

EXPLANATION/REFERENCES			
The JLOS SDP-IV is by and largely funded by the GoU; the expected contribution of the Development Partners is likely to be less than 10%. Therefore, a transition or exit strategy is not applicable.			
2.3.8	At the end of the activity, the envisaged outputs will have a lasting effect on the local partners.	<input type="checkbox"/> The proposal contains a clear vision (with objectives) as to how the quality of the activities and/or financial independence of the local partner will be enhanced. <input type="checkbox"/> To achieve these objectives, specific measures will be taken during implementation of the activity. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal devotes attention to the capacity of the local partner to generate income from various sources. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal sets out suitable criteria against which progress in regard to institutional sustainability can be measured.	0
EXPLANATION/REFERENCES:			
Total score (maximum score 27 points) No scores 2.3.7. and 2.3.8. because these questions are not relevant for SDP-IV since 90% of the budget is provided by the 'partner', i.c. the GoU. Total score is 17 and NOT 1 (automatic system doesn't work)			1

2.4 Cooperation, harmonization and added value

JLOS SDP-IV is financed by the Government of Uganda, with contributions from development partners through basket and bilateral arrangements. At the time of design of the SDP, development partners committed to support the implementation of the Plan included the Netherlands, Sweden, Austria and the European Union through the basket arrangement and in accordance with the Government of Uganda Donor Partnership principles that are currently under revision. Ireland will support anti-corruption initiatives while Denmark, the US, UNICEF, UN Women and others to be identified will support the plan through direct bilateral support.

The design of JLOS SDP is flexible to allow other development partners to join at a later date. The coordination of financial support, technical knowledge and international experience between development partners will continue to be done under the JLOS Development Partner Group (DPG). In 2018, the Netherlands was the Chair of the JLOS DPG, and the current Chair is the EU. The Netherlands will be Chair again after the EU. This position as the Chair was appreciated and allowed the

Netherlands to play an active and visible role in the policy/political dialogue with the GoU and the various specific stakeholders, including civil society.

The Joint GoU-Development Partner Review will be held annually in September/October to monitor progress against planned activities. Participants will include JLOS members and invited stakeholders. Preparation for and reporting on the JLOS Forum and the reviews will be coordinated by the sector Secretariat, in the context of twice-yearly technical meetings with the Technical Committee including institutional Policy and Planning Units (PPUs) and the JLOS Development Partners Group. The JLOS DPs will present their annual assessment and the Chair of the JLOS DPs will deliver a keynote speech to convey the key policy messages.

The added value of this arrangement is reduction of transaction costs on both sides. Instead of bilateral meetings with individual DPs, there is an agreed framework that defines channels of communication, consultation and review by and through the DPG and the JLOS Secretariat.

2.5 Channel and aid modality (including alignment)

The aid modality is earmarked funding of result areas within the SDP-IV that are in line with the Dutch policy priorities for the Security and Rule of Law Agenda. The JLOS SDP-IV arrangement is fully aligned from a policy and financial point of view. Even though the financial arrangements might differ (earmarked funding, sector budget support etc.), financial reporting and audits cover all the funding flows and can be traced in the annual operational budget.

The SWaP/basket funding arrangement will be applied as was done for the previous arrangements. Channelling the funding through the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development has proven to be efficient and transparent. Most of the funding through the SWaP comes from the development budget of the GoU as can be appreciated in Chapter V of the PSD-IV document (page 56 – 60).

Activity Appraisal Document ODA

€ 1.000.000 or more

I REQUESTED DECISION CONCERNS

Application number	4000002708		
Short name application	Securing Refugee-Host Relations in Uganda		
Long name application	Securing Refugee-Host Relations in northern Uganda through Enhanced Protection (Phase II)		
Description application	The project aims to enhance the protection, well-being and dignity of South Sudanese refugees and their hosts in Adjumani, Kiryandongo and Lamwo districts.		
Budget holder	DSH		
Number business partner	30046673		
Implementing organisation	Makerere University Refugee Law Project		
<u>Legal relationship</u>	Grant		
<u>Commitment</u> in euros	EUR 7.477.207		
Funds centre	1704U02010001 (opvang in de regio)		
Activity start date	1 May 2019		
Activity end date	31 October 2023		
Contract start date	1 May 2019		
Contract end date	30 April 2023		
Evaluation planned?	Yes, mandatory (see decisiontree in 5.3.6.)		
<u>Aid modality</u>	Other programme aid		
<u>Donor role</u>	Single donor		
<u>Technical assistance</u>	TA<10 Less than 10% of the activity budget		
<u>Beneficiary's country/region</u>	Uganda		
Location within the country (be as specific as possible)	District	Name location(s)	Adjumani, Lamwo and Kyriyandongo district
<u>CRS Code</u>	15190 – Facilitation of orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility.		
<u>Policy marker principal</u>	InsOntw – Institutionele Ontwikkeling en capaciteitsopbouw		

Policy marker significant	GikhMV – Bevordering gelijkheid tussen mannen en vrouwen en empowerment van vrouwen KlmAdp – Klimaatverandering: adaptatie? MnsRcht – Mensenrechten
---------------------------	---

II. ACTIVITY APPRAISAL

2.1 Contribution made by the activity to BZ policy objectives (policy relevance)

The proposed activity contributes directly to the Dutch foreign policy objective of promoting political stability and democracy. Supporting the Government of Uganda (GoU) to strengthen its capacity to provide basic services for refugees from South Sudan – creating solutions to address the refugee crisis in the region – is fully in line with the policy of the Netherlands and the EU.

2.1.1 Description policy relevance

This intervention contributes to Sustainable Millennium Goal number 16: 'promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels'. Furthermore, the intervention also clearly fits within the MFA policy document 'investing in global prospects'.

The updated BHOS policy promotes four closely connected objectives:

- preventing conflict and instability;
- reducing poverty and social inequality;
- promoting sustainable and inclusive growth and climate action worldwide;
- enhancing the Netherlands' international earning capacity.

This includes improving the protection and prospects of refugees and displaced persons in host countries in the region of origin, and preventing irregular migration. A cross-cutting goal of BHOS policy is to advance gender equality and improve the position of women and girls. Discrimination against women is visible in all aspects of society, which means that gender equality requires active attention in all areas of BHOS policy.

The project also aims to contribute to climate change adaptation by halting deforestation and soil degradation through the planting of trees that can withstand the effects of climate change and by reducing refugees and host communities vulnerability to climate change through the potential generation of new sources of income that are climate-resilient.

Finally, the intervention contributes to the results framework of the Migration and Development division; especially to the following outcomes:

- Improved legal position, including registration, assistance for vulnerable people, the right to work and the right to access basic services.
- Refugees and vulnerable host communities are better protected against violence and abuse.
- Expanded and improved integrated basic service delivery that includes both refugees and host communities.
- Improved social cohesion between refugees and host communities.

Basic assumptions underpinning the choice of the proposed interventions:

- Interventions are focused both on refugees and host communities;
- Interventions should be aligned with other programs and the efforts of other donors;
- Lead themes are protection, stronger legal position, education, supporting host communities;
- Focusing on women and girls is a crosscutting theme in all interventions;

2.1.2 Appraisal

Appraise the policy relevance of the project, using the appraisal table. If the maximum score is not achieved, explain why. If certain criteria do not apply, please indicate this.

