Roskilde University

The CRRF and its multi-stakeholder engagement as a Ugandan refugee response - whose responsibility?

Jule Chiara Wichern & Kasper Koch Autrup

Master Thesis

International Development Studies

Roskilde University, June 2020

Supervisor: Jacob Rasmussen

Abstract

This thesis examines how the 'whole-of-society' approach within the implementation of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) in Uganda practices 'responsibility-sharing', the new guiding principle of global refugee responses, in relation to the protection of refugees. The concepts of domestication, brokerage and translation and responsibility for the protection of refugees are applied to scrutinize the national adaptation of the international refugee framework. The findings of this study are shaped and informed by the triangulation of empirical material gathered during fieldwork in Uganda, empirical material from scholars with a similar approach and the content of the Ugandan CRRF. The concept of domestication highlights how the importance of the engagement of the international community in the framework impacts the practice of protection through responsibility, especially expressed in the vast involvement of the UNHCR. As a close partner to the Government of Uganda (GoU), the UNHCR's constitutes the main delegator of funds and possesses the mandate to facilitate the Ugandan refugee responses. Thus, the concept of domestication illustrates the IOs influential role and how the multiple identities of the UNHCR, results in the absence of a central role of authority, enabling mechanisms of responsibility-shifting. Applying the concept of brokers and translators explores the duality of the more than 110 stakeholders involved and illustrates the persisting humanitarian-development divide, despite the CRRF's focus on bringing the later. NGOs and host communities, operating as brokers and translators, are obtaining a 'dual-face', by having to traverse the 'middle' of the field, between donors and refugees, consequently highlighting the importance of these actors in practicing responsibility for refugees' protection in Uganda. The findings are combined to examine the interactions between the different roles of the GoU and the organisations, and the consequences this has in relation to the protection of refugees. The dual roles of stakeholders involved arguably leads to issues of underfunding, duplication of work, corruption, limited access to social services for refugees and hosts, scarce protection for urban refugees, consequently impacting the protection of refugees.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

CRRF - Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework

DCA - DanChurchAid

DRC - Democratic Republic of Congo

EU - European Union

GCR - Global Compact on Refugees

GoU - Government of Uganda

INGO - International Non-Governmental Organisations

NNGO - National Non-Governmental Organisations

IO - International Organization

NDP - National Development Plan

NYD - New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants

OPM - Office of the Prime Minister

PRS - Protracted Refugee Situations

ReHoPe- Refugee and Host-Communities Empowerment

RLP- Refugee Law Project

RRP - Refugee Response Plan

STA- Settlement Transformative Agenda

UNGA - United Nations General Assembly

UNHCR - United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

1. Introduction

The Global Refugee Regime has come under increased pressure, facing the highest number of displaced people on the move since the Second World War (Miller, 2017; UNHCRa, 2019). As the largest part of this refugee population is hosted by countries that are already facing issues of political and economic instability, the international community was called upon to create a cooperative framework of solidarity and 'responsibility-sharing', and the foundation for the future global governance of refugees: the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants (NYD) (2016) and the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) (2018) (UNHCR, 2019). The most important feature of the NYD, is the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) (GoU, 2019). The goal of the CRRF is to secure the protection of refugees globally, while simultaneously stabilizing the global refugee regime in times of *"unprecedented displacement and retrenchment from multilateralism"* (Crawford et al., 2019:2). The CRRF emphasises the need for a 'whole of society approach' in refugee responses, which stresses the necessity of a multi-stakeholder cooperation between international, regional, national and local actors, including governments and international non-governmental organisations (INGO) and national non-governmental organisations (NNGO), but also the private sector, financial institutions and civil society (GoU, 2019; UNHCR, 2019). This multi-stakeholder approach was designed to overcome the divide between humanitarian and development actors, requesting them to orchestrate humanitarian and development needs in their work with refugees and hosting communities (ibid.).

Uganda has experienced the influx of over 1 million refugees fleeing from emergency situations in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Burundi, and South Sudan, making it the host of the biggest refugee population in Africa and the third biggest host worldwide, after Pakistan and Turkey (UNHCRa, 2019; Crawford et al., 2019). Considering the immense influx of refugees and the countries' continuous experience of Protracted Refugee Situations (PRS) (Miller, 2017: 8), but also its progressiveness in refugee affairs, Uganda is seen as an ideal pilot country for the CRRF, (UNHCR, 2017). It was also the approach followed by the Government of Uganda (GoU), that inspired the creation of the NYD and made the international community consider Uganda as *"almost proof of concept for the CRRF"* (Crawford et al., 2019:3). Consequently, the country's implementation of the CRRF, which launched in Uganda in March 2017, serves as the case for this thesis, for which a two-week fieldwork was conducted

The 'whole-of-society approach' of the CRRF in Uganda is translated into a multi-stakeholder cooperation led by the GoU and the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). It is facilitated by the UNHCR, and implemented through 116 partners, including national and international organisations (IO), the private sector, NNGO's and INGO's (UNHCRa, 2020). Consequently, the CRRF in Uganda offers valuable knowledge and insights into how the global efforts for the principle of shared responsibility are practiced on the national and local level, and how the CRRF is able to successfully combine national and international efforts to ensure the protection of refugees' rights.

1.1. Problem Area

One of the key challenges for the realization of the CRRF is the issue of funding, as the framework lacks the assumed financial resources (Schlitz et al., 2019: 48; Dowd and McAdam, 2019). Furthermore, as the funding for the CRRF is almost completely channelled through the UNHCR and not the GoU itself (Degnan and Kattakuzhy, 2019; UNHCRb, 2019), the UNHCR obtains a large influence within the delegation of funds and projects, thus also influencing the overall outcome of the Ugandan model.

The 'whole-of-society' approach of the CRRF in Uganda has recently received increased scepticism. Scholars have pointed out that two of the most affected communities of the projects and policies carried out under the CRRF, the host-communities and the refugees themselves, are largely underrepresented in the implementation (Montemurro and Wendt, 2017; Huang et al., 2018). Taking into account that the goal of the CRRF is to reflect a 'whole-of-society' approach, the pressing issue of host-communities and refugees' arguably insufficient representation, questions how the framework effectively addresses their needs. Another point of critique is the missing alignment of the different government ministries, despite the government's ambition to follow a 'whole-of-government' approach (OPM, 2020). In order to orchestra humanitarian and development assistance, the alignment of ministries seems vital. Nonetheless, the GoU incorporated the CRRF into its National Development Plan (NDP), which reflects an eagerness to align ministries better in the future and target individual national development needs in communities, by emphasising the high development-potential in the refugee response (GoU, 2019; UNHCR, 2019).

In view of the challenges of funding and under-representation of host communities and refugees, and the continuous difficulties for refugees to access to social services (Kreibaum, 2016), it becomes vital to investigate how the CRRF is practicing the responsibility of

protecting refugees in this multi-stakeholder approach. The involvement of different levels of partners, where everyone is supposed to follow the concept of 'shared responsibility', makes it crucial to explore what this shared responsibility means in practice and for whom it applies. In a multi-stakeholder approach it appears challenging for stakeholders to practice this protection in the international and national arena as they first and foremost need to preserve their international image, while at the same time adapt to local Ugandan structures and needs leaving them in the difficult situation of manoeuvring this 'dual-face' - preserving two, potentially conflicting images of oneself simultaneously, internationally and in the designated national on the ground (Miller, 2017).

Furthermore, it is important to recognise that the CRRF is an internationally negotiated framework, facilitated by the UNHCR who has been a key operator in international refugee affairs for decades (Crisp and Slaughter, 2009). Scholars have pointed out that this continuation of high-profile organisations' engagements in the CRRF is a 'top-down' approach, which fails to recognise national and local needs and reinforces the old refugee regime instead of reforming it radically (Hathaway, 2018; Rudolf, 2019). As the protection of refugees and their rights lies at the core of the global refugee regime, it is important to examine how this protection is guaranteed in a framework that has been negotiated on the international level and implemented in Uganda. How stakeholders involved conduct their work under the principle of sharing responsibility in the protection of refugees is vital to examine in the Ugandan case, as this highlights how the issue of rights' protection is not just a legal or moral responsibility, but is situated in the practice between these two broader debates, making it a highly relational and practical phenomena to examine. Thus, this thesis aims to answer the following research question:

How is the international framework of the CRRF implemented in Uganda and how can the practice of protecting refugees through a 'whole-of-society' approach be explained by mechanisms of brokerage and translation, and domestication?

2. Methodology

The subsequent section presents an overview of methodology and methods used in this thesis. First, the empirical material, the reasoning behind choosing said material, as well as the challenges linked to the combination of the chosen material, is outlined. The second part

describes the research design of this study, which presents the methods used, followed by a discussion of the case selection. Third section is an outline of our own fieldwork, how the material was produced and the challenges and perspectives that appeared while conducting the fieldwork. Following the outline of our fieldwork, is a discussion of our own positionality and delimitations of the research. The last section is a discussion of the ethical considerations tied to the conducted fieldwork.

2.1 Empirical Material

This thesis builds on two types of empirical data, more specifically, first-hand empirical material from our fourteen-day fieldwork in Uganda and empirical material from scholars, with a similar fieldwork approach, i.e. Hovil (2018), Bohnet and Schmitz-Pranghe (2019) and Crawford et al. (2019). Therefore, empirical material utilized in this thesis, consists of empirical material obtained through our own fieldwork conducted in Uganda and secondary sources, with a similar approach first-hand approach of being in the field talking to the actors involved, has informed the knowledge within this thesis. We are fully aware that our own empirical material alone, is not sufficient to validate the research in question. Consequently, while the majority of the empirical material stems from empirical fieldwork material, there is also incorporated secondary empirical material that carries a desk study nature, material that has a more legislative and policy related entity. This material is incorporated as our exploratory and critical research, touches upon national and local issues, but also includes international perspectives that cannot only be illuminated by incorporating first-hand research, but also needs a more international scope to be fully explored, considering the evolvement of the CRRF. By incorporating secondary sources and official policies in a triangulating manner with our empirical material, we have tried to overcome any shortcomings in basing this thesis on our own profitable, however somewhat condensed, fourteen-day fieldwork. The triangulation of material also enhances the validity vice-versa, as our own empirical material overcome the shortcomings in not relying solely on secondary sources. Therefore, it is important to note that any conclusion or arguments made in the analysis have not been based only on our own research. It is linked to the findings of secondary empirical material and in shortage of such link, our own research has been disregarded, in order to enhance the validity of the research.

2.2 Research Strategy

This research explores the international framework of the CRRF in relation to stakeholders' responsibility for refugees' protection as emphasised in the framework. The case selection of Uganda has been based on the fact that the country hosts one of the fastest growing refugee populations globally and that it has chosen to be a pilot country for the initiated framework of the CRRF (UNHCRa, 2019). Moreover, the country has been globally acclaimed as model to emulate, by having one the most welcoming and progressive models when discussing sustainability, responsibility and refugees (Hovil, 2018; Huang et al., 2018), consequently furthering the relevance and validity of choosing exactly this country. The objective is to explore how this multi-stakeholder initiative, consisting of GoU, IOs, NGOs, INGOs, refugees and host-communities, affects and correlates with the responsibility for the refugees. To engage with perspectives of domestication, brokerage and responsibility for protection, we need different information from the stakeholders involved as the concepts looks at the intimate relationship between government, organisations, communities and refugees, especially at a national and local level. Consequently, the first hand perspective of our own fieldwork has provided us with the sub themes i.e. guest-host relationship, education, land and corruption, which in turn have been connected to issues addressed by the first hand perspectives of the secondary literature of i.e. funding, humanitarian-development nexus, role of organisations and government, which in turn have been linked to the broader analytical framework of domestication, brokers and translators and responsibility. This process and knowledge are argued to be crucial in answering our research question, as it allows us to explore both the micro level of national and local implementation. We have utilized the theoretical framework in chapter 3 to analyse the gathered empirical material from fieldwork conducted in Uganda, in coherence with other scholarly literature and the policies of the CRRF and ReHoPE, as previously illuminated. The analysis is divided into three parts and explored through the concepts of domestication, brokers and translators and responsibility. The concept of domestication has been utilized to analyse the macrolevel and the role of government and IO's/UNHCR in part one, paving the way for an analysis of the role of NGO's and host-communities through the concept of brokers and translator in part two, while the last part have analysed the microlevel of the responsibility of the stakeholders involved in part one and two, in relation to the protection of refugees, all in relation to the themes discovered in our own empirical material and the secondary empirical material.

2.3 Fieldwork

The empirical material produced in Uganda was gathered using semi-structured interviews, observations, formal and informal conversations with stakeholders involved in the CRRF, consisting of refugee settlement leaders, urban refugees, host community, NGO's, IO's and government official from Adjumani district. A total of 16 interviews was conducted, consisting of one with the OPM, one with the European Union (EU), three with NGO's, two with host-communities, four with university employees and five with refugees. The time between interviews was used to make observations, which allowed us to study the everyday situations of the societies in which we stayed, that might be of importance. The interviewees where selected through an identification of the stakeholders involved and a selection based on familiarity, size and accessibility (UNHCR, 2019). The choice to interview refugees and host-communities was based on the ability to obtain the personal perspectives of the everyday life and the consequences of the CRRF, from the individual refugees and communities that host them, in relation to the aspects of responsibility and self-reliance. Elite-interviews with organizations and government officials have been conducted, as this builds on the individual perspective by including the implementers and officially in charge entities, thus furthering the research and the focus of responsibility. (Kvale, 2007).

Each interview followed an interview guideline, that was left open ended, where the questions were divided into three different layers: international, national and local, in order to acquire both the macro and micro perspectives on the question at hand. Thus, it left us with an openness to develop follow-up questions during the conversation and to develop knowledge, perspectives and meanings that would have otherwise been unattainable (Dewalt et al., 1998; Skinner, 2013). The three-layered questions were developed on issues that arose by reading other scholarly literature, as well as previously conducted research projects about Uganda and the framework of the CRRF. Furthermore, as the number of interviews and observations increased, various themes became apparent. Several interviewees referenced issues that are arguably tied to the aspect of responsibility, i.e. stating that Uganda cannot do this alone and aspects of the ongoing debate on the humanitarian-development nexus, as one interviewee talked about how the needs of refugees keeps on changing from humanitarian assistance. Another interviewee touched upon the fact that the situation in Uganda has moved a little from humanitarian needs towards development, however, humanitarian aid is still very important, as only a small portion of the projects have moved from humanitarian to development. Moreover, the role of organisations was often referred to, in either a positive notion or in an arguably more negative manner, in

relation to the services provided, when talking about the difficulties tied to the shared responsibility attached to the framework. Consequently, as the interviews progressed, the themes of brokerage and domestication, in relation to the role of the many stakeholders involved, became illuminating concepts that could help explore the findings of the fieldwork conducted. Moreover, this difference in individual and organizational experiences, coupled with the openness of the interviews, resulted in insight of issues that were not part of the initial interview questions, such as the aspect of security, new information on the services provided and the role of funding (Dewalt et al., 1998).

