

A young boy with a backpack is smiling in a classroom. He is wearing a dark blue t-shirt and a dark backpack. The background shows other children in a classroom setting.

# UGANDA COUNTRY REFUGEE RESPONSE PLAN

The integrated response plan for refugees from South Sudan, Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo

January 2019 — December 2020

**CREDITS:**

UNHCR wishes to acknowledge the contributions of partners and staff in Uganda Office, Regional Service Center (RSC) - Nairobi and Headquarters who have participated in the preparation of the narrative, financial and graphic components of this document.

Production: UNHCR, Regional Refugee Coordination Office (RRC), Nairobi, Kenya.

The maps in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion on the part of UNHCR concerning the legal status of any country or territory or area, of its authorities, or the delimitation of frontiers or boundaries.

All statistics are provisional and subject to change.

For more information:

Burundi crisis go to: [Burundi Information Sharing Portal](#)

South Sudan crisis go to: [South Sudan Information Sharing Portal](#)

DRC crisis go to: [DRC Information Sharing Portal](#)

[Uganda refugees country page](#)

**FRONT COVER PHOTOGRAPH:**

*Thirteen-year-old South Sudanese refugee John Luis, from Juba, South Sudan, inside a classroom at Ofonze Primary School in Bidibidi refugee settlement, Yumbe District, Northern Region, Uganda*

---

# Contents

## Uganda Refugee Response Plan

Executive Summary	5
Background and Achievements	6
Planning Scenarios	9
Needs Analysis	13
Response Strategy & Priorities	30
Partnership & Coordination	35
Planned Response for 2019 & 2020	42
Financial Requirements	52

## Annex

Monitoring Framework	56
2019 Financial Requirements Summary	66
2020 Financial Requirements Summary	69

**1.73\*M**


2019-2020 PROJECTED  
REFUGEE POPULATION

**US\$ 1.86B**


2019 REQUIREMENTS

**61**


2019 & 2020 PARTNERS  
INVOLVED



Refugee Population Trends 2015 - 2020\* (Source UNHCR, OPD)



2019 and 2020 Requirements by Situation | in millions US\$



# Executive Summary

Whilst seeking to meet humanitarian needs, the 2019-2020 RRP also serve as a transition plan towards sustainable refugee response programming in Uganda. As such, this plan contributes to achieving the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) in Uganda, alongside interventions carried out by government institutions.

## STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Under the leadership and coordination of the Government, the Uganda 2019-2020 RRP aims at achieving the following objectives:

- Through to 2020, Uganda's asylum space is maintained, equal and unhindered access to territory is preserved;
- The Government of Uganda owns protection processes that promote the full enjoyment of rights, and international protection standards;
- By 2020, the refugee response paradigm in Uganda has progressively shifted from care and maintenance to inclusion and self-reliance;
- By 2020, refugees progressively benefit from provision of inclusive basic social services;
- By 2020, refugees are well on their path to access durable solutions

## PRIORITY OUTCOMES

Partners and sectors will be guided by the following priority outcomes for planning and programming:

1. Refugee protection;
2. Emergency response;
3. Education;
4. Environment;
5. Livelihoods;
6. Urban refugees.

## 2019-2020 RRP'S INNOVATIONS

The 2019-2020 RRP brings a number of novelties compared to previous RRP's, as follows:

- Two-year planning cycle;
- Disaggregated targets for host communities;
- Resilience interventions to support national systems to achieve integrated social service delivery;
- Sector strategies and priorities aligned to existing government sector response plans;
- Enhanced results framework to monitor the RRP performance;
- Sector needs analysis based on the 2018 joint inter-agency Multi-Sector Needs Assessment.

## Partners appealing for funds from non-UN sources

Sectors	South Sudan	DRC and others	Burundi	Total
Protection	29	19	7	<b>31</b>
Education	16	10	1	<b>17</b>
Environment & Energy	12	10	2	<b>15</b>
Food Security	1	1	1	<b>1</b>
Health & Nutrition	13	11	3	<b>14</b>
Livelihood & Resilience	37	21	5	<b>37</b>
Shelter, Settlement & NFI	9	11	2	<b>11</b>
WASH	19	14	2	<b>20</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>61</b>

\* The baseline for this projection is based on a mix of OPM RIMS figures and verification data for settlements where verification had been completed as at June 2018, when the RRP planning process began. Sector targets and agency budgets for 2019 and 2020 have been developed based on this projection. In order to align the population planning figures, targets and budgets with the results of verification, this RRP will be revised in early 2019.

# Background and Achievements

## Overview

Over one million refugees have fled to Uganda in the last two and a half years, making the Pearl of Africa the third largest refugee-hosting country in the world after Turkey and Pakistan<sup>1</sup>, with 1.36 million refugees by June 2018. Wars, violence and persecution in the Horn of Africa and Great Lakes Region were the main drivers of forced displacement into Uganda, led by South Sudan's conflict, insecurity and ethnic violence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and political instability and human rights violations in Burundi.

South Sudanese make up the largest refugee population in Uganda (985,512 people) as at June 2018, followed by refugees from the DRC (271,967) and Burundi (36,677). Another 70,988 refugees from Ethiopia, Eritrea, Rwanda, Somalia and Sudan have lived in protracted exile in Uganda for the past three decades.

More than 60 percent of Uganda's refugees are under the age of 18, one of the most visible consequences of conflicts in neighboring countries - and with clear implications for the provision of protection services.

Twelve of Uganda's 121 districts host the overwhelming majority of refugees. About 92 percent live in settlements alongside the local communities, mainly in northern Uganda or West Nile (Adjumani, Arua, Koboko, Moyo, Lamwo and Yumbe) with smaller numbers in central Uganda or Mid West (Kiryandongo and Hoima) and southern Uganda or South West (Kyegegwa, Kamwenge and Isingiro). Urban centres are home to eight percent of the refugee population, especially Kampala.

With expected refugee influxes from the DRC (140,000), South Sudan (70,000) and Burundi (7,000) throughout the period covered by the RRP, Uganda is likely to host about 1.74 and 1.73 million refugees by the end of 2019 and 2020 respectively<sup>2</sup>. These figures also factor about 138,000 returns to DRC (30,000), South Sudan (100,000) and Burundi (8,000) over the same time period.

## Achievements and challenges

Border and protection monitoring along the Ugandan borders ensured that 121,682 new refugee arrivals were provided with reception assistance and transferred to settlements in the first semester of 2018. Among them

were 30,954 refugees from South Sudan, 88,737 from the DRC and 1,991 from Burundi. No case of refoulement was reported in 2018.

<sup>1</sup> UNHCR, 2017 Global Trends Report: <http://www.unhcr.org/5b27be547>

<sup>2</sup> The baseline for this projection is based on a mix of OPM RIMS figures and verification data for settlements where verification had been completed as at June 2018, when the RRP planning process began. Sector targets and agency budgets for 2019 and 2020 have been developed based on this projection. In order to align the population planning figures, targets and budgets with the results of verification, this RRP will be revised in early 2019.

## CRRF AND UGANDA'S REFUGEE POLICY

The Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), formally launched in March 2017, embraces existing initiatives, mechanisms and policies seeking to address the needs of refugee and host communities in Uganda.

Uganda's favourable protection environment for refugees is grounded in the 2006 Refugee Act and the 2010 Refugee Regulations. These legislations allow refugees freedom of movement, the right to work, establish a business, own property and access national services, including primary and secondary education and health care.

South Sudanese and Congolese asylum seekers are granted refugee status on a prima facie basis, while refugees from other nationalities undergo Refugee Status Determination (RSD) interviews with the Refugee Eligibility Committee, an inter-ministerial body. Prima facie refugee status determination for Burundian was revoked in May 2017 and entered into force on 1 June 2017.

Through its Settlement Transformative Agenda (STA), Uganda pursues a non-encampment policy to refugee protection and assistance. Refugees are provided with a plot of land for housing and cultivation and can settle alongside their host communities.

The CRRF seeks to advance Uganda's STA, embedded into the National Development Plan II (NDP II, 2016-2021), including through the implementation of the humanitarian refugee response (emergencies and protracted situations) and development-oriented interventions like the Refugee and Host Populations Framework (ReHoPE), under the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). CRRF's long-term goal is sustainability of STA and inclusion of refugees into national and local development plans.

A multi-stakeholder CRRF Steering Group, co-chaired by the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) and the Ministry of Local Government (MoLG), supports the practical application of CRRF, with technical support from the CRRF Secretariat. The CRRF Steering Group consists of 32 members from Line Ministries, Government Departments and Agencies, Local Governments, development and humanitarian donors, representatives of UN Agencies, national and international NGOs, the private sector and international financial institutions.

In January 2018, the CRRF Steering Group adopted a roadmap, with milestones and priority interventions for refugee stakeholders between 2018 and 2020 bridging the gap between NDP II and NDP III. Creating entry points for non-traditional refugee responders in Uganda, the roadmap highlights the following priority focus areas: adaptation and standardization of refugee response and protection based on lessons learned; access to quality education for refugee and host communities; water delivery and infrastructure; environment and energy; health care; and livelihoods, resilience and self-reliance.

For the first time in Uganda's history, national and local development plans will include refugee issues. In March 2018, the Ministry of Education introduced its Education Response Plan (2018-2021) with the aim to respond to the additional strains placed on the educational system in refugee-hosting districts. Following this lead, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Water and Environment have also begun developing integrated response plans, due for release in the second half of 2018 and early 2019 respectively.

The Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) continued to undertake registration and documentation of refugees.

Following serious allegations of fraud and corruption within the refugee response, UNHCR and WFP reached out to the Government in late 2017 to seek cooperation in addressing growing concerns about the accuracy and reliability of refugee data used for fundraising, programming and of assistance.

In response, the government and UNHCR launched a verification of all refugees in Uganda in March 2018, using UNHCR biometric systems. More than 515,000 refugees were verified as of June, including 359,798 South Sudanese, 104,305 Congolese and 26,623 Burundians, with verification continuing until the end October 2018.

Furthermore, a memorandum of understanding between UNHCR and the Government of Uganda, signed in mid 2018, enabled OPM to use UNCHR's enhanced biometric systems to register refugees.

In the settlements, refugees continued to receive monthly food rations, household items and access to multi-sectoral services, in addition to a plot of land for housing and farming.

Following the sudden and mass refugee influx from DRC's Ituri province in late December 2017, several transit and reception centres were built or expanded in 2018. This includes construction of Nyakabande's new transit centre (Kisoro district) and Matanda transit centre (Kanungu district); refurbishment and repair of Bubukwanga transit centre (Bundibugyo district); and expansion of Kyaka II and Kyangwali reception centres. Furthermore, six new settlement areas were opened in Kyangwali (four) and Kyaka II (two) to provide land and shelter for new refugee arrivals from the DRC.

RRP partners opened 72 kilometres of access roads in Kyangwali and Kyaka II and rehabilitated another 43 kilometres of district roads in Hoima and Kyegegwa to ease relocation and settlement of new arrivals. In northern Uganda, 3.2 kilometres of roads were opened in Rhino, while another 25.4 kilometers of existing roads were rehabilitated and maintained in Rhino and Imvepi (10.4 km) and Adjumani settlements (15 km).

Partners continued to support the national health care system as well as health facilities and referral services in and around refugee settlements, helping maintain the crude mortality rate and under five mortality rate at 0.1 death every 1,000 people per month – below the non-emergency standard of 1 death every 1,000 people per month.

Due to cholera and Ebola outbreaks in the DRC in 2018, RRP partners in coordination with the Ministry of Health deployed resources to strengthen screening measures at entry points and expand traditional and community-based disease surveillance systems.

In the first six months of 2018, supply of safe drinking water was maintained at 16 liters per person per day (l/p/d) across the refugee response. About 14 percent of water was provided through water trucking in settlements hosting South Sudanese and 98.8 percent in settlements hosting Congolese and Burundians.

Building on existing complaint mechanisms, partners launched in October 2018 an inter-agency centralised refugee feedback, complaint and resolution mechanism to enhance accountability to affected populations.

In line with the Grand Bargain's commitment to improve joint and impartial needs assessments, a joint inter-agency multi-sector needs assessment of refugee and host communities was carried out in 12 refugee-hosting

districts and 30 refugee settlements to provide evidence-based data for the development of the 2019-2020 RRP.

The level of funding for the refugee response in Uganda reached an all time low this year, with only 42 percent of earmarked and unearmarked contributions received as of October 2018. While the number of refugees per 1,000 inhabitants has tripled to 35 since 2016 –putting a huge pressure on local resources and services, external aid has been progressively dwindling over the years, causing major gaps in the refugee response. RRP partners continued to face enormous challenges in stabilising existing programmes and often meeting the

minimum standards of service provision, let alone investing in long-term and more sustainable interventions.

Severe underfunding has particularly compromised the quality of child protection and education services and limited investments in prevention and response to Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV), environmental protection, support for host communities, and permanent community infrastructure. With 34 percent of its population below income poverty line (US \$1.9 per person per day<sup>3</sup>), Uganda may be unable to fully realize a comprehensive refugee response and maintain its progressive refugee policy without adequate support from the international community.

## Planning Scenarios

### SOUTH SUDAN

The parties to the conflict in South Sudan signed a Declaration of Agreement on 27 June and a subsequent power-sharing deal on 5 August in Khartoum, committing to a permanent ceasefire and the formation of a government of national unity. While this represents a positive development in the peace process, the refugee influx from South Sudan is likely to continue through to 2020 due to ongoing political crisis, insecurity and declining economy, though at lower rates compared to recent years.

The country's growth domestic product (GDP) per capita in 2014 was US \$1,111 dropping to less than US \$200 in 2017. Inflation stood at 122.9 percent in July 2018 and the South Sudanese pound (SSP) continued to depreciate trading at approximately 144.8 per US Dollar (USD) in August 2018 - compared to 50 per USD before July 2016 conflict.

Based on the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) analysis for September 2018-March 2019<sup>4</sup>, an estimated 3.73 million people would face Crisis (IPC Phase 3) another 1.47 million Emergency (IPC Phase 4). Hunger and food insecurity may contribute to drive displacement into Uganda, especially among the 650,000 people estimated to be highly food insecure in South Sudan's bordering regions with Uganda, namely West, Central and Eastern Equatoria.

3 UNDP, 2016 HDR Report: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/composite/MPI#a>.

4 [http://www.ipcinfo.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/ipcinfo/docs/IPC\\_SouthSudan\\_AcuteFI\\_2018Sept\\_March2019.pdf](http://www.ipcinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/ipcinfo/docs/IPC_SouthSudan_AcuteFI_2018Sept_March2019.pdf)

Uganda is expected to host 1.11 million refugees from South Sudan in 2019 and 1.07 million in 2020, with 50,00 new refugee arrivals in 2019 and 20,000 in 2020. This plan foresees that about 20,000 refugees may spontaneously return home in 2019 and up to 80,000 in 2020, provided that the prospects for a sustainable peace become more tangible.

**DRC**

Refugee outflows into Uganda are likely to continue in 2019 and 2020 due to unrest and widespread human rights violations in North Kivu as well as inter-community and inter-ethnic violence in Ituri. The nexus between political and sectarian violence will remain a key feature of the DRC’s political instability, whereby a deeper political crisis is likely to revive and galvanize armed groups and militias across the country. At least 70 armed groups operate in Eastern DRC, close to the border with Uganda, and have a long history of atrocious attacks on civilians, including killings, abductions and rape. Among them are the Allied Democratic Forces/National Army for the Liberation of Uganda (ADF/NALU), the March 23 Movement (M23) and the Mayi Mayi groups.

While President Kabila announced on 7 August he would not stand in the election scheduled for 23 December 2018, the polls remain highly contentious and may exacerbate existing political and ethnic tensions, leading to a new crisis



©UNHCR / MICHELE SIBILON

and renewed refugee outflows. The presidential candidate submitted by the ruling coalition, former Interior Minister Ramazani Shandary – Kabila’s long-time right-hand man, is believed to have no power network of his own or influence in the military, with president Kabila continuing to pull the strings from behind the scenes.

