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ABSTRACT

Refugee funding problem today is founded on the dual nature of the international system, made up of complex interplay of interstate and international bonds. Currently the solidarity of the refugee regime is backed by close links among civil society, Non-Governmental Organizations, the media and UNHCR itself. The study revealed that there is less humanitarian funding globally, this was attributed to the ever growing humanitarian need and protection issues and the presence of fewer (traditional) donors funding the refugee program leading to un-proportionate ratio of funding vis-à-vis the refugee population. The study also revealed that, willingness of hosting states to accept refugee inflows in this age and day, is clearly fading and moreover because of national security concerns. Unfavorable exchange rate has also contributed to the decreased funding thus affecting the refugee regime

The trend of reduced refugee funding has greatly impacted host countries and especially refugees. Majority (80.6) of the beneficiary/refugee respondents indicated that reduction of refugee funding has resulted to: Deaths from treatable diseases, trauma and psychiatric conditions, ration cuts and malnutrition amongst children and old, some refugees even return to uncertain conditions at home rather than stay in the camps, exploitation and abuse of women refugees who venture out of camps in search of work, early marriage of young girls, increased stress and domestic violence within families and increasing theft. There is also poor education due to inadequate numbers of teachers and education facilities, deaths from treatable diseases, trauma and psychiatric conditions. Majority (99%) of the key informants reported withdrawal of some programs, dismissal of staff hence affecting the quality of the program.

In order to mitigate this challenge, a three phase formula (pre-crisis, during crisis and post-crisis) that revolves around short term and longer term measures of efficiency in utilization of funds emerged. This can be achieved by, strengthening the national frameworks available, other frameworks incorporating Africa countries (AU) should be created to participate and have an oversight role in prioritization of both the refugees/host countries needs/concerns. These frameworks should devotedly work together with UNHCR to ensure that their different frameworks address refugee needs while promoting preventive measures through encouraging good governance, resources mobilization, reconstruction and re-integration of refugees.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Donor countries simply do not have enough resources to provide funds for humanitarian work and they must make choices and priorities. At the same time big emergencies globally continue to increase such as in Syria, Philippines, Iraq and West Africa. The end result is simple, more demands for resources worldwide combined with fewer resources available and hence reduced quantity and quality of refugee service.

In 2012, an estimated 7.6 million people were newly displaced due to conflict or persecution, including 1.1 million new refugees - the highest number of new arrivals in one year since 1999. Another 6.5 million people were newly displaced within the borders of their countries – the second highest figure of the past ten years. Some 35.8 million persons were of concern to UNHCR by end 2012, the second highest number on record\textsuperscript{1}, of this figure, 17.7 million were IDPs and 10.5 million were refugees - 2.3 million people more than in 2011. The refugee figure was close to that of 2011 (10.4 million) and the number of IDPs had increased by 2.2 million since end 2011. Developing countries hosted over 80 per cent of the world’s refugees, compared to 70 per cent ten years ago. The 49 Least Developed Countries were providing asylum to 2.4 million refugees by year-end. Pakistan was host to the largest number of refugees worldwide (1.6 million), followed by the Islamic Republic of Iran (868,200), Germany (589,700) and Kenya (565,000)\textsuperscript{2}.

\textsuperscript{1} UNHCR Global Trends 2012
\textsuperscript{2} UNHCR Global Trends, op.cit
The available funding for the humanitarian sector globally is not increasing, rather it is reducing. Despite the abundance of literature on international regimes, surprisingly little attention has been given to how they are funded and the impact of funding on regime performance\(^3\). Africa is a vast and varied continent with different histories and geographic conditions; different stages of economic development; different sets of public policies and patterns of internal and international interaction. More than 25 per cent of the world’s refugee populations live in sub-Saharan Africa, the number of refugees and asylum-seekers in the region stood at 3.3 million at the end of 2013 with a voluntary donor contribution to Africa of $792,326,119\(^4\). In 2012, the number of refugees grew slightly, to some 2.8 million with a voluntary contribution of $ 878,011,951\(^5\). In 2011 the total number of refugees in Africa was 2.7 million and the total voluntary contribution was $754,772,683\(^6\). 2010, registered 2.1 million refugees with a total voluntary contribution of $ 562,523,713\(^7\). From these statistics, it is clear that conflicts are increasingly becoming a major problem which has resulted to increased number of refugees. However the voluntary contribution is not proportional to the increased refugee numbers. Therefore the current study sought to establish the causes of reduced refugee funding.

Various refugee protection policies and legislations have been put in place both internationally and nationally. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was established in 1950 to provide international protection to refugees. UNHCR is guided by a number of agreements, most notably the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 protocol that broadened its geographic and temporal coverage. There are also several

---

\(^4\) UNHCR *Global report 2013*  
\(^5\) UNHCR *Global report 2012*  
\(^6\) UNHCR *Global report 2011*  
\(^7\) UNHCR *Global report 2010*
regional agreements, including the 1969 Organization of African Unity convention that expanded the definition of refugee to include persons fleeing generalized violence. Over the years, in addition to its mandate for refugee protection, UNHCR has become the principal coordinator of relief operations. Kenya is a signatory to these legal instruments. On the domestic front, however, Kenya lacked any national refugee legislation until 2007, when the Refugee Act came into force. Despite these legislations and policies in place, focus on emerging trends on increased numbers of refugees and hence management cost was not factored in these legal instruments. Therefore the reducing refugee management cost continues to be a major problem in the developing world, including Kenya. Another aspect that would not be ignored in the research is the impact of the reduced refugee funding. The history of refugees in Kenya dates back to independence in 1963. The country has been host to refugees from its neighboring countries which have experienced civil war, political unrest and upheavals at one time or another. These include countries such as Ethiopia, Somalia, South Sudan, Uganda, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Burundi and Rwanda. The refugees are today settled in two camps in Kenya; Dadaab in Wajir County and Kakuma refugee camp Turkana County. The total numbers of refugees, stateless and Asylum-seekers in Kenya at the end of 2013 was 607,120.

The U.N.H.C.R, other U.N specialized agencies like UNICEF and other NGOs have assumed the responsibility of providing the basic needs for the refugees in these camps (i.e. food, shelter, water, healthcare, sanitation and education while the Kenya Government provides the necessary administrative and security back up and generally maintains Law and Order in the camps. The enforcement of the 2007 Refugee Act followed a period of sustained advocacy by UNHCR and

---

8 UNHCR Global Report 2013.
civil society organizations. The Act established a Department for Refugee Affairs (DRA) which functions includes developing policies, promoting durable solutions, coordinating international assistance, receiving and processing applications for refugee status, registration, issuing identity cards and travel documents and managing the refugee camps. This has enhanced refugee protection initiative, however it being highly funded by the Kenya government with some support from UNHCR limiting other potential donors. The current study also discusses possible mitigation strategies to be adopted in Kenya.

The current study is an ex-post facto type. The area that has been selected as the focus of the current study is Kenya. This is because it hosts two large refugee camps: Kakuma Refugee Camp is located in Turkana District of the northwestern region of Kenya, 120 kilometers from Lodwar District Headquarters and 95 kilometers from the Lokichoggio Kenya-Sudan border. Kakuma was established in 1992 to serve Sudanese refugees, and has since expanded to serve refugees from Somalia, South Sudan, Ethiopia, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Eritrea, Uganda, and Rwanda. According to current UNHCR statistics, the camp population stands at just close to 180,000 refugees. In 2007, Kakuma Refugee Camp hosted 21% of the total refugee population in Kenya. The semi-arid climate of Kakuma is ill suited to agriculture, while restrictions on employment deter refugee job-seeking. Those who work with NGOs receive a small incentive payment for their work, but incentive staff represents only a fraction of the refugee population. As Arafat Jamal concludes from his evaluation of Kakuma camp, “Anyone confined to a place like Kakuma is rendered automatically dependent on some form of