2.4 Positionality

Applying a critical lens, we recognize that we as researchers are not neutral and that this research is not value free. The research has its starting point in the certain preconceptions that we had, and which have guided the making of this thesis. One important preconception to reflect upon is that Uganda has been a praised for its refugee progressiveness, which is a point that we, in previous projects, have questioned. These preconceptions and the connected knowledge initiated the research in the first place, while also influencing the choice of empirical material, and our critical standpoint encouraged us to investigate the dominating ideas that has influenced the debate on refugees, stakeholders, responsibility and the Ugandan case. The aim of the research is not value free either. Within the previously conducted research lies a somewhat critical perspective on the international positivity that surrounds the CRRF and its implementation in Uganda. It is with this critical lens in mind that we have sought to understand and explore the role of the framework and the multi-stakeholder approach and the relationship between these stakeholders and the responsibility of refugees. Moreover, we are exploring perspectives where there are power relations at stake, as the role and actions of IO's and governments have implications for NNGOs and INGOs, but also for refugees, as they are arguably one of the most vulnerable and heavily scrutinized subjects in the world.

2.4.1 Analytical limitations

There are analytical themes that could potentially be beneficial for this thesis to engage in, but have intentionally been excluded, as these themes are either a thesis in itself or at the very outskirts of the scope of this research. One such theme is citizenship and repatriation. Even though this theme could be highly insightful to discuss in relation to responsibility, the

exploration of the intersection between responsibility and protection for refugees in Uganda and the concept of citizenship would exceed the framework of this thesis, considering the theme's complexity and scope as illuminated by Hovil (2016) and Crisp and Long (2016). Additionally, there is no distinction made between the origin of refugees and the different experiences of e.g. Congolese and South Sudanese refugees. Consequently, the research does not capture the diversity of the refugees, who derive from different experiences and origins, thus, they are not one homogenous group, as the only distinction made is between urban refugees and refugees in settlement. While perspectives of i.e. origins, heritage and experiences, are arguably important to address when researching refugees, these perspectives are argued to be situated in another debate, that investigates the individuality of refugees more thoroughly than what this research seeks to do.

2.4.2 Limitation of access

Whereas access to the settlements in Adjumani has been said to be easier once in Uganda, the reality proved otherwise. Even with the use of key informants and personal contacts as gatekeepers (Kawulich, 2005), the access to the camps was not obtained during our stay. Despite these individuals being respected, neutral (Ibid.) and had previously helped other students and scholars in gaining access to the settlements, permission was not given. When discussing the various reasons why it seemingly had become harder to access the settlements, two statements of relevance kept reappearing. The key interviewees all, independently of each other, mentioned the aspect of the increased scholarly focus on the settlements and the refugees, and the fact that it is an election year in Uganda. Furthermore, this could also provide a possible explanation to the lack of response from the UNHCR. Despite contacting offices in Kampala, Gulu and Adjumani, both before, during and after the fieldwork we were not able to establish contact with this key-stakeholder, an obvious shortcoming when trying to address the research question at hand. However, despite these gatekeepers not being helpful in providing access to the settlements, they were helpful in getting access to tribal leaders and interviews in settlement host-communities and also to self-settled urban refugees, who would arguably otherwise be unattainable due to their vulnerability.

2.5 Ethical considerations

When conducting any type of research there are arguably many different ethical considerations, whether it may be safety of the participants (Kawulich, 2005; Creswell, 2009: 86-92) or political, social or ethnic characteristics (Mackenzie et al., 2007), it is important to have an ethical guideline (Ufm.dk, 2002 ; Ethics Blog, 2012). The ensuing section contains the ethical considerations that arose before, during and after the research conducted in Uganda.

2.5.1 Before

One of the primary obligations as a researcher, is to not harm the subjects of the research (Ufm.dk, 2002; Ethics Blog, 2012). As this research, to a large extend, is including vulnerable communities and individuals, the dignity, culture and possible past experiences of the refugees, in relation to the questions asked, were discussed thoroughly among the authors of this thesis. Moreover, the important perspectives were discussed with our supervisor, who himself has vast experience in conducting fieldwork in Uganda and Kenya, and all in relevance to the ethical standards set for carrying out fieldwork (Ufm.dk, 2002; Ethics Blog, 2012). In order to be transparent and open, we send a document with our interview guide in the initial contact with the interviewed stakeholders. Additionally, a discussion between the authors and the supervisor took place, highlighting the aspects of voluntary participation and that the participants could walk away from the interview at any point, retract their statements or refuse to answer any question posed. This was initiated to secure the safety and autonomy of the participants (Mackenzie et al., 2007), to establish trust and keep delicate information hidden from public and to keep in mind the sensitive issues we inevitably would come across (Creswell, 2009).

2.5.2 During

When arriving in Uganda, we attended a workshop on "Refugees in Eastern Africa". The workshop was part of an ongoing collaboration between Roskilde University and Gulu University called Building Stronger Universities, with leaders and participants from universities, refugees and the OPM attending. Among the individuals invited to participate and give a presentation were three refugees, all chosen as leaders of settlements in Adjumani and

Kyangwali. However, the refugees were also chosen by OPM and UNHCR in advance, thereby arguably tainting the information obtained from them, as they were there in 'official' capacity as leaders of the settlements, combined with the presence of OPM official, which arguably somewhat negated their critical outspokenness. However, participating in this two-day workshop, established a report and gained the trust of the participants (Bernard, 1994), which subsequently led to an interview with one of the leaders outside of the workshop.

The constant notion of taking field notes and revisiting these notes after each interview generated new insights to the research at hand, especially considering the perspectives in relation to safety, services provided and funding of the framework, thereby generating new ideas and questions relevant to the protection of refugees, which consequently have increased the validity and quality of the research (Dewalt et al., 1998; Kawulich, 2005). Moreover, a recorder was used for some of the interviews, thus allowing us to revise what had been stated, thereby circumventing any shortcomings in our notes. It is important to mention that the recorder was only used when we were given consent to use it before starting the interview and it was strongly stated that the recording would not contain any characteristics that would make the interviewee identifiable.

Whenever we met an interviewed stakeholder for the first time, we made sure to inform the interviewee of the purpose of the research, our status as students, in order to share enough and sufficient information about the research, to make sure questions about our presence, motives and use of the material are put to rest (Kawulich, 2005) and we reiterated, before each interview, that the interviewee could at any time leave, refuse to answer or retract an answer at any point.

2.5.3 After

After the conducted fieldwork, we revisited the empirical material gathered and divided the material obtained into different categories, with much emphasis on not distorting the material and thereby misrepresenting the stakeholders, which could potentially cause protracted unintentional circumstances (Ufm.dk, 2002; Ethics Blog, 2012). Each interviewee has been sent a copy of the report, thereby honouring our ethical arrangement. Lastly, as the ethical guidelines ascribe, several interviewees have been made anonymous, which is necessary as it engages sensitive issues of i.e. corruption, critique of government, that could potentially lead to interviewees being denied access to projects, intimidation or harmed in other ways.

3. Theoretical Framework

The following chapter establishes the theoretical framework by introducing the key concepts and contributions that inform the analysis. As this thesis aims to explore how the responsibility for the protection of refugees is practiced through mechanisms of brokerage and domestication in the national adaption of the CRRF in Uganda, it is consequently important to shed light on the academic discussion surrounding this research and highlight the gaps discovered in previous works. The first part of this literature review introduces the overall discussion of the humanitarian-development-nexus in refugee responses, which the Ugandan case makes a perfect example for, highlighting the general critique of humanitarian and/or development responses to refugee management and the potential of a combined effort such as the CRRF. Following this and considering the fact that the CRRF is first and foremost a framework negotiated on the international level that depends on the local adaptation and interpretation, a discussion on the relevance of the concept of domestication is presented in the second part of this review. Furthermore, we present contributions on the concepts of brokerage and translation, as these concepts are considered highly insightful in examining the dynamics of a 'whole-of-society', or multi-stakeholder approach like the CRRF in Uganda. This discussion leads us to the final part of the review, that introduces the perspectives on responsibility and protection of refugees' rights, and which scholars shape our knowledge on the responsibility for the protection of refugees, enabling us to situate this thesis in that debate. The literature review on how these concepts have developed over time is presented in order to clarify our use and interpretation of each concept and how they are utilized as a means to shape and inform the analysis, and thus serves as the overall theoretical framework of this study.

3.1 Literature Review on the theoretical perspectives

3.1.1 Humanitarian-Development-Nexus

The CRRF's emphasis on combining humanitarian and development assistance in the management of refugees in Uganda reflects the global trend of shifting humanitarian assistance towards development assistance, catalysed by a growing global discussion that criticized the humanitarian-development divide in contemporary and past refugee responses (Montemurro and Wendt, 2017: 4). While various refugee policies have portrayed refugees in securitising terms and as 'burdens-for-society', parts of the global refugee regime have simultaneously

addressed the discursive shift away from this narrative, by recognising the development potential refugees bring with them to their host communities (Faist, 2008; Jacobsen 2002: 107). Outlined by Hovil (2007) and Jacobsen (2002), this positive impact of refugees has already been 'realized' by previous Ugandan refugee politics, with its focus on the accomplishment of refugee's self-reliance, but has only recently been adapted to the international community's efforts. The emphasis on the importance of development assistance is also expressed by various scholars, amongst them Stamnes (2016), Miller (2017), Khan and Sackeyifo (2018) and Rudolf (2019), who have critiqued how the focus of solely humanitarian assistance in refugee politics has governed the issue of displacement as a short-term issue, while in reality refugees have to reside in intended 'temporal' spaces for an average of over 17 years, leaving them in a state of limbo for generations, often without protection and economic opportunities (Stamnes, 2016: 1; Rudolf, 2019: 209; Khan and Sackeyifo, 2018: 696). This permanent character of a situation that was intended to be temporal is a recurring phenomenon in PRS (Miller, 2017: 8). As Miller (2017) points out, handling these PRS only on humanitarian terms hinders refugees on becoming self-reliant and independent, but reinforces their dependence on humanitarian aid provided by IOs in camps (ibid.). The emergency responses to previous PRS, are only capturing the needs of refugees in the beginning period of displacement, while they do not cover the needs that evolve after several years in the camps (ibid.) The same concern is raised by Stamnes (2016) who claims that even though both approaches, humanitarian and development assistance, first and foremost follow the idea of enhancing people's livelihoods, their time-frames and measurements to such improvement and their underlying principles and values vary significantly. Consequently, a sole humanitarian focus threatens to severely reduce the basic human rights and needs of refugees, as the individual economic and social needs of refugees vary over a longer timeframe. This is also stressed by Khan and Sackeyifo (2018), who discuss the potential of the GCR to bring change into the humanitarian-development divide and solve 'dehumanizing' situations in African refugee camps where limited protection of refugees' socio-economic rights is provided.

Furthermore, this issue situates our thesis in the discussion of the humanitarian development nexus, as we are interested in examining how the responsibility of refugees' protection is practiced, and by whom. Following the argument of Rudolf (2019) the multi-stakeholder approach in Uganda that operates under the premise of the NYD and the GCR, is focusing on the development potential of refugees for host communities and the 'cyclical' empowerment of each other. Moreover, Betts, Bloom & Omata (2012) and Montemurro and Wendt (2019) have pointed out how the Ugandan approach with its private sector involvement in the CRRF, has

captured exactly this development potential of refugees by providing employment opportunities and better livelihoods, while donor interests have increasingly diminished (Montemurro and Wendt, 2017: 15; Crawford et al., 2019).

While the mentioned scholars have pointed out the issue of refugee camps being temporary spaces with refugees being in a constant limbo, Schlitz. et al. (2019) argue that the CRRF in Uganda has captured this issue by reimagining the camp itself as a place where refugees can potentially become self-reliant with the prospect of becoming independent without any need of support in the future. Even though the CRRF is argued to bring change into the consequences of the humanitarian-divide, the authors expect these changes to be overestimated (ibid.). Dryden-Peterson and Hovil (2004) share this scepticism. They highlighted the shortcomings of the self-reliance strategy in Uganda prior to the CRRF, by pointing out the limited freedom of movement or little access to services and resources. Also, international organizations are assumed to stay in Uganda for a long period of time, having to manoeuvre between international and local structures, since working under an international framework that needs to be adapted to the local settings (ibid.)

3.1.2 Domestication

The discussion on the local adaptation and interpretation of the international framework by both international and national partners is important to explore, in order to situate the relevance of this research. The work by Miller (2017), reflects one of the key contributions in this discussion. Her book investigates how, and under which circumstances the UNHCR can take the role of a surrogate state and how this influences the protection of refugees (Miller, 2017). As most contributions on the work of IOs have focused mainly on their influence and dynamics at the global level, Miller examines what roles IOs take when operating at the domestic-level, working 'within' the state, what influence this role has on its relationship with the designated states, and how this role may differ to their international one (ibid.). Her argument is that contrary to their global role, IOs can acquire surrogacy on the domestic level through their domestic presence. For this, Miller introduces the concept of 'domestication'. Consequently, her research is highly relevant for this thesis, considering that we aim to analyse the dynamics evolving out of the multi-stakeholder approach and how this practice the responsibility to protect refugees. Miller's concept of domestication is highly influenced by Robert Latham (2001) work on transterritorial deployments, who examined the interface of global actors and domestic political and social structures. The concept of domestication borrowed much from Latham, who focuses on

organizations that operate via transterritorial deployments and argued for the 'dual face' of those organizations by their presence on the global and local level, enabling them to take over responsibility on the local level (Latham, 2001). However, Miller (2017) points out that her conceptualization of domestication extends its understanding by considering different extents of e.g. the provision of services, governance and influence on the hosting state, and is thus better in its application to cases where organisations take over surrogate statehood and/or their relationship with hosting states (ibid.). Furthermore, Miller emphasises how the concept of domestication uncovers how any given IO is embedded in the designated local structures and how the characteristics from the organisation with its local presence differ significantly from its international image and characteristics, giving organisations multiple identities (ibid.: 19). These multiple identities are strengthened by the fact that once domesticated, IOs tend to subcontract parts of their projects to local actors, for instance NGOs, intensifying the IOs local presence and influence (ibid.: 22) This sub-contraction of domestic actors leads to the relevance of exploring the literature on exactly these actors, as they are relevant stakeholders in the CRRF's multi-stakeholder approach.

