

UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES
POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION SERVICE
AND DIVISION OF OPERATIONAL SERVICES



UNHCR's expanded role in
support of the inter-agency
response to situations of
internal displacement

*Report of a lessons learned and
effective practice workshop*

PDES/2006/06
November 2006

Policy Development and Evaluation Service

UNHCR's Policy Development and Evaluation Service (PDES) is committed to the systematic examination and assessment of UNHCR policies, programmes, projects and practices. PDES also promotes rigorous research on issues related to the work of UNHCR and encourages an active exchange of ideas and information between humanitarian practitioners, policymakers and the research community. All of these activities are undertaken with the purpose of strengthening UNHCR's operational effectiveness, thereby enhancing the organization's capacity to fulfil its mandate on behalf of refugees and other displaced people. The work of the unit is guided by the principles of transparency, independence, consultation, relevance and integrity.

Policy Development and Evaluation Service
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
Case Postale 2500
1211 Geneva 2
Switzerland

Tel: (41 22) 739 8249

Fax: (41 22) 739 7344

e-mail: hqpd00@unhcr.org

internet: www.unhcr.org

All PDES evaluation reports are placed in the public domain. Electronic versions are posted on the UNHCR website and hard copies can be obtained by contacting PDES. They may be quoted, cited and copied, provided that the source is acknowledged. The views expressed in PDES publications are not necessarily those of UNHCR. The designations and maps used do not imply the expression of any opinion or recognition on the part of UNHCR concerning the legal status of a territory or of its authorities.

Table of contents

Introduction.....	1
Summary of recommendations	3
UNHCR’s recent experience with the cluster approach	5
UNHCR’s engagement in other IDP operations	7
UNHCR and IDPs: charting the way forward	9
Strategic goals, results-based performance and impact indicators	15
Conclusion.....	19
Annex 1: Workshop agenda.....	21
Annex 2: List of participants.....	27

Introduction

1. A lessons-learned and effective practice workshop on UNHCR's expanded role in support of the inter-agency response to internal displacement situations was convened by the Division of Operational Services (DOS) and the Policy Development and Evaluation Service (PDES) from 11 to 14 October 2006 in Nairobi. This report is based on the principal themes of the workshop agenda, which is attached as Annex 1. The report was prepared by Khassim Diagne, Senior Policy Adviser (IDP operations), Division of Operational Services.

2. The idea to convene this workshop mainly derived from the fact that UNHCR has assumed, since December 2005, a new leadership role in relation to internally displaced persons (IDPs), better known as the 'cluster approach'. Nine months after the introduction of the cluster approach, it was deemed necessary to take stock, at least in the interim, of what innovations the new approach has introduced to UNHCR's operations, what challenges remain and in which directions the Office should invest in order to better assume its leadership role in the areas under its responsibility, i.e. protection, camp coordination/camp management and emergency shelter.

3. By way of contrast, and to compare UNHCR's operational experience in various IDP situations, the workshop brought together not only countries where the cluster approach has been activated but also a number of different countries where the organization is working with IDPs. The list of participants is attached as Annex 2.

4. The specific objectives of the workshop were:

- To take stock of the achievements and challenges nine months after the introduction of the cluster approach;
- To identify some key common features and problems, share lessons and discuss to what extent experiences gained in one country could be replicated elsewhere;
- To arrive at a common understanding of a strategic vision of the Organization in situations of internal displacement within an inter-agency framework;
- To identify the gap areas and propose solutions for better delivery capacity;
- To reach broad agreement on key strategic goals and indicators to measure progress especially in relation to the clusters under UNHCR's responsibilities.

5. The workshop, which was held in Nairobi, was opened and closed by Ms. Neimah Warsame, Manager of the UNHCR Regional Hub in Nairobi. Jeff Crisp (PDES) and Khassim Diagne (DOS) facilitated the discussion. Atle Solberg and Katharina Rohl kindly assisted in the compilation of the workshop's notes. Hannah Entwisle organized the workshop and assisted in the compilation of the workshop's recommendations, which are summarized in the next section of the report.

Summary of recommendations

Protection and response

- UNHCR, in close consultation with its partners in the Protection Cluster Working Group, should develop a global IDP protection strategy. Within that strategy, the Office should then clarify the scope of its protection interventions in IDP operations;
- UNHCR should take stock of good protection practices, compile them and distribute them to the field and to the protection partners in the protection cluster;
- UNHCR should review the “Agenda for Protection” and assess its relevance to situations of internal displacement;
- UNHCR should encourage other clusters to use the Age, Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming tool in programme planning and design notably on issues linked to the beneficiaries’ involvement in the process;
- UNHCR should document and analyse the positive and negative impact of IDP operations on refugee protection.

Durable solutions and exit strategies

- Beyond the activation procedure agreed upon for new IDP emergencies in relation to the cluster approach, clarification is required as to when UNHCR will engage and disengage in other internal displacement situations and the role the Office should play in preventing displacement;
- Further clarification is also required on UNHCR’s role in the Early Recovery Cluster.

