Despite the fact that concrete examples were presented only in 2 country situations, on a theoretical level, interviewees were inclined to suggest that in urban areas it is possible to do far more support for small business, since in rural areas there is little or no market for activity of this nature and people in urban areas tend to be somewhat more independent.⁵¹ The more natural diversification market in urban areas allows for better results of vocational skills training programs. This is qualified by the note that in many post-conflict situations, cities (for example; Kabul) do not present such a different market from some rural villages.

5.9 Education

One of the specific findings of an inter-agency mission to South Sudan in 2006, suggested that education is not seen as a priority sector within UNHCR, 'despite the high priority put on education by the returnees and despite the fact that education is recognized within UNHCR as one essential tool to ensure protection'.⁵² This suggests that more may need to be done more generally (not only in urban areas) to support returning families' confidences in the education system in the area of return.

Despite this concern, there was evidence of some operational activities in the sector of education ongoing in urban areas for the benefit of returnees. Good examples of these activities were particularly found in Southern Sudan and included collaboration with UNICEF to ensure material and school kits from UNICEF to returnee areas, education monitoring in returnee areas and training in peace education. These activities took place in Juba, as well as other areas. In pursuance of an improved education intervention in Southern Sudan, a total of 900 primary school teachers in Juba, Malakal and Wau and 90 secondary school teachers and officials in Wau, are receiving training, through a partnership with Windle. There are other activities which will benefit the education sector as part of the wider reintegration effort in Juba and the city of Aweil, such as the construction of the national Teacher Training Institutes and five primary schools. Apart from this activity ongoing as part of the reintegration efforts in Southern Sudan, it should be noted that during the reintegration period in Abkhazia, 22 schools were built by UNHCR in Gali, the district centre of the Gal district.

⁵⁰ Global Appeal Report 2006 and (At – a – Glance: Liberia Operation, April-July2007)

⁵¹ Yuka Hasegawa gives the example of elderly ladies picking up bottles in Kabul for (resale).

⁵² Education Mission to Liberia also Report on inter-agency mission South Sudan

5.10 Access to Healthcare

Practices for Public Health and HIV in Urban Settings report (2008) (hereinafter referred to as the Good Practices for Public Health Report).⁵³ Some of these challenges which urban returnees might share include those stemming from: lack of information about available services from the local government, especially if the returnees were outside of their country of origin for prolonged periods, or returned to a region or locality other than that which they originated from; ill equipped and overburdened public facilities; cost and lack of income; language or cultural barriers⁵⁴; lack of documentation, and community fragmentation. One key distinction between the position of urban refugees/asylum seekers and returnees in urban areas is that the latter are still under the authority of their own government and may thereby be entitled to health care access directly from the government.

It is acknowledged in the Good Practices for Public Health Report that there are particular challenges faced by urban refugees and asylum seekers that necessitate UNHCR assistance and support, but that these are limited in scope to reconstruction or refurbishment of town hospitals, supplying of equipment and in some cases, time-limited employment of key clinical staff.⁵⁵ It is not considered to be part of the UNHCR mandate to support the structure of the government to the extent that it ceases to buttress existing mechanisms and becomes a replacement service. In taking on such a role, the scope of UNHCR's assistance can be uncertain in terms of timeframe and target group definition. Indeed, an interviewee suggested that the UNHCR operational response in terms of access to health care for returnees should not go beyond vaccinations and dissemination of local health information upon return, in addition to supporting physical infrastructure and temporary supply of equipment and/or staff to hospitals.

For the purposes of outlining the extent of UNHCR operational engagement regarding returnees' access to health care, it is suggested that the Good Practices for Public Health and HIV in Urban Settings, should be expanded to apply to urban returnees or perhaps mirrored in a similarly structured but policy oriented document which outlines a coherent approach to providing health care assistance to returnees.

5.11 Water

There was no concrete information gleaned, specific to urban areas, regarding UNHCR programs to increase access to water for returnees. However, an interviewee did comment on the potential difficulties of such an endeavour. The rationale presented was that; when the water source destroyed in rural areas there is a relatively simple solution of digging a well, whilst when this occurs in urban areas it may be a matter of reinforcing the entire water system. This was explained as being the case in Kabul, where the water supply situation could not be amended one district at a time given that the infrastructure is connected to the main water system. It may not even have made sense to reinforce the entire infrastructure, since it was created in the Soviet style which was by then faltering anyway and further, this engaged issues of the city development plan which had not yet been firmly consolidated by the government.

6 Rationalisation of Minimal Operational Response

⁵³ Good Practices for Public Health and HIV in Urban Settings: Public Health & HIV Section UNHCR Geneva July 2008.

⁵⁴ This challenge is less likely to manifest for returnees than for refugees/asylum seekers, however it may occur in cities where the returnee caseload comes from widely divergent locations, and may have been living in exile for extended periods, or coming from different cultural/ethnic background.

⁵⁵ The latter examples were noted in the PDES Evaluation on Southern Sudan. The team noticed these activities in towns such as Kurmuk, Yei, Yambio and Kajo Keji.

6.1 Lack of Perceived Need

In making enquiries of the interviewees about the UNHCR's approach to urban reintegration, it seemed that among some of the staff members there is a view that returnees to urban areas do not have as prominent needs as those in rural areas, or perhaps that their needs are not those which can be addressed by UNHCR. The rationale presented in support of this view was that many returnees have gained experiences, skills and even capital during exile especially if they lived in urban areas during that time and in moving to urban areas in their country of origin, these returnees (as well as others who may not have acquired the same levels of assets or skills), are opportunely placed to avail themselves of livelihood opportunities which are thought to present themselves more naturally in urban areas.

When asked why there were no reintegration activities implemented in Herat city, (other than the initial 'immediate assistance'), an interviewee responded that 'the *need* was less in Herat than in surrounding villages and rural areas. It was explained that in Herat city returnees were not homeless; they joined local communities and resided therein. Many Afghan refugees in Iran lived in urban areas and hence, upon return, they gravitated towards Herat. Because they had resided in urban areas during asylum, they tended to have some resources/education/skills etc. Thus, returning to urban areas came naturally and logically (even if, for many, it was not the area of origin). These perceived factors combined contribute to the logic that UNHCR projects/activities did not occur in Herat.'

6.2 Urban Reintegration Activities Enhance Urbanisation

One of the primary reasons proffered by interviewees as to why UNHCR operations might tend to be relatively limited in urban areas, was that urbanization – a negative force when uncontrolled or untempered, especially in post-conflict societies – was being reinforced by the high presence of agencies and donor concentration in these urban centres. Thus, it was inherently more necessary and logical for the focus of UNHCR to remain in the rural areas and in some instances, this was the request the government authority. Indeed, this was said to be the case in Afghanistan, and was explicitly so in Southern Sudan where the GOSS is trying to stem the process of urbanization and take the towns to the people rather than vice versa.

In this vein, the lack of urban reintegration activities can perhaps be perceived as a way to deal with issues faced by urban returnees: 'To deal with the urban issues you have to deal with the rural issues'. This explains the peripheral reasons behind projects which were implemented in the hope that they would pull people away from urban areas: through small income projects, loans and land allocations. This was said to be the case by an interviewee, regarding Vojvodinia, Serbia, where a successful livelihoods program was implemented based on the production of tomatoes and tomato based products.

It is submitted that discouraging returns to urban areas (let alone urbanization more generally), may not a logical basis on which to build a reintegration program. Firstly, there is some level of inevitability of the process of expansion of urban areas in post-conflict situations⁵⁶ and furthermore, it is not the place of UNHCR to determine or delimit the geographical parameters within which returnees can get assistance, if it means upturning the freedom of those people to return to wherever they may feel is best for them and their family. An interviewee in fact, explicitly indicated that the returnees who were returning to urban areas in Afghanistan, could not be blamed and their decision should in fact be lauded as one which was logical, given the multiple agencies and organizations which were available to give support, as well as the potential for better services and less traditional, restrictive measures.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ UN-Habitat

⁵⁷ Bernard Doyle Interview

6.3 Outside the Mandate due to Development Questions that arise

It was submitted by one of the interviewees that there should be a generic approach to urban areas, but that the Office should not 'expand their mandate' and that doing so would be to stray into the politicized realm - too far away from the humanitarian issues which should remain central to HCR operations.⁵⁸ Suggestions were also made that UNHCR does not have the 'patience, resources or expertise' to pursue a more comprehensive strategy of operations in urban reintegration. Therefore, the solution proffered was that any strategic participation should be limited to advocating that other agencies engage in reintegration activities, without pushing this envelope to the extent that UNHCR turns its back completely on a group of putative beneficiaries. Indeed, these concerns raise questions about the nature of and extent to which partnerships and cooperation played a role in any urban reintegration activities.