3.1.3 Brokers and Translators

As the most important contribution of the CRRF is its 'whole-of-society' approach, the discussion on those stakeholders practicing the so-called dual-face is helpful in order to answer the research question. The role of local actors working together with IOs, as highlighted by Miller (2017), can be explored through the concept of brokers and translators. The discussion of brokerage and translations gives valuable insights into the facilitators of the CRRF, with the main authors writing on this being Mosse & Lewis (2006). The foundation for their work is that the interaction within development work must integrate an understanding of development work as a *"complex set of local, national and cross-national social interactions"* (Mosse and Lewis, 2006: 1). Their work is heavily inspired by Bierschenk et al. (2002), whose research highlights the influence and significance of the practices and social structures under which numerous actors involved in development work, operate and interact with each other. The best way to illuminate structures and practices of development work is by examining the roles of 'brokers', as they form an important part of governance in the context of international development work (ibid.: 4). Their concept of brokers describes a certain group of actors within development projects who have expertise in the control, interpretation and acquisition of development revenue and are placed in-between the recipients and donors of aid, also claimed to be the key

actor in the competition for the implementation of projects in their locale which they are representing (ibid.). Even though, Bierschenk et al. (2002) recognize that brokers acquire their position by default, or their position is considered a by-product of development projects, they have desirable and specified expertise and strategies worth investigating (ibid.: 13). The phenomena of brokers and their key role in the dynamics of development work is enabled through the fragmented structures of politics in postcolonial countries, *"where power is exercised both through formal bureaucratic logics and through a diverse range of "supra-local" associations and networks, in which there is a flourishing of intermediate actors and organizations."* (Mosse & Lewis, 2006: 12).

Mosse & Lewis (2006) add to the thoughts of Bierschenk et al., with a more sociological concept of 'translation', borrowed from Bruno Latour. Latour emphasizes the need to understand and take into account the production of social meanings through actors and their interpretations. The interpretations of actors, according to Latour (2000) is inherently performative and thus the expansion of the concept of development brokers with the concept of translation enables a framework that examines interactions and connections between *"people, information & ideas"* (Mosse & Lewis, 2006: 15). The main goal of the authors' work is to examine how projects in the development world are realized through mechanisms of individuals' translating (ibid.). Consequently, their conceptualization becomes highly relevant when examining the dynamics of practices of responsibility sharing in the protection of refugees through the CRRF in Uganda.

Sally Engle Merry (2006) utilizes a similar approach, with a focus on the interpretation and application of human rights internationally. Her work stresses the point that ideas or frameworks that have been formulated internationally are typically adapted to various local structures and meanings (ibid.). Of vital importance in this process, is the role of translators, 'the people in the middle', who translate the internationally negotiated ideas to specific local situations and operate between local, regional, national and global meaning system (ibid.). Engle Merry (2006) labels these translators as 'knowledge brokers' who are, despite their key role and influence, very vulnerable at the same time as they are often distrusted and their loyalties can be ambiguous, making them 'double agents'. Adding to the work of Mosse & Lewis, Merry argues that translators operate under unequal power-distribution, as the work of translators is ultimately depended on their source of funding and their positionality, leading to their work following self-interest rather than the interests of the greater framework (ibid.: 40). In her view, the process of translation inhibits a clear hierarchy and marks a top-down process from the international to the local arena, as development actors are highly dependent on

international funding mechanisms, making them present their proposals within the common international language that attracts funding. With her example of the application of Human Rights, human rights language is often used in these proposals, as projects framed in that language are known to attract most funding (ibid. 48.). This results in the fact that local institutions adopt the language of human rights, even though their initial proposals for a project suggested a different approach. As translators operate exactly within this attraction of funding and translation between local and international networks, they are trained to be more donor-pleasing than actually translating the needs of the local networks (ibid.). Consequently, Engle Merry's contribution is vital to consider when examining the question of how the responsibility of the protection of refugees is practiced among stakeholders within the CRRF in Uganda, as the multi-stakeholder approach needs to be translated to the local, making the concept of translators and brokers operating between international, national, regional and local networks, vital.

3.1.4 Responsibility

Situated in the ongoing Humanitarian-Development debate, the linkage of refugees and responsibility is not a recent discussion. Whereas the focal point of the 1950s and 1960s, in relation to refugees, was primarily a matter of refugees moving East to West to be granted asylum for defecting (Gammeltoft-Hansen and Tan, 2017), the ensuing development in the global legal framework, facilitated the shift towards a broader acceptance and scope of what can be deemed as international human rights (McAdam, 2007). However, despite this broader acceptance and scope, it is argued by Gammeltoft-Hansen and Tan (2017), that during the last three decades, the issue of refugees and asylum has increasingly become an aspect that is politicized. Coupled with an increasingly globalized international community, the politicization of refugees, resulted in a growing correlation between refugees, illegal migration and human smugglers (Hurwitz, 2009). Initiatives and actions that relate to what Moreno-Lax and Lemberg-Pedersen (2019) discuss, is a debate between universalism of human rights or state sovereignty, a debate that has been ongoing since the 1980s and has been criticised by various scholars (Gammeltoft-Hansen and Tan, 2017).

Recognising that this thesis explores the question of how responsibility for the protection of refugees is practiced within the CRRF in Uganda, it is important to first and foremost emphasize the phenomenon of refugees' protection. This question of protection inherently asks for the

protection of rights, which is why Hannah Arendt's (1986) contribution on 'the right to have rights', constitutes a part of the theoretical foundation of this research, which uses the concept of refugee protection through responsibility as a relational concept, situated in-between the legal and moral debate of refugees protection. Furthermore, the integration of Arendt's notion of 'the right to have rights' highlights how the discussion of the humanitarian-development nexus and the question of responsibility of protection of refugees in development projects like the CRRF, needs to include the perspective of human rights in international relations. According to Arendt (1986), the rights of individuals are conditional and exclusive for those who are citizen of a given country and legally form part of a state, which places Arendt in the middle of the debate about the universalism of human rights and its limitations through state sovereignty. Arendt's ideas on the role of the nation state on the protection of refugees' rights can be utilized when discussing different actors' role and the practicing of responsibility amongst them, especially when non-state actors are assumed to practice responsibility for the protection for refugees. Arendt further emphasizes the conditionality of rights on national states by stating that once someone becomes a refugee, he or she becomes a case of charity, where their rightlessness is expressed through the sole fact that due to national sovereignty no other state is obliged to take care of them nor protect them, where their rights of freedom of movement or opinion become basically irrelevant (ibid.: 296). Accordingly, when discussing the protection of refugees' rights in Uganda through the CRRF, Arendt's argument helps to inform the analysis on how refugees are still able to practice their rights when residing in Uganda, and as a 'case of charity', meaning being dependent on humanitarian actors and their assistance and international funding. The refugee response through the CRRF portrays an example that may disrupt the dichotomy suggested by Arendt of rights depending on statehood, as it is a framework negotiated within the international community consisting of various states from different 'origins', and the fact that Uganda has also been claimed an exceptional example that may actually have practiced the protection of refugees' rights. Arendt's division of state and people's sovereignty also does not include the potential forms of surrogacy that IO's may take on, once operating in the domestic level in Uganda, as highlighted by the work of Miller (2017) and her concept of domestication.

Despite the ongoing debate of human rights and state sovereignty since the 1980s, as advocated by Gammeltoft-Hansen and Tan (2017), Blake (2001) and discussed by Arendt (1986), a fundamental human rights initiative appeared in the start 2000s. The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) first appeared in a report by The International Convention on State Sovereignty in December 2001 and argued to be a result of the thoughts of Deng in 1995, in which Deng

proposed that responsibility to protect people from large-scale human rights violations and mass atrocity and state sovereignty is co-constitutive (Badescu and Weiss, 2010) . Badescu and Weiss (2010) argue that sovereignty is contingent and not absolute, thus, when a state is not willing or able to be responsible for its citizens and protect them from violence it is up to the international community to take charge and be responsible for the protecting of these rights. Cunliffe (2010) furthers this critique and argues that while it might be agreed upon internationally, the weaker states are not likely to be heard when it comes to where, when and how the R2P is to be applied.

As evidenced in the literature discussed above, the R2P has been debated by various scholars, however it is arguably a polarized debate, that to a large extend discusses the aspect of sovereignty, responsibility and humanitarian interventions or lack thereof, from a state perspective, thus, the individuals and their lives, are very rarely emphasized or illuminated. Welsh (2014), tries to further the discussion to include some of these aspects that are lacking in the general discussion when it comes to refugees and responsibility. Exactly which route to take is not the question illuminated by Welsh, more it is a matter of opening a linkage between refugees and responsibility, a linkage that needs to be part of the scholarly debate. Seemingly there is a recent global tendency to try and initiate frameworks that deal with the ongoing protracted refugee crises, as evidenced by the quote from UN General Secretary: *"If there is one lesson to draw from the past few years",* wrote the United Nations Secretary-General in mid-2016, *"it is that individual countries cannot solve [large-scale refugee movements] on their own. International cooperation and action ... must be strengthened"* (Dowd and McAdam, 2017: 864). Türk and Garlick (2016) argues that key circumstances where UNHCR and States have successfully cooperated in developing and implementing initiatives to deal with large scale refugees, coupled with the newly proposed GCR, provide a foundation for the design and application of comprehensive refugee responses, where responsibility sharing measures a secured. As forced displacement is argued to not end anytime soon, it is in the interest of all states to move away from unilateralist actions towards a framework based on the increased focus on refugees, to cope with the challenges that are seemingly ongoing (Türk and Garlick, 2016). Dowd and McAdam (2017) also discuss the issue of the CRRF and the GRC. Similar to Türk and Garlick, Dowd and McAdam also call it *"a significant and timely opportunity for the international community to adopt concrete commitments with respect to responsibility-sharing"* (Dowd and McAdam, 2017: 865). It is further argued, that despite the initiative, what becomes the reality and if it is different, remains to be seen (ibid.).

3.2 Sub-conclusion

The literature review above on the development of the debate in the humanitarian-development nexus, which the CRRF with its 'whole of society' approach aims to address, as well as the discussion of the developments of the concepts of domestication, brokerage and translation and the responsibility to protect refugees rights serves as the theoretical framework of this thesis. The starting discussion on the divide between humanitarian and development actors and domestication serves as building parts of the analysis on the numerous stakeholders involved in the framework and helps to illuminate under what conditions and circumstances the CRRF has been implemented as the Ugandan national refugee response. Furthermore, the discussion on the concepts of brokerage and translation builds a vital theoretical tool in order to understand the role that actors outside of the 'official' actor-framework carry in practicing responsibility for refugees and their protection. Lastly the discussion on responsibility for refugees' protection informs our knowledge for the analysis, where we analyse how responsibility is practiced through the CRRF in Uganda. This serves to bridge the identified gap in literature, by exploring whose actually responsible for the refugees in the CRRF.

4. The domestication of the CRRF in Uganda

The following chapter analyses how the CRRF, a framework that has been negotiated at the international level as a result of the NYD and led to the creation of the GCR, has been adapted and applied nationally in Uganda. In order to understand how the guiding principle of responsibility-sharing through a 'whole of society' approach is practiced and coordinated within the in national implementation of the new refugee response plan, it is vital to analyse the coordination and delegation between the different stakeholders involved in the planning and practice of the Ugandan model. The first part of the chapter examines how the international refugee response plan has been localized in Uganda, by not only presenting the different stakeholders which are declared to share the responsibility of refugees living and arriving in Uganda, but also by analysing how the wide range of stakeholders working under the CRRF reflects the need to target the humanitarian-development nexus in refugee responses. In order to understand the layout of the cooperation under the CRRF, the first part of this chapter illustrates the overall structure of the CRRF in Uganda and serves to provide the needed knowledge for the rest of the analysis. Following this, and recognising the vast presence of

international humanitarian and development actors in Uganda that are not only responsible for carrying out projects in the name of the CRRF, but are especially determining the projects successfulness through their heavily needed financial resources, the second part of this chapter scrutinizes the role of IO's within the Ugandan model. Lastly, the role of the UNHCR builds the focus point of this chapter, as the UNHCR is declared the GoU's main partner with its mandate of facilitating the national coordination and application of the framework (GoU, 2018). The UNHCR's high involvement in the decision-making processes of the international and national framework and its great domestic presence in and around the Ugandan refugee settlements is thus analysed more closely through the concept of domestication and its possibility to create forms of surrogacy, a relevant analysis in order to further understand how the responsibility for the protection of refugees can be explained in the Ugandan 'whole of society' approach.

4.1 From the NYD to the CRRF in Uganda

With the NYD negotiated and adopted by all 193 Member States of the UN in September 2016 a new milestone has been set to emphasize on the importance of global solidarity practices to strengthen the protection of refugees' rights internationally (UNHCR, 2017; Crawford et al., 2019: 2). This principle of solidarity is expressed by the declaration's focus on the need to support countries and communities which host the largest share of refugees. The affirming of the GRC in 2018 further strengthened this solidarity emphasis through its key principle of responsibility-sharing. This principle should be the guiding principle for all actors involved in refugee responses and iterates that in times of ever-growing displacement, refugees are a matter of shared responsibility internationally, not just the responsibility of the hosting states (UNHCR, 2019). Accordingly, the UNHCR was mandated to negotiate and implement several country-specific CRRF's in over a dozen of refugee hosting countries, among them Uganda, in order to have a more predictable and comprehensive refugee response in times of continued mass-movements and financially-burdened countries hosting the largest share of these (UNHCR, 2019). The need for the CRRF to be country-specific was addressed through a two year long consultation between the UNHCR and hosting states and a task team consisting of not just staff from the UNHCR and the states, but also civil society, the private sector, development and humanitarian actors (UNHCR, 2017). Consequently, even though the CRRF is following an internationally agreed declaration and commitment, the creation of the national

action plan for the CRRF in Uganda included relevant local and national stakeholders and integrated their experiences on refugee management in Uganda. The knowledge gained through consultation with Ugandan stakeholders was of vital importance for the roll-out of the CRRF internationally, not only because it was the first country to implement parts of the CRRF, but mostly because of the countries' renown refugee-welcoming policy environment prior to the CRRF (GoU, 2018; UNHCR, 2017). However, these strategies, have been limited to scarce available financial resources and capacities of the government (World Bank, 2016). Burden and responsibility sharing is not only including financial support for hosting countries by the international community, but also the provision of information and knowledge in form of international employment in refugee projects, as well as humanitarian support by providing social services, and development support by e.g. advancing local infrastructure (Khan & Sackeyifo, 2018: 697). This form of responsibility sharing thus asks for the inclusion of a wide range of actors in the lay-out of the CRRF. The same ambition is also reflected in the consultation of the CRRF roll-out in Uganda between the UNHCR and various national and international stakeholders involved and reflects the NYD's emphasis on the need for a 'whole-of-society' approach in order to comprehensively address the management of refugees (Crawford et al., 2019:2).