Tools and resources

- UNHCR should clarify the budget structure, resource mobilization and resource allocation processes for IDP operations taking into account the inter-agency approach on these matters;
- UNHCR should review its human resource management system and ensure that the best teams of staff are available at the beginning of new IDP emergencies, and that IDP operations are properly staffed;
- UNHCR needs to develop teams with compatible skill sets and experience available for immediate deployment at the onset of IDP emergencies;
- UNHCR needs to equip its staff members with coordination, partnership, and communication skills to lead and participate in clusters;

- UNHCR needs to review its staff safety and security procedures in IDP situations;
- UNHCR should take stock of the existing tools and programming instructions to adapt them to the IDP context focusing on inter-agency assessment, planning and implementation;
- A dedicated link in the intranet to share information and resources on IDP issues should be established;
- UNHCR should develop a communication strategy on IDP issues. Headquarters and the field should regularly keep each other abreast of developments on these matters;
- The internal and external reporting requirements should be reviewed to examine to what extent IDP issues could be mainstreamed in the existing reporting mechanisms.

Partnerships and coordination

- UNHCR needs to improve its partnerships with other agencies and organizations;
- A review of the existing MOUs and other agreements to see where they fit in the IDP context needs to be undertaken;
- The Office should also explore the development of new partnerships, particularly with NGOs;
- As cluster lead, the Office should ensure that governments are engaged in cluster activities whenever possible/appropriate;
- Headquarters should provide UNHCR staff based in the field with additional guidance on the humanitarian reform process and the overall implications for on-going activities.

Strategic goals and results-based indicators

- In consultation with other cluster leads and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, UNHCR should develop generic performance and impact indicators on the clusters under its areas of responsibility.

UNHCR's recent experience with the cluster approach

6. In general, colleagues working in field operations support the adoption of the cluster approach as a meaningful and efficient way to “get together in emergencies” and an opportunity to work with others. It was said that the most important element brought in by the cluster approach was the accountability of the cluster lead and also the cluster members. In many instances, the clusters are seen as a finite group of organizations, agencies and institutions bringing in resources and expertise to the table. In other instances, clusters were promoted as an infinite number of players who could make a contribution, a sort of a “come one come all” approach. Clusters were generally seen as being more successful when they were further away from the capital or centre.

7. Positively, several colleagues also noted the flexibility offered by the cluster approach which allowed some country teams to activate only those clusters which they felt were relevant to their particular situation. Some participants underlined the frequency of the meetings under the cluster approach which they thought, if properly handled, constituted appropriate fora through which effective coordination of programmes could take place. Other colleagues compared the clusters to service desks where one could go to obtain knowledge on how specific situations could be handled.

8. However, there was a sense that a lot more work remains to be done in this new approach starting first and foremost with some greater clarity of the language used, for example, ‘clusters’ and ‘sectors’ or, in the case of Colombia, ‘thematic’ or ‘working’ groups. This also applied to the relations between the clusters at the global, capital and field level. UNHCR-led clusters were generally viewed as providing helpful feedback from a headquarters perspective. However, the protection cluster needed to “catch up” in the area of guidance concerning the scope of protection interventions in situations of internal displacement. Some participants felt that UNHCR-led clusters are primarily about protection responsibilities, and that clusters such as camp coordination/camp management could be better handled through the protection cluster, as was the case in Uganda.

9. The other big area of concern among field colleagues was the lack of clarification on some key concepts such as the provider of last resort and the notion of accountability. “What if one of the clusters does not perform, i.e. water/sanitation or logistics?” seemed to be the central question in the minds of many colleagues. Prompted by a discussion on the real time evaluation of UNHCR's emergency operations in Syria, where some confusion prevailed as to whether or not the cluster approach was activated, the workshop also agreed on the need for greater clarity with respect to the potential application of the cluster approach to refugee situations. For example, the mechanisms used to trigger HCR's leadership role in the cluster approach, especially in slow onset emergencies, IDP disengagement criteria and UNHCR's role in the prevention of displacement, could all do with further clarification.

10. Participants noted the different contexts in which the cluster approach has been rolled out. The three initial roll out countries were not as a matter of fact the “classic” emergencies and, in Liberia notably, UNHCR which assumed the protection lead was almost at the end of its return programme.

11. The role of OCHA in relation to inter-cluster coordination seemed to be problematic. A number of colleagues emphasized the need for a better management of issues across clusters which include the allocation of funds in countries with a pooled fund or a Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), the inclusion of HIV/AIDS, gender and the environment in the work of the clusters.

12. Several workshop participants commented on the late and limited operational presence of UNDP in situations of early recovery. As a result, HCR may find itself playing a greater than anticipated role in this cluster. Some colleagues noted that the recently issued "Guidance Note on Using the Cluster Approach to Strengthening Humanitarian Response" (November 2006) may complicate matters even further should the decision not to "establish Early Recovery sectoral groups at the country level" be endorsed by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC).

13. The workshop noted that while the reform of humanitarian responses is intended to produce greater predictability of response, the funding available for IDP operations remained unpredictable.

