



**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF DENMARK**

Danida

KEEPING THE PROMISE: THE ROLE OF BILATERAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS IN RESPONDING TO FORCED DISPLACEMENT

MAY 2020



**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF DENMARK**
Danida

KEEPING THE PROMISE: THE ROLE OF BILATERAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS IN RESPONDING TO FORCED DISPLACEMENT

MAY 2020

Desk analysis and consultations with
officials from displacement-affected states
and selected development partners



By Niels V.S. Harild, policy expert on
forced displacement and development

Production: Evaluation, Learning and Quality Department, Ministry
of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, May 2020

Graphic Production: Kontrapunkt

ISBN: PDF: 978-87-93760-41-7

This report can be downloaded through the homepage of the Ministry of Foreign
Affairs or directly from the homepage of the Evaluation, Learning and Quality
Department <http://evaluation.um.dk>.

Contact: elk@um.dk

Responsibility for content and presentations of findings and recommendations
rests with the authors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	6
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Background	10
1.2 The KISED P model	13
1.3 Structure of the report	16
2. Methodology and Objective	9
3. Lessons from the KISED P Evaluation	20
4. Findings from and Reflections on Consultations and Global Nexus Evidence	26
4.1 Overview of key findings	29
4.2 Global relevance of the KISED P approach	29
4.3 Opportunities	29
4.4 Challenges and emerging approaches	29
5. Recommendations	32

The following annexes to the Evaluation Study can be downloaded as separate PDF-files from evaluation.um.dk

Annex 1: Global Displacement Humanitarian Development Nexus: Lessons Learned

Annex 2: Further reflections on Burden and Responsibility Sharing

Annex 3: Terms of Reference

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge Finn Skadkjaer of Tana in particular for his input to the evidence and advice on lessons. Roger Zetter as a good sparring partner, Carolina Sanchez-Paramo, Tara Visvanath, Nandini Krisnan, Caroline Sergeant, and Xavier de Victor for their input to parts of the World Bank chapter, Hans Stausbool, Anna Schmitt, and Harmke Kruithof for their input to the EU chapter, Ewen Macleod UNHCR for providing key information on the GRF preparation process. Cordelia Chesnutt and Ayla Yurtaslan Olsen for edits and advice, and finally Thomas Thomsen and Marianne Vestergaard of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark for excellent collaboration throughout the formulation process.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BMZ	German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development
BRS	Burden and Responsibility Sharing
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIDP	County Integrated Development Plan
CRRF	Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework
DFID	Department for International Development of the United Kingdom
DG DEVCO	Directorate General for International Cooperation and Development
DG NEAR	Directorate General for Neighbourhood and Enlargement Nations
EU	European Union
ECHO	European Commission's department for overseas humanitarian aid and for civil protection
GCR	Global Compact on Refugees
GISEDP	Garissa Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan
GRF	Global Refugee Forum
HDP	Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus
HR	Human Resources
IDA	International Development Association
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IFI	International Financial Institutions
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
KISEDP	Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
WBG	World Bank Group

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION: The 2019 [Global Compact on Refugees \(GCR\)](#) sets the parameters for the future approach to displacement situations. The GCR foresees a much stronger involvement of development actors than in the past, and in doing so, reflects a nexus approach to forced displacement. When this study refers to the operationalization of the GCR, it implies operationalizing a humanitarian-development nexus approach in displacement situations. With protracted global refugee situations extending for decades in the absence of resolutions to conflicts and sustainable peace, there is a clear need for sharper messaging to development partners on what they should do in order to implement the comprehensive response foreseen in the GCR. This study aims to do just that. The study is directed toward development thinkers, planners and implementors in Danida and other aid agencies, offering recommendations on how to operationalize the transformative vision and comprehensive response laid out in the GCR. The study is based on a combination of consultations with select bilateral development partners and a literature review including a summary of the historic dimensions of international approaches to address displacement situations. The consultations also targeted stakeholders engaged in the preparations for and the organization of a panel presentation on “How to get burden and responsibility sharing right for the GCR” at the December 2019 Global Refugee Forum.

NEXUS APPROACH: The needs of displacement affected population do not start out as humanitarian and then become development-oriented as time passes. There is no linear progression of impact, needs and opportunities. The consequences of forced displacement are, instead, varied and often severe, costly and long lasting. In practical terms, it often entails the loss of homes, land, belongings and livelihoods, the disruption of family and community life, loss of community resilience, human capital challenges. The displaced may strain the capacities of the communities in which they live, impede the achievement of development goals, and create community tension, particularly in conflict or post-conflict settings. On the other hand, refugees have strong coping mechanisms and possess skills and resources that, if harnessed, can contribute to the local economy, the building of community resilience, and the wellbeing of host or return communities and the displaced themselves.

CHANGING THE PARADIGM: Five years ago, the Government of Kenya decided to address the arrival of large numbers of new South

Sudanese asylum seekers into the Turkana region, which already hosted the Kakuma camp, by pursuing a long-term development-oriented approach. Thus, the Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISED P) was conceptualised in 2015 by the local county government and UNHCR with support from other actors including the World Bank Group (WBG). The overall aim of KISED P is to improve the quality of life and economic self-reliance of refugees and host populations through more comprehensive and inclusive, area-based development approaches, utilizing the comparative advantages of national and international humanitarian and development partners until such a time when lasting solutions for refugees can be found. In 2019, Danida and UNHCR carried out a Joint Evaluation of the KISED P, the results of which are tested in this study in order to explore their global relevance for future approaches to displacement situations. Lessons from KISED P, as a first of its kind representing a different approach, are relevant to bear in mind for future nexus approaches aiming to operationalize the GCR.

The evaluation notes important achievements in government-led development planning, service delivery and self-reliance and highlights the need for sustained sector investments to boost delivery capacity and economic activities. Most importantly it points to the outstanding need to establish an agreement on burden and responsibility sharing (BRS). In light of this, the key recommendation emphasizes the need for high level discussions between the Government of Kenya and its development partners to come to a BRS agreement, basically requiring a more central engagement of the development partners. Supporting recommendations include a) further alignment of policy frameworks; b) promoting full mainstreaming in development plans; c) support to government planning, d) delivery and monitoring capacity to enhance service delivery, e) further refugee inclusion and self-reliance; and improved fundraising efforts.

While conclusions and recommendations from the evaluation were used as the basis for the consultation process of this study, the input from respondents was predominantly on the global approach to future displacement situations – with inspiration from the takeaways from the evaluation. The most important findings from the consultations are structured as opportunities and challenges.