4.1.1 The 'whole-of-society' approach and its stakeholders

Considering Uganda's relatively progressive refugee strategy, the implementation of the CRRF was supposed to strengthen national mechanisms and strategies, which were already in place. Consequently, instead of abandoning national structures that were already in place, the implementation of the CRRF was first and foremost supposed to strengthen and advance the Ugandan refugee strategy (UNHCR, 2017). This approach is also reflected in the Ugandan CRRF Road Map that followed the consultation between all actors, and which was implemented in January 2018 and updated in 2019. The road map states that *"the 'what' has not changed, by the 'how' has"* (GoU, 2019), meaning that the CRRF is not radically changing Uganda's approach, but aims to improve it. A representative of the EU delegation in Kampala also emphasized this, by stressing that it is important to keep in mind that Uganda had various policy documents prior to the CRRF, like Refugee and Host-Communities Empowerment (ReHoPe) and the Settlement Transformative Agenda (STA), so the CRRF implementation in Uganda did by no means have to start from scratch (Interview 2).

One of the building features of the CRRF road map and the national implementation of the framework, is the creation of the CRRF Steering Group, consisting of over 32 members from not only various ministries of the GoU (18 seats), but also international and national humanitarian and development actors, financial institutions as well as 2 refugee representatives and 5 representatives of from host-communities (14 seats) (GoU, 2019). The Steering Group which is responsible for the implementation process of the CRRF and is led by the GoU, is further supported and coordinated through the CRRF Secretariat, also led by the OPM, and consisting of government officials from the OPM and UNHCR delegates as well as other delegates from NNGOs and donors (Crawford et al., 2019: 8; GoU, 2019). Consequently, as reflected in the build-up of both the Steering Group and the Secretariat, the CRRF in Uganda follows the principle of a 'whole-of-society' approach in its multi-stakeholder involvement in the planning, monitoring and implementation of the framework.

The road map emphasises the relevance of combining and bringing together humanitarian and development actors and thus clearly addresses the increasing international critique on refugee responses relying too much on solely humanitarian actors, which govern refugee projects as a short-term issues and do not address the issue of refugees dependence on humanitarian aid, thus leaving them in a state of 'limbo' for generations and creating PRS without any economic opportunities (Stamnes, 2016: 1; Rudolf, 2019: 209; Khan and Sackeyifo, 2018: 696). By aiming to shift to more development solutions in its refugee response, the CRRF road map in Uganda aspires to include a development focus next to the, still needed, humanitarian focus, in managing refugees in order for these to benefit their host communities in the long term perspective, even after they return to their home countries (GoU, 2019). The broadening of the range of actors involved and engaged in the Ugandan model thus is argued to not only meet short-term humanitarian needs, but essentially to reduce vulnerabilities of host and refugee communities and aim for resilience and self-reliance through a coordinated cooperation between humanitarian and development actors (ibid.). The development focus of the approach is further emphasised through a 'whole-of-government' approach, which is claimed integral for a 'whole-of-society approach (Montemurro and Wendt, 2017: 17), where refugees are integrated not only into the NDP II, but also in newly developed individual sector plans for the sectors of e.g. health, education, environment or sanitation and water (GoU, 2018; GoU, 2019; UNHCR; 2019). However, the sector plans are argued to be misaligned in the implementing ministries, which is considered vital in order to achieve the goal of refugees to become self-reliant (Interview 2; Interview 3; Montemurro and Wendt, 2017: 17). However, as also recognised by one of our interviewees, the CRRF has only been implemented effectively in

2018 and it was rather impossible for the GoU to have all sector plans already designed and implemented before the start of the framework, but the sector plans are all there now and it needs time to show tangible results (Interview 2).

Furthermore, the GoU and the UNHCR, jointly implemented the Refugee Response Plan (RRP) for January 2019-December 2020, which provides more practical tools for them and their partners to implement projects under the CRRF by outlining priority outcomes that shall guide partners and sectors in their work (UNHCR, 2019). These priority outcomes are functioning as prioritization criteria in case under-funding occurs and set out the main principles that all stakeholders should follow (ibid.). The priority outcomes enshrined in the RRP 2019-2020 as well as the government-led sector plans are coordinating the multi-stakeholder framework by emphasizing where specified contributions from international and national partners are needed, however, various commentators expressed that the coordination of all involved stakeholders is flawed in various areas. It is stated that a clear monitoring framework is not present within the CRRF (Huang et al., 2018). This is also emphasized by an EU representative in Kampala, who said that simply too many actors are engaged in the framework, which makes it not only more difficult to coordinate with each other, but also to monitor and keep track of "who does what". The multi-stakeholder approach in Uganda also includes the risk, as every other multi-stakeholder initiative, of actors pursuing different agendas and follow differing objectives, where their conflicting interests can have negative effects on the target group of the CRRF and not bring the promised effect of self-reliance (Montemurro and Wendt, 2017: 16). The GoU indirectly addresses this concern, by stating that considering the importance of coordination within the model, it would be 'ideal' to have all actors operating in the same direction, following the CRRF roadmap, however, it is stated, this *"all-embracing alignment in the response is yet to come to light since various actors have various platforms and refugee coordination models"* (OPM, 2020). Furthermore, even though the Ministry of Local Government co-chairs the CRRF Steering Group, critics have pointed out that local districts are not represented enough within the coordination of the framework (Haldorsen et al., 2017).

4.1.2 International Responsibility Sharing

As expressed through the vast number of involved international partners engaged in the CRRF, and their commitment to the principle of responsibility-sharing for the protection of refugees in Uganda, the role of the international community becomes vital to examine. One of the major aspects that reflects this role is their support through funding and capacity strengthening. As

underfunding and limited resources have arguably limited the successfulness of Uganda's refugee approach prior to the CRRF, the GoU decided to follow the application of the CRRF first and foremost in order to maintain and advance its already existing approach through increased international support and funding (GoU, 2019). The success of the Ugandan CRRF is to a large extent dependent on increased international cooperation and support from the international community, and the improvements that so far came with the CRRF are claimed to have been impossible without international support from the partners (ibid.). Because the increased influx of refugees in the last years is said to have exceeded national capacities and resources to support host communities and refugees, the sharing of responsibility with the international community, described in terms of funding, is vital. Consequently, the road map directly calls upon the international community to live up to their funding commitments and increase their funding in a long-term perspective to make it more predictable and flexible, while simultaneously aligning with the priority outcomes of the RRP and working in cooperation with the government (ibid.).

Despite these ambitions, the CRRF continues to be underfunded (Crawford et al., 2019: 9). Consequently, only the most basic needs can be prioritised, following the priority outcomes, and short-term humanitarian projects are prioritized over the longer-term development programs (ibid.; UNHCR, 2019). Therefore, the aim to address the humanitarian-development nexus in refugee responses has not yet been achieved, as also donor interest remains to focus on humanitarian assistance, reflected in funding trends of 2017 where 75% of the funding was channelled to humanitarian assistance and only 25 % were addressing development projects (Crawford et al., 2019: 9; Forichon, 2018). Another issue, however, is that humanitarian aid has also diminished since the implementation of the CRRF, as the framework shifted the narrative from humanitarian to the need of development funding, resulting in various humanitarian actors rechannelling their funds to other humanitarian emergencies around the world (Crawford et al.,2019; 9 Interview 3). Humanitarian aid is still very much needed, as a representative from an INGO working under the CRRF expressed, and the CRRF remains a humanitarian crisis above all (Interview 3). As a large proportion of the international community is engaged in the CRRF in forms of partners also operating 'on the ground', the problem of these partners not living up to their funding commitments is interesting when investigating their role under the concept of domestication. Taking into account that their physical presence and national projects are largely influenced by their funding commitments in terms of focusing largely on humanitarian responses as a priority outcome, the organisations and partners are characterized as obtaining a dual-face and possesses multiple identities (Miller, 2017). Internationally their

image is to share responsibility with the host state and concentrate their work around creating self-reliance for refugees and resilience for host-communities, while nationally many partners are committing to and implementing more emergency response projects, contrasting the international image. Thus, as the concept of domestication highlights, they influence the GoU in terms of its protection for refugees to the extent that their local projects do not necessarily reflect the greater ambition to overcome the humanitarian-development divide, but are, through the ever-increasing number of partners involved in the CRRF, increasing their local presence in Uganda through their projects of humanitarian service provision and sub-contractors (Miller, 2017).

With the international community not living up to its funding commitments, where the funding of the CRRF in 2018 reached only 57 percent, and in 2019 only 55 percent of the planned budget (UNHCRa, 2020), the concept of responsibility sharing in the multi-stakeholder approach becomes fragile. As stated in the RRP 2019-2020, without the support of the international partners and their financial resources, Uganda will be unable to realize the full potential of the framework and achieve its goal of self-reliance for refugees and resilience for host communities (UNHCR, 2019). With the outlined priority outcomes by the GoU and the UNHCR and the designed sector plans of the line ministries, the partners of the CRRF were supposed to be given guidelines of where to place their projects and funds, but continuous underfunding and difficulties in communication and coordination, as well as the multiple-identities IOs often obtain in the national setting, seem to have led to only limited successfulness. One example of this is the fact that out of 1.19 million refugees living in Uganda in December 2018, 1.15 refugees were still dependent on receiving food assistance from partners in the settlements, instead of being self-reliant, where 72% stated that non-governmental assistance was their main source of food (UNHCR, 2019). Furthermore, 67 % of refugees' household reported limited access to food (ibid.). Consequently, the role of partners, especially the UNHCR and the World Food Program who deliver social services and food to refugees and host communities, and thus international partners, is vital in guaranteeing survival and provide, at least, for the basic humanitarian needs of refugees.

4.1.3 UNHCR as a domesticated surrogate state?

The powerful role of the UNHCR within the Ugandan CRRF is first and foremost expressed through its involvement on all coordination levels: leadership, inter-agency, sector and district (GoU, 2019: 28) as well as its overall mandate to facilitate the overall framework in partnership

with the GoU. Furthermore, while the road map of the CRRF and the RRP 2019-2020 reflects a joint negotiation between the GoU and the UNHCR, the UNHCR is considered the main source and provider of funding, as almost all aid is channelled through the UNHCR and not the GoU (Degnan & Kattakuzhy, 2019). Consequently, this presents the influence the UNHCR possesses in delegating the funds to the various partners and consequently determine the priority outcomes of the CRRF.

The role of the UNHCR can be understood through the concept of domestication. As Miller (2017) has pointed out, the UNHCR and other IO's can take on various roles when working in the field with a local presence. These roles acquired in the field, in this case especially in settlements in Uganda, are often different to its international role. While the UNHCR internationally is known for its moral mandate for the protection of refugees and for using tools like naming and shaming in order to influence state's on their response to refugee protection (Miller, 2017) its role in Uganda can be argued to be going beyond this naming and shaming mechanisms of influencing the state. One example is the recurring testimonials and incidences of accusing the UNHCR present in Uganda with being involved in corruption. As the main provider of funding, UNHCR has come under criticism for, together with the GoU, artificially raising the number of refugees arriving in Uganda in July 2018 and thus being accused of aiming to generate more funding through a larger amount of people in need of humanitarian aid (Crawford et al., 2019; GoU, 2019). These accusations of corruption extend to instances where the UNHCR is accused of accepting or even requiring bribes to give access to social services to refugees, or unrightfully imprisoning refugees who complained about the procedures of the UNHCR (Interview 13; Hayden, 2019). It is important to emphasise that their national image in Uganda, through its vast local presence, differs from its international image of being a moral influence on states to protect refugees, thus showing the dual face of the organization in its involvement in the framework. The partnership between the UNHCR and the GoU is argued to be very close, some NNGOs have argued that it is this close connection to the government that has made the UNHCR corrupt (Miller, 2017: 149).

While the UNHCR is supposed to be merely a partner engaged in the framework, in relation to monitoring and facilitating it, various examples show how the organisation may have extended its influence on the state and works as an 'equal' responsible entity in the framework. Following observations made by Miller (2017) and others, stating that *"the UNHCR is in on everything"* (Miller, 2017: 147; Crisp and Slaughter, 2009) refugees and delegates interviewed during our fieldwork expressed the UNHCR as a very powerful actor within the Ugandan Model. One representative of an NNGO described the UNHCR as being close to a dictator, as they tell you

what to do and you have to follow their instructions (Interviewee, 2020). Others have stated, especially refugees living in settlements, that while the offices of the OPM are often quite far away from the settlements and hard to reach, the UNHCR is always present within the settlements, be it through offices, staff positioned there or providing social services (Interview 12; Interview 13; Interview 14). Accordingly, complaints and feedback from refugees, but also host-communities, is often primarily brought to UNHCR staff in the settlements instead of reaching staff from the GoU.