7 Partnerships and Cooperation

As discussed above, returnees in urban areas are intermingled with other displaced populations as well as members of the local community who may or may not be in vulnerable positions. Thus, execution of functional reintegration projects has to meet the challenge of working with as well as being supportive of the activities of other humanitarian agencies, national authorities and development agencies.⁵⁹ Indeed, there is commonly a higher concentration of actors in urban areas, particularly in national capitals. This may be for security reasons, or because the capitals are the economic, commercial and administrative centres. This plurality of actors does not necessarily precipitate greater efficiency, progress or awareness regarding the situation of returnees in urban areas. Quite on the contrary, the information gleaned from interviewees would suggest that a high number of decentralized shareholders and actors (whether or not tending to the same beneficiaries or with widely divergent mandates), are one of the key barriers to conducting fully functioning and efficient programs for urban reintegration. Moreover, the presence of UNHCR and the multitude of other actors engaging in inter-agency work in urban areas correlate strongly with the rise of urban growth and the higher numbers of returnees in urban areas. This cyclical tendency of urban reintegration activities creating a pull factor toward urban areas may potentially make operations increasingly difficult.

The concentration of actors in urban areas has the effect that rural areas may be left without as much attention. It remains the case that where NGO and UN orgs are based is most likely to be where the donor funds are focused. It follows from this that identification of implementing partners is less difficult in urban areas. South Sudan, for example, is so large that it is not easy to identify high return areas. When there is no identifiable concentration it is less likely that agencies will come in to assist. Where agencies have been identified however, it should be explicit how the intervention should be distributed to avoid gaps in assistance. For instance, when an interview was asked about the minimal shelter activities ongoing in Kabul, it was expressed that at the time, provision of shelter in urban areas had appeared to belong more to the mandate of UN-HABITAT as opposed to that of UNHCR. It was suggested later on that, the UNHCR does not suffer linkages with other agencies or governments very well. This may be an area where improvement could be made.

Ensuring that activities take the form of being supportive of, as opposed to separate from or contrary to, those of the government, is of utmost importance to maintain balance between cooperation and capacity building (as opposed to capacity confiscation).⁶⁰ This balance may be particularly difficult to strike where the relevant ministry, with which the UNHCR need communicate to execute its

⁵⁸ Yuka Hasegawa

⁵⁹ This is from Cheng-Hopkins Assistant High Commissioner (operations) speech in connection to the scoping study with the Cities Alliance:

⁶⁰ Herald Tribune July 28, 2002 Michael Ignatieff 'Nation Building Lite'

assistance to returnees, is of limited utility or has become a source of patronage and corruption.⁶¹ Regarding the Afghan situation, it was recommended in 2005 that in the short term, the present sharing of institutional responsibilities for the return and reintegration process within Afghanistan should be retained but made to work more effectively, especially at local level and in urban contexts. There needs to be even stronger emphasis on institutional strengthening, system development, and capacity building that includes provisions for a sharper engagement and advocacy on protection issues.⁶²

The importance of the destination of return (can often be impacted by the government approach to return and reintegration. In Southern Sudan for example, the priority (since the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement) has been *return* rather than *reintegration*. It has been the government's expectation that people would want to return home and would be welcomed back by their relatives, on whom the responsibility for resettling them would fall. Thus, supporting reintegration at community level has been left to communities themselves, (while international aid organizations have mostly remained focused on meeting immediate needs. Meanwhile, the GOSS's main preoccupation has been on rebuilding major infrastructure and addressing security issues.)⁶³

In Liberia, the government participation in the repatriation and reintegration process was limited – and served to frustrate the UNMIL and the coordinated programmes in which UNHCR was involved.⁶⁴ This has been achieved under often very difficult circumstances, including the limited capacity of the main government counterpart in the return process (the LRRRC), as well as the lack of adequate human resources and logistical capacity within the IDP Unit of UNMIL's Humanitarian Coordination Section (HCS). In addition, although UN agencies, ICRC and NGOs are implementing reintegration and recovery activities in areas of return, funding for such activities remains insufficient and serves to dissuade some IDPs from returning at the present time.

8 Conclusion

Poverty is fuelling a high level of internal mobility and urban migration. The situation is expected to improve in the years to come as agricultural production rises and transport and communications infrastructure improves. In the short term, however, the current trend for returnees to gravitate towards urban centres is likely to continue.⁶⁵ There is a lot of missing knowledge on how to protect and assist returnees in urban areas. There is a need to reflect upon and analyse the challenge of transposing the strengths of UNHCR reintegration operations into city contexts – keeping in mind the intermingled urban population and the mix of agencies and government authorities that need to be coordinated in order to develop a coherent position. Explicit policies would be favourable, either on how UNHCR plans to gain and put to use insight as to how to undertake humanitarian activities in urban areas or how to engage in efficient partnerships toward the same ends.

⁶¹ This suggestion has been made of the Ministry for Return and Repatriation in Afghanistan...

⁶² <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=SUBSITES&id=4208f30c4>

⁶³ ODI Reintegration Report on Southern Sudan Phase II

⁶⁴ <http://iys.cidi.org/humanitarian/hsr/05a/ixl105.html>

⁶⁵ <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=SUBSITES&id=4208f30c4> AFGHANISTAN CHALLENGES TO RETURN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1/3/2004

9 Case Studies

9.1 Liberia Case Study

Background to Repatriation

UNHCR has engaged in massive repatriation and reintegration activities in Liberia, where, in December 1989, 700,000 people fled the country. By mid-2007 more than 160,000 Liberian refugees from Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea, Nigeria and Sierra Leone returned home through UNHCR's voluntary repatriation operation, along the terms of the Regional Multi-year (2004-2006) Operations Plan. It is important to note that many of the persons of concern are returning IDPs, as apart from returning refugees.³ The IDP return process was completed in 2006, by the end of which, some 237,822 were assisted. Since 2007, the Office has focused on developing partnerships with the Government of Liberia, UN agencies, NGOs and others to sustain the community-based reintegration of the returnees.⁶⁶

A UNHCR evaluation report indicates that the vast majority of IDP and refugee returnees have returned to rural areas in the north-west of the country. However, endemic poverty and limited access to basic services in the rural areas⁶⁷ have contributed to significant rural-urban migration and consequently; over-population in Monrovia, with an estimated population of 1.3 million now occupying an urban area designed for 500,000.⁶⁸

Profile of Returnees and Patterns of Return to Urban Areas

- The proportion of spontaneous returns to border areas is significantly high. The challenge is to identify communities where people are returning on their own and to respond to the collective needs of returnees and receiving communities.⁶⁹
- Since their coming to Liberia, persons of concern both in the urban and rural areas have resided in those communities without major incidents although few isolated cases of criminality and abuse, not necessarily on account of their status, against some were received.⁷⁰
- Particularly in the rural areas, persons of concern have developed coping mechanisms and established stronger traditional, social and cultural links with the population in those communities where they also access limited basic services. It may be the case that these links are not as readily made in urban areas.⁷¹

Information on the profile of returnees in urban areas and the patterns of return more generally (apart from general indications of provincial destinations), was sparse, indeed.