---

9 The Refugee Act, 2007:Republic of Kenya
10 UNHCR, Fact Sheet, September. (UNHCR Branch Office, Nairobi, 2008)
hand-out”. Dadaab refugee camp was established 20 years ago to house up to 90,000 refugees fleeing from Somalia's civil war. Today it is a home to more than has 424,307-registered Somali refugee population. It is also considered the largest refugee camp in the World, located in an arid portion of eastern Kenya near the Somali border.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Protecting and assisting the refugees is becoming increasingly complicated with the emergence of a number of complex and interconnected global mega-trends that has resulted to a shift of focus as concerns refugee funding. Developing countries that host refugees for protracted periods experience long-term economic, social, political, and environmental impacts. Their presence increases the demands for education, health services, infrastructure such as water supply, sanitation, and transportation, and also in some cases, for natural resources such as grazing land and firewood. In different parts of the world, states have different traditions of asylum provision. In the United States, Australia, and Canada, the main means of providing protection has been through resettling refugees. In contrast, in Europe and much of the developing world, the most common means by which refugees have found protection has been by spontaneously arriving at the border of the country and claiming asylum. Since the 1951 Convention was drafted and adopted, many states have since its adoption become party to the Convention. Despite this fact, countries have been faced with significant and very unequal responsibilities as a result of highly fluctuating inflows of asylum seekers into their territories. Some states appear to make much larger contribution to the protection of refugees than others,

13 As at 23 January 2011, 144 states are party to the 1951 Convention, and 145 to the 1967 Protocol, UNTC
especially the countries bordering the conflict afflicted countries. Even after conflicts subsides in the countries of conflict there seems to be no concern by those countries to support their citizens “refugees” in whatever manner. As the costs of assisting asylum seekers in Africa and now Kenya have risen and reduced funds registered by humanitarian agencies, greater flexibility in determining the best solutions and more investment in alternative and longer-term forms of refugee management are needed. This was clearly witnessed when the UN's World Food Program (WFP) announced that it would reduce food rations for residents of Kenya's Dadaab and Kakuma refugee camps by 50 percent on November 2014 which was as a result of insufficient funding. In this context several questions remain unanswered. For instance, what causes reduced refugee funding?, What are the impacts of reduced refugee funding on refugee management in Kenya? and what are the possible mitigation strategies to be adopted in Kenya?

1.3 Objectives of the Research

1.3.1. General Objective

To establish the challenges of reduced refugee funding to host countries, its impact to refugee management and possible mitigation strategies.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The study was guided by the following objectives:

1. To establish factors causing reduced refugee funding.
2. To establish the impact of reduced refugee funding on refugee management in Kenya.
3. To discuss the possible mitigation strategies to be adopted in Kenya.

1.4 Justification

The international obligation not to return refugees to danger is absolute, and applies to all countries regardless of their level of economic development. Meeting the life-saving needs of
refugees, setting up fair and efficient asylum procedures, helping refugees return home or integrate in host communities all have a financial cost, met by receiving States, as well as by the international community in a spirit of international solidarity. Needs however, far outstrip resources. The question of funding for the international refugee regime is important for two reasons. First, UNHCR depends entirely on voluntary contributions for its field operations. The agency receives just 2 percent of its funds from the UN general budget for headquarters staff. The remaining 98 percent of an annual budget exceeding $1 billion must be raised through appeals to UN member states and other donors. The vast majority of the agency’s funding comes from industrialized countries, with the United States, the European Union, and Japan together accounting for 94 percent of government contributions. Because of the particular interests and political priorities of these donors, roughly 80 percent of the funding is earmarked for specific operations or programs.

Because of this funding structure, UNHCR is highly vulnerable to fluctuations in the level of donor contributions. Second, since its inception, burden sharing has been an underlying norm of the international refugee regime. The 1951 convention recognizes in its preamble that “the grant of asylum may place unduly heavy burdens on certain countries” and calls for international cooperation. Subsequent regional agreements in Africa, Europe, and Asia also incorporated the concept of burden sharing. Despite its importance, these instruments did not legally obligate third countries to assist host states financially or otherwise.

Kenya is one of the developing countries that host refugees and asylum seekers from more than eight different countries. Such countries experience long-term economic, social, political, security and environmental impacts\textsuperscript{17}. Although studies on the influences of refugees have been done in other areas, a comprehensive study on challenges of increased inadequacy of reduced refugee funding and possible mitigation efforts in Kenya, has not been. Probable solutions to mitigate the challenges and easing the burden of the host country are yet to be made. This is guided from the fact that most African countries assented to the 1951 Convention, but few of them actively participate in the collective refugee burden, especially the refugee countries of origin, even after the conflict subsides, not much is done to aid their people abroad “refugees”. In addition, the costs of assisting asylum seekers in Africa and especially Kenya have risen. This is from the statistics showing unequal proportion of increased refugee numbers versus voluntary donor contribution.

Therefore, greater flexibility in determining the best solutions and more investment in alternative and longer-term forms of refugee management are needed which necessitates the current study. This study intends to explore challenges of reduced refugee funding and possible mitigation efforts in Kenya and the consequent relationship that might both be conflictual or cohesive. The results will be instrumental to policy makers and even managers of refugee issues to ensure that the effects coming along with reduced refugee funding are minimized at both the local, national and international level and furthermore minimal conflict among the refugees and between the refugee and the host community. Future studies on the refugees will also borrow a lot from the findings and results made from this study.

\textsuperscript{17} UNHCR, \textit{Global report 2004}
1.5 Literature Review

Majorities of refugees in the world, do not arrive in a 'controlled' manner, but arrive spontaneously; they flee their country of origin in search of refuge abroad. 'Abroad' will usually be the neighboring country that will indeed be 'forced' to receive them. This obligation derives from the prohibition of refoulement, the core provision of the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol that supplemented the Convention laid down in Article 33 paragraph 1 thereof:

\[
\text{No Contracting State shall expel or return ('refouler') a refugee in any manner whatsoever to the frontiers of territories where his life or freedom would be threatened on account of his race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion}^{18}\text{.}
\]

This provision secures both the most basic protection of refugees by trumping domestic immigration law regarding entry of aliens, but it causes, simultaneously, huge disparities in terms of distribution. A major debate in contemporary refugee regime is the perceived conflict between burden sharing in terms of refugee funding and the duty of the government towards its citizens.

1.5.1 History overview of international refugee protection

The history of international protection starts with the League of Nations. World War I (1914-1918), its preliminaries (the Balkan Wars, 1912-1913) and its aftermath in the Near East (the wars in the Caucasus, 1918-1921, and the Greco-Turkish War, 1919-1922) caused considerable upheavals in the States involved and especially in the Russian Empire. Large numbers of refugees (estimates vary between 1 and 2 million) left Russian, later Soviet, territories for various countries of Europe or Asia Minor, Central and East Asia between 1918 and 1922 and also thereafter. Emergency relief was provided mainly by charitable organizations. However, these organizations could not extend their succor beyond material assistance. Furthermore, resources were becoming exhausted, and there was no central coordinating body. Therefore a

\[^{18}\text{1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol, Article 33 paragraph 1}\]
High Commissioner was to be appointed to define the status of refugees, to secure their repatriation or their employment outside Russia, and to coordinate measures for their assistance. Well before World War I tragic events in the Ottoman Empire had affected various ethno-religious communities, the Armenians, who are the victims most frequently mentioned, as well as Assyrians (Nestorians), Chaldeans (Uniate Nestorians) and Jacobite Syrians, Turks, Kurds and other Muslim groups also suffered. As for the Greeks who survived the massacres and the Balkan and Greco-Turkish Wars, they joined with their Bulgarian or Turkish counterparts in the “facultative mutual” exchange of populations that took place under the Treaty of Constantinople (1913), the Turco-Bulgarian Treaty (1913), the Greek-Turkish Agreement (May 1914) and the Treaty of Neuilly (1919), and finally in the compulsory exchange of Greek and Turkish populations provided for by the Treaty of Lausanne (1923). In order to protect and assist the refugees from the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic, the mandate of the High Commissioner of the League of Nations was extended to Armenians in 1924 and to “other categories of refugees” (Assyrians, Assyro-Chaldeans, Syrians, Kurds and a small group of Turks) in 1928. During the League of Nations period (1921-1946) several institutions were created to perform some or all of the tasks of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

The next important phase was that of the International Refugee Organization (IRO). Established on 15 December 1946, to resettle refugees and displaced persons, mainly from Central Europe, United States, Australia, Western Europe, Israel, Canada and Latin America. The IRO was originally meant to complete its operational activities on 30 June 1950, it became evident that, it was unlikely, to say the least, that the problem of refugees would be solved by that date. The UN

---

20 Gilbert Jaeger, “On the history of the international protection of refugees” op.cit
21 League of Nations, Treaty Series, Vol. CLIX, No. 3663. Assimilated refugees were Assyrians, Assyro-Chaldeans, Syrians, Kurds and a small number of Turks.
General Assembly decided on 3 December 1949 “to establish, as of 1 January 1951, a High Commissioner's Office for Refugees”\(^{22}\) and on 14 December 1950 adopted the Statute of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

1.5.2 The Mandate and the Funding of the UNHCR

Given recent refugee population movements in lesser-developed countries (LDCs), it is often forgotten that the early work of the UNHCR was in primarily developed, Western states. However as low-cost, small weapons became widely available in LDCs by the late 1960s, refugee policy became intertwined with conflict and post-conflict recovery. Patrick argues that the post-conflict environment and concomitant refugee crises confronted “donors . . . [with] what game theorists term a ‘dilemma of common interest’: they may be tempted to enjoy the diffuse gains of stability and growth while letting others shoulder the burdens of peace building”\(^{23}\).

