

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework UGANDA

## REPORT

### CRRF STEERING GROUP MEETING

12<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2017

VENUE: IMPERIAL ROYALE HOTEL

#### **Background**

The Minister of State for Relief, Disaster Preparedness and Refugees, Honourable Musa Ecweru presided over the first Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework Steering Group (CRRF Steering Group) meeting in Kampala on 12 October 2017. The meeting followed the launch of the CRRF by the Prime Minister of Uganda in March 2017; the first CRRF Workshop meeting and the Uganda Solidarity Summit on Refugees all held in June 2017. It built on the agreement and discussions held at the June CRRF Workshop and the subsequent work done to agree on Terms of Reference (TORs) and focus areas for the CRRF in Uganda. The first CRRF Steering Group meeting established the governance structure of the CRRF in Uganda by adopting the TORs for the CRRF Steering Group and the CRRF Secretariat; agreeing on the composition of the CRRF Steering Group and the governance structure of the CRRF Secretariat.

The rationale and background for the establishment of the CRRF Steering Group was highlighted in the Minister's opening remarks. The establishment of the CRRF Steering Group follows the exponential growth of the refugee response in Uganda, resulting from a high influx of refugees, which necessitated a better-coordinated and more comprehensive response, beyond the humanitarian one. It is also a follow up to the New York Declaration on Refugees and Migrants, which all Governments in the room then adopted, and which calls for a whole-of-society and whole-of-Government response to new refugee flows.

Following an unprecedented influx in 2016, which has been managed by the Government in collaboration with humanitarian actors, mainly UNHCR, the need to ensure a stronger emphasis on development has been underscored. To ensure that the CRRF Steering Group exercises its decision-making role, it is important that it draws on the expertise of existing structures and coordination mechanisms. This is why a nomination procedure has been put in place to ensure that information flows to and from the CRRF Steering Group to the refugee hosting districts, Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies, donors, humanitarian/development agencies and national and international responders. The CRRF Steering Group should therefore receive reports from the Inter-Agency Coordination Forum as well as from donors and different Government bodies as well as non-traditional actors. The CRRF Steering Group can feed into the National Partnership Forum (NPF) and other mechanisms established to ensure better coordination between actors in Uganda.

The meeting brought together approximately 35 participants, including representatives from the Government, national and international NGO's, refugee hosting district representatives and the UN. Not all of those invited to the inaugural meeting were able to participate and thus specific measures were agreed upon to ensure broad-based and consistent participation of Ministries, the private sector and refugee representatives in subsequent meetings. The CRRF Steering Group will be chaired by the Government and facilitated by UNHCR.

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework UGANDA

## **Agenda for the Meeting**

1. Prayer
2. Communication from the Honourable Minister of State for Relief, Disaster Preparedness and Refugees (Chairperson)
3. Adoption of the Terms of Reference of the CRRF Steering Group and the CRRF Secretariat (Hon. Minister)
4. Report from the first CRRF Workshop – June 2017 (UNHCR)
5. Report on the Pledges from the Solidarity Summit (OPM)
6. Guidelines on the Utilization of Funds from the Summit (MoFPED)
7. Summary of the Meeting's Action Points
8. Closing Remarks (Chairperson)

## **Communication from the Honourable Minister/Chairperson, Musa Ecweru**

The Honourable Minister told the meeting that Uganda has become a role model to the world because of its progressive refugee policy which recognizes refugees as human beings. Currently, Uganda is facing an unprecedented refugee influx in the country, and this is making the country's burden even heavier. This necessitates a change in approach to ensure the continued success and sustainability of the Ugandan model.

The Honourable Minister added that to date, the emphasis has been on humanitarian work with some attempts to introduce development aspects with interventions such as the Development Assistance for Refugees (DAR), which was introduced in 2006 to respond to refugee hosting areas. DAR a well thought out response even though the numbers of beneficiaries were small and fatigue was already setting in among the host communities. According to the Honourable Minister, Uganda did not anticipate the current huge influx which has presented us the country with a huge responsibility of now serving both the host and refugee communities. The Honourable Minister emphasized that there was a need to change the approach as it could not continue to be business as usual.