The concept of domestication helps to explain how the UNHCR, through its local presence, can take over more accountability of refugee affairs on the ground. Miller (2017) argues that the domestication of organisations can take on various forms, the most extreme form being surrogacy. Key indicators for an IO to be considered a surrogate state are their provision of services that would usually be expected to be offered through the government (e.g. health, education, water), the practice of governance functions that the state normally manages (like administration function), their local visibility as an accountable and legitimate authority through either physical presence or their resources, and a clear physical presence in a designated area (Miller, 2017: 23). The UNHCR in Uganda seems to fulfil all of these indicators in some refugee settlements, while not in all. Miller (2017) argued that while the UNHCR used to practice surrogacy especially over PRS of South-Sudanese Refugees, they practice a partnership with Congolese Refugees (ibid.). However, her work was conducted prior to the increased influx of South-Sudanese refugees in 2016, thus also prior to the implementation of the CRRF, and has actually assumed the number of refugees arriving in Uganda to decrease (ibid.). Therefore, while not arguing for a clear-cut surrogacy of the UNHCR in Uganda, tendencies of a surrogacy are present. The UNHCR does not only provide a vast amount of services and delegate funds to sub-contracted national partners to refugees, which normally the government would be considered responsible for, but is also referred to as a legitimate powerful authority within the refugee settlements in Uganda with a high physical local presence and visibility. This is supported by statements of interviewees living in refugee settlements. The UNHCR is not only the first point of referral for complaints, but also manages a lot of administrative roles in the settlements. Roles which the government, through the introduced complaint mechanisms, officially should be in charge of, as well as influencing administration in mentioned instances of refugees bribing UNHCR officials to get access to relevant documentation (Interview 12; Interview 13; Interview 14; Crawford et al., 2019).

As the domestication of organisations can lead to mechanisms of responsibility shifting between stakeholders, according to Miller (2017), it becomes highly relevant to explore who refugees, host communities and other stakeholders consider responsible within the CRRF framework. With a highly domesticated UNHCR, it represents how an IO's domestication can influence the CRRF and practices responsibility shifting with the government, which is a key mechanism resulting of a highly domesticated, almost surrogate IO. Thus, this case presents how target groups of refugees and host-communities, largely address blame and complaints for malfunctions of the practice of the framework to the UNHCR, instead of the GoU (Miller, 2017: 33). Consequently, if i.e. social services are lacking or of a poor quality, and that it is first and foremost the international partner rendered as responsible for the provision of services, through their funding and subcontracting of work to national organisations, it is these international actors that are publicly blamed for the weaknesses of the framework and the problems experienced in the districts with refugee settlements (ibid.). The continuous concern raised by GoU for the need of the international community to live up to their funding commitments, reiterates this responsibility shifting. Furthermore, various interviewees have emphasized the responsibility of the UNHCR to improve the services provided in the settlements (Kreibaum, 2016; Hovil, 2018; Interview 12; Interview; 13). The focus on the UNHCR being highly responsible for the outcome of the framework and thus as a target for critique, is also reinforced by various statements claiming that the UNHCR is very influential, displaying dictatorship tendencies, and without it nothing would be working (Miller, 2017; Interview 4). It is important to note, however, that the empirical material that indicates tendencies of surrogacy of the UNHCR in Uganda has not indicated a decline in accountability for the framework by the Government. Refugees and NGO officials in settlements increasingly expressed how the Government is in charge, how they are thankful for the work of the GoU and the help it is providing (Miller, 2017:147; Interview 12; Interview 13). Consequently, mechanisms of responsibility-shifting in the case of the Ugandan model do not mean that UNHCR is seen as the single responsible subject in the public perception, but that both the UNHCR and the GoU are often seen as equally responsible, resulting in a situation where there is no perceived central authority for responsibility, but two (Montemurro & Wendt, 2017). Despite the official responsibility of the CRRF in Uganda lies at the GoU on paper, the importance of the public perception of responsibility through an intense domestication of IO's like the UNHCR results in a blurrier responsibility in practice.

The question of whether or not the UNHCR thus acts as a surrogate state in the Ugandan refugee model, is not of a definitive nature. Even though the organisation fulfils most of the criteria that

measures the degree of domestication of organisations and thus indicates surrogacy, as highlighted above, the role of the government in control over its own territory and sovereignty is still present. Thus, with a high degree of domestication, the role of the UNHCR can be considered as *"a shared power story - on where Uganda still holds the material power of decision-making and 'veto' power, but where UNHCR holds other forms of power via perception, rhetoric and financial underwriting"* (Miller, 2017: 149-150), functioning in some instances as a surrogate state, but still in partnership with the GoU. However, it has also been critiqued of being too close, which limited the UNHCR ability to monitor the practices of GoU to protect refugees, thus not fulfilling its moral mandate (Dolan and Hovil, 2006; Miller, 2017: 143). This leads back to the 'dual-face' that the UNHCR seems to have acquired while working with a vast local presence in Uganda, but also maintaining its international image of impunity and morally guiding states in refugee protection. The multiple identity the UNHCR thus obtains, following Miller (2017), is expressed through its role as not just a donor and monitor of the CRRF, but also as main implementer and coordinator and provider of resources (Montemurro & Wendt, 2017: 19). These multiple identities are broadened through UNHCR's sub-contracting of projects in local settlements that intensify the local presence and consequently the domestication of the IO even further.

4.2 Sub-conclusion

This chapter has served as the first building block to answer the research question of the thesis. By describing how the internationally negotiated framework has been implemented nationally in Uganda as a multi-stakeholder approach with the involvement of national and international partners in the local adaptation, the importance of especially the international community in not only the formulation of the framework, but also in the local adaptation is of high relevance. The concept of domestication highlights, that the adaptation of the CRRF in Uganda to a large degree depends on the local presence of international partners and their resources and how the highly domesticated IO UNHCR plays a vital brick in the practice of the CRRF, not lastly through its publicly perceived responsible image. This role, and also the role of other partners working within the framework who are sub-contracted as partners for the layout and implementation of projects is further discussed below through the concepts of brokerage and translations, considering that these concepts help to explain how the responsibility for the protection of refugees is practiced within the over 110 partners in CRRF.

5. Brokers and Translators

5.1 Identity of brokers and translators

As previously mentioned in 3.1.3, the inclusion of the concepts of brokerage and translators, offers a framework through which international development objectives, such as the CRRF, can be analysed, by adding useful insights on politics, practices and outcomes of said objectives. In this thesis, it is explored by looking at the relationship between the many stakeholders involved in the CRRF, from Government, IOs, INGOs, NNGOs, host-communities to refugee leaders and their role in relation to the responsibility and protection of refugees and their rights. The inclusion of development brokers and translators can provide a thorough exploration into the processes and efficiency of policies and the management of aid in international development, especially when the stakeholders involved are of local, national and international origin (Mosse and Lewis, 2006: 1-26). As the framework of the CRRF contains stakeholders of all origin, there is a diverse set of local, national and international interactions occurring, thus, it becomes improbable to only explore these interactions singularly in relation to state, civil society or broader national or international practices of an administrative or economic character (ibid.).

In order to explore the role of these brokers and translators and their influence in relation to the question at hand, it is significant to shortly try and identify who these subjects are argued to be, in relation to the framework of the CRRF. Development brokers and translators are actors that are entrenched in a given local, national or international setting, through which the subjects are either directly or indirectly involved in the forming and implementation of political matters (Bierschenk et al., 2002). Within their given setting, these subjects take a position as mediators or go-betweeners, at the crossing point between the individuals who are targeted by the development project and the sender of the project (ibid.). Consequently, the brokers and translators explored in the multi-stakeholder framework of the CRRF, are situated in a variety of settings, between the UNHCR, the GoU, the host-community, and refugees. The host community becomes a target group as a consequence of the 70-30 division of funds to refugees and host-communities respectfully, as per the CRRF (UNHCR, 2018: 14). Moreover, brokers and translators are the link between targets and sender, irrespective of these subjects deriving from public or private organizations and companies or if it is part either multilateral or bilateral agreements (Bierschenk et al., 2002). Thus, no matter the origin, they are in theory representing the requirements of the target group and are in charge of voicing these requirements to the

structures responsible for the development project and the external donors (ibid.). Therefore, the brokers and translators are identified as the NNGO's, INGO's, host communities and local subjects who holds importance in a given community. By being the link between the UNHCR and the refugees, these brokers are argued to be of great importance, as they are arguably not only inactive operatives, but are crucial stakeholders when implementing development project, as the CRRF, in especially African communities (ibid.).

5.2 Funding

One of the main challenges of the CRRF and its implementation in Uganda, is the issue of funding. These shortcomings in funding have raised questions in regard to the commitment of the international community, especially considering the responsibility-sharing aspect of the CRRF (Dowd and McAdam, 2017). Despite these funding shortcomings, the funding is on par with the overall funding of UNHCR led project globally, which lies at around fifty percent (UNHCR, 2020). This is also evidenced through interviews conducted with stakeholders, who act as brokers and translators in the CRRF. Whereas the underfunding is acknowledged, the representative from the EU office in Uganda also stated that while it may be underfunded, no development project had ever been overfunded and for every development project within the UNHCR, funds are always lacking (Interview 2; Dolan and Hovil, 2006: 11: Ndonga Githinji and Wood, 2018). Moreover, the complexity of the CRRF makes it difficult to assess whether or not it is to be considered a success and the relation to of funds (Interview 3). If one were to only look at the progress in terms of reaching the indicators set, then the plan arguably works, to a certain extent, and the only issue to reach more of the indicators set, would then be a lack of funds (Ibid.). However, what is also part of the equation when discussing the lack of funds, is the lack of interest and commitment of the international community to directly fund the CRRF through directly supporting the GoU, especially considering that supporting sustainable national structures directly, would be cheaper and thereby require less funding than the current UNHCR led response (Crawford et al., 2019). The lack of commitment to directly fund and support the GoU is argued to stem from a translators superior obligation to one side, at the expense of the other side and is part of the economic and political power superiority process where the powerful transnational actor is the decision maker, at the expense of the local and less powerful actor (Merry, 2006). Moreover, what can contribute to this unwillingness, is the fact that INGO's in Uganda receive nineteen percent of the available funds, whereas NNGO's receive under one percent (UNHCRb, 2019). As the INGO's that work as brokers and

translators within Uganda are dependent on the funding from UNHCR to be able to implement projects, the UNHCR is arguably unwilling to give up the influence it resides over these INGO's, influence they arguably would concede if they were to directly fund the GoU. Moreover, due to the relationship with the UNHCR, INGO's then become what can be described as leaders of the brokers club (Bierschenk et al., 2002). By affiliation and their connections to donors, the INGO's achieve a strategic position of power, to implement and initiate projects that are unattainable for the NNGO, who do not hold this strategic position. Thus, if the UNHCR was to directly fund the GoU, this would likely lead to an increase in the funds given to NNGO's, at the expense of INGO's and therefore the power structure could arguably shift, thereby endangering the relevance of the INGO in Uganda.

5.3 Humanitarian- Development cooperation

The multi-stakeholder scope of the CRRF is argued to create obstacles situated in the humanitarian-development nexus. Actors stemming from the humanitarian and development field respectively have different points of departure and different approaches to address a given project (Thomas, 2017). Their working mechanism are different, they engage with different parts of government and more often than not, they have different donors who require different results (ibid.). Thus, it is often difficult for development actors and for instance the UNHCR to determine the right point of time in which one should shift from humanitarian assistance to development assistance, not being able to recognize the potential of a coexistence (Miller, 2017: 47). Consequences of such difference are evident, as it is argued that humanitarian projects are working with short time budgets, regularly year to year, which creates unpredictable working conditions (Interview 2). Humanitarian projects in Uganda are under a vast amount of pressure, as other humanitarian crises, i.e. Syria, draw more attention and consequently money from donors (Interview 3, Crawford et al., 2019). There is currently an international shift away from looking at the refugees in Uganda as a humanitarian situation and more as a situation that require development actions (Interview 2), which is problematic as the situation is very much still of a humanitarian nature (Crawford et al., 2019; Interview 3). As a result of this divergence of opinions and struggle between the humanitarian and the development sectors, an interviewee stated that they have had to change some of their project descriptions on paper, from humanitarian to development, in order to get them approved, despite the projects still being a humanitarian project when implemented. Translators and brokers, such as these organizations, works at the crossroads between local, national, and global systems of meanings and implement

ideas stemming from the global system and redefining these ideas to the local or national setting (Merry, 2006). Therefore, organisations are in a constant limbo and in a state of conflict, as they must fit their projects to suit both the refugees but also to the global system from which these project ideas come from. This makes them both powerful and vulnerable, as they are able to manipulate the refugees but still open to exploitation from the global system (Ibid.: 39-40). Consequently, the differentiated viewpoints, of the situation in Uganda being of a humanitarian or a development character, or both, can arguably lead to institutional turf wars, where organizations are fighting over the same project. However, the struggle for relevance, also leave them vulnerable from the down-up, as the refugees may not receive the intended outcome of the project, and critique it, as it is differentiated on either paper or in implementation.

Platforms to steer the many stakeholders involved have been put in place, with the CRRF steering group and the secretariat in charge of the coordination at the overall level (GoU, 2019) and as *"multi-stakeholder initiatives by nature engage actors with differing objectives, and hence they call for a process for managing potentially conflicting interests"* (Montemurro and Wendt, 2017: 19). However, there has been a critique of this process and the level of coordination between the development and humanitarian sector at both the national and local level, despite interagency meetings (Huang et al., 2018; Crawford et al., 2019). Moreover, the structure of the CRRF framework have been argued to be highly bureaucratic, which consequently makes coordination highly time-consuming (Crawford et al., 2019). Subsequently, this is argued to, among other things, cause the duplication of work (Interview 3; Interview 14; Merry, 2006). While the interagency meetings that is held every week and sometimes every month, is argued to be profitable for the coordination of the actors involved, the issue of duplication of work still exist, largely due to the many stakeholder involved and to the structure of the CRRF and the many links a stakeholder has to go through in order to get a project approved (Interview 3). Moreover, this organisation representative stated that their organization has had more than one project cancelled, as they did not get the permits in time, due to the many links and different oversights they had to go through (ibid.). Another stakeholder, not directly receiving funds from the framework of the CRRF stated that there is a negative competition between the INGO's and NNGO's involved, in what he described as a situation where organizations were reporting each other to higher authorities and the heart of the problem was a lack of a project database, that could ensure that no project was duplicated. While these issues of duplication and cancelling of projects can be argued to 'just' be a consequence of a lack of coordination of the diverse set of local, national and international actors involved, the duplication can also be argued to stem from a conceited and unscrupulous

move made by the stakeholders (Bierschenk et al., 2002; Merry, 2006). This is a prime example of the ambiguity brokers have to traverse (Lewis and Mosse, 2006:1-26) and arguably holds consequences either way, for both the broker and the target group. By duplication of projects, the implementing broker runs the risk of not pooling their given expertise, thereby implementing projects that arguably are of a reduced value to the receiver. Moreover, if the lack of coordination and the many coordinating links a brokering stakeholder must pass through in order to get a project permission results in a cancelation of the project, the receiver is possibly affected by the non-implementation of a potentially profitable project and the broker is at risk of losing the confidence of the UNHCR, Government or donors, on who the broker is dependent on.