On 1 August, the DRC Minister of Health declared a new Ebola virus outbreak in North Kivu, which quickly spread to Ituri. Ongoing conflict and armed activities of militia groups in these areas make the response to the outbreak extremely challenging. Without access to health care or treatment in the Ebola-affected areas, there is a risk that infected patients or Congolese fearing infection may use refugee routes into Uganda to seek medical attention.

Food insecurity in the DRC may marginally contribute to refugee outflows into Uganda, especially from Ituri. Interethnic violence in Djugu and Imuru territories has led to a disruption of the agricultural system, resulting in significant loss of harvest. In the likelihood of meagre harvest seasons, more Congolese will cross to Uganda in search of a food.

Some 100,000 new refugee arrivals are expected to cross to Uganda in 2019 and 40,000 others in 2020, bringing the DRC refugee population to approximately 509,000 in 2019 and 539,000 in 2020. Should political tensions defuse and security improve in North Kivu and Ituri, return to the country of origin may become a reality, though marginal in scope. This plan puts the number of expected returns to 10,000 in 2019 and 20,000 for the following year.

## BURUNDI

The situation in Burundi is expected to remain calm but unpredictable in 2019, with a trickle of refugees likely to continue throughout the year due to threats and abuses by members of the Imbonerakure militia, but also deteriorating economy.

On 17 May 2018, 73 percent of voters casted their ballot for “yes” in a Constitutional referendum that resolved to boost the powers of President Pierre Nkurunziza. The new Constitution was promulgated on 7 June, and although President Nkurunziza announced that he would not re-run for office after his term, the ‘yes’ win could potentially allow him to stay in office until 2034. The opposition and human rights organizations said that the constitution’s revision goes against the Arusha accords adopted in 2000 to end a 13-year civil war in Burundi and weakens the mechanisms to protect the Tutsy minority in a Hutu-majority country.

The political crisis has heavily affected the Burundian economy, with GDP dropping in 2015 and 2016 and hitting a zero growth in 2017. The inflation rate increased from 5.5 percent in 2016 to 18 percent in 2017, contributing to deteriorating food insecurity.

Burundi’s next presidential elections, scheduled for 2020, have the potential to generate violence and further precipitate the existing economic crisis, leading to displacement within and outside the country, including to Uganda.

A minor secondary refugee movement from Tanzania cannot be excluded should government policies towards Burundian refugees become more restrictive.

Uganda is expected to host some 43,000 Burundian refugees by the end of 2019 and about 42,000 by the end of 2020, with 5,000 new refugee arrivals in 2019 and 2,000 others in 2020. The return of refugees remains high on Burundi's agenda, but its capacity to absorb returns is low. While no Burundian refugees in Uganda have so far expressed any intention to return home, it is expected that about 4,000 people may spontaneously return home in 2019 and 4,000 others in 2020. The operation will continue to monitor the situation and look into providing support to those wishing to go back home.

## Beneficiary Population

The base refugee population includes 1.36 million individuals, based on OPM-UNHCR verification findings for settlements where verification was completed, and OPM Refugee Information Management System (RIMS) data for settlements where verification is ongoing, all of as of June 2018. The refugee population is anticipated to grow to 1.73 million individuals by the end of 2020, taking into account likely scenarios for influxes, population growth, and possible opportunities for voluntary return in safety and dignity.

	Population as of end of December 2018	Planned Population as of end of 2019	Planned Population as of end of 2020
South Sudan	1,060,809	1,112,025	1,074,266
DRC and other refugees	583,551	583,222	614,887
Burundi	41,402	43,230	42,094
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,585,762</b>	<b>1,738,477</b>	<b>1,731,246</b>
Host populations in refugee-hosting sub counties	2,236,973	2,304,506	2,351,313
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3,822,735</b>	<b>4,042,983</b>	<b>4,082,559</b>

Concerning the Ugandan hosting community, the RRP will primarily target populations in 43 refugee-hosting sub-counties with a total population of 2.35 million individuals anticipated by 2020. Communities and individuals in refugee-hosting sub-counties will benefit from assistance along specific targeting criteria, different for each sector, and to the extent that resources permit. Entire refugee-hosting districts may also benefit from system-level interventions.

## Needs Analysis

The needs analysis underpinning this RRP is broken down by sector and is based on government sector response plans, where available (Education, Health, WASH) and the findings of the 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA, which was purposely carried out to inform this plan. Other existing needs assessments and studies have been used to provide further evidence on needs and gaps.

### PROTECTION

Despite Uganda's favourable protection environment, refugees are faced with numerous protection challenges due to the magnitude of displacement and growing vulnerabilities, compounded by diminishing resources and strained social services in refugee-hosting districts.

[Reception, registration and refugee status determination](#) - Limited capacities of border authorities and reception staff, as well as shortfalls in coordination among key partners create delays and backlogs in registration and issuance of documentation.

In order to reduce the lengthy processing time for asylum seekers awaiting refugee status determination (RSD), there is a need to strengthen the capacity and accelerate the work of the Refugee Eligibility Committee (REC), an inter-ministerial body in charge of RSD for asylum seekers who fall outside the prima facie recognition. The Refugee Appeals Board (RAB) also needs support to be able to review on a more regular basis the cases of asylum seekers rejected at first instance.

Additional human resources, equipment and better Internet connectivity are needed to address delays in registration in most locations. When asylum seekers and refugees fail to be timely registered, they may be unable to access certain services or experience delayed service provision.

Mechanisms and pathways allowing refugees to report complaints and receive feedback in the areas of reception, verification, registration and RSD are limited and need to be strengthened and better coordinated.

**Persons with specific needs (PSN)** - While over 103,000 refugees have been identified as persons with specific needs<sup>5</sup> as of June 2018, many more will require targeted protection services and support by the end of 2020. Among them are unaccompanied and separated children, women, children and older persons at risk, persons with disabilities and serious medical conditions, and persons carrying trauma. Community outreach and mobilization need to be further strengthened as to enable communities to effectively play an active role in their own protection.

Psychosocial interventions for trauma survivors require significant investments, especially for refugees who were directly or indirectly exposed to extreme violence, lost family members or witnessed the destruction of their homes.

According to 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA, at the national level 22 percent of refugee households reported that at least one member was scared or in psychological distress, with the highest percentage (46 percent) in Isingiro district (hosting mostly DRC and Burundi refugees). Out of these households, 40 percent reported that the family member in psychological distress was unable to access psychosocial care, with 77 percent in Kiryandongo district and 69 percent in Moyo district (both hosting South Sudan refugees).

**Access to justice** - Refugees face significant challenges in accessing justice, especially in remote areas where the presence of the judiciary and police is limited or non-existent. In most settlements the number of police officers is inadequate to respond to the needs of an increasing population, especially female police officers – which represents a barrier for female refugees to come forward and report SGBV incidents. Lack or inadequate transportation and poor access to communication means are additional challenges facing the police deployed in refugee settlements across Uganda.

**Coexistence between communities** - Tensions exist between the host communities, long-term refugees and new arrivals due to competition over decreasing resources (firewood, water, land) and the real or perceived belief of unequal access to services. Inter-ethnic tensions among refugee communities are also a concern and reflect the configuration of group power back in their countries of origin. Nevertheless, conflict-prevention and peace education programmes remain significantly under-resourced and require substantial investments as part of a strategy to prepare refugees to return home in the long run.

**Civilian character of asylum** - There are concerns that combatants from various armed groups may enter Uganda through refugee flows, compromising the civilian character of asylum and refugee settlements and potentially leading to incidents of forced recruitment, child abuse, SGBV and inter-communal tensions. Existing policies and practices on separation, internment, demobilization and rehabilitation of former combatants need to be further strengthened.

**Child Protection** - Children represent 60 percent<sup>6</sup> of refugees and asylum seekers in Uganda. Before, during and after flight refugee children face serious protection risks, including family separation, physical, sexual and gender-based violence, psychosocial distress, child labour and other forms of violence. According to the 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA, households in both refugee (12 percent) and host communities (14 percent) reported having children

5 Data from proGres v4 and outcomes of most recent PSN assessment exercises.

6 UNHCR Uganda Operation Country Statistics, RIMS, June 2018.

who had experienced violence. Among refugee households, the highest level of violence was reported in some of the districts hosting South Sudanese refugees, namely Kiryandongo (19 percent), Lamwo (17 percent) and Yumbe (17 percent)<sup>7</sup>. As for host community households, the highest level of violence against children was reported in Isingiro district (30 percent).

The 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA highlights teenage pregnancy, defilement, child neglect, corporal punishment, mistreatment and neglect of fostered children as common amongst all population groups<sup>8</sup>. With a weak community child protection system, children are struggling to cope and to adapt to the new circumstances in the country of asylum. Poor psychosocial functioning among children is increasingly manifested in behavioural and conduct disorders.

There are currently 29,295 unaccompanied and separated children<sup>9</sup> (UASC) in Uganda. The joint inter-agency MSNA report identified that a higher number of refugee households has vulnerable children (orphans, unaccompanied, separated) than host community households. More host community and refugee households in districts hosting South Sudanese refugees were identified to have vulnerable children than in districts hosting refugees from DRC, Burundi and other nationalities. There is limited access to child protection services, with 68 percent of refugee and 84 percent of host community households with vulnerable children across Uganda reporting having children in need of adequate services<sup>10</sup>.

**Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV)** - With significant numbers of women and children, the refugee populations in Uganda are highly vulnerable to SGBV, including persons with specific needs (PSNs).

In both South Sudan and DRC, sexual violence has been used as a weapon of war, including rape. Many have experienced sexual abuse, torture and separation from family members before or during flight.

For SGBV incidents that occurred before or during flight, survivors have little or no chance to effectively pursue legal redress. Emotional and psychological trauma is common among refugees who have experienced violence or have witnessed violence perpetrated against family or community members.

SGBV also occurs in Uganda, affecting both new refugee arrivals and long-term refugees. In addition to the 3,021 SGBV survivors identified and assisted as of June 2018 (1,769 from South Sudan, 1,196 from the DRC and 56 from Burundi), many more are expected to be needing support by the end of 2020 as a result of anticipated refugee influxes and improved identification and reporting mechanisms.

The most reported SGBV incident among South Sudanese refugees was physical assault (44 percent), followed by psychological violence (24 percent), rape (11 percent), forced and early marriage (7 percent) and sexual assault (6 percent).

7 UNHCR/REACH Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessment, 2018.

8 Preliminary report on the Joint Interagency Assessment on measures, mechanism and services for protection of women and children conducted in refugee settlements in Uganda, 2018

9 UNHCR Uganda Factsheet Child Protection, June 2018.

10 UNHCR/REACH Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessment, 2018.



© UNHCR / JORDI MATAS

Rape ranks as the most prevalent form of SGBV (36 percent) among refugees from the DRC, followed by physical violence (23 percent), psychosocial abuse (18 percent), forced marriage (6 percent) and sexual assault (5 percent). Most of the rape incidents occurred in the country of origin and were reportedly perpetrated by militia groups.

The most common forms of SGBV affecting Burundian refugees were physical assault, rape, sexual assault and emotional abuse.

Intimate partner violence is the prevailing form of SGVB amongst the incidents occurred in Uganda.

According to 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA, out of 37 percent of refugee households who self-rated the safety and security of their current location as less than good, 15 percent cited SGBV as a reason for insecurity. The highest percentages were reported in Koboko (50 percent), Kamwenge (29 percent) and Moyo (33 percent), with the first two districts hosting refugees from the DRC and the latter refugees from South Sudan.

One of the contributing factors to SGBV is shift in the traditional power balance within households, with an increasing number of women becoming the main or sole breadwinner at home. Whilst leading to increased SGBV within domestic walls, the increasing disempowerment of men have also caused them to be more exposed to emotional and psychological violence.

Denial of resources (e.g. food, household items, money), limited access to post-primary education and livelihood opportunities act as aggravating factors in the incidence of SGBV. Scarcity of food remains a key cause for intimate partner violence. Women and children are at heightened risk of assault when travelling to remote and isolated areas for collection of firewood and water or walking through communal areas with inadequate lighting.

Although illegal according to Uganda laws, child, early and forced marriages are prominent and socially accepted among the refugees. It has been reported that underage girls are often taken back to South Sudan to be married off and return to Uganda only after marriage.

A growing number of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and inter-sex (LGBTI) individuals from refugee-producing countries, especially DRC, need focussed attention. This category of asylum seekers not only are not granted refugee status in Uganda, but also face low tolerance and acceptance among the members of the public, and hence insecurity.

Underreporting of SGBV cases remains a major concern, due to a variety of factors including fear of stigma, shame, family reaction and dissolution, perception of SGBV as a private matter, or lack of confidence in reporting channels.

Prevention and response services are not adequate to effectively address the protection needs of a growing population, with many SGBV survivors relying on community structures that often re-victimized them instead of serving their interest. Delays in accessing justice and limited human and financial resources are huge challenges to the provision of quality and effective services.

## EDUCATION

Uganda is expected to host 1,58 million refugees by year-end 2018, including about 517,000 children of primary and secondary school age. With 217,000 new refugee arrivals anticipated by the end of 2020, another 130,200 pupils will need pre to post-primary education services, putting a further strain on the already stretched capacity of national and district-level education systems – and compromising both access to and quality of education service delivery.

Currently, 53 percent of the primary-aged and 92 percent of the secondary-aged children are out of school, and an average of 22 percent are enrolled in grades lower than expected for their age. Host community enrolments are equally striking: a gross enrolment rate of 120 percent at primary level shows incidences of over and under-age enrolment, while an 18 percent low enrolment rate at secondary level indicates critical gaps. These are compounded by high drop-out rates at all levels and alarming indicators at primary level such as 154 pupils per classroom ratio and 85 pupils per teacher<sup>11</sup>.

Findings from the 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA, reinforced by additional references, point to a number of critical factors preventing refugee and host community children in Uganda from accessing a quality education.

<sup>11</sup> Ministry of Education and Sports: Education Response Plan for Refugees and Host Communities in Uganda (Aug 2018, approved but pending final review and sign-off).

Out of the refugee households that reported having at least one child out of school, 36 percent in Koboko (district hosting DRC refugees) and 32 percent in Lamwo (district hosting South Sudanese refugees) cited child marriage as a barrier to girls' education. Host community households with at least one child out of school also reported child marriage as a reason for girls being out of school, with 12 percent in Yumbe and 10 percent in Adjumani and Lawmo. The highest prevalence of child marriage is in northern Uganda, where the majority of the refugee-hosting districts are located<sup>12</sup>. A 2016 survey indicates that as many as three in ten Ugandan girls have their first child before their 18th birthday; and more than a third marry before they turn 18<sup>13</sup>. Early marriage and pregnancy lead to girls dropping out of school, unlikely to ever return. Non-formal education pathways such as catch up classes and accelerated education programmes, are entry points of return to formal education for these girls but need to be part of a more holistic package of interventions to mitigate the protection risks for adolescent girls from both refugee and host communities.

Although Uganda's Universal Primary Education policy stipulates free compulsory primary education of good quality for all children, 'hidden costs' to accessing education remain. Financial constraints are among the main hindrances to educational enrolment and retention in schools, with parents compelled to cover the costs of scholastic materials, school uniforms and examination fees. According to the 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA, out of the households with at least one child out of school, 31 percent of refugee households and 45 percent of host community households consider the cost of education a prohibitive one. Of them, 54 percent of refugee households and 95 percent of host community households cited tuition fees as the highest unaffordable expenditures related to education, with refugee children more likely to access scholarships or tuition subsidies from humanitarian organizations compared to Ugandan children<sup>14</sup>.

Low enrolment and attendance, and high dropout rates among children and youth can also be attributed to language barriers. While the South Sudanese primary school curriculum is in English and has some similarities to the Ugandan primary school curriculum, refugees from Burundi, DRC and other Francophone countries face challenges in adjusting to a new curriculum in a foreign language<sup>15</sup>. The 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA found that the highest percentage of households with school-age children where at least one child is not attending school are in districts hosting refugees from Francophone countries such as DRC and Burundi, namely Kyegegwa (46 percent), Hoima (33 percent), Kamwenge (32 percent) and Isingiro (22 percent). Other studies confirm the low attendance rates of Congolese children in the same districts<sup>16</sup>. In the multi-linguistic setting of refugee-hosting areas, support to mother-tongue literacy, language bridging courses, community involvement in schools and engagement of bi-lingual teacher assistants in classrooms are highly needed to mitigate these critical challenges.