He went on to add that it is critical to match humanitarian work with development interventions and that the two must be given same energy, resources and emphasis; under the CRRF to build the bridge between the two. He called upon all those present at the meeting to put the same emphasis on both areas and sell it to the rest of the world. As a country, Uganda wants to promote the model of humanitarian – development approach in the management of the refugee crisis to the rest of world. He saw the humanitarian-development bridge as a useful means to help Uganda manage the refugee influx. The Honourable Minister further stated that the Government would like the development interventions to be made with the same emphasis, energy and resources as the humanitarian action in the past years.

The Honourable Minister went on to say that the Government of Uganda and participants to the meeting, who have all agreed to maintain their commitment to the CRRF they must now collectively figure out how to make it work, to ensure that everyone is moving in the same direction and using the same language.

The Honourable Minister emphasized that although the Government will be captaining the process, it was important for all actors involved to be reminded that all involved were sitting on the same ship. In order

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework

## UGANDA

to succeed there must therefore be mutual trust between the Government, donors and all partners. He urged all involved to be efficient and transparent and was convinced that this will lead to success. He went on to underline that with Uganda's progressive policies coupled with the goodwill and support from the international community, success was assured.

The Hon Minister ended by thanking all attendees for making time to come and help fine tune the way forward.

### **The Terms of Reference (TORs) and Composition of the CRRF Steering Group**

The presentation of the TORs was delivered by Godfrey Kaima, the Under Secretary – Relief, Disaster Preparedness and Refugees in the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). He outlined the process, including the discussions at the CRRF Workshop held in June and the subsequent delegation of the work on the TORs to a small team consisting of two Government Ministries (OPM and Ministry of Local Government), UN, donors and NGO representatives. These TORs were subsequently shared within the different coordination fora that exist and comments received back were incorporated, including those of the Permanent Secretary of OPM, who reviewed the TORs in August.

He highlighted that the composition of the CRRF Steering Group was deliberately designed to offer a representative and inclusive forum. In order to make it manageable, the different groups, such as the UN, the donors and the NGOs had been asked to nominate participants that represent the whole group from the existing coordination mechanisms. It was noted that it is not possible for the CRRF Steering Group to include every entity involved in the response and thus the nomination procedure was established to ensure that the CRRF Steering Group represented the various stakeholders, without creating a parallel structure. The CRRF Steering Group members discussed the composition of the CRRF Steering Group, particularly with the view to identify major stakeholders that may be missing.

### **DELIBERATION ON THE CRRF STEERING GROUP COMPOSITION AND TORs**

Participants underlined that for Uganda, this is a golden opportunity to enable coherence, especially within the humanitarian-development nexus. It was considered important to ensure no-one is left behind in terms of stakeholders to shape the model, scale it and promote it in other places. The two UN agencies nominated by the UNCT stressed that they were there as representatives of the UN family as a whole, not their own agencies.

The Local Development Partners Group (LDPG) representatives highlighted the fact that international development agencies had been asked to nominate only one representative. This meant, in their view, that the humanitarian part of the response was overrepresented, and that the focus would continue to be more on the refugee response than on the development needs of the refugee hosting districts. To ensure a balanced CRRF Steering Group, the international development actors requested representation by at least 3 representatives from LDPG (in addition to the UN Resident Coordinator). This would be critical group for linking the humanitarian and development nexus.

Several actors emphasized that while welcoming the framework, there was a need for the local actors to ensure that the application of the CRRF took into account the local context. While the humanitarian response has been well managed in Uganda, all actors must recognize the overlap of humanitarian and

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework

## UGANDA

development activities in certain localities. This emphasized the CRRF Steering Group's role to focus carefully tailored coordination towards end goal and therefore, an equal number of voices from both the humanitarian and the development side was recommended. The Steering Group must enjoy high level implementation oversight to ensure that it can direct actors to cover identified needs and gaps and that the implementation follows a coordinated direction.

Additionally, to ensure robust discussion within the Steering Group, stronger participation from local authorities and refugees must be incorporated. The inclusion of 3 Chief Administrative Officers (from South West, Mid-West and West Nile) of refugee hosting districts was recommended. It was also recommended that Local Councils members (District Chairperson) should be part of the Steering Group to inform the development perspective from districts.