No.	Criteria 2.1 Policy relevance	Indicators (score 0, 1, 2)	Score	EXPLANATION/ REFERENCES

2.1.1	The proposed intervention ties in with the operational objectives in the Explanatory Memorandum and the related policy memorandum (policy theory and <u>intervention logic</u>).	<input type="checkbox"/> The proposed intervention ties in with both the main objective and the secondary objectives .	2	The intervention ties in with objections of the Grant Policy Framework for Migration and Development, and the MLS of the embassy.
2.1.2	The proposed intervention ties in with the ODA <u>priorities</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> The proposed intervention ties in with more than one of the result areas of the BH&OS priorities.	2	Improving the protection and prospects of refugees and displaced persons in host countries in the region of origin is one of the priorities of the most recent policy note (May 2018). This Program clearly contributes to this priority.
2.1.3	The proposed intervention ties in with the annual plan and the result chain of the <u>MIB/MASP</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> The intervention is specifically mentioned in the result chain of the MIB/MASP.	2	
2.1.4	The relevance of the proposed intervention to the crosscutting themes of women's rights and gender equality / climate / PSD / coherence and strengthening of civil society organisations	<input type="checkbox"/> The proposed intervention is relevant to more than one of the crosscutting themes.	2	The proposed intervention is relevant to the crosscutting themes of women's rights and gender equality and coherence and strengthening of civil society organisations
Total score (maximum 8 out of 8 points)			8	

2.2 Problem analysis and lessons learned

2.2.1 Description

Uganda has made significant progress over the last 30 years in terms of achieving development outcomes, fostering stability, and moving towards a more democratic system of governance. There are, however, considerable challenges with regard to the quality and access to services. These include a rapidly growing population, a highly unequal distribution of wealth, gender inequalities, marginalization of specific groups including women and youth, endemic corruption, human rights violations, and a system of political governance which is dominated by one ruling party.

Uganda is a hospitable destination for refugees from around the Great Lakes region, but continues to be under pressure; prior to the influx of South Sudanese from mid-2016 onwards, the population of refugees stood at approximately 600,000. Currently, after biometric registration following allegations of trafficking and mismanagement of refugee resources by the refugee regime, the number stands at 1,239,912 (as of March 2019). Of these, 808,554 are from South Sudan (66.1%), 332,506 from Democratic Republic of Congo (27.2%), with the balance coming from Burundi (3.2%), Somalia (2.3%), and Rwanda (1.2%).

In South-Sudan, following intensive diplomatic negotiation, SPLA and SPLA-IO recently signed a peace agreement with support of the Governments of Uganda, Ethiopia, and Sudan. Under the power-sharing deal Riek Machar resumed his position as co-vice-President, but this has not yet led to any reduction in the number of South Sudanese refugees. Instead South Sudanese worry about the fragility of the peace agreement and refugee numbers steadily increased from 1,154,352 in October 2018 to 1,177,030 in November, and 1,190,922 in December 2018. To many refugees, the traumatic events that forced them into exile remain unaddressed, and they do not contemplate return in the immediate future.

Uganda is confronted by a mass influx of refugees who bring with them complex dynamics within and between refugee and host populations, compounded by a highly traumatized refugee population and a host population that is itself still recovering from two decades of conflict during the LRA. The need for enhanced security and policing capacity is increasingly evident, both within refugee settlements, refugee hosting districts, and between refugees and their host. Because of the different ethnic backgrounds, tensions start to grow. This often leads to conflicts and outbreaks of physical violence both within refugee settlements and between refugees and host. The lack of firewood and drinking water is also a root cause of conflicts between refugees and between refugees and the host communities. The Uganda Police Force does not have the capacity to manage and contain these conflicts. Gender balance still requires urgent attention since some settlements barely have female officers.

There is also a widespread problem of refugees held on remand long beyond constitutionally permitted limits; in some cases refugees have been detained without trial for months, in others for years, with severe impacts on the basic rights of the detained individual, their psychological wellbeing, as well as survival and self-reliance of their households.

RLP will aim to:

1. Strengthen Rule of Law stakeholders in Uganda (including Uganda Police Force, Immigration, Prisons, UPDF, Magistrates, Community leaders) through providing appropriate technical knowledge and skills required to interact effectively with complex refugee communities.
2. Address profound harms experienced before and during flight using the proven Screen-Refer-Support-Document model to reduce vulnerabilities of refugees and hosts, promoting access to health and enhance self-reliance.
3. Empower refugee and host voices, both to speak for themselves in dialogue with stakeholders on rights, protection and service provision, and to create skills for present and future usage.
4. Enhance durable refugee-host relations through engaging host communities in mitigating impacts of sudden overpopulation and resultant environmental degradation through income generation and reforestation activities.
5. Promote best practice through national dialogues and regional and international advocacy on refugee-host relations in Uganda.

2.2.2 Appraisal

Appraise the contextual analysis of the project proposal using the appraisal table. If the maximum score is not achieved, explain why and how this is dealt with. If certain criteria do not apply, please indicate this.

No.	Criteria 2.2	Indicators (score 0,1,2)	Score	EXPLANATION/ REFERENCES
	Contextual analysis			
2.2.1	The proposal is based on a careful and thorough contextual analysis, from which a logical problem definition and objective are generated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal is based on a careful and thorough analysis and results in a logical problem definition and objective.	2	
2.2.2	Based on the problem formulated, the proposal explains in a logical manner why the intervention is aimed at the specified geographical location.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal gives a realistic explanation of why the intervention is aimed at the specified geographical location and substantiates this with examples.	2	
2.2.3	The proposal justifies the choice of <u>target group</u> .	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal clearly justifies the choice of target group.	2	
2.2.4	The proposal sets out which relevant actors were involved in formulating the proposal and what influence they had on the content of the proposal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal only sets out the involvement of actors in formulating the proposal OR only sets out the involvement of actors in the proposed intervention (including its management).	1	
2.2.5	A <u>stakeholder analysis</u> (incl. women and youth) has been carried out and the results incorporated in the proposal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal sets out who has a stake in the programme/project and details their relative interests.	2	
2.2.6	The proposal describes how the results of evaluations and/or studies feed into formulation of	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	

	the proposal.	The proposal clearly sets out how results from evaluations and/or studies contributed to formulation of the proposal.		
Total score (maximum ¹² out of 12 points)			11	

2.3 Objectives (outcomes), results (outputs), activities and resources, based on the SMART principle

2.3.1 Description

RLP will deliver benefits to refugee and host communities (outcomes) primarily through a set of goods and services (outputs) which are delivered against specific performance benchmarks or indicators. The proposed outcomes, performance indicators and related outputs are:

Outcome 1 (Linking to MFA outcome indicator 1.1a):

Improved capacity of Uganda Police and other rule of law stakeholders to effectively interact with complex refugee communities and hosts;

Outcome indicator 1:

Percentage of refugees and hosts (m/f) that report improved protection and delivery of services by Uganda Police and other rule of law stakeholders.

Related outputs are:

- 1.1. No. of Rule of Law stakeholders trained to effectively interact with refugees and hosts;
- 1.2. No. of refugees and hosts (m/f) referred by Rule of Law of stakeholders for services;
- 1.3. No. of refugees and hosts (m/f) receiving direct pro--bono legal support;
- 1.4. No. of University students benefitting from experiential learning.

These will be measured through:

Quarterly reports, registration forms, attendance lists, legal intervention form, and baseline and evaluation reports.

Outcome 2 (Linking to MFA outcome indicator 1.1b):

Improved confidence, productivity and resilience of vulnerable South Sudanese

Outcome indicator 2:

Percentage of survivors who recover and enjoy improved physical and psychological functionality.