Needs and Challenges Faced by Returnees in Urban Areas

- In the urban areas, many returnee children were used as breadwinners through street peddling.⁷²
- The recent rise of world food prices has significantly affected a large portion of the population in Liberia, especially the urban poor. Rate of severely food insecure households in greater Monrovia alone rose to 8 percent, a 4 percent hike from a year and a half ago.⁷³

⁶⁶ Global Appeal Update 2009

⁶⁷ In the rural areas, 64% of the population is estimated to be living in extreme poverty (less than \$0.5 per day), whilst in Monrovia, the percentage is 22%.⁶⁷ – Evaluation Reporta

⁶⁸ . Real Time Evaluation of UNHCR's IDP Operation in Liberia UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Services (PDES/2007/02 - RTE 2 July 2007) By Neil Wright and Enda Savage and Vicky Tennant

⁶⁹ Update No. 5 Oct 2004 – February 2005

⁷⁰ APR 2007 pg. 16

⁷¹ Annual Protection Report 2007

⁷² PDES Evaluation Report

⁷³ UNMIL: The Newsletter of the UN in Liberia October 2008 Issue 2

UNHCR Policy Stance

The Operations Plan for Repatriation and Reintegration of Liberian Refugees which clearly outlines the parameters and even to some extent, the expected practical manifestation of the UNHCR response, can be regarded as a policy document. It is stated in this document that 'some returnees may opt to settle in urban centers rather than in their places of origin. The level and quality of assistance provided in rural areas is likely to be a determining factor in this choice.'⁷⁴

UNHCR Operational Response

Returnee Monitoring

In 2004, the UNHCR established a monitoring mechanism with the Norwegian refugee Council (NRC) in the Counties of Montserrado, Margibi, Grand Cape Mount, Lofa, Nimba and Grand Gedeh, and with the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) in Maryland, Grand Kru and River Gee. UNHCR is supporting the already established monitoring mechanism with four NGOs to provide information on the communities and numbers of returnees. The most accurate and up to date information obtained is from ICRC in Lofa and DRC in the south. Both agencies have been working in the respective areas for a few years and never completely departed during the last conflict. Their network for information gathering and post conflict information on populations in the communities at the time of the Peace Accords in October 2003 up to the end of 2004 provides a good understanding of the number and rate of return to Lofa and Maryland.⁷⁵

There is little or no specific reference to returning refugees or IDPs in urban areas. Many of the returns are indicated as being in and around Monrovia, however, the documentation gleaned does not contain information pertaining to these groups in particular.

Livelihoods

Information on UNHCR's operations in Liberia indicates that livelihood programs have been something of a priority in UNHCR's reintegration operations and that the programme has benefited hundreds of skilled and unskilled former refugees on return. Regarding urban areas, the programs have been largely funded by the UNHCR whilst implemented through partners, on small scale, and relatively short term, basis. The types of programmes in the first 6 months of 2007 alone include livelihood assistance to more than 500 urban returnees and host residents of the host community in various skill training disciplines.⁷⁶

On completion of the 8-month training, beneficiaries were thereafter given start-up kits to enable them to have sustainable livelihoods and opportunities for self-employment, while returnees without any skills are trained to have a career.⁷⁷ Some of the small business start up grants (ranging from \$100 to \$500) were awarded to applicants who presented good business plans. This livelihoods based program was based on an ILO and UNHCR Technical Cooperation Partnership for the Socio-Economic Reintegration of refugees, Returnees and IDPs in 2004.⁷⁸ External documents indicate that a few returnees in Monrovia were beneficiaries of this program.⁷⁹

Co-Existence and Peacebuilding

⁷⁴ Regional Multi-Year Operations Plan for the Repatriation and Reintegration of Liberian Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons 2004-2007. (UNHCR August 2004)

⁷⁵ Repatriation and Reintegration Update No. 5 Oct 2004 – February 2005

⁷⁶ At-a-glance: Liberia Operation, April-July 2007) Different disciplines included: computer, driving, tailoring, home economics, tie & dye, beautification, interior decoration, masonry, carpentry, auto mechanics, electricity, electronics, plumbing, air conditioning & refrigeration and drafting.

⁷⁷ (At – a – Glance: Liberia Operation, April-July 2007)

⁷⁸ <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/employment/crisis/download/tcliberia.pdf> ILO-UNHCR Technical Cooperation Partnership (TCP) in Liberia: Decent Work as a Durable Solution

⁷⁹ Weekly Forum for Social Justice in Africa: News <http://www.pambazuka.org/en/category/comment/42770> accessed June 8, 2009.

In October of 2008 UNHCR as a recipient organization for the Peacebuilding Fund, began participation in a project for Fostering National Reconciliation and Conflict Management in Liberia through 'community empowerment'. This community-based peace education programme is intended to provide communities with the essential tools to address poor leadership and the misuse and abuse of power. The 18-month project is to be implemented in both rural and urban areas by the Justice Peace Commission in Lofa, Nimba and Grand Gedeh counties. Where the implementation will take place in urban areas, the intervention will be limited to particular neighbourhoods. The area selection was done according to which zones were the most 'conflict-prone' and selected through stakeholders workshops with Government, UN, NGO, CSO partners.

The project will target 10-20% of total population of each community where the program is implemented. Furthermore, the intended outputs are such that; the number of violent conflicts resulting from discrimination and exclusion reduced; growth experienced under the PRS is perceived as "inclusive" in the CE Programme communities; and that communities receiving workshops are deemed more attractive by socially responsible donors and/or investors.⁸⁰

Health and Gender

UNHCR's SGVB partner, DEN-L (Development Education Network – Liberia) has renovated and furnished the SGBV Resource Centre, located in Monrovia. Resource materials were also donated by UNIFEM and UNHCR. The resource centre at the Ministry for Gender and Development is one of UNHCR's commitments to support gender mainstreaming in Liberia. The centre serves as a library and enables students, researchers and other interested persons to have a deeper insight of gender issues affecting women, children and the community at large.⁸¹

Education

Through its implementing partner LUSH (Liberians United to Save Humanity), UNHCR is renovating and producing furniture for the Primary School in Gbonota, Bong County.⁸²

Partnerships and Government Cooperation

The UNHCR reintegration programme was formulated in such a way that it would be able to fill gaps in services being provided by other actors.⁸³ This reflects a constructive, even if not explicitly integrated approach which avoids UNHCR duplicating the activities already ongoing. It is notable that, although there is no specific urban reintegration programme integrated as part of the activities of the UNCT and UNMIL programmes in Liberia, documentation suggests that their development activities will benefit urban communities and urban development such that reintegration concerns may be somewhat abated in part.

The findings suggest that in Liberia, coordinated programmes of UNMIL in which UNHCR was involved, have been achieved under often very difficult circumstances, including the limited capacity of the main government counterpart in the return process (the LRRRC), as well as the lack of adequate human resources and logistical capacity within the IDP Unit of UNMIL's Humanitarian Coordination Section (HCS).⁸⁴ In addition, although UN agencies, ICRC and NGOs are implementing reintegration and recovery activities in areas of return, funding for such activities remains insufficient and serves to dissuade some IDPs from returning at the present time.⁸⁵ On the other hand, an example of a well coordinated project through partnership is between UNHCR and JICA. JICA has undertaken projects in urban areas which can benefit returnees. These projects include; the rehabilitation of a maternity ward as well as contributions towards urban planning.

⁸⁰ Peacebuilding fund Liberia: Project Summary A-1

⁸¹ Liberia Humanitarian Situation Update No. 127 (OCHA) 27 November 2004

⁸² UNCHR News Stories <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.htm?tbl=NEWS&id=41ab266d4&page=news>: November 29, 2004. n.b. Gbonota, Bong County has only a population of 3696 in a 7km radius but it is nonetheless, categorized as a 'city'.

⁸³ Liberia: 2006 Programmes and Strategies 9 February 2006 UNHCR

⁸⁴ <http://iys.cidi.org/humanitarian/hsr/05a/ixl105.html> OCHA Situation Report Liberia Report for 8 - 22 May 2005. (14 June 2005)

⁸⁵ <http://iys.cidi.org/humanitarian/hsr/05a/ixl105.html> OCHA Situation Report Liberia Report for 8 - 22 May 2005. (14 June 2005)

The cluster approach was introduced in Liberia in 2006. According to a PDES Evaluation report, there was a widespread feeling that the cluster approach came too late in Liberia and was 'largely superimposed on existing structures.'⁸⁶ Despite these sentiments, the evaluation concluded that the introduction of the cluster approach enhanced the legitimacy and effectiveness of the coordination structures, namely the integrated mission in Liberia (UNMIL).⁸⁷

It appears that partnerships and coordinated programs were made good use of during the UNHCR Operation in Liberia. There is little detail however as to how these programs were implemented in Monrovia and in other urban areas of Liberia. With limited information, it is difficult to infer the efficacy of these partnerships for addressing reintegration issues in urban areas.

9.2 Sudan Case Study

Background of Repatriation

This case study will focus on the situation of returnees and the UNCHR operational approach to reintegration activities in Juba, Southern Sudan. As of the end of 2008, the cumulative total of repatriated Sudanese refugees reached 295,970, of which 139,140 returned under the UNHCR assisted self-repatriation programme.⁸⁸ UNHCR estimates that approximately 14,500 refugees have returned to Juba since 2005. Of this figure, only 2,150 have been organized by the Office or international agencies, whereas some 11,840 refugees have returned spontaneously.