5.4 Transparency and accountability

Traversing the middle of the field in development projects that have an international scope and evolve around aid, like the CRRF in Uganda, also entails that brokers come into contact with the issue of corruption (Mosse, 2005), especially as *"The failings of ruling regimes (including corruption within them) are no longer censored as internal matters but have become central to the concerns of external donors; although at the same time (as noted) aid relationships are reframed in the language of partnership and local ownership"* (Mosse, 2005: 4). While one of the founding principles of the CRRF is based on an agreement to focus on transparency and accountability of all actors involved (GoU, 2019: 20), several actors involved have been accused of being part of corruption (Betts et al., 2019: 6-7, Crawford et al., 2019). In 2018 Ugandan officials were accused of inflating the number of refugees in the country, in order to receive more funding from the UNHCR, which consequently also reduced the willingness of donors to channel money to the government (Crawford et al., 2019). As a consequence, the UNHCR and the government launched a new biometric system, that allows for the registration of refugees (Betts et al., 2019). Additionally, an interpreter working for the UN in Uganda exposed corruption relating to resettlement and carried out by UNHCR workers, that resulted in a seven-month long investigation that shed light on corruption within the UNHCR in five different countries (Hayden, 2019). Not only does corruption affect government and UNHCR officials, the stakeholders who act as brokers within Uganda are all, in one way or another affected. One stakeholder stated that corruption is experienced by almost every Ugandan citizen, while another emphasized that corruption was at its highest when only the OPM were in charge of refugee entry points. Moreover, one of the stakeholders told of constantly being

pressured to deliver fuel or other goods in the region where they work and the staff that they hire have to pay extra money if they want to get their children enrolled in the local school (Interviewee). However, it is not only extra money or services they need to pay, they also had to implement internal anti-corruption procedures, which are very time-consuming, and the stakeholder is in a constant limbo of assessing if it is profitable to take these corruption cases to court. Another stakeholder also touched upon the issue of responsibility-sharing, which is at the forefront of the CRRF framework. He acknowledged that it very difficult to keep track of the refugees, who in some cases fluctuate between more than one organization in order to receive the services. This fluctuation is argued to be doable as the stakeholders have a very hard time keeping track of where all the money is flowing to, due to the many stakeholders involved, despite the implementation of a thorough system to track exactly these funds.

5.5 Guest-Host relationship

Whereas corruption is argued to partly create a distrust between target sender and government, it is also argued to be a result of a weakness in a nationally led approach, that consequently affects local host-communities (Crawford et al., 2019). It is argued that *"the focus on the host communities is the glue that holds together the whole-of-society response",* bridging the objectives of the humanitarian and development actors (Montemurro and Wendt, 2017: 12). Moreover, the framework of the CRRF entails a perspective of treating both refugees and host communities as equal partners (GoU, 2019). This is argued to require the building relationships within the community and to make sure that the host communities are directly involved in the development of the projects locally (Montemurro and Wendt, 2017). The CRRF in Ugandan is supported by the ReHoPe which in turn supports the integration of refugees through the National Plan II and the STA (GoU, 2019). However, these policy initiatives are argued to *"all be designed by the government of Uganda in cooperation with international actors, and all reflecting a top-down approach"* (Hovil, 2018: 12). Moreover, especially the western part of the Nile region in Uganda, has traditionally been experienced as marginalized, with insufficient infrastructure and in the northern part of Uganda the host communities are not experienced as having more resources than those of the refugees (Bohnet and Schmitz-Pranghe, 2019), areas that hold sixty-two percent of the refugees in Uganda (UNHCRb, 2019: 20-21). Consequently, the top down approach and the already scarce resources are putting a strain on the guest-host relationship, despite the 70-30 percent division of resources as per the CRRF (Betts et al., 2019). Tensions exist between the host communities, refugees and due to competition over decreasing

resources i.e. firewood, water, food and land and the unequal access to services (Bohnet and Schmitz-Pranghe, 2019; ibid.). Nevertheless, there is seemingly no adequate strategy to reduce conflict as programs aimed at securing conflict and peace, remain significantly scarce and require substantial investments as part of a strategy to prepare refugees to return home in the future (UNHCRb, 2019: 19-20). In order to address the shortcomings of the overall framework on the issues highlighted above, brokers have started to differentiate the 70%-30% division when implementing projects. The EU started with 70%-30%, but in 2020 they change the division to 50%-50% as *"we need to target both sides, to not spark any conflict"* (Interview 2). However, another stakeholder stated that refugees already need more than the 70 percent they are offered, but if it is divided differently than 70-30, you have a situation where the refugees becomes better off than the original society (Crawford et al., 2019, Interview 3). An interviewed stakeholder from an NGO, who is not directly funded by the framework of the CRRF, thus, somewhat excluded from this framework, argues that building roads should not be part of the thirty percent belonging to the host-community and that other stakeholders involved are not providing the benefit that is supposed to go to the host, as there is too much money spend on staff of organizations. An elder chairman for a local tribe has also implemented initiatives in the local environment to address the shortcomings of the overall framework. As the government is very far away and the refugees are staying with the people here, the host community is doing much more than UNHCR and all other partners (Interview 10). The representative's association becomes a stakeholder and broker, as they are situated in the middle of the refugee/host-community/government perspectives as part of the host community, but still act as brokers and translators within this environment. The association has designed new initiatives to help the refugee management, i.e. a refugee welfare committee and make use of the local council to sort out small conflicts, instead of running to the police or government officials (Ibid.). It is further stated *"Ugandan Government should help the people to help the refugees. The circumstances in Adjumani were not perfect when the influx came as we ourselves have not enough, so we cannot take the load on ourselves, but refugees are our brothers and sisters, it is good to be kind to refugees, cause maybe tomorrow we need help"* (Ibid.).

Furthermore, urban refugees are argued to be largely excluded from the framework of the CRRF, subsequently from any form of safety net or support (Hovil, 2018). There is only one implementing partner, Interaid, who has the responsibility for UNHCR's program that deals with urban refugees. Meanwhile, there are other organizations that represent the significant community protection of these refugees, but they are to a large extend excluded from the formal framework of the CRRF (Betts et al., 2019). One such excluded stakeholder and broker, is the

organisation Refugee Law Project (RLP), who is brokering and translating the needs of urban refugees in relation to the framework. The organisation is dealing with urban refugees and issues of safety in urban areas; however, they are not receiving funds from the partners in the framework but has to seek it elsewhere in the national and international community (Interview 4). Self-settled refugees in Gulu and Kampala are staying somewhat close to their perpetrators and they face big security risks by being situated here, especially for South Sudanese, urban areas are more insecure than settlements as there are still silent killings and abductions of these refugees (Interviewee, 2020). Moreover, the RLP offers guidance on refugees' rights, as they are left with little available options, in regard to getting the services and help that are offered in, but largely restricted to the settlements. Contrary to statements from a regional deputy chief from the OPM, in which he concluded that the framework indeed captures the refugees in urban areas, urban refugees interviewed stated that they would not have any safety net or support if it were not for organizations that operate outside of the CRRF (Interview 15; Interview 16). The interviewed urban refugees stated that no support was given by the UNHCR or any official government. If you wanted to, you could get directed to a place that you can go to get help, but no help is actually given there (Interview 16).

The role of host-communities in the framework is arguably of a two-fold entity, as both brokers and translators work in relation to the refugees but are also partially the target group. Thereby, the host-community holds two different perspectives and potential strategies within the CRRF, as both target and broker (Rossi, 2006). Host-communities are often enrolled by development actors, to strengthen the implementation of the project (ibid.), as evidenced by the statement from an interview part of the host-community *" the relationship between refugee and host used to be worse, it is better now, by design, by change of perception and cooperation"* (Interview 10). However, this also open up for the possibility of the host-community manipulating this connection, by identifying the vulnerabilities of the NGO's and exploit them to their own benefit (Rossi, 2006). That is not to say that the new strategy of implementing a fifty-fifty percent divide between refugee and host-community is a direct consequence of such manipulation, however, the potential is there. Whether by design or default, this type of relationship, thus, effects the refugees involved as they in case this receive twenty percent less of the funds, in a situation where they are already argued to be drained of resources.

5.6 Sub-conclusion

This section of the analysis has explored the role of the brokers and translators, who in various settings, are subcontracted to implement projects and agendas to address the needs of refugees. The duality in which these stakeholders operate, traversing the middle of sender and target, is argued to create circumstances were the loyalty of the stakeholders are put to the test. As INGO's and NNGO's have to satisfy the demands of donors, that might not always fit the needs of refugees, ambiguity arises, in the pursuit of staying relevant. Moreover, to stay relevant and without an official project database, these organizations are argued to engage in turf wars and duplication of work, which consequently decreases the value of a given project, by not pooling their resources and knowledge. Additionally, host-communities also experience this ambiguity and test of loyalty, as they are both part of the target group while also acting as brokers and translators. Consequently, by default or intentionally, the host-community potentially engages in actions that have egoistic perspective, especially relevant in the areas where resources are already scarce. Lastly, the framework is argued to not capture all refugees, as evidenced through the case of urban refugees. While organisations like the RLP are, intentionally or unintentionally, not part of the framework, their actions as brokers and translators in relation to urban refugees, has everything to do with the responsibility of protecting the refugees.

6. The responsibility for the protection of refugees within the CRRF in Uganda

The final chapter of the analysis combines the findings of the first analytical chapter that examined how the CRRF has been implemented on the national level in Uganda as a complex multi-stakeholder approach and through the domestication of international partners, with the findings of the analysis on the role of brokers and translators, as important actors working under the framework, thus exploring how the protection for refugees is practiced in the Ugandan model. The notion of the responsibility for protection, is utilized as an analytical tool that understands protection as a relational practice between the stakeholders, shedding light on how the practice of protection through the framework is related to the work and involvement of different actors. Thus, the analytical concept is placed between the debate of 'legal' protection of refugees' rights and the humanitarian, 'moral' rights discourse, by investigating how protection of refugees rights is coordinated and realized in practice. Thereby, the following

chapter is not solely focusing on the refugees' perspective, but also necessarily includes other stakeholders' perspectives, as protection is also realized through their practice. By doing this, the problems and mechanisms arising from the domestication of an IO in Uganda and the work of brokers and translators that practice the so-called 'dual-face' in their coordination between donors and recipients in the CRRF, is scrutinized through the lenses of protection. The latter is argued to be something that is delivered not just from the organisations or state, but something that refugees at times must seek themselves, as protection depends on the resources, physical location, character of organisations and time and place of arrival.

The combination of the key analytical concepts of domestication, and brokers and translators are consequently connected to the overarching theme and concept of the responsibility for the protection of refugees, considering that one of the main principles of the CRRF is operating under is the sharing of responsibility in refugee affairs globally.

The first part of this chapter scrutinizes how the complexity of the 'whole-of-society' approach in Uganda impacts the protection of refugees, considering mechanisms of responsibility shifting between partners and how refugees are affected by the multitude in partners. Following this, the second part illuminates how the issue of underfunding and a seemingly continuous mismatch between humanitarian and development actors in the current layout of the CRRF is affecting refugees' rights. Furthermore, considering that urban refugees make up a significant share of the overall refugee population (UNHCR, 2019), but are largely ignored under the umbrella of the framework, the question of responsibility for their protection is addressed in the third part. Finally, this chapter concludes with an analysis of the importance of host-communities and their role in the protection of refugees, in order to comprehensively answer the research question of how the international framework of the CRRF is domesticated in Uganda and how the protection of refugees and their rights can be explained through mechanisms of brokerage within this 'whole-of-society' approach.

6.1 The impact of the multi-stakeholder coordination on the micro level

As the first part of the analysis has highlighted, the Ugandan CRRF's 'whole-of-society' approach is implemented through a highly complex multi-stakeholder involvement of over 100 partners, with the number continuing to increase. This complexity of the framework, as shown, is also intensified through the vast responsibility ascribed to the UNHCR and its role as a highly domesticated partner practicing partial surrogacy in a very close relationship to the GoU. The

issue of the UNHCR possessing multiple identities through their domestication and sub-contractors of projects raises the concern of ambivalent loyalties towards the framework. Especially with the local image of the UNHCR being often perceived as almost state-like and sometimes even considered corrupt, it contrasts its international image of a moral entity guiding states to protect the rights of refugees. These ambivalent loyalties, also ascribed to brokers and translators manoeuvring between donors and the refugees (Merry, 2006), arguably have an impact on the refugee's perception of their protection of rights through the framework. Instead of being able to turn to one central authority of responsibility, which the GoU is supposed to fulfil officially, but, as shown, is shared with the UNHCR and other partners involved, refugees are faced with the problem of being uncertain of whom to claim as accountable in a given situation (Interview 13). The CRRF Roadmap states that all government authorities and ministries are expected to be better prepared to take over more leadership in the future (GoU, 2019), thus also more responsibility. The current situation refugees face is one where they have to turn to the authority that is closest to them or is willing to listen to them and address their issues (Interview 13; Interview 14). However, these organisations' loyalty can be ambivalent when aiming to react according to donor and recipient demands simultaneously, thus diminishing refugee's trust in partners actually working for their protection, as pursued by the CRRF. The fact that refugees turn to those organisations that are closest to them, or willing to listen to them and sometimes "pick and choose" between organisations further highlights how their protection is very much depending on where and how refugees are situated. Consequently, the practice of protection very much depends on e.g. organisations locality and refugees' access to organisations, or social bonds between refugees and organisations, which community refugees are members that serves their rights protection (Arendt, 1986). With the UNHCR also occupying surrogate functions in the CRRF, the protection of refugees rights becomes very much matter of the international organisation, "a case of charity" (Arendt, 1986), and it illuminates how rights protection is not solely dependent on state sovereignty, but the responsibility for it has a multitude dimension (Welsh, 2014;Dowd and McAdam, 2017).