14. The workshop participants unanimously noted the lack of state involvement in the cluster approach.

15. While the situation on the ground varied from functioning governments in Uganda and Colombia, a credible but not empowered government in Liberia, a dysfunctional state in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and a failed state in Somalia, colleagues emphasized the need for cluster leaders to ensure that government counterparts in the field were consulted and engaged in the work of the clusters. Given the constraints, perhaps not as fully fledged members, but at least some coordination mechanism needs to be put in place. The meeting noted that governments should of course be part of the solutions but, in some instances, a government's actions may cause displacement and that this would in turn influence the type of intervention that is warranted. This is of particular relevance for the protection cluster which needs to be aware and possibly coordinate its actions with the "political" side of the United Nations.

16. The lack of effective beneficiary involvement in the work of the clusters was also highlighted. The Age, Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming (AGDM) tool was cited as one of the frameworks through which UNHCR, as cluster lead, could influence other cluster participants in terms of programme design and planning. The role of national actors such as religious bodies and grassroots NGOs was also mentioned as quite relevant to the work of the clusters.

UNHCR's engagement in other IDP operations

17. An inconsistent and uneven humanitarian response to internal displacement in Darfur (2004) was identified as the episode that had effectively 'killed' the first generation of the collaborative approach. Participants provided a number of examples, including Liberia (2004), Tsunami-affected countries (2004/2005) and Uganda to describe an internal displacement coordination and response mechanism that suffered from inconsistency and unpredictability.

18. In principle, the cluster approach was warmly welcomed as a framework that could strengthen coordination among humanitarian actors and the steering of the humanitarian response in complex IDP emergencies. Despite some disagreement on the use of the cluster terminology, participants decided that, regardless of the language used, they would maintain the principles of accountability, responsibility and predictability, and that these principles will always remain as key challenges when designing better humanitarian response mechanisms.

19. Several colleagues noted that coordination problems associated with the collaborative approach had stimulated the development of working arrangements and coordination mechanisms that had predated but mirrored central features of the cluster approach. For example, in Colombia the so-called Thematic Group on Internal Displacement was tentatively re-launched in 2005 and the group tried to apply central principles of the cluster approach, including the core concept of accountability, encountering lots of resistance from various UN agencies, especially on the human rights focus.

20. Following a mission of the IASC to Colombia in September 2006, it was decided to apply the cluster approach (called in this specific situation, the Thematic or Working Group). UNHCR is leading the Working Group on Protection and is currently drafting the work plan to be approved before the end of the year. Georgia and Nepal provided examples of IDP operations where UNHCR aims to strengthen its partnership and deepen its strategic engagement with IDPs, in an environment that currently lacks the resources needed to enable the leadership and accountability necessary for the cluster approach.

21. On a general note, key principles at the centre of the cluster approach appear to have been adopted and applied across a number of diverse IDP operations, prior to and after the launching of the humanitarian reform process. As a matter of fact, a number of participants stressed the innovative aspect of the cluster approach and argued that the challenge of 'getting together' in emergencies has been with the organization since its inception. It was argued that, unless UNHCR was able to better deepen and engender partnership with other agencies and organizations, engage in effective coordination, assume and exercise leadership and build up its response capacity, many of the problems that had haunted the collaborative approach would re-emerge in existing and future complex emergencies.

22. On a final note under this agenda item, participants recommended the need to tap into institutional memory and knowledge available in the organization when adopting the cluster approach.

UNHCR and IDPs: charting the way forward

23. To put this agenda item into context, two plenary presentations were made: one focusing on the humanitarian reform process, and the other on UNHCR and IDPs.

24. The workshop discussed at length the implications for UNHCR of a rapidly changing external environment and in particular the consequences of the ongoing UN reform process. Competition for mandates and funding, the proliferation of actors and strategic positioning by UN agencies posed challenges for UNHCR. The UN reform was viewed as a timely initiative and offered the Organization a unique opportunity, and indeed a duty, to enhance its partnership with other actors and to scale up its activities in the areas of protection and assistance to internally displaced persons. The workshop emphasized the need for a “mentality shift” in UNHCR and the need for “buy in” and stronger commitment from the whole house.

25. It was emphasized that UNHCR’s involvement with IDPs is not a new issue. Therefore there is a need to take stock of what UNHCR has done in this area and build from that in the new arrangements. Ultimately there is a need for HCR to understand and better articulate the leadership responsibilities it has accepted. Those leadership responsibilities entail establishing effective presence from the beginning of an emergency with the best team of staff members available.

26. Many colleagues acknowledged that the new engagement did not require a change of mandate but a more clearly spelled out role, based on the understanding that governments continue to bear primary responsibility for the protection and welfare of their citizens, whether displaced or not. And moreover, that the international community has the responsibility to protect people if governments are unable or unwilling to look after their own citizens. The workshop particularly highlighted the limited involvement of host governments in the whole humanitarian response reform process and agreed that there is a need to address this situation.

27. At the global level, the definition and scope of UNHCR protection interventions need to be agreed internally and subsequently communicated to the outside. The same applies to the country level protection strategies which should also follow the same process.

28. In the light of recent concerns expressed by member states on the potentially negative impact of UNHCR’s involvement with IDPs on the institution of asylum, it was agreed that the Office should document and analyse the positive and negative impact on refugee protection when the organization is involved in IDPs in the country of origin and asylum. The case of Colombia in particular could be of interest, where ten years of work with IDPs has improved the national protection mechanisms and may have reduced the need for international protection, as possibly indicated by the relation between the number of IDPs, in the millions, and of refugees, in the tens of thousands.