Refugee crises since the 1960s altered the nature of the UNHCR from an apolitical, coordination agency to an operational organization charged with assisting states in eliminating refugee problems\(^{24}\). These changes have affected the refugees of concern to the UNHCR as well as its budgetary needs. For example in the early 1950s, the UNHCR’s refugees of concern totaled no more than 1 million with an operating budget of approximately $300,000. By 1995, the number of UNHCR “refugees of concern” was over 15 million with a budget of approximately $550 million\(^{25}\). By the mid-2000s, the UNHCR’s budget surpassed $1 billion. While Hveem presents data which show that by the mid-1990s, more than half of all global aid was channeled through

\(^{22}\) UNGA Res. 319 (IV), Refugees and stateless persons, of 3 December 1949
multilateral agencies, with the UNHCR one of the largest recipients, Loescher argues that “one of the UNHCR’s most significant weaknesses is its dependence on voluntary contributions to carry our existing and new programs. The flow of assistance from donor governments is neither reliable nor always in the most appropriate form.” As a consequence, one of the costs to an organization in which burden-sharing might be concentrated among a small group of states is the perception that donor finance leads to state-capture. In the case of the UNHCR, “some have also discounted the UNHCR as a mere policy tool of the United States, its major donor state.” In essence, those states that provide the public good allow the free riding behavior of other states in order to dominate the policy-making of the organization (a private benefit). Whether this characterization of UNHCR policy-making is accurate requires an understanding of state behavior, refugee protection as a pure public good and the possible private benefits.

1.5.3 The current worldwide refugee situation

Given that the mission of the UNHCR is to protect the human rights of refugees against forced repatriation and increasingly assist IDPs, hypothetically, those states which are more democratic are more likely to bear a greater burden to contribute to the UNHCR in order to promote the rule of law in relation to refugee protection. As Barnett argues that:

“because domestic order is best secured through democratic practices, the rule of law at home provides for the foundation of the rule of law abroad . . . democracy is increasingly treated as a principle of international order.”

---

Indeed Suhrke argues that in refugee protection, “the logic of burden-sharing starts from the premise that helping refugees is a jointly held moral duty and obligation under international law.”30 In an exhaustive study on the financing of humanitarian activities, Smillie and Minear argue that “humanitarianism is located within competing and sometimes inconsistent domestic and foreign policy priorities . . . disproportionate spending is likely to flow to emergencies that are closer to donor countries than those that are farther away” 31. One means by which states can exclude others from the benefit of refugee protection is through earmarking contributions. Each year, the UNHCR’s annual program budget highlights the strategic priorities of the organization, and an annual pledging conference is convened at which donors commit to fund activities. When contributing to the UNHCR’s budget, states can specify where and how their contributions are used. So-called “tight” earmarking involves specifying specific states and activities while “light” earmarking specifies a geographic region32. Earmarking is a common practice of donor states, Betts argues that UNHCR earmarking among European Union (EU) member states reflects the security concerns as well as historical linkages between states which ultimately transforms the contribution into a private benefit33.

Throughout its existence, the UNHCR has relied on NGOs for operations. Indeed, UNHCR was never intended to be an operational organization but rather work with and through NGOs34. As a consequence, much of the UNHCR’s budget is channeled through NGO operational partners. In any given year, a third of the UNHCR’s budget is allocated to NGOs. Given the budgetary and

---

operational importance of NGOs to the UNHCR, it has since the 1980s held annual formal consultation meetings with NGOs. These consultations are structured into regional and thematic panels in which operational and funding issues are addressed. For example at the 2005 consultation, 183 NGOs were represented, and all NGOs are identified in the consultation program with a country of origin.

Not surprisingly, many donor states “insist of the use of their nationals in humanitarian programs, or will be more generous if their nationals are placed in key positions”\textsuperscript{35}. In terms of the UNHCR, many donor governments fund programs on condition of an expatriate presence\textsuperscript{36}. Contribution conditionality provides the state a private benefit not only because of the requirement to use donor NGOs, but also “because of the visibility that their work [donor NGOs] commands on the home front”\textsuperscript{37}.

The funding of the UNHCR is an important issue as over time, the mandate and the regional breadth of the organization has significantly increased\textsuperscript{38}. While the initial focus of the UNHCR was to protect refugees fleeing communist states and assist in the re-location efforts to the West, de-colonization starting in the late 1950s, and especially in the 1960s, significantly expanded the regional focus of the organization (as well as the type of refugee of concern). More recently, there has been a heated debate within the organization as to the level of assistance it should render to internally displaced persons (IDPs). Budgeting for refugee protection is a particularly difficult task as outbreaks of civil and international war can lead to unpredictable and significant

population movements. For all these reasons, securing donor government funding has been a major UNHCR concern.

Although UNHCR receives contributions from a large number of governments, intergovernmental organizations, NGOs, and individuals, just 15 donors provide most of its funding: 14 governments and the European Commission. From 1995 through 2000, these 15 donors provided over 95 per cent of UNHCR’s total funds. To reduce the vulnerability inherent in relying on such a narrow donor base, UNHCR is constantly seeking ways to enlarge its circle of donors. Focusing on countries with emerging economies, UNHCR hopes to develop a wider and more geographically representative donor base. In fiscal year 2000, for example, UNCHR suffered a budget shortfall of US$89 million. When money is short, important programs, such as children’s education and self-sufficiency projects, must be curtailed or cut. To add to this uncertainty, the level of media interest and with that, international support varies from situation to situation. UNHCR has found it more difficult to raise funds for longstanding refugee populations, which are often forgotten by the media, than for the refugee emergencies that attract sudden and sweeping media attention.

1.5.4 Coping strategies by refugee host countries

As new waves of refugee problems in Asia, Europe, America and Africa emerged, new conceptual programmatically and financial challenges to this international refugee regime have resulted. Countries in Europe and America have faced “asylum crisis” since 1980s. However some policies to streamline the burden have been developed. Since the early 1990s, sparked by the crisis in former Yugoslavia, the European Union developed ambitions for a more ‘equitable balance of efforts’ in this area. These ambitions for a more comprehensive EU burden-sharing

system in this area were made most explicit in the text of the Amsterdam Treaty of October 1997, Article 63 which states that the Council shall adopt measures ‘promoting a balance of effort between Member States in receiving and bearing the consequences of refugees and displaced persons’. Because of such pledges, there have been numerous European burden-sharing initiatives in this area: physical burden-sharing: physical sharing of people between countries based on a fixed distribution key that tries to take account of countries' relative protective capacities; financial burden-sharing (sharing money): Payment of financial compensation to the most popular destination countries. In the EU, has established European Refugee Fund (ERF) for the implementation of emergency measures to provide temporary protection in the event of a mass influx of protection-seekers\(^{40}\). This fund, which is jointly financed by the Member States, seeks to support special projects for the reception, integration and repatriation of refugees and displaced persons; third option is, policy harmonization: where states take a common policy through either multilateral action or the harmonizing of domestic refugee laws. For instance, the EU has worked towards the convergence of Member States’ laws on forced migration since the mid-1980s. What started with initially non-binding intergovernmental instruments has since been followed by developments in Community law\(^{41}\).

