



Research
& Evidence
Facility

EU Emergency Trust
Fund for Africa

September 2022



The Global Compacts on Migration and Refugees: taking stock of progress and the way forward in the Horn of Africa

Felicity A. Okoth¹

¹ PhD Fellow – International Migration and Ethnic Relations,
Research Network. (IMER) Bergen



Research
& Evidence
Facility
EU Emergency Trust
Fund for Africa

The Research and Evidence Facility Consortium



SOAS University of London
Thornhaugh St,
Russell Square,
London WC1H 0XG
United Kingdom

www.soas.ac.uk

Team Leader:
Laura Hammond
Project Manager and
Research Officer:
Louisa Brain



The University of
Manchester
Arthur Lewis Building,
Oxford Road,
Manchester M13 9PL
United Kingdom

www.gdi.manchester.ac.uk

Migration & Development
Key Expert: Oliver Bakewell
Communications Manager:
Christopher Jordan



Sahan
Nairobi, Kenya

www.sahan.global

Conflict & Governance Key
Expert: Vincent Chordi
Research Coordinator:
Padmini Iyer
Research Team Leader:
Lavender Mboya

This report was prepared by Felicity A. Okoth.

This report was prepared with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of the researchers and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union or the EU Trust Fund for Africa.

Suggested citation: Okoth, Felicity A., September 2022. 'The Global Compacts on Migration and Refugees: taking stock of progress and the way forward in the Horn of

Africa'. London: EU Trust Fund for Africa (Horn of Africa Window) Research and Evidence Facility.

Cover image by sadikgulec on iStock, ID 526980417.

For more information on The Research and Evidence Facility visit the website blogs.soas.ac.uk/ref-hornresearch and follow @REFHorn on Twitter.



Funded by the European Union
Emergency Trust Fund for Africa.

Contents

List of acronyms.....	2
Executive summary.....	3
1 Introduction and background.....	6
2 Context.....	9
2.1 EUTF in the Horn of Africa.....	11
3 Key findings.....	12
3.1 Policies and programmes have been influenced by conversations around the compacts.....	12
3.11 Taking stock of regional and international organisations' activities around the compacts.....	13
3.12 GCR more visible than the GCM.....	16
3.2 From paper to reality: observations on implementation.....	18
3.21 Limited coordination among stakeholders.....	20
3.22 Capacity gaps at state levels.....	22
3.23 Failure of localisation?.....	23
3.3 Loss of momentum.....	24
3.31 Funding expectations and the cycle of frustration.....	25
4 Conclusions and recommendations.....	27
References.....	29
Annex 1: EUTF regionally funded projects.....	31
Annex 2: EUTF country-specific funded projects.....	34
Annex 3: List of key informants.....	37

List of acronyms

AMADPOC	African Migration and Development Policy Centre
AU	African Union
BMM	Better Migration Management (programme)
CRRF	Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework
EAC	East African Community
EUTF	European Union Emergency Trust Fund for stability and addressing root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons in Africa (EUTF for Africa)
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
GCM	Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration
GCR	Global Compact on Refugees
GIZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German development agency)
GRF	Global Refugee Forum
HoA	Horn of Africa
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMRF	International Migration Review Forum
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
KfW	German National Development Bank
KISED	Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan
MPFA	Migration Policy Framework for Africa
NCM	National Coordination Mechanism
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
ReDSS	Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat
RDPP	Regional Development and Protection Programme
RMPF	Regional Migration Policy Framework
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Executive summary

Four years after the adoption of the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration (GCM) at the UN General Assembly, the environment in which donors, UN agencies and governments in the Horn of Africa (HoA) are expected to translate commitments into action has remained unstable. New and intensified challenges, including those linked to the Covid-19 pandemic and the increasingly severe impacts of climate change in the region, have heightened the need to critically review the extent to which the compacts are changing conversations on migration and displacement in the region.

This desk review analyses and compares the progress made towards the commitments of the GCR and GCM in the HoA. It examines two critical aspects of the potential contributions made by these global compacts: the direct impact in terms of stimulating new programmes supported by new funding; and the indirect impact of changing the dialogue around migration and displacement in the region to bring the principles enshrined in the two compacts into the foundations of policy. The study focuses on how the compacts have influenced programming undertaken by the European Union Emergency Trust Fund for stability and addressing root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons in Africa (EUTF) in the region. For comparative purposes, the study also explores how the compacts have been adopted into policy and programming by other actors, such as national governments, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and international organisations.

Key findings

Overall, the study finds that the GCR and GCM have lived up to some of the expectations placed upon them and fallen short on others. Commendably, the compacts have stimulated policy discussions at regional and country levels.

The following key findings have emerged from the review:

- 1. Although the EUTF's work in the HoA has been greatly influenced by the GCR–Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) and GCM, the GCR and the CRRF are more visible in EUTF documents than the GCM.** Interventions related to the GCR–CRRF are particularly favoured in terms of EUTF funding and overall programming compared to the GCM.
- 2. The IGAD, and UN bodies like the UNHCR and IOM, are also driving the GCR and GCM agenda, respectively, in the HoA through various programmes and consultative processes at the national and regional levels.** A lack of coordination and collaboration among the various stakeholders in the implementation of the two compacts, however, appears to pose a significant barrier to progress.
- 3. There is a disparity in the adoption and implementation of the GCR and GCM by countries in the region.** The GCR's grounding in existing norms and its actionable,

centralised process (led by the UNHCR) has made progress toward its implementation (in comparison with the GCM) more visible and practical.

4. **States in the region have uneven implementation capacities when it comes to the two compacts.** Kenya, Uganda and Djibouti, considered to be on the development trajectory, have greater capacity to implement the compacts than other countries in the region such as Ethiopia, Sudan, South Sudan and Somalia.
5. **CRRF rollout countries (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda) have made significant progress in the implementation of the GCR.** This can be attributed to the EUTF and other international partners, which have commissioned and funded programmes geared towards the implementation of the CRRF in these countries.
6. **Unlike the bottom-up approach that the implementation of GCR has taken, the GCM is being adopted and implemented in a top-down manner, thus hindering local ownership.** Discussions on the GCM are being held at the national level, hindering an awareness of the compact at the local level, which is not the case with the GCR–CRRF.
7. **Donor fatigue and loss of momentum in implementing the two compacts are significant barriers to their implementation.** Competing national priorities, funding gaps and Covid- 19 and other crises are additional reasons found to have slowed the momentum of the compacts.

Key recommendations

1. **Donors should set up mechanisms for assessing and determining how best to streamline GCM objectives in their interventions in the region.** This will ensure adequate attention is paid to challenges and opportunities present in the GCM cooperation framework at country levels.
2. **The EU and other major donors should advocate and support improved coordination between key stakeholders implementing programmes or policy action related to the two compacts.** GCR and GCM working groups (by country) should be set up where key stakeholders can share experiences, opinions and ideas for contributing to the progress of the compacts.
3. **The IGAD should invest in an open access database/repository – managed by its Migration Programme – where documents on lessons learned, good practices and other knowledge products on the GCM and GCR are aggregated for use by all stakeholders.** This will facilitate accessible and long-term peer exchange, as well as institutional knowledge, beyond the regional consultative processes.
4. **International partners should lobby states to develop and share their Progress Declaration on the Implementation of the GCM, as well as progress on their 2019 Global Refugee Forum (GRF) pledges, in line with the GCR.** This will enable donors and key migration stakeholders to clearly identify country-specific migration and forced displacement and governance gaps that can be addressed through various interventions.

5. **The EU and other major donors should support the IOM to formulate and revise Migration Governance Indicators (MGI) for all countries in the region in light of evolving migration dynamics.** This will provide an opportunity for governments to take an in-depth look at their migration policies and identify good practice, as well as areas of potential growth, in line with the GCM. The MGI profiles will also guide international partners' interventions within these countries.
6. **The EU and other major donors should support long-term, impact-oriented programmes that emphasise whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches to migration governance.** This will ensure stakeholder buy-in at local and national levels, and the overall sustainability of GCM and GCR objectives.
7. **The EU and other major donors should support governments and UN Network on Migration organisations to contextualise the GCR and GCM in line with country-specific development priorities to attract sustained interest in the region.** This can be done by identifying governments' priorities and initiatives, which can then be scaled up to address the relevant objectives of the twin compacts.
8. **International partners should advocate and support – both technically and financially – the revision of IGAD's Migration Policy Framework, so that it aligns with GCM and GCR objectives.** Regional frameworks are likely to elicit more action from member states than do the global compacts.

1 Introduction and background

The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM) and the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) arose from the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants signed in 2016. The two compacts have followed different routes in their development and adoption. The GCM, with its 23 objectives, was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 19 December 2018¹ and is aimed at improving the governance of international migration and increasing the levels of international coordination. The GCM breaks new ground as an agreement negotiated by states in a policy arena that had previously resisted consensus and includes a commitment by UN member states to provide migrants with access to basic services. The GCM convened its first intergovernmental International Migration Review Forum (IMRF) in New York on 17–20 May 2022, with the goal of reviewing the progress made at the local, national, regional and global levels in implementing the compact.² So far, some goals (including strengthening international cooperation on migration and investing in asylum and protection capacities) seem to have sparked greater enthusiasm among governments than others (such as substantially increasing social security benefits for migrants in third countries). The compact also tasks the UN Network on Migration with the setting up of a capacity-building mechanism, consisting of a start-up fund for the implementation of projects, a connection hub for developing solutions and a global knowledge platform for storing best practices.

¹ 152 countries voted in favour of adopting the GCM, but several voted against it or abstained, including some EU member states (against – Czech Republic, Hungary, Israel, Poland, United States of America; abstaining – Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Chile, Italy, Latvia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Romania, Singapore, Switzerland. <https://press.un.org/en/2018/ga12113.doc.htm>

² IOM (2022) <https://www.iom.int/international-migration-review-forum-2022>.