The complexity of the framework, is also addressed by various interviewees, working in organisations that could be labelled as brokers and translators. It is stated, that the amount of bureaucracy the contemporary framework requires, is much more complex than it used to be with the involvement of new partners, restricting INGOs and NGOs in their work (Interview 2; Interview 3; Hathaway, 2018: 593-594). As an international partner, organisations constantly have to conduct reports on their process to a wide range of different stakeholders like the OPM, the individual districts as well as the international community. These reports make it difficult

for organisations to comply with all aspects on the individual expectations of the report receivers (Interview 3), exemplifying the ambivalent loyalties brokers have to work under. Furthermore, this issue raises the concern for reports not translating the reality into paper form, but being phrased in terms of pleasing the demands of the individual entities, thus potentially understating the actual plight of refugees or including their needs in the settlement to a degree that would potentially not address refugee's expectations (Interview 4).

As the analysis on the UNHCR's domestication in Uganda has shown, the UNHCR is often the authority closest to refugees, as the government is claimed to be very far from the settlements (Interview 10). However, there have been differing statements on the actual presence of the government in the settlements, by other interviewees stating that each settlement is governed by one OPM commander, as a government representative (Interview 3; Miller, 2017). Consequently, the situation of the central responsible authority within the settlements is arguably inconsistent and blurry, emphasizing again the complexity of the framework and instability in practice, as these circumstances further allow for mechanisms of responsibility shifting where refugees are left with the responsibility to find out who is responsible for their affairs. This highly impacts refugees' protection considering the link between responsibility and the protection of rights outlined by Welsh (2014). However, as the UNHCR domestic presence in the settlements is expressed through local UNHCR offices in each settlement (Interview 3), it is important to note that they are predominantly perceived as the big donor coming in, who overall has good intentions but should be more aware of local surroundings and the culture in the settlements (Ibid.; Interview 10). Consequently, there is a high risk of refugees feeling misunderstood by the organisation, which can not only lead to miscommunication between the two parties, but also to the fact that refugees generally feel less protected and strengthened in their rights (Interview 15). Thus, in order to address the protection for refugees better within the framework, there is a need for all stakeholders, the government, the UNHCR, districts as well as ministries and NNGO's and INGOs to engage more closely (Interview 2), in order to create a stronger referral point for refugees to go to and feel supported by (Montemurro & Wendt, 2017:17-18), and to be able to uniformly practice protection that attempts to overcome its conditionality on national sovereignty, as expressed by Arendt (1986), through international responsibility sharing (Welsh, 2014)

The misalignment of stakeholders and problems of coordination are further expressed through instances where Ugandan citizens have registered as refugees in order to receive the same services as refugees (Interview 3; Interview 4; Interview 7). Consequently, the lack of coordination between stakeholders, with no central authority of responsibility, has created

spaces for people to manoeuvre within the framework and receive the same benefits as intended first and foremost for refugees. The issue with Ugandans registering as refugees, from a refugee-perspective, is that this results not only in some refugees potentially receiving less services, considering the scarcity of services overall, but especially that refugee numbers are artificially rising. This leads to raising donor scepticism in the accuracy of refugee numbers, which will make them potentially drop out of the framework and withdrawing their financial support (as was the case when UNHCR and the GoU were accused of manipulating refugee statistics in July 2015) (Interview 3; Crawford et al., 2019). Consequently, the practice of protection for refugees is also very much situated around how transparent the different stakeholders interact with each other.

Despite the shortcomings on the protection for refugees through the complexity of the framework, however, it should not go without saying that the implementation of the CRRF in Uganda has also led to some improvements for refugees and their plight, considering the fact that the continuation of the Ugandan approach heavily relies on a larger involvement of the international community and their resources. Due to the CRRF, some organisations have extended their work to refugees in Uganda, where according to interviewees, little has been done before the CRRF to actually support refugees (Interviewees; Oliver and Boyle, 2019). While already working in development affairs in Uganda prior to the CRRF, the EU, for instance, has labelled Uganda a priority country due to the vast influx of refugees (Interview 2; Crawford et al., 2019). Consequently, the shift of attention through the CRRF to refugees in Uganda has led to an increased focus on their protection and reintroduced the overall global responsibility in refugee protection, which according to Welsh (2014) is vital in the practice of protection.

Nonetheless, despite some improvements for the overall protection of refugees through the involvement of the international community in the CRRF, the framework is arguably lacking a comprehensive representation of refugee voices (Montemurro & Wendt, 2017:11; Rudolf, 2019: 2019). Even though two refugee leaders are part of the CRRF Steering Group and are represented in the individual settlements' Refugee Welfare Councils (GoU, 2019,), this amounts to a relatively small representation considering the great and diverse refugee population in Uganda from mainly South Sudan, DRC and Burundi (UNHCR, 2019). While the effort of including refugees in the Steering Group should be acknowledged as recognizing them as a key-stakeholder, statements from refugees illustrate how this has not translated into a great feedback-cycle between refugees and the other stakeholders, as "*OPM, UNHCR and other NGOs do not understand what it means to be a refugee (...) the different needs, wants and*

basically an overall understanding of refugees as human beings" (Interview 15). Similar critique is raised by other scholars who express that the various needs of refugees are not addressed in the framework or not given priority to (Bohnet and Schmitz-Pranghe, 2019; Crawford et al., 2019), consequently influencing the overall protection of rights in the framework, as they are limited in options of getting their voices heard and their actions acknowledged by the leading partners UNHCR and GoU, thus not being able to practice their rights (Arendt, 1986). Moreover, as observed when attending a workshop with three refugee leaders of two different settlements present, these gave the impression to be very considerate and careful in addressing issues in the settlements, by continuously thanking the GoU and the UNHCR for their work, taking into account that one OPM officer was also present at the workshop (Observation Gulu, 2020). This observation expresses similar concern about the representativeness of refugee leaders, who according to Montemurro & Wendt, 2017, may not always be democratically elected and represent only a portion of the refugee community, and who are only listened to as long as they state what is in line with the broader political vested interests of the GoU and the international organisations. Consequently, similarly to brokers and translators, refugee leaders also find themselves in the difficult situation of having a double agency attached to their position. By having to represent a large heterogeneous population of refugees living in their settlements, their purpose of using their platform for addressing refugees' needs to the audience of donors, GoU, UNHCR and other partners, may be limited by the intimidation of exactly these actors. Consequently, if the basic needs of refugees are not iterated through refugee leaders and the 'chain of command', the protection of refugees decreases (Easton-Calabria and Omata, 2018).

6.1.1 Corruption

Cases of corruption linked to the UNHCR as a domesticated actor in the CRRF and the organisations' multiple identities illuminate corruption as a restricting factor for the practice of the framework in Uganda, especially considering its intend to function with transparency and under the principle of good governance (GoU, 2018). This argument is furthered by the role of brokers and translators who come into contact with issues of corruption or can also be corrupt themselves. Such aspects are linked to trying to balance needs of donors and recipients and thus, for instance, having to assess whether or not to report corruption to authorities and take it to court, or pay bribes in order to achieve their project's aim without interference from, for instance, the GoU, which has argued to sometimes intimidate organisations voicing critique or

report corruption (Dolan & Hovil, 2006: 11-12; Miller, 2017: 48; Interviewees, 2020). These different loyalties of organisations functioning as brokers, have large impacts on refugees, who are the main target group of instances of corruption in refugee affairs (Interview, 15). If refugees report on corruption, which according to a refugee leader in Northern Uganda should always be reported (Interview 13), and are not taken to the authorities by the brokers that they have addressed the complaints to, the chances of corruption becoming less of an issue are slim and refugees will continue to be restricted in their rights through corrupt mechanisms. The case of the UNHCR and the GoU manipulating refugee numbers in 2015 has decreased donor trust and commitments to refugees in Uganda, consequently impacting the protection of refugees due to limited financial resources. Other instances of corrupt authorities are illustrated through refugees' testimonials, both living within and outside of the settlements, where local officers had to be bribed in order for them to receive their documentation papers (Interview 13; Interview 15; Hayden, 2019). Taking into account that refugees heavily rely on documentation on their refugee status as it determines their access to social services as well as movement outside of settlements (Rudolf, 2019: 219; Interview 9), cases where documentation is depending on bribing local officers show how corruption impacts the protection of refugees, and how in return refugee protection depends largely on stakeholders practicing the principle of good governance. As one interviewee stated, corruption involves mostly local officers in the settlements (Interview 2). Recognising that these local officers are arguably the closest operational individuals to refugees and the first-point of referral for refugees, their corrupt-character will leave refugees in an uncertain situation of mistrust and anxiety about reporting cases of corruption, considering that they will continue to live side-by-side with the alleged corrupt authority. Another outcome of this situation is that refugees have started to make illicit documentation, running the risk of being caught for illegal documentation and get punished (Interview 13; Interview 9). The importance of documentation for refugees further highlights how refugees' protection very much depends on their official status declared officially on paper, where a loss of documents largely decreases them being targeted by stakeholders' protection initiatives, thus highlighting how dependent the membership of a community, as outlined by Arendt (1986), is for the protection of rights, as paper declare the status and membership status.

6.1.2 Duplication of work

The first part of the analysis investigates the complexity of the multi-stakeholder approach and

highlights how the practice of the framework prove difficult in terms of monitoring the individual work of involved partners. Despite the role of the UNHCR and GoU as part of the Steering Group, to monitor the coordination of the framework, the issue of duplication of the work among partners is ever present in Uganda, as articulated by various stakeholders and interviewees (Interview 2; Interview 4; Interview 11; Interview 14; Crawford et al., 2019; Huang et al., 2018). This is further highlighted in the work of brokers and translators, who are often competing for the same funds and thus phrase their projects in ways that attract most funding (Merry, 2006), while not necessarily implementing projects that strictly follow the needed support articulated through the priority outcomes in the RRP 2019-2020 and in the individual sector plans of the GoU. Accordingly, the practice of a shared responsibility with clearly delegated tasks and projects addressing individual needs for refugees and host communities is limited through instances of project duplication. A clear database monitoring all partners work is missing to overcome this problem (Interview 4; Interview 2). As the permission of a project is to a large degree dependent on the approval from the GoU, but also the UNHCR, their responsibility in delegating projects to brokers, in a timely and more effectively manner, is called into question. As ever more partners are involved in the CRRF, the risk of a rise in duplication of work remains. This duplication has also been exemplified by instances where refugees fluctuate between organisations in order to receive services, with these organisations being unaware of the 'double' provision. Consequently, on the one hand, the duplication of work could result in refugees having access to more services, which in times of underfunding could be profitable from a refugee perspective. On the other hand, it illustrates an uncertain delegation of responsibility within the framework which creates the possibility of responsibility-shifting between organisations. The problem that many projects duplicate the work of other international and national actors results in not all issues being addressed equally, as some projects simply would receive less funding or would risk not being approved by the UNHCR and the GoU. Consequently, refugees are unable to a) have all their needs fulfilled and rights protected but also b) not being able to hold anyone accountable for the lacking of more needs-based projects, considering the amount of stakeholders involved, whose work is backed-by the approval of UNHCR and GoU, who in return can blame each other equally for the missing protection of refugees due to their close relationship and power position. Thus, the problem of duplication of work illuminates how the protection of refugees is influenced by and situated in the middle of the struggle for funds and approval, and stakeholder's coordination of projects between each other. .

6.2 The effects of funding issues and the humanitarian-development divide

Highlighted in the first two chapters of the analysis, the CRRF continues to be largely underfunded. The importance of the international community in terms of their provision of financial resources, and the high influence of the UNHCR as the main delegator and recipient of funds in the Ugandan model in the first part, as well as the issue of development brokers competing for these funds showed how determinant funding is for the outcome of the framework. Most importantly, however, as the main target group of the CRRF refugees are especially affected by the lack of financial resources, as their protection depends on the financial feasibility of projects. The priority outcomes outlined in the RRP 2019-2020 (UNHCR, 2019) serve as a guideline for partners to prioritize their funds in times of under-funding accordingly. The first priority being the overall protection of refugees and the second priority being emergency response, these focus on humanitarian projects addressing the most basic needs for refugees (ibid.). With the remaining four priority outcomes of education, environment and livelihoods, with a focus more on development actors, the scarce financial resources available in the framework can first and foremost only be used for humanitarian projects, despite the frameworks overall aim of making refugees self-reliant (GoU, 2018; GoU, 2019; UNHCR, 2019). As the humanitarian-development divide is supposed to be addressed through the CRRF by a cooperation between humanitarian and development actors, this divide can thus only be bridged partially. However, considering the CRRF has been phrased in a development-narrative, various humanitarian donors and partners have dropped out of the framework and shifted their attention to 'more pressing' or another humanitarian crisis. This occurs despite the refugee situation in Uganda continuing to remain first and foremost a humanitarian crisis instead of a development project, not meaning that development initiatives are needless (Interview 3; Crawford et al., 2019). The predictability of funding thus is argued to be one of the main issues within the CRRF, and with an continuous prioritisation of humanitarian projects that operate on short budgets and timeframes (Schlitz et al., 2018: 41; Interview 2), refugees face the situation where their development needs, as part of their social and economic rights, are not addressed sufficiently and they continue to run the risk of being a case for charity (Arendt, 1986).

As the burden and responsibility sharing principle in the CRRF is first and foremost practiced through the international communities' financial support, but also through their provision of information and knowledge in refugee projects as well as social services, the impact of weak

funding commitments of the international community on the micro level is noticed in various areas. While one of the main aims of the Ugandan model is for refugees to become self-reliant, it has been shown that by December 2018, over 90% of refugees have still been dependent on food assistance from partners (UNHCR, 2019). Considering that the services are dependent on available funds, the quality of services is lower in contemporary times of underfunding, affecting the protection of refugees' rights. While interviewed refugee leaders, all stated that the services they are provided with are generally good and helpful, they have raised various concerns about the provision of services (Interview 12; Interview 13; Interview 14; Betts et al., 2019). The distribution of food, for instance, is argued to be too far away, and taking into account that each refugee receives only a limited amount of food items, one already is forced to sell some of them in order to pay for transport to the distribution and back to the settlement (Interview 13). Furthermore, as scholars have pointed out, the provision of food items, which are the same for each refugee, and their exchange for other items on the market results in markets being 'flood' by the same products, while important other food items to balance their diet are missing (Interview 14; Kaiser, 2016: 226) Additionally, malnutrition is argued to still be an issue in the settlement, according to the representative of a national organisation (Interview 4), showing how the provision of food assistance does not reach all equally or is generally lacking (UNHCR, 2018) leading to a situation where refugees are without, or in short supply, of one of the key mechanisms for protection, the access to food.