One of the initiatives is the 2002 political agreement at the Brussels JHA Council regarding a common definition for persons eligible for refugee and subsidiary protection status. The rationale behind the proposed mitigation strategies is that states have a moral value of solidarity and cooperation and also, it might make sense for states to accept a role as net contributor today, if

\(^{40}\) European Council, 2000

they can expect to become net beneficiaries of the system when in need at some point in the future\textsuperscript{42}.

In Southwest Asia, afghan refugees have since been in Pakistan and Iran, having left following the Soviet invasion. In 1985 a modest program of international assistance to the Afghan refugees in Iran was mounted. In Pakistan a major refugee assistance effort was also initiated. Unlike Southeast Asia, where large numbers of private voluntary agencies were permitted to provide assistance, the Thai government wanted to remain as far removed from the refugees as possible., the Pakistan government established a significant administrative capacity on its own to assist the refugees. Efforts were made to restrict the range of assistance provided to basic essentials, services such as education and self reliance and income generation projects were prohibited on the ground that the government did not want the refugees to become complacent or to have any incentive remain in Pakistan. By 1985 with persistent encouragement from UNHCR and the few private agencies that had been permitted to operate in the camps, attitudes began to shift. The World Bank negotiated with the Pakistan government to create a public works project that provide opportunities for refugees and Pakistanis to earn income by planting trees, digging irrigation canals, repairing roads and performing other activities which were intended to rehabilitate infrastructure damaged by the presence of so many refugees. Voluntary agencies were invited to develop a variety of health care, education, vocational training and income generation projects\textsuperscript{43}.


In Africa, a steadily growing number of States have meanwhile ratified and implemented the *Magna Carta* for refugees, the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. The first International Conference of Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA I) produced fairly extensive funding to meet the needs of the greatly expanded refugee population in Africa. However, African host countries felt that insufficient attention and resources were being given to the burden which these refugees created for the host country. The second International Conference of Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA II) in 1984 was an effort to bridge those differing concerns. However, the limited momentum that was created through the ICARA II was soon overpowered by a new massive flow of refugees from Ethiopia into Sudan. In response, UNHCR shifted its focus back to emergency relief. This priority of emergency relief by UNHCR in Africa has continued to be emphasized in the wake of further refugee movement. Today, many African countries of asylum look at refugee issues within the context of rapidly expanding national population, declining economies, and uncertain international commitments to carrying more burdens. The “crisis in durable solutions” that existed in Africa in 1980 has been obscured and exacerbated by the influx emergencies and thus UNHCR official “warehoused” into care and maintenance camp. Africa and more so refugee host countries are more in need of new solutions today.

### 1.6 Theoretical Framework

The study applied the theory of collective action first developed by Olson in 1965 to account for interest group behavior and later extended to international organizations to test whether the
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nature of refugee protection influences state motivations to provide contributions. As Russett and Sullivan argue, the theory of collective action “was made in order to know why nation-states behave as they do.”\textsuperscript{48} We identify the costs and the benefits to states that chose to provide financial contributions to the UNHCR in an effort to determine why states contribute as well as the level of state contribution. He indicates that refugee protection can be viewed as a pure public good with the concomitant free riding problems. Refugee protection offers several private benefits which transform the calculations made by states in the provision of refugee protection. Thus while there is a significant measure of free riding behavior among many states, the private benefits offered by refugee protection changes the contribution calculation which alters the nature of refugee protection from a pure public to an impure public good.

Olson’s theory of groups defines the characteristics of a public good as non-rivalrous and non-excludable. The consumption of the good by one individual does not reduce the amount of the good available to others, and no one can be excluded from consuming the good. Based on the rational behavior of individuals, Olson concludes that the provision of a public good will likely be assumed by those members of the group who are best able to provide the good. Other members will tend to free ride and benefit from access to the good without contributing to its provision.

However as previously noted, UNHCR funding is not calculated by a pre-determined formula negotiated among states but based almost exclusively on voluntary contributions. Olson points out that international cooperation can occur through independent contributions where states agree to cooperate for some specified purpose and then individually determine the extent of


cooperation\textsuperscript{49}. However, the voluntary nature of UNHCR funding combined with the unpredictability of refugee movements places enormous strains on the organization. He summarizes the problem for an agency such as the UNHCR when he asks whether “an organization supported through independent contributions [can] provide an optimal supply of the collective goods for which it is expected to be responsible?”\textsuperscript{50} While the nature of the good can influence state behavior, it is important to keep in mind that the characteristics of the organization also affect state behavior. International organizations which provide more private benefits to members should be able to increase contribution levels as burden-sharing becomes more equal, and thus states should engage in less free riding behavior. If there are few private benefits that the organization can provide, then states will be reluctant to burden-share leading to sub-optimal outcomes. To be able to determine whether the UNHCR provides such benefits requires an understanding of its history and mandate, and a cursory examination of these issues has been provided in the literature review.

1.7 Research Methodology

This section provides the description of the area of study, population and sample of study, sampling procedures, research design and methodology, research instruments, research variables, data collections and analysis procedures.

1.7.1 Research Design

The research design for this study was descriptive research design of the ex-post facto type. This is an appropriate design for fact finding and results in pertinent principles of knowledge and


solutions to fundamental problems. This design was adopted as it aided in critically understanding the challenges of reduced refugee funding and the possible mitigation measures.

1.7.2. Study Area

The study was conducted in Kenya, to refugees and institutions/ agencies providing refugee protection services.

1.7.3. Target Population

The target population of the study comprised of key staff from relevant refugee protection institutions and agencies: United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees (UNHCR), World Food Program (WFP), implementing partners: Government agency (Department of Refugee Affairs), NGOs (Lutheran World Federation, National Council of Churches of Kenya, Windle Trust, World Vision, Norwegian Refugee Council, Isra Aid, Danish Refugee Council and International Rescue Committee). Efforts were also made to collect data from the key informants from the refugee community.

1.7.4. Sampling Procedures

Probability sampling procedures was adopted in the current study to ensure representativeness of the sample as well as enable generalization of the findings to the entire population. On the other hand, non-probability sampling procedures was used in situations where personal judgment of the researcher was necessary in order to collect the appropriate data to address the research objectives. Purposive, stratified and simple random sampling procedures were used in the study. Purposive sampling was used in the selection of sections in the Agencies. To ensure participation
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of all subjects the sampling entailed the use of clusters and quotas. Stratified and Simple Random sampling techniques were used to select refugee communities and subjects respectively.

1.7.5. Data collection procedure

This research was informed by both primary and secondary data. Sources of primary\textsuperscript{53} data included; key informants from the refugee community, staff from refugee protection institutions and Agencies. Secondary\textsuperscript{54} data was collected from relevant secondary sources, including research institutes and publications, NGOs, internet, research studies, administrative records, existing statistics and multilateral agencies. These ensured that adequate data with in-depth details was collected to enhance validity and reliability.

1.7.6. Research Instruments

Structured questionnaires and interview schedules were administered. This ensured many questions asked are strictly answered within the context of the research objectives. Each item in the questionnaire was developed to address a specific objective. The questionnaires were developed with the assistance of the supervisor to ensure that they are thorough and capable of capturing all required information for the purpose of this research. The questionnaires were developed and administered to all the respondents by the researcher with assistance from trained research assistant, after getting permission from the university administration. Interview schedules with questions of semi-structured and unstructured types were also used. The interview questions were similar in intent with the questionnaire to give validity to the responses received and check the consistency of responses. Respondents were taken through the questions by the researcher personally to ensure that the research intentions are consistently adhered to.

\textsuperscript{53} Hall, R. \textit{Applied social research: planning, designing and conducting real-world research}. (South Yarra, Vic: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

\textsuperscript{54} Hall, R. \textit{Applied social research}. Op.cit
1.7.7. Data Analysis

Data in this research were analyzed by use of both descriptive and inferential statistics\(^{55}\). At the end of data collection completed questionnaires from the field were examined, coded and appropriately organized for computer analysis. Quantitative data analysis using SPSS involved generating descriptive statistics such as frequency tables and charts to review general findings on the research questions. On the other hand, qualitative data from key informants were analysed by organizing the data into categories or themes using word tables.