Juba has been experiencing particularly rapid urban growth. Expectations of better opportunities and services act as pull factors. The resulting urban growth, through high levels of return and general rural to urban migration, is exacerbated by ongoing displacement from nearby rural areas.

Profile of Returnees to Juba and Patterns of Return

- IRC monthly reports show that only about 10% of returnees originate from Juba town. Generally, the remainder made the decision to return to Juba because of the economic and employment opportunities it is seen to offer, and because of the marginally better services there compared with rural areas and other towns in Southern Sudan.⁸⁹
- Juba residents and aid agency staff report that many returnees are better qualified and better skilled, with better employment prospects, than those who remained in Juba, but this should not mask the fact that Juba has a significant number of very poor and unskilled returnees.⁹⁰

Issues and Challenges faced by Returnees in Urban Areas

- In Juba, findings suggest that shelter is at a premium and many returnees live in temporary and congested settlements.
- Tensions run deep between the government and local communities over the allocation of new land to expand the boundaries of the town and demarcate new parcels for services, investment, government offices and infrastructure, and residential plots for returnees.
- The information gleaned suggests that; often, returnees to Juba take up residence with relatives for extended periods of time (4 months or longer), until they are able to find work and shelter.⁹¹ This is not a sustainable situation for many households of the host community in Juba, for which resources may already be scarce. Furthermore, this may lead to tensions caused by overcrowding, or perhaps by minor conflicts caused by cultural/behavioural differences and misunderstandings.⁹²

⁸⁶ Real Time Evaluation of UNHCR's IDP Operation in Liberia UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Services (PDES/2007/02 - RTE 2 July 2007) By Neil Wright and Enda Savage and Vicky Tennant.

⁸⁷ Real Time Evaluation of UNHCR's IDP Operation in Liberia UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Services (PDES/2007/02 - RTE 2 July 2007) By Neil Wright and Enda Savage and Vicky Tennant..

⁸⁸ Returnee Area Monitoring Report

⁸⁹ ODI

⁹⁰ ODI

⁹¹ ODI Report

⁹² ODI pg 13

- Lack of access to land in urban areas is making investment and the introduction of new services impossible, including schools, primary health centres and boreholes.⁹³
- Moving towards coexistence in Juba and other urban areas may be a particular challenge, given that a highly concentrated population made up of groups with ‘different histories and life experiences, different social networks and values, and different economic and employment prospects – against a backdrop of rapid urban growth’ poses unique difficulties to move towards reconciliation.⁹⁴
- The prospect of employment opportunities draws many returnees to Juba, however, information suggests that expectations of employment have in most cases been frustrated, and most returnees complain about the economic hardship they face in Juba. Even when returnees have the skills to aspire to more regular employment, access may be hampered by bureaucratic obstacles to obtaining a national ID card. Another impediment to more formal employment for returnees is the lack of certificates of qualification, often lost or left behind.⁹⁵

UNHCR’s Operational Response:

UNHCR Policy Decision:

The ODI report indicates that the UNHCR funding was for return to states such as Eastern Equatoria, Jonglei and Upper Nile, rather than to Juba. It is unclear whether this reflects a policy decision to focus reintegration assistance in rural areas, or an information deficit regarding the intentions of returning refugees and patterns of return. There is no explicit policy statement indicating whether or not UNHCR had a strategic plan as to whether or how to approach reintegration activities in Juba. Further evidence of any such policy stance, if any, must be inferred from the reintegration activities actually undertaken in the city of Juba.

Returnee Monitoring

Returnee monitoring has been underway regarding organized returns. These have been conducted by IOM who took over the returnee monitoring from OCHA. However, sources suggest that spontaneous returns have gone largely unmonitored as they remain difficult to track.⁹⁶ This disparity goes some way in underlying some of the operational challenges faced, concerning reintegration activities in Juba.

In 2005, UNHCR discussed alternative and complimentary methods of returnee monitoring with the support of implementing partners. In 2006 returnee monitoring through these partners was carried out in five States. Since 2008, the Office has run a returnee monitoring programme with IRC in Juba.

Returnee monitoring more generally has produced some valuable outputs, notably a village assessment database, but has been adversely affected by interrupted partnerships, weakness in strategic analysis and insufficient links with programme planning.⁹⁷ City specific information is limited and the results of monitoring usually correlate to State-wide findings.

Other Protection Activities:

UNHCR chaired the protection working groups in three of the ten States in Southern Sudan: Central Equatoria (Yei and Juba), Lakes State (Rumbek), and Upper Nile (Malakal). Sixty-five community-based protection training sessions were offered: 20 for local authorities, ten for NGO partners, ten for operational partners and 20 for the local communities.⁹⁸

- **680 community reintegration projects have been carried out since 2005**

⁹³ ODI Reintegration report pg. 4

⁹⁴ UNHCR 2008 Returnee Monitoring as well as ODI

⁹⁵ ODI Report pg. 16

⁹⁶ ODI Ref as well as Annual Protection Report

⁹⁷ Southern Sudan; Evaluation

⁹⁸ Global Report 2006

- 162 reintegration projects in health, 429 projects in WASH and 89 projects in education since 2006
- 65 education facilities has been constructed and/or rehabilitated
- UNHCR also facilitated workshops, supported vocational training centres, skills training classes, adult literacy and informal teacher training⁹⁹

Livelihoods:

The government and international organisations are the main employers in Juba. Aside from residents employed before and during the war, white-collar jobs in the public sector are only available to the highly educated returning diaspora or well educated returnees from within Sudan, often pre-war employees seeking to be reinstated in their previous jobs.¹⁰⁰

UNHCR, WFP and implementing and operational partners provided skills training for some 500 returnees at a mechanical workshop and a multi-skill training centre in Juba. Start-up kits were provided to each trainee.¹⁰¹ Apart from this, there is no suggestion of programmes in support of livelihoods run by UNHCR.

Coexistence:

The 2008 Returnee Monitoring Report recognizes that coexistence is particularly a challenge for returnees in urban and semi-urban areas for the following reasons: returnees are generally said to have an advantage over host community members in terms of education and employment, which indicates that the latter may require more interventions to build their individual capacities; returnees are also seen as having privileges over the others because of the material assistance (i.e. the return/repatriation package they receive during the process of return. These reasons may lead to resentment towards returnees from the local community and potentially, conflict.¹⁰²

One coexistence activity taken up in Juba by UNHCR was the organization of several meetings with a number of influential local and tribal chiefs to discuss matters related to conflict between returnees and local communities over land and to women's rights to own land.¹⁰³ From the information sourced, it was not indicated that there were other coexistence or peacebuilding activities ongoing, or highlighted as part of the UNHCR's reintegration program in Juba. It is however, apt that the coexistence activity in which the UNHCR was engaged in, sought to address the most contentious issue between returnees and the local community; the scarcity of land.

Education:

Education is the primary responsibility of the Government, in this case the Ministry of Education Science and Technology, assisted by the international community. UNICEF is the lead agency in education. UNHCR's strategy is moulded in collaboration with the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) who developed an Annual Work Plan. UNHCR's education strategy from May 2005 was a product of consultations with a number of stakeholders. In principle it seeks to complement the Government's efforts.¹⁰⁴

UNHCR currently has work in progress at 35 primary and five secondary schools as well as four girls' dormitories across Southern Sudan. Specific to the urban area of Juba, during 2006, UNHCR also provided support to Juba Day Secondary School, which is the only secondary school in Juba that has an English curriculum and therefore receives many returnee students. Assistance to the school in the capital included construction of a borehole and pit latrines as well as fencing and distribution of

⁹⁹ Education Sector Presentation at UNHCR HQ June 2009

¹⁰⁰ ODI Report

¹⁰¹ Global Report 2006

¹⁰² Returnee Monitoring Report 2008 pg. 6

¹⁰³ South Sudan Operation: Achievements in South Sudan in 2005, Director's Office for the Sudan Situation, Khartoum (March 2006) <http://www.unhcr.org/partners/PARTNERS/441033252.pdf> accessed May 14, 2009 at 12:33. Achievements in South Sudan 2005, Director's Office for the Sudan Situation, Khartoum, March 2006.

¹⁰⁴ Report Inter Agency Education Mission to Southern Sudan

school stationary.¹⁰⁵ In addition, the construction of two national Teacher Training Institutes and five primary schools for teacher practice in Juba and Aweil as well as vocational and skills training for youth in Juba, make up other components of the UNHCR's intervention in the urban areas of Southern Sudan.