Objectives of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collect and utilise accurate and disaggregated data as a basis for evidence-based policies 2. Minimise the adverse drivers and structural factors that compel people to leave their country of origin 3. Provide accurate and timely information at all stages of migration 4. Ensure that all migrants have proof of legal identity and adequate documentation 5. Enhance availability and flexibility of pathways for regular migration 6. Facilitate fair and ethical recruitment and safeguard conditions that ensure decent work 7. Address and reduce vulnerabilities in migration 8. Save lives and establish coordinated international efforts on missing migrants 9. Strengthen the transnational response to smuggling of migrants 10. Prevent, combat and eradicate trafficking in persons in the context of international migration 11. Manage borders in an integrated, secure and coordinated manner 12. Strengthen certainty and predictability in migration procedures for appropriate screening, assessment and referral | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. Use migration detention only as a measure of last resort and work towards alternatives 14. Enhance consular protection, assistance and cooperation throughout the migration cycle 15. Provide access to basic services for migrants 16. Empower migrants and societies to realise full inclusion and social cohesion 17. Eliminate all forms of discrimination and promote evidence-based public discourse to shape perceptions of migration 18. Invest in skills development and facilitate mutual recognition of skills, qualifications and competences 19. Create conditions for migrants and diasporas to fully contribute to sustainable development in all countries 20. Promote faster, safer and cheaper transfer of remittances and foster financial inclusion of migrants 21. Cooperate in facilitating safe and dignified return and readmission, as well as sustainable reintegration 22. Establish mechanisms for the portability of social security entitlements and earned benefits 23. Strengthen international cooperation and global partnerships for safe, orderly and regular migration |
|---|---|

The GCR, on the other hand, was developed by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in consultation with member states to improve the international community's response to the large-scale movements of refugees and protracted refugee crises. The GCR is an innovative approach embedded in an established, if fragile, international regime. It shifts the focus from the obligations of refugee-hosting countries towards shared responsibility and a commitment to thinking through how other states can and should support host countries more effectively. It includes and builds on the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) that was set out in the New York Declaration. Furthermore, the GCR includes a commitment to establish the Global Refugee Forum (GRF) as a mechanism to build on the lessons of the CRRF, share good practices and secure financial and technical support to implement programmes delivering on the GCR objectives coordinated by the UNHCR. The first GRF was held in Geneva in 2019. From the outset the GCR has been associated with an extensive programme of action, whereby the CRRF was being implemented on the ground even before the GCR was adopted.

Objectives of the Global Compact on Refugees

1. **Ease the pressure on host countries**
 -
2. **Enhance refugee self-reliance**
3. **Expand access to third-country solutions**
4. **Support conditions in countries of origin for return in safety and dignity**

This rapid desk review examines the responses to the signing of the GCM and the GCR in the HoA and focuses particularly on the ways in which the compacts have affected the programming undertaken by the EUTF in the region. The study also explores how the compacts have been adopted into policy and programming by other actors, such as national governments, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and international organisations. The key questions that guided the study are:

1. How far has the work of the EUTF in the HoA been affected by the GCM and GCR?
2. To what extent are other actors (IGAD, governments in the region, UN agencies, NGOs, etc) drawing on the GCM and GCR in their migration and refugee programming?
3. What are the differences in the ways the two compacts have been adopted into policy and programmes by these actors?

To achieve its aims, the study involved a desk-based review of programme and policy documents from the EU and other actors such as IGAD and national governments, existing literature from academic journals, NGO and civil society reports, government reports and policies, and information from international institutions such as the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), the UN and donors. It involved ten key informant interviews conducted remotely with staff from the EUTF and EU delegations, IOM, UNHCR and other actors (See Annex 3). Because of the limited timeframe and timing of the review (summer 2022), some key informants could not be interviewed.

2 Context

Migratory movements in and out of the HoA are diverse and significant in volume. Flows of people in, between and from countries in the region are triggered by many varied and interrelated factors. Migrants, asylum seekers and refugees often travel along similar routes into, within and out of the region – a trend that is referred to as mixed migration. This report will, however, mostly refer to migrants and refugees, as they are the categories explicitly mentioned in the objectives of the GCR and GCM. Significantly, the HoA continues to be one of the world’s most prominent refugee-producing and hosting regions. As of September 2022, the UNHCR estimated there to be nearly 5 million refugees and asylum seekers within the region. This represents close to one-sixth of all refugees and asylum seekers worldwide. The largest of these groups were being hosted by Uganda (1.5 million), Sudan (1.1 million) and Ethiopia (0.9 million).³

The GCR has been visible in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia and Uganda, as they are pilot countries for CRRF rollout in the region. These countries have made important contributions of good practice and lessons learned to the GCR Digital Platform in light of CRRF programming.⁴ The need to support durable solutions in the HoA as a result of continued conflict in the region and the decreasing humanitarian funding available to support essential services has also led to stakeholder buy-in to the CRRF.⁵ Different donors have committed to support the aforementioned CRRF pilot countries, incorporate assistance to protracted refugee situations into national development plans and to ensure that refugees, returnees, hosts and others living in areas affected by displacement are given equal opportunities to achieve self-reliance and wellbeing.⁶ This was formalised in the Nairobi Declaration during a 2017 meeting held by the IGAD in Kenya. Follow-up conferences were organised in Djibouti – focusing on education – and in Kampala – focusing on livelihoods – and subsequently resulted in the Djibouti and Kampala Declarations.⁷

By contrast, the GCM is not underpinned by an ongoing array of funded activities coordinated by one UN body. Various initiatives have, however, been launched to help support the delivery of different GCM objectives, as seen with the convening of the IMRF and establishment of the UN Network on Migration. The UN Economic Commission for Africa has undertaken a review of progress in reaching these objectives across the continent, drawing on reports from member states. It provides little evidence that the signing of the GCM has substantively influenced migration-related programming in the continent or – key to this review – in the HoA.⁸ The UN

³ <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/rbehagl>.

⁴ <https://globalcompactrefugees.org/channel/good-practices>.

⁵ The term ‘durable solutions’ refers to “any means by which the situation of refugees can be satisfactorily and permanently resolved to enable them to live normal lives”. This could be through (1) integration in the host community; (2) voluntary repatriation; or (3) resettlement. Regularised labour migration as a refugee solution has also made consistent appearances in UNHCR papers intended to address the challenges of mixed migration flows and protracted refugee situations. Ineli-Ciger, M. (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718166-12340118>.

⁶ <https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/6324/ircdrcnrcjointreportv4final.pdf>.

⁷ <https://blogs.soas.ac.uk/ref-hornresearch/files/2020/03/CRRF-report.pdf>.

⁸ <https://www.uneca.org/sites/default/files/SROs/North-Africa/gcm2021/E2100831.pdf>.

Network on Migration, set up to provide coordinated support to the implementation of the GCM, has resulted in the establishment of a group of champion countries that are a focus for support. Ethiopia and Kenya are GCM champion countries in the HoA. The implementation of the GCM has, however, taken more time to unfold in these countries – primarily because of its novelty. The description of its implementation modality – specifically the cooperative framework aimed at capacity building – is unclear, as is the entire institutional set-up.

Summary of GCM Cooperation Framework

On international cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Implement the GCM through enhanced bilateral, regional and multilateral cooperation and a revitalised global partnership in a spirit of solidarity.- Continue building on existing mechanisms, platforms and frameworks to address migration in all its dimensions.- Strive to reinforce engagement in North–South, South–South and triangular cooperation and assistance in recognition of the centrality of international cooperation for the effective fulfilment of objectives and commitments.- Align cooperation efforts with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.
On capacity building	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Establish a capacity-building mechanism in the United Nations, building upon existing initiatives, to support efforts of member states to implement the Global Compact.- Allow members states, the United Nations and other relevant stakeholders, including the private sector and philanthropic foundations, to contribute technical, financial and human resources on a voluntary basis in order to strengthen capacities and foster multi-partner cooperation.- The capacity-building mechanism consists of:<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) a connection hub that facilitates demand-driven, tailor-made and integrated solutions;b) a start-up fund for initial financing to realise project-oriented solutions;c) A global knowledge platform as an online open data source that serves as a repository of existing evidence, practices and initiatives.

Since it is a non-legally binding framework that allows states to cherry-pick the actions they will take – and given the political sensitivities around it – the compact is generally difficult to implement. Despite the dynamics highlighted above, the implementation of the two compacts in the HoA has drawn the interest of different stakeholders, with the EUTF standing out as a major donor to this cause. The EUTF has been described as a game changer in positioning migration and forced displacement much higher on the agenda of IGAD and partner countries.⁹ This is illustrated in the subsequent sections of this report.

⁹https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/sites/default/files/exec_summary_learning_lessons_from_the_eutf_final.pdf.

2.1 EUTF in the Horn of Africa

The EUTF was activated in October 2015 and formally adopted at the Valetta Summit on Migration in November 2015. The purpose of the EUTF is to support the Joint Valetta Action Plan by funding partners working towards fulfilling its objectives.¹⁰ The EUTF implements activities across three regions of Africa – the Sahel and Lake Chad, the HoA, and North Africa. Initially designed to provide an emergency response to the 2015 migration crisis and support the Joint Valetta Action Plan, the EUTF gave birth to a much more ambitious and long-term-oriented matrix of interventions, and to the beginning of a coordinated response to many of the critical issues and challenges along the mixed migration routes in Africa.