1.7.8. Ethical Issues

This study used human respondents; hence certain ethical issues were to be considered. This was necessary to ensure privacy as well as the integrity of the participants. Among the critical issues to be considered in the research process included consent and confidentiality. In order to secure the consent of the selected participants, the researcher relayed all important details of the study, including the aim and purpose. By explaining the important details, the respondents were able to understand the importance of their role in the completion of the research. The respondents were informed that they could withdraw from the study even during the process. With this in place then the respondents were not forced to participate in the study. The confidentiality of the participants was ensured by not disclosing their names or personal information in the research. Only relevant details that help in answering the research questions were used. The necessary permission to conduct the research was obtained after clearance to undertake the study by the university administration.

\(^{55}\) Babbie, E. *The practice of social research*. (Belmont, Calif: Wadsworth Cengage, 2010).
1.7.9. Scope/Delimitations of the study

This study assessed the challenges of reduced refugee funding and possible mitigation efforts. It brought out the aspect of: what factors causes the reduced refugee funding, its impacts to host countries and possible mitigation efforts. The research was conducted in Kenya especially the Agencies that promote refugees protection, refugees and the UNHCR as from January 2015 to June 2015, by using both qualitative and quantitative research.

1.8. Definition of terms

**Refugee** was used here in its broadest sense to characterize individuals who have left their country in the belief that they cannot or should not return to it in the near future, although they might hope to do so if conditions permit. In this usage, the category includes those recognized under the Geneva Convention, but also those who have applied for refugee (or a subsidiary) protection status.

**Host community:** Referred to the Turkana community who have been occupying Kakuma district before the influx of the refugees, it also refers to Kenya.

**Burden sharing:** A subset of international cooperation in which States and other entities take on responsibility for refugees, in terms of funding or assist other States in fulfilling their responsibilities.
1.9. Chapter Outline

Chapter one consists of the introduction to the study and discusses statement of the problem, objectives, literature review and methodology. Chapter two provides an overview of factors causing reduced refugee funding globally while chapter three discusses the impact of reduced refugee funding on refugee management in Kenya.

Chapter four identifies the possible mitigation strategies and options that can be adopted in Kenya and chapter five provides the summary, conclusions of the study, gives recommendations and provides suggestions on areas for further study.
CHAPTER TWO

FACTORS CAUSING REDUCED REFUGEE FUNDING

More than 25 per cent of the world’s refugee populations live in sub-Saharan Africa. In 2010, there were some 10 million people of concern in sub-Saharan Africa, including more than 2.1 million refugees and over 6.2 million internally displaced persons (IDPs), the total voluntary contribution to Africa was $562,523,713\textsuperscript{56}.

The year 2011 was dominated by humanitarian emergencies. The number of people of concern to the Office in sub-Saharan Africa increased significantly, from slightly over 10 million in January 2011 to over 12 million by the end of the year. This was mainly due to the refugee displacements from Côte d’Ivoire, Sudan and Somalia, which boosted the total number of refugees in Africa to almost 2.7 million, including nearly 100,000 new Sudanese refugees in western Ethiopia and South Sudan, and more than 700,000 from Somalia. The number of IDPs rose to almost 6.7 million compared to 6.2 million in 2010, despite a significant number of returns. The total voluntary contribution was $754,772,683\textsuperscript{57}.

In 2012, a number of simultaneous, large-scale emergencies commanded most of UNHCR’s resources in Africa: Violence and political turmoil in Mali, clashes in South Kordofan and Blue Nile states in Sudan, a flare-up of fighting in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and a resurgence of rebel activity in the Central African Republic (CAR) displaced hundreds of thousands of people. Many countries were affected by refugee emergencies, including Burundi, Burkina Faso, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mauritania, Niger, Rwanda, South Sudan, Sudan, Uganda and Zambia, kept their borders open and generously provided refuge to

\textsuperscript{56} UNHCR Global Report 2010
\textsuperscript{57} UNHR, Global Report 2011
the displaced. Several of these countries recognized the arriving refugees on a prima facie basis. The number of refugees grew slightly, to some 2.8 million in 2012. The voluntary contribution to Africa was $878,011,951. The number of refugees and asylum-seekers in the region stood at 3.3 million at the end of 2013 with a voluntary donor contribution to Africa of $792,326,119. Therefore the above trend points out the disproportional refugee funding, which is a critical contemporary issue.

Majority of the key informants reported that there is less humanitarian funding globally, this was attributed to the ever growing humanitarian need and protection issues; hence the funding is shifted to emergencies/most affected populations in the world. This corroborated the UNHCR online report which pointed out that major crises are taxing the global humanitarian industry: the Ebola outbreak in West Africa, fighting in South Sudan, Central African Republic and Syria, and hunger in the Sahel are just some of the multitude of problems that require support. Humanitarian needs from Syria to the Central African Republic to Haiti have strained the budgets of both WFP and UNHCR. The warning that money was not sufficient came as World Food Program and UNHCR announced in July 2014 that food rations for 800,000 African refugees were to be reduced60.

Climate change has become one of the major emergencies and is also taking tall on the discussions and forums on how the resources/ funding have been allocated to mitigate the menace are being held globally. The Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predicted an increased frequency and severity of climate events such as storms, cyclones and hurricanes, as well as longer-term sea level rise and desertification, which will impact upon

---

58 UNHCR, Global report 2012
59 UNHCR, Global report 2013
people’s ability to subsist in certain parts of the world. As far as actual numbers are concerned, there is no doubt that ‘current predictions are fraught with numerous methodological problems and caveats’\textsuperscript{61}. Kniveton suggestion that some 50 to 250 million people will be displaced by 2050 stems from a very rudimentary methodology,\textsuperscript{62} yet in the absence of a more rigorous dataset it has become the yardstick adopted in much of the literature, often without question. Despite this, it is interesting to note that Sir Nicholas Stern, in his authoritative review of climate change in 2007, estimates of 200 million as ‘conservative’\textsuperscript{63}. In an exhaustive study on the financing of humanitarian activities, Smillie and Minear argued that

\begin{quote}
“Humanitarianism is located within competing and sometimes inconsistent domestic and foreign policy priorities . . . disproportionate spending is likely to flow to emergencies that are closer to donor countries than those that are farther away”\textsuperscript{64}.
\end{quote}

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has also drawn attention to the environmental impacts of climate change as the key driver of an anticipated surge in human movement in the coming decades\textsuperscript{65}, with the most affected areas being Africa, the mega delta regions in Asia and small island States. Therefore in such humanitarian emergencies policy priorities are diverted to either prevent or mitigate the effects of climate change in the donor countries first and then other countries follow.

\textsuperscript{63} N. Stern, \textit{The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review} (CUP, Cambridge, 2007)
The findings also indicated that the presence of fewer (traditional) donors funding the refugee program has contributed to inadequate funding. This is because the ratio of funding vis-à-vis the refugee population in the years have been diminishing since there has been refuge Influx in the world and the ever increasing emergencies; this affirms the mentioned statistics. As a key informant (UNHCR-Head of Kakuma Sub-Office) pointed out that, there has been a decreased funding trend from UNHCR to implementing agencies. This signifies a reduction in UNHCR funding pool and therefore agrees with Loescher who argues that one of the UNHCR’s most significant weaknesses is its dependence on voluntary contributions to carry our existing and new programs. The flow of assistance from donor governments is neither reliable nor always in the most appropriate form.66

The study also revealed that, willingness of hosting states to accept refugee inflows in this age and day, is clearly fading as the diminishing goods and services serve as the indicator and moreover because of national security concerns. Suhrke argues that in refugee protection, “the logic of burden-sharing starts from the premise that helping refugees is a jointly held moral duty and obligation under international law.”67 Aal also states that refugees are perceived not simply as victims of conflict but also as direct threats to security. The classification of refugees as threats to security is based on the fear that among arriving refugee populations are armed combatants.68 This was also witnessed in Tanzania, where funding levels reduced leading to changes in Tanzanian refugee policy that contributed to the pattern of restrictions and crackdowns and thus affecting refugee protection. Funding cuts affected Tanzania’s government

---

policy in three main ways: by reducing the benefits of the refugee presence, thus generating a negative net impact; by increasing security concerns along the border and within Tanzanian communities; and by providing Tanzanian officials with an excuse for developing a more restrictive approach toward refugees 69.