Some of the programmes have been coordinated efforts with partners. Some 900 primary school teachers in Juba, Malakal and Wau and 90 secondary school teachers and officials in Wau, are receiving training, through a partnership with Windle. Currently JICA is undertaking infrastructure projects and vocational projects in Juba to support the reintegration process in collaboration with UNHCR and other partners.¹⁰⁶

Problems regarding returnees' access to education do persist and access is undermined by language problems for the returnees from DRC, CAR and Khartoum, lack of nationality documents (e.g. birth certificates) and the inadequate number of secondary schools to absorb returning students.¹⁰⁷ One of the suggestions of a review of the Community Based Reintegration Projects is that the UNHCR interventions have not been sufficient to keep up with the increasing number of returnees. This is in addition to IDPs returning and the trend of people seeking from rural to urban areas for job opportunities and education for their children. Subsequently many of the facilities constructed since 2005 up to date are suffering from overuse and exhaustion.¹⁰⁸

Health:

Health is an area in which UNHCR has taken up steps toward activities in urban areas to aid the reintegration of returnees as well as to support the local community. For example, UNHCR participated in the SGBV Working Group in Yei where agencies discussed referral mechanisms and general SGBV concerns in the area. The projected outcome of the meeting was that participants would sensitize their communities on the correct procedures for using the referral forms and pledge to undertake greater advocacy.¹⁰⁹

Some of the other endeavours undertaken by UNHCR in urban areas also involve other agencies as partners. Namely, UNHCR-PWJ (Peace Winds Japan) started constructing the health facility in Pariak, south of Bor. (Although, not all the construction materials could be positioned, as the concerned government ministry has not released tax exemption letters in Juba.)¹¹⁰ UNHCR is an active member of the HIV and AIDS Task Force that was established under the auspices of the newly formed Southern Sudan Aids Commission based in Juba.¹¹¹ This year, UNHCR-SUHA (Sudan Health Association), through an IGAD-funded HIV/AIDS project, have commenced renovation of the county AIDS Commission in Kajo Keji.¹¹²

Furthermore, findings indicate that UNHCR's field offices arranged referrals for returnees with serious medical conditions to Juba Teaching Hospital, (and in some cases to Khartoum). Returnees were sensitized about HIV and AIDS at way stations, and antiretroviral treatment was available in Juba for those who tested HIV positive.

Water and Sanitation:

¹⁰⁵ <http://www.unhcr.org/partners/PARTNERS/441033252.pdf> Achievements in South Sudan 2005, Director's Office for the Sudan Situation, Khartoum, March 2006.

¹⁰⁶ Education Mission to Southern Sudan

¹⁰⁷ Education (_sector _) presentation on Southern Sudan at UNHCR HQ June 2009

¹⁰⁸ Prioritization of 2009 Community Based Reintegration Projects – Education Document

¹⁰⁹ Humanitarian Action in Southern Sudan Report Week 19; 04-10 May 2009

¹¹⁰ Humanitarian Action in Southern Sudan Report Week 19; 04-10 May 2009

¹¹¹ UNHCR Global Report 2006

¹¹² Humanitarian Action in Southern Sudan Report Week 19; 04-10 May 2009 Disclaimer: The information in this report is consolidated from OCHA field reports, UN agencies, RCO at state level, NGOs, and other humanitarian partners. The report is subject to availability of data and does not claim to be exhaustive or fully verified. If you have inputs for the next edition, or questions/comments to the current issue, please contact: Truphosa Anjichi, OCHA, Humanitarian Reporting Officer. (ochaonline.un.org/OchaLinkClick.aspx?link=ocha&docId=1110708)

UNHCR drilled and rehabilitated some 100 boreholes across Central, Western and Greater Equatoria, Jonglei, and Upper Nile States. No such activity was undertaken by UNHCR in Juba.¹¹³ The UNHCR did however, undertake a project in the urban area of Malakal to construct a water system, shower rooms and garbage pits. .

It is noted in the 2006 Global Report for Sudan, that an international NGO drilled several boreholes in and around Juba. Similar activities were apparently undertaken by international NGOs in the cities of Malakal and Bor. It is not explicitly indicated in the Global Report that these NGOs were acting as implementing partners of the UNHCR or whether the projects were in anyway connected to the UNHCR's reintegration activities. One might infer from this information that whilst UNHCR engaged in water provision for returnees and local communities primarily in rural areas, other international NGOs were seeking to provide cities and the surrounding peri-urban areas with greater availability of water.

Partnerships and Coordination:

In Southern Sudan the collaborative approach prevailed in some sectors. The assignment of responsibilities in the field of protection and support to return according to geographical criteria (e.g. UNHCR leadership in Blue Nile, Eastern and Western Equatoria, reflect the complexity of Sudan and the impossibility to apply a single and unique approach throughout. This is in contrast to Darfur where the cluster approach was more coherent, though never truly deemed a cluster approach).¹¹⁴

The International Rescue Committee (IRC) and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) were the key partners for returnee and protection monitoring in Juba, Terekeka and Kajo Keji counties.

Moreover, JICA has also been active in South Sudan since 2005. Ongoing programs include urgent rehabilitation projects in water and transport sectors as part of the long-term urban development planning for the city of Juba, and support for skill/vocational training at the MTC, a vocational training centre, in collaboration with GTZ. UNHCR and JICA are closely working together on issues related to peace building and reintegration and currently through this partnership, agricultural projects are ongoing in a suburb of Juba.

Furthermore, as highlighted succinctly by the PDES Evaluation report, other partnerships were established with agencies such as UNICEF (education, water and sanitation), FAO (seeds and tools) and WFP (food), and 18 other implementing partners. A qualifier as to the efficacy of these partnerships is also highlighted by the report, suggesting that the partnerships were hindered by the limited presence of most agencies and NGOs, for whom the areas of refugee return in greater Equatoria were not necessarily a priority.¹¹⁵

The complicated governmental and administrative division in Sudan makes cooperation with the government in aid of returnees, a cumbersome process. Reintegration activities, whether in rural or in urban areas, must go through several levels of administrative screening prior to being firmly permitted by the higher echelons of administration. Furthermore, there is no dedicated *reintegration* ministry as opposed to the Sudanese Relief and Rehabilitation Commission, which is currently the UNHCR's main government counterpart.

Lessons Learned:

The problem of land in Juba is particularly urgent. The issue requires immediate attention through the provision of appropriate technical support by the international community and dedicated political attention at the highest levels of GOSS.¹¹⁶ Given the fact that many of the challenges faced by returnees in the city of Juba, appear to revolve around difficulties related to land availability, UNHCR's activities, may be changed toward assuming a role for advocacy for recognition of land rights or, as recommended by the PDES Report: securing access to land by returnees, engaging in a joint project

¹¹³ UNHCR Global Report 2006

¹¹⁴ See Annual protection report 2007 pg. 20

¹¹⁵ PDES Evaluation paper.

¹¹⁶ ODI Reintegration report pg. 4

with, for example; UN Habitat and public awareness raising on land rights.¹¹⁷ An attempt to launch a project of this nature was already made under the land management programme at UN-Habitat. The agency had launched a project for an Urban Land Inventory database, which was intended to cover the towns of Yei, Juba, and Wau in the first phase. In 2007, the project had to be significantly scaled down however, due to limited funding.¹¹⁸ Therefore, a lesson learned is that funding should be prioritized for this process.

Greater awareness of the urbanization progress should be reflected in the UNHCR's strategic planning for addressing returnee issues in urban areas. It may be necessary to strengthen the design of returnee monitoring so as to encapsulate the problems faced by returnees in urban areas, as well as reinforce the links between the findings of returnee monitoring and the strategic reintegration projects which are actually implemented by UNHCR.¹¹⁹ In this regard, it is promising that, along with UNDP, UNICEF and HABITAT and at the request of the SPLM/A Secretariats for Local Governance and Infrastructure, UNHCR is taking part in a study to obtain better information on the challenges related to urban integration in South Sudan.¹²⁰

Furthermore, as highlighted by the ODI report, the organised return programme has dominated all planning and assistance to returnees since its inception in early 2007. This has meant that assistance to spontaneous returnees has tended to be overlooked; indeed, few spontaneous returnees in Juba town appear to have received the three-month assistance package including plastic sheeting, and food and non-food items, for which all returnees are eligible upon their arrival.¹²¹

9.3 Afghanistan Case Study

Background of Repatriation

By the end of Jan 2009, more than 4 million Afghan refugees have returned home from Pakistan, Iran and other countries with UNHCR's assistance. In addition, over 1.2 million Afghans returned spontaneously and over 0.8 million Afghans were deported from these countries. The majority returned to the rural areas, however, c. 42% have returned to urban destinations, such as Kabul, Nangarhar and Kunduz. This percentage of returnees availing themselves of urban migration is much higher than was initially expected. Returns to urban areas may abate in the future as agricultural production, transport, and communications infrastructure improve in the rural parts of the country. In the short term, however, it is projected that the current trend for returnees to gravitate towards urban centers is likely to continue.