Related outputs are:

- 2.1. No. of refugees (m/f) screened for experiences of violence;
- 2.2. No. of refugees and hosts (m/f) receiving psychosocial support;
- 2.3. No. of refugees and hosts (m/f) transported to seek medical intervention;
- 2.4. No. of refugees and hosts (m/f) receiving medical intervention;
- 2.5. No. of refugees documented and profiled after receiving medical intervention.

These will be measured through:

Quarterly reports, Medical recovery Monitoring Form, Discharge and satisfaction documentation tool, Client Assessment and Treatment Form, Counseling intervention summary form, baseline survey report, and project evaluation report.

Outcome 3 (linking to MFA outcome indicator 1.1a):

Empowered South Sudanese ably speaking for themselves and contributing to critical debate and social change.

Outcome indicator 3:

Percentage of refugees that confidently report cases and engage in dialogue with Police and other rule of law stakeholders.

Related outputs are:

- 3.1. No. of refugees (m/f) receiving adult education;
- 3.2. No. of refugees (m/f) trained in video skills;
- 3.3. No. of refugee support groups formed and trained;
- 3.4. No. of events commemorated.

These will be measured through: Quarterly reports, registration forms, baseline report, project evaluation report and attendance lists.

Outcome 4 (Linking to MFA outcome indicator 1.2c):

Improved restoration of originally degraded lands in refugee and host communities.

Outcome indicator 4:

Percentage of refugees and host community members participating in environmental restoration activities.

Related outputs are:

- 4.1. No. of dialogues on environment conducted;
- 4.2. No. of refugee--run tree nurseries for environmental and income generating purposes;
- 4.3. No. of trees planted in degraded refugee and host lands;
- 4.4. No. of environmental stakeholders partnered with in tree--planting campaigns.

These will be measured through:
Quarterly reports, registration forms and attendance lists.

Outcome 5 (Linking to MFA outcomes 1.1a, 1.1b, 1.2c):

Increased influence in refugee--related policies by regional and international stakeholders.

Outcome indicator 5:

No. of refugee--related policies and practices influenced.

Related outputs are:

- 5.1. No. of regional dialogues held with cultural and faith based leaders in refugee hosting districts;
- 5.2. No. of consultative workshops held with key refugee stakeholders.

These will be measured through:
Quarterly reports, attendance lists and registration forms.

The above set of five outcomes and their related outputs that must be achieved in order to reach the desired project objectives.

2.3.2 Appraisal

Appraise the logical framework using the appraisal table. If the maximum score is not achieved, explain why and how this is dealt with. If certain criteria do not apply, please indicate this.

No.	Criteria 2.3 Outcomes, outputs, activities and resources based on the SMART principle	Explanation of score (1 point per indicator)	Score
2.3.1	The objectives at outcome level are clearly formulated, fall within the proposal's span of influence and are realistic. The outcomes fol-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The outcomes are specifically formulated.	5

	low logically from the problem formulated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The objectives follow logically from the problem formulated. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The objectives fall within the proposal's span of influence and are realistic (taking account of its duration and local circumstances). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The objectives are acceptable to the target group and other stakeholders. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The objectives formulated are realistic bearing in mind the scope of the activities and the capacity of the (local) organisation(s).		
--	--	--	--	--

**EXPLANATION/
REFERENCES**

there are many totally different outcomes on different subjects (rule of law, protection, environment) which can cause fragmentation. There clearly is a coherence but for most outcomes you can have a project on its own. But since this is a continuation of an earlier program it is proved by the results that it is within the span of influence and realistic

Additional appreciation

Gender indicator 3:

The objectives do not include an explicit reference to women/ men, girls/ boys and gender equality.

2.3.2	Progress in achieving the outcomes can be determined objectively on the basis of measurable performance indicators.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Relevant performance indicators have been formulated for each outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A baseline measurement and a measurable target (quantitative and/or qualitative) have been formulated for each performance indicator. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The verification method (the means by which data is collected and the sources of that data) is realistic and feasible.	3	
-------	---	---	----------	--

**EXPLANATION/
REFERENCES**

Additional appreciation

gender indicator 1:

There are no relevant, gender specific performance indicators formulated for the outcomes.

2.3.3	The outputs formulated are concrete and fall within the proposal's span of control. The outputs follow logically from the outcomes formulated.	<p>The project proposal is divided into clear phases, each having concretely formulated outputs.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The outputs are specific.</p> <p>There is a clear link between the outputs and the out-comes, i.e.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the outputs can be expected to contribute to achievement of the outcomes.</p> <p>The outputs are</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> acceptable to the target group and other</p> <p>The outputs formulated are realistic bearing in mind the scope of the activities and the capacity of the (local) organisation(s) .</p>	5
<p>EXPLANATION/ REFERENCES</p> <p>The outputs are a bit too specific. Most activities are also mentioned as outputs. Therefore there are too much outputs formulated per outcome (especially output 1) and it becomes a bit unclear, but considering the results of the previous phase, they are realistic.</p>			
2.3.4	Progress in achieving the outputs can be determined objectively on the basis of measurable performance indicators.	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Relevant performance indicators have been formulated for each output.</p> <p>A baseline and a measurable target (quantitative and/or qualitative) have been formulated for each performance indicator.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The verification method (the means by which data is collected and the sources of that data) is realistic and feasible.</p>	3
<p>EXPLANATION/ REFERENCES</p> <p>Additional appreciation gender indicator 1 and 2:</p>			

<p>For each output are relevant, gender specific performance indicators formulated;</p> <p>Baseline, targets and verification methods are put on to collect gender specific information. Each relevant baseline or target is divided in the number of males and females.</p>			
2.3.5	There is a logical link between the proposed activities and the outputs formulated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal sets out the nature of the activities and explains how the activities formulated will contribute to achieving the outputs.	1
EXPLANATION/ REFERENCES			
2.3.6	There is a logical link between the activities and the project budget (efficiency).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The budget is supported by figures on price and quantity (p x q). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The budget is broken down by output and/or outcome.	2
EXPLANATION/ REFERENCES			
2.3.7	When the activity ends, its envisaged outputs will have a lasting effect for the ultimate target group.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal contains a clear vision (with objectives) as to how the activities will be continued when the intervention comes to an end. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> To achieve these objectives, specific measures will be taken during implementation of the activities to ensure that the target group will help continue the activities. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal contains suitable criteria against which progress in continuing the activities can be measured. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal includes a transition plan or exit strategy, identifying the various actors.	4

EXPLANATION/ REFERENCES				
2.3.8	At the end of the activity, the envisaged outputs will have a lasting effect on the local partners.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal contains a clear vision (with objectives) as to how the quality of the activities and/or financial independence of the local partner will be enhanced. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> To achieve these objectives, specific measures will be taken during implementation of the activity. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal devotes attention to the capacity of the local partner to generate income from various sources. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal sets out suitable criteria against which progress in regard to institutional sustainability can be measured.	3	
EXPLANATION / REFERENCES				
Sustainability				
<u>Rule of Law</u>				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Equipping the Uganda Police Force with (in Kiryandongo with 1 Car and 2 Motorcycles) to increase their mobility and improve community policing – an activity that can continue on its own and led by Uganda Police and Community Leaders. 2. Strengthening capacity building and Training of Trainers – including through dissemination of the recently published Training Manual and User Guide to different Police and UPDF training schools across the country following Training of Trainers courses conducted in Phase I. 3. Placing UPF, UPDF and other Justice Sector duty bearers for experiential learning at RLP – skills which they will carry-on in their day-to-day work. 4. Giving legal and medical students experiential learning opportunities that are demonstrated to influence their subsequent career choices towards social justice related work 				
<u>Addressing Harms</u>				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Addressing medical conditions arising from violence before they create chronic dysfunction, 				

- thereby enhancing survivor recovery and self-reliance
2. Training peer organisations in the Screen-Refer-Support-Document approach to identification of and response to war-related harms
 3. Placing health workers in government hospitals to add to existing capacity of local governments, tackle xenophobia and accusation of bias towards refugees. These health workers will continue to support all patients seeking health services.