In the HoA, the EUTF's interventions are targeted towards challenges that go beyond country borders, with migration management being a key area of intervention. The EUTF's work in the region covers nine countries: Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda, as well as neighbouring countries in particular circumstances.¹¹ Central to its actions are promoting safe, orderly and regular migration in alignment with the GCM. Funded programmes in the region focus on protection, return and reintegration, trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants, border management and the humanitarian–development–peace triple nexus, while putting the region's migration trends and dynamics at the centre of its programming.¹² As such, the EUTF works with IGAD, building on areas of work in which the regional body is active, such as durable solutions for refugees, peace and security and resilience building, and harmonisation of national policies and strategies.¹³ The EUTF's commitment to work towards durable solutions for refugees in the region aligns with the GCR's objectives of minimising the adverse drivers and structural factors that compel people to leave their country of origin.

¹⁰ The European Union Emergency Trust Fund for stability and addressing root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons in Africa – Strategic Orientation Document
https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/sites/default/files/strategic_document_eutf_africa_1.pdf.

¹¹ https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/region/horn-africa/regional_en.

¹² https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/sites/default/files/exec_summary_learning_lessons_from_the_eutf_final.pdf.

¹³ https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/region/horn-africa/regional_en.

3 Key findings

Policies and programmes aimed at migratory movements in the HoA have historically been geared towards forced displacement, despite the region having a mixed migration profile. Consequently, a humanitarian approach to policy and programming has for a long time taken centre stage in the region. Various stakeholders have, however, strategically shifted from looking at the phenomenon from an emergency, short-term standpoint towards a longer-term, more integrated development approach alongside the CRRF and GCR. Other forms of migration have also received increasing attention. The report found that there are robust conversations around the two compacts, but this has not effectively translated into action at state levels.

3.1 Policies and programmes have been influenced by conversations around the compacts

The desk review of documents and interviews with key informants revealed that the EUTF's work in the HoA has been hugely influenced by the GCR–CRRF and the GCM. This is evidenced by the EUTF's intervention criteria in the region changing in the past five years to include the two compacts. Regional and state-level EUTF-funded projects explicitly mention the twin compacts in their action documents.¹⁴ EUTF projects – commissioned before the New York Declaration – have also secured additional funding to enable them to capture the objectives of the GCR and GCM during implementation.¹⁵ However, the CRRF and GCR feature more prominently in EUTF action documents than does the GCM – with the latter glaringly missing in EUTF interventions at national levels.¹⁶ This disparity is highlighted in matrices created based on this rapid review (see Annexes 1 and 2). Interviews conducted with key EU informants attribute this disparity to the fact that GCR and CRRF principles were integral in programmes funded by the EU and the EUTF before the New York Declaration, making the transition easier. The Khartoum Process launched in 2014, a precursor to the 2015 Joint Valetta Action Plan, already targeted some of the compact's objectives, such as the need to make EU programming more sustainable by focusing on self-reliance, integrated approaches and getting the buy-in of local authorities, thus making the transition to CRRF smoother.

The CRRF is more visible in our action documents because it fits well with what was already the focus of the EUTF. We only needed to put in additional funding. This is unlike development funding around the GCM which is a new policy area we are engaging in... It is less concrete as opposed to the GCR or CRRF, where you can target concrete action support.¹⁷

The novelty and complexity of the GCM's cooperation framework can be attributed to limited EUTF interventions focusing on the compact at the state level. Despite not appearing clearly in EUTF action documents, the GCM agenda is, nonetheless, being promoted through EUTF

¹⁴ https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/region/horn-africa/regional_en.

¹⁵ Key informant, EU delegation, Ethiopia.

¹⁶ EUTF, Horn of Africa, https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/region/horn-africa_en.

¹⁷ Key informant, EU Delegation, Kenya.

funding, as evidenced, for instance, in the ‘Facility on Sustainable and Dignified Return and Reintegration in support of the Khartoum Process’ implemented by IOMIGAD and ILO and phase two of the Better Migration Management Programme (BMM II) implemented by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). Both projects were commissioned before the signing of the two compacts but benefited from additional EUTF funding and are currently incorporating more than half the GCM objectives in their programme implementation.¹⁸ Key regional and international organisations, and specifically UN bodies have also adapted their programming to incorporate the objectives of the twin compacts. The IGAD’s Migration Programme and the Migration Working Group (which brings together people working across the organisation’s different divisions while maximising synergies) both have the GCM and GCR at the centre of policy discussions and programming.¹⁹

The 25 March 2017 IGAD Special Summit on Durable Solutions for Somali Refugees and Reintegration of Returnees in Somalia built on the New York Declaration and the CRRF to deliver the commitments made by IGAD member states. These included maintaining an open-door policy for refugees and asylum seekers and providing opportunities for local integration of individual refugees. IGAD member states participated in IGAD’s First Regional Ministerial Conference on Refugee Education in December 2017, which led to the Djibouti Declaration on Regional Refugee Education, agitating for the enhanced capacity of IGAD member states to implement commitments to quality education and learning for refugees and host communities. The IGAD member states then shared their draft national action plans to implement the Nairobi Declaration on Durable Solutions for Somali Refugees and Reintegration of Returnees in Somalia (The Nairobi Declaration) in March 2018. They further participated in the second regional ministerial conference on livelihoods and jobs in March 2019 in Kampala, Uganda, resulting in IGAD’s Kampala Declaration on Jobs, Livelihoods, and Self-reliance (adopted in March 2019). These regional discussions have promoted activities aimed at achieving GCR and GCM objectives at the state level, as will be illustrated in the next section.

3.11 Taking stock of regional and international organisations’ activities around the compacts

This review found that IGAD – through the Nairobi Process and the regional application of the CRRF – has effected changes in the legislation for refugees and their host communities in the HoA. This is demonstrated by Ethiopia’s 2019 Revised Refugee Proclamation, Somalia’s 2019 National Policy on Refugee-Returnees and IDPs and Kenya’s 2021 Refugee’s Act, which align with the objectives of the GCR, undergirded by the Nairobi, Kampala and Djibouti Declarations. Concrete actions have also come out of these deliberations, as is shown by Uganda’s naturalisation of long-term Rwandan refugees and Kenya’s inclusion of refugees in the National Health Insurance Scheme. IGAD has also given space to the GCM, as demonstrated by the 2021 Regional Consultative Process on Migration, which had the compact at the heart of various discussions. Free and safe labour migration specifically came out as a key intervention area, with ILO at the centre of these discussions.²⁰

¹⁸ Key informant, IOM Regional Office, Kenya.

¹⁹ https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/sites/default/files/eutf_igad_case_study_final_0.pdf.

²⁰ Key informant, African Migration and Development Policy Centre (AMADPOC), Kenya.

The GCM has not, however, translated into policy at the IGAD level yet. This is attributed to the fact that IGAD's Regional Migration Policy Framework (RMPF) – which is the main policy document governing migration in the region – precedes the GCM and is due for revision, as it is already ten years old.²¹ As such, IGAD's EUTF-funded Free Movement of Persons and Transhumance Protocols – despite being adopted in 2021 (three years after the GCM) – does not explicitly mention the GCM but instead bases itself on IGAD's RMPF and the African Union's (AU) 2018 Migration Policy Framework for Africa (MPFA). These regional frameworks address some of the objectives of the GCM without explicitly basing themselves on the compact. IGAD, in collaboration with IOM and ILO, is also working on a return and reintegration framework inspired by the GCM but this also does not explicitly refer to the GCM.²² Despite not mentioning the GCM in its policy documents, IGAD migration programmes aim to facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration management (see Annex 1).

UN bodies like the UNHCR and IOM are also driving the GCR and GCM agendas, respectively, in the region with some success. According to UNHCR's 2021 Global report,²³ and its latest country strategies, the organisation's programmes have largely been informed by the CRRF and are in line with specific countries' pledges at the 2019 GRF. UNHCR has specifically established consultative processes with governments in the region to identify points of focus like refugee self-reliance, refugee inclusion in national systems, and integrated area-based programmes for refugees, returnees and host communities in line with specific countries' GRF policy pledges.²⁴ Further, in the spirit of the GCR, UNHCR has formed strategic partnerships with non-traditional partners, as seen in its cooperation with development actors, financial institutions, local governments and civil society to achieve its programmatic goals.

All UNHCR project proposals and programmes we are engaged in at the moment are pretty much resting on GCR and CRRF. All our conversations with the local and national governments and donors like the EU, FCDO [the UK's Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office] and Dutch government have the GCR and CRRF mentioned...For instance, the Danish government gave us money for humanitarian work but now we are using part of it for building government asylum capacity processes and systems...We've been planning yearly but from next year we are starting to do a multi-year plan to accommodate the GCR and are adopting more development-oriented programming. From next year, 2023 to 2026, we have a multi-year plan.²⁵

Similar sentiments were shared when discussing the GCM:

The GCM discussion in IOM is very robust because we are mainstreaming its elements into all of our programmes. We have colleagues that are designated as focal persons who do the quality assurance to ensure that specific GCM elements are included in programme implementation...if you are developing a new programme proposal, you have to show to what extent it is addressing the

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ <https://reporting.unhcr.org/>.

²⁴ <https://reporting.unhcr.org/strategic-directions-2022-2026>.

²⁵ Key informant, UNHCR programme manager, Kenya.

GCM elements or to which objective you are referring.²⁶

As articulated above, IOM has made GCM a core programming framework with its 2020–24 regional strategy embracing GCM’s commitment “to cooperate internationally to ensure safe, orderly and regular migration, with full respect for human rights and humane treatment of migrants regardless of migration status.”²⁷ As such, its programmes in the HoA have prioritised assistance to member states in the governance of migration and by providing more effective policy support, such as in the drafting of national migration policies and strategies on safe and regular migration. An example is Djibouti’s 2021 National Migration Strategy, which is informed by the GCM. Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda and South Sudan also have their draft migration policies informed by the compact.