To ensure the refugee participation within the CRRF Steering Group and to avoid that the forum is informed directly by refugees, the decision was made to rely on the elected structures in refugee settlements. This would thus mirror the representation of the host communities, who were represented in the Steering Group not only by Government and District authorities, but also by elected officials. However, given the complex nature of the refugee settlements in Uganda, with around 10 nationalities spread out in different districts, it was agreed to have the Refugee Advisory Board drawn from already elected refugee representatives, and to ensure that this Board also elects 1-2 refugees to participate in the Steering Group. It was also discussed that given the demography of the refugee inflow, with over 84 % being women and children, the refugee representation must also reflect the female perspective. In addition to the female participation from the refugee perspective, the Steering Group members were encouraged to reflect on how to best ensure a gender-balance in subsequent meetings

OPM- DOR and UNCHR were tasked to organize the Refugee Advisory Board.

Consensus was reached on the composition of the CRRF Steering Group through broadening it to include elected officials from the districts, more development actors and the refugees themselves. Consistency in participation was emphasized as well as the need to agree that the people representing agencies are empowered to take decisions and make final agreements.

The TORs were approved as well as the quarterly meeting schedule, which are to be strictly adhered to unless a new influx or other unforeseen events that require more rapid meetings for urgent decisions to be taken.

### **SUMMATION:**

1. TORs of CRRF Steering Group adopted
2. Composition of the CRRF Steering Group amended and agreed, as per attachment. Amendments as follows:
  - a) 2 LC5s from the refugee hosting districts (West Nile and South West)
  - b) 3 CAO from South West, Mid-West, and West Nile (increased by 1)
  - c) 3 development partners (increased by 2).
  - d) 2 refugee representatives
3. A Refugee Advisory Board to be set up by OPM/UNHCR before year-end, based on existing refugee representation structures (i.e. elected by the refugees) to allow for the selection of the two refugee representatives in the Steering Group

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework

## UGANDA

### **The Terms of Reference of the CRRF Secretariat**

Honourable Minister Musa Ecweru, who was chairing the meeting, in his introduction, highlighted that the TORs of the CRRF Secretariat have been elaborated on through joint efforts by the Government, UN, NGO and donor groups following the CRRF Workshop in June 2017. The TORs have also been circulated by UNHCR to the various stakeholders through the established donor and inter-agency mechanisms. There is broad agreement on the functions of the CRRF Secretariat as the technical body that reports to the CRRF Steering Group. The different functions expected by the CRRF Steering Group were discussed. The Government of Uganda communicated that as the captain of the ship, it will lead the work of the CRRF Secretariat to support all stakeholders.

The issue on which there has been continued discussion is the location of the CRRF Secretariat and whether or not this should be an independent institution or be integrated into the existing refugee department. The chair requested an open and transparent discussion, with a view of ensuring that a final decision be taken on the matter so that the CRRF Secretariat could commence its work.

### **DELIBERATION ON THE CRRF SECRETARIAT**

The meeting participants underlined that while the CRRF Steering Group meets every quarter, the CRRF Secretariat, with technical support from a variety of actors – from both the humanitarian and development side – should prepare the meetings and provide recommendations for decisions. The CRRF Steering Group must decide on areas of priority to guide its work and should be able to rely on expertise made freely available.

The humanitarian donors' representative confirmed that the TORs have been extensively discussed and that the humanitarian actors were comfortable with the TORs. The focus should now shift to ensure the links between the Ministries are facilitated and that there is a convening power. For this to take place, the line Ministries should second staff to the CRRF Secretariat. This was supported by the development actors, citing concrete examples of where artificial boundaries between humanitarian and development activities had been created, in part due to the lack of convening power of one or the other. The need to ensure the Government agencies and ministers were onboard and actively contributing for the benefit of both refugees and host populations was underlined.

On the composition of the CRRF Secretariat it was highlighted that the involvement of the Ministry of Finance was key and important for ensuring the participation of line Ministries. While it was recommended that the Ministry of Finance be approached to ensure participation in the CRRF Secretariat, it was pointed out that the CRRF Secretariat, unlike the CRRF Steering Group, was not a representative body, but a technical body which would require skilled people on short term (2-3 years) contracts. The CRRF Steering Group should ensure that the skill set matched the job descriptions and guide and steer the CRRF Secretariat through the adoption of a work plan detailing the functions required. This should form part of the roadmap that the CRRF Secretariat should develop in time for the next CRRF Steering Group meeting.