The 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA shows that out of the households with at least one child out of school, 94 percent of refugee and 100 percent of host community households consider being 'too young' as a reason for their children

12 UNICEF, Press Release, June 2016 .


13 World Bank, Educating Girls: A Way of Ending Child Marriage and Teenage Pregnancy, December 2017; Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 2016 (UDHS) conducted by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics between June 1.

14 UNHCR/REACH Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessment.

15 Ministry of Education and Sports: Education Response Plan for Refugees and Host Communities in Uganda / ERP (Aug 2018, approved but pending final review and sign-off).

16 Development Pathways, 'Analysis of Refugee Vulnerability in Uganda and Recommendations for Improved Targeting of Food Assistance', April 2018 p.51.

Show the mean  
cts differen why do  
mixed w  
Give or  
the figure  
measure



to calculate the density of an  
object with mass 20g and volume  
2cc

to use the experiment to  
answer the questions

not attending school, with specific reference to children of pre-primary age, between 3 to 5 years. This belief could be one of other factors contributing to the low gross enrolment rates of children of pre-primary age in both refugee and host communities, at 39 percent and 19 percent respectively. A study on child poverty and deprivation in refugee-hosting areas in Uganda also found that being 'too young' (43.2 percent) as well as parental indifference (19.1 percent) as the most cited reasons by surveyed households for children of primary school age being out of school<sup>17</sup>.

Persistently low enrolment and attendance rates for both refugee and host community children and youth can be found in post-primary education. The gross enrolment rate (GER) among refugee children stands at 11 percent for secondary education. Only 18 percent of Ugandan children of secondary school age living in refugee-hosting districts are enrolled in secondary education, which is lower than the national average of 27.1 percent. There are still sub-counties without a secondary school, including where refugees are hosted, and only 18 secondary schools in refugee-hosting districts in northern Uganda, including government, community and private schools<sup>18</sup>.

A key barrier for refugees to access secondary education is the lack of or non-acceptance of certification proving they have completed primary education in their home country. Other constraints include the long distance between home and the nearest school, and poor school facilities. According to the joint inter-agency MSNA, examination fees represent a prohibitive cost for secondary school-aged children, preventing them to transition from upper primary into secondary. There are some scholarship programmes available for high achieving students from vulnerable households, but the number of places is limited.

## ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT

Refugees and hosts are mostly dependent on natural resources to meet their basic needs for cooking energy, materials for shelter and agricultural land. Some also generate income by selling biomass and non-wood forest products. In addition to leading to environmental degradation and reduced groundwater recharge and supply, these demands contribute to increased risk of SGBV for women and children whilst collecting fuel wood, to reduce food and nutrition security and to deplete sources of cooking fuel. The health risks associated with exposure to unmanaged solid waste remain a critical concern. Competition over diminishing natural resources has the potential to exacerbate tensions between refugee and host communities.

Environmental screening has not been integrated in settlement planning, magnifying the risks of environmental and social hazards such as flooding, conflicts over land use and resource access, and loss of vegetation, wetlands and local watersheds. While every settlement requires an Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIA) as the basis for site-specific environmental management and site planning, ESIA have been officially undertaken only in refugee settlements in Rwamwanja and Arua districts, with Bidididi settlement currently underway.

<sup>17</sup> Child Poverty and Deprivation in Refugee-Hosting Areas: Evidence from Uganda 2018. Economic Policy and Research Centre, Cardiff University and UNICEF Uganda.

<sup>18</sup> ECHO, Education Monitoring Mission – Uganda report 2017.

Refugees are often settled in environmentally marginal locations with population densities up to ten times the national average. The demands on ecosystem services from rapid refugee influxes outpace planning and implementation of remedial measures. The recent influx from the DRC has placed significant pressure on forest resources especially around Kyaka II and Kyangwali settlements, while vegetation cover is greatly depleted in the north, especially around settlements in Adjumani, Yumbe and Arua. Land use conversion from forest cover to agricultural use is prevalent. The 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA found that there is a significant gap in knowledge of agroforestry principles where only 33 percent of refugee and 27 percent of host community households had training in good agricultural practices (GAP).

While reforestation and afforestation efforts are underway, dedicated woodlots for fuel and agroforestry interventions are needed in all settlements at a much larger scale, including deliberate planning for management of planted trees for at least a year to improve survival rates.

Uganda's National Environment Act (1995) stipulates the establishment of district Environment Protection Committees to act as local regulatory, monitoring and feedback mechanisms, but only few exist today due to lack of resources. None of the refugee settlement across the country is integrated in existing Catchment Management Plans.

Access to sustainable energy for sufficient and clean cooking, lighting and power remain key challenges in the refugee settlements and in Uganda at large. Energy for productive uses to support livelihood activities and appropriate technology for food preservation are scarcely available. Over 75 percent of refugees<sup>19</sup> are without any renewable source of energy.

According to the 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA, on average refugee and host community households own less than one light source and 1.5 light source per family respectively, with heavy reliance on low-quality fuels such as kerosene and firewood. As a result, the risk of indoor air pollution, respiratory tract infection, and eye diseases increase. Solar lanterns are inconsistently provided and some are sold for cash to meet other needs. Furthermore, a larger-scale solar street lights coverage is required to improve security and reduce the risks of SGBV. Market-based interventions to increase access to quality energy products are needed.

The 2018 joint inter-agency MNSA shows that 93 percent of refugee and host community households depend on fuel wood energy for cooking, with only 45 percent of refugee and 20 percent of host community households reporting use of energy saving stoves. Distributed stoves are often unused and training is not provided to improve adoption. While constructed Lorena stoves tend to have better adoption, there is a need to expand manufacturing training programs for local artisans. There is low adoption and availability of alternative cooking fuels such as briquettes and biogas.

Refugee households use on average 22 percent of their income for energy, with women and children spending 12-24 hours a week for firewood collection. Firewood consumption in northern Uganda averages between 2.5-4.5 kg

<sup>19</sup> UNHCR, 2018 mid year report.

per person per day, with host communities being on the higher end of that range<sup>20</sup>. This means that at least 1.3 million tonnes of firewood are needed every year to meet the firewood consumption needs of over 1.36 million refugees, equating to a yearly demand of nearly 20 5-year-old fast growing trees per individual.

Energy efficiency and climate change mitigation need to be mainstreamed across sectors, especially through implementation of solar power and sustainable cooking energy. Similarly, all partners involved in the refugee response need to integrate environment mitigation measures with emergency preparedness, response, stabilization and empowerment measures across all the sectors.

## FOOD SECURITY

Out of 1.36 million refugees in Uganda as of June 2018, 1.1 million were receiving food assistance in the settlements either in-kind or through cash transfers.

According to the 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA, the highest percentage of refugee households classified as people with unmet needs within the Food Security sector were found in the Southwest (16 percent) hosting mainly refugees from DRC and Burundi, followed by West Nile (14 percent) and the Midwest (9 percent) hosting the majority of refugees from South Sudan.

At national level, 18 percent of refugee households were found to have low food consumption score (poor or borderline), with 32 percent in Kyegegwa (hosting DRC refugees), 28 percent in Lamwo (hosting South Sudan

20 GiZ, 2018; FAO, 2017.



refugees) and 25 percent in Kamwenge (hosting DRC refugees). Households in Imvepi (9 percent) in Arua district and Kyaka II (9 percent) in Kyegegwa had the highest percentage of poor food consumption score across all assessed households.

Sixty seven percent of refugee households reported insufficient access to food for all the members of the household in the 7 days prior to data collection and 72 percent reported non-governmental assistance to be the primary source of food.

While 38 percent of refugee households reported agriculture as one of their primary sources of livelihoods, 70 percent of refugee respondents reported to have access to land for cultivation during the most recent agricultural season. Among the latter, 73 percent reported that the land was not sufficient to provide food for the entire household. With anticipated refugee influxes through to 2020, it is likely that the reduction of available land for long-term cases will continue, including agricultural land.

There is a need to standardize general across the refugee response in Uganda and increasingly roll out cash-based transfers for both general food assistance and livelihood and food-for-assets interventions. In order to respond to the different level of vulnerability of different refugee populations, food rations need to be diversified – and a plan will be conceived in 2019 to that effect.

It remains critical for the Food Security sector to establish strong linkages with the Livelihood&Resilience sector to help promote refugee self-reliance, especially through agricultural interventions. Such cross-sector coordination is fundamental to design programmes that help refugees access markets, sell off surplus produce and, as a result diversify their diet and meet other needs (e.g. through Purchase for Progress programs).

Additional food security and nutrition and market assessments are needed to help inform food assistance programming and link market support to food and cash-based interventions.

With over 1.5 million refugees likely to be in need of food assistance by 2020, it is of paramount importance to ensure a healthy food pipeline throughout the RRP period in order to reduce the risk of malnutrition among refugees and their reliance on negative coping mechanisms to secure food.

## HEALTH & NUTRITION

In view of achieving provision of integrated health services and equitable access for both refugee and host communities, there is an urgent need to strengthen the health care system at national, district and local level through investments and measures that enhance its capacity to respond to current needs and future shocks.

With an increasing refugee population and anticipated refugee influxes through to 2020, the capacity and resources of primary healthcare institutions remain at a constant risk of being overstretched. In particular, refugees living in

urban areas and outside the settlements access government health facilities that have not planned for additional patient caseload, leading to increased workload on health workers, frequent shortage of medicines and out-of-pocket medication expenditures by both refugee and host communities during stock-out periods<sup>21</sup>.

The 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA revealed that 51 percent of refugee and 17 percent of host community households were categorized as people in need in the health sector, with refugee households ranking as high as 64 percent in Mid West (hosting DRC and South Sudan refugees), 57 percent in South West (hosting DRC and Burundian refugees) and 49 percent in West Nile (hosting South Sudan refugees).

At a district level, 71 percent of refugee household classified as “in need” in Kamwenge (hosting DRC refugees), 69 percent in Kyegegwa (hosting DRC refugees), 61 percent in Yumbe (hosting South Sudan refugees) and 56 percent in Arua and Hoima (hosting respectively South Sudan and DRC refugees). The most vulnerable refugee households in need of health services (57 percent) were found in Kiryandongo (hosting South Sudan refugees).

Both refugee (55 percent) and host community households (44 percent) reported lack of drugs at health facilities as the biggest challenge in accessing health services for those who sought treatment but were unable to receive it, with the highest percentage in West Nile (56 percent). Cost of medicines was also reported as a barrier to access health services for refugee (20 percent) and host community households (34 percent), with the highest percentage for refugee households in South West (36 percent) and West Nile for host community households (37 percent).

Uganda’s current existing health care system consists of 100 service delivery points, of which only 63 percent are permanent, 64 percent are government-accredited and 56 percent require upgrading<sup>22</sup>. According to 2017 Health Information System (HIS) data, the number of consultation per clinician a day is 68 in settlements hosting Burundian refugees, 57 in settlements hosting DRC refugees and 50 in those hosting South Sudan refugees. There is a need to set up new additional health facilities in line with the government guidelines and enable them to deliver the full package of health interventions as per the universal health access package. This requires investments for staffing, medical and nutrition supplies, infrastructure, equipment, referral services as well as skills training of existing medical personnel.

There is a need to strengthen reproductive health services across the refugee response to increase the number of deliveries attended by skilled health workers. As of June 2018, 92 maternal deaths were reported in average every 100,000 live births, with 97 percent of deliveries attended by skilled personnel in settlements hosting Burundi refugees, 96 percent in settlements hosting DRC refugees and 94 percent in those hosting South Sudan refugees.

There is need to expand family planning, adolescent sexual and reproductive health (ASRH), cervical cancer screening and comprehensive HIV/AIDS services. Currently, 14,732 refugees and host community members living with HIV/AIDS are receiving anti-retroviral treatment (ART), of which 35 percent are refugees and 65 percent local

21 MoH HSIRRP, 2018.

22 MoH HSIRRP, 2018.

Ugandans. The need for HIV/AIDS prevention and response interventions is extensive, given poor knowledge and awareness about HIV, sociocultural factors of HIV/AIDS-related stigma, inadequate provision and low uptake of HIV prevention and treatment services.

Refugee-producing countries neighbouring Uganda and refugee-hosting areas inside Uganda are vulnerable to communicable disease outbreaks due to cross border movement, congestion, inadequate sanitation and geographic location of settlements. As part of the preparedness and response to cholera, meningitis and measles outbreaks and risk of Ebola, there is a need to strengthen infection prevention and control, strengthen surveillance, stock essential drugs and improve the capacity of health care providers to effectively respond to potential disease outbreaks, especially at district and local level. More efforts are needed to improve health facilities serving refugees and to facilitate their accreditation by the Ministry of Health.

According to the 2017 Food Security and Nutrition Assessment (FSNA), the prevalence of Acute Global Malnutrition (GAM) remained at within the acceptable standard in settlements hosting refugees from South Sudan (10 percent), DRC (4 percent) and Burundi (4 percent), with Palabek settlement recording the highest rate (12.4 percent). However, a nutrition screening of Congolese new arrivals in 2018 through Mid-Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC) measurements showed that both GAM and Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) were above emergency thresholds, at 11.2 percent and 2.5 percent respectively.

As per WHO classification, anaemia among children aged 6-59 months was 'high' in most refugee settlements across Uganda, with Nakivale, Oruchinga and Kampala classified as 'medium'. Anemia among non-pregnant women aged 15-49 years was 'medium' in all settlements but Palabek, which ranked 'high' at 47 percent.



Against this backdrop, more efforts are needed to enhance targeted supplementary feeding programme, skills training for health workers in Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) practices in emergencies and expand use of a newly introduced vaccine in the routine immunization. Preventive approaches to address acute malnutrition and micronutrient deficiencies are needed to complement the existing curative measures.

## LIVELIHOODS & RESILIENCE

Despite Uganda's progressive approach to refugee management, refugees living in settlements and their host communities remain vulnerable and at risk of recurring shocks. At least 80 percent of refugees in Uganda live below the international poverty line of US\$ 1.9 per day<sup>23</sup>. According to the 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA, 26 percent of refugee households reported relying on humanitarian aid as a coping strategy to support family members in the 30 days prior to data collection.

The alarming rate of dependency of refugees in Nakivale settlement (67 percent) highlights the risk for refugees to become dependent on humanitarian assistance if interventions do not adequately focus on sustainable and resilient livelihoods going forward. FAO's Resilience Index Measurement Analysis (RIMA) found that refugee households are less resilient than host community households due to low education levels, poor diversification of income sources, limited number of crops cultivated and productive assets<sup>24</sup>. Moreover, the recent vulnerability study found that the time refugees have spent in Uganda is not closely correlated with levels of vulnerability<sup>25</sup>.

The joint inter-agency MSNA<sup>26</sup> found that 51 percent of refugee and 14 percent of host community households are in need of livelihood support, with the highest percentage among refugee households in West Nile (55 percent). At district level, the greatest needs for livelihood support among refugee households are in Moyo (65 percent), Yumbe (60 percent), Arua (57 percent) and Kyegegwa (53 percent).

Regarding the application of livelihood coping strategies<sup>27</sup>, refugees from the DRC and Burundi reported sales of more animals (non-productive than usual) as well as reduced essential non-food expenditures such as education and health. Kyangwali settlement recorded the highest percentage (25.2 percent) of consumption of seed stock held for next season as their livelihood coping strategy.

Ninety-seven percent of host communities and 95 percent of refugees in northern Uganda reported to be engaged in crop production, while only 45 percent of host communities and 22 percent of refugees sell part of their produce<sup>28</sup>. Agriculture is the most commonly reported source of livelihoods for refugee (38 percent) and host community (84 percent) households in the 30 days prior to data collection. However, across refugee-hosting districts agriculture is characterized by low production and productivity, high vulnerability to climate change and high post-harvest losses<sup>29</sup>.