Further, Kenya and Ethiopia – GCM champion countries in the region – presented their voluntary progress reports during the May 2022 IMRF. Kenya’s report indicated that the adoption of the GCM had created new policy developments, as shown by the country’s revision of the draft National Migration Policy 2019, its Labour Migration Management Bill and National Labour Migration Policy 2020, the Data Protection Act, 2019, revision of the Counter Trafficking in Persons Act, 2010 and a review of national social protection policy. To this end, the National Employment Authority (NEA) launched an online/electronic platform for the recruitment of domestic workers (MUSANED) from Kenya to Saudi Arabia for the protection of such workers, the majority of whom are women. There is a possibility of expanding this with similar platforms in other countries receiving Kenyan domestic labour, and also of including other skills and professions. NEA further established a pre-departure training programme for potential Kenyan migrant workers on life/work events in destination countries. The number of Labour Attachés seconded to missions abroad in Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) increased to two each, with the possibility of increasing consular services personnel in Jordan, Lebanon, Yemen and Iraq. The government has also formed an inter-ministerial committee in charge of reviewing all its bilateral labour agreements to enhance negotiations on both skilled and unskilled labour migrants from Kenya, especially women migrants.²⁸

Ethiopia’s report noted that the country is currently developing a National Migration Policy in line with GCM objectives. Further, the Refugees Proclamation No 1110/2019 has replaced Proclamation 409/2004 and is currently in force. It aims to guarantee better access to rights and safety for refugees – specifically the right to gainful employment and access to labour protections that will protect them from exploitation and unfair wages. Ethiopia’s Overseas Employment Proclamation (No 923/2016), aimed at regulating the employment of Ethiopians abroad, has also been amended and ratified by Proclamation No 1246/2021 to ensure that the rights, safety and dignity of Ethiopians employed overseas are protected. Based on Proclamation No 1178/2020 on the Prevention and Suppression of Trafficking in Persons and Smuggling of Persons, a directive has been issued to determine the organisation and operation of the National Partnership Coalition and a draft regulation for the Rehabilitation of

²⁶Key informant, IOM Regional Office, Kenya.

²⁷ IOM, *East and Horn of Africa Regional Strategy 2020–2024*, p. 10. https://eastandhornofafrica.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbdl701/files/documents/East%20and%20Horn%20of%20Africa%20Regional%20Strategy%202020-2024_0_0.pdf.

²⁸ <https://migrationnetwork.un.org/system/files/docs/Kenya%20-%20Voluntary%20GCM%20Review.pdf>.

Victims Fund has been prepared. The previous Labour Proclamation No 377/2004 was repealed and replaced by Proclamation No 1156/2019 to guarantee migrant protection. Based on the above policy changes, a directorate has been set up under the Ethiopian Statistics Service to collect, organise and analyse comprehensive information on migration and to disseminate information appropriately. The Ministry of Labour and Skills, in collaboration with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is in the process of appointing Labour Attachés in prominent hosting countries of destination for Ethiopian migrant workers, in order to protect their rights, dignity, security and interests. The government is further strengthening stakeholder coordination systems to ensure a whole-of-society and whole-of-government approach.²⁹

The IOM, in coordination with IGAD, has further assisted countries in the region to set up National Migration Coordination Mechanisms (NCMs) to ensure that migration and related issues are discussed in a coordinated manner. The regional BMM II programme – funded by EUTF and the German development agency (GIZ) – has promoted NCMs as avenues for conversations on effective and coherent coordination between government institutions responsible for migration management at local, national and regional levels.³⁰ Our study found that NCMs have played an important role in catalysing discourses centred on the GCM among relevant government stakeholders.³¹ Beside the formulation of new policies mentioned above, countries like Sudan and Ethiopia are revising existing labour migration policies and related legislative frameworks to align them with GCM objectives.³² As mentioned above, Kenya is also revising legislation around labour migration, as seen in the draft Labour Migration Management Bill. These steps highlight the centrality of the GCM in changing conversations on migration governance in the region. This position was reinforced by a key informant:

Before 2015 migration was not prioritised in conversations at national levels. But now you can see things are shifting because countries in the region are speaking to each other on migration issues. There's a concerted effort to develop policies on migration management and coordination and this is evidenced by policies and laws that are being put in place at both regional and national levels.³³

Despite the progress mentioned by the informant above, our review found an imbalance in the attention the two compacts have garnered at both the state and regional levels, as will be illustrated in the next section.

3.12 GCR more visible than the GCM

The review found that the GCR and the CRRF were more visible in EUTF documents when compared with the GCM (see Annexes 1 and 2). The difference was evident at country-level programming, as no country benefited from EUTF funding in relation to the GCM. Champion countries (Kenya and Ethiopia) were found not to fare any better in terms of benefiting directly from EUTF programming in this regard. Other EU projects related to migration also took a

²⁹

<https://migrationnetwork.un.org/system/files/docs/Ethiopia%20%20Voluntary%20GCM%20Review.pdf>

³⁰ BMM II Mid Term Evaluation.

³¹ Key informant, AMADPOC, Kenya; IOM, Regional Policy Mapping (forthcoming).

³² IOM, Regional Policy Mapping (forthcoming).

³³ Key informant, AMADPOC, Kenya.

regional implementation approach. Various factors were identified as causing the glaring difference between GCR and GCM programming in the HoA– key among them the region’s history of hosting forced migrants and the existence of different approaches preceding the GCR, ie durable solutions, area-based approaches, the triple nexus approach – all related to the GCR and CRRF. This has consequently made the adoption and implementation of the GCR easier for different stakeholders and, key to this study, the EUTF. This was illustrated by a respondent dealing directly with EUTF programming in Kenya:

With the CRRF it was easy for us because structures were already in place. You had the Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISEDPA) in Kenya, for instance, as a solid thing way before the GCR. Things just fell into place for us...I believe the gap in GCM programming results from the fact that we as the EU often prefer having concrete structures in place before putting in money. With the GCM things are not very clear at the moment.³⁴

Similar sentiments were shared by an EU key informant in Uganda:

If you look at the Refugee and Host Population Empowerment (ReHoPE) programme which is in place outside GCR modalities, you would be tempted to say that it is a GCR-grounded project because it is basically the same thing. Uganda has strong refugee frameworks, and this has made it a little easier for the EUTF to come in and fund GCR and CRRF projects...The GCM in Uganda I would say is less tangible, you cannot really wrap your fingers around it.³⁵

The presence of CRRF-related structures and processes thus appears to have provided the necessary support and a foundation for EUTF programming in the region. Other development partners have also favoured the GCR at both regional and country levels and have taken a regional approach to funding GCM-related objectives. This is evidenced by the implementation of various programmes such as the GIZ’s ‘Strengthening the Capacities of IGAD and its Member States in Support of Regional Migration Policies in the Horn of Africa’, which is closely connected to the German National Development Bank’s (KfW) Regional Migration Fund. The Swiss Development Corporation is also funding a project aimed at building regional and national capacities for improved migration governance, as is the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency with its ‘Developing Capacity in Migration Statistics’ project, an institutional cooperation programme between Statistics Sweden, the AU and four regional economic communities in Africa including IGAD.

The review found that the lack of country-specific funding for the GCM is linked to the complex cooperation framework between development partners and states envisioned by the compact. The majority of those interviewed for the study pointed to the fact that GCM broke new ground as an agreement negotiated by states in a policy arena that had previously resisted consensus:

Migration, unlike forced displacement, is much broader. It is a borderline development and security issue. It is very tricky navigating these issues

³⁴ Key informant, EUTF, Kenya.

³⁵ Key informant, EU, Uganda.

because states think of guarding their interests...The GCR has more consensus, because it is backed by an international legislative framework and of course the fact that refugees are more visible than migrants.³⁶

The above sentiments are in line with those of Czaika and De Haas (2013), who argue that migration governance goes beyond the movement of people. Governing migration, according to them, is in essence multi-sectoral as migration-related policies span all public policies – from health, education and housing to communication, security and justice. This complexity is unfortunately not adequately recognised by the GCM. Some key informants also felt that the broad scope of the GCM objectives was a hindrance to its effective adoption and implementation in the region. Countries specifically lack comprehensive national legislative frameworks to pin most of the compact objectives on and further lack administrative structures and resources to fully accommodate the compact. This is different from the GCR, which is limited in scope (four objectives) and already has existing frameworks that only need to be revised to capture the compact’s objectives.

The wide, non-binding objectives of the GCM have also given countries the leeway to cherry-pick objectives to prioritise. The IMRF voluntary GCM progress reports for Djibouti, Ethiopia and Kenya revealed that objectives touching on policy formulation and cooperation on migration governance have had more traction compared with objectives that call for the opening of administrative and social systems to accommodate free, safe and orderly movement of people in the region. While the IMRF has acted as a platform for reporting on progress, the GCM lacks overall robust reporting mechanisms. Regional bodies (IGAD and the East African Community) and regional policy frameworks were found to have more influence than the GCM when it comes to policy formulation and general migration governance in the region. National migration policies currently in draft form (Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, South Sudan) were found to draw more from the AU’S MPFA and IGAD’s RMPF. The review found that their order of structure similarly aligns with that of the AU’s MPFA. This finding is buttressed by a respondent who stated that:

What I’ve observed from IGAD member states’ latest draft policy documents is that the GCM is a ‘by the way’. They of course mention that they are formulating policies in the spirit of the GCM during discussions but what you see on paper is that they focus more on the African Union documents. But, like I said, the challenge is they can always create the policies based on all these GCM aspects, but implementation is what will be lacking.³⁷

Most of the informants opined that, while countries in the region are commendably formulating migration policies and revising existing ones “in the spirit of the GCM and GCR”, their implementation has been a challenge for the majority of the countries.

3.2 From paper to reality: observations on implementation

This review found that CRRF rollout countries (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda) have made significant progress in the implementation of the GCR. In particular, the EUTF has facilitated the capacity building of different government departments in these countries both

³⁶ Key informant, GIZ regional office.

