



Forced Displacement Working Group Meeting

Friday 16 December, 14:00 – 15:30
26-28, avenue Giuseppe Motta, Geneva

NGOs/UN Agencies Present

NGOs present: Caritas Internationalis; DRC; IDC; Intersos; JRS; LWF; NRC; Oxfam; Plan International; RefugePoint; WVI

A/ Working Modalities

Internally at ICVA, there has been some thinking around improving working modalities of the Forced Displacement Working Group. As we move forward, meetings are getting more intense with more agenda items to discuss and more aspects to follow up on. Hence, the ICVA Secretariat eagerness to hear directly from members on two aspects:

- Should we make more use of mailing list(s) to share information (e.g. creating dedicated mailing lists on CRRF/Refugee Compact and other topics)?
- Should we focus the FDWG meetings on more action-strategic discussions over 1 or 2 themes max per meeting?

Main reactions:

- *On Information-Sharing:*
 - It is a key element of the FDWG that we should keep. The FDWG is also a good forum to jointly analyze information.
 - We should ensure that the information shared is most useful for field staff – think of ways of communicating and relevance of the information.
- *On jointly strategizing:*
 - FDWG is valuable for offering the space to reflect with others and strategize on the advocacy position, hear observations and assessments.
 - Having more action-oriented meetings would be appreciated while ensuring it does not turn into a reporting exercise to ICVA.
- *On the group itself:*
 - There is a lack of clarity around who is part of the FDWG. In this perspective, regular sharing of the FDWG mailing list would be useful.
 - On the phrasing and sense of ownership: there is a need to invite more explicitly WG members to suggest agenda items; members can bring up issues/concerns and take the lead on any of the discussed matters.
- *On the substance discussed during the meetings:*
 - Operational vs policy challenges: The policy and protection discussion is usually very strong, but we still need to keep space for operational discussion.

- Some of the operational/programmatic discussions should be moved to the Humanitarian Financing Working Group, in order to ensure it is not left behind.
- FD is very broad – should the name be changed?
- *On the CRRF/Refugee Compact*: Shall we set up a completely separate WG on the Compact or think of various work streams?
 - Need to keep ourselves more coordinated in order to know who is the best placed to push (GE vs NY discussion for ex), where we want to head, what we want to see next; etc.
 - Too many WGs should be avoided, but if there is a need to be more specific on the CRRF, there could be an ad hoc TT or a similar structure.
 - A specific mailing list on the CRRF could be useful.

Action points:

- **Include as a constant agenda item the review of action points from the previous WG (not added burden for members but simply to ensure we follow up on collective decisions).**
- **Notes from the previous WG will be sent earlier for easy follow-up and more time dedicated to share information with field staff.**
- **On the CRRF/Refugee Compact: A dedicated mailing list will be created**
- **Based on those feedback, ICVA will come back in January with some more concrete suggestions, including the WG ToR for review.**

B/ CRRF/Refugee Compact:

On the Task Team:

- Has apparently been understaffed for the moment; few information coming out (even internally to UNHCR).
- Hired a communications and advocacy specialist, coming from the NGO community; to start as of mid-January. Hopefully this will mean improved NGO involvement.
- World Bank is apparently seconding a staff for 6 months to work with the Task Team.

On the pilots:

- 3 pilots decided (Uganda, Tanzania, Somalia) but others seem stalled. Will there be only 3 pilots in Africa? Other approaches (e.g. thematic approaches in some countries, such as on 1) Reception and admission; 2) Support for immediate and ongoing needs; 3) Support for host countries and communities; 4) Durable solutions). How would this play out?
- On the mission to Uganda: meeting with governments; idea of setting up a secretariat; what about engagement with NGOs?

On NGO coordination:

- ICVA created a draft matrix in order to share information on respective activities/projects related to the CRRF/Compact – (continued) feedback & inputs welcome.

UNHCR-NGO Annual Consultations:

- Those will be an opportunity to engage with UNHCR on the CRRF and the Refugee Compact.
 - UNHCR Partnership section indicated that the Task Team will produce a concept note describing what would be the expected outcome of the consultations from their side. NGOs are asked to do the same.
- ⇒ **ICVA will consult broadly on this but your thoughts are already welcome.**

Main reactions:

- *On Uganda:*
 - There was a meeting in Uganda as part of the regular inter-agency process, nothing specific.
 - A CRRF Secretariat will apparently be created with the government but NGOs do not seem (yet) to be part of it.
 - NGOs seem to have a number of question marks on the process and value of the CRRF, e.g.: The Secretariat first task seems to be to map out who is doing what. This is not really groundbreaking. What is new? How is it going to help us? Would more engagement also mean more coordination and possibly more confusion?
 - Some NGOs also seem to foresee potential accountability issues as more (government) actors may be involved in a context of increased funding. Even donors seem to harbor misgivings about where funding would go; how it would be managed.
 - Discussions in the Solutions Alliance move towards governments (their responsibility, financial security) and it is operating in the same pilot countries than the CRRF. However, UNHCR seems quite defensive vis-à-vis the Solutions Alliance, asserting that it is UNHCR which has been tasked to work on the CRRF, not the Solutions Alliance.
 - ⇒ **What does it mean in terms of collaboration & working together in the field? Who has the lead: Solutions Alliance or the CRRF?**
- *On Tanzania:*
 - Inter-agency briefing indicated that 2017 will be a learning year although NGOs felt one year might not be enough to generate key lessons.
 - CRRF in Tanzania will be built on current in-country initiatives, brought under one same umbrella.
 - The implementation of the CRRF should be also done around the commitments made by the Tanzanian government in NY (move away from the camp policy; allow more integration).
 - There is a need for a strong coordination ownership at the local level.
 - Joint advocacy messages were prepared by NGOs in Tanzania on the NY Summit and the operationalization of the CRRF (on integration, self-reliance and resilience building), which are being used by UNHCR and the government in the country – **Plan International to share those messages with the group.**
- *On ways/lack of engagement with CSOs:*
 - Maybe it is fair to understand lack of engagement with NGOs. We are still at an early stage of the process, CRRF should be seen more as a gradual process over

the next couple of years to address all the components needed to respond to a refugee crisis. There is the need to break down some of those activities.