The study in addition, established that unfavorable exchange rate has contributed to the decreased funding thus affecting the refugee regime. This may be attributed to economic and political memes of a country. Within states, political will needs to become sufficiently mature to allow for the formulation of a workable strategy for refugee protection 70. The focus of international attention has shifted away from the provision of asylum to refugees and towards eradication of the “root causes” of refuge migration. This challenge is even made greater by the fact that one state policy decisions on the relative leniency or restrictiveness of its asylum regime often creates negative externalities for other states and can thus lead to strained relations between states 71.

In conclusion, the refugee problem today is founded on the dual nature of the international system, made up of complex interplay of interstate and international bonds. Currently the solidarity of the refugee regime is backed by close links among civil society, Non Governmental Organizations, the media and UNHCR itself. Therefore UNHCR must go beyond its traditional state centric to assume a more universal perspective of fund raising.

69 Beth Elise Whitaker, “Funding the International Refugee Regime: Implications for Protection”, (PhD diss. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Global Governance 14, 2008), 241–258
71 Examples were the strained relations between Denmark and Sweden following the introduction of highly restrictive asylum measures by the new conservative government in Denmark.
CHAPTER THREE

IMPACT OF REDUCED REFUGEE FUNDING ON REFUGEE MANAGEMENT IN KENYA

The basic demographic characteristics of the study respondents have been presented at the beginning of this chapter. Figures such as tables have been used to further illustrate the findings where necessary. The demographic data of the respondents among the beneficiaries/refugees was imperative for these characteristics to be studied since they play a role in enabling us understand the various aspects of refugee funding and its impact, they were also gauged whether they have an understanding of the refugee program funding, this was critical since it enabled them answer the trend on funding from 2010 to date and the impact of such trend.

Basic demographic characteristics of the respondents

The current study specifically targeted the respondents above 18 years of age who had knowledge of refugee program funding. The basic demographic characteristics examined included: gender, age, profession of the respondent back in their country and the period of stay in the camp.

a) Gender

Thirty one respondents were interviewed. Twenty one were males who comprised 67.7% of the sample. The females were 10 and comprised 32.3%. Seven key informants were also interviewed, in which 100% of the respondents were male. This clearly reveals that even though women compared to men make up the majority of camp residents, they are for the most part excluded from access to information and thus decision-making processes. Most of them are ignorant and are have little say on how their needs and concerns can be addressed.
Table 1.1 Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2015)

b) Age

The ages of respondents ranged between 18 and above 45 years. There were 58 (58.1%) respondents aged between 27 and 35 years. They were followed by those in the 18-26 age brackets who comprised 32 (32.3%). The other age categories had fewer respondents, 3 (3.2%). This is shown in chart 1.2. The highest percentage was in 27-35 years age bracket. This can be attributed to the possibility of most of the refugees at this age have children and are curious on what is happening around them that can affect their well being either positively or negatively.

The ages 18-26 are in school and therefore are inquisitive in knowing who funds, how, when and what can they do to survive in cases of poor or less services.

Table 1.2 Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2015)
c) Occupation in the country of origin

There were 61 (61.3%) respondents were students back in their country of origin, followed by 16 (16.1%) who had informal (domestic workers) work. 9.7% were farmers, In formal work (civil servants) and those who refused to answer category, were two respondents in total, each equally comprised 6.5% of the sample as shown in Table 1.3. this indicate that majority of the refugees have education and therefore if well empowered they can contribute to the economic growth of the host county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refused to answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2015)

d) Years of the respondent in the camp

The respondents’ period of stay in Kakuma refugee camp varied. Majority 38.7% of the respondents had stayed for less than five years, followed by 22.6% that have stayed for a period between 6-10 years, while 9.7% had stayed there for more than 20 as shown in Table 1.4. These findings reveal that majority of the refugees migrate to other areas (towns) to look for better livelihood, where they can use their potential to improve their living. Others choose to remain in the camp because there is no option other than staying in the camp.
Table 1.4 Years of the respondent in the camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2015)

e) Respondent’s knowledge/ understanding of the refugee program funding

Majority, 83.9% of the respondents had the knowledge/ understanding of the refugee program funding while 16 (16.1%) of the respondents did not have any knowledge of refugee program funding. This is shown in chart 1.5

Table 1.5 Respondent’s knowledge/ understanding of the refugee program funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2015)

71.0% of the respondents explained refugee program funding in terms of services provided by refugee protection agencies and donors (food, health, water, housing, non food items), while 12.9% described the funding based on grants from countries.

Table 1.6 Respondent description of refugee program funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of services by donors/implementing agencies</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants from countries</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2015)
f) Status of services in the camp from 2010 to date

To ascertain the impact of reduced refugee funding the study also looked at the status of the service provision in the camp. 80.6% indicated that the services have depreciated, followed by 12.9% who indicated improvement and 6.5% indicated stagnation of services in the camp. This illustrated in Table 1.7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciating</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stagnant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2015)

Depreciating services in the camp were attributed to the following:

Decreased humanitarian funds, majority of the respondents specified that there is a reduction in funding due to increased emergencies that require donor support worldwide. This corresponds with UN High Commissioner for Refugees António Guterres sentiment that pointed out that:

"The number of crises around the world is far outpacing the level of funding for humanitarian operations, and vulnerable refugees in critical operations are falling through the cracks, it is unacceptable in today’s world of plenty for refugees to face chronic hunger or that their children drop out of school to help families survive”.

The study also showed that the moral perception of helping has changed, for the reason of “protracted refugee situation”: They have always been there and they have somehow survived, therefore they will always survive. This they pointed out to cuts in food ration and budgets cuts of the implementing agencies (NGOs).

---

72 “UNHCR. As food shortages hit 800,000 African Refugees”, op.cit
Increased number of refugees was another rationale; the study pointed out that the few facilities in the camp are overstretched; humanitarian aid agencies provide minimum healthcare, education, and shelter to refugees, because the refugees are so many, the resources few, and the duration of refugees’ abode unpredictable.

The study also highlighted that there was poor planning and prioritizing of fundamental issues: the respondents lamented that there is no drainage system and hence displacements and reconstruction of houses every rainy season, variety of food is no longer provided as it used to be, therefore they have to sell the ration and buy other nutritious foods and also not much attention is paid on medical services and unfortunately the elderly and the physically challenged refugees are not factored in when such emergencies/issues arise.

Moreover poor service was attributed to unqualified personnel where some of the agencies’ staff do not provide the required services, this was mostly experienced in the health sector.

**Impact of depreciating services/funds**

Majority of the beneficiary respondents stated that there have been deaths from treatable diseases, trauma and psychiatric conditions (depression, madness). This was echoed by a key informant (Field coordinator- International Rescue Committee-Kakuma office) who affirmed that there has been reduction on the quality of medical services delivered to the refugees.

Inadequate food supply: The refugees have experienced ration cuts due to inadequate food supply in the distribution centers, they are no longer receiving rations of corn-soy blend, nutritious flour enriched with vitamins, while vegetable oil rations have been cut. This has resulted to malnutrition amongst children and old, selling the ration to buy other (nutritious)
foods, most of the refugees go hungry for number of days waiting for the distribution date, some refugees even return to uncertain conditions at home rather than stay in the camps. This was also echoed by one of the key informants (Head of Sub-Office-WFP, Kakuma) who reported that:

“Our reduced food ratio has greatly affected them, as they no longer receive enough food”.

Moreover the study concurs with UNHCR report that refugees hit by the food shortages are struggling to cope, posing a host of additional problems as they resort to "negative coping strategies." These include an increase in school dropouts as refugee children seek work to help provide food for their families; exploitation and abuse of women refugees who venture out of camps in search of work; "survival sex" by women and girls trying to raise money to buy food; early marriage of young girls; increased stress and domestic violence within families; and increasing theft. The result is a vicious cycle of poverty, food insecurity, deterioration of nutritional status, increased risk of disease, and risky coping strategies. The findings also concur with WFP report that indicated, the impact of food cut, especially on children, can be immediate and often irreversible. Under-nutrition during a child's first 1,000 days from conception can have lifelong consequences, compromising both physical growth and mental development. This "stunting" leaves affected children at a severe social and economic disadvantage for the rest of their lives.