³⁷ Key informant, AMADPOC, Kenya.

directly and indirectly, as seen in Kenya's 'Enhancing self-reliance for refugees and host communities in Kenya' project, which partly aims to improve the government's overall asylum management through building the capacity of the Refugee Affairs Secretariat – now the Department of Refugee Services. In Uganda, Koboko Municipality has benefited from direct EUTF funding through the 'CRRF DIRECT - Displacement Responses through Regional Cooperation and Technical Exchange' programme. A similar capacity-building approach applies in Ethiopia through the 'Promoting Stability and Strengthening Basic Service Delivery for Host Communities, Refugees and other Displaced Populations in Gambella Regional State of Ethiopia'.

An ex-post evaluation of the EUTF project 'Regional Development and Protection Programme [RDDP] in Kenya: Support to the Development of Kalobeyei' and a mid-term evaluation of the 'Enhancing Self-reliance for Refugees and Host Communities in Kenya' project reveal that progress has been made in offering integrated services in the health and education sectors in the settlement. Evaluations of the projects have found that EUTF funding has acted as a catalyst to leverage and got the local government interested and on board, thus providing opportunities to include refugees in local government planning.³⁸ This fact was reiterated by a key informant:

In Uganda, integrated services are becoming a reality. If UNHCR constructs a health facility, we negotiate and dialogue with the government to include the health facility in their budget, because the health facility is also used by the host community. In some instances, you have more refugees using some of these facilities as compared to the host community. The government takes on the responsibility to include some of these facilities. They do code these facilities to be able to include them in the national budget. That was not the case before 2016.³⁹

Similar sentiments were shared in the context of Kenya's KISEDIP, which is funded by the EUTF and other development partners. Through the RDDP in Ethiopia, the city of Jijiga was also hailed as a success in terms of offering integrated services to refugees, IDPs and the host community, undergirded by the CRRF.⁴⁰ Ethiopia has, however, generally been slower in the implementation of EUTF projects geared toward the achievement of the GCR. In particular, the conflict in Tigray has is reported to have contributed to delays. Implementation modalities before the conflict have changed in its wake, because of the impossibility of using collaboration tools (involving local authorities) as before. Programmes commissioned before 2020 are nevertheless progressing and nearing completion.⁴¹

South Sudan – which is not a CRRF rollout country – is also making only limited progress in the implementation of the GCR, despite making pledges at the 2019 GRF.⁴² Sudan and Somalia – though the latter was initially a CRRF rollout country – have also not made great

³⁸ Ex-post evaluation for the EUTF 'Regional Development and Protection Programme in Kenya: Support to the Development of Kalobeyei'; Mid-term evaluation 'Enhancing Self-reliance for Refugees and Host Communities in Kenya'.

³⁹ Key informant, UNHCR, Uganda.

⁴⁰ Key informant, GIZ.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Key informant, UNHCR, Uganda.

strides in the implementation of the GCR, despite the UNHCR stating that its work (in all countries) in the region is undergirded by the GCR.⁴³ Our review did not find concrete UNHCR strategies for the implementation of the GCR in Somalia and South Sudan. The EUTF similarly does not have projects directly linked to the GCR and CRRF in these two countries. In contrast, Sudan, which is not officially implementing the CRRF, has benefited from EUTF funding and was on the road to fulfilling its GCR objectives before the political instability of 2021.⁴⁴ We attribute EUTF funding in the country to the fact that Sudan has an established out-of-camp assistance model that follows a refugee, IDPs and host community integrated service-delivery approach – which is in line with the CRRF.

The review did not find country-specific programmes funded by the EUTF solely aimed at achieving GCM objectives. However, there were EUTF projects underway in Djibouti (Sustainable Solutions for the Most Vulnerable Host Populations, Refugees, and Migrants in Djibouti – 2017) and Sudan (IMPROVE-EU Integrated Measures to Promote Rural–Urban Value Addition and Employment – East Sudan – 2018), which touch on both the GCR (objectives 2 and 4) and GCM (objectives 2, 16, 18, 21). EUTF funding has also enabled UN organisations like the IOM – through its role implementing programmes such as the BMM II – to push for policy change. There has been progress from a policy perspective as some countries in the region (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, South Sudan, Uganda) are formulating and revising policies in line with the GCM, as noted earlier.

Little evidence was found on the implementation of these policies, however. There are also no mechanisms in place to monitor the extent to which the policies are being implemented. This is affected by the lack of clarity at the level of the United Nations Network on Migration. Despite the network being tasked with coordinating the adoption of the GCM, with IOM as the chair, there are no clear reporting mechanisms outside the IMRF. Further, with GCM being a non-binding cooperation framework, countries have been left to implement the compact voluntarily. Regional and country-specific factors have, nevertheless, also influenced the extent to which migration related policies are being implemented. Various underlying issues were identified in this regard.

3.21 Limited coordination among stakeholders

The review found that limited coordination among various stakeholders was hampering the implementation of migration-related policies and overall GCM objectives at the state level. Outside the NCMs there exists a lack of synergy among different government stakeholders working on migration governance. It has been a challenge to expand the GCM dialogues across relevant line ministries, because it is difficult to have discussions on the protection of migrants, for instance, if the ministries of interior, labour, diaspora, gender, health and social services are working in silos. Key informants for this study revealed that coordination efforts have been greatly hampered by government ministries not sharing information and data because of a lack of integrated systems. Non-government stakeholders emphasised that the high turnover rate of government officials was also a key hindrance to setting up coordination mechanisms with government stakeholders. It was revealed that often there is no proper

⁴³ Key informant, UNHCR, Kenya.

⁴⁴ Key informant, GIZ regional office.

transfer of information and no institutional memory.⁴⁵ These sentiments were linked to weak institutional structures which are often shaken by political changes.

You start working with one minister today, you reach very good decisions, and for political reasons, that minister is changed. And then you have to start from square one to orientate the new minister. And when this new minister comes, he usually has his agenda. He has his plan, and it will take him some time to understand these structures.⁴⁶

Coordination was also found to be a challenge among non-government stakeholders. The review found that there are no robust country-specific donor- or implementing partner working groups cooperating in the adoption and implementation of the GCM – as is the case with the GCR at the national level. Consequently, it was difficult to track migration and development programmes in the region, and information on them is scattered and inconsistently available. Good lessons and progress made – if at all – therefore remain invisible at country levels in comparison with the regional level. Commendably, IGAD has facilitated stakeholder conversations on the GCM at the regional level through Regional Consultative Processes with assistance from IOM. However, it lacks a repository where various stakeholders in the region can access and learn from the achievements of specific countries in GCM and GCR activities.

As the coordinator of the UN Network on Migration, IOM does not stand out as a GCM coordinating body at national levels (as UNHCR is to the GCR), despite facilitating consultative processes on migration in the region. The lack of a GCM coordinating organisation has limited the extent to which development partners, international organisations, NGOs, civil society, the private sector and other stakeholders can coordinate on GCM implementation outside the confines of the NCMs, which are chaired by national governments. While the NCMs have been at the forefront of policy discussions undergirded by the GCM, it is specific government ministries that are in charge of streamlining the compact's objectives into policy and programming – which, as noted above, they do in silos.⁴⁷ As such, migration-related policy implementation has generally been slow and difficult to measure in the region, with donors cautious about funding the process. This can be traced back to the GCM implementation modality being vague and non-binding, unlike the GCR, which finds precedence in the 1951 Refugee Convention and the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa – also captured in the AU's MPFA.⁴⁸

Therefore, this review found a lack of coordination and alliance in the implementation of the GCR and GCM. There are signs that the two compacts are drifting further apart rather than coming together, despite sharing areas of overlap on issues such as mixed migration and climate-induced migration – key trends in the HoA. Conversations on shared issues take place in isolation, in the context of one or the other compact, and national implementation plans do not identify room for closer coordination of efforts or combined funding. Divided responsibility for refugee policy and migration policy within governments in the region also explains some of the problems, and this separation is replicated within the UN system. The widening gap between the two compacts can be partly attributed to UNHCR's concerns that bringing refugee

⁴⁵ Key informant, UNHCR, Uganda.

⁴⁶ Key informant, ReDDS.

⁴⁷ Key informant, AMADPOC, Kenya.

⁴⁸ Focus Group Discussion, GIZ regional office.

and migration issues too closely together is likely to dilute the traditional protection space carved out for refugees. Governments, on the other hand, fear that this will dramatically expand the obligations placed on them to protect other people on the move.⁴⁹

3.22 Capacity gaps at state levels

The review found that countries in the region had uneven implementation capacities when it came to the two compacts. Administrative and structural challenges were identified as key factors contributing to the slow implementation of the GCM and GCR in the HoA. All countries in the region were found to lack administrative capacity in the form of personnel and systems able to integrate migrants' data from all ministries; this makes it difficult to formulate and implement policies in an informed manner. Infrastructure such as hospitals and schools offering services to the host populations were found to be limited and, in most cases, inadequate or non-functional, thus making it impossible for countries to extend these services fully to migrants and displaced persons.⁵⁰ Political instability in the region has also played a role in hindering the effective implementation of the compacts:

We had made so much progress in Sudan prior to the coup but now we are back to zero. They have other priorities like stabilising the country. It is hard to engage them on the GCM or the GCR at the moment.⁵¹

The review looked at how international organisations like the IOM and UNHCR were engaging governments on the GCM and GCR to address the challenges listed above. Key informants from these organisations mentioned that it was generally difficult to get governments to implement the two compacts. Using funding from different donors, UNHCR was setting up infrastructure like hospitals and schools in localities heavily involved in hosting refugees, and setting up integrated refugee and host community service delivery systems with the end-goal of handing them to the local and national governments, in the spirit of the GCR. In the case of IOM, it was revealed that its approach to dealing with governments has not fundamentally changed to incorporate the GCM as a basis for engagement at both policy and programmatic levels. Rather, it was following its own country-specific objectives:

You don't need to develop other mechanisms to show that you are incorporating GCM into your country-specific programmes. However, you can change the implementation strategy to make sure that you are also compliant with the GCM...Most processes in the region and within specific countries – some of which precede the GCM – comply with the compact without necessarily mentioning it.⁵²

IOM's reluctance to develop new GCM-oriented mechanisms targeting governments – despite this being part of its 2020–24 regional strategy and project documents – was attributed to the length of time it takes to build the capacity of and engage the government on new migration governance measures, especially when the latter are informed by non-binding regional and

⁴⁹ https://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/mpi-global-compacts-migration-refugees_final.pdf.