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework

## UGANDA

In terms of reporting lines, the TORs specifies that the CRRF Secretariat will be reporting to the Permanent Secretary (PS) at the Office of the Prime Minister. During the deliberations it was clarified that the CRRF Secretariat will be working with Department of Refugees, but that it will be an independent entity. The PS has the authority to pull all the agencies together and will strive to find the balance between humanitarian and development actors. It was underlined that the Ministry has already embarked on this road, having worked with multiple actors over the past year and having ensured the inclusion of refugees in the national development plans. Caution was expressed in terms of creating a parallel structure to the current refugee department, however, the independence required of the Secretariat was highlighted by the majority of the participants. It was agreed that a departure from the “business as usual” approach was required by the CRRF and that this could not be achieved by simply reinforcing existing structures. Thus the CRRF Secretariat would need to be an independent entity, headed by either a Director or the Under Secretary, reporting directly to the Permanent Secretary. It was decided that this decision between the two options should be left to the PS. The Government highlighted that they are open to proposals from other actors in regards to the secondment of staff to the CRRF Secretariat.

The chair closed the discussion by highlighting that it was clear that the majority of the actors prefer a stand-alone CRRF Secretariat that will report to PS on daily basis. While OPM Refugees is managing the humanitarian coordination, the situation itself is now no longer only humanitarian. To encourage development actors come in more strongly and concretely, the CRRF Steering Group must find ways of doing business differently. The CRRF Secretariat would not create a parallel structure, as it sits within OPM, but it shall be independent from the different departments within OPM. It will work closely with OPM Refugees, and with all stakeholders. It was agreed that there was need to ensure that coordination mechanism that were set up worked and have the confidence of all actors.

### **SUMMATION:**

1. CRRF Secretariat TORs adopted
2. CRRF Secretariat location will be inside of OPM, but not within existing departments. The Head of the CRRF Secretariat will report directly to the Permanent Secretary and be above the department heads and commissioners, at either Director or Under Secretary level.
3. The Government welcomes secondments to the CRRF Secretariat
4. The CRRF Secretariat should be operational immediately and shall update and develop the roadmap for the CRRF in Uganda in preparation for the next CRRF Steering Group meeting.

### **Report from the first CRRF Workshop – and the follow up (UNHCR)**

UNHCR reported on the work undertaken at and after the CRRF Workshop held in June 2017, underlying the key decisions made, including the validation of the Refugee Host Population Empowerment (ReHoPE) strategy; the initial discussions on the governance structure of the CRRF and the roadmap. The CRRF Workshop also highlighted the need for further work to be undertaken in regards to the five commitments made by several actors under the Grand Bargain. These five commitments include increased transparency; national ownership; use of cash based programming; multi-year planning and financing and strengthening the link between humanitarian and development actors. It was highlighted that these commitments are very much in line with the ongoing work under the CRRF umbrella. The Representative of UNHCR reminded the CRRF Steering Group members that the Prime Minister had stressed that the CRRF was not an end in itself, but an approach to further the objective of working towards a comprehensive response to the needs in the refugee hosting districts.

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework

## UGANDA

In terms of CRRF achievements so far, UNHCR highlighted the Government leadership, not only of the CRRF but also of specific sectors heavily supported by humanitarian interventions such as Health, Education and Water and Sanitation. Multi-year planning and financing (Education Cannot Wait, multi-year trust funds) has been developed in certain areas, but this remains an area where more work will be required. The strengthening of the engagement between humanitarian and development actors was also evident, even if this was more on the policy and framework level than in practical examples on the ground. The ToRs task the CRRF Secretariat with highlighting good examples of the progress already made in Uganda to ensure that these form part of the CRRF trajectory.