23 FAO and OPM. Food Security, Resilience and Well-being Analysis of Refugees and Host Communities in Northern Uganda. (2018) Rome. pg. 15.

24 Idem, pg. 4.

25 WFP, UNHCR and OPM. 2017. Analysis of Refugee Vulnerability in Uganda, pg.14

26 UNHCR/REACH Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessment, 2018.

27 UNICEF, UNHCR, WFP and MoH. 2017. Food Security and Nutrition Assessment in Refugee Settlements, pg. 85

28 FAO and OPM, pg. 13.

29 WFP, UNHCR and OPM. 2017. Analysis of Refugee Vulnerability in Uganda

The joint inter-agency MSNA found that 70 percent of refugee and 91 percent of host community households had access to agricultural land in the most recent planting and harvesting season. However, 75 percent of refugee households in West Nile, 69 percent in South West and 60 percent in Mid West reported that land was insufficient to produce food for the entire households.

Out of households who reported having access to agricultural land, 39 percent of refugee and 54 percent of host community households cited lack of seeds as the main reason for being unable to cultivate, followed by lack of tools (33 percent for refugee and 38 percent for host community households). Further, crop diseases such as the cassava mosaic disease, and infestations such as the Fall Armyworm present additional challenges to food security and income generation, as does the lack of adequate animal health services.

For non-farm livelihoods, limited business support services, micro-credit and vocational skills training opportunities are key barriers to earning an income outside of agriculture. Only 2 percent of refugee households have managed to obtain salaried employment.<sup>30</sup> Overall, 13 percent of refugees aged 15 years and above are classified as self-employed and one in five households (20 percent) has at least one household member engaged in informal trade and services. However, most employment options offer low wages. Lack of documentation showing education and skills, language and lack of social networks represent key barriers to gaining employment for refugees<sup>31</sup>.

To stabilize livelihood and overcome the socio-economic empowerment disconnect, geographic and population differences need to be considered in the provision of livelihood support. When exploring different livelihood strategies, key factors linked to productive assets, knowledge, skills and aspirations need to further be considered as do market linkages and opportunities.

## SHELTER, SETTLEMENT AND NFIS

About 217,000 new refugee arrivals expected through to 2020 will need household NFIs and emergency shelter support, as well as accommodation on shelter and agriculture plots in settlements. The modality for NFI deliveries may transition from in-kind kits to cash-based support, depending on the market economies and other context-specific parameters.

In order to facilitate the smooth relocation of new refugee arrivals from border entry points through to household shelter plots, the existing transit and reception centres will need ongoing construction maintenance, repairs, potential expansion and installation of energy-saving stoves.

The existing refugee settlements require detailed plot mapping, led by the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development (MLHUD) and OPM, with involvement of Sub-County Area Land Committees (ALCs), in order to produce cadastral survey plans that are aligned with the local area physical development plans. These blueprints will inform the spatial redesign process, where necessary, to maximise sustainable land use, protect environmentally sensitive areas and improve livelihood opportunities for both refugees and hosts.

<sup>30</sup> Idem, pg 7

<sup>31</sup> WFP, UNHCR and OPM. 2017. Analysis of Refugee Vulnerability in Uganda, pg.13

The allocation of productive land for agriculture is essential to promoting resilient incomes and self-sustaining food security. To ensure a harmonised approach, any new settlement should be planned and mapped in accordance with the same land use management principles.

The 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA results revealed that, on average, 21 percent of refugee and 33 percent of host community households do not have access to a market within walking distance. Furthermore, 38 percent of refugee and 50 percent of host community households reported facing problems accessing markets to buy or sell agricultural products or livestock in the last 30 days prior to the survey<sup>32</sup>. While recognising that ‘refugees’ integration into the local economy is a long-term process<sup>33</sup>, it is essential that settlement planning urgently take into account measures to address these physical limitations, including by allocating strategic locations for new marketplaces and creating or upgrading access routes to existing markets.

In some refugee settlements in the West Nile, there is a need to focus on the continued relocation of refugees from flood-prone areas to higher ground, in coordination with OPM and negotiation with local land owners. This reality is reflected in the joint inter-agency MSNA results where Koboko and Lamwo districts recorded the highest percentage of refugee households reporting flooding, 54 percent and 42 percent respectively.

The extensive road infrastructure within all refugee settlements will require ongoing maintenance and upgrades to increase their all-year durability through wet seasons. Investments in road networks improvements have the potential to create jobs for both refugees and host communities through a cash-for-work scheme.

Gaps in solar street light coverage and institutional rainwater harvesting will need to be addressed so as to increase settlement security and provide more water for production.

Since mid-2016, no countrywide in-depth shelter or NFI needs assessments have been conducted in the refugee settlements. Furthermore, there is no detailed database on shelter conditions per population or per settlement, nor is it known the total numbers that require urgent repairs or semi-permanent upgrades.

Nonetheless, the 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA is able to provide an approximate indication of broad sector concerns that necessitate further investigation and analysis. A total of 73 percent of all refugee households surveyed claimed that their shelter is prone to leaking when it rains. In addition, South Sudanese refugees in the West Nile reported to possess fewer NFIs per household in comparison to the Congolese and Burundians in the Southwest. A door-to-door household NFI survey in all settlements would be key to provide a deeper understanding of unmet NFI needs across the operation – to be followed by a targeted distribution of missing items. It is a priority for the sector to gather baseline information and data in order to ascertain individual needs and to prioritize targeted shelter/NFI interventions.

32 UNHCR/REACH Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessment, 2018.

33 FAO, Food security, resilience and well-being analysis of refugees and host communities in Northern Uganda,” Resilience Analysis Report No. 12, 2018.

Despite a lack of comprehensive data, it is evident that all refugee population groups continue to live in emergency shelters longer than advisable and many PSN families are yet to receive labour support to upgrade to semi-permanent construction. In Bidibidi settlement alone, partners had not reached even 10 percent of vulnerable South Sudanese refugees with shelter needs as of August 2018<sup>34</sup>.

The sector will seek to uphold a fair and consistent approach to the design and implementation of semi-permanent shelters, incorporating the most environmentally-friendly and contextually-appropriate materials to the extent possible. More efforts are needed for shelter partners to adhere to inter-agency minimum standards such as termite protection for timber or bamboo and the overall shelter dimensions, and to strengthen coordination with the WASH, Energy and Environment, and Livelihoods and Resilience sectors in order to achieve a holistic approach to refugee protection and management.

## WASH

On average, access to water in refugee hosting sub-counties stood at 16 litres per person per day (l/p/d) as of June 2018, with 18.7 l/p/d and 17.5 l/p/d for South Sudan refugees and their hosts respectively. In settlements hosting refugees from the DRC and Burundi, water supply ranged from below 10 to 15 l/p/d for both refugees and host communities.

Most water infrastructure developed in the settlements is temporary, with technical and financial feasibility limitations. Unit cost of supplying water is high due to operational inefficiencies coupled with reliance on costly water trucking to fill a 12 percent gap in the daily water demand in the settlements.

Provision of water has largely focused on water demand for domestic use, although refugees continued to resort to domestic water supply for brick production and to mud plaster their homes. In 2017, the construction of valley tanks in Kyaka II and Rwamwanja settlements was an attempt to provide water supply for productive uses, but huge inadequacies have compromised the success of these initiatives.

There is complete lack of integrated water resource management, with developments in the settlements often failing to consider the larger catchment area for planning and programming. The environment is heavily impacted by over-reliance on groundwater without monitoring behaviour of benevolent aquifers in most refugee-hosting districts, absence of deliberate catchment conservation and rehabilitation initiatives.

According to the 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA, 79 percent of refugee and host community households own a single family latrine, with over 55 percent of refugee households reporting child males and females as unable to access the latrine due to their young age.

In settlements hosting South Sudanese refugees, unavailability of materials for construction of family latrines coupled with low levels of community participation have delayed transition from communal to family latrines. In settlements hosting refugees from the DRC and Burundi, instances of hard ground conditions and waterlogged areas are

<sup>34</sup> As of August 2018, UNHCR Protection team estimate approx. 15,000 PSNs in Bidibidi, out of a total population of 287,800 people.

aggravating factors in low-level family latrine coverage among vulnerable families. In general, the life span of ordinary family latrines is shorter than optimal due to the inadequate provision of construction materials. While 3,017 communal latrines exist in public spaces, 35 percent of schools, markets, food distribution centres and health facilities still lack institutional latrines.

Across the entire refugee response there are only three faecal sludge treatment units and no vacuum truck to adequately manage excreta disposal. Solid waste at household level is rudimentarily treated as soil conditioner while markets and communal areas lack an organized management system to segregate, collect, dispose and/or reuse waste. Efforts to convert sanitation wastes into value are very limited and include biogas pilots and briquette making.

The lack of a harmonized and context-specific behaviour change communication strategy for hygiene awareness initiatives continued to slow down adoption of positive hygiene practise among refugees. This is further worsened by limited provision of hygiene supplies, with 48 percent of refugee households reporting lack of soap during the joint inter-agency MSNA. Of them, 58 percent cited financial constraints as a reason for lacking soap, with the highest percentage in Mid West (79 percent) and South West (69 percent).

Awareness on handwashing appears to be relatively high among refugee households as per the 2018 joint inter-agency MSNA, with 77 percent reporting washing their hands after defecating, 76 percent before eating and 56 percent when hands are dirty. However, more efforts are needed to improve hygiene related to food preparation and child feeding. According to the joint inter-agency MSNA, only 37 percent of refugee households reported washing hands before cooking and 16 percent before child feeding and after cleaning a baby.

There is a need to harmonize approaches in the implementation of WASH programmes in the settlements and refugee-hosting districts. Service delivery modalities in the settlements are structured around humanitarian principles and do not take into account tariff policy or transition plans for operation and maintenance. It is essential that WASH initiatives are in line and coordinated with District Development Plans (DDPs) and Catchment Managements Plans (CMPs). There is also a need for a shared knowledge management platform to help partners deliver services in line with government frameworks and priorities. Enforcement of statutory policies and regulations from Ministry of Water and Environment remains weak.

## Response Strategy & Priorities

The Uganda 2019-2020 RRP serves as the joint strategy setting, needs assessment and resource mobilisation tool for all UN and NGO partners of the refugee response.

The Uganda RRP is consistent with the following national and international frameworks:

- The Constitution of Uganda;
- The Uganda Refugee Act and Regulations;

- The 1951 Refugee Convention, and the 1969 OAU Refugee Convention;
- IGAD regional declarations on refugee matters.

## Strategic objectives

Under the leadership and coordination of the Government, the Uganda 2019-2020 RRP aims at achieving the following objectives, in line with the Uganda Multi-Year Multi-Partner Protection and Solutions Strategy (2016 -2020):

**Strategic objective 1:** Through to 2020, Uganda's asylum space is maintained, equal and unhindered access to territory is preserved and the government's emergency preparedness and response capacity is progressively strengthened.

**Strategic objective 2:** The Government of Uganda owns protection processes that promote the full enjoyment of rights, and international protection standards throughout the displacement cycle are efficient and fair.

**Strategic objective 3:** By 2020, the refugee response paradigm in Uganda has progressively shifted from care and maintenance to inclusion and self-reliance through development of individual capacities and the promotion of a conducive environment for livelihoods opportunities.

**Strategic objective 4:** By 2020, refugees progressively benefit from provision of inclusive basic social services, including health, education, child protection, water and sanitation, provided by national authorities in refugee hosting districts.

**Strategic objective 5:** By 2020, refugees are well on their path to access durable solutions. They are either able to return voluntarily to their countries of origin, or have found third country solutions, or start attaining socio-economic opportunities similar to hosting communities in Uganda, including ability to exercise their full range of rights.

## Priority outcomes

Partners and sectors will be guided by the following priority outcomes for planning and programming – which will also serve as criteria for prioritization in case of austerity and severe under-funding.

- **Refugee protection:** All newly arriving refugees and asylum seekers in Uganda will have access to territory and protection, including strengthened refugee status determination processes, biometric registration and documentation. The Uganda model, including the non-encampment policy, freedom of movement and right to work for refugees, will continue to provide a dignified refugee protection environment. Across all sectors, refugees must be assisted with respect to age, gender and diversity considerations, catering for

specific needs. Protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) must be ensured, and there is zero tolerance in the refugee response towards this. An inter-agency Feedback, Referral, and Resolution Mechanism will be accessible to all refugees and host communities. Prevention and response to SGBV and child protection constitute major cross-cutting protection outcomes.

- **Emergency response:** All newly arriving refugees and asylum seekers in Uganda will benefit from life-saving basic needs assistance interventions. This includes prioritization of operations supporting their initial installation in refugee settlements and/or in urban areas. Preparedness for higher than anticipated refugee influxes, and preparedness for related health emergency risks such as cholera or Ebola for example, remain priorities.
- **Education:** In a situation where primary and secondary facilities and resources lag far behind the overall need, and many education indicators are still in red, education must be prioritised. Education lays the foundation for the future prosperity and development of refugee (in asylum or upon their voluntary return home when possible) and Ugandan hosting communities. Education interventions support a set of related outcomes, such as child protection, prevention of SGBV, social cohesion and livelihoods, and therefore have a strong multiplier effect.
- **Environment:** Hosting communities, field monitoring, and expert studies have identified environmental protection and restoration as a priority, and environmental degradation at significant scale as a threat. The rapid growth of the refugee population in Uganda has led to a surge in demand for natural resources, including wood fuel, construction material, land for agriculture and groundwater along with an increase in waste production (e.g. faecal sludge, solid waste). The most visible and immediate impact is loss of forest cover and vegetation in refugee-hosting areas. Across all sectors, these effects need to be prevented and mitigated, for example through the use of alternative energy solutions for cooking fuel, and increased re/afforestation measures, among others. This issue could negatively affect social cohesion and peaceful co-existence between refugees and hosting communities.
- **Livelihoods:** With the understanding that the RRP focusses on the immediate and transition phase of assisting refugees, desired priority outcomes are the improvement of livelihoods and access to short-term opportunities for refugees and hosting populations, especially in areas such as agricultural production, afforestation measures, and labour intensive public works. The aim is not necessarily to achieve sustainability, which is not a realistic outcome for an RRP, but an injection of short-term immediate livelihood opportunities. The outcome, benefiting both refugees and host community members, will have a multiplier effect on other desired outcomes, such as food security, social cohesion, reduction of aid dependency, and productive engagement of the youth.
- **Urban refugees:** As the Uganda refugee model allows for freedom of movement of refugees, some have chosen to reside in urban areas rather than settlements, while others commute between settlements and urban areas. While the situation of refugees in Kampala is well understood, this is not the case for



refugees in other towns and cities of Uganda. The 2019-2020 RRP will prioritize better assessments of refugees in urban areas, more engagement with municipal actors, and enhanced support to refugees and hosting communities in these areas, resources permitting.

#### PRIORITY MODALITIES

Across all sectors, to achieve the above strategic objectives and priority outcomes, the following modalities will take priority:

1. **Labour-intensive activities:** As feasible and appropriate, opportunities for labour intensive works for larger numbers of unskilled, and skilled, refugees and host community members should be prioritized, over short and longer term. Among others, this may include public works, environmental restoration, community outreach, and stimulation of agricultural production, including value chain creation.
2. **Cash-based interventions and connectivity:** Market feasibility permitting, opportunities to transform in-kind assistance to cash-based assistance should be seized. The injection of cash, through unconditional multi-purpose, and conditional cash-based interventions will have multiplier effects on food security, social cohesion, reduction of aid dependency, and productive engagement of the youth, among others. The development of the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) tool will ultimately support the cost efficiency and cost effectiveness, and pave the way for coherent multi-purpose cash programming and delivery. The establishment of a common platform for cash transfers will be pursued.