29. The workshop pointed out that UNHCR’s role will vary according to the phases of displacement (prevention, emergencies, on-going conflicts, failed states or developed states with working institutions, protracted situations and return/local

(re) integration) and that the organization's new role will entail working in non-camp situations. This will require context-specific protection interventions.

30. In terms of more specific aspects of the scaling up process, the workshop made the following observations and identified the following policy priorities.

Developing protection strategies and responses

31. There is currently a lack of a global IDP protection strategy, both at the inter-agency level and within UNHCR itself. UNHCR should assume a leading role in filling this gap.

32. Effective IDP protection depends on a shared analysis of the problems to be addressed, as well as a shared understanding of key protection objectives that can be incorporated in individual agency programmes. The major difference UNHCR can make, with its partners, is to put together at the outset of an emergency a field-driven protection strategy and implement it.

33. The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement provide a useful basis for the development of protection strategies, including jointly with governments, particularly since the principles have been recognized by all UN member states as an "important international framework for the protection" of IDPs. UNHCR should also examine the Agenda for Protection to assess its relevance to situations of internal displacement.

34. There is a need to ensure that good practices and lessons learned from the field are collected, compiled, distilled and shared amongst field operations. The establishment of a dedicated IDP website would assist in this respect.

35. There is a need to ensure that protection concerns are mainstreamed across all clusters, as activities undertaken by all of the clusters have important protection implications.

36. At country level, there is a need for a dedicated UNHCR staff member to facilitate inter-agency cooperation and coordination on protection issues. Those staff members should be sufficiently senior and they need specific training on coordination.

37. Attitudes towards protection are often mixed within UN Country Teams. Some UN actors do not share the rights-based focus of UNHCR and OHCHR and place primary emphasis on maintaining a harmonious working relationship with the authorities.

Building partnerships and strengthening coordination

38. UNHCR's understanding of the 'partnership' concept must go beyond contractual and funding arrangements and embrace the notion of developing common visions, understandings and strategies. Agency resources must be pooled if common objectives are to be attained.

39. UNHCR must have staff with coordination and communication skills in those areas where it has assumed a lead role. If it is to assume this role effectively, UNHCR must also ensure that it has an adequate field presence.

40. UNHCR will increasingly find that it has to work in the context of integrated UN missions. While such missions can pose a threat to the independence and impartiality of humanitarian action, they also provide humanitarian actors such as UNHCR with new opportunities. UNHCR can capitalize on such opportunities by engaging with integrated missions and placing or seconding staff to them. UNHCR should keep in touch with such personnel in order to benefit from the information and expertise that they have at their disposal.

41. If the cluster approach is to function effectively, UNHCR must be prepared to engage in joint planning and programming activities. Such activities can prove to be very labour intensive and require an additional investment of staff time, human resources and money.

42. UNHCR's field offices require additional guidance on the whole humanitarian response reform process and its implications for their activities. Particular advice is required with respect to the CERF and pooled funding.

43. In an IDP context, national partners (governmental, non-governmental and civil society) are of particular importance. UNHCR and its partners must develop common capacity-building strategies and endeavour to ensure that national actors are able to develop a sense of ownership. In general, developing countries have not been active participants in the humanitarian reform process and do not have a good understanding of what it entails.

44. Governments should ideally be involved from the beginning of an IDP operation, although such an approach may be problematic in the context of failed states and in situations where the state is directly or indirectly responsible for situations of internal displacement.

45. While the cluster approach has promised to produce greater accountability within the humanitarian sector, the number of agencies and coordinating mechanisms involved in the cluster approach threaten to dilute rather than strengthen accountability. To ensure that accountability is reinforced, cluster leads and members must ensure that they submit timely and accurate reports on their activities and impact, while Humanitarian Coordinators must be prepared to take appropriate action when cluster leads and individual agencies fail to perform. UNHCR with its new role and accountability in the cluster approach should be more forthcoming in demanding effective leadership by the Humanitarian Coordinators.

Promoting durable solutions and clarifying exit strategies

46. The question "when does internal displacement end" may not be the most helpful one to ask from an operational perspective. It is more important to focus on the point at which UNHCR and other agencies should withdraw from situations of internal displacement, such as when IDPs/returnees no longer have specific needs, or when adequate government structures are in place to ensure protection and assistance.

47. Many questions remain to be answered about the role of the Early Recovery Cluster and its leadership by UNDP. While UNHCR should not withdraw prematurely from situations of internal displacement, there is a risk that its involvement will be extended by default.

48. Participants also raised other issues that may require further clarification, such as the validity of applying refugee concepts by analogy, and which will have important operational implications for UNHCR.

49. IDPs should always be consulted and informed with respect to the durable solutions available to them, especially in situations where UNHCR and other agencies plan to disengage.

50. The refugee-related notion of 'durable solutions' should be clarified in the context of internal displacement.

51. IDPs should not necessarily be expected to return to their place of origin or previous residence. IDPs in both urban and rural areas may prefer to remain in the location to which they have been displaced, or to seek a future outside their own country. In the latter case, IDPs should be advised with respect to legal migration and family reunion possibilities.