OPPORTUNITIES: There are currently a number of unique global opportunities that lend themselves to solidifying a paradigm shift in the response to displacement situations. In different ways they promote, support or underscore, like the KISED P evaluation, the importance of achieving BRS: (i) The GCR provides a common framework for an effective nexus approach; (ii) WBG and EU DEVCO have put in place a set of policies, tools and resources for development operations; (iii) the OECD has developed Humanitarian-Development-Peace (HDP) nexus guidelines, a refugee financing policy and a common position for the

Global Refugee Forum (GRF) against which development partners will be measured; (iv) A limited but growing number of displacements affected countries are mainstreaming displacement into national development plans on the basis of inclusive refugee policies and costed sector programmes; (v) Some bilateral development partners have put in place policies and operations in support of a nexus approach; and (vi) UNHCR has begun its internal adaptation from leadership and control of the international refugee response towards one focusing more on smart facilitation.

CHALLENGES: While these opportunities signal that there is international momentum, host states and bilateral development partners need to address several challenges in order to capitalize on the above opportunities: (i) As also found in the KISED P evaluation: unless agreements on BRS are achieved in displacement situations it will not be possible to effectively operationalize the transformative vision of the GCR globally. (ii) This requires that displacement issues are included and operationalised in national development plans supported through development cooperation (as also recommended in the KISED P evaluation). (iii) The centrality of and need for a direct dialogue between displacement-affected states and their development partners and with UNHCR in an informative, facilitating and supportive role is key in this respect.

Institutional and organisation mandates currently operating do not holistically address the diverse array of consequences of complex crises and displacement. Approaches are siloed and may worsen structural vulnerabilities and constitute inefficient and unsustainable responses instead of nurturing and supporting the most innovative engagements that the international assistance community can deliver. Challenges therefore include that current policies and strategies, and organisational and operational systems and procedures, and incentive structures present barriers to mainstreaming displacement – both in development partner and national development institutions. In terms of policy and strategy challenges, resistance to change is considerable, but obstruction is less in those institutions where clear nexus policies are in place. In terms of operational procedures and systems there is often limited flexibility in organisations to address sector needs arising from sudden increases in numbers of displaced, or to engage in innovation that may come from field practitioners. Another barrier is the traditional one country approach to development cooperation that can be a hindrance to the needed regional perspective on displacement situations. “Fire-walls” between departments units, including siloed staffing structures can also be a considerable disincentive to change, particularly if the nexus knowledge base is low and if decision making is centralized.

BUILDING ON EVIDENCE: There is a long history of efforts to align and interlink humanitarian aid and development assistance in order to better address these aspects of complex crises and protracted displacement.

The nexus substance emerged from UNHCR in the 1950ies and 60ies and in the late 1990ies the EU launched the Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) terminology which looks at the humanitarian development link more broadly. In recent years there are more concerted efforts by states and agencies to apply a nexus approach to humanitarian and development challenges (as elaborated in Annex 1). For approaches to address the complexity of the situations and to be sustainable there are (at least) three key lessons from the many years of agreements, approaches and engagements:

- The point of departure for dialogue and planning should be focused on long-term policy, and the operational lead should be the displacement affected state. The point of departure should also include a comprehensive political economy and context analysis, which take the concerns of the displacement impacted state into account.
- Both national and international development institutions and agencies must understand that displacement is a core development issue needing to be addressed as such from the beginning, while also considering the humanitarian concerns.
- The centrality of reaching agreement on BRS requires sustained political will from the displacement impacted state and its development partners, the role of UNHCR is to be a prudent facilitator.
- These lessons also corroborate with the findings and recommendations of the KISED evaluation and the consultations conducted in this study.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Displacement-affected states to consider:

At policy level:

- Take a long-term developmental approach to displacement up front, based on an inclusive refugee policy that allows displaced people to be part of and contribute to local social and economic development;
- As part of the established national development planning structure, crystalize self-interest concerns and other perspectives of the social, political, economic and security implications of the refugee situation;
- Take the lead on engaging bilateral and multilateral development partners in a dialogue focused on fair and efficient burden and responsibility sharing;
- Mainstream displacement into national development plans and make it a development priority.

At operational level:

- Enhance or adapt sector approaches to ensure sufficient delivery capacity.

- Involve development partners up front in political economy and context analyses, as well as sector planning and costing.

Danida and other development partners should consider:

At policy level:

- Make displacement a priority in bilateral development cooperation with displacement-affected states (be that host states or states receiving returning refugees);
- Commit to promoting development cooperation at the core of future approaches to displacement situations;
- Develop a clear and efficient nexus approach for responding to displacement and fragility;
- Make a policy commitment to work with host states and other development partners on situation-specific mechanisms in order to achieve trust, understanding and agreement on BRS;
- Commit to applying the full palette of political, diplomatic, and trade tools to promote the transformative vision of the GCR at the country and regional level through collaboration with other development partners as well as at development, foreign policy and security fora at the global level.

At operational level:

- Adapt internal structures, processes, tools, HR resources and incentives to ensure a coherent approach across development cooperation and humanitarian assistance in partner countries affected by displacement;
- Develop institutional guidance for how to inspire, facilitate, be part of or lead context specific sector approaches in order to deliver on the GCR vision where relevant;
- The guidelines should include promotion of context-specific partnership platforms among development partners leading to joint political economy and context analyses as a basis for a common framework for action;
- Promote relevant GCR-inspired institutional changes in multilateral development and humanitarian institutions;
- Advocate in: (i) the WBG governing board for the WBG to be more proactive in leading a coherent social and economic response to displacement among development partners in displacement-affected countries and; (ii) EU member state consultations on the need for continued political, policy and operational commitment towards a long-term development response by DG DEVCO and DG NEAR in the European Commission.

If multilateral and bilateral development partners and displacement-affected states do not address the above recommendations, there is great risk that the transformative vision of the GCR will remain just that. Momentum will be lost with fall back to the traditional, unsustainable humanitarian model, where states as duty bearers abdicate responsibility for the crisis and displacement, by transferring the responsibility to local and international humanitarian agencies without the capacity to address the situations in a comprehensive and sustainable manner.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Five years ago, the Government of Kenya – through the Turkana County Governor – decided to address the large number of new South Sudanese arrivals in Turkana by pursuing a long-term development-oriented approach. UNHCR and other actors took up this challenge together with the county government, and in 2015 the Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISED P) was designed. The overall aim of KISED P is to improve quality of life and economic self-reliance of refugees and host populations through more comprehensive and inclusive, area-based approaches, utilizing the comparative advantages of all actors, until such a time when lasting solutions for refugees can be found. The Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) was adopted three years after the KISED P was designed, and has similar visions and objectives. In broad terms, this vision is to enhance refugee self-reliance, ease pressure on host country communities and promote lasting solutions. The GCR embodies a humanitarian development nexus approach to displacement. Lessons from KISED P as a first of its kind representing a new way of working are therefore important to bear in mind for future Nexus approaches aiming to operationalize the GCR. The KISED P has been evaluated jointly by Danida and UNHCR in 2019.