Partners will develop deeper partnerships with the private sector, such as financial service providers, mobile network operators, and other connectivity actors. This will result in an improvement of the necessary infrastructure for data delivery from cell towers to devices. In addition to helping increase refugees' access to financial services, connectivity and related interventions will serve the entire response, for example for biometric registration and verification systems, communication with communities, access to information and adoption of innovative digital tools and solutions that have positive impact on protection outcomes.

Activities will leverage the skills and capacities of communities to engage in and support a connected environment. Enhanced connectivity will also cover Ugandan hosting populations, supporting an inclusive approach.

**3. Capacity building for Government service providers and local actors:** To achieve integrated social service delivery, the capacity of district authorities and line Ministries is a pre-requisite. The humanitarian response should gradually move away from parallel service provision and seize every opportunity to involve districts and line Ministries. The capacity of national NGOs will be further strengthened. As far as possible, national NGOs should be given greater responsibilities.

**4. Conflict-sensitive programming:** Interventions across all sectors must be sensitive to drivers of conflict and tensions, as to ensure that they not only achieve their desired outcomes, but also contribute to social cohesion among refugee communities, and between refugees and host communities. Interventions must de-escalate, and not trigger additional tensions. Meaningful consultations with communities on programme/project design are essential.

Across the response, the need for joint and coordinated assessments and in-depth thematic studies remains crucial to ensure a better understanding of the needs of refugee and host communities, to identify gaps in the response and draw attention to issues requiring strategy adjustments and innovation.

## MONITORING AND OVERSIGHT

Building on ongoing initiatives, an enhanced monitoring framework will be established to assess the performance of this RRP and to ensure progress against the targets set by partners at the start of the planning process.

Sector Co-leads, UNHCR and OPM will regularly reach out to RRP partners to gather information and data for RRP progress reports, including through sector activity mapping matrices (5Ws). Systematic progress reporting against the indicators in the RRP results framework will be a requirement for all partners.

RRP partners also have an obligation to participate to existing coordination mechanisms at national, district and local level to help improve service delivery and address operational challenges. Partners are also required to regularly report on funding received against this plan as to demonstrate their contribution to the Uganda refugee model, and to support advocacy and resource mobilization.

The ultimate goal of deploying a robust monitoring framework is ensuring transparency and accountability, avoiding duplications and re-adjusting the response when inefficiencies and gaps are identified.

## Strengthening livelihoods and resilience

Whilst being mainly a humanitarian plan, this RRP also includes a transition element towards sustainable refugee response programming in Uganda. As such, this plan contributes to achieving the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) in Uganda, alongside interventions carried out by Government institutions within the framework of the National Development Plan (NDP II) and of Government-led sector transition plans for refugee-hosting areas, supported by multilateral and bilateral development partners.

The scope of the 2019-20 Uganda RRP includes refugee protection and assistance for new refugee arrivals and long-term refugees, as well as resilience programming for refugees and hosting communities. Resilience interventions take place at three levels:

- 1) individual or household level;
- 2) community level; and
- 3) system level.

The focus of resilience interventions in this RRP is on supporting national systems to achieve integrated social service delivery for both refugees and hosting communities.

Government sector response plans for refugee hosting areas will provide the planning and programming framework to respond to the needs of refugee and host communities in those sectors, including Education, Health & Nutrition, and WASH. At the time of developing this RRP, the Education Response Plan was the first government sector plan of this kind already launched and the Jobs and Livelihoods Response Plan was underway.

## Partnership & Coordination

OPM provides the over-arching policy and coordination framework of the refugee response in Uganda, with CRRF serving as a whole-of-society approach to pursue and achieve an all-inclusive response. Operational coordination takes place within the framework of a refugee coordination structure dedicated specifically to refugee-hosting areas:

1. Leadership level: co-led by the Uganda Government (OPM), and UNHCR;
2. Inter-agency, country level (UN and development partner operational focal points, NGO country directors): co-led by the Uganda Government (OPM and MoLG) and UNHCR;
3. Technical sector level: co-led by Government, UN and NGO partners for each sector;
4. District/settlement level (inter-agency and sector structures): OPM, DLGs, and UNHCR co-chair.

Under the overall leadership of OPM, the role of line Ministries and district authorities in the coordination of the refugee response will be further strengthened in 2019-2020. Sector working groups of the refugee response will



align with Government sector groups under the National Development Plan (NDP). The refugee Education, Health and WASH sector working groups have already piloted this approach and are co-chaired by line Ministries. This will ensure that refugees and refugee-hosting areas are increasingly integrated in the NDP.

The refugee response in Uganda is delivered by a total of 107 partners, including 21 national NGOs (NNGO), 73 international NGOs (INGO), 11 UN agencies, and 2 bilateral development partners (only those participating in the refugee response operational coordination and the RRP are listed here, but there also other development partners supporting refugee-hosting areas).

### THE SOUTH SUDAN REFUGEE RESPONSE IS DELIVERED BY 97 PARTNERS:

#### National NGO: 16

Care and Assistance for Forced Migrants (CAFOMI), Caritas Uganda (CU), Community Empowerment for Rural Development (CEFORD), Community Technology Empowerment Network (CTEN), Drop in the Basket (DiB), Humane Africa Mission (HAM), Humanitarian Assistance and Development Services (HADS), Infectious Disease Institute (IDI), Kabarole Research and Resource Centre (KRC), Reproductive Health Uganda (RHU), Rural Initiative for Community Empowerment in West Nile (RICE-WN), The Uganda National Apiculture Development Organization (Tunado), Transcultural Psychosocial Organization (TPO), Uganda Law Society (ULS), Uganda Red Cross Society (URCS), Uganda Refugee Disaster and Management Council (URDMC).

#### International NGO: 69

A-Z Children's Charity, Action Africa Help (AAH), Action Against Hunger (ACF), Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA), African Initiatives for Relief and Development (AIRD), African Medical and Research Foundation (AMREF), African Women and Youth Action for Development (AWYAD), Agency for Accelerated Regional Development (AFARD), Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD), Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED), American Refugee Committee (ARC), Andre Foods International (AFI), Association for Aid and Relief Japan (AARJ), Association of Volunteers in International Service (AVSI), Associazione Centro Aiuti Volontari (ACAV), Building Resources Across Communities (BRAC), CARE, Catholic Organisation for Relief and Development Aid (CORDAID), Catholic Relief Service (CRS), Child Voices International, Concern World Wide (CWW), Cooperazione e Sviluppo (CESVI), DanChurchAid (DCA), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Doctors with Africa (CUAMM), Finn Church Aid (FCA), Food for the Hungry (FH), Give Directly, Global Aim, Global Refugee International (GRI), Healing Kadi Foundation, Help Age International, Humanitarian Initiative Just Relief Aid (HIJRA), Humanity&Inclusion (HI), IMPACT, Inter-church Organization for Development Cooperation (ICCO Cooperation), International Aid Services (IAS), International Center for Research in Agro Forestry (ICRAF), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), International Rescue Committee (IRC), IsraAid, Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS), Johanniter, Lutheran World Federation (LWF), Lutheran World Relief (LWR), Malteser International (MI), Medical Teams International (MTI), Mercy Corps (MC), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), OXFAM, Peace Winds Japan (PWJ), Peter C. Alderman Foundation (PCAF), Plan International (PI), Real Medicine Foundation (RMF), Right to Play (RtP), Salvation Army, Samaritan's Purse (SP), Save the Children International (SCI), Self Help Africa (SHA), Trocaire, Tutapona Trauma

Rehabilitation (TTR), War Child Canada (WCC), War Child Holland (WCH), Water Mission Uganda (WMU), Welthungerhilfe (WHH), Windle International Uganda (WIU), World Vision International (WVI), Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), ZOA.

#### UN: 10

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UNWOMEN), United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Migration Agency (IOM), United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations World Food Programme (WFP), United Nations World Health Organization (WHO).

#### Bilateral development partners: 2

Belgian Development Agency (ENABEL), German International Cooperation (GIZ)

### THE DRC (AND OTHER NATIONALITIES) REFUGEE RESPONSE IS DELIVERED BY 61 PARTNERS:

#### National NGO: 11

Baylor, Care and Assistance for Forced Migrants (CAFOMI), Friends of Kisoro, Humane Africa Mission (HAM), Humanitarian Assistance and Development Services (HADS), InterAid, Kabarole Research and Resource Centre (KRC), Nsamizi Training Institute of Social Development (NSAMIZI), Programme for Accessible health, Communication and Education (PACE), Uganda Law Society (ULS), Uganda Red Cross Society (URCS).

#### International NGO: 41

Action Africa Help (AAH), Action Against Hunger (ACF), Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA), Africa Humanitarian Action (AHA), African Initiatives for Relief and Development (AIRD), African Women and Youth Action for Development (AWYAD), Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD), Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED), American Refugee Committee (ARC), Association for Aid and Relief Japan (AARJ), Association of Volunteers in International Service (AVSI), Building Resources Across Communities (BRAC), CARE, Catholic Organisation for Relief and Development Aid (CORDAID), Catholic Relief Service (CRS), Concern World Wide (CWW), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Finn Church Aid (FCA), Finnish Refugee Council (FRC), Food for the Hungry (FH), Give Directly, Help Age International, Humanitarian Initiative Just Relief Aid (HIJRA), Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team (HOT), IMPACT, International Aid Services (IAS), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), International Rescue Committee (IRC), Johanniter, Lutheran World Federation (LWF), Lutheran World Relief (LWR), Medical Teams International (MTI), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), OXFAM, Regional Health Integration to Enhance Services in Eastern Uganda (RHITES), Samaritan's Purse (SP), Save the Children International (SCI), Tutapona Trauma Rehabilitation (TTR), War Child Holland (WCH), Windle International Uganda (WIU), World Vision International (WVI).

**UN: 9**

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Migration Agency (IOM), United Nations Populations Fund (UNFPA), United Nations World Food Programme (WFP), United Nations World Health Organization (WHO).

**THE BURUNDI REFUGEE RESPONSE IS DELIVERED BY 29 PARTNERS:**

**National NGO: 5**

Care and Assistance for Forced Migrants (CAFOMI), Friends of Kisoro, Nsamizi Training Institute of Social Development (NSAMIZI), Programme for Accessible health, Communication and Education (PACE), Uganda Red Cross Society (URCS).

**International NGO: 18**

Africa Humanitarian Action (AHA), African Initiatives for Relief and Development (AIRD), American Refugee Committee (ARC), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Finnish Refugee Council (FRC), Food for the Hungry (FH), Humanitarian Initiative Just Relief Aid (HIJRA), IMPACT, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), International Rescue Committee (IRC), Medical Teams International (MTI), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), OXFAM, Regional Health Integration to Enhance Services in Eastern Uganda (RHITES), Samaritan's Purse (SP), Save the Children International (SCI), Tutapona Trauma Rehabilitation (TTR), Windle International Uganda (WIU).

**UN: 6**

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Migration Agency (IOM), United Nations Populations Fund (UNFPA), United Nations World Food Programme (WFP).





# Planned Response for 2019 & 2020

Sector strategies are guided by the overall strategy and operational priorities, laying out the approach and measures that the sectors envisage to address identified needs, with a focus on priority needs. In sectors with existing government response plans (Education, Health, and Water), the response and priorities are aligned to those plans.

## Protection

The overall Protection objective is to ensure that refugees and asylum-seekers have access to territorial asylum and fair and swift asylum procedures, and fully enjoy their rights as set forth in international and domestic refugees laws, including documentation, freedom of movement, right to work and access to services. Efforts will be put towards supporting and strengthening Government's institutional capacity for emergency response and improving registration and efficiency in the asylum system whilst continuing provision of life-saving services, monitoring and mitigation of protection risks.

Partners will endeavour to ensure that the protection and solutions strategy is people-centred and follows an age, gender and diversity approach, engaging women, men, girls and boys in designing and delivering programmes. Comprehensive feedback and referral mechanisms will be strengthened to ensure accountability to affected populations – a fundamental principle underpinning the entire refugee response. The response will ensure that persons with specific needs have equal access to protection and assistance and have the opportunity to participate in community self-management and decision-making.

Reinforcing psychosocial services and infrastructure in refugee-hosting areas remains a key priority, including identification of individuals carrying trauma, provision of individual and group counselling and follow-up.

Partners will increase efforts and interventions aiming at fostering peaceful coexistence among communities (between refugees and hosts and between refugees of different ethnic background), including community dialogue, advocacy and awareness campaigns highlighting the positive impact of refugee presence on the local economy.

### Child Protection

Child Protection partners will continue to strengthen the case management system through emphasis on case prioritization and workforce skills development. The child protection module of proGres v4 will be rolled-out to enhance case management, improve collaboration and data collection. This will include adoption of inter-agency Standard Operating Procedures and Information Sharing Protocols.

Focus will remain on improving the placement of unaccompanied children in alternative care, including training of foster parents and provision of livelihood support. Efforts will be made to further align alternative care procedures for refugees with national alternative care policies. Given the limited capacity of the child protection workforce, community-based child protection structures will be strengthened through training, ongoing mentoring and provided with support to effectively follow-up and monitor children placed in alternative care and other children with protection concerns to ensure early identification and mitigation of further protection risks.

Psychosocial support for children in refugee and host communities will be provided, including in Child Friendly Spaces. Structured psychosocial interventions will focus on strengthening children's resilience and their capacities to protect themselves. Provision of support for post-primary education, vocational skills training and other targeted interventions for refugee and host community adolescents and youths will be strengthened to reduce their susceptibility to various protection risks, including teenage pregnancy, early marriage and drugs dealing. The capacity of the social welfare workforce at sub-national level will be strengthened through recruitment, advocacy for deployment of staff, and training of these on child protection.

### SGBV

Awareness activities will be strengthened to increase understanding of SGBV, Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA), human trafficking and existing mechanisms to report such these incidents. Simplified referral pathways will be developed and widely distributed to increase understanding of reporting mechanisms, while basic assistance for vulnerable individuals will continue with a view to reduce reliance on negative coping mechanisms and exposure to SGBV risk.

Youth will be specifically targeted with information and recreational activities. Promoting engagement of men and boys in the development and implementation of any SGBV strategy remains key in pursuing transformational behaviour change, including through increased use of the Start, Awareness, Support, Action (SASA) methodology to address the power imbalance between men and women.

Investment in infrastructure and assets is essential in preventing and responding to SGBV, including installation of security lights in common areas, establishment of safe spaces and wellness centres for women, psychosocial, medical and legal supports for SGBV survivors, and procurement of additional vehicles and motorcycles to enhance police mobility on patrol and outreach. Capacity building of service providers will be key to ensure provision of quality and effective services to SGBV survivors.

A national plan of action will be implemented in 2019-2020 to ensure SGBV prevention and response is mainstreamed across all sectors. Linkages with the Livelihood & Resilience sector are of particular importance, both in terms of prevention (economic empowerment of men and women) and response (livelihood support for SGBVs survivors).

### OBJECTIVES

1. Registration conducted on an individual basis with minimum set of data required

2. Adequate and quality child protection services for children, including case management services, are provided in refugee and host communities
3. Effective and safe child protection systems that prevent and respond to child protection concerns in refugee and host communities are strengthened
4. Protection of and accountability to all refugees are strengthened through meaningful engagement with communities, with particular attention to at-risk groups
5. Peaceful co-existence among communities strengthened
6. Protection systems are strengthened and refugees women and girls are aware of the existing referral pathways with the aim of ensuring their full enjoyment of rights, reduction of SGBV risks and reinforced multi-sectoral response including through mainstreaming of SGBV across all sectors
7. Physical safety, access to justice, rule of law and civilian character of the refugee settlements is assured and protection of human rights promoted in refugee settings

## Education

The main objectives of the 2019-2020 Education Sector strategy, in alignment with the Education Response Plan for Refugees and Host Communities in Uganda (ERP), is to provide refugee and host community girls and boys with equitable and inclusive access to a quality education and to strengthen systems at the national, district and community levels. This strategy has been designed to enable those who are out of school to return to schools and those who are in school and at risk of dropping out to continue their learning.