52. Assisting IDPs to settle in the location to which they have been displaced should not have the effect of consolidating the process of ethnic or racial cleansing in situations where particular groups of people have been targeted for expulsion from their usual place of origin. For this purpose, the creation of conditions sustaining return to places of origin should be promoted and it must be ensured that IDPs are able to make a genuine, informed choice about whether to return or to integrate into society elsewhere.

53. As citizens within their own state, IDPs should be fully involved in conflict resolution, political and electoral processes that will affect their future and their opportunities for finding a solution to their displacement.

Providing tools and resources

54. UNHCR can only do more with more. It cannot do more with the same or less.

55. Human resource issues are fundamental to UNHCR's extended role with IDPs and its involvement in the cluster approach. There is a particular need for additional field-based protection staff and for people with effective coordination and communication skills, as well as language (other than English!) skills.

56. With regard to field staff and structure, the workshop raised a number of issues that should be considered including: the need to ensure expeditious and swift deployment of staff to assume UNHCR cluster responsibilities in sizeable operations and in emergencies, the need for specific IDP protection training and for the developed skills profile to apply to all staff engaged in IDP operations.

57. Addressing staff safety and security in situations where IDPs are to be found in zones of active conflict was also identified as a priority area.

58. UNHCR's special surge and deployment schemes have proven to be very valuable, but are they sustainable in the longer-term? In too many cases, the Office invests in the recruitment and training of short-term personnel who then move on to other agencies. Although the deployment schemes were assisting the offices to assume the new cluster leader responsibilities, these coordination roles actually do not lend themselves to short-term deployments and a rapid turn-over can also be counterproductive. Therefore UNHCR needs to establish the capacity to actually assume its new responsibilities.

59. With regard to financial resources, there are opportunities for UNHCR to undertake effective local fundraising efforts. Field staff need additional advice and guidance on how to approach this task. Also, given continued donor enquiries on the issue of mainstreaming the special budgets into the annual budget, an urgent policy decision as to whether to have a unified budget or separate budgets covering refugees and IDPs is needed. If the decision was ultimately reached to go for unified budgets, there is a need to maintain flexible mechanisms to mobilize resources locally.

60. UNHCR's extended involvement will require an additional investment in operational 'hardware': office equipment, vehicles, computers etc. Recent experience suggests that such resources also enable UNHCR to fulfill its refugee mandate more effectively.

61. 'Software' is needed as well as 'hardware'. UNHCR staff need new guidelines (especially guidelines that are brief and user-friendly) on issues related to IDPs and the cluster approach. They also need to develop a better understanding of the mandates, activities, strengths and limitations of other organizations, and assistance in developing better management and leadership skills. Some of these skills may be gained during secondments or loans to other agencies.

62. The capacity of headquarters to deal with UNHCR's extended IDP involvement and to respond to questions from the field appears to be inadequate and must be reassessed. While this need not necessarily take the form of a dedicated IDP unit, greater transitional capacity is required at headquarters in relation to UNHCR's expanded role with IDPs. Such capacity is needed to handle information management, communicate, prioritize tasks (tools, guidelines, training, skills profile), coordinate internally and externally, and provide support to the field.

Strategic goals, results-based performance and impact indicators

63. One of the workshop's objectives was to discuss strategic goals and to find common indicators to assess UNHCR's performance and impact in the three clusters under its responsibility. There was consensus that strategic goals would not have to be country-specific, but should be formulated in general terms in order to then be adapted to relevant operations. Similarly, a "menu" of indicators could be provided to cluster participants from which the relevant ones could be selected and agreed upon.

64. It was noted that the demand for clear indicators and "results-based management" was a call made by donors who would want to measure UNHCR's engagement with IDPs in its role as cluster lead, but equally important were indicators that could measure UNHCR as a humanitarian actor and assess the impact such engagement had on the lives of the beneficiaries. Workshop participants were informed that a joint, inter-agency progress report on UNHCR-led clusters would be submitted by February 2007. This report should contain key measurable indicators.

65. Indicators, it was suggested in the discussion, could be grouped into "performance" and "impact" categories. For example, a "performance indicator" of UNHCR's coordination activities could be the degree of inclusion of partner organizations (such as the government, NGOs, the Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies), or the humanitarian access gained. An "impact indicator" would measure the impact UNHCR's cluster work has directly had on the lives of beneficiaries, for instance, a drop in the mortality rate.

66. The reasons given for this distinction were twofold. First, many forms of impact on beneficiaries would not be measurable in quantitative terms, for instance the impact of training for military officials. Second, real impact would be difficult to measure in the short term. For these reasons, the workshop agreed to focus on performance indicators, at least initially. It was noted however, that overly focusing on performance, rather than impact, brought with it the risk of a self-centred perspective, thus doing injustice to UNHCR's humanitarian role. It was recommended that where possible and when such data was available, field operations should report on impact

67. Participants were reminded that, as cluster lead, UNHCR had the responsibility for data collection and management. Several participants expressed concerns related to the inter-agency applicability of indicators and data, based on experiences in their respective countries. Partner agencies such as WFP, UNICEF and UNDP already used very different indicators and data management systems, and would find it difficult to change this state of affairs. A compromise could be the creation of a general "umbrella" system into which these different data could be fed. Whether or not the creation and use of a common database for all cluster partners covering everything of importance throughout a country was feasible or even desirable was disputed by participants, with many in favour of looking to the global cluster lead for support and encouragement.