With global refugee situations extending for decades in the absence of resolutions to conflicts and the emergence of peace, millions of forcibly displaced face protracted displacement before lasting solutions can be found. The learnings underpinning the GCR confirm broad agreement that going forward in dealing with these displacement situations, much more consistent involvement of national, bilateral, and multilateral development partners in displacement work is needed. On the basis of resources collected, this study aims to provide concrete recommendations to bilateral development partners (often mistakenly referred to only as donors) and displacement-affected states.

1.2. The KISED P model

KISED P delivers on what constitutes a change in approach towards hosting refugees in Kenya in line with the GCR. Acknowledging the likelihood that there will be an extended period before circumstances allow voluntary and sustainable return of refugees to their countries of origin,

the approach has evolved from establishing traditional refugee camps, towards settlements where refugees can access basic services through national systems and are encouraged to become more self-reliant. There has been a progressive inclusion of refugee concerns within the county government's development planning processes. Central to this process is the leadership displayed by the Kenyan Government at various levels, and the facilitation provided by UNHCR. However, this process is not just about refugees: KISED P is embedded in the county integrated development plan (CISP) and acknowledges that successful hosting is contingent on sustained good relations with the local community. This depends on equality of access to, and tangible improvements in, the provision of services and livelihood opportunities for the local population.

1.3. Structure of the report

First the methodology and objectives are described followed by the key points of the evaluation of the KISED P. In the following section, the most important findings from the consultations are analysed with reference back to the KISED P evaluation as appropriate. The findings are in three groupings: (i) The global relevance of the KISED P approach; (ii) opportunities; and (iii) challenges and emerging approaches.

2. METHODOLOGY AND OBJECTIVE

This study has the dual objective to provide concrete recommendations on the role of (i) Denmark and (ii) the wider international community in supporting humanitarian development nexus work in displacement situations. The study is intended to support government policy and operational innovations and future partnerships for the operationalization of the GCR globally, as well as testing the global validity of the findings from KISED, based on consultations, desk study and experience. While relevant for the international community at large, the study will make specific recommendations for Danida, other bilateral development partners and displacement-affected states. The study employed two methods:

Consultations

- Informant consultations with select bilateral development partners and displacement affected state officials.
- Consultations in preparations for and organisation of a spotlight session with a panel presentation on “How to get burden and responsibility sharing right for the GCR” organised by Denmark at the Global Refugee Forum (GRF), which took place in Geneva on 16-18 December 2019.

Literature review

- A review of historic and recent policy and operational humanitarian development nexus evidence in displacement situations.

The resource documentation for this study was obtained through a combination of phone and in-person consultations with five bilateral development partners (BMZ, Canadian CIDA, Sweden, DFID and Danida), displacement-affected states officials from Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia, as well as OECD, EU DEVCO and UNHCR. Of these, Uganda, Kenya, UNHCR, Danida, EU DEVCO and OECD participated in the spotlight session at the GRF.

To achieve its objective, the study aims to address the following questions:

- How can bilateral donors such as Denmark use existing evidence from research, evaluation and studies, including the UNHCR-Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs commissioned KISED evaluation, to further the work on supporting long-term solutions to protracted displacement crises?
- What are specific challenges and opportunities – based on the evidence available – for Denmark, other donors and international organisations engaged in operationalizing the humanitarian-development nexus?

3. LESSONS FROM THE KISED P EVALUATION

The KISED P evaluation findings illustrate progress and challenges to the operationalization of GCR – drawing from an initiative that started prior to the adoption of the GCR. The evaluation confirms that KISED P is on the right track, and that important **progress** has been made in (i) Government leadership and a long-term development approach; (ii) inclusion of refugees in government service delivery structures; (iii) the promotion of refugee self-reliance; (iv) equal access to services and livelihood opportunities by refugees and host community; and (v) strengthening planning, implementation and monitoring capacity of national structures. The key challenge to realizing the KISED P approach identified by the evaluation concerns burden and responsibility sharing, which requires the costed plan and financing model to be realistic, the policy framework to be fully implemented and the need to achieve agreement on burden and responsibility sharing.

The key recommendation of the evaluation is to initiate high-level political dialogue between the Government of Kenya and involved development partners to reach agreement on a more inclusive refugee policy (protection framework and temporary economic integration) alongside the net cost implications and mechanisms for burden and responsibility sharing. Other recommendations stand in their own right, but also serve to support and inform this high-level burden and responsibility sharing dialogue. They include:

1. Continue work towards one joint area-based development plan for both refugees and host communities, mainstreamed into local and national government budgets.
2. Support to local government planning and leadership through capacity enhancement.
3. Secure a more central involvement of national and international development actors.
4. Promote further mainstreaming of refugees in national service delivery mechanisms.
5. Strengthen pathways to self-reliance and community reliance and full enactment of related policy frameworks.
6. Strengthen financial resourcing through better nationally led planning jointly with partners.

3. Lessons from the KISED P Evaluation

These conclusions and recommendations from the KISED P evaluation were used as the starting point for the consultation process of this study to assess relevance of the KISED P experience in other displacement situations. Overall, information gathered from respondents did not go into the granularity of the KISED P evaluation, their contribution focused on the global approach to future displacement situations, drawing on the KISED P evaluation for broad inspiration.

4. FINDINGS FROM AND REFLECTIONS ON CONSULTATIONS AND GLOBAL NEXUS EVIDENCE

4.1. Overview of key findings

KEY FINDINGS

1. The findings and recommendations of the KISED P evaluation are of global relevance. Particularly the need for agreement on burden and responsibility sharing.

There are a number of current opportunities to draw on:

2. The Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) provides a common framework for an effective nexus approach.
3. The WBG and EU have recently put in place aspirational policies, tools and financial resources for development operations.
4. OECD has developed HDP guidelines, a refugee financing policy and a common position for the GRF against which development partners will be measured.
5. A limited but growing number of displacements affected countries are mainstreaming displacement into national development plans on the basis of inclusive refugee policies and costed sector programs.
6. Some bilateral development partners have put in place policies and operations in support of a nexus approach.
7. UNHCR has begun its internal adaptation from leadership and control of the international refugee response towards one focusing more on smart facilitation.