### **National Ownership and the Government's priorities**

The Honourable Minister highlighted that while there have been achievements, the Government needs to better articulate its priorities. The priorities for the Government of Uganda relate to infrastructure development and halting the negative environmental impact, including that resulting from climate change, in refugee hosting areas. Both the Government and the district representatives highlighted the need for concrete improvements and specific projects to show the host population in the refugee hosting areas that they are benefitting from the presence of refugees. With the exception of the regular refugee agencies' projects under the ReHoPE umbrella, there was nothing to show from the Solidarity Summit and subsequent missions by non-traditional partners to the refugee hosting areas. While budgets and priorities had been requested, and the local authorities had spent considerable time and effort in providing these, long-term development activities were not yet there. The issue of managing host community expectations would need to be tackled by the CRRF Steering Group.

Linked to this, the Honourable Minister underlined the issue of local capacity and the witnessed discontent from the local population in terms of recruitment by INGOs. This is also a question of transparency; as it is not clear why donors' recruitment has to focus on international staff. He emphasized that Ugandans must be part of the refugee response, in particular when it is focused on the host community. The INGO/NNGO representatives were reminded that more openness in the recruitment process was desired to combat these negative impressions. Both the INGO and the NNGO representatives confirmed that they would take the issue of fairness in recruitment back to the NGO forum and that a more in-depth analysis of the situation and brief on the current situation could be presented at the next meeting.

### **Cash Based Assistance**

The Honourable Minister pointed out that while there was consensus on the aims of the refugee response, there was still room for dialogue on how to collectively can reach the common goal. The increased use of cash based assistance was noted as a concrete issue that would warrant further discussion, given that it had been also raised in the report back from the CRRF workshop. While cash transfers are positive and help refugees to access goods, the Honourable Minister highlighted that there are also risks that cash based assistance brings negative side-effects. He gave the example that cash could cause refugees to be idle and fall in to bad habits (drinking) – which is a critical issue to discuss and to agree on when going forward.

There was also a discussion about the fact that there is poverty in many of the villages in the refugee hosting areas. The Government's expectation is that longer-term development interventions will help

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework

## UGANDA

local Ugandans, and is not asking for food aid or cash for its own citizens. However, the perception that refugees receive cash while locals do not is an issue that needs to be looked at properly.

In responding to the question of cash based assistance, the international aid agencies clarified that this was currently given primarily as a replacement for food aid. It was being carefully monitored, also in terms of impact on the local market. Used wisely, cash based assistance should benefit all, including host populations, as it would increase the development potential of the refugee hosting districts.

On the question of equity between refugees and hosts, the long-term vision would be to have refugees integrated into the national social security platform and benefitting from the same level and type of cash based assistance. This would however take some time and require a more in-depth discussion.

### **Multi-Year Planning and Third Country Option**

There was a short discussion on multi-year planning. It was noted that some initiatives such as Education Cannot Wait had brought a different, non-humanitarian timeframe to the response and this was welcomed. On third country options, in planning ahead, the Government underlined that it is not only the Government of Uganda, but also the other countries, that need to keep their borders open. It was noted that while resettlement is a part of the CRRF, and it is a long-term solution that has ripple effects on the remaining refugee population, it benefits very few individuals, and there is concern that this will be even more restricted in the future. This was seen as not assisting with the creation of the Comprehensive Response that looks at all phases of the refugee cycle.

While Uganda is welcoming all refugees, the hope is that refugees will be able to leave Uganda and return home. The Honourable Minister underlined that while refugees are welcome to stay for 100 years, their status will not change to that of Ugandan citizens. He explained that while naturalization may have been possible for small numbers of people; like in the past with those arriving from Rwanda and Congo, this is no longer feasible with over one million refugees. This is yet another reason for why the development activities are required.

### **Link between Humanitarian and Development Actors**

There was a short discussion on how to ensure that the Comprehensive Response benefits both the refugees and host communities that live in same environment. It was highlighted that a World Bank study showed that there are instances when refugees are better off than locals and that to ensure that all population groups are catered for, tailored interventions that are focused on hospitality should be looked at. It was also noted that there is a fear that with the CRRF, the resilience activities aimed at the host community may no longer be given the same weight. The refugee hosting districts need investments that are beyond those the humanitarian actors can provide. This is also linked to the building-up of the capacity of local responders. Local NGOs must have capacity to be able to lead the front line emergency response. Attention has also to be paid to the environment and to addressing climate change and environment.