68. Agreement on monitoring indicators and methodology was considered particularly important in order to ensure that developments monitored and information collected would effectively serve their purpose. Either way, more

frequent and extensive sharing of information among agencies should be encouraged from the global cluster. There was also discussion on the role and usefulness of the Humanitarian Information Centre (HIC) in streamlining data requirements and providing standard templates for data collection and reporting.

69. At the end of a rich and lively discussion, there was a consensus that solutions to notions of data management and defining the most relevant indicators should be found locally, while headquarters/the global cluster should and would be ready to assist.

70. Some positive practical examples were provided during the discussion including inter-agency agreement on a common monitoring form used by all (Liberia), increased transparency and wider distribution of data including to the government (Liberia), and the development of general protection indicators reflecting or incorporating individual agencies' indicators (Somalia). Problematic shared experiences included a failed attempt to develop a joint protection database due, *inter alia*, to individual NGOs' own monitoring mechanisms (Darfur), as well as the fact that once joint forms had been agreed on by agencies, they conflicted with UNHCR-internal guidelines (Darfur).

Indicators by cluster: protection

71. On the basis of the Guiding Principles, the main objective in the prevention of forced internal displacement was respect for international humanitarian and human rights law. Indicators towards this goal could be:

- The existence of a national legal framework and public policies to prevent displacement, while retaining the possibility for affected persons to seek asylum;
- A gaps analysis of rights to which access was lacking;
- Engagement with the authorities and support for government structures;
- Support for civil society; and
- The effectiveness and efficiency of knowledge transfer.

72. UNHCR's role and involvement in the prevention of displacement was the subject of some controversy. Participants agreed that UNHCR, as the global lead agency for protection, had a role in the prevention of displacement. They differed, however, in terms of whether UNHCR should only engage in preventative activities in situations where UNHCR was already present on the ground, or whether it should be more proactive – for which the new cluster approach provided an opportunity – and adopt a broader approach which included the deployment of staff to situations where displacement seemed imminent.

73. Where direct engagement may seem problematic, several participants favoured a more active preventative role for UNHCR by working through other partners. Suggestions ranged from taking the lead in advocacy work vis-à-vis the UN Security Council and other actors, to lobbying partner agencies, such as ICRC, OHCHR or

DPA, to ensure respect for international humanitarian and human rights law and possibly establish a presence where needed.

74. Once displacement had occurred, the main objective in response was to ensure enjoyment of rights in a non-discriminatory manner. Indicators included:

- Functioning monitoring mechanisms would be in place;
- Gaps would be addressed;
- IDPs were empowered and invited to participate in decisions affecting their own lives;
- UNHCR and partners should have access to the displaced.

75. The final objective was to find durable solutions for the displaced and to create an environment which would allow them to choose freely between different solutions, all of which would ensure their access to rights. Some suggested indicators are:

- IDPs would be fully informed of conditions for each solution (return and reintegration, local integration at the site of displacement or elsewhere);
- IDPs would have access to basic services in the area of displacement;
- Security measures would be in place, and sustainable safety could be ensured;
- IDPs would have access to documentation;
- Functioning property restitution/compensation mechanisms would be in place;
- IDPs would be involved in medium to long-term development plans.

76. As a potential durable solution, the possibility and desirability of evacuating/resettling IDPs to other countries was discussed, and examples of past practice were given (Colombia with individual cases resettled to Canada, Serbia etc.).

77. The conceptual debate on some of the above issues demonstrated both the need to think them through more thoroughly, and that caution must be used when applying refugee concepts and terminology to internal displacement by analogy.

Camp coordination/camp management (CCCM)

78. As a cross-cutting cluster, indicators for the performance and impact of the CCCM cluster were particularly difficult to find. There was agreement that it could not be considered the responsibility of the CCCM cluster to duplicate other clusters' objectives, or to simply monitor their performance. Instead, the main objective for the CCCM cluster was considered to be the identification of gaps, and to address any potentially remaining needs.

79. Indicators could be the existence and functioning of camp management structures, and of support to government structures. However, a potential conflict between performance and impact indicators was pointed out: for example, the lifting of a curfew and subsequent increased freedom of movement could be seen as indicating satisfactory performance, while its impact might even be negative for beneficiaries, as the risk of SGBV may increase as a result.

Emergency shelter (ES)

80. The following strategic goals for the ES cluster were listed: to have an adequate response capacity in place (in terms of stocks, staff and a coordination mechanism), to incorporate protection concerns into the site planning, location and design as well as into NFI distribution, and to have developed an exit strategy. It was noted that the indeterminate scope of the concept of “emergency” left unclear the notion of when and where UNHCR’s responsibility as global cluster lead would be triggered and terminated.