Refugee & Host Voice

1. The Speak Your Rights curriculum, finalized in Phase 1, opens opportunities for learners: At least 30 percent of our graduates in EFA have moved positively including acquisition of paid employment and now able to support themselves and their households.
2. Empowering South Sudanese refugees to be self-sufficient through establishing & mentoring support groups and victim associations that by the end of the intervention are autonomous allows members to have collective voice, and to advocate for themselves.
3. Training of trainers for Graduates of video-advocacy training, who will then be able to lead on or support advocacy activities as well as livelihood projects through commercial audio-visual production.
4. The Innovation Centres will develop business plans charging modest sums for video coverage and other media work commissioned by UN, NGOs and Governmental Duty-bearers.

Mitigation of Environmental Impacts

1. Trees planted are mainly on land provided by host communities and institutions like schools that are able to continue maintaining the trees.
2. Establishment of community-level and led nurseries that can sell seedlings to NGOs, UN, Local Government should enhance sustainability

Refugee-Host Relations Management

1. Equipping District Local Government political and technical leadership with sufficient knowledge of the international and national policy and legal frameworks allows them to sustainably manage and administer the refugee-host relationship and integration at local level.

Total score (maximum score 27 points)

2

2.4 Cooperation, harmonisation and added value

The Netherlands is the sole donor on this proposal. The Refugee Law project will work together with a large number of (local) organizations and/ or other parties. For instance with the UPF, UN-HCR, UN WOMAN, OPM, UPDF, JLO sector, Makerere University etc.

This project is unique in:

- Building on a carefully developed relationship with the UPF.
- Rolling out a tried and tested screening and referral methodology on a scale that far surpasses any current project.
- Promising a far more substantive response to the injuries and related dysfunctions that are widespread in newly arrived refugee populations but for which there is currently little or no provision. While there are several existing Implementing Partners (DRC, MTI, RMF, TPO, IRC) which are able to receive medical and counselling referrals for basic conditions, they do not provide for complex injuries (e.g. rectal prolapse), nor do they provide support during hospitalization.
- Offering comprehensive support for male survivors of violence that goes hand-in-hand with support to women survivors
- Promoting full inclusion of refugee and host communities through the use of community radio as a platform for all
- Providing full legal aid – including court representation - to refugees in the settlements
- Developing a cadre of professionally trained community interpreters who can be deployed in judicial institutions
- Providing training on the use of video and other social media to refugees
- Linking the use of re-afforestation as an environmental remedy with conflict-mitigation between refugees and their hosts

- Prioritising youth for skills development in the field of communications to enhance the prospects of post-conflict development

2.5 Channel and aid modality (including alignment)

The aid modality is earmarked funding for this project to the Refugee Law Project. This modality is appropriate as it gives RLP the opportunity to fulfil the objectives in the proposal. The Refugee Law Project provides sufficient transparency and flexibility to responsibly manage a financial budget of 7.5 million euro.

Refugee Law project has a strong alignment with both the (local) authorities and the communities. There is a relatively low fiduciary risks because of the fact that the resources will exclusively managed by the Refugee Law Project.

The institutional arrangement has a very high degree of alignment, both in terms of policy priorities of the GoU and other organizations, but also in financial management and reporting.

The implementing partner does not provide any financial contribution itself and is depending on the financial contribution of the Netherlands to implement the programme.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Budget

5.1.1 Breakdown of costs

S/NO	ITEM/Objective	TOTAL Euro					
1.0	OBJECTIVE ONE: To Build the Capacities of Uganda Police Force and Host Authorities	331.320	297.313	286.392	309.325	1.224.349	16%
2.0	OBJECTIVE TWO: To build the confidence of South Sudanese Refugees through addressing profound harms	358.552	348.787	355.762	362.878	1.425.979	19%
3.0	OBJECTIVE THREE: To Empower Refugees to Speak for Themselves	164.132	250.717	176.249	179.774	770.872	10%
4.0	OBJECTIVE FOUR: To engage the host communities in reversing the impacts of sudden overpopulation and resultant environmental degradation	76.211	56.555	57.686	58.840	249.293	3%
5.0	OBJECTIVE FIVE: To conduct regional and international advocacy of refugees issues in Uganda	53.560	99.832	64.305	103.793	321.490	4%
6.0	Activity 6: Monitoring and Evaluation	9.930	26.929	10.332	28.017	75.208	1%
7.0	Institutional & Organizational Development	15.842	16.159	16.482	16.812	65.294	1%
8.0	Programme Salaries	658.722	671.896	685.334	699.041	2.714.993	36%
	DIRECT PROGRAMME COSTS	1.668.269	1.768.188	1.652.543	1.758.479	6.847.479	92%
9.0	Equipment Costs (if any)	52.800	2.592	17.772	2.697	75.861	1%
	Total Programme Costs	1.721.069	1.770.780	1.670.315	1.761.176	6.923.340	93%
10.	8% administrative costs	137.686	141.662	133.625	140.894	553.867	7,4%
	Grand Total	1.858.754	1.912.442	1.803.940	1.902.070	7.477.207	100%

5.3 Monitoring

5.3.1 Narrative and financial reports

See appendix C (the performance assessment decision tree) -> Outcome 8:

Audit opinion

+ report of findings

+ final evaluation of efficiency and effectiveness

5.3.2 Audit opinion

See appendix D (audit certificate decision tree) -> Audit opinion on the beneficiary's annual accounts.

5.3.3 IATI - International Aid transparency Initiative

RLP is in the process of becoming IATI compliant. The embassy in Kampala will invite RLP for Future IATI workshops and other IATI assistance, together with the contract partners of the embassy. The organisation will be requested to report on results in accordance with the IATI standard, as set out in the BZ publication guidelines.

5.3.4 Annual plans and other reports

n.a.

5.3.5 Monitoring calendar

Report type	Period	Submission by
Narrative progress report	1 May 2019 – 31 December 2019	31 March 2020
	1 January 2020 – 31 December 2020	31 March 2021
	1 January 2021 – 31 December 2021	31 March 2022
	1 January 2022 – 31 December 2022	31 March 2023
Financial progress report	1 May 2019 – 31 December 2019	31 March 2020
	1 January 2020 – 31 December 2020	31 March 2021
	1 January 2021 – 31 December 2021	31 March 2022
	1 January 2022 – 31 December 2022	31 March 2023
Audit	1 May 2019 – 31 December 2019	31 March 2020
	1 January 2020 – 31 December 2020	31 March 2021
	1 January 2021 – 31 December 2021	31 March 2022
	1 January 2022 – 31 December 2022	31 March 2023
Final narrative and financial report, <u>including Audit</u>	1 May 2019 – 30 April 2023	31 October 2023
Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission terms of reference • Submission Mid-term evaluation report • Submission Evaluation report 	1 May 2019 – 30 April 2021	30 November 2020
	1 May 2019 – 30 April 2023	28 February 2022
	1 May 2019 – 30 April 2021	31 July 2021
	1 May 2019 – 30 April 2023	31 October 2023
IATI Please upload input on the MFA indicators in IATI **	1 May 2019 – 30 April 2020	31 July 2020
	1 May 2020 – 30 April 2021	31 July 2021
	1 May 2021 – 30 April 2022	31 July 2022
	1 May 2022 – 30 April 2023	31 July 2023

** Please make sure that all data will be disaggregated for male/female and refugee/host community.

5.3.6 Evaluations

Evaluation is planned based on the fact that the activity's financial value is more than €5 million. See Appendix 'decision tree evaluations'.