- It is incumbent on UNHCR to tell NGOs how the CRRF will be implemented. It should develop instructions for its own country offices as well as for partners.
 - Some members believe there is the need for synergy and interconnectedness in the development of the two Compacts. It is difficult to address the CRRF/Refugee Compact in isolation. It could be useful to have conversations in both; difficult to understand by what process this is being developed.
 - UNHCR seems worried that making too strong a connection between the two Compacts may result in the Refugee Compact being watered down or even derailed especially if the Migrant Compact fails to be adopted. Some FDWG members agree that this is a risk.
 - Some members feel there is more clarity on the Migration Compact process than with the Refugee Compact one. The discussions on the CRRF are very disjointed and it is difficult for NGOs to understand how and where to engage. UNHCR expected to have the Refugee Compact finalized on 19 September and may now be apprehensive of any process which could suggest changes in the text; make it lose control.
 - We may need to push UNHCR now for some more formal mechanism of engagement, coordination and exchange of information. Some NGOs have sent concrete questions to the task Team (e.g., on the scope of the 'refugee' definition in the CRRF (broad or restricted) but received no answer so far.
- ⇒ **Shall we organize a series of informal briefings with UNHCR?**
- ⇒ **Shall we develop joint messages on the current development, namely the lack of UNHCR's engagement with CSOs? It may help us putting together key messages and develop our own timeline.**
- *On the matrix:*
- JRS' areas of focus on the CRRF development: reception, education, expand beyond primary education and right to work for refugees. It is expected that the solutions aspects will not get much traction. Focus will not be on process.
 - It needs to be used as a living document, a space to jointly brainstorm and strategize.
 - Expanding definition of CSO: as we are filling out the spreadsheet, welcome to talk about the development component of our activities.
- ⇒ **ICVA to add a column "in planning" for potential future activities & to present it as a living document and circulate again.**

On openDemocracy:

openDemocracy asked ICVA to write a piece on the Follow-up to the NY Declaration.

- Deadline is fast approaching: 10 January.
 - Focus of ICVA piece will be on "equitable and predictable responsibility sharing and refugee protection mechanisms". In this piece, we also have the opportunity to highlight past, current or planned actions or joint actions/advocacy.
- ⇒ **Your contributions to the ICVA piece are welcome, ICVA will be sending an e-mail with all relevant info.**

- ⇒ **Also possibility to write individual NGO pieces. Let Jerome know if interested & will connect you with openDemocracy.**

C/ High Commissioner's Dialogue on Protection Challenges (Children on the Move):

Debrief of members' involvement in the Dialogue, especially through the Friends of the Dialogue's Group and on the outcome and next steps of this HC Dialogue:

- Development of the traditional NGO Key Messages Document and new opportunity to deliver a joint statement at the end;
 - There was an overall good interaction with UNHCR in the preparations (3 dedicated meetings with UNHCR, opportunity to comment on UNHCR's Background paper and on agenda/participation; NGO documents uploaded on UNHCR Dialogue web page, etc.);
 - Some NGOs indicated concrete results from their participation to the Dialogue (e.g., UNHCR coming out clearly, vocally and unequivocally against detention of children;
 - Post-Dialogue Report: Notes from different sessions will be compiled. This report might be turned into NGO outcome document to ensure better follow-up on key issues that were raised; NGOs met with UNHCR and UK mission to discuss the Children at Risk settlement program, etc.)
 - In the closing session, F. Grandi said: We achieved collective ownership of concepts and ideas. What we need to do is to translate these into collective push.
 - ⇒ However, not much in terms of concrete follow up?
 - Concrete outcome of the Dialogue presented by the HC were:
 - A UNHCR Refugee Youth Advisory Board will be created;
 - A web portal will be created to share good practices and remain connected.
 - On the Refugee Compact, Grandi said: "we will make sure that suggestions and operational solutions will feed into the pilots for CRRF" and that the 2017 Dialogue on Global Compact should include reflection of all previous dialogues.
- ⇒ Could CSOs do more to link 2016 and 2017 Dialogue?

D/ High Commissioner's Structured Dialogue (Greece)

ICVA just came back from a Structured Dialogue Mission in Greece (workshops in Athens on 12 Dec and in Lesvos on 14 Dec with NGOs and UNHCR). Preliminary feedback:

- Struggled a bit with UNHCR participation;
- Greece - very specific context in terms of the politics & type of actors;
- Key points:
 - Importance of information sharing around advocacy, bringing volunteer groups around coordination mechanisms.
 - Good capacity building approach between INGOs and NNGOs.
 - Uncertainty of next year situation in terms of funding and the kind of scenario to expect.

E/ AOB

The next meeting will take place on Tuesday 31 January, 2pm