⁵⁰ Focus Group Discussion, GIZ regional office.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

global frameworks.⁵³ As such, remodelling existing programmes to include GCM indicators was the preferred route. This is made easier by the fact that the majority of IOM's programmes were already aligned with the GCM objectives. It has thus been easier for the organisation to weave the GCM into its implementation than to start new GCM-focused initiatives.

When it comes to implementation, we do not look at everything with the kind of a GCM lens because invariably you find that most of these ongoing processes are already addressing issues that are already being worked on or have been proposed by GCM. So, in practical terms, we find that we are not asking them to develop something new, but we are only telling them to recognise and acknowledge that these processes are also contributing to GCM processes.⁵⁴

This statement highlights the expendable nature of the GCM programmatically in country-specific interventions – the more so when governments lack the capacity to adapt new mechanisms and processes. The novelty of the GCM again comes into play, as there are no existing structures to support the implementation of its objectives. The setting up of new structures and overall capacity building is likely to take longer than the timelines most programmes are given. This does not, however, negate the fact that GCM objectives are being captured by programmes not specifically geared towards achieving its objectives at either national or local levels.

Localisation was viewed by key informants as a positive step towards the achievement of the two compacts. First, because local stakeholder buy-in is likely to foster sustainable programming; and, second, because a bottom-up approach to capacity building has been found to be more resistant to change because local government officials – who are often at the heart of policy implementation – are rarely redeployed based on political alliances.⁵⁵ However, the two compacts are not currently being evenly implemented at national and regional/local levels.

3.23 Failure of localisation?

The review found that the GCM was being adopted and implemented in a top-down manner in contrast to the bottom-up approach the GCR has taken, coordinated by UNHCR. This makes the GCM less visible in the HoA, according to some of our respondents.

Most local government officials do not really know what the GCM is about. The same could be said for some national officials. You do not really hear people talk about it. The GCM is wonderful but outside the confines of the national government and specific ministries, an awareness is lacking...This is unlike the CRRF which has percolated to the district levels. In Uganda, for instance, you have CRRF posters even in the most remote government offices and people are quite aware of it.⁵⁶

While some countries in the region (Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia and South Sudan) have brought together both government and non-government stakeholders to deliberate on the GCM

⁵³ Key informant, IOM Regional Office, Kenya.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Key informant, AMADPOC.

⁵⁶ Focus Group Discussion, GIZ regional office.

through NCMs, this has been done at the national level and not involved local stakeholders. There has been a lack of participation of both local government administrators and local NGOs and civil society organisations (CSOs), leading to an overall lack of awareness of the GCM at the local level. There are plans in the case of Kenya and Ethiopia to involve local governments in the implementation of GCM, but this has not yet materialised. Migrant organisations and the private sector were found to be absent from these discussions at both national and local levels. Djibouti, Sudan and Somalia do not include non-government stakeholders in migration coordination mechanisms, hindering their effective participation in migration governance.⁵⁷

GCR–CRRF programming is more evident at the local level, as local stakeholders have participated in planning and decision making in CRRF rollout countries explaining why they have an awareness of it compared to the GCM. Local NGOs and CSOs are not explicitly linking their programming to the GCM, however. Some informants pointed to the fact that, outside UN agencies, GCM and GCR objectives are not at the centre of local stakeholders' conversations, except when the agenda is led by donors and/or UN agencies. As such, other processes also take precedence in their programming based on who is pushing the agenda.

The NGOs in our consortium are aware of the GCR and CRRF but they are more conversant with durable solutions and are implementing their programmes with this in mind. Of course, the CRRF is very close to durable solutions, as both emphasise area-based approaches where refugees and host communities are targeted, but we do not necessarily link our programming to the GCR or CRRF.⁵⁸

The same gap was highlighted by a different respondent who stated:

In the context of the implementation of CRRF, some of our implementing partners struggle to understand the framework as it is not always at the core of their programming. They know about it through our conversations with them, and some of them throw around the word here and there but, again, some of them come in and explain that they are not fully cognisant of what the CRRF is supposed to achieve.⁵⁹

While the two compacts have not effectively percolated to the local level from either programmatic or policy standpoints, the GCR–CRRF is faring better than the GCM. This is attributed to the fact that migration and forced displacement are governed nationally, since issues related to them fall within the ministries of interior and security and are often not decentralised in most countries in the region. By virtue of historically hosting refugees, the GCR has, however, gained traction at local levels compared to the GCM.

3.3 Loss of momentum

The review found that there has been a degree of fatigue and loss of momentum across the board when it comes to the implementation of the two compacts. The GCR and CRRF have been particularly hard hit, given the enthusiasm of most stakeholders (development partners,

⁵⁷ IOM, Regional Policy Mapping (forthcoming).

⁵⁸ Key informant, ReDDS.

⁵⁹ Key informant, UNHCR, Uganda.

international organisations, NGOs and governments themselves) for what they would achieve. Somalia and South Sudan, in particular, were found to be behind in fulfilling their GRF pledges as a result of capacity challenges. The coup in Sudan and the conflict in Ethiopia have also acted as brakes on activities that were already in motion in these countries.⁶⁰

Similar sentiments are shared by development partners as regards the CRRF:

I would say that in the year 2016–17 there was a lot of momentum. A lot of hope in terms of how this new way of thinking would translate into operational work or translate into different types of policy. But I think, over time, the excitement that was in place in 2016 is not the place we are right now.⁶¹

The HoA's dynamic context is held responsible for this loss of momentum. Countries like Kenya, Uganda and Djibouti, considered as being on a development trajectory, have more adaptive capacity, while Ethiopia, Sudan, South Sudan and Somalia, considered fragile, have more limited capacity to implement the compacts. As such, regional programmes initially designed to address specific GCM and GCR objectives have ended up being implemented without focusing on these objectives. The GCM was found to have rapidly lost momentum in fragile states, as its objectives are not a priority for their governments compared to security, the economy and provision of basic services to citizens.⁶²

Conflicting actions by governments regarding the compacts were further found to have resulted in lethargy among development partners when it came to funding GCM and GCR-aligned programmes. In Kenya, for instance, the government announced camp closures after signing the CRRF road map and engaging with development partners to get funding, as in the case of the World Bank's Development Responses to Displacement Impact Project. The government's stance has currently changed with the signing of the 2021 Refugee Act, with a roadmap being drawn on how to change the Kakuma and Daadab camp model into an integrated settlement model.⁶³ Uncertainty regarding the government's commitments to the two compacts compounds the challenge of effectively setting up long-term development-oriented programming.

3.31 Funding expectations and the cycle of frustration

There are frustrations across the board on the funding aspect of the compacts. Documents reviewed and key informants interviewed revealed that, despite the EUTF expending funds to raise the profile of migration and displacement issues in conversations within the region, progress towards this goal has generally been slow.⁶⁴ On the other hand, frustrations exist among countries within the region, as there were hopes that the compacts would generate greater financial support to help them achieve their objectives. The unmet expectations on both the EUTF's and regional governments' sides have not only slowed the momentum of compacts, they have also resulted in frustration.

The funding not really coming as people thought it would...I think there is a

⁶⁰ Key informant, EU, Ethiopia

⁶¹ Key informant, UNHCR, Kenya

⁶² Key informant, IOM, regional office

⁶³ Key informant, UNHCR, Kenya

⁶⁴ Key informant, EU, Ethiopia

need to strike a balance between how governments view the compacts and how the international community view it and we know that we are not naïve to the fact that governments in this region have viewed this type of engagement as a sort of a fundraising tool to get more funding into refugee hosting communities or refugee hosting areas.⁶⁵

These frustrations will doubtless continue unless a clear funding mechanism beyond the EUTF is established for the compacts and more urgently for the GCM. This is because the UNHCR has facilitated a clearer fundraising framework for the GCR. A lack of clarity over the GCM's added value was highlighted by some of the key informants as an impediment to its funding by donor countries. The UN Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund (or Migration MPTF, characterised in the GCM as the 'start-up fund') has not had a multiplier effect as initially envisioned. Pledges to the fund remain way below what was expected,⁶⁶ thereby limiting the number of countries and organisations that can benefit from it and progress towards its objectives. The impact of Covid-19, the Ukrainian crisis and global inflation are likely to further result in limited pledges.

Covid-19 was also found to have slowed the progress of programmes geared towards the two compacts. Most international organisations, NGOs and countries have shifted their focus by directing resources towards pandemic response. This has affected EUTF-funded programmes in two ways. First, individuals working in these organisations were deployed to other functions such as border management. Second, under Covid-19 restrictions, most of their activities were delayed for long periods, with other activities being reprogrammed to conform to the new realities of working. Activities that involved engaging with government officials were particularly affected, as most functions were shut down at both national and local levels. Covid-19 did make the formulation of policies and programmes geared towards return and reintegration a priority, however, as the pandemic exposed how ill-prepared governments were to deal with large numbers of migrants returning to their countries of origin. For instance, IGAD, in collaboration with ILO and IOM, is working towards a return and reintegration policy at the regional level. Countries like Ethiopia, Somalia and Kenya are also discussing the formulation or revision of policies geared towards the reintegration of returnees.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Key informant, ReDDS.