Rijksdienst

4000002708

Result Management System

Securing refugee-host relations in Northern Uganda through enhanced protection

4000002708

Created By Winke van der Els
Created On:02-May-2019, 13:35
Last Modified on:03-May-2019, 12:35
Workflow State:Assessment.Final

Policy Result Framework

Climate

Result Area	Theme / Subtheme	Indicator-code	Type	Nature	Baseline	Disaggregates	Contribution	Attribution	% of Target in Framework
1. Climate change adaptation: reduced vulnerability of human and natural systems to current and expected impacts of climate change through increased resilience or reduced exposure (SDG 13/Paris)	Climate								

Migration

Result Area	Theme / Subtheme	Indicator-code	Type	Nature	Baseline	Target	Disaggregates	Contribution	Attribution	% of Target in Framework
					Base-line Text	2019 2020 2021 2022 2023				
Improved sustainable living conditions for refugees and orderly, safe and responsible migration										
1. Improved protection and socio-economic prospects for refugees and host communities	Support for regional host countries									
1.1a Improved legal position, including registration, assistance for vulnerable people, the right to work and the right to access basic services	Support for regional host countries / Legal position and protection									
		ST Percentage of population covered by social protection floors/systems IOM - MI_ST_12	Quantitative	Cumulative	11.666666					
1.1b Refugees and vulnerable host communities are better protected	Support for regional host countries / Legal position and protec-									

against violence and abuse	tion	ST Percentage of population covered by social protection floors/systems IOM - MI_ST_35	Quantitative	Cumulative	50				
1.1.4 Fund projects that enhance protection of refugees and host communities with a focus on SGBV, child abuse, psychosocial support and community policing	Support for regional host countries / Legal position and protection								
1.2a Expanded and improved integrated basic service delivery that includes both refugees and host communities	Support for regional host countries / Education and integrated service delivery								
1.2.1 Fund projects that expand the capacity of service delivery systems to increase access to integrated basic services (e.g. education, health care, water, infrastructure, waste management, energy) for refugees and host communities	Support for regional host countries / Education and integrated service delivery								
		ST # of crisis impacted individuals directly benefitting from improved service delivery as a result of DSH-MO programmes Guidance Note Monitoring 1.2a - MI_ST_16	Quantitative	Incremental	1299	900	900	900	900
1.2b Increased quality education and vocation-	Support for regional host countries /								

al training for refugees and host communities	Education and integrated service delivery								
1.2.2 Fund projects that improve access to quality education and vocational training for refugees and host communities	Support for regional host countries / Education and integrated service delivery	ST Number of people enrolled in formal or non-formal education and training DGIS indicator 1.2b - MI_ST_24	Quantitative	Incremental	1187	1050	1050	1050	1050
1.2c Improved social cohesion between refugees and host communities	Support for regional host countries / Education and integrated service delivery								
1.3a Increased number of refugees and host community members are employed in decent work	Support for regional host countries / Economic development and decent work								
1.3.2 Fund projects that create more jobs and income generation opportunities in areas where many displaced people reside	Support for regional host countries / Economic development and decent work	ST Number of people assisted to develop economic income generating activities DGIS indicator - MI_ST_23	Quantitative	Incremental		9	9	9	9
1.4 NL interventions take conflict sensitivity into account	Support for regional host countries / Conflict sensitivity								
1.5 NL interventions take gender sensitivity	Support for regional host countries /								

into account	Gender sensitivity
1.6 NL interventions take institutional development of national and local authorities and institutions into account	Support for regional host countries / Institutional development

If applicable:

Explanation why this activity only contributes to one framework

Explanation why decided not to choose at least one of the indicators which belong to the outcome or output of the PTRF.

no data

Explanation why baselines and targets were not being registered

no data

Refugee Law Project Narrative Proposal “Improving Prospects for Refugees and vulnerable host communities” – Uganda, re. DSH/BU/UITN/RLP

The following narrative addresses all the issues outlined in the Application Template.

Additionally, in response to the letter of the Minister for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation dated 18 January 2019 (ref DSH/BU/UITN/RLP), it speaks to:

1. How youth will be targeted within the intervention and what specific risks they are facing (See 2.1.5)
2. Base-lines, target values and verification methods, with specific attention to gender and the collection of gender-specific information (See 2.5 below and Annex A – Results Framework)
3. How this intervention will form a continuation of the currently implemented Activities (see 2.1.11b)

II. Activity Appraisal

2.1.1 Summary of proposed interventions and how they relate to context analysis and problem statement

Envisioning Uganda as a place of asylum in which refugees and hosts enjoy their rights and contribute to Uganda’s development; building on lessons learned Oct 2017 – Dec 2018; contributing to burden-sharing with Uganda by building self-reliance and voice of refugees and host population, mitigating environmental impacts, and disseminating best-practices; in line with the Global Compact on Refugees, CRRF and ReHOPE, the five interrelated and conflict-sensitive objectives of this intervention consolidate & further elaborate multi-disciplinary and innovative solutions targeting vulnerable refugees & hosts, governmental and non-governmental duty bearers and leaders, and aim to

- 1) **Strengthen Rule of Law** stakeholders in Uganda (including Uganda Police Force, Immigration, Prisons, UPDF, Magistrates, Community leaders) through providing appropriate technical knowledge and skills required to interact effectively with complex refugee communities. This builds on the training manual published during Phase I to realise key policy initiatives.
- 2) **Address profound harms** experienced before and during flight using the proven Screen-Refer-Support-Document model to reduce vulnerabilities of refugees and hosts, promoting access to health and enhance self-reliance.
- 3) **Empower refugee and host voices**, both to speak for themselves in dialogue with stakeholders on rights, protection and service provision, and to create skills for present and future usage.
- 4) **Enhance durable refugee-host relations** through engaging host communities in mitigating impacts of sudden overpopulation and resultant environmental degradation through income generation and reforestation activities.
- 5) **Promote best practice** through national dialogues and regional and international advocacy on refugee-host relations in Uganda.

2.1.2 In-depth Context analysis and problem statement

Unstable Refugee Numbers: Uganda, well known as a hospitable destination for refugees from around the Great Lakes region, continues to be under pressure; prior to the influx of South Sudanese from mid-2016 onwards, the population of refugees stood at approximately 600,000. Currently, after biometric registration following allegations of trafficking and mismanagement of refugee resources by the refugee regime, the number stands at 1,190,992 (statistics as of 31 December 2018). Of these, 789,099 were from South Sudan (66.3%), 312,699 from Democratic Republic of Congo (26.3%), with the balance coming from Burundi (2.9%), Somalia (2%), Rwanda (1.2%), and Eritrea/Sudan/Ethiopia/Others constituting 1.4%.