To bring more learners into education and ensure quality of learning, the absorption capacity of the primary and secondary schools will be strengthened through setting increasing targets in the pupil:teacher ratio over the next two years, as well as promoting double shifting to address the significant overcrowding and over-enrolment in primary education. To address the challenges of teacher supply and quality, ongoing support will be provided to primary and secondary teachers and head teachers, as well as refugee teachers serving as classroom assistants. An improved pupil:teacher ratio is critical to achieving better learning outcomes. The provision of alternative learning pathways such as accelerated education programmes

will help ensure access to education for overage children, out-of school-children and youth and help them transition back to the formal system.

The sector will continue to invest in quality of teaching and learning through continuous professional development for teachers in areas such as child-centred pedagogy, psychosocial support, classroom management and lifeskills. Specifically, targeting training and support for refugee teachers will provide opportunities for skilled professionals to continue their profession following displacement. Essential materials for students will complement these efforts to ensure that children not only access school but that teaching and learning are supported.

The response will focus on strengthening engagement between district local government and Education Sector partners, including through regular education co-ordination meetings and stronger information management and sharing at settlement, district and national levels. At the community level, the capacity of school-based governance structures, such as School Management Committees, will be enhanced to help monitor quality teaching and learning at the school-level.

Supporting vulnerable children to access education will continue, particularly for adolescents and secondary school aged children as well as children with specific needs. It is also a priority that an increased number of girls enroll in primary schools, sit and pass P7 exams and subsequently enroll and complete secondary school. The provision of life skills and vocational skills training to

children and adolescents, especially those who are out of school, is critical to ensure social stability among the refugee and host communities.

Through the Education sector, partners will work toward enhancing working relationships with District Education Officers and School Management Committees/Board of Governors and Parent Teacher Associations to ensure community ownership of schools.

## OBJECTIVES

1. Equitable access and inclusive relevant learning opportunities increased
2. Delivery of quality education and training improved
3. Systems for effective delivery strengthened



## Energy & Environment

A catchment-based approach will be used to plan and implement environment and natural resource protection and restoration while promoting green livelihoods. In partnership with District Local Governments (DLGs) and Water Management Zones, environmental impact assessments, action plans and forest resource management plans will be developed for each refugee-hosting sub or micro-catchment. Site plans will designate protected buffers, wetlands and plantation zones around institutions and roadways. Boundary planting will be used to control movement of livestock. A minimum of 20 trees will be planted and maintained per refugee per year including indigenous, fruit trees and useful species to meet the needs of refugees and hosts using a cash-for-work approach. Plantations for energy will be established for each settlement.

Access to energy will be improved for cooking, lighting and productive uses. Demand for cooking fuel will be decreased by improving access to energy-saving in households and institutions, by training of trainers and artisans to fabricate energy products, including improved cookstoves and heat-retaining bags. Alternative sources of energy such as solar, briquettes and biogas will be promoted where appropriate. Energy kiosks will be supported to provide market access to quality energy products.

Energy, environment and climate-resilient interventions will be mainstreamed into each sector, especially awareness, advocacy and education. Climate-smart agriculture, agroforestry and sustainable construction value chains will be enhanced. Solar lighting will be increased through street lighting and solar lanterns in NFI kits. Health facilities and schools will benefit from solarisation and institutional stoves. Rainwater harvesting, faecal and solid waste management will be prioritized in water resource management activities.

### OBJECTIVES

1. Environment and natural resources protected and restored and green livelihoods promoted using a catchment-based approach
2. Access to sufficient and sustainable basic energy services for lighting, power and cooking increased and climate change drivers mitigated with reduced reliance on wood and fossil fuels
3. Energy, environment and climate response planning, coordination, implementation, monitoring strengthened and environmental mitigation measures mainstreamed across all sectors

## Food security

This plan envisages continuation of general food assistance for refugees to allow them to meet their immediate food and nutrition needs and sustain a minimum level of food security.

All new refugees arrivals at the border crossing points will received food assistance in the form of High Energy Biscuits (HEB), while hot meals will be served in transit and reception centres, as refugees await relocation to the

settlement. A settling-in ration will be provided when refugees move to their new plots, with subsequent monthly dry rations in the form of food or cash transfers. After completion of refugee verification in the settlements, data from UNHCR's proGres and Biometric Identity Management System (BIMS) databases will be used to verify the identity of all persons authorized to collect food assistance on behalf of beneficiary households.

Cash-based Interventions will increasingly replace in-kind food as a transfer modality in order to provide additional flexibility in the choice of locally available food commodities and to enhance local market prospects. The choice of transfer modality in selected settlements will be informed by regular market assessments, and market food price monitoring will determine the transfer value to be provided to beneficiaries. Different distribution models will be assessed to keep pace with the evolution of the financial services landscape in Uganda. Furthermore, an integrated programming approach will be pursued to strengthen the overall food system in refugee-hosting areas, including by improving retail supply chain management in local markets. The objective is to ensure that food commodities are fairly-priced and meet quality and quantity standards in the market.

Gender and protection measures as well as accountability to affected populations will be mainstreamed to ensure the food assistance is effective and responsive to the food security needs of refugees. In addition, monitoring and impact assessments will be conducted to ensure that food assistance reaches the targeted refugee households and expected food security outcomes are achieved.

## OBJECTIVES

1. Refugees have access to adequate nutritious food to meet their basic food and nutrition needs
2. Targeted food assistance provided to the most vulnerable refugee households based on assessed needs
3. Food Assistance to refugees progressively linked to livelihood and self-reliance interventions to enhance resilience





## Health & Nutrition

Overall, the strategy of the Health & Nutrition sector is to ensure full integration of comprehensive primary health care services for refugees into national and local government systems. Health partners will continue to enhance coordination and inter-sectoral collaboration; strengthen the provision of equitable, safe, quality and sustainable health services in refugee-hosting districts, both for new refugee arrivals and long-term refugees; and reinforce health systems in refugee-hosting areas.

Provision of the minimum health service package for all refugees is a key priority, with an emphasis on preventive and promotive health care for new refugee arrivals at entry points, transit and reception centers and during their initial stay in settlements. This package includes vaccination, nutrition screening, emergency referrals and provision of life-saving primary health care services, in addition to surveillance and response measures for disease outbreaks.

Nutrition programs will continue throughout the period covered by this RRP. Malnourished refugees will be treated based on presence or absence of complications. Patients suffering from Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) without medical complication will be provided with outpatient care; those suffering from SAM with medical complication will receive inpatient care; and those suffering from Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM) will be enrolled in Supplementary Feeding Programmes (SFP). As a preventive measure, children aged 6-23 months and Pregnant Women and Lactating Mothers (PLW) will be targeted with Blanket Supplementary Feeding Programmes (BSFP). Partners will also support and promote Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF). Effective prevention and management of malnutrition will be also pursued through reduction of micronutrient deficiencies and community management of acute malnutrition.

Capacity building of health workforce is a priority, especially strengthening the role of community-based health workers – a key and very often the only liaison between a patient and the health services. Their role proves to be particularly important in raising awareness on reproductive health and HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment.

Emergency preparedness and response activities will be strengthened to improve the capacity of health care providers to effectively respond to potential disease outbreaks, including by enhancing disease surveillance and stockpiling essential drugs.

Close coordination with the Ministry of Health will continue at national, district and local level to ensure that health care services for refugees and host communities in refugee-hosting areas are in line with government policies, guidelines and standards.

### OBJECTIVES

1. Provide emergency life-saving health and nutrition interventions for new refugee arrivals and strengthen outbreak preparedness and response

2. Increase equitable access to and utilization of integrated quality health services for refugees and host communities across all the phases of displacement
3. Strengthen the health care system to cope with the increased demand for health services by refugees and host population

## Livelihoods & Resilience

A graduated approach will be used to stabilize and build diversified, sustainable and resilient livelihoods, with emergency livelihood interventions serving as a basis to develop longer-term strategies. In acknowledging that the time refugees have been displaced for is not closely related with their degree of vulnerability, emergency livelihood support will target new refugee arrivals and vulnerable long-term refugees. In line with individuals' skills, knowledge and aspirations, emergency livelihood support will promote immediate job creation, supported by initial capacity building. Interventions will include community asset creation (e.g. road rehabilitation, irrigation system, reforestation, markets and other infrastructure development), access to productive assets to stimulate agriculture production and other income generating activities.

Whilst contributing to reduce dependency on humanitarian assistance, emergency livelihood support alone is not enough to achieve sustainability. The

transition to sustainable livelihoods requires the promotion of market-driven opportunities, private sector linkages and extensive capacity building of individuals and livelihood groups to profitably scale up their activities. Strategic investment in businesses will support value chains and sustainable job creation. Livelihood diversification is a key priority to ensure that the capacity of refugees to better cope with future shocks and stresses is enhanced. The sector will increase capacity building efforts to improve vocational, technical, business, entrepreneurial and financial skills of refugee and host communities.

An enabling environment -understood as equitable access to policies and rights, technical and financial services and infrastructures- is crucial for sustainability and resilience. Engagement and capacity building of DLG to integrate refugees into district development plans and improve refugee access to rights will be a critical activity.

### OBJECTIVES

1. Emergency livelihood support to complement basic household needs is provided
2. Household livelihood strategies are strengthened to support household self-reliance
3. The enabling environment is reinforced to support resilient livelihoods

## Shelter, Settlement & NFIs

The sector will continue to ensure that all populations of concern receive appropriate and timely shelter and NFI support in line with the minimum agreed standards for Uganda. The introduction of cash-based shelter/NFI assistance instead of in-kind kits will, where feasible, empower refugees with greater independence and dignity, as well as contribute to local economic growth. Direct labour support to the construction of PSN shelters, both emergency and semi-permanent, will remain a priority, along with ongoing repairs and maintenance works to communal shelters at transit facilities.

The implementation of a revised shelter strategy, incorporating more environmentally-sustainable, culturally-sensitive and flexible design options, will be a core sector goal. In addition, the establishment of settlement planning guidelines will facilitate site planning improvements and contribute to maximise land use, increase host community benefits to refugee presence and expand livelihood opportunities for both refugees and hosts. Any roadworks project will require a comprehensive needs assessment to guarantee its added value to refugees and host communities.

The phased rollout of a household address system for refugees will enable the integration of settlement cadastral plans with local government plans, and help keeping track of multi-sector assistance and defining locations for future interventions. The integration of settlement plans with Uganda's Land Information System (LIS) will enable the government to take full responsibility for all land use development and management in refugee-hosting areas.

Partners active in the sector will expand the scope and reach of construction trainings and cash-for-work initiatives for refugees and hosts when implementing any shelter or infrastructure programme. Furthermore, there will be a strong focus on ensuring that fair and equitable support is provided to all refugees across the country, provided that sector standards and strategies be respected in all settlements.

### OBJECTIVES

1. Ensure the minimum NFI standards for all refugees are met
2. Access to improved and sustainable shelters for refugee households is increased
3. Integration of settlement plans with local government plans for maximized land use is improved
4. Multi-sectoral support services for the refugee response provided



The sector aims at ensuring that refugees and hosting populations have safe and sufficient access to quality water and to improved sanitation and hygiene services, including at household level and in institutions such as schools and health facilities. The overall goal is to ensure that refugees can fulfil their basic right to water, sanitation and hygiene, in line with Sustainable Development Goals 6.

The sector will put more effort in shifting from a humanitarian to a market-driven and development approach vis a vis the implementation of WASH programmes, with people's needs and the environment at the centre of any intervention.

Ministry of Water and Environment, Catchment Management Committees and DLGs will take the lead role in the planning, design, implementation, operation and maintenance of WASH initiatives in respective areas. The government sector response plan, currently under development, will guide interventions in refugee-hosting districts.

Improving cost-effectiveness of delivering water and sanitation services remains a key priority, including through optimization of existing infrastructure and adoption of appropriate digital technologies for installing and monitoring solar/hybrid systems at water sources.

Furthermore, catchment protection and rehabilitation activities will be incorporated and strengthened as part of catchment management approach. WASH partners will enhance coordination with other sectors including on strengthening delivery of services in institutions. Community engagement in management of services will be strengthened to improve participation and ownership and opportunities to engage with private sector explored. A key priority is to increase the capacity of WASH partners to respond to emergencies, including through capacity building and advance planning.

## OBJECTIVES

1. Access to water supply for refugees and hosting populations improved
2. Access to sanitation and hygiene services for refugees and hosting population improved
3. Institutions for effective management and provision of water and sanitation at national, regional and lower levels considering refugee settlements and host communities strengthened

# Financial Requirements

## 2019-2020 Financial Requirements Summary

### By Refugee Population and Organization

ORGANIZATION	BURUNDI	DRC & Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
Action Against Hunger (ACF)		5,800,000	7,000,000	12,800,000
African Women and Youth Action for Development (AWYAD)		500,000	600,000	1,100,000
Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED)		1,500,000	1,500,000	3,000,000
American Refugee Committee (ARC)	653,057	4,323,094	4,021,027	8,997,178
Association for Aid and Relief, Japan (AAR Japan)			2,000,000	2,000,000
Association of Volunteers in Internation Service (AVSI)		15,805,000	3,047,787	18,852,787
Building Resources Across Communities (BRAC)		400,000	700,000	1,100,000
Care and Assistance For Forced Migrants (CAFOMI)	954,366	1,036,804	2,821,273	4,812,443
CARE International		6,050,000	9,797,603	15,847,603
Caritas Uganda			2,909,603	2,909,603
Catholic Organization for Relied and Development Aid (CORDAID)		2,563,000	3,731,000	6,294,000
Catholic Relief Services		6,954,863	9,471,777	16,426,640
Cooperazione e Sviluppo (CESVI)			650,000	650,000
DanChurchAid (DCA)			5,570,000	5,570,000
Danish Refugee Council (DRC)		29,500,000	33,199,975	62,699,975
Enabel			4,147,534	4,147,534
Finn Church Aid (FCA)		1,300,000	5,200,000	6,500,000
Food for the Hungry (FH)			3,982,797	3,982,797
Humane Africa Mission		900,000	2,350,000	3,250,000
Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team (HOT)		900,000		900,000
Humanity & Inclusion (HI)			900,000	900,000
IMPACT Initiatives	30,598	429,687	784,016	1,244,301

ORGANIZATION	BURUNDI	DRC & Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
Inter-church Organization for Development Cooperation (ICCO)			461,189	461,189
International Aid Services (IAS)		250,000	321,516	571,516
International Rescue Committee (IRC)			3,225,514	3,225,514
IsraAid			240,000	240,000
Johanniter		515,000	567,000	1,082,000
Kabarole Research and Resource Centre (KRC)		1,441,829		1,441,829
Lutheran World Federation (LWF)		7,164,163	11,589,258	18,753,421
Lutheran World Relief (LWR)		400,000	600,000	1,000,000
Malteser International			2,245,713	2,245,713
Medical Teams International (MTI)		2,123,778	2,578,370	4,702,148
Mercy Corps			3,500,000	3,500,000
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)		12,219,049	28,818,111	41,037,160
OXFAM		5,631,683	26,768,750	32,400,433
Plan International (PI)			3,393,273	3,393,273
Right to Play (RtP)			1,700,000	1,700,000
Samaritan's Purse (SP)		1,240,000	710,000	1,950,000
Save the Children International (SCI)		7,676,421	14,730,068	22,406,489
Self Help Africa			700,000	700,000
TPO Uganda			2,878,945	2,878,945
TROCAIRE (Only operational in Palabek Settlement)			1,350,000	1,350,000
Tutapona Trauma Rehabilitation (TTR)			300,000	300,000
Uganda Red Cross Society (URCS)	60,000	2,927,410	4,169,689	7,157,099
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	6,667,847	29,276,954	55,950,193	91,894,994
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	1,210,000	2,870,000	13,440,000	17,520,000
United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN WOMEN)			6,500,000	6,500,000
United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	9,761,124	18,755,573	28,283,802	56,800,499
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	25,562,727	393,157,244	305,040,047	723,760,018
United Nations Migration Agency (IOM)		18,507,650	18,317,100	36,824,750
United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)			6,000,000	6,000,000
United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)	1,840,000	3,800,000	19,241,374	24,881,374