Key challenges are:

8. The fundamental challenge is to find workable mechanisms to achieve burden and responsibility sharing in displacement situations in order to effectively operationalize the transformative vision of the GCR globally.
9. Policy and strategy, operational procedures and systems, and organizational and incentive structures must be changed to overcome internal barriers to mainstream displacement in development partner and national development institutions.

4.2. Global relevance of the KISED P approach

Finding 1.

The findings and recommendations of the KISED P evaluation are of global relevance. Particularly the need for agreement on burden and responsibility sharing.

The development partners consulted confirm the global relevance of the KISED P vision, approach and the evaluation lessons. Some have policies and resources to apply to such approaches and are doing so in other situations as well. Some bilateral development partners are supporting the KISED P approach through development cooperation but point to the need for improved coordination and deeper collaboration among development partners to improve engagement with the host state. This in turn points to the need for development partners to agree on common policy and operational messages in their dialogue with the government.

In Kenya, KISED P and the emerging GISED P for the Garissa region hosting the Dadaab refugee camp, provide good opportunities for development partners to improve their collective support for these plans. This could include joint advocacy for devolution of management responsibility, introduction of policies more conducive to self-reliance and reforms that will augment local planning and delivery capacity, increased cost effectiveness, greater accountability, increased use of cash etc. While all development partners that were interviewed for this study are in support of the KISED P approach, some are reluctant to provide direct budget support due to accountability issues. Therefore, they find other means of providing financial and technical assistance, and support to sector programs such as health, education and social protection programs. While most development partners have programs that cover the Turkana County, the extent to which they include KISED P still appears scant, as KISED P only recently became fully part of the

County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP). Some bilateral development partners are supporting KISED P through development cooperation directly or indirectly, while others do not render support.

Several development partners are in full support of and have made financial pledges towards the International Finance Corporation (IFC) managed challenge fund for improved private sector engagement in Turkana county. The fund aims to increase investments to boost economic activity benefitting the host population and the refugees. In supporting the IFC fund, one respondent assumes IFC and the government will ensure that the operations financed are in line with the CIDP. Another development partner supports the IFC fund primarily as a useful and effective way to attract private sector investments, not necessarily as part of the CIDP. All are eagerly, and with some impatience, awaiting the fund to become effective. There is broad agreement among bilateral development partners that the experience that will be gained from this involvement by IFC, once it becomes operational, will be of relevance for other displacement situations. It has the potential to illustrate if, and how, it is possible to attract private investments to poor marginalized high-risk parts of a country.

In conclusion all respondents agree that the development-led comprehensive KISED P approach has proven its value and should serve to inspire others on how to address displacement elsewhere, adapted to local context. Respondents agree with the evaluation's message that KISED P is on the right track, and with the suggestions for how to address the outstanding challenges.

4.3 Opportunities

The last few years have seen the emergence of important game-changers in the response to forced displacement situations. The GCR has been adopted, large multilateral development actors changed their policies and operations and began including displacement in their development work, and so did some displacement-affected states and some bilateral development actors. OECD developed displacement nexus guidance and financing policies for development partners. With these, the actual roll-out of full-scale nexus approaches are increasingly recognized as an operational necessity. In other words, there is an important momentum for change emerging. Change towards a development led comprehensive nexus approach to displacement.

Finding 2.

The Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) provides a common framework for an effective nexus approach.

The GCR emerged from the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants in 2016 and calls for greater support to refugees and the countries that host them. In this, the development challenges associated with forced displacement were recognized. Respondents to this study acknowledged, and the GCR was recognized for providing an important international framework for all actors, particularly displacement-affected states and their development partners. (See also Chapter 2 and 4 in Annex 1 for more details). Respondents recognized that the KISED P evaluation exemplifies both policy and operational experience that will be important for the design of nexus approaches to future displacement situations and hence to the operationalization of the GCR.

As illustrated by the proceedings at the December 19, 2019 GRF, the GCR has generated important momentum both in terms of policy and operational aspects which needs to be sustained. While the GCR is a unique achievement and an important reference point, it is formulated in broad terms and does not entail any form of commitment from states, neither from displacement-affected states, nor low, middle or high-income countries. Thus, in spite of its transformative vision, the GCR allows states to continue business as usual if they so choose. This could stifle needed changes and is important for the development community to be aware of.

Finding 3.

The WBG and EU have recently put in place aspirational policies, tools and financial resources for development operations.

Respondents to this study recognize the fundamental importance of the WBG and EU, as the two largest multilateral development actors, applying analytical work and substantial financial resources for development operations addressing displacement situations in both middle and low-income countries, and other IFIs are following suit. The KISED P evaluation, for example, highlights the importance of early socio-economic analytical work for policy adjustments and planning. It also recognizes that collaboration among development partners could stand to be improved. The fact that multilateral and bilateral development partners normally engage separately with host states is not seen by respondents as conducive. Real collaboration amongst development partners in the field needs to be improved. Bilateral development partners have important roles to play in the WBG governing board and in the EU to ensure that these organisations both a) sustain and expand their efforts, and b) improve their approach to leading development partnerships in the field in terms of joint analytical work and policy dialogue and operations. While the WBG has increased its resources for displacement from IDA 18 to IDA 19 (i.e. its fund for the poorest countries), it is uncertain if the new European Commission will maintain its financial commitment to

displacement in its new multiyear budget (2021-2027) under negotiation in 2020.¹

It is important to note that most of the financing is additional, and what is new in policy terms is that these development partners are not engaging because of the humanitarian aspects of a displacement situation. They engage as they have begun to realize that large displacement situations have social and economic impacts on development and need to be included in development policies and operations as part of the poverty alleviation agenda, and to ensure the sustainability of existing development achievements. The global pressure on humanitarian funding and the scale of the Syrian refugee crisis and its implications for the surrounding countries and Europe helped accelerate this paradigm shift. This was also the case with the displacement crises in the Horn of Africa, and to some extent the Sahel displacement situations. The recognition of displacement as a development challenge by these two multilateral organisations allowed them to respond to these situations through development interventions and particularly for the EU at the same time attend to the political pressure to contain the refugees where they are. Annex 1 provides a detailed description of how the WBG concretely has approached its work on displacement as an inspiration to bilateral development partners. While engagement by multilateral development partners is of tremendous importance for the GCR approach, it is only the beginning, and the current momentum must be sustained.

Finding 4.

OECD has developed HDP guidelines, a refugee financing policy and a common position for the GRF against which development partners will be measured.