Poor education was also cited as another challenge, this was due to inadequate numbers of teachers and education facilities (classrooms); one classroom is shared by over 90 pupils, this has led to other pupils dropping out of school and joining “gang groups” in the camp. This was also

---

confirmed by a key informant (Sub Program Manager- Windle Trust Kenya, Kakuma) that as a result of reduced refugee funding, there is lack of enough teachers, learning resources and materials and hence low education quality.

The research further revealed that refugees suffer displacement every rainy season, the respondents attributed this to poor planning and they indicated that emergency funds used in this situation could be redirected to other priorities, such as food supply. Majority 99% of the key informants interviewed from the implementation agencies reported that they have also been affected by the reduced funding. It has led to withdrawal of some programs, dismissal of staff and under delivery of services. 1% of the respondent reported that they were not affected because the organization is self independent. They also reported that reduction of staff has affected the economic growth of the country due to reduction of Pay as You Earn/ less tax. On the other hand (12.9%) of the respondents gave the following reasons for improvement of services: There are many agencies providing different services in the camp and have employed qualified refugee incentive staff to assist in implementation of various interventions in the camp. Since they are the beneficiaries they strive to ensure that they use the opportunity to better their community (refugee). 6.5% of the respondents also argued that the services were static because there are no new services that have been introduced in the camp.
CHAPTER FOUR

POSSIBLE MITIGATION STRATEGIES TO BE ADOPTED IN KENYA

Currently, protection represents only a portion of UNHCR’s annual budget, especially compared to its assistance programs, but the two are seen as working in conjunction with one another. It is clear that budget cuts affect the level of countries operation and thus willingness of governments to host refugees, material assistance to refugees and on refugee protection. When comparing relative contributions to refugee protection, states are likely to disagree about how such contributions should be assessed. By looking at some of the most directly linked burdens/responsibilities that countries are faced with as a result of international refugee flows, it is possible to arrive at some approximations of relative responsibilities that countries are faced with or prepared to accept. Unequal protection burdens and resulting concentrations of refugees often mean significant pressures on social services and can lead to resentment among the affected host population. As such they can constitute a serious threat to effective refugee protection.

By virtue of geographical proximity to the country of origin some states may consequently end up with huge refugee populations, sometimes even disproportionately large when compared with the size of the hosting population or per capita income GDP in the country of refuge. Situations that may be aggravated by other factors such as the condition of the states of refuge: an uneven burden is especially heavy for developing countries, countries in transition, and countries with limited resources. Another aggravating factor relates to the root cause of flight: in case a political solution that paves the way for a fundamental change of relevant circumstances in the country of origin that would allow repatriation is not forthcoming, protracted refugee situations may result.
A protracted refugee situation means bearing a protracted burden for the country of refuge. The recurrent and persistent call for burden sharing is, therefore, not surprising.\textsuperscript{75}

UNHCR-Head of Kakuma sub-office reported that protection delivery unit is one of their key programs that ensure all the asylum seekers and refugees are protected. He further pointed out that the reduction of funding witnessed has resulted to under delivery of services and this has affected the psycho-social well being of the refugees. Barnett foresaw this when he argued that the funding of the UNHCR is an important issue as over time, the mandate and the regional breadth of the organization has significantly increased.\textsuperscript{76} Refugee crises since the 1960s altered the nature of the UNHCR from an apolitical, coordination agency to an operational organization charged with assisting states in eliminating refugee problems.\textsuperscript{77}

In order to lessen the challenges, the study sought to find out possible mitigation measures that can be applied in Kenya: Most of the key informants reported that refugee agenda should be synthesized in three phases, pre crisis, during crisis and post crisis. As Sorbo indicates, all these aspects get inextricably intertwined - before, during and after the peak of the crisis.\textsuperscript{78} This formula will aid in planning (prioritizing) and implementation. This will not only provide relief from life-threatening suffering, but also reduce local vulnerability to recurring disasters, enhance indigenous resources and mechanisms, empower local institutions and leadership, reduce dependence on outside assistance, and improve prospects for long term development.

\textsuperscript{78} Sorbo, G.M. ‘from Mogadishu to Kinshasha: Concluding Remarks’ in G.M.Sorbo & P. Vale (eds) Out of Conflict: from War to Peace (Bergen: Michelsen Institute, 1997)
In pre and during crisis situations, emergency relief is key; this is characterized by short term, emergency service in the face of a disaster. These operations include provision of clean water, food and sanitation equipment to distressed populations, establishing shelter for homeless refugees, providing repair for salvageable structures, and prevention, containment and treatment of life-threatening diseases.

Development should be considered as post emergency situation which is characterized by long term projects which help the communities achieve sustainable, social and economic structures. Development assistance focuses on the development of vital components of refugee community: agriculture, education, infrastructure, and employment. It is deemed a success when continued aid becomes unnecessary because the refugee community has become self-sufficient. Therefore, NGOs should among the stakeholders to initiate and enable refugee self reliance. A key informant (UNHCR-Head of Kakuma sub-office) reported that: Coming up with sustainable livelihoods for the refugees will ease the problem; as donors are no longer reliable. This was corroborated by other key informants from the implementing agencies/Non Governmental Organizations who indicated that the refugees should be economically empowered to be self reliant. This practise has been implemented in various refugee host countries for instance: World Bank negotiated with the Pakistan government to create a public works project that provide opportunities for refugees and Pakistanis to earn income by planting trees, digging irrigation canals, repairing roads and performing other activities which were intended to rehabilitate infrastructure damaged by the presence of so many refugees.\textsuperscript{79} Throughout its existence, the

UNHCR has relied on NGOs for operations. Indeed, UNHCR was never intended to be an operational organization but rather work with and through NGOs\textsuperscript{80}.

Targeting individual donors and foundations who can commit to support the refugees within a specific time. They can earmark either emergency relief, humanitarian aid during refugee stay in the camp or development.

More voluntary agencies/Countries can be also invited to develop a variety of health care, education, vocational training and income generation projects. Although humanitarian assistance continues to be a key component of refugee interventions in organized camps, there is no sustained emphasis on ensuring that at all times basic needs are catered for.

On the other hand the refugee respondents listed the following measures to be adopted to ease the challenges highlighted in chapter three: Employment of competent personnel, some respondents lamented that some implementers employ unqualified personnel thus provide poor quality services, therefore recruitment procedures should be based on competence and qualification; cash assistance program to the old and vulnerable; among the basic needs, priority should be given to food supply and to avoid displacement during the rains drainage system should be constructed. Moreover based on teacher student/pupil ratio, more education facilities should be put in place (tertiary institutions should be considered). Empowerment: most of the refugee respondents also reported that initiating livelihoods on the refugees will make them less dependent especially on the basic needs (food, non food items and shelter). They indicated that the system of total dependence has reduced them to lazy and paralyzed their potential and participation in economic growth of the country. They reinforced that empowerment will also

come from education and training and therefore more effort be paid on learning institutions. Therefore the findings concur with UNHCR report which indicated that many refugees arrive in countries of exile lacking any means to support themselves in many host countries; they remain very dependent on international assistance – sometimes for years – until they can return home or find other solutions. Establishment of an oversight structure: some of the respondents felt that poor provision of services was also linked to unethical practices such as mismanagement of funds. Therefore, they proposed program/organization financial audit by the donors and participation of the beneficiaries/ refugees in the process or an oversight authority be formed to enable accountability. This will aid in transparency of operations, quality services and priorities set. More donors/repatriation: some of the respondents outlined that, new donors to be identified (states) because the traditional donors are overwhelmed with the increased state of humanitarian emergencies. However, other respondents stated that the process of repatriation should be conducted periodically to reduce refugee population. This will also ease refugee burden in the host country.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Refugee situation in the contemporary age threatens an individual’s survival and well-being. This has been widely witnessed in the world, in Africa and more so refugee host countries such as Kenya, by the funding cuts on the refugee programs. The refugee host countries have suffered wholesome (security, political, economic and socially). On the other hand the refugee fraternity has equally suffered. Most humanitarian efforts intervene in the first stages of refugee incidence and thereafter withdraw when their funding is used up. This happens to the detriment of refugees who cannot be able to immediately cater for their basic and pressing needs. The “crisis in durable solutions” that existed in Africa in 1980 has been obscured and exacerbated by the influx emergencies and thus UNHCR official “warehoused” into care and maintenance camp. Africa and more so refugee host countries are more in need of new solutions today. Even though states face compassion fatigue and are increasingly unwilling to get involved, humanitarian aid in refugees’ regime still remains a collective action.