This case study will focus primarily on the UNHCR operational approach to reintegration in Kabul and Herat City. Prior to outlining the UNHCR strategy adopted it is first necessary to outline the profile of returnees to urban areas and address the main challenges they face in Kabul and Herat City.

Profile of Returnees and Patterns of Return

- Data suggests that the majority (80%) of the returnees from both Iran and Pakistan is of low educational standard, is asset poor, and were predominantly employed as day laborers;
- Monitoring of returnees and information sourced from repatriation data indicates a high degree of landlessness (c. 70%);
- Analysis of trends to date shows that the majority of returns to date have been from urban locations: 75% of the returns from Pakistan in particular have been from urban locations rather than the more established refugee villages and settlements. This fact is important considering the pattern that returnees who resided in urban areas during asylum are more likely to take up residence in urban areas upon return;

¹¹⁷ PDES Evaluation report

¹¹⁸ 2007 Work Plan for the Sudan - Project Revisions by Agency, **Sunday, October 07, 2007**. At http://workplan.unsudanig.org/2007/docs/WP07_Project_Revisions_Org.pdf: accessed June 11, 2009.

¹¹⁹ PDES Evaluation Report.

¹²⁰ UNMIS: UN Assistance to IDPs and Returnees in Sudan, January to June 2005, Issue 1, September 2005 pg. 5

¹²¹ ODI Report

- Approximately 40% of the returning Afghans from Iran (predominantly single, unregistered men) have repatriated outside the official UNHCR assisted voluntary return process;
- The trend of provincial mobility and urbanization is prominent. In the province of Herat, 30% of households are originally from another province. This mobility can be associated with a desire for better job opportunities and sometimes with security constraints;¹²²
- Particularly women coming back from Iran would have had far more freedom in exile than in Afghanistan. Thus upon return, they were better off remaining in urban areas where the cultural restrictiveness of the rural areas did not apply so strongly. An interviewee indicated that Herat City in particular is far more 'relaxed' than in rural areas, a fact which stems from different social arrangements.¹²³

Challenges Faced by Returnees in Kabul and Herat City

- Shelter is said to rank as the most dominant issue affecting the returnee population.¹²⁴ Returnee families without shelter in Kabul take up residence in destroyed public buildings, occupy other families' property or live in crowded, shared dwellings. Additionally, rent prices have escalated dramatically in the capital.
- High competition for access to basic needs and services. For example, water shortages and competition for access is a prevalent problem in the Afghan capital in as much as in the rest of the country.¹²⁵
- Returnees do not always trust the medical facilities in their village; they often prefer to walk long distances to seek services in provincial capitals. This inevitably increases risks to women's health and overburdens already stretched services.¹²⁶ Furthermore, tertiary level hospitals are available only in Kabul.¹²⁷ Recognizing the superior access they had enjoyed as refugees, women in Herat City stated that some now had to resort to going to Iran to deliver their babies.
- A study by German NGO Medica Mondiale shows that, between 2005 and 2006, 77 cases of self-immolation were registered in the public hospitals of Herat (37), Kabul (35) and Wardak (5). The non reported cases are widely believed to be in the hundreds, especially in Herat city.
- These cities are now made up of a largely heterogeneous population which does not break down into traditional power structures – family/tribal - which may yet be found in rural areas. This affects the returnees' ability to avail themselves of social networks for support.
- Although women from all social and ethnic groups are affected by SGBV, there are indications that some vulnerability factors are associated to returnees in particular, since the prevailing social-cultural environment in Afghanistan into which returnee women arrive is often substantially more restrictive than countries of asylum they previously lived in.¹²⁸

UNHCR Policy Stance

It was indicated by two of the interviewees that, regarding the UNHCR engagement in Afghanistan, there was a policy decision taken to delimit the parameters for the UNHCR operational response to rural areas only. This was apparently instigated by the request of the Afghan Interim Administration on the basis of the concern that the flow of returnees was contributing to the cycle of urbanization and their anticipation that money and aid would be flowing predominantly toward urban areas, with more non-governmental agencies also concentrated in these areas. This specific request by the Administration that UNHCR operate in rural areas does not appear to have been published explicitly.¹²⁹ Neither was the UNHCR policy statement published as such. An interviewee explained

¹²² <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=SUBSITES&id=45333ed72> Altai Consulting: Integration of Returnees in the Afghan Labor Market. Accessed May 14, 2009, at 15:40

¹²³ Interview (Bernard Doyle). He notes however; even in Herat women's freedom curbed more than in Iran).

See also APR 2006 pg.38

¹²⁴ Returnee Monitoring Report pg. 16 (indicating that a piece of information applies to both urban and rural). The UNHCR sub-office in Kabul City, reported early on in the repatriation process

¹²⁵ (2007 Annual Protection Report pg. 25)

¹²⁶ Returnee Monitoring Report 02/03

¹²⁷ Apr 07 pg 37

¹²⁸ APR 07 pg. 28

¹²⁹ Perhaps the closest that one can get to an inference of this position is the explicit statements made by Mr. Brahimi, the then Secretary General's Special Representative to Afghanistan, that the UN mission should be made

that the intention was to avoid publicizing a policy position that may have raised sensitive issues about the equity of focusing in rural areas whilst there were persons of concern in urban areas also.

Despite the cryptic and apparently untraceable nature of this policy stance, adherence thereto is apparent in the UNHCR's operational response. The majority of interviewees - having little or no awareness of this policy stance as an official constraint on their operations in urban areas - recognized, at any rate, that there may have been a *de facto* policy of this nature in force. The evidence of this policy is reflected in the Global Appeal and the other operational summary documents, which contain little or no mention of activities ongoing in urban areas. The nature of the writing in many of these documents presents a presumption that UNHCR reintegration activities were almost exclusively conducted in rural areas.¹³⁰

UNHCR Urban Reintegration Activities

Returnee Monitoring:

Encashment Centre Returnee Monitoring was occurring in centers in Kabul, Jalalabad, Gardez, Kandahar and Mazar-e-Sharif as of 2003.¹³¹ In the majority of operational reports, information on the number and destination of returns is given according to regional or provincial delineations. These are broad in scope and do not give an indication as to whether the returnees in these regions reside in urban or rural areas. This is due to the fact that returnee monitoring did not necessarily occur specific to all provincial capitals, as apart from the entire district. Indeed, a member of staff indicated that there was no returnee monitoring done in Jalalabad in the early stages of the UNHCR operation there.

The reflection of the results in the Annual Protection Report (particularly the most recent of 2007), focuses on the push factors from countries of asylum and there is little indication of the nature of the intended (or realized) destination of returnees. One might infer that this was not considered as one of the important findings of the monitoring process or alternatively, that this information was not adequately gleaned through returnee interviews.

Immediate Assistance:

The Cash assistance program was implemented in conjunction with the returnee monitoring at the Encashment centers and was indeed conducted across all locations in Afghanistan to which the UNHCR had access.

Participatory assessments took place in Kabul, Mazar-e Sharif and Herat with focus groups of different ages, gender and ethnicity. While discussions with adults focused on shelter issues, meetings with children and adolescents included a whole range of concerns such as education, health, etc. A workshop was organized in Kabul where Sub-Offices prepared action plans to respond in a structural way to identified needs.¹³²

Safe Houses:

During 2007, UNHCR directly supported two safe houses in Kabul, and worked in close co-ordination with two more houses, one in Herat and one in Mazar-e Sharif. The Humanitarian Assistance for Women and Children of Afghanistan (HAWCA) safe house in Kabul hosted 53 new cases in 2007 and a total of 55 cases received legal assistance and some form of durable solution. The Afghan Women Skills Development Center (ASWSDC) run safe house, hosted 43 women. All the cases received

up of a minimum presence, and that the integrated mission should leave only a 'light footprint'. 'Addressing the structure of the future United Nations mission in Afghanistan Security Council 4469th Meeting* (AM) Press Release: **SC/7295** Secretary-general, special representative Brahimi tell security council rapid disbursement of funds pledged essential for afghan recovery

¹³⁰ **Profile:** 55% of interviews were with men and 45% with women. 91% of interviews were conducted with persons living in rural areas, 9% with persons living in urban areas. The interviewees were Afghans of various ethnic origin and different religious beliefs (Sunni and Shia). – conducted for Human Rights and Field Monitoring Findings (pg. 64 Apr 2006)

¹³¹ Annual Protection Report 2007

¹³² Annual Protection Report Pg.42

vocational and literacy training, and psychological counselling. While the Mazar-e Sharif and Herat safe houses are not economically supported by UNHCR, a close liaison is maintained by the UNHCR sub-offices.¹³³

A 'Women's Network' or 'Safe house' project, similar in concept to that indicated above, was also implemented in 2003 by UNHCR in Kabul. It is unclear how long that safe house project was funded by the UNHCR or what the outcomes of the project were, since documentation on this was not available.