Respondents appreciate the important framework and guidance provided to bilateral development partners in the recent and new engagement of the OECD in displacement work. Of particular importance are the [OECD guidelines on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace nexus](#) as they apply squarely to the need for a nexus approach to displacement. The more recent [policy note on financing refugee situations](#) and the OECD/DAC common position for the [Global Refugee Forum](#) are also of importance.²

This recent involvement of OECD is of particular importance for field effectiveness of development operations as it on the one hand provides an official policy and operational framework for bilateral development

1 See Annex 1 for details of the work on displacement by the WBG and the EU.

2 See Annex 1 for further details of OECD/DAC work on displacement.

partners to lean on as they develop their own policies for development cooperation. On the other hand, the bilateral development partners will be measured, through the OECD peer review process, on how effectively they have followed this framework. It will focus the minds of the progressive thinkers and make it more difficult for traditionalists to argue for a traditional humanitarian approach. The KISED P evaluation does not refer to the OECD work but could have included a recommendation that development partners in Kenya should follow the OECD guidance.

Finding 5.

A limited but growing number of displacements affected countries are mainstreaming displacement into national development plans on the basis of inclusive refugee policies and costed sector programs.

Host state respondents indicated that there is political will to ensure an effective nexus approach through coherent development cooperation and humanitarian action. They have developed inclusive refugee policies and begun the related mainstreaming into national development planning. The KISED P evaluation also confirms such an approach in Kenya. Uganda has for many years had a progressive and inclusive policy and is continuing to refine its operationalization, most recently with sector costings undertaken jointly with development partners. Ethiopia has a more recent progressive policy and is struggling with its implementation in the face of a wide range of structural and political changes as well as economic, service delivery and environmental challenges.

As these developing countries are taking inclusive policy approaches to displacement in stark contrast with the more and more restrictive policies of European countries, it is essential that their efforts be recognized by their development partners. It is important that these examples of progressive refugee policies be allowed to come to full fruition with the additional development support required, not only for the benefit of the displacement-affected communities, but also to provide evidence and inspiration for displacement-affected states that currently have more restrictive policies. For example, Kenya made the following pledge at the December 2019 GRF: “Subject to sufficient donor support, the Government of Kenya will continue to operationalize the inclusion of refugees in County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) and area-based approaches to building resilience by mitigating the impact of protracted displacement on host communities and preparing refugees for solutions.” The pledge will address issues with regard to water, environment and energy, in line with the commitments undertaken under the IGAD Nairobi Declaration. Kenya is making displacement a development priority; the ball is now in the court of its development partners to provide the additional development support. Each displacement situation has its

own political economy and context. It is through successful implementation of inclusive and context specific policies in displacement-affected states that the transformative vision inherent in the GCR needs to stand the test of time. As this study illustrates, development partners in particular have important roles to play in working with displacement-affected states to ensure sustained success.

Finding 6.

Some bilateral development partners have put in place policies and operations in support of a nexus approach.

Some bilateral development partners were found to have development policies and strategies that promote inclusion of displacement issues with specific resource allocations that are being applied in operations benefitting displacement-affected communities. BMZ, DFID and Danida are important examples. BMZ has for years had an approach that mainstreams displacement into its development work with both technical support and operational examples in the Horn of Africa. In DFID, development cooperation decisions are made at the country level under the overarching policy to include displacement with host country concerns in poverty reduction efforts. DFID supports such operations in Kenya and Ethiopia and Jordan. Both DFID and BMZ recognize the need for deeper development cooperation between bilateral development partners at the field level.

Denmark has been at the forefront of nexus approaches to displacement, starting with the Region of Origin policy first applied in Uganda some 20 years ago, now solidified in the 2017 global Danish strategy World 2030, covering both humanitarian assistance and development cooperation and being applied in all partner countries with displacement. Denmark also provides substantial development support through multilateral development organisations, i.e. the UN, the WBG and the EU as well as civil society organisations. Other bilateral development partners are in the process of adapting towards this direction, albeit with some inertia. Most have identified and are addressing internal challenges, Switzerland and Finland for example have evaluated their nexus policies and approach. The evaluations illustrate that both countries have a strong political will to promote and are on the road towards an effective nexus approach.³

3 For further details of bilateral development work on displacement see Subsection 4.2.6 in Annex 1.

To illustrate what bilateral development partners need to do and also indicating Denmark's commitment, the Danish State Secretary for development stated the following in the preparations for the December spotlight session at the GRF:

"We all have to recognize that displacement situations almost always end up being protracted – and that leads to development challenges and opportunities. Displacement situations should be seen as part of the development agenda by default. Refugees are part of the poverty agenda – and we must respond accordingly as part of the 2030 agenda.

*We need to work much closer together with host governments and with each other on building the necessary analysis and plans. We need to understand the situation of refugees and local host communities much better. Improved data from thorough analysis on context and impact is crucial."*⁴

The bilateral development partners interviewed for this study have different understandings and levels of political will to engage fully beyond providing funding for displacement issues. They have all focused on the humanitarian development nexus and its implications for approaches to displacement situations. However, their official commitment in terms of inclusion in overall development policies and strategies and conducive institutional frameworks varies from full-fledged mainstreaming to still on the drawing board. Consequently, and importantly, many bilateral development partners have some level of political will to operationalize an effective nexus approach to displacement situations, but the application varies. It is context specific, and often depends on individuals.

The high level of political will expressed by bilateral development partners and the emerging positive trends are critical for them to form effective policy and operational partnerships and collaboration. This is particularly the case at the country level, but holds true for advocacy at the global level as well. There appears from respondent input and evidence to be a critical mass emerging both in terms of political will, strategies and resources. However, further progress may require development partners to set aside some of their individual strategic and development objectives in support of the greater good. The work of the WBG to take a development approach to displacement provides an

4 Respondent input from Danida for the preparations of the December 2019 spotlight session at the GRF on "how to get Burden and Responsibility Sharing right for the GCR."

important source for inspiration for bilateral development partners and is therefore described in some detail in Subsection 4.2.4 in Annex 1. A real joint collaborative effort, as opposed to merely a coordinated effort by bilateral development partners to promote the operationalisation of the GCR is more essential than one may think.

Finding 7.

UNHCR has begun its internal adaptation from leadership and control of the international refugee response towards one focusing more on smart facilitation.