Following intensive diplomatic negotiation, SPLA and SPLA-IO recently signed a peace agreement with support of the Governments of Uganda, Ethiopia, and Sudan. Under the power-sharing deal Riek Machar resumed his position as co-vice-President, but this has not yet led to any reduction in the number of South Sudanese refugees. Instead South Sudanese worry about the fragility of the peace agreement and refugee numbers steadily increased from 1,154,352 in October 2018 to 1,177,030 in November, and 1,190,922 in December 2018. To many refugees, the traumatic events that forced them into exile remain unaddressed, and they do not contemplate return in the immediate future.¹

Uganda Police Force and Other Law & Order Services Stretched Thin: Enhancing policing capacity, both within refugee settlements and between refugees and hosts, remains critical, not least to manage and contain outbreaks of physical violence. Confronted by a mass influx of refugees who bring with them complex dynamics within and between refugee and host populations, compounded by a highly traumatized refugee population and a host population that is itself still recovering from two decades of conflict, the UPF remains stretched thin.²

In Phase I of the Project, **core needs for transport and police posts** and housing were tackled in Palabek in Lamwo district and Maaji II in Adjumani district), but have yet to be met in Kiryandongo. Filling transport gaps facilitates rapid follow-up on reported crimes, arrest and transfer to court or prison. Reducing delays in justice enhances the relationship between police, refugees and hosts, thereby decreasing the risk of instability in the form of mob justice, inter-ethnic clashes within settlements, and refugee-host clashes. Adequate logistic capacity also helps in systematic attempts to remove small arms. Phase I began to address gaps in the skills and awareness of police and other duty bearers. Phase II will build and consolidate initiatives given the large numbers involved, and frequent rotations of officers.

In Phase II, RLP will continue to advocate for increase in the number of Police officers in the and around refugee settlement to strengthen security and community policing. Currently, there are only 5 police officers attached to Palabek refugee settlement manning up to 34,889 refugees – representing a ratio of 1:6877, way above the standard ratio of 1:400. Gender balance still requires urgent attention since some settlements barely have female officers; Palabek refugee settlement has 1 female officers who is torn between serving refugees and other assignments at district level.

¹ From our screening work, it is evident that for significant numbers of refugees who arrived in Uganda from 2016 onwards, this is in fact their second or even third time in exile from South Sudan.

² Senior Commissioner of Police, Felix Ndyomugenyi, verbal communication, 19 June 2017

Phase I built **constructive relationships with all prisons** in the refugee-hosting areas, but uncovered a widespread problem of refugees held on remand long beyond constitutionally permitted limits; in some cases refugees have been detained without trial for months, in others for years, with severe impacts on the basic rights of the detained individual, their psychological wellbeing, as well as survival and self-reliance of their households. In Phase II, we envisage strengthening psychosocial support to refugees and hosts in prisons in and around refugee hosting areas. Whereas Uganda Prison Service (UPS) recognizes the need for psychosocial support for inmates, and 'Counselling Guidance' as a component of 'Rehabilitation', UPS is stretched thin and ill-equipped to address the needs, with only one counsellor attached to each prison. Not surprisingly there is no content on their website for 'Counselling Guidance'. Our efforts to bring this situation to the attention of the authorities have resulted in **co-financing (with UNHCR) special High Court sessions** as a means of tackling these severe backlogs. Given the widespread nature of this particular blockage to basic rights to fair trial and detention, Phase II will consolidate additional and regular mobile sessions along with regular monitoring of detention facilities.

Phase II will **strengthen the referral pathway for protection and security-related cases** in a manner that addresses other key stakeholders in the law and order sector. Notwithstanding the trainings delivered during Phase I, magistrates, immigration officers, prisons, UPDF and local leaders (Local Councils, Refugee Welfare Councils) remain in need of ongoing training on the key rights and obligations of refugees, to ensure that refugee-host relations are addressed in a timely fashion.

A Highly Traumatized Refugee Population: Refugees arrive in Uganda having experienced **high levels of violence in their country of origin and with untreated wounds**. Under Phase I of this project, the *Screen-Refer-Support-Document* (SRSD) model has been effectively rolled out and further refined in three refugee settlements. In Phase I, we supported over 1028 refugees and hosts with war-related injuries to access medical interventions beyond the scope of humanitarian medical Implementing Partners and requiring referral to more highly skilled and equipped medical facilities.

Such **referrals have proven overwhelmingly successful** and in numerous instances have allowed the individual to recover from severely debilitating injuries and resume a normal active existence, with economic, social and psychological benefits extending from the individual survivor, through her or his household, and into the wider refugee community. As predicted, while the majority of cases are identified through our systematic screening process, a pattern of peer referrals for screening has begun to emerge. A number of success cases have now been documented, with one short piece published (*21 Years Running*).

Security Challenges Within Refugee Communities: Cases of **ethnic clashes**, which replicate the very tensions that refugees seek to escape from when they cross the border, continue to be documented. The proximity of refugee settlements to a porous border aggravates refugees' insecurity, and heightens the possibility of inter-ethnic clashes, abductions back to Sudan, forcible recruitment by Sudanese armed groups, proliferation of small arms (which are periodically confiscated at boarder points), and forced marriages, particularly of young girl refugees.

While a lot has been achieved in securing refugee-host relations in Phase I, cases of ethnic tensions continue to be reported in refugee settlements, as well as clashes between host and refugees. Peaceful and co-existence activities need to be strengthened with robust activities in Phase II including initiatives for empowering host and refugee communities to build cultural bridges for peaceful coexistence, thus contributing to sustainable peace.

Late 2018 saw unprecedented cases of foreign spies disguised as refugees in settlements. Whereas government is yet to provide official statements, media houses have unveiled some of those anomalies that continue to worry refugees following earlier cases of kidnaps, arrest and forceful repatriation. State Minister for Relief and Disaster Preparedness, Mr Musa Ecweru was quoted to have said “...Whereas there are millions of people running away from conflict in their countries, there are also those posing as refugees but with intentions of undermining the host country’s security.” This not only undermines the security of the country but aggravates already fragile security situations in refugee settlements.

Ecosystem Losses and Security Challenges Between Refugees and Their Hosts: Tensions over natural resources persist between refugees and hosts, from land for agricultural purposes, thatch for roofing, and wood for charcoal - all of which accelerates already severe environmental degradation arising from activities such as charcoal burning that impoverished host communities have been engaged in. The Government’s policy of land distribution, intended as a long-term solution to food rationing/distribution, nonetheless exacerbates deforestation and soil degradation. A growing refugee population that is both unable to produce their own food and unable to access employment opportunities, may end up stealing food from host communities. The coexistence currently enjoyed between refugees and the host community is therefore fragile.

In Phase II, RLP will expand engagements with district and community leaders on climate change. We recognize that many actors are working on climate change by providing seedlings to refugees and some hosts. However, refugees occupy pieces of land measuring 30 x 30 metres. On this they have to construct temporary shelters and pit latrines, and also use it to plant crop. They are therefore unable to engage in commercial tree planting projects. Also, many afforestation projects lack tree management plans; as such ends trees are planted but with no budget and initiatives on how the trees will be protected against wild fire, animals and drought. In Phase II, we will proactively engage multiple stakeholders in establishing tree management plans as well as broadening environmental protection to include issues of bush burning, soil erosion and pollution. Also, we will facilitate students support tours to connect university studies studying climate change and agriculture to support the schools and communities that have planted and managing the trees.