### **Report on Pledges from the Solidarity Summit (OPM)**

The presentation on Pledges from the Solidarity Summit was made by Charles Bafaki, the Principal Settlement Officer at OPM. The report had been compiled by a team from OPM Refugees, the Ministry of Finance and Planning, the UN Resident Representative's Office and UNHCR. The total amount donated to

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework

## UGANDA

date is \$ USD 523,585,590. The follow up was done by a technical team that has individually reached out to all donors that donated during the Solidarity Summit and a report of the follow up undertaken was attached to the meeting documents. The presentation noted that it had been difficult to receive precise information from donors, as some of the money was part of their regular contribution to funds and agencies and therefore it is not additional “but already accounted for through other mechanisms.”

Allocation of funds; some were allocating to specific agencies and special activities:

- UNHCR: 208 million USD
- UNICEF: 10 million USD
- WFP: 115 million USD
- Government programs and NGOs (basket fund): 49 million USD
- IOM: 2 MILLION USD

It was noted that the Basket Fund set up by the Government has not received any funds. The question of clearing funds and ensuring the CRRF Steering Group was able to direct funds was raised. However, donor governments clarified that due to their financial rules, many of them would not be able to provide funds to a steering group, or even directly to a Government bank account. The CRRF Steering Group therefore would not be in a position to “clear” funds earmarked by donors to specific agencies. However, the work of the CRRF Secretariat and subsequent decisions by the CRRF Steering Group could help direct funds, and prevent overlaps between different funding mechanisms. For this to be possible, it is important that the CRRF Steering Group is kept informed about the use of funds, and the intended purpose. Those agencies that have received funds as a result of the pledging conference should be asked to report on the usage of these funds. Going forward the Secretariat, pursuant to the ToRs, will work on resource tracking with established mechanisms, talking to all partners and receiving an update on pledges.

Given that the issue of the follow-up to the Solidarity Summit has been raised by many, a proposal made that the PS call for a separate follow-up meeting be organized for a wider range of Stakeholders where a briefing could be given by the Government on the current situation.

### Summation

1. A specific meeting on the pledges received should be held as a follow up to the summit.
2. The allocation of funds can be a topic for more discussion at the next Steering Group meeting.

### Guidelines on the Utilization of Funds from the Summit (MoFPED)

It was reported that a presentation has been prepared on the proper usage of the funds from the Solidarity Summit that shall be received by the Government. However, at the moment this fund does not contain any pledges, and therefore this presentation is for information only. From the Government’s view it is important that the funds are coordinated and that the Government has insight into how this is used. This is especially important for the district level officials, as this is money that should flow into the districts.

It was highlighted that a lot of funds are flowing to the districts, but that all actors need to be better at “telling the story” to local officials as well as the world at large. The CRRF Steering Group needs to be able to update all actors as to what is being done to help host districts, for example water funding to districts and the new water system in Adjumani. In addition to what is being done by the international community, there also needs to be better accounting of government spending on the refugee response. The

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework

## UGANDA

humanitarian donors are reporting humanitarian pledges through the regional refugee response plan, which is linked to the UN's global financial tracking system. However, this is not matched by reporting from the development actors or the Government. Funding and investment tracking needs to be improved.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs pointed out that there are questions related to the financial situation as a result of the Solidarity Summit that need to be answered. The most pressing of these is articulation of the benefit of the Solidarity Summit for refugees and host communities. The Government must be able to demonstrate not only that the Ugandan model works, but also be able to point to specific investments made in areas of concern.

### **Summary of the Meeting's Decisions and Action Points (OPM)**

#### **Decisions**

1. Adoption of the Terms of Reference (TORs) of the CRRF Steering Group (attached)
2. Adoption of the Terms of reference (TORs) of the Secretariat (attached)
3. Agreement on the composition of the CRRF Steering Group, revised from original proposal to include more development partners, additional district representatives as well as refugee representatives (see attached)
4. Agreement on the establishment of the CRRF Secretariat under the Permanent Secretary of the Office of the Prime Minister, as an independent body, chaired either by a Director or the Under Secretary of OPM.
5. Agreement to operationalize the CRRF Secretariat with immediate effect