Internal UNHCR evaluations and external evaluations indicate that UNHCR has considerably increased its engagement in humanitarian-development cooperation, and that the predominant narrative within UNHCR centers on the organisation being a facilitator and catalyst for development actors.⁵ As an example of operational evidence of this adaptation, the KISED P evaluation underscores this point. As noted by the KISED P experience and the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) piloting of the GCR vision, UNHCR has begun its internal adaptation from leadership and control of the international refugee response, toward one focusing more on prudent facilitation of a comprehensive approach. The effects are only beginning to emerge with mostly positive signals, and UNHCR should continue the progressive adaptation, including of its internal procedures and budget structure. However, UNHCR's engagement with development partners is less transformative than could be expected. This is not surprising as adjustments in development approaches and policies normally come from within the development institutions themselves.

With regard to UNHCR's ongoing adaptations, facilitation and interventions at the December 2019 GRF clearly illustrated that the agency is opening up to needed internal changes. But as the High Commissioner put it in his concluding remarks, *"the GRF will only be seen as a success if the spirit shown and pledges made by all translates into tangible positive changes in displacement-affected communities"*. If this does not materialize, it is quite likely that UNHCR will be forced to revert to its more traditional ways. If that happens, the GCR will be "dead". This is a clear signal to bilateral development partners to step up their efforts to deliver, particularly at the country level. These findings also illustrate that UNHCR cannot influence the development agenda; change has to come from within development institutions. However, UNHCR's adaptation towards facilitation is important and should continue.

5 See Subsections 4.2.1, 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 in Annex 1 for details.

In conclusion and specifically with reference to Findings 2 to 7, these important game changing developments provide a unique set of opportunities to accelerate a snowball effect on the operationalization of the humanitarian development nexus in displacement situations. But it is still early days and not the time for complaisance. The emerging internal realization by displacement-affected states and development partners that displacement is a core development issue needs to be sustained and fully developed. Ongoing change in multilateral organisations need to be nurtured and supported by states in their management structures, and the trend of increased bilateral engagement needs to be cemented through better collaboration and partnerships. Most importantly those host countries sticking their neck out with inclusive refugee policies need to see tangible support. If not, the momentum will be lost for a very long time.

Displacement is complicated, politically sensitive, emotional and mostly taking place in difficult operating environments and it would be easy for bilateral development partners to wash their hands, justified by this context and the above positive trends, and sit back in a wait and see mode. That would be a huge mistake. The present nascent opportunities will need to be pursued with perseverance, and real change only happens when it is state driven – this case driven by displacement-affected states and development partner states.

4.4 Challenges and emerging approaches

While the opportunities above signal that there is international momentum, host states and bilateral development partners and International Financial Institutions (IFIs) need to address several challenges in order to capitalize on the above opportunities. Both the KISED P evaluation, consultations, the review of evidence and the author’s experience point to the following challenges:

Finding 8.

The fundamental challenge is to find workable mechanisms to achieve burden and responsibility sharing in displacement situations in order to effectively operationalize the transformative vision of the GCR globally.

Burden and responsibility sharing consists of two main elements: (i) government agreement to enact an inclusive refugee policy framework that allows access to work, trade and property along with basic legal rights at par with the local population; and (ii) agreement by international development actors to support the process, including through

sufficient additional financing as an incentive for more efficient inclusive and solutions-oriented refugee policies.

The KISED evaluation highlighted the importance of burden and responsibility sharing (BRS) for the future success of the initiative. Consultations for this study ascertained that unless agreements on BRS are achieved in displacement situations, it will not be possible to effectively operationalize the transformative vision of the GCR globally. This requires (i) that displacement issues are included and operationalised in national development plans and supported through development cooperation; and (ii) a recognition of the centrality of direct dialogue between displacement-affected states and development partners within the framework of a supportive foreign policy regime – and with UNHCR in an informative, facilitating and supportive role. It's a matter between those that are responsible for setting development and refugee policies and those that can provide substantial additional resources through development cooperation.

In consultations for this study, bilateral development partners emphasized potential obstacles to bear in mind, including: (i) the degree of political will, including restrictive policy environments and shrinking international support; (ii) slow reaction speed by development partners to new crises, and (iii) frustration among displacement-affected countries in the Global South over the mismatch between their liberalizing refugee policy environment and more restrictive policies in the North. Other issues are seen as potentially conducive: (i) the broad international support behind the GCR; (ii) positive political will among certain host governments; and (iii) the mutual benefits inherent in the GCR.

In countries with inclusive refugee policies, interesting sector examples are emerging. See Finding 5 above and Subsection 4.2.4 in Annex 1. Even in restrictive policy environments, at least one successful example was mentioned by respondents of health sector support to displacement-affected communities through development cooperation. The level of pre-existing presence and capacity of bilateral development partners impacts the ability to engage. One development partner highlighted the Jordan, Lebanon and Ethiopia Compacts as examples of larger country wide approaches to burden sharing. These Compacts came about as a result of direct state-to-state negotiations addressing respective concerns and incentives by looking at the displacement situations as an economic opportunity. For engagement with host states on refugee policies bilateral development partners recognizes the need to understand much better the context specific interrelationship between conflict dynamics, climate impact and different types of people on the move – an important triangle. Respondents also highlighted that for certain countries, policy restrictions may prohibit development cooperation, only allowing donors to provide humanitarian aid.

When development partners begin engagement with displacement-affected states, they may want to pay attention to a point made during the consultations for this study by a senior individual with solid nexus experience:

“In promoting an effective GCR operationalization we should move away from refugee laws and conventions language on right to work and move. That has not worked. The international donor community should stop banging host states on the head with laws. Instead we should make the case for host states in an economic way, to provide host states with economic incentives to influence their refugee policies amongst others as a starting point for talks on burden and responsibility sharing. This could include that hosting refugees can also lead to development financing for nationals as well. Bribery or not – it’s real politic.”⁶

Based on input from respondents other elements for BRS approaches and dialogue platform emerged. The local context determines the partnership dynamics within the government and among the development partners, and between the government and the development partners. The context will also determine the most appropriate leadership, and the composition of the core group of partners. The initiative to form the partnership can come from the government or from one or a group of development partners. Once the partnership parameters are in place the first steps towards preparing dialogue on burden and responsibility sharing can begin starting with agreeing on the most important issues to be discussed most likely selected from the following options:

- Method for joint political economy and context analysis
- Availability of global evidence
- Agreement on timeline prospects
- Methods for conducting sector costing
- Methods for measuring impact of deferent policy options
- Respective incentives and self-interests
- Respective internal structural impediments
- Strategic approach options

6 Development partner interview.

Following dialogue on these issues, discussions on needed policy adjustments and related net cost coverage can proceed, leading to an agreement on burden and responsibility sharing. Then adjustments to planning and programming can be made accordingly. This also means that an effective nexus approach to displacement situation will need to have development cooperation at its core with a central focus on achieving burden and responsibility sharing and hence engagement by development partners from the very beginning. Further reflections on how to achieve BRS are detailed in Annex 2.