⁶⁶ In the form of regular voluntary financial contributions from member states, the UN, international financial institutions and other stakeholders, including the private sector and philanthropic foundations.

⁶⁷ Key informant, AMADPOC, Kenya.

4 Conclusions and recommendations

The European Union through its Emergency Trust Fund (EUTF) has been at the forefront of the adoption and implementation of the Global Compacts on Refugees and Migration in the Horn of Africa. Other development partners, national and international organisations, and regional entities (such as IGAD) have also been coordinating activities geared towards the achievement of the twin compacts. Through direct and indirect funding to GCR- and GCM-related actions, the EUTF has been found to influence conversations on migration and forced displacement, as demonstrated by the policies and programmes that are being implemented in the region. The IGAD and UN organisations alike were found to be particularly central to these conversations, as they received the bulk of EUTF funding geared towards coordination and implementation of programmes related to the compacts. The GCR was, however, found to be more visible than the GCM in the region, as it is buttressed by existing structures and processes which are closely tied to the CRRF. The EUTF was found to favour the GCR thanks to concrete existing structures which the GCM currently does not have.

However, the review identified some foundations for the compacts in existing frameworks, like the Khartoum Process and the humanitarian–development–peace triple nexus. There also exists a disparity in the extent to which the two compacts are being adopted and implemented by different countries. Political instability, capacity gaps and limited coordination around the two compacts were identified as a hindrance to their effective adoption and implementation. Covid-19 was also found to be slowing momentum at both ends. The lack of clarity on funding is a cloud hanging over the compact's implementation at country levels, as are unmet expectations.

Based on these findings, the review makes the following recommendations:

1. **Donors should set up mechanisms for assessing and determining how best to streamline GCM objectives in their interventions in the region.** This will ensure adequate attention is paid to challenges and opportunities present in the GCM cooperation framework at country levels.
2. **The EU and other major donors should advocate and support improved coordination between key stakeholders implementing programmes or policy action related to the two compacts.** GCR and GCM working groups (by country) should be set up where key stakeholders can share experiences, opinions and ideas for contributing to the progress of the compacts.
3. **The IGAD should invest in an open access database/repository – managed by its Migration Programme – where documents on lessons learned, good practices and other knowledge products on the GCM and GCR are aggregated for use by**

all stakeholders. This will facilitate accessible and long-term peer exchange as well as institutional knowledge, beyond the regional consultative processes.

4. **International partners should lobby states to develop and share their Progress Declaration on the Implementation of the GCM, as well as progress on their 2019 Global Refugee Forum (GRF) pledges, in line with the GCR.** This will enable donors and key migration stakeholders to clearly identify country-specific migration and forced displacement and governance gaps that can be addressed through various interventions.
5. **The EU and other major donors should support the IOM to formulate and revise Migration Governance Indicators (MGIs) for all countries in the region in light of evolving migration dynamics.** This will provide an opportunity for governments to take an in-depth look at their migration policies and identify good practice, as well as areas of potential growth, in line with the GCM. The MGI profiles will also guide international partners' interventions within these countries.
6. **The EU and other major donors should support long-term, impact-oriented programmes that emphasise whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches to migration governance.** This will ensure stakeholder buy-in at local and national levels and the overall sustainability of GCM and GCR objectives.
7. **The EU and other major donors should support governments and UN Network organisations to contextualise the GCR and GCM in line with country-specific development priorities to attract sustained interest in the region.** This can be done by identifying governments' priorities and initiatives, which can then be scaled up to address the relevant objectives of the twin compacts.
8. **International partners should advocate and support – both technically and financially – the revision of IGAD's Migration Policy Framework, so that it aligns with GCM and GCR objectives.** Regional frameworks are likely to elicit more action from member states than do the global compacts.

References

- Czaika, M. and H. De Haas (2013). "The Effectiveness of Immigration Policies." *Population and Development Review* 39(3): 487-508. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2013.00613.x>
- Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) (2021). *A Region on the Move: 2020 Mobility Overview in the East and Horn of Africa and the Arabian Peninsula* [available at <https://dtm.iom.int/reports/east-and-horn-africa-%E2%80%94-region-move-%E2%80%93-2020-mobility-overview-east-and-horn-africa-and>].
- European Commission (EC) (n.d). *Durable Solutions* [available at https://home-affairs.ec.europa.eu/pages/glossary/durable-solutions_en].
- EC (2018). *European Minutes of the Fourth Board Meeting of the European Union Emergency Trust Fund for Africa* [available at https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/sites/default/files/minutes_4th_eutf_africa_board_meeting_final_4.pdf].
- EC (n.d). *Pioneering the Global Compact on Refugees in the Horn of Africa* [available at https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/region/horn-africa/regional_en].
- EC (n.d). *Better Migration Management Programme Phase II – EUTF project action fiche* [available at https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/sites/default/files/t05-eutf-hoa-reg-78_-_bmm_ii_ocnhpwq.pdf].
- EC and Altai Consulting (2021). *Focus on IGAD’s Work on Migration in the Horn of Africa*. Brussels: European Commission [available at https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/sites/default/files/eutf_igad_case_study_final_0.pdf].
- European Union Emergency Trust Fund (EUTF) (n.d.). *Factsheet EUTF Horn of Africa* [available at https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/region/horn-africa_en].
- EUTF (n.d). *Our Mission* [available at https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/index_en].
- European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) (2016). *Lives in Dignity: from Aid-dependence to Self-reliance*. Report [available at <https://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/our-work/opinions-information-reports/opinions/lives-dignity-aid-dependence-self-reliance>].
- German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) (n.d). *Social and Technical Investment* [available at <https://www.idos-research.de/en/search/?q=social+and+technical+investment&x=0&y=0>].
- Government of Kenya (2020). *Support for Host Community and Refugee Empowerment* [available at <https://refugee.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Kenya-Comprehensive-Refugee-Response-Framework-CRRF.pdf>].
- International Labour Organization (ILO) (n.d). *Advancing Social Justice, Promoting Decent Work* [available at <https://www.ilo.org/africa/about-us/lang--en/index.htm>].

- ILO (n.d). *AU/ILO/IOM/UNECA Joint Programme on Labour Migration Governance for Development and Integration in Africa* [available at https://www.ilo.org/africa/areas-of-work/labour-migration/policy-frameworks/WCMS_671954/lang--en/index.htm].
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2022). Report on the International Migration Review Forum 2022 [available at <https://www.iom.int/international-migration-review-forum-2022>].
- Ineli-Ciger, M. (2022). Is Resettlement Still a Durable Solution? An Analysis in Light of the Proposal for a Regulation Establishing a Union Resettlement Framework, *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 24(1), 27-55. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718166-12340118>
- IOM (2021). *Migration Policy Practice XI: Special Issue on Global Mobility in 2021* [available at <https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/mpp-44.pdf>].
- IOM (2020). *Regional Strategy 2020–2024* [available at https://eastandhornofafrica.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbdl701/files/documents/East%20and%20Horn%20of%20Africa%20Regional%20Strategy%202020-2024_0_0.pdf].
- International Rescue Committee (IRC) (2021). *Navigating Barriers and Maximising Incentives in Support of Refugees and Host Countries*. New York: IRC [available at <https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/6324/ircdrcnrcjointreportv4final.pdf>].
- Research and Evidence Facility (REF) (2020). 'Comprehensive refugee response in the Horn of Africa'. Blog [available at <https://blogs.soas.ac.uk/ref-hornresearch/files/2020/03/CRRF-report.pdf>].
- Refugee Consortium of Kenya (2021). *Synopsis of the Refugees Act, 2021* [available at https://www.rckkenya.org/uploads/2022/03/Synopsis_of_the_Refugees_Act,_2021].
- Southern African Development Community (2020). 'Regional Migration Policy Framework'. Press release [available at <https://www.sadc.int/latest-news/sadc-develops-regional-migration-policy-framework>].
- United Nation High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (n.d). *Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework: Delivering more Comprehensive and Predictable Responses for Refugees* [available at <https://www.unhcr.org/comprehensive-refugee-response-framework-crrf.html>].
- UNHCR (2018). *CRRF Ethiopia* [available at <https://data.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/65916>].
- UNHCR (2021) *Global Report 2021* [available at <https://reporting.unhcr.org/globalreport2021/pdf>].
- UNHCR (2022). 'Kenya: latest updates'. *Global Focus* [available at <https://reporting.unhcr.org/kenya>].