Shelter:

In the winter of 2002/2003, many returnees were gathering in Kabul and were unable to acquire shelter; remaining homeless in Kabul city during the winter. This state of affairs was brought to international attention by an article in the Herald Tribune in early 2003 and the matter subsequently came to be addressed by the UNHCR operation in Kabul which began implementing winterization activities.¹³⁴ These winterization and shelter activities temporarily brought UNHCR focus to urban areas.

This focus took the form of quickly set up shelter programmes and encouragement of NGOs to care for returnees and vulnerable persons in urban areas.¹³⁵ A memorandum of understanding was subsequently signed with UN-HABITAT which incorporated provisions for cooperation on the provision of shelter for returnees in urban areas.¹³⁶ In subsequent years, winterization was done in Kabul for the benefit of persons of concern, (IDPs as well as returnees and host communities also benefited from these efforts).

An interviewee issued a qualifier against viewing this shift in focus as a departure from the UNHCR policy stance on operations in Afghanistan. She indicated that the winterization efforts may be categorized, less as an integral part of the reintegration activities of the UNHCR operation, and more as a humanitarian effort made independently of the reintegration strategy since it benefited not just returnees *per se* but the most vulnerable inhabitants of the city more generally and was an entirely *ad hoc* response.

Aside from these winterization activities there were also limited shelter activities ongoing in Kabul. UNHCR operations allotted funding for the construction of 1,500 individual shelter units in Kabul (of some 52,000 basic homes across the rest of the country) and conducted the emergency rehabilitation of 24 public buildings in the capital which were sheltering squatters.¹³⁷

As far as documentation and interviews reflect, similar activities were not conducted in Herat. The need of returnees was perceived to be minimal in comparison to those residing in surrounding rural villages, and unlike a particular group of IDPs in the city which received some assistance¹³⁸, were difficult to identify once settled within the communities. Thus, UNHCR operations within the 'shelter' sector in Herat did not proceed beyond, the (non-financial) support of the Women at Risk protection safe-house.

More recently, in 2009 the UNHCR policy stance was considering playing an enhanced role in the refurbishment of damaged houses and public buildings, enlarging the homes of returnees with

¹³³ Annual Protection Report

¹³⁴ Half A Million Are Left Homeless in Afghan Cities as Winter Bites, (Carlotta Gall, January 2, 2003)

¹³⁵ Maki Shinohara Interview

¹³⁶ December 2003.

¹³⁷ Afghanistan: Shelter programme in full swing ahead of winter Briefing Note: 24 October 2003 (accessed at: <http://www.unhcr.org/news/NEWS/3f98fb133.html> April 22, 2009 at 14:19)

¹³⁸ : IDPs in Herat received some assistance (shelter/health/coal/winterization/NFI). Acknowledges that the assistance received by these IDPs was probably disproportionate to the need (in terms of numbers of people and their condition vis-à-vis what was offered to them.) This group was relatively easy to identify because they resided in distinct part of the city – and generally easier to ID than returnees. (This is not to say however, that identification was a simple matter – registration was not occurring at the time and many of the ID cards carried could have been duplicated/duplicates etc.)

expanded families, and winterization in Kabul. It has been observed by UNHCR staff that a key problem is that there is no one authority in charge in Kabul, such that interventions will probably take place at the informal local level, through community organizations.¹³⁹

Extremely Vulnerable Individuals (EVIs) Program:

Among the returnees, there are groups with special needs or Extremely Vulnerable Individuals (EVIs) who require support for their reintegration. Assistance to EVIs arises out of a UNHCR proposal to the Danish Government to fund a network for EVI assistance in 11 Provinces. The project aims to assist the most vulnerable persons among the returnees (assisted & forcible) and IDPs so that they can develop coping mechanisms and improve their chances of a sustainable return and reintegration. The implementation of the project started in June 2005 and continued in 2006 in 11 provinces (Baghlan, Balkh, Bamyan, Faryab, Ghazni, Kabul, Kandahar, Kunduz, Ningarhar, Paktia and Khost).¹⁴⁰ It is not clear whether these projects were focused in the urban areas of these provinces.

Partnerships:

One of the interviewees raised questions regarding the utility of having a return and reintegration dedicated ministry in Afghanistan, which was said to have become largely a source of patronage and corruption which has hindered the mainstreaming of reintegration issues. On the other hand, the same source indicated that the Ministry for Rural Development has been a much more effective partner.

Afghanistan may be an example for where the complementary strategies of engaging other partners have been made of use to a limited extent, even in sectors which were traditionally UNHCR's strength. For example, UN-Habitat has largely taken on the role of providing shelter in Kabul. Given the lack of reintegration activities in urban areas where UNHCR has active or passive participation, it would appear that working with implementing partners would have been made recourse to with greater frequency and intensity over the course of the reintegration operation thus far. Of course, it may be the case that this was not a possibility given the urban areas policy constraint, (the extent of which is unclear).

Associated Rationale for Limited Intervention / Operation / Lessons Learned:

The UNHCR activity in Kabul is mired by policy as well as by the practical constraints to conducting reintegration work in urban areas more generally. However, given the fact that much of the Office's work had administrative bases in city centres of Kabul, Jalalabad and Herat, it was, perhaps, an inevitable consequence that some small components of the operation should carry over into city centers – these activities include provision of workshops (the spill over effects of having encashment monitoring centers based in cities).¹⁴¹

Some of the interviewees who were not aware of a policy restriction on operations in urban areas presented other reasons for why UNHCR engagement may have been limited in these locations. Regarding the limited activities related to shelter, it was suggested that it takes far longer to build shelter in urban areas since it needs to be integrated with plan/development structure which is in stark contrast to rural areas; where plastic sheeting may go a long way.¹⁴² More generally, it was emphasized that returnees in urban areas are a less visible group, given the conglomeration of people who may all have similar needs and concerns in the urban environment, namely; urban IDPs, economic migrants, urban poor and returnees who have made a secondary movement to urban areas.

Specific to Herat City, one interviewee presented the rationale that the influx of returnees into Herat city, was not perceived as a prima facie cause for concern by the UNHCR office between 2005 and

¹³⁹ SW Asia Reps Meeting Briefing by Vicky Tennant.

¹⁴⁰ A separate project for identification and assistance of EVIs at the Islam Qala border (Hirat Province since 2002) and Zaranj border (Nimroz Province since 2005) has been implemented by Sub-Office Hirat.(Operational monthly Summary Jan 09 pg. iv)"

¹⁴¹ pg. 42 of APR 2007

¹⁴² Maki Shinohara interview

2007. It was observed that the *need* was less in Herat than in surrounding villages and rural areas. It was gleaned through interview with a senior member of staff that returnees were not homeless in Herat city; they joined local communities and families and resided therein. Many refugees in Iran lived in urban areas and hence, upon return, gravitating to urban areas came naturally/logically (even if, for many, it was not the area of origin). It follows from these observations that it was not considered necessary to implement projects to the same extent in Herat city as in rural areas.

10 Bibliography

Aubin, L. (2008) 'Safe Repatriation: Protection of Unaccompanied Minors and Separated Children' UNHCR Ethiopia

Crisp, Jeff (2001) 'Mind the gap! UNHCR, humanitarian assistance and the development process' Working Paper No. 43 UNHCR, New Issues in Refugee Research

Danish Refugee Council, (2008) 'DRC Presentation: "Return and Reintegration"' Echo Partnership Conference, Brussels, 9.12.2008 Ann Mary Olsen, Deputy Head, Danish Refugee Council

Fielden, A. (2008) 'Ignored Displaced Persons: The Plight Of IDPs In Urban Areas' Research Paper no. 161 (New Issues in Refugee Research), (PDES)

Grace, J. (2003) 'One Hundred Households in Kabul A study of winter vulnerability, coping strategies, and the impact of cash-for-work programmes on the lives of the "vulnerable"' Afghan Research and Evaluation Unit: Case Studies Series.