It is important to place host country perspectives at the centre of the BRS dialogue, a quote from the Danish state secretary on development offered in the preparations for the spotlight session at the GRF in December 2019 illustrates available political will in support of host countries.

“We development partners have to understand that host governments are driven by legitimate concerns and aims when defining their refugee policies and development plans. We should help address those concerns when possible.”⁷

What did not come out so clearly from respondents to this study, was the need to look at all regional aspects involving both the country of origin, and neighbouring countries of asylum, in the upfront political economy and context analysis. The KISED P evaluation would have been more complete, if it had addressed the regional perspective of the situation in countries of origin and the implications of these regional dynamics on the KISED P approach. Integrating a regional perspective early would allow the design of a refugee policy in the host country to be guided by the eventual return potential to the country of origin. Bringing on board a cross border and solutions-oriented perspective from the beginning is often overlooked in the preparatory analysis of displacement situations.

Predicting future displacement situations was only touched in the periphery by respondents. If prediction analysis would be part of the broader context understanding systematically, the potential host country and its development partners could be better prepared both in terms of policy options and operational sector approaches. This could limit strategic decision errors caused by an unforeseen displacement situation. Such preparation could be insulting to neighbouring countries,

⁷ Respondent input from Danida for the preparations of the December 2019 spotlight session at the GRF on “how to get Burden and responsibility sharing right for the GCR.”

as it could be interpreted as calling on conflicts to happen, and should, if applied, be handled with some degree of prudence and confidentiality amongst those involved. If context allows regional preparedness dialogue and scenario building could also be considered. The consequences of being unprepared would seem to justify such preparedness efforts.

Finding 9.

Policy and strategy, operational procedures and systems, and organisational and incentive structures must be changed to overcome internal barriers to mainstream displacement in development partner and national development institutions.

In terms of **internal policies and strategies**, input from respondents indicates that challenges and opportunities vary from those development partners with strong policy directions supported by budget allocations to those that struggle with operationalization to those that are still working on their policies. For example, BMZ has a policy to fully integrate displacement in country specific development cooperation. Danida has recently introduced a policy that requires humanitarian and development sectors to work together when bilateral development cooperation planning is formulated but progress is slow as resistance to change traditional approaches are difficult to change and takes a long time. Yet other respondents are still at the policy and strategy formulation stage illustrating resistance to change also at that level. It should also be recognized that development policies on displacement in donor countries are often influenced by a domestic debate on broader themes related to flows of irregular migrants and refugees thus providing resistance to progressive policy adjustments. In some situations, shifting political priorities may override long-term planning that affect development operations and the nexus approach. Maintaining the focus on displacement in development planning once the excitement around the GCR wanes is likely to be a challenge.

In terms of **internal operational procedures and systems**, several bilateral development partners indicate completed or ongoing transformation, in order to allow for flexibility in response to forced displacement. For example, BMZ has a system where innovation or sudden needs in how to address displacement can be added to ongoing development programmes with additional funding. Another example of internal organisational innovation is considerations by DFID of regional movements of refugees and their impact on multiple countries to promote one regional response based on shared data and analysis of impact, needs, opportunities and cost. The traditional one country approach to development cooperation can be a hindrance to the needed regional perspective. There is broad agreement amongst respondents that further progress often requires changes to rigid development

planning frameworks and procedures and overcoming traditional and set opinions amongst development practitioners and policy makers. The signing on to the GCR and the OECD/DAC HDP guidelines should be encouraging cross silo fertilization.

In terms of **internal organisational and incentive structures**, it varies across development partners. For example, BMZ has an integrated planning process in place but the collaboration between sections dealing with bilateral development cooperation and multilateral cooperation needs improvement for more effective operations at the country level. As for incentives, BMZ's bilateral development programmes can access additional funds for displacement activities based on performance criteria. Sweden, Danida and Cida indicate traditional siloed staffing structures as examples of a considerable disincentive to comprehensive approaches and see need for a stronger knowledge base on the nexus, clearer and better funding streams, and decentralized decision-making to allow staff to voice suggestions and develop ways of working across the nexus that are appropriate for the given context. Respondents emphasized the importance of strong nexus policies and strategies necessary to drive structures and internal collaboration through creating an accountability framework and related incentives for staff.

To further illustrate what is needed to begin solving, these challenges here is a quote from the Danish State Secretary for development provided in preparation for the spotlight session:

"We got a new Danish unified strategy for development cooperation and humanitarian action a few years ago. It defined refugee response as a top priority. And it created incentives for all units in the ministry to think across instruments, in a more coherent way. So, we got the right strategic framework in place – and it has worked in some places but not in all. We are learning as we move along. We have to make procedures and processes for strategic planning and concrete programming far more adaptive, agile and flexible. Otherwise it simply does not work – bureaucracy and rigid systems kill new thinking. It's about doing development differently. For example, we are developing a new coherent country program in Kenya in a different way. All parts of the ministry are working together on a joint analysis and shared overall objectives – right across development cooperation, humanitarian cooperation and policy dialogue. This will include support for refugee and host communities in northern Kenya"⁸

⁸ Respondent input from Danida for the preparations of the December 2019 spotlight session at the GRF on "how to get Burden and responsibility sharing right for the GCR."

In conclusion, the experiences of the consulted bilateral development partners illustrate that an effective bilateral nexus approach requires internal mainstreaming of structures, policies, planning processes and tools. A substantial challenge to an effective GCR roll-out exist in those internal barriers described above. These are often very entrenched, reflecting strong traditional mindsets or disincentives as also described in Chapter 2 of Annex 1. It appears that overcoming these obstacles will require sustained commitments by high-level decision-makers and strong leadership. Good examples to build on exist in displacement-affected states such as Uganda, Ethiopia, Jordan and parts of Kenya and with development partners such as BMZ and Danida as elaborated on in Subsection 4.2.6 of Annex 1.

From the perspective of displacement-affected countries, policy decisions depend largely on the domestic politics, economics and security issues and sometimes the perception of what type of external support can be expected. It is often the challenges of planning and operational capacity as well as financial accountability mechanisms that need to be addressed. It can also be a challenge to shift from established, entrenched and ringfenced refugee administration units, often established and funded by UNHCR, towards a comprehensive whole-of-government approach.