In northern Uganda, where well established refugee settlements on government gazetted land were supplemented with hastily thrown together settlements on land generously offered by host communities (a process mediated by cultural leaders), refugee-host tensions persist over land use and use of related natural resources. However, there are growing cases of host asking for their land back, and stopping refugees from accessing firewood and poles for contraction following unmet expectations and unfulfilled promises by government to land owners. Even worse, the land offered to refugees does not have a formal agreement and/or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with OPM and district leaders, and with uncertainty

on when they will be handed back to the landowners. Lamwo residents continue to demand for agreements for refugee land – a request that government is yet to honour despite multiple meetings asking government to expedite the process. While residents were not coerced to give their land to settle refugees, they continue to beg government for signed agreement to confirm and formalize the process – failure to heed to these requests is a ticking time bomb, as captured in a recent study by IRRRI titled “My Children Should Stand Strong to Make Sure We Get Our Land Back”.

Small arms: The potential for violence is aggravated by the presence of small arms in settlements. Incidents of Uganda Police and UPDF exchanging gun fire with South Sudanese refugees who possess small arms have been reported several times since 2013. For instance, on 05 June 2016 at least five Dinka refugees were killed, and dozens were injured when clashes broke out between the Dinka and police in Kiryandongo Refugee camp in Kiryandongo District. The Uganda Police claimed that the South Sudanese refugees (Dinka) had firearms and had resisted arrest for their involvement in breaking into and looting food from the refugee camp food store. Recently, the RDC of Kiryandongo reported that there are small arms in refugee settlements, a report denied by central government and security officials in the district. Ironically, the RDC is a member of the district security committee chaired by the LC V. This not only leaves refugees and host in dilemma, but presents with huge security threat.

Lack of Urban Alternatives: The presence of a large refugee population causes a lot of stress to the already thin and hard to access social services, especially in relation to job seeking, education, and health services, and particularly in areas such as Adjumani where refugees outnumber the host population. Whereas “Kampala sets examples for how cities can help refugees”, the rising prices and cost of living in urban centres make it even harder for refugees to seek sanctuary in urban centres. Whereas UNHCR has Alternatives to Camps Policy (ACP) and Comprehensive Policy on Urban Refugees (CPUR), Uganda only recognizes urban refugees in Kampala but not in other major urban centres including Gulu, Mbarara, Mbarara, and Hoima. Even worse, there is only 1 UNHCR implementing partner working with close to 103,000 urban refugees in Kampala.

Refugee settlements including Adjumani, Arua, Yumbe, and Palabek recently saw strikes over food items and quality of services. These halted operation of Implementing and Operational partners for 1 week. In November 2018 an unprecedented riot in Omugo reception centre in Arua over food went further to disarm a special police constable. Staff of some service providers including UNHCR and WFP were taken hostage, and property was destroyed, including that of the RDC of Yumbe. The strike prompted OPM and UNHCR to organize an emergency meeting to investigate what happened and decide on processes for food distribution.

As this example highlighted, where youth are ignored they can eventually constitute a security threat. However, they also represent an untapped opportunity insofar as youth and children are generally more open and more accepting of new ideas around cultural diversity, social inclusion and cohesion. Phase II will consolidate on the trainings and mentorship offered during Phase I by including video advocacy training and organizing video boot camp and refugee and host youth film festivals – skills acquired are psychologically rewarding and economically enriching for self-sustenance.

A Communications Deficit: Refugee-host tensions continue to be aggravated by language challenges (while Madi and Acholi are cross-border languages, Nuer, Dinka, Shilluk etc. are not, and this poses particular challenges for women given that 80% have only some primary schooling, with only 13% going on to secondary school). They are also aggravated by the lack of shared platforms for communications related to differences and to common concerns.

In Phase I the Refugee Law Project sought to establish a community-based radio station that would offer a platform to both refugees and hosts – hoping that it would facilitate widespread dissemination of key information to refugee and host populations, most of whom are located in relatively isolated rural settlements. However, and despite government plea to national and international actors to support its development, applications to the Uganda Communications Commission for a broadcasting license were rejected on the grounds that there was ‘no spectrum’ in Lamwo district. Subsequently and in consultation with Dutch MFA, a budget reallocation was approved in July 2018 that included provision for establishment of an “Innovation Centre” in Gulu to better enable refugee and host youth to work on multi-media projects and create a new set of voices in refugee-host related debates. Phase II will further support the innovation centre and its capacity for wider reach and impact, and will see through establishment of two more innovation centres in for use by both refugees and hosts.

The situation in refugee settlements can itself be a cause of trauma, not least for youth confronted with and immobilized by a lack of educational and employment opportunities with which to secure their future. Unless engaged and sensitized they may become more prone to engage in violence. Phase I engaged refugee and host youth in ‘boot-camps’ video advocacy and essentials of video documentation and advocacy. Examples of the output of their work in Phase I include *The Future* and *The Tap* and *The Net*, all offering unique insights into and perspectives on the experiences of refugees and their hosts. For World Refugee Day 2018 a series of short statements by refugees and hosts were captured in the course of Phase I. During the second regional conference on forced migration, participants voted for the best video, and awards were presented to best performing videography group.

A Host Population that is also in need: Both Adjumani and Lamwo fall within the area of northern Uganda that bore the brunt of the protracted LRA-Government of Uganda conflict (1986-2005). Adjumani district was established in 1997 out of the eastern portion of former Moyo District. Lamwo District was established in 2009, coinciding with large-scale return from the Acholi IDP camps of the late 1990s and early 2000s. Gen Moses Ali, the First Deputy Prime Minister, recently said “We are now behind by 10 years in terms of development because of the [LRA] war” (read [external link](#)).

Patterns of **nationals impersonating refugees** (particularly in order to get relief items meant for refugees), described as “rampant” in some refugee settlements, notably in Adjumani District, should be understood against this backdrop of long-standing poverty. According to police, suspects confessed that they had decided to register as refugees due to poverty. Similarly, cases of Ugandans registering as refugees in their own country have been reported in Kyegegwa and again, residents allude to poor service delivery as one of the push factors. Cases of impersonation include cases of refugees hiring host community children to register under their household numbers so as to increase household relief. Such impersonation is

facilitated by the fact that major ethnic groups (notably Madi and Acholi) straddle the South Sudan-Uganda border.

A January 2019 news item (*“OPM Forced Ugandans to register as refugees in Kyangwali”*) intimated that over 1,000 Ugandans residing in areas neighboring Kyangwali refugee settlement were forced to attain refugee status in order to retain ‘ownership’ of their land, and that with the help of soldiers and police, residents were tortured and forced to sign documents forcing them to become refugees on their own land and then issued with refugee cards – a situation which, according to residents, began in November 2018. While we wait for the story to unfold further, this is another issue of concern that Phase II will rigorously advocate against.

Key principles of the Global Compact on Refugees and the CRRF are not being operationalized:

In the course of Phase 1 it became clear that, contrary to the intention to work closely with local authorities, District local Government is largely excluded from decision-making related to the hosting of large refugee populations.