Annex 1: EUTF regionally funded projects

PROJECT	OBJECTIVE (link to GCM/GCR/CRRF)	IMPLEMENTATION
<p>Towards Free Movement and Transhumance in the IGAD region</p> <p>€14,952,000</p> <p>Adoption: 28/04/2016</p> <p>Partners: IGAD, ILO</p>	<p>Facilitate the free movement of persons and improve regular labour migration and mobility in the IGAD region in order to enhance regional economic integration, stability and development. (Not mentioned)</p>	<p>Implemented.</p> <p>Considering the progress achieved, in June 2020 the project was topped up with an amount of €5 million. This will help promote interregional legal migration further, while enhancing orderly cross-border mobility and migration, regional economic integration, and regional development.</p>
<p>Delivering durable solutions to forced displacement in the IGAD region through the implementation of the global compact on refugees (GCR)</p> <p>€3,000,000</p> <p>Adoption: 31/10/2019</p> <p>Partners: IGAD</p>	<p>Strengthen and implement the IGAD Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) process by reinforcing the regional dialogue on forced displacement, creating strategic partnerships between key actors to improve international responsibility sharing, and building synergies between regional and national GCR processes. (GCR)</p>	<p>Currently being implemented</p>
<p>Facility on Sustainable and Dignified Return and Reintegration in support of the Khartoum Process</p> <p>€60,950,000</p> <p>Adoption: 15/12/2016</p> <p>Partners: IOM</p>	<p>Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration management through the development and implementation of rights-based, development-focused and sustainable return and reintegration policies and processes. (GCR/GCM)</p>	<p>Implemented</p> <p>In May 2018, a top-up of €20 million was approved to aid the Regional Facility on Dignified Return and Sustainable Reintegration in supporting the reintegration of returnees from the Central Mediterranean Route and EU member states in particular.</p> <p>An second top-up of €10 million was accepted in</p>

		<p>December 2019, to allow continued provision of emergency protection, life-saving assistance, voluntary return and reintegration of vulnerable migrants – as well as the generation of migration data and capacity-building activities – until mid-2021.</p> <p>An additional top-up of €5.95 million for the action was finalised in July 2021, increasing the total EU contribution to €60.95 million. The additional funds aim to reinforce the core set of activities under the pillars of migration data, capacity building, assisted voluntary return and reintegration assistance, and monitoring and evaluation.</p>
<p>Collaboration in cross-border areas of the Horn of Africa</p> <p>€67,015,000</p> <p>Adoption: 15/12/2016</p> <p>Partners: GIZ, UNDP, IGAD</p>	<p>Prevent and mitigate the impact of local conflict in these borderland areas, and promote economic development and greater resilience. (GCR)</p>	<p>Implemented</p>
<p>Better Migration Management Programme Phase II</p> <p>€20,500,000</p> <p>Adoption: 12/12/2017</p> <p>Partners: GIZ, IOM</p>	<p>Improve the management of safe, orderly and regular migration in the region and support national authorities in addressing the smuggling of migrants and the trafficking in human beings within and from the Horn of Africa (GCM)</p>	<p>Implemented and currently acting as a baseline for BMM III Evaluation (KII)</p>
<p>CRRF: Inclusive Urban Development and Mobility</p> <p>€8,200,000</p> <p>Adoption: 01/01/2019</p> <p>Partners: Cities Alliance Uganda, ACAV, Koboko Municipality Ethiopia, UNHCR, IRC</p>	<p>Increase the safety and wellbeing of displaced populations and their host communities living in urban or peri-urban settings and reduce inequalities between these groups. (CRRF)</p>	
<p>Providing sustainable settlement options and increasing self-reliance of South Sudanese refugees in Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)</p>	<p>For South Sudanese refugees and host communities in Haut-Uélé and Ituri provinces of the DRC to live in safety and dignity, in an enhanced protected environment and with access to livelihoods and basic services. (CRRF)</p>	

<p>€ 3,000,000</p> <p>Adoption: 12/12/2018</p> <p>Partners: UNHCR, PAGODA</p>		
<p>CRRF DIRECT - Displacement responses through regional cooperation and technical exchange</p> <p>€13,000,000</p> <p>Adoption: 28/05/2019</p> <p>Partners: DRC, ReDSS</p>	<p>Increase the safety and wellbeing of displaced populations and their host communities and reduce inequalities between these groups.</p> <p>Support the implementation of the objectives of the CRRF in relation to displacement from the Great Lakes region, which affects the region itself as well as the wider Horn of Africa. (CRRF)</p>	

Source: https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/region/horn-africa_en.

Annex 2: EUTF country-specific funded projects

COUNTRY	PROJECT	OBJECTIVE (link to GCM/GCR/CRRF)	IMPLEMENTATION
Djibouti	<p>Sustainable solutions for the most vulnerable host populations, refugees and migrants in Djibouti</p> <p>€20,500,000</p> <p>Adoption: 12/12/2017</p> <p>Partners: IOM, WFP</p>	<p>Protect refugees and migrants and provide lasting solutions to the problem of refugees, migrants and host populations in general in the context of the CRRF and the commitments made by the Government of Djibouti in these areas. (GCR/GCM)</p>	<p>Implemented</p> <p>Evaluation: the action has achieved encouraging results in favour of refugees, migration and forced displacement in Djibouti.</p> <p>In December 2021, an amendment of €2 million was approved, focusing on supporting Ethiopian migrants arriving or returning from Djibouti along the Eastern Migration Corridor.</p>
	<p>Empowerment and development of refugees through education, access to social protection services and economic opportunities</p> <p>€7,890,000</p> <p>Adoption: 12/12/2018</p> <p>Partners: UNHCR, WFP</p>	<p>Integrate refugees into the social and economic fabric of Djibouti in full respect of the principles of the CRRF. (CRRF)</p>	<p>Being implemented</p>
Ethiopia	<p>Stimulating economic opportunities and job creation for refugees and host communities in Ethiopia in support of the CRRF</p> <p>€14,750,000</p> <p>Adoption: 12/12/2017</p> <p>Partners: UNHCR</p>	<p>Ease pressure on Ethiopia as a major host country for refugees and increase refugee self-reliance by fostering sustainable, integrated and self-reliant solutions for both refugees and host communities in Ethiopia in response to their developmental needs and aspirations. (GCR/CRRF)</p>	<p>Implemented</p>

	<p>Promoting stability and strengthening basic service delivery for host communities, refugees and other displaced populations in Gambella Regional State of Ethiopia</p> <p>€13,000,000</p> <p>Adoption: 28/05/2019</p> <p>Partners: CSOs, regional and local authorities, private sector, among others</p>	<p>Promote stability and strengthen basic service delivery for host communities, refugees and other displaced populations in Gambella Regional State, Ethiopia (GCR/CRRF)</p>	<p>Being implemented</p>
Kenya	<p>Piloting private sector solutions for refugees and host communities in Northwest Kenya</p> <p>€5,000,000</p> <p>Adoption: 01/01/2020</p> <p>Partners: IFC</p>	<p>Promote better economic integration and self-reliance of refugees and host communities in the Kakuma and Kalobeyei area by supporting market-led solutions that strengthen and deepen local markets and respond to key development challenges. (CRRF)</p>	<p>Being implemented</p>
	<p>Enhancing self-reliance for refugees and host communities in Kenya</p> <p>€33,270,000</p> <p>Adoption: 12/12/2018</p> <p>Partners: UNHCR, WFP, FAO, UN HABITAT</p>	<p>1. Enhance the Government of Kenya's overall asylum management, and support government-led CRRF roll-out at both national and county levels. 2. Contribute to the implementation of the KISEDIP for refugees and host communities in Turkana County. 3. Improve economic self-reliance of refugees and host communities in Garissa County. (CRRF)</p>	<p>Being implemented</p>
Somalia	<p>RE-INTEG: Enhancing Somalia's responsiveness to the management and reintegration of mixed migration flows</p> <p>€ 55,000,000</p> <p>Adoption: 28/04/2016</p> <p>Partners: UNHCR, WHO</p>	<p>Support a sustainable and durable reintegration of refugees and returnees from Yemen, Kenya, Europe and other areas of departure and of IDPs in Somalia; anchor populations within Somalia.</p>	<p>Being implemented: to assist Somalia in its response to the Covid-19 pandemic, a €5 million top-up to this action was approved in November 2020.</p>
Sudan	<p>Integrating refugee children into the Sudanese education system</p> <p>€25,000,000</p>	<p>Contribute to the improvement of quality education for all children, including refugees, IDPs, nomadic and host communities in South Darfur and South</p>	<p>Being implemented</p>

	<p>Adoption: 12/12/2018</p> <p>Partners: UNICEF</p>	<p>Kordofan; facilitate integration of refugee children into Sudan's national education system in line with the country's commitments under the Djibouti Declaration for Refugee Education (CRRF)</p>	
	<p>IMPROVE-EU integrated measures to promote rural-urban value addition and employment – East Sudan</p> <p>€ 8,000,000</p> <p>Adoption: 03/03/2018</p> <p>Partners: GIZ</p>	<p>Contribute to improved livelihoods of refugees, migrant workers and host communities in East Sudan. (CRRF)</p>	<p>Being implemented</p>
Uganda	<p>RISE – response to increased demand on government services and creation of economic opportunities in Uganda</p> <p>€20,000,000</p> <p>Adoption: 01/10/2018</p> <p>Partners: GIZ, CARE</p>	<p>In line with the CRRF and ReHoPE strategy for Uganda, strengthen local authorities in delivering basic social services to all people in the refugee-hosting districts; enable greater resilience and self-reliance among both refugee and host communities. (CRRF)</p>	<p>Being implemented</p>
	<p>Security, Protection and Economic Empowerment (SUPREME) in Uganda</p> <p>€18,000,000</p> <p>Adoption: 12/12/2018</p> <p>Partners: Justice, Law and Order Sector (JLOS)</p>	<p>Improve overall safety and economic wellbeing for refugees and host communities in Northern Uganda. (CRRF)</p>	<p>Being implemented</p>

Source: https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica/region/horn-africa_en.

Annex 3: List of key informants

Donors	
Representative from EU delegation, Kenya	Project Officer, EUTF/Migration and Forced Displacement
Representative from EU delegation, Uganda	Programme Officer, EUTF/Refugee Response
Representative from EU Delegation, Ethiopia	Programme Officer, EUTF/ Migration Management and Displacement
Representatives from GIZ	Regional Coordinator, BMM BMM Advisor, Kenya and Somalia Regional Migration Cluster Coordinator Migration representative from the HQs
UN agencies	
Representative from UNHCR, Kenya	Programme Officer
Representative from UNHCR, Uganda	Programme Officer
Representative from IOM, Regional Office	Deputy Regional Programme Manager, BMM
Representative from ILO, Regional Office	Chief Technical Advisor for ILO, Kenya
Implementing agencies	
Representative from ReDDS, Regional/Kenya	Solutions specialist, Research and Capacity Development
Think-tank	
Representative from African Migration and Development Policy Centre (AMADPOC), Kenya	Chief Executive Officer