81. Performance indicators included the availability of existing stocks, of technical expertise, of a list of required NFIs, and of a sufficient number of qualified staff deployed, as well as the existence and functioning of a cluster coordination mechanism. Overall, the protection needs of the affected population would have to be reflected.

82. Impact indicators included the provision of the required quantity of adequate shelter and NFIs and that physical protection would be provided.

83. As a final note to the workshop, there was some discussion around the feasibility and desirability of UNHCR providing protection to IDPs without also providing assistance. The cluster approach was seen by some as the last opportunity for UNHCR to stay relevant in the provision of humanitarian assistance.

84. It was noted that a continued assistance role, even if minimal, could enable or improve access to communities in the field, particularly in regions such as Africa where institutional infrastructure for protection was largely absent or inadequate and the economic situation was extremely difficult. Participants felt that there was a need to clarify UNHCR’s role on issues related to the provision of assistance, but that in practice responses would best be tailored to the realities on the ground given the very diverse displacement situations around the world.

Conclusion

85. Participants' overall comments and concluding remarks at the end of the three and half day workshop attested that it was a timely initiative which allowed field operations with diverse programmes and activities to exchange information, build on good practices and systematize the knowledge they have acquired throughout their years of working with IDPs. The workshop also allowed field operations to interact more closely and engage in a frank discussion with the relevant sections at headquarters that are working on IDP issues and to discuss to what extent headquarters could provide more support to the field as UNHCR scales up its engagement with IDPs.

86. The challenge is now in the implementation of the recommendations which came out of the discussions. These recommendations will be dealt with in the context of the scaling up process requested by the High Commissioner.

Annex 1: Workshop agenda

**Lessons Learned and Effective Practice Workshop:
UNHCR's Expanded Role in Support of the Inter-Agency
Response to Internal Displacement Situations
Nairobi, Kenya
11 to 14 October 2006**

Day 1, Wednesday 11 October

- 9:00-9:15 **Introduction, and Question & Answers:** Objectives and Participants and Organisers' Expectations of the Workshop: Jeff Crisp, Head, Policy Development and Evaluation Service
- 9:15-10:30 **Presentation, and Question & Answers:** "Overview of the Humanitarian Reform," Khassim Diagne, Senior Policy Advisor, IDP Operations
- Presentation, and Question & Answers:** "UNHCR and IDPs: New commitments within an inter-agency response," Khassim Diagne, Senior Policy Advisor, IDP Operations
- 10:30-11:00 Coffee break
- 11:00-1:00 Discussion on UNHCR's strategic directions/vision in relation to IDPs
- 1:00-2:00 Lunch
- 2:00-5:00 Continuation of the discussion

Day 2, Thursday 12 October

- 09:00-09:45 **Global Cluster Presentations, and Question & Answers:** Protection, Camp Coordination/Camp Management, and Emergency Shelter Clusters (10 minutes each)
- Presentations will address the following areas: 1) Stated goals and objectives of global cluster, 2) Overview of activities thus far, 3) Future priorities and activities, 4) Achievements and challenges*
- 09:45-11:00 **Plenary Discussion:** Observations on the cluster approach at the global level
- How are the global clusters functioning overall? What challenges do the global clusters face in offering support to field operations? What support could the global clusters provide to the field? What are some success stories of the cluster approach at the global level?*

- 11:00-11:15 Coffee break
- 11:15-1:00 **Cluster Roll-out Country Presentations** (7 minute presentation)
 Cote d'Ivoire
 DRC
 Liberia
 Pakistan
 Somalia
 Uganda
 Lebanon
- Presentations will address the following areas: 1) Stated goals and objectives of clusters, and UNHCR operations, 2) Overview of protection and operational activities thus far, 3) Future priorities and activities, 4) Achievements and challenges*
- 1:00-2:00 Lunch
- 2:00-4:00 **Plenary Discussion:** Observations on the cluster approach at the field level
- How is the cluster approach working overall? How taxing is the coordination role? What are the major obstacles to performing your leadership role effectively? What challenges do you face in establishing and sustaining coordination mechanisms? What are some success stories of the cluster approach at the field level? What challenges do you face in working with partners, particularly NGOs? How effective are information sharing and reporting mechanisms?*
- 4:00-4:15 Coffee break
- 4:15-5:45 **Country Presentations** (7 minute presentation)
- Sudan
 Colombia
 Georgia
 Serbia and Montenegro
 Nepal
 Chad
- Presentations will address the following areas: 1) Stated goals and objectives of operations, 2) Overview of protection and operational activities thus far, 3) Future priorities and activities, 4) Achievements and challenges*
- 5:45-7:00 Discussion
- Day 3, Friday 13 October**
- 9:00-11:00 Recap of previous day and participants' observations

Based on themes raised during previous discussion and presentations, the workshop facilitators will outline the major thematic and cross-cutting issues and ask the participants to expand upon these themes. Participants will be encouraged to share experiences with these challenges and opportunities, as well as solutions. In particular, the discussion will focus on the need to build partnerships with other actors such as the Office of the Representative of UN Secretary-General on the Human Rights of IDPs. During this discussion, Katharina Rohl, Research/Programme Assistant, Office of the RSG, will make a short presentation on collaboration between the Representative and UNHCR.