ORGANIZATION	BURUNDI	DRC & Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
United Nations World Food Programme (WFP)	10,679,263	168,751,671	335,539,875	514,970,809
United Nations World Health Organization (WHO)	735,000	4,908,922	5,362,324	11,006,246
War Child Canada (WCC)			3,397,500	3,397,500
War Child Holland (WCH)		1,125,000	2,175,000	3,300,000
Water Mission Uganda (WMU)			1,000,000	1,000,000
Welthungerhilfe			2,800,000	2,800,000
Windle International Uganda		756,000	1,945,944	2,701,944
World Vision International (WVI)		5,310,480	17,000,000	22,310,480
ZOA			1,600,000	1,600,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58,153,982</b>	<b>766,771,275</b>	<b>1,038,824,947</b>	<b>1,863,750,203</b>

## By Sector & Refugee Population

SECTOR	BURUNDI	DRC & Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
Protection	16,606,172	134,322,258	145,695,925	296,624,355
Education	789,424	65,689,239	121,982,564	188,461,228
Energy a& Environment	730,362	64,522,174	53,356,421	118,608,956
Food Security	10,400,436	165,295,558	328,766,513	504,462,507
Health & Nutrition	5,074,947	77,219,665	83,141,377	165,435,989
Livelihoods & Resilience	17,903,085	101,581,631	165,268,371	284,753,086
Shelter & NFIs	5,442,746	75,966,548	60,414,541	141,823,835
WASH	1,206,810	82,174,202	80,199,235	163,580,248
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58,153,982</b>	<b>766,771,275</b>	<b>1,038,824,947</b>	<b>1,863,750,203</b>

**ANNEX**

# Monitoring Framework

## Protection

	South Sudan		DRC and others		Burundi	
	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Registration conducted on an individual basis with minimum set of data required						
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of refugees registered on an individual basis with minimum set of data required						
2019	1,112,025	Not applicable	509,366	Not applicable	43,230	Not applicable
2020	1,074,266	Not applicable	539,554	Not applicable	42,094	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR:</b> % of refugees documented on an individual basis						
2019	100%	Not applicable	100%	Not applicable	100%	Not applicable
2020	100%	Not applicable	100%	Not applicable	100%	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of persons that have access to RSD procedures						
2019	Not applicable	Not applicable	2,000	Not applicable	15,000	Not applicable
2020	Not applicable	Not applicable	2,000	Not applicable	15,000	Not applicable
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Adequate and quality child protection services for children, including case management services, are provided in refugee and host communities						
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of children with specific child protection needs receiving individual case management services						
2019	47,721	12,000	17,300	5,500	7,500	2,500
2020	36,827	8,000	19,200	5,000	6,500	2,300
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of registered UASC in alternative care who receive regular monitoring and support						
2019	27,550	3,000	7,772	1,500	750	500
2020	27,657	3,100	6,650	2,000	800	500
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of boys and girls registered and participating in psychosocial support services through structured activities at child friendly spaces						
2019	350,000	150,000	180,000	120,000	25,000	15,000
2020	250,000	150,000	200,000	130,000	20,000	15,000
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Effective and safe child protection systems that prevent and respond to child protection concerns in refugee and host communities are strengthened						
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of reported cases of abuse, violence and exploitation receiving age and gender sensitive services in refugee and host communities						
2019	18,000	15,000	12,000	6,500	8,000	3,000
2020	16,000	13,500	13,500	7,000	8,500	4,000
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of partner and government staff trained on child protection						
2019	5,467	3,347	2,543	1,130	40	22
2020	5,100	3,262	2,594	1,186	35	22
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of functional community-based structures dedicated to child protection						
2019	4,453	1,648	850	50	150	30

2020	4,218	1,638	5,229	2,101	145	30
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Protection of and accountability to all refugees are strengthened through meaningful engagement with communities, with particular attention to at-risk groups						
<b>INDICATOR:</b> % of women in leadership structures and community groups for community self-management and empowerment						
2019	48	Not applicable	48	Not applicable	48	Not applicable
2020	50	Not applicable	50	Not applicable	50	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of complaints addressed through effective feedback mechanisms						
2019	30,447	9,898	16,166	4,913	800	200
2020	35,490	11,698	19,414	6,071	700	150
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of persons with specific needs provided with targeted support						
2019	83,000	20,200	48,000	12,000	5,243	1073
2020	81,000	20,000	51,000	12,750	5,291	1088
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Peaceful co-existence among communities strengthened						
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of reported incidents of conflict within refugee communities						
2019	70	Not applicable	40	Not applicable	10	Not applicable
2020	60	Not applicable	30	Not applicable	8	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of reported incidents of conflict between host and refugee community						
2019	70	Not applicable	40	Not applicable	12	Not applicable
2020	60	Not applicable	30	Not applicable	10	
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of refugees receiving psychosocial support						
2019	400,000	Not applicable	220,000	Not applicable	2,100	Not applicable
2020	350,000	Not applicable	234,000	Not applicable	2,050	Not applicable
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Protection systems are strengthened and refugees women and girls are aware of the existing referral pathways with the aim of ensuring their full enjoyment of rights, reduction of SGBV risks and reinforced multi-sectoral response including through mainstreaming of SGBV across all sectors Eff						
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of SGBV awareness campaigns conducted for refugees and host community ( awareness campaigns, FGDs, IEC, trainings, media)						
2019	20,087	6,479	1,319	436	300	30
2020	12,918	3,694	1,405	444	300	30
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of SGBV survivors identified and receiveing appropriate multi-sectoral support						
2019	14,767	3,589	3,227	788	600	129
2020	12,439	3,307	5,539	3,720	583	137
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of functional structures (duty bearers) trained and able to support survivors						
2019	2993	1290	550	157	85	50
2020	2889	1346	496	137	70	50
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Physical safety, access to justice, rule of law and civilian character of the refugee settlements is assured and protection of human rights promoted in refugee settings						
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of refugees receiving legal assistance and legal aid services						
2019	50,000	Not applicable	28,000	Not applicable	10,000	Not applicable
2020	50,000	Not applicable	30,000	Not applicable	10,000	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of security packages provided for law enforcement						
2019	100	Not applicable	50	Not applicable	25	Not applicable
2020	100	Not applicable	50	Not applicable	25	Not applicable

<b>INDICATOR: # of refugees and host communities sensitized about the Ugandan and Refugee law</b>						
2019	250,000	Not applicable	50,000	Not applicable	15,000	Not applicable
2020	250,000	Not applicable	50,000	Not applicable	15,000	Not applicable

## Education

	South Sudan		DRC and others		Burundi	
	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host
<b>OBJECTIVE: Equitable access and inclusive relevant learning opportunities increased</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: % children of school and non school age enrolled in pre-primary ECD</b>						
2019	41%	41%	41%	41%	41%	41%
2020	43%	43%	43%	43%	43%	43%
<b>INDICATOR: % children of school and non school age enrolled in Primary</b>						
2019	61%	122%	61%	122%	61%	122%
2020	63%	124%	63%	124%	63%	124%
<b>INDICATOR: % children of school and non school age enrolled in Secondary</b>						
2019	15%	20%	15%	20%	15%	20%
2020	18%	22%	18%	22%	18%	22%
<b>INDICATOR: # of children accessing non-formal education (includes non-formal Vocational Training, Lifeskills &amp; Accelerated Education)</b>						
2019	53,123	23,784	18,379	7,248	1,315	564
2020	43,972	17,422	18,942	7,443	1,242	532
<b>OBJECTIVE: Delivery of quality education and training improved</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: # of teachers and head teachers in Primary Schools funded under Partner contribution (not under MoES payroll)</b>						
2019	5,070	1,269	1,329	155	145	297
2020	6,283	796	1,644	167	177	322
<b>INDICATOR: # of teachers trained on formal and non-formal Continuous Professional Development programmes (CPD) trainings aimed to support teacher professional development and strengthen the quality of in-classroom</b>						
2019	10,472	4,505	6,226	1,431	48	14
2020	10,568	4,319	6,254	1,458	48	38
<b>INDICATOR: # of learners transition from AEP to formal education</b>						
2019	18,684	3,165	5,887	1,409	1,024	65
2020	28,026	3,979	8,830	1,837	1,536	97
<b>INDICATOR: % of schools supervised at least once a term by the district education office/ DES/ MOES</b>						
2019	21%	26%	21%	26%	21%	26%
2020	27%	39%	27%	39%	27%	39%
<b>INDICATOR: # of pupils per teacher for Primary Schools</b>						
2019	77	57	77	57	77	57

2020	71	55	71	55	71	55
<b>INDICATOR: # of pupils per classroom for Primary Schools</b>						
2019	135	67	135	67	135	67
2020	122	64	122	64	122	64
<b>INDICATOR: # of pupils per textbook for Primary Schools</b>						
2019	6	3	6	3	6	3
2020	4	3	4	3	4	3
<b>INDICATOR: # of pupils per stance for Primary Schools</b>						
2019	92	53	92	53	92	53
2020	81	53	81	53	81	53
<b>OBJECTIVE: Systems for effective delivery strengthened</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: # of districts with education coordination mechanism meeting at least 6 times a year</b>						
2019	12	12	12	12	7	7
2020	12	12	12	12	7	7
<b>INDICATOR: # of education related community structures (SMCs, CMCs, BOGs, PTAs) supported to monitor the quality of teaching &amp; learning</b>						
2019	1393	714	552	203	23	27
2020	1325	766	598	226	27	36

## Energy & Environment

	South Sudan		DRC and others		Burundi	
	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host
<b>OBJECTIVE: Environment and natural resources protected and restored and green livelihoods promoted using a catchment-based approach</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: % extent environmental risks associated with the operation are mitigated</b>						
2019	70%	70%	67%	67%	65%	65%
2020	90%	90%	87%	87%	85%	85%
<b>INDICATOR: # hectares of forests, wetlands, riverbanks and lakeshores protected and restored</b>						
2019	13,900	13,900	7,290	7,290	540	540
2020	26,857	26,857	15,372	15,372	1,052	1,052
<b>INDICATOR: # of households generating income from 'green livelihoods' (agroforestry, beekeeping, energy-saving tech, sustainable construction)</b>						
2019	25,420	13,340	7,078	14,107	324	1,488
2020	35,640	23,059	11,782	21,533	526	2,266
<b>OBJECTIVE: Access to sufficient and sustainable basic energy services for lighting, power and cooking increased and climate change drivers mitigated with reduced reliance on wood and fossil fuels</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: # of targeted households that self-report using fuel-efficient cook-stove to cook the main meal</b>						
2019	187,517	126,473	73,448	176,340	5,404	18,606
2020	224,158	183,987	115,753	264,510	7,893	27,909

<b>INDICATOR: # of households using alternative and/or renewable energy (e.g. solar, biogas, ethanol, briquette, lpg)</b>						
2019	247,717	178,028	89,648	70,561	8,011	10,762
2020	239,993	182,470	107,119	71,740	8,278	10,857
<b>INDICATOR: # of institutions (Health, Education, Reception) using sustainable energy (e.g. institutional stoves, solar, biogas, ethanol, briquette, lpg)</b>						
2019	245		94		7	
2020	350		104		10	
<b>OBJECTIVE: Energy, environment and climate response planning, coordination, implementation, monitoring strengthened and environmental mitigation measures mainstreamed across all sectors</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: # of Environment Impact Assessments completed for integration into sub-catchment management and physical plans</b>						
2019	4		3		0	
2020	6		5		0	
<b>INDICATOR: # of extensions workers, partner staff, and government officials receiving environmental orientation across all sectors</b>						
2019	5,000		2,500		500	
2020	10,000		5,000		1,000	
<b>INDICATOR: % of total refugee response operational spending on implemented energy, environment and climate-resilient interventions mainstreamed into other sector</b>						
2019	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
2020	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%

## Food Security

	South Sudan		DRC and others		Burundi	
	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host
<b>OBJECTIVE: Refugees have access to adequate nutritious food to meet their basic food and nutrition needs</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: # of refugees receiving in-kind food assistance</b>						
2019	879,137	Not applicable	350,585	Not applicable	27,471	Not applicable
2020	848,720	Not applicable	372,997	Not applicable	26,661	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR: # of refugees receiving cash</b>						
2019	219,784	Not applicable	145,987	Not applicable	6,868	Not applicable
2020	212,180	Not applicable	155,507	Not applicable	6,665	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR: % of HH with poor or borderline Food Consumption Score (&lt;20%)</b>						
2019	30%	Not applicable	40%	Not applicable	35%	Not applicable
2020	18%	Not applicable	20%	Not applicable	19%	Not applicable
<b>OBJECTIVE: Targeted food assistance provided to the most vulnerable refugee households based on assessed needs</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: % of refugee households receiving targeted assistance</b>						
2019	20%	Not applicable	20%	Not applicable	20%	Not applicable
2020	30%	Not applicable	30%	Not applicable	30%	Not applicable

<b>INDICATOR: % of HH with poor or borderline Food Consumption Score (&lt;20%)</b>						
2019	30%	Not applicable	40%	Not applicable	35%	Not applicable
2020	18%	Not applicable	20%	Not applicable	19%	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR: Coping Strategy Score of targeted refugee households (EVIs, PSN)</b>						
2019	8.61	Not applicable	15	Not applicable	20	Not applicable
2020	6	Not applicable	13	Not applicable	18	Not applicable
<b>OBJECTIVE: Food Assistance to refugees progressively linked to livelihood and self-reliance interventions to enhance resilience</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: % of refugees receiving food assistance and participating in livelihood programmes</b>						
2019	10%	Not applicable	10%	Not applicable	20%	Not applicable
2020	20%	Not applicable	20%	Not applicable	20%	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR: % of host population participating in refugee livelihood activities</b>						
2019	10%		10%		10%	
2020	20%		20%		20%	

## Health & Nutrition

	South Sudan		DRC and others		Burundi	
	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host
<b>OBJECTIVE: Provide emergency life-saving health and nutrition interventions for new refugee arrivals and strengthen outbreak preparedness and response</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: Under-five mortality rate</b>						
2019	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
2020	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
<b>INDICATOR: Global Acute Malnutrition rate</b>						
2019	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
2020	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
<b>INDICATOR: Proportion of sites holding monthly Refugee health and nutrition coordination meeting chaired by MoH &amp; DHOs</b>						
2019	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2020	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>OBJECTIVE: Increase equitable access to and utilization of integrated quality health services for refugees and host communities across all the phases of displacement</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: Outpatient utilization rate</b>						
2019	2	2	2	2	2	2
2020	2	2	2	2	2	2
<b>INDICATOR: Health facility delivery rate</b>						
2019	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
2020	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%

<b>INDICATOR: Immunization coverage rate</b>						
2019	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
2020	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
<b>INDICATOR: Severe Acute Malnutrition recovery rate</b>						
2019	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%
2020	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%
<b>INDICATOR: Tuberculosis case detection rates/100,000</b>						
2019	253	253	253	253	253	253
2020	253	253	253	253	253	253
<b>OBJECTIVE: Strengthen the health care system to cope with the increased demand for health services by refugees and host population</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: Proportion of refugee serving health facilities accredited by Ministry of Health in refugee hosting districts</b>						
2019	50%	50%	50%	50%	100%	50%
2020	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>INDICATOR: Proportion of Health Center IV and District referral hospitals supported (Infrastructure, HR and commodities)</b>						
2019	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2020	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>INDICATOR: Consultation per clinician per day in refugee hosting districts</b>						
2019	50	50	50	50	50	50
2020	50	50	50	50	50	50

## Livelihoods & Resilience

	South Sudan		DRC and others		Burundi	
	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host
<b>OBJECTIVE: Emergency livelihood support to complement basic household needs is provided</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: Coping Strategy Index Score</b>						
2019	0.12	0.23	0.108938	0.247218	0.123730	0.247218
2020	0.16	0.28	0.148938	0.297218	0.163730	0.297218
<b>INDICATOR: Food Consumption per capita/Month</b>						
2019	13	16	16.97737	18.28355	14.63141	18.28355
2020	16	19	19.97737	21.28355	17.63141	21.28355
<b>INDICATOR: # of refugee and host community HH receiving emergency livelihood support</b>						
2019	152,252	51,674	70,774	32,019	5,945	4,373
2020	159,490	52,858	67,827	31,875	4,990	3,033
<b>OBJECTIVE: Household livelihood strategies are strengthened to support household self-reliance</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: Composite Productive Assets Index</b>						
2019	0.53	0.71	0.346882	0.461365	0.459640	0.461365