BUILDING ON EVIDENCE

There is a long history of efforts to align and interlink humanitarian aid and development assistance in order to better address these aspects of complex crises and protracted displacement. The nexus substance emerged from UNHCR in the 1950ies and 60ies and got its name in the late 1990ies as the EU invented the Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) terminology which looks at the humanitarian development link more broadly. In recent years there is concerted efforts by states and agencies towards applying a nexus approach to humanitarian and development challenges (as elaborated in Annex 1). There are (at least) three key lessons from the many years of agreements, approaches and engagements in this respect that corroborates with the findings from the consultations for this study and indeed with the findings and recommendations of the KISED P evaluation.

KEY HISTORIC LESSONS IMPORTANT FOR FUTURE NEXUS APPROACHES TO DISPLACEMENT SITUATIONS

- The point of departure for dialogue and planning should be focused on long-term policy, and the operational lead should be the displacement affected state. The point of departure should also include a comprehensive political economy and context analysis, which take the concerns of the displacement impacted state into account.
- Both national and international development institutions and agencies must understand that displacement is a core development issue needing to be addressed as such from the beginning, while also considering the humanitarian concerns.
- The centrality of reaching agreement on BRS requires sustained political will from the displacement impacted state and its development partners, the role of UNHCR is to be a prudent facilitator.

A successful nexus approach to displacement is centrally about displacement impacted states and their development partners having the political will and a sustained commitment to make it happen. See Annex 1 Chapter 6 for further details.

Concluding overall, the historic evidence and findings from the consultations for this study corroborate. There is understanding among some displacement-affected states and bilateral development partners of the need for a whole of government approach to displacement situations. But there are also many situations where this is not the case. Efforts to support situations with inclusive refugee polices must be reinforced through development cooperation. This would also serve as inspiration for displacement situations where the policy environment is more restrictive. An effective GCR requires commitments by both displacement-affected states and their development partners.

The recommendations for displacement-affected states and their development partners, therefore, focus on how to make this happen in both policy and operational terms. This would enable support for the nexus approach embodied in the GCR.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

DISPLACEMENT-AFFECTED STATES TO CONSIDER:

At policy level:

- Take a long-term developmental approach to displacement up front, based on an inclusive refugee policy that allows displaced people to be part of and contribute to local social and economic development;
- As part of the established national development planning structure, crystalize self-interest concerns and other perspectives of the social, political, economic and security implications of the refugee situation;
- Take the lead on engaging bilateral and multilateral development partners in a dialogue focused on fair and efficient burden and responsibility sharing;
- Mainstream displacement into national development plans and make it a development priority.

At operational level:

- Enhance or adapt sector approaches to ensure sufficient delivery capacity;
- Involve development partners up front in political economy and context analyses, as well as sector planning and costing.

DANIDA AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS SHOULD CONSIDER:

At policy level:

- Make displacement a priority in bilateral development cooperation with displacement-affected states (be that host states or states receiving returning refugees);
- Commit to promoting development cooperation at the core of future approaches to displacement situations;
- Develop a clear and efficient nexus approach for responding to displacement and fragility;
- Make a policy commitment to work with host states and other development partners on situation-specific mechanisms in order to achieve trust, understanding and agreement on BRS;
- Commit to applying the full palette of political, diplomatic, and trade tools to promote the transformative vision of the GCR at the country and regional level through collaboration with other development

partners as well as at development, foreign policy and security fora at the global level.

At operational level:

- Adapt internal structures, processes, tools, HR resources and incentives to ensure a coherent approach across development cooperation and humanitarian assistance in partner countries affected by displacement;
- Develop institutional guidance for how to inspire, facilitate, be part of or lead context specific sector approaches in order to deliver on the GCR vision where relevant;
- The guidelines should include promotion of context-specific partnership platforms among development partners leading to joint political economy and context analyses as a basis for a common framework for action;
- Promote relevant GCR-inspired institutional changes in multilateral development and humanitarian institutions;
- Advocate in: (i) the WBG governing board for the WBG to be more proactive in leading a coherent social and economic response to displacement among development partners in displacement-affected countries; and (ii) EU member state consultations on the need for continued political, policy and operational commitment towards a long-term development response by DG DEVCO and DG NEAR in the European Commission.

If multilateral and bilateral development partners and displacement-affected states do not address the above recommendations, there is great risk that the transformative vision of the GCR will remain just that. Momentum will be lost with fall back to the traditional, unsustainable humanitarian model, where states as duty bearers abdicate responsibility for the crisis and displacement, by transferring the responsibility to local and international humanitarian agencies without the capacity to address the situations in a comprehensive and sustainable manner.

Concluding remarks by Ms Jennifer Namuyangu, Minister of State for Local Government; Uganda at the spotlight session on “Getting burden and responsibility sharing right for the GCR” at the December 2019 Global Refugee Forum in Geneva:

“We have learned that as displacement always takes many years to solve – we need to look at displacement as a development issue. Just like the Turkana governor Kenya has just informed us through the Kalobeyei example. We in Uganda and colleagues in Ethiopia are doing the same.

This illustrates that large displacement situations are too big for one actor to manage. We need to do it together. We have heard achievements and challenges from both host states and development partners. The global framework is here. Development partners are mainstreaming displacement into their policies and have funds for operations.

We have heard today that if we take a development approach there is additional development financing available. Achieving burden and responsibility sharing requires from host states and development partners to do the following:

- *Agree on a need to discuss burden and responsibility sharing based on trust and understanding*
- *Agree most displacement end up protracted and must be handled through development cooperation*
- *Agree on need for joint context analysis, impact assessments and costed sector planning.*

Burden and responsibility sharing requires agreement on a package of inclusive refugee policies and funding of net additional cost through additionality. For this to work, host states need to have inclusive refugee policies and make displacement a development priority. Development partners need as a group to work with host state to cover the additional investments. And to achieve this everybody needs to be on board and work together: The private sector, civil society organizations, the state government, and our development partners. Both parties need to adapt their internal structures and procedures for this approach to be effective.

So if we are to get Burden and Responsibility Sharing right for the GCR, it's through development collaboration in direct engagement between host states and their development partners.”

Link to audio recording of the session

https://conf.unog.ch/digitalrecordings/index.html?guid=public/60.2092/AFE478A4-E734-4754-B3F3-8D5540C7E6D0_15h07&position=0

**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF DENMARK**

2 Asiatisk Plads
DK-1448 Copenhagen K
Denmark

Tel +45 33 92 00 00

Fax +45 32 54 05 33

um@um.dk

www.um.dk

ISBN: PDF: 978-87-93760-41-7