Thematic issues may include the following:

- *Cluster leadership and coordination*
- *Collaboration with NGOs, humanitarian partners, and governments-*
- *Need for assistance from global clusters*
- *Information management*
- *Resource mobilisation*

11:00-11:20 Coffee break

11:20-13:00 **Discussion Groups***: UNHCR's Leadership Role in the Field

Four thematic discussion groups will be created during the workshop based on issues raised by participants. Discussion themes may include:

- Good practices in establishing and leading clusters, and information management
- Inter-cluster coordination and OCHA's role
- Working with other partners within cluster/sectors to identify gaps, create strategic plans, and fill gaps
- Addressing protection gaps in other clusters
- Specific themes related to UNHCR and IDPs in "non-cluster" countries

Participants will be requested to choose a group to discuss these or other pertinent thematic issues in more detail. Each group will select the top five challenges and opportunities within their thematic area, and discuss potential solutions and best practices to resolve these challenges, and to take advantage of the opportunities.

This session will provide an opportunity for discussing the specific technical issues within each cluster, including opportunities, problems, challenges, and specific support required from the global clusters. While we believe that the above mentioned topics are of special relevance, they are also posted as placeholders for any other important topic the participants would like to discuss. What is important is that we consider the workshop as field-centred, as an opportunity for field participants to report on their experiences, and to express their needs in terms of HQ support.

** After every discussion group during the workshop, each group will make a presentation to the entire workshop for discussion and additional*

contributions. Therefore, each discussion group should appoint a facilitator and a rapporteur at the beginning of each discussion group session.

- 1:00-2:00 Lunch
- 2:00-4:00 **Discussion Group Presentations:** Brief presentations (5 minutes each) from the discussion groups, followed by plenary discussion
- 4:00-4:15 Coffee break
- 4:15-6:00 **Discussion Groups:** UNHCR's Operational Role in the Field/Working with IDPs with in a collaborative inter-agency response

Four thematic discussion groups will be created during the workshop based on issues raised by participants. Discussion themes may include:

- Protection strategies and response
- What assistance does the field need from headquarters, and what does headquarters need from the field? (Reporting, tools, standards, etc.)
- Working with Government authorities, non-State actors, military, integrated missions, humanitarian access, and security
- Phases of displacement, exit strategies, and working with UNDP on early recovery
- Working within staffing and resource constraints
- Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues such as gender, age, disabilities and human rights

Participants will be requested to choose a group to discuss a thematic issue in more detail. Again, the thematic issues may be adjusted in light of participants' interest. Each group will select the top five challenges and opportunities within their thematic area, and discuss potential solutions and good practices to resolve these challenges, and to take advantage of the opportunities.

While reviewing these issues, participants should address the following questions: What have been the most significant achievements in your IDP operations? Do you have the tools and assessment methodology necessary to perform your operations? Do you have staff members with the appropriate skills? What challenges do you face in working with Government and other actors, such as NRC and the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement?

Day 4, Saturday 14 October

- 9:00- 10:00 Restitution by the discussion groups followed by discussion
- 10:00-12:00 Setting strategic goals and objectives at field and global level/Developing performance and impact indicators/Tools and resources required to meet targets

- Protection
- Camp Coordination/Camp Management
- Emergency Shelter
- Other areas/sectors

This session will begin with a brief plenary presentation on the concept of performance and impact indicators, and the extent to which performance and impact indicators are measurable. Each group will be provided with performance and impact indicators to begin the discussion. However, this should only be viewed as starting point to assist the group in developing its own impact/performance indicators. These indicators should also be based on the previous 2007 planning processes, which many of the countries will have already finalised prior to the workshop.

- 12:00-1:15 **Discussion Group Presentations:** Brief presentations (5 minutes each) from the discussion groups, followed by plenary discussion
- 1:15-1:45 Conclusions and next steps

Annex 2: List of participants

Bettocchi,	Guillermo	UNHCR Somalia
Cooper,	Sharon	UNHCR Liberia
Crisp,	Jeff	UNHCR Geneva
Deck,	Peter	UNHCR Uganda
Diagne,	Khassim	UNHCR Geneva
Encontre,	Ann	UNHCR Sudan
Gruenert,	Ralf H.W.	UNHCR Democratic Republic of the Congo
Guernas,	Guy-Rufin	UNHCR Cote d'Ivoire
Hussain,	Naveed	UNHCR Georgia
Manca di Nissa,	Michele	UNHCR Nepal
Mignone,	Roberto	UNHCR Colombia
Nassif,	Laila	UNHCR Sudan
Osmond, Rohl,	Douglas Katharina	UNHCR Regional Hub (Nairobi) Office of the Representative of the SG on the Human Rights of IDPs
Solberg,	Atle	UNHCR Geneva
Steinacker,	Karl	UNHCR Geneva
Tsuchida,	Yoichiro	UNHCR Geneva
Unluova,	Ivana	UNHCR Somalia
Warsame,	Neimah	UNHCR Regional Hub (Nairobi)
Young,	John Andrew	UNHCR Serbia and Montenegro
Zwack,	Michael	UNHCR Pakistan