Herald Tribune July 28, 2002 Michael Ignatieff 'Nation Building Lite'

Herald Tribune January 2, 2003 Carlotta Gall, 'Half A Million Are Left Homeless in Afghan Cities as Winter Bites'

International Rescue Committee (IRC), (2007) *Evictions of IDPs in Juba – and its Effect on Returnees*, Returnee and Protection Monitoring, Central Equatoria.

IRIN: Humanitarian News and Analysis (2009) 'Burundi: "Forgotten and Unseen at the Edges of the City' Available at: <http://www.irinnews.org/report.aspx?ReportId=83878>

Ittig, Annette 'Urban development in Kabul: an overview of challenges and strategies' Available at: <http://www.institute-for-afghan-studies.org/contributions/projects/dr-ittig/urbandev.htm> accessed April 27th, 2009 at 10:04.

Macrae, Joanna, *Aiding Peace... and War: UNHCR, Returnee Reintegration and the Relief/Development Debate* (December 1999) in Handbook for Repatriation and Reintegration

Mattingly, M. and Gregory, P. 'The peri-urban interface: intervening to improve livelihoods' Available at: <http://www.research4development.info/PDF/Outputs/NRSPPIIBriefLR.pdf>.

Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Government of South Sudan (2007) *Approved Coordination Mechanisms and For a for the Education Sector: DRAFT*, Yambio, July 2007

OCHA (2005) *Situation Report Liberia: Report for 8 - 22 May 2005* Available at: <http://iys.cidi.org/humanitarian/hsr/05a/ixl105.html>

Pantuliano. S., (2008) 'Unchartered Territory: Land, Conflict and Humanitarian Action' Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute, London.

Pantuliano. S, Buchanan-Smith, M. Murphy, P., Mosel. I, (2008) 'The Long Road Home: Opportunities and obstacles to the reintegration of IDPs and refugees returning to Southern Sudan and the Three Areas, Report of Phase II; Conflict, Urbanisation and Land.' Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute, London.

UNHCR (1997) *Comprehensive Policy Document on Urban Refugees*

UNHCR (1995) *UNHCR's Policy and Practice Regarding Urban Refugees, A Discussion Paper*, Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/research/RESEARCH/3bd4254e7.html>

UNHCR (1997) *UNHCR Policy on Refugees in Urban Areas*, UNHCR/IOM/90/97

UNHCR (1999) *Global Appeal: 'Inspection, Investigation and Evaluation'*

UNHCR (2007) *Municipal Profile for Drvar, Bosnia and Herzegovina* Available at: <http://www.unhcr.ba/updates/may07/Drvar%20update%20jan07.pdf>

UNHCR (2003 Provisional Release) *Handbook for Registration*

UNHCR (2003) *Framework for Durable Solutions for Refugees and Persons of Concern*.

UNHCR (2003) *Returnee Monitoring Report: Afghanistan Repatriation January 2002 – March 2003*

UNHCR (2004) *Shelter Programme in Progress Kabul Press Briefing: 8 August 2004*

UNHCR (2004) *Regional Multi-Year Operations Plan for the Repatriation and reintegration of Liberian Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (2004 – 2007)*

UNHCR (2004) *Quick Impact Project Provisional Guide* Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/partners/PARTNERS/41174ce94.pdf>

UNHCR (2004) *Handbook for Repatriation and Reintegration Activities*. Geneva: UNHCR.

UNHCR (2004) *Liberia Bulletin*, Vol. 1 Issue No. 7, December 2004

UNHCR (2005) *Return and Reintegration of Sudanese Refugees to Southern Sudan: Revised Supplementary Appeal*.

UNHCR (2005) *Afghan Operation Update: September 2005*

UNHCR (2006) *Global Appeal Report*

UNHCR (2006) *Income Generation and Coexistence*

UNHCR, GTZ, JICA (2006) *Inter-Agency Mission "Education in Reintegration" Southern Sudan 27 November – 08 December 2006*. (Internal)

UNHCR (2006) *South Sudan Operation: Compendium of CBRPs and their Progress as of 31 January 2006*

UNHCR (2006) *Practical Guide to the Use of Standards and Indicators in UNHCR Operations: 2nd Edition*.

UNHCR (2007) *At – a – Glance: Liberia Operation, April-July 2007*

UNHCR (2007) *Study Finds Urgent Socio Economic Needs Among Afghans* Kabul Press Information 27 September, 2007

UNHCR (2007) *Liberia Annual Protection Report*

UNHCR (2008) *Education Mission to Liberia Report* Division of Operational Services

UNHCR (2008) *Operational Information Monthly Summary Report – October 2008*, Operational Information Unit, Branch Office Kabul.

- UNHCR, (2008) *Good Practices for Public Health and HIV in Urban Settings* (Public Health & HIV Section UNHCR Geneva)
- UNHCR (2008) *Follow up on the UNHCR Education Programme: report of mission to Liberia 27 March – 5 April, 2008* (DOS)
- UNHCR (2008) *Returnee Area Monitoring Report: Southern Sudan* Office of the Deputy Representative Juba, South Sudan.
- UNHCR (2008) *Policy Framework and Implementation Strategy: UNHCR's Role in Support of the Return and Reintegration of Displaced Populations*. Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/48c628d42.html>
- UNHCR (2008) *Kabul Conference Pledges Support for Sustainable Return*, Press Releases, 19 November 2008
- UNHCR (2008) Evaluation of UNHCR's Returnee Reintegration Programme in Southern Sudan (PDES)
- UNHCR (2008) *UNHCR's Role in Support of the Return and Reintegration of Displaced Populations: Policy Framework and Implementation Strategy* Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/excom/EXCOM/47b06de42.pdf>
- UNHCR (2009) *Concept Paper High Commissioner's Dialogue on Protection Challenges. Challenges for persons of concern to UNHCR in urban settings (Geneva, 9-10 December 2009)*
- UNHCR (2009) *Global Appeal Update* Geneva: UNHCR
- UNHCR (2009) *Operational Information Monthly Summary Report - January 2009: Statistical Overview of Returned Afghan Refugees from Pakistan, Iran and Neighbouring Countries, IDP Caseload and Movements and Reintegration Activities 02 March 2002 – 31 January 2009*. Operational Information Unit, Branch Office Kabul.
- UNHCR (2009) *Update on UNHCR's Water Programme* UNHCR Kabul Press Information, 16 February 2009.
- UNHCR (2009) *Update on UNHCR's Shelter Programme* UNHCR Kabul Press Information, 2 February 2009.
- UNHCR (2009) *UNHCR Winter Aid for over 30,000 Vulnerable Afghan Families*, UNHCR Kabul Press Information, 29 December 2008.
- UN-HABITAT (2009) *State of the World's Cities 2008/2009: Harmonious Cities*
- UNPBF (2008) *Liberia Peacebuilding Fund: Project Summary* Available at: <http://www.unpbf.org/docs/projects/PBF-LBR-A-1%20Project%20Summary.doc>.
- U.S. Department of State: Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (2009) 'Impact Evaluation Of Prm Humanitarian Assistance To The Repatriation And Reintegration Of Burundi Refugees (2003-08)' Available at: <http://www.state.gov/g/prm/rls/pubs/2009/121591.htm>
- Wily, L.A. (2003) 'Land Rights in Crisis: Restoring Tenure Security in Afghanistan' Afghan Research and Evaluation Unit: Issues Paper Series. Available at: <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/APCITY/UNPAN016656.pdf>

Interviewees

Abe, T., Senior Development Officer, Operational Solutions and Transitions Section (OSTS)

Doyle, B., Head, Inter-Agency Unit

Hasegawa, Y. Senior Desk Officer, MENA Iraq Support Unit

Le Guillouzic, H., Senior Public Health Officer, Public Health and HIV Section

Reybet-Degat, F., Senior Policy Adviser, Office of the Controller

Sharpe, T., Senior Policy Adviser, Policy and Legal Unit

Shimizu, Y., Senior Operations Officer, Operational Solutions and Transitions Section (OSTS)

Shinohara, M., Senior Emergency Preparedness and Response Officer, Emergency Prep & Resp Sect.

Yoshida, N., Deputy Representative, Sudan

The functional titles are as of the time of interview.