The trend of reduced refugee funding has greatly impacted host countries and especially refugees. Majority (80.6) of the beneficiary/refugee respondents indicated that reduction of refugee funding has resulted to: Deaths from treatable diseases, trauma and psychiatric conditions (depression, madness); ration cuts due to inadequate food supply in the distribution centre’s, the refugees are no longer receiving rations of corn-soy blend, nutritious flour enriched with vitamins, while vegetable oil rations have been cut. This has led to malnutrition amongst children and old, selling the ration to buy other (nutritious) foods, some refugees even return to uncertain conditions at home rather than stay in the camps. Some have resort to “negative coping
strategies." These include an increase in school dropouts as refugee children seek work to help provide food for their families; exploitation and abuse of women refugees who venture out of camps in search of work; "survival sex" by women and girls trying to raise money to buy food; early marriage of young girls; increased stress and domestic violence within families; and increasing theft. There is also poor education due to inadequate numbers of teachers and education facilities. Refugees suffer displacement every rainy season, due to poor planning.

However (12.9%) of the refugee respondents indicated improvement of services in the camp: There are many agencies providing different services in the camp and have employed qualified refugee incentive staff to assist in implementation of various interventions in the camp. Since they are the beneficiaries they strive to ensure that they use the opportunity to better their community (refugee). 6.5% of the refugee respondents also argued that the services were static because there are no new services that have been introduced in the camp. Majority 99% of the key informants interviewed from the implementation agencies reported that reduced funding has led to withdrawal of some programs, dismissal of staff hence affecting the economic growth of the country due to reduction of Pay as You Earn/ less tax and under delivery of services. On the other hand 1% of the respondent reported that they were not affected because the organization is self independent.
Conclusion

The study clearly reveals that refugee problem today is founded on the dual nature of the international system, made up of complex interplay of interstate and international bonds. In order to properly regulate the international refugee regime, UNHCR must go beyond to assume a more universal perspective: collective action of states, individuals and non-state actors

Recommendations

In order to mitigate this challenge of reduced refugee funding, a three phase formula (pre-crisis, during crisis and post-crisis) that revolves around short term and longer term measures of efficiency in utilization of funds emerged. This revolves around ensuring adequate relief, recovery and reconstruction of basic social and economic services and securing the return, resettlement, and reintegration of refugees.

Secondly, ensuring the refugees are empowered to live a life that is different from that of helpless refugees, peaceful environment, security, self-sufficiency and increased involvement of women at all levels should be considered. This intervention needs to focus on an approach that ensures effective dynamic linkages between longer-term measures for economic recovery, sustained growth and poverty reduction.

To achieve this, the national frameworks available (DRA) should be strengthened and other frameworks incorporating Africa countries (AU) should be created to participate and have an oversight role in prioritization of both the refugees/host countries needs/concerns. These frameworks should devotedly work together with UNHCR to ensure that their different frameworks address refugee needs while promoting preventive measures through encouraging good governance, how resources can be mobilized, reconstruction and re-integration of refugees.
Also there is a need to develop clearly agreed operational guidelines for the conduct of procedures in situations of mass influx in order to identify refugees in need of protection, addressing the livelihood needs of refugees and their well being in all aspects (basic needs, freedoms, legal and physical safety) after realizing the magnitude to which refugee crises affect the victims themselves and hosting states and communities.

Moreover focus should be made on other new/non-traditional donors, such as foundations and individual donors to be part of the marshal plan. They can also earmark the service/activity they want to fund and for what period of time. Voluntary agencies can be also invited to develop a variety of facilities such as health care, education, vocational training and income generation projects.

**Area for Further Study**

The impact of African countries on refugee regime.
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Hello. My name is Ruth Nelima and I am a Master of Arts student at the Institute of Diplomacy and International Studies in the University of Nairobi. I am conducting a research on challenges of reduced refugee funding and possible mitigation efforts: a Case study Kenya. The findings of this study will be used to write an M.A Project. The findings will also help in understanding the factors that explain the concept of reduced refugee funding, its impact and possible mitigation efforts that can be instrumental to policy makers and even managers of refugee issues. I would highly appreciate your patience and time spent to answer the following questions. All information collected will be treated as confidential and thus will not be disclosed to any other parties for unknown intentions. Thank you in advance for your continued cooperation.

**ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire number</th>
<th>Date of interview [Interviewer: Enter day, month and year]</th>
<th>Time of interview [Interviewer: Enter hour and minute, use 24 hr. clock and be exact]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of interview:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Instructions to the interviewer: Ask all the questions and circle the correct responses: [NOTE: All interviewer instructions are italicised].

**PART A: DEMOGRAPHICS**

1. What is the gender of respondent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is the correct name of organization you are representing?

   ........................................................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................................................
3. What is your official position/title?

.................................................................................................................................

PART B: QUESTIONS RELATING TO REDUCED REFUGEE FUNDING AND POSSIBLE MITIGATION EFFORTS

4. Is your organization/institution involved in refugee protection? *Probe for their role concerning refugee protection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes explain
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

5. Who funds your refugee program?
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

6. In your Agency/organization, how is the funding trend from 2010 to date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increasing</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stagnant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Has your Agency/organization been affected by the above state of refugee funding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How?
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

9. What factors have contributed to the above state of funding?
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

How has the named state of funding affected the refugees?
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
10. How has the named state of funding affected the other refugee protection/implementing agencies

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

11. How has the named state of funding affected the government of Kenya?

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

12. In your opinion, what are the possible measures that can boost refugee program funding on host refugee countries in Africa?

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

13. In your opinion, what are the possible measures that can boost refugee program funding in Kenya?

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

Appendix 2: Interview Guide for refugees

Hello. My name is Ruth Nelima and I am a Master of Arts student at the Institute of Diplomacy and International Studies in the University of Nairobi. I am conducting a research on challenges of reduced refugee funding and possible mitigation efforts: a Case study Kenya. The findings of this study will be used to write an M.A Project. The findings will also help in understanding the factors that explain the concept of reduced refugee funding, its impact and possible mitigation efforts that can be instrumental to policy makers and even managers of refugee issues. I would highly appreciate your patience and time spent to answer the following questions. All information collected will be treated as confidential and thus will not be disclosed to any other parties for unknown intentions. Thank you in advance for your continued cooperation.

**ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire number</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview [Interviewer: Enter day, month and year]</td>
<td>Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of interview [Interviewer: Enter hour and minute, use 24 hr. clock and be exact]</td>
<td>Start:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART A: DEMOGRAPHICS

1. What is the gender of respondent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How old are you? [Interviewer: Enter three digit numbers. Don’t know =999, Refused to answer=998] [If the respondent does not know his/her age you can go around the question by asking the year when he/she was born then calculate the age]

3. What was your profession back in your country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence farmer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic worker/maid/househelp</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed services/police/security personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan/skilled manual worker</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical worker</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trader/hawker/vendor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business owner [owns small business of less than 10 employees]</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium business owner [owns large business of 10 or more employees]</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional worker [e.g. lawyer, accountant, nurse, engineer etc]</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government worker</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail worker</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never had a job</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife/househusband</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others [specify]</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to answer</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. For how long have you been in the refugee camp in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 yrs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B: QUESTIONS RELATING TO REDUCED REFUGEE FUNDING AND POSSIBLE MITIGATION EFFORTS

5. Have you heard of the refugee program funding? *Probe for specific aspects of the services in the camp such as provision of food, NFIs, health facilities in relation to where the funding comes from*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What do you know about it?

..........................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................

7. How have the services from implementing agencies been in the camp from 2010 to date? *Probe whether the services have been improving or not*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciating</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stagnant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explain........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

8. What do you think are the reasons for such state of services?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

9. What challenges have the refugees encountered as a result of the mentioned state of resources/services/funding from the agencies?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

10. What measures can you give in your opinion may make services better?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................