2020	0.65	0.85	0.466882	0.601365	0.579640	0.601365
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Average # of income generating activities (IGA) per household						
2019	1.8	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.2
2020	2.1	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.8	2.5
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Wealth Index						
2019	0.6	0.7	0.5601924	1.019296	0.7287044	1.019296
2020	0.65	0.75	0.6101924	1.069296	0.7787044	1.069296
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> The enabling environment is reinforced to support resilient livelihoods						
<b>INDICATOR:</b> % of targeted population employed or self-employed in sustainable livelihoods activities over the last 12 months						
2019	33%	54%	38%	54%	40%	54%
2020	38%	59%	43%	59%	45%	59%
<b>INDICATOR:</b> Asset benefit indicator						
2019	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%
2020	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%
<b>INDICATOR:</b> % of targeted population with access to services through the DLG and private sector to develop their livelihood activity						
2019	7%	16%	7%	7%	8%	7%
2020	10%	19%	10%	10%	11%	10%

## Shelter, Infrastructures & NFIs

	South Sudan		DRC and others		Burundi	
	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Ensure the minimum NFI standards for all refugees are met						
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of newly arrived refugee households receiving core relief items						
2019	5,000	Not applicable	10,000	Not applicable	666	Not applicable
2020	17,500	Not applicable	35,000	Not applicable	2,332	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of stabilised refugee households benefiting from replenishment NFIs						
2019	139,000	Not applicable	63,600	Not applicable	7,200	Not applicable
2020	220,175	Not applicable	106,791	Not applicable	12,523	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of refugee households who receive cash-based NFI assistance						
2019	69,502	Not applicable	31,835	Not applicable	3,602	Not applicable
2020	73,392	Not applicable	35,597	Not applicable	4,175	Not applicable
<b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Access to improved and sustainable shelters for refugee households is increased						
<b>INDICATOR:</b> # of newly arrived refugee households provided with emergency shelter support						
2019	5,000	Not applicable	10,000	Not applicable	666	Not applicable

2020	17,500	Not applicable	35,000	Not applicable	2,332	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR: # of individuals (refugees + hosts) receiving sustainable shelter construction training</b>						
2019	2,100	900	2,570	450	210	90
2020	4,200	1,800	2,100	900	420	180
<b>INDICATOR: # of refugee and host community households with specific needs assisted with semi-permanent shelters</b>						
2019	8,000	1,600	6,000	1,200	500	100
2020	73,120	Not available	24,330	Not available	2,295	Not available
<b>OBJECTIVE: Integration of settlement plans with local government plans for maximized land use is improved</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: # of settlements benefitting from integrated local physical development plans based on Environment and Social Impact Assessments</b>						
2019	11	Not applicable	1	Not applicable	1	Not applicable
2020	26	Not applicable	5	Not applicable	2	Not applicable
<b>INDICATOR: # of kms of roads rehabilitated (including roadside vegetation) for all-year access to community services</b>						
2019	60	60	50	50	10	10
2020	120	120	100	100	20	20
<b>INDICATOR: # of energy-saving street lights installed in refugee hosting areas (excluding staff institutions)</b>						
2019	250	250	150	150	50	50
2020	500	500	300	300	100	100
<b>OBJECTIVE: Multi-sectoral support services for the refugee response provided</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: # of response activities that receive necessary delivery of logistics</b>						
2019	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
2020	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
<b>INDICATOR: # of information management products in support of inter-agency operational coordination</b>						
2019	100	50	502	1,007	100	50
2020	100	50	380	900	100	50
<b>INDICATOR: # of technical needs assessments conducted</b>						
2019	4	4	58	82	4	4
2020	4	4	66	97	4	4

## WASH

	South Sudan		DRC and others		Burundi	
	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host	Refugees	Host
<b>OBJECTIVE: Access to water supply for refugees and hosting populations improved</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: # of litres per person per day</b>						
2019	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
2020	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0

<b>INDICATOR: % of water meeting minimum quality standards ( FRC and/or E-Coli standards)</b>						
2019	100	100	100	100	100	100
2020	100	100	100	100	100	100
<b>INDICATOR: % of water pumped through renewable energy (solar or grid)</b>						
2019	68	68	56	56	56	56
2020	71	71	75	75	75	75
<b>OBJECTIVE: Access to sanitation and hygiene services for refugees and hosting population improved</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: % household latrine coverage</b>						
2019	86	85	90	85	90	85
2020	100	100	100	100	100	100
<b>INDICATOR % of persons with knowledge on 3 critical handwashing times</b>						
2019	78	60	95	60	78	60
2020	85	85	85	85	85	85
<b>INDICATOR: # of institutional sanitation facilities constructed (schools, health centres, markets)</b>						
2019	431	170	811	243	23	7
2020	471	141	291	87	10	3
<b>OBJECTIVE: Institutions for effective management and provision of water and sanitation at national, regional and lower levels considering refugee settlements and host communities strengthened</b>						
<b>INDICATOR: % of water schemes designs reviewed, optimized and approved by Ministry of Water &amp; Environment Approval committee</b>						
2019	100	Not available	100	Not available	100	Not available
2020	100	Not available	100	Not available	100	Not available
<b>INDICATOR: # of water schemes under management of utilities (NWSC or Umbrella Organisations)</b>						
2019	22	Not available	12	Not available	0	Not available
2020	120	Not available	12	Not available	4	Not available
<b>INDICATOR: # of Catchment Management Committees with refugees included as members</b>						
2019	38	Not available	16	Not available	1	Not available
2020	17	Not available	13	Not available	1	Not available

# 2019 Financial Requirements Summary

ORGANIZATION	BURUNDI	DRC & Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
Action Against Hunger (ACF)		2,900,000	3,500,000	6,400,000
African Women and Youth Action for Development (AWYAD)		200,000	300,000	500,000
Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED)		500,000	500,000	1,000,000
American Refugee Committee (ARC)	326,273	2,114,516	2,006,597	4,447,386
Association for Aid and Relief, Japan (AAR Japan)			1,000,000	1,000,000
Association of Volunteers in Internation Service (AVSI)		8,465,000	2,587,510	11,052,510
Building Resources Across Communities (BRAC)		200,000	350,000	550,000
Care and Assistance For Forced Migrants (CAFOMI)	435,686	465,247	1,608,405	2,509,338
CARE International		2,525,000	5,749,197	8,274,197
Caritas Uganda			1,559,603	1,559,603
Catholic Organization for Relied and Development Aid (CORDAID)		1,000,000	1,584,000	2,584,000
Catholic Relief Services		2,734,961	4,685,415	7,420,376
Cooperazione e Sviluppo (CESVI)			350,000	350,000
DanChurchAid (DCA)			2,470,000	2,470,000
Danish Refugee Council (DRC)		16,000,000	20,000,000	36,000,000
Enabel			3,597,781	3,597,781
Finn Church Aid (FCA)		650,000	2,600,000	3,250,000
Food for the Hungry (FH)			1,782,797	1,782,797
Humane Africa Mission		450,000	1,200,000	1,650,000
Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team (HOT)		400,000		400,000
Humanity & Inclusion (HI)			500,000	500,000
IMPACT Initiatives	15,471	208,718	397,962	622,151
Inter-church Organization for Development Cooperation (ICCO)			251,074	251,074
International Aid Services (IAS)		250,000	225,706	475,706
International Rescue Committee (IRC)			1,760,469	1,760,469
IsraAid			120,000	120,000
Johanniter		260,000	300,000	560,000

ORGANIZATION	BURUNDI	DRC & Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
Kabarole Research and Resource Centre (KRC)		646,141		646,141
Lutheran World Federation (LWF)		3,778,725	6,471,870	10,250,595
Lutheran World Relief (LWR)		200,000	300,000	500,000
Malteser International			1,299,513	1,299,513
Medical Teams International (MTI)		1,123,778	1,578,370	2,702,148
Mercy Corps			2,500,000	2,500,000
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)		5,270,707	15,932,411	21,203,118
OXFAM		3,044,153	13,653,517	16,697,670
Plan International (PI)			1,841,174	1,841,174
Right to Play (RtP)			700,000	700,000
Samaritan's Purse (SP)		620,000	400,000	1,020,000
Save the Children International (SCI)		3,941,834	7,359,143	11,300,977
Self Help Africa			280,000	280,000
TPO Uganda			1,338,945	1,338,945
TROCAIRE (Only operational in Palabek Settlement)			600,000	600,000
Tutapona Trauma Rehabilitation (TTR)			150,000	150,000
Uganda Red Cross Society (URCS)	35,000	1,507,521	2,760,039	4,302,560
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	3,615,469	15,320,404	29,253,093	48,188,966
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	610,000	1,420,000	6,980,000	9,010,000
United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN WOMEN)			3,250,000	3,250,000
United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	4,970,061	9,576,326	14,637,369	29,183,756
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	12,951,339	225,676,782	210,000,000	448,628,121
United Nations Migration Agency (IOM)		11,520,950	10,291,400	21,812,350
United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)			3,000,000	3,000,000
United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)	920,000	1,900,000	9,620,687	12,440,687
United Nations World Food Programme (WFP)	5,449,246	86,979,077	170,802,316	263,230,639
United Nations World Health Organization (WHO)	350,000	2,337,582	2,553,488	5,241,070
War Child Canada (WCC)			1,270,000	1,270,000
War Child Holland (WCH)		775,000	1,125,000	1,900,000
Water Mission Uganda (WMU)			400,000	400,000

ORGANIZATION	BURUNDI	DRC & Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
Welthungerhilfe			1,800,000	1,800,000
Windle International Uganda		378,000	972,972	1,350,972
World Vision International (WVI)		1,460,480	8,000,000	9,460,480
ZOA			1,100,000	1,100,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29,678,545</b>	<b>416,800,902</b>	<b>593,207,823</b>	<b>1,039,687,270</b>

## By Sector & Refugee Population

SECTOR	BURUNDI	DRC& Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
Protection	8,430,751	68,950,462	87,151,729	296,624,355
Education	412,682	55,329,717	74,794,467	188,461,228
Energy a& Environment	367,200	32,776,411	33,975,028	118,608,956
Food Security	5,311,031	85,441,454	167,662,951	504,462,507
Health & Nutrition	2,544,974	39,397,165	49,859,906	165,435,989
Livelihoods & Resilience	9,071,361	51,104,059	92,823,184	284,753,086
Shelter & NFIs	2,757,541	38,514,513	38,706,933	141,823,835
WASH	783,005	45,287,122	48,233,625	163,580,248
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29,678,545</b>	<b>416,800,902</b>	<b>593,207,823</b>	<b>1,039,687,270</b>

# 2020 Financial Requirements Summary

ORGANIZATION	BURUNDI	DRC & Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
Action Against Hunger (ACF)		2,900,000	3,500,000	6,400,000
African Women and Youth Action for Development (AWYAD)		300,000	300,000	600,000
Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED)		1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
American Refugee Committee (ARC)	326,784	2,208,578	2,014,430	4,549,792
Association for Aid and Relief, Japan (AAR Japan)			1,000,000	1,000,000
Association of Volunteers in Internation Service (AVSI)		7,340,000	460,277	7,800,277
Building Resources Across Communities (BRAC)		200,000	350,000	550,000
Care and Assistance For Forced Migrants (CAFOMI)	518,680	571,557	1,212,868	2,303,105
CARE International		3,525,000	4,048,406	7,573,406
Caritas Uganda			1,350,000	1,350,000
Catholic Organization for Relied and Development Aid (CORDAID)		1,563,000	2,147,000	3,710,000
Catholic Relief Services		4,219,902	4,786,362	9,006,264
Cooperazione e Sviluppo (CESVI)			300,000	300,000
DanChurchAid (DCA)			3,100,000	3,100,000
Danish Refugee Council (DRC)		13,500,000	13,199,975	26,699,975
Enabel			549,753	549,753
Finn Church Aid (FCA)		650,000	2,600,000	3,250,000
Food for the Hungry (FH)			2,200,000	2,200,000
Humane Africa Mission		450,000	1,150,000	1,600,000
Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team (HOT)		500,000		500,000
Humanity & Inclusion (HI)			400,000	400,000
IMPACT Initiatives	15,127	220,969	386,054	622,150
Inter-church Organization for Development Cooperation (ICCO)			210,115	210,115
International Aid Services (IAS)		-	95,809	95,809
International Rescue Committee (IRC)			1,465,045	1,465,045
IsraAid			120,000	120,000
Johanniter		255,000	267,000	522,000

ORGANIZATION	BURUNDI	DRC & Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
Kabarole Research and Resource Centre (KRC)		795,688		795,688
Lutheran World Federation (LWF)		3,385,438	5,117,388	8,502,826
Lutheran World Relief (LWR)		200,000	300,000	500,000
Malteser International			946,200	946,200
Medical Teams International (MTI)		1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
Mercy Corps			1,000,000	1,000,000
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)		6,948,342	12,885,700	19,834,042
OXFAM		2,587,530	13,115,233	15,702,763
Plan International (PI)			1,552,099	1,552,099
Right to Play (RtP)			1,000,000	1,000,000
Samaritan's Purse (SP)		620,000	310,000	930,000
Save the Children International (SCI)		3,734,587	7,370,925	11,105,512
Self Help Africa			420,000	420,000
TPO Uganda			1,540,000	1,540,000
TROCAIRE (Only operational in Palabek Settlement)			750,000	750,000
Tutapona Trauma Rehabilitation (TTR)			150,000	150,000
Uganda Red Cross Society (URCS)	25,000	1,419,889	1,409,650	2,854,539
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	3,052,378	13,956,550	26,697,100	43,706,028
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	600,000	1,450,000	6,460,000	8,510,000
United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN WOMEN)			3,250,000	3,250,000
United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	4,791,063	9,179,247	13,646,433	27,616,743
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	12,611,388	167,480,462	95,040,047	275,131,897
United Nations Migration Agency (IOM)		6,986,700	8,025,700	15,012,400
United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)			3,000,000	3,000,000
United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)	920,000	1,900,000	9,620,687	12,440,687
United Nations World Food Programme (WFP)	5,230,017	81,772,594	164,737,559	251,740,170
United Nations World Health Organization (WHO)	385,000	2,571,340	2,808,836	5,765,176
War Child Canada (WCC)			2,127,500	2,127,500
War Child Holland (WCH)		350,000	1,050,000	1,400,000
Water Mission Uganda (WMU)			600,000	600,000

ORGANIZATION	BURUNDI	DRC & Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
Welthungerhilfe			1,000,000	1,000,000
Windle International Uganda		378,000	972,972	1,350,972
World Vision International (WVI)		3,850,000	9,000,000	12,850,000
ZOA			500,000	500,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>28,475,437</b>	<b>349,970,373</b>	<b>445,617,123</b>	<b>824,062,933</b>

## By Sector & Refugee Population

SECTOR	BURUNDI	DRC & Other	SOUTH SUDAN	TOTAL
Protection	8,175,421	65,371,796	58,544,196	132,091,413
Education	376,742	10,359,522	47,188,097	51,490,317
Energy a& Environment	363,162	31,745,763	19,381,392	246,047,071
Food Security	5,089,405	79,854,104	161,103,562	73,633,944
Health & Nutrition	2,529,973	37,822,500	33,281,471	131,754,483
Livelihoods & Resilience	8,831,724	50,477,572	72,445,187	132,091,413
Shelter & NFIs	2,685,205	37,452,035	21,707,608	61,844,848
WASH	423,805	36,887,080	31,965,610	69,276,495
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>28,475,437</b>	<b>349,970,373</b>	<b>445,617,123</b>	<b>824,062,933</b>