#### **Action Points**

1. CRRF Secretariat tasked to take the road map forward, in consultation with stakeholders, to be presented for review at next Steering Group meeting.
2. CRRF Secretariat to circulate a calendar and schedule of meetings for next 12 months
3. INGO and NNGO representatives to convey message from the CRRF Steering Group about the necessity ensure fair recruitment procedures in refugee hosting districts and to report back on this at the next CRRF Steering Group meeting.
4. Institutions and agencies (UNHCR, WFP, etc.) that received pledges at the Solidarity Summit will give updates on the status and utilization of these funds to the CRRF Steering Group through the CRRF Secretariat
5. OPM (PS) to call a separate meeting as a follow up on pledges and utilization of funds
6. Under the TORs, the CRRF Secretariat should build into the Road Map the preparation and presentation of thematic papers to the CRRF Steering Group for consideration. Themes suggested include:
  - a) Self-reliance of Refugees
  - b) Concerns of Host Communities
  - c) Empowering Local Actors
  - d) Building Local Content in the Recruitment Process
  - e) Standards in Refugee Management and Protection
  - f) Environment and Climate Change as it effects Refugee Hosting Areas
  - g) Infrastructure Projects

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework UGANDA

## **8 Closing Remarks (Chairperson)**

In closing, the chair highlighted the importance of the CRRF succeeding in-country to ensure that Uganda would remain a model for the rest of the world in terms of progressive refugee hosting policies and ensuring close linkages between the ongoing humanitarian response and the development activities in the refugee hosting areas.

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework UGANDA

## CRRF Steering Committee Meeting

**12 October 2017, Imperial Royale Hotel  
Attendance List (based on attendance sheets)**

No	Name	Organisation	Title
Meeting Chair: Honorable Musa Ecweru, Minister of State for Relief, Disaster Preparedness and Refugees			
<b>Government</b>			
01	David Apollo Kazungu	OPM	Commissioner/Refugees
02	Godfrey Kayima	OPM	Under Sec. Disaster and Refugees.
03	Charles Bafaki	OPM	Principal Settlement Officer
04	Wagubi Cosmas	OPM	Kampala
05	Kirabo Agrippinab	OPM	Kampala
06	Sandra Nohoro	OPM	Kampala
07	Walter Omondi	RDO	Mbarara
08	Titus Jogo	RDO	Adjumani
09	Mawejje Andrew	CAO	Adjumani
10	Eswilu Donault	CAO	Isingiro
11	Arthur Kafeero	Min. of Foreign Affairs	Ambassador
12	Nujuni Benon	Min. of International Affairs	Asst. Commissioner
13	Mutiibwa Robert	Min. of Water and Environment	
14	Sseremba Geoffrey	Permanent Secretary	UnderSecretary
<b>Donors</b>			
15	Isabelle D'Haudt	ECHO	Head of Office
16	Cedric Merel	European Union	Head of Cooperation
17	Petr Pribyla	European Union	Program Advisor
18	Tadakazu Kanno	Japan Embassy	Head of Econ. Coop.
19	Kyosuke Kawazumi	JICA	Chief Representative
20	Yui Takayama	JICA	Representative
21	Colette Marcellin	U.S. Embassy	Charges D'Affaires
22	Jean Woynicki	U.S. Embassy	Reg. Ref. Coord. (PRM)
23	Mark Meassick	USAID	Mission Director
24	Jo Lesser	USAID	Deputy Director
<b>UN AGENCIES</b>			
25	Bornwell Kantande	UNHCR	Representative

# Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework UGANDA

26	Elkhidir Daloum	Acting RC / WFP	Country Director
27	Almaz Gebry	UNDP	Country Director
28	Jens Hesemann	UNHCR	Snr. Field Coordinator
29	Miriam Malmqvist	UNHCR	Head, Solutions Unit
30	Rehema Permall	RCO	Partnerships Officer
	<b>NGO's</b>		
31	Lilu Thapa	DRC	Int. NGO Representative
32	Richard Ssewakiryanga	National NGO Forum	Executive Director
	<b>FACILITATORS/ NOTES</b>		
1.	Annika Sandlund	CRRF Secretariat	
2.	Innocent Ndahiriwe	OPM	
3.	Catherine Robinson	UNHCR	