2.1.3 Context-specific, evidence-based approach including theory of change: Each of the five objectives has an associated theory of change: **1) *Creating sustainable and conflict-sensitive relations within refugee communities and between refugees and hosts requires strengthened rule of law***, which requires training and support to duty-bearers **2) *If previously untreated war-related injuries are identified and treated it enhances capacities for self-reliance as well as peaceful co-existence***. During Phase I, RLP regularized “Screen-Refer-Support-Document” (SRSD) as a groundbreaking mode of intervention to address the challenges related to silences around war-related injuries including rape. The SRSD model has enabled early disclosure, with positive impacts on timely uptake of professional medical and psychosocial rehabilitation. From late 2018, and using the SRSD model, 4,316 refugees and hosts were screened (2,822f, 1,474m & 20 Sexual and Gender minorities), from which we **identified** 1,432 survivors of war-related injuries (33% of total screenings). We **referred** and **supported** 1,054 (378 still awaiting referral). See, for example, *21 Years Running*). A comprehensive presentation on implementation during 2018 is supplied in “Optional Attachments” **3) *Refugees and host communities, including local authorities, must have voice if they are to be involved in decision-making that affects them***, and this will contribute also to more secure refugee-host relations **4) *Mitigating environmental degradation associated with mass influx improves the prospects for harmonious refugee-host relations*** **5) *Evidence-based advocacy derived from strong interventions can strengthen humanitarian systems to the benefit of refugee-host relations***.

2.1.4 Gender Analysis: Of Uganda’s refugee population 51% are women and girls, 49% men and boys. 61% are below 18 years. Amongst adults, the gender ratio is 54% women to 46% men. Vulnerable groups include women and girls, persons with disabilities, elderly persons, children, sexual and gender minorities, female and male survivors of sexual violence and other war-related injuries, single-headed households, child-headed households. Default understandings of gender roles and relations remain patriarchal and heteronormative. Respect for adult men and women are predicated on having a spouse and children and being able to support them. High unemployment, xenophobia and the absence of extended family networks in refugee settings, put traditional gender roles under pressure; Men struggle to

provide due to lack of marketable skills, bureaucratic obstacles to exercising their professions, and trauma-related health challenges aggravated by severe barriers to disclosure, particularly of sexual violence related complications. Whereas male-headed households tend to include relatively few non-biological children, single women often head households that include numerous children of siblings. This is one of the factors pushing women into new and more public roles and responsibilities even as they struggle to cope with their own multiple traumas (See film *21 Years Running*). Another is the gendered pattern of detention; during Phase I visits to prisons found that nearly 100% of refugee detainees are male.

RLP's 2017 finding from screening of 937 South Sudanese refugees in Adjumani, Kiryandongo, Lamwo and Kampala, namely that only 4% of women and 2% of men escaped South Sudan without experiencing any form of physical violence, has been further supported by the results of systematic screening in Phase 1. We continue to document gendered experiences of physical violence. Men disclose higher levels of physical violence and torture than women. Equally, disclosure of sexual violence experiences remains much higher amongst women than men but, as anticipated, the gap is beginning to narrow as other victims learn of the recovery of their peers as a result of the project ([read report](#)). Shifts in power at household level, often exacerbated by high levels of unaddressed trauma, particularly sexual trauma, can fuel not only domestic violence, but also tensions with neighbours. Fearing abandonment, few victims disclose to their spouses; cross-infections can result. Bringing up the children of siblings who have been killed, as well as children born of rape, creates further tensions in households and communities. Sexual violence related reproductive health problems prevent survivors from having children, with major individual and social consequences.

High levels of vulnerability coupled with xenophobia result in further experiences of sexual violence in the country of asylum, both by women and men: Defilement, rape, early marriages, indecent assault, and domestic violence are widespread in refugee settlements, between ethnic groups within settlements, and between hosts and refugees. Girl and boy refugees (particularly unaccompanied minors) have often been direct witnesses of violence in the country of origin and are highly vulnerable to sexual abuse and exploitation, particularly the many whose caregivers cannot afford to send them to school. 10% of refugee children reportedly experience [sexual violence, many while collecting firewood](#) and water. UNHCR statistics suggest larger numbers of male unaccompanied minors and separated children than female ([external link](#)). Young girls are at risk of FGM in some communities. Risks to LGBTI refugees are multiplied by the combination of state-sponsored homophobia, community level hostility and civil society indifference.

Specific gender patterns include; more women than men enroll in RLP's English for Adult classes in the settlements. Survival challenges push many to physical and psychological risk: Women report frequent demands for sex in return for access to basic needs – water, food rations, education. 11% of women refugees screened by RLP reported being forced into survival sex to meet daily needs, as did 2.5% of men ([read report](#)). LGBTI and sex workers, as well as male survivors, frequently self-medicate rather than risk ridicule from medical staff, thereby jeopardizing recovery and increasing the cost of appropriate health care once accessed.

2018 saw cases of rape and defilement allegedly committed by refugees against hosts. In April 2018, the Daily Monitor reported that [“Refugee camps in northern Uganda choke on sexual violence cases”](#), narrating an ordeal of a girl allegedly raped by a 21-year-old South Sudanese refugee. The father of the girl who is one of those who generously offered his land to settle refugees said *“What happened to my daughter was painful because I was one of the many people in Adjumani that offered my land to the refugees in the area. It is very painful that this is the way that I and my family have been paid back.”* If not addressed, such incidences risk frustrating progress in securing refugee host relations. Happily, such occurrences have since reduced from the project areas we have been working in (Lamwo, Kiryandongo, & Adjumani).

2.1.5 Attention to youth: Through phase I, we learnt that refugee and host youth grapple with assorted challenges notably; limited opportunity for secondary and tertiary education, lack of economic opportunities, limited skills to engage in self-reliance activities, high levels of untreated trauma, loss of a vision of their future. In Phase I, as well as basic English language skills being provided to youth, RLP trained refugee and host youth in basic videography (see [The Net](#), [The Future](#), [It Hurts Me](#), [Uganda Gave Me Land](#), and [It Could Be Me](#) for the outputs). After RLP’s application to establish a community radio station was blocked by government, RLP therefore realigned the budget for radio station to establish an Innovation Centre, which draws refugee and host youth to further develop their media skills and voice. In phase II, we will strengthen this by training more youth on basic videography, radio production, advocacy, and seek opportunities for referrals for secondary and tertiary education. Through the proposed intervention, we will equip the youth with more video equipment, conduct more training and mentorship, and offer psychosocial support given that some of the issues they document can trigger unpleasant memories. Specifically, the project will equip refugee and host youth with screening packs *alias* Screening Back Packs. Therein the following equipment will be procured to form the pack; High Definition Projector, solar panel, its battery, and projector screen, and tri-pod. The backpack will enhance community-facilitated film screening sessions where youth can exhibit their art and photos, music, dance and drama along with rigorous engagements with community members on key issues of concern.

2.1.6 Lessons from previous related programmes: Drawing on lessons-learned over the period 1 October 2017 – 31 April 2019 from Dutch MFA-supported interventions in Kiryandongo, Adjumani, & Lamwo, the proposal retains and aims to consolidate the five broad objectives established Phase I, namely; strengthening the Rule of Law; supporting refugees’ recovery from war-related injuries in the interests of enabling self-reliance; enhancing refugee voice and refugee-host communications; extension of environmental activism & protection; and multi-level advocacy to ensure that positive impacts are scaled-up, both in Uganda, but also globally. Key lessons learned during Phase I included;

Objective I: Rule of Law: Mobile legal aid clinics and facilitated special High Court sessions help reduce overstay on remand

- Training and equipping police, prisons, judicial, and immigration officers compliments governments work, helps address justice needs, and builds better working relationships
- Community policing and information sessions are key in building and strengthening trust between refugees, hosts and RoL duty bearers