Furthermore, social services, such as education and health facilities, are described as insufficient and are exhausted due the large number of people requiring assistance, as refugees and host communities share the same social services (Betts et al., 2019:5). Especially the issue of limited education opportunities is raised by stakeholders (Kreibaum, 2016; UNHCR, 2019; Interview 12; Interview 11). While primary education is a mandate that the GoU has to fulfil, secondary education is not mandatory to be given to refugees, according to an OPM official (Interview 1). However, many refugees are complaining that their education stops at primary level and they have almost no opportunity to develop their educational paths when living in Uganda, where especially adult education is argued to be "*standing still*" (Interview 14; Schlitz et al., 2019: 45).

The limitations funding consequently has on the availability of services influences the practice of the responsibility of protection for refugees, as the access to health care, education and food is considered vital for the realization of the protection of refugees' rights (GoU, 2019; Dowd and McAdam, 2019). Even though the provision is de-facto practiced, the quality of services is heavily impacting the life of refugees. Especially the limited access to education signifies how

the future of refugees is predetermined at an early age by denying access to secondary and university education. However, education is considered a key factor in the path to self-reliance and for refugees' contribution to their host-communities (Interview 15; Betts et al., 2019). As one refugee stated, the issue of education can be explained through the lacking effort of the OPM to improve education for refugees (Interview 13), thus declaring the GoU as the responsible entity for providing quality education and reinforcing the narrative of the responsibility for rights protection depending on the state (Arendt, 1986). However, as the OPM official at a workshop stated, secondary education is not mandatory for the government to fulfil (Interview 1), shifting the responsibility away from the Government. Stating in the CRRF roadmap, the Government argued that once the plan is fully funded, the access to quality education for refugees and Ugandans alike can be realized (GoU, 2019), thus indirect emphasizing on the responsibility of the international community for improving the education services.

As development actors are especially supposed to increase employment opportunities for refugees in the areas their residing, but considering their limited engagement through limited financial resources, the role of employment further impacts the realization of refugees' rights protection, especially their social and economic rights (Jacobsen, 2002). Despite ambitions to hire refugees, various representatives of the refugee population have stated that their access to the job market is largely limited (Interview 14; Interview 15; 2017; Betts et al.,2019) While being able to sell their food items on local markets in some instances, or start their own business in the settlement (Interview 14) jobs in and around the settlements are argued to be for Ugandans first (ibid.; Interview 1). The engagement of the private sector in the CRRF, which has often been described as the key driver for bringing development to the settlement, have so far not created the desired effect (Montemurro and Wendt, 2017: 15) This might also be the result of ambivalent loyalties ascribed to all partners working within the framework, which are especially present in the working of the private sector, which arguably is not operating first and foremost for the improvement of the protection of refugees but following mostly commercial and business narratives of self-interest behaviour (ibid.). Consequently, the issue of stakeholders within the 'whole-of-society' approach implementing their work under varying and differing objectives and agendas, risks not only the successfulness of the CRRF, but is inherently impacting the protection of refugees and their rights, considering that their access to the job market is limited and the obstacle of employers prioritization Ugandan citizens.

Through a continuous dependence on humanitarian assistance, limited access to social services as well as the latter's poor quality, and the limited opportunities of employment, refugees are significantly hindered on becoming sufficiently self-reliant. Despite the focus of moving from humanitarian emergency assistance towards development initiatives, strengthening the possibility for refugees to becomes self-reliant cannot be considered a short-term project and requires years of focus (Interview 3, McAdam and Dowd, 2019; Kreibaum, 2016). The opportunities for refugees to at least enhance their situation seem highly limited in times of immense underfunding and ambivalent strategies and agendas practiced by international and national partners involved in the framework. As one refugee living outside of the settlements has stated "*You cannot move from humanitarian subsistence to development without having some kind of access to capital (...) microfinance*" (Interview 15). Consequently, economic opportunities are lacking for refugees, where banks are not providing loans to refugees even though these might have a higher income than otherwise officially required for the loan, making many refugees feel like a burden to some extent, as their skills are being ignored by the job market and they are unable to show their full potential in their new communities (ibid.). However, one of the organisations we have interviewed in Gulu and Kampala, the RLP, realized the potential of hiring refugee and encourages other organisations to do the same (Interview 4; Interview 5). Especially refugees' skills as interpreters in the work of organisations with other refugees are considered highly important, which is why interpreters hired by RLP are now usually all from a refugee-background that speak the same languages as the organisation's target groups, and are also able to relate to the experiences of refugees, aiming to avoid misunderstandings between 'clients' and the organisations (ibid.). The RLP's role as a broker between donors and refugees as the target group thus shows how the role of brokers can lead to the improvement of refugee's protection, by not only protecting refugees through their work as an organisation dealing with refugees' rights abuses, but actively hiring refugee in their staff and also encouraging other organisation to do so.

The issue of funding can be linked to what is argued to be an essential part of protecting the rights of refugees (Dowd and McAdam, 2019). Responsibility for, and protection of, refugees is not only dependant on funds, but is very much contingent on physical protection as well (ibid.) and *"States—especially developed ones—seem much more willing to provide financial assistance than to accept refugees into their territories"* (ibid.:892). Consequently, in light of the CRRF in Uganda being underfunded and in connection to the statement above, the protection of refugee is arguably jeopardized through more than one front. Thus, it is linked to the broader debate of responsibility and protection of refugees, and situated in the state

sovereignty - human rights debate, addressed by Gammeltoft-Hansen and Tan (2017) and Blake (2001), as meeting the 'demands' of international donors in relation to only fund the CRRF, arguably reduces the protection of refugees (Easton-Calabria and Omata, 2018).

6.3 Protection for urban refugees?

As the last priority outcome of the RRP, urban refugees are the last target of international resources and support from partners (UNHCR, 2019). While on paper, refugees in Uganda are allowed to move freely, the provision of services is limited to the settlements (Kreibaum, 2016; Hovil, 2018; Bohnet & Schmitz-Pranghe, 2019: 5; GoU, 2018; UNHCR, 2019). Furthermore, the freedom of movement of refugees has also been argued to be limited due to the fact that refugees in settlements require permission to leave the settlements and that authorities quickly becomes suspicious when refugees ask for permission to leave the settlements, with their movement being tracked through the permission (Interview 12; Interview 4; Hovil, 2018). Consequently, as the provision of services for refugees is limited to settlements only, UNHCR and GoU have been critiqued for redefining what a 'true' refugee is, namely people living in settlements with access to services, thus neglecting the protection status of the ever growing refugee population residing in urban areas (Hovil et al., 2005 ; Miller, 2017: 140). This has vast impacts on the protection of refugees living in urban areas, as refugees' protection is de-facto connected to their residence in settlements, making their rights conditional (Arendt 1986). Despite the lacking aid provisions and official protection through the partners of the CRRF, many refugees have been able to improve their livelihoods through their self-settlement and are often more self-reliant than refugees living in Ugandan settlements (Hovil, 2007). One of the key reasons for this is that urban refugees often settle in areas with pre-existing social networks and support systems, where upon arrival financial support is provided by other urban refugees, or through remittances by other members of their social network (Interview 15; Interview 16; Bohnet & Schmitz-Pranghe, 2019: 5). Therefore, the protection of refugees in urban areas stems heavily from the refugees own connections and not from international nor national organisations, the private sector or other partners working under the CRRF in Uganda. Consequently, despite the success of various self-settled refugees in urban areas in terms of economic opportunities and independence from humanitarian assistance, this opportunity is often only realizable for those that can fall back on available resources provided within their communities.

The question of responsibility for protecting refugees living in urban areas remains largely unanswered in the CRRF, especially since not all of these individuals are financially stable and self-reliant but continue to lack access to services such as education and health facilities (Bohnet & Schmitz-Pranghe, 2019:5). It is not only the GoU that has failed to address the protection of urban refugees, until now. The UNHCR, who is supposed to influence states on their improvement towards their protection refugees, has not managed to substantially extend its provision of services and protection to urban areas. Therefore, the case of urban refugees in Uganda highlights some of the shortcomings in the framework's emphasis and practices of protection of refugees' rights and sharing of responsibility. While only one implementing partner, Interaid, has responsibility for UNHCR's urban programme, which is however limited to Kampala only, national organisations like the RLP, take over the role of the responsible entity for protecting refugees, by not only hiring urban refugees, but also by legally advising them and creating 'safe spaces' where urban refugees can seek protection and assistance (Interview 5). Consequently, the RLP highlights an important broker carrying out work with the principle of refugee protection, without being one of the implementing partners of the CRRF (Interview 4).

6.4 The role of host communities within the framework

The CRRF in Uganda does not only aim for refugees to become self-reliant, but also to create resilient host-communities, which is why the framework includes the engagement of host-communities and districts hosting the largest share of refugees. While host-communities are represented through five seats in the CRRF Steering Group, local districts are represented only through the Ministry of Local government (GoU, 2019). Even though this expresses the urgency of including the consultation of host-communities and local districts in negotiations and implementations of CRRF-led projects, critics have pointed out that the role of the host community is understated and not supported enough within the framework (Montemurro and Wendt, 2017:11-12). As the second chapter of the analysis has highlighted, host communities have a two-folded role in the Ugandan model, as both brokers and translators in their relation to refugees, but also as a target group, as CRRF projects are supposed to channel 30% of their funding towards host communities (UNHCR, 2018: 14). Recognising the critiques and needs of host-communities to receive more shares of the resources (Dryden-Peterson and Hovil, 2004), some partners have started to channel 50% of funding to host-communities, thus aiming to address refugees and host-communities equally (Interview 10; Interview 2). Even though it

could be argued that this redistribution of funding has a negative impact on the protection of refugees, as they are 'losing' 20% of resources, it can be argued that refugees also benefit from the increased support for host-communities. Humanitarian and development actors supporting and strengthening host-communities' resilience could improve the overall development of the districts for refugees and host-communities alike. However, this largely depends on the type of projects implemented and whether it is viewed as a humanitarian or development situation. If the needs of host communities are services, i.e. access to food and water just to get through the day, projects that deal with long term development arguably do not meet the current needs of refugees and host-communities and the same can be argued if humanitarian projects are implemented where the needs are more long term development. Furthermore, despite the relationship between refugees and host-communities described as generally 'good', 'close', or as *"brothers and sisters"* (Interview 10; Interview 14), cases of rivalries and conflicts between both parties continue to occur (Interview 4; Interview 10; Hovil, 2016; Kreibaum, 2016). Some of these conflicts stem from the fact that host-communities experience refugees being prioritised by national and IO's, also expressed by Ugandan citizens registering as refugees (Hovil, 2007; Interview 2; Interview 10). By aiming to equally support refugees-and host communities these conflicts could be reduced, thus maintaining a peaceful co-existence which is vital for the protection of refugees, considering that they predominantly have fled from violence and conflicts in their home countries and require security and protection.

The role of host-communities in the protection of refugees is vital to examine, as the successfulness and implementation of the whole framework relies heavily on host communities and districts to welcome refugees in their community (Hovil, 2018). Various interviewees have stated that it lies in the nature of Ugandans to welcome refugees and be generous and kind to them, not lastly due to many Ugandans once having been refugees themselves (Interview 1; Interview 10). Most often host-communities constitute the first actor that gives food and land to refugees upon arrival, when international and national partners in the settlements are still occupied with administering the arrival of refugees (Interview 10). Districts have further argued, that due to their important and first hand role in receiving refugees, they would prefer less interference from the government and also have a greater say in the refugee response, as their role is vital but not recognised accordingly, considering the low representation of host-communities' districts in the CRRF Steering Group (Haldorsen et al., 2017; Interview 3). Even though the CRRF, and prior Ugandan refugee policies, have emphasized on the provision of land to refugees for them to be able to engage in subsistence farming, the fact that this land originally belonged to members of the host community is often not stated (Interview 10).

Therefore, by giving up a piece of their own land, in times where fertile land is already scarce and land conflicts, especially in Northern Uganda, continue (Kreibaum, 2016), host-communities provide a key building block on the way to refugees' pursuit of self-reliance. Their role of responsibility in the protection of refugees is thus critical, as the layout of the CRRF depends to a large extent on the host-communities integration of refugees into their community. This is further expressed by a host community member who states that the government is very far, and the refugees are first and foremost staying with the people 'here', where host communities are doing much more than UNHCR and other partners (Interview 10). Following Arendt (1986), this integration and membership to a certain community is key in protecting refugees' rights, even though in this case membership is expressed mostly through tight and close relationships between both parties and not through citizenship. It highlights, how the realization of protection is very much dependent on the practice of host-communities and their active integration of refugees.

Recognising the role of host communities in the CRRF, the framework's top-down character is critiqued by various scholars and interviewees (Hovil, 2019:12; Interview 2; Interview 10). This top-down approach is critiqued indirectly by a host-community member who stated that it was especially local initiatives from a host-community, thus bottom-up initiative, that has positively brought change to the settlements, exemplified through the creation of the refugee welfare committee, but also through their everyday life with refugees where the latter are heavily integrated into the local communities (Interview 10). These bottom-up initiatives are vital for the successfulness of the CRRF and should be practiced more within the framework, as the representative of an IO in Kampala stated. One of the reasons for this is that an approach better integrating districts in the negotiation and implementation might also lead to a more effective management of resources to the individual districts, as not all districts have the same needs and conditions. This might also better circumvent the issue of underfunding and weak funding commitments by the international community, by hiring more local staff and operate the CRRF through more cost-effective national systems instead of through *"expensive UNHCR and INGO-led"* (Crawford et al., 2019: 11) systems. This could ultimately lead to a decrease in the surrogate tendencies of the UNHCR in Uganda. Thus, it would reinforce the perception of one central authority of responsibility for the protection of refugees, namely the GoU, with all other partners, nationally and internationally practicing shared responsibility through cooperation and partnership (Welsh, 2014).

7. Conclusion

The multi-stakeholder engagement within the CRRF in Uganda has been explored through the concepts of domestication, brokers and translators and responsibility, in order to illuminate how the current international focus on responsibility-sharing, self-reliance and resilience, translates to the practice of protecting refugees' rights.

In the first part, the complexity of the national adaptation of the framework, with its 'whole-of-society' approach, has been exemplified through the concept of domestication, which highlighted the differing roles the UNHCR and GoU take on in carrying out the framework. As key-stakeholders facilitating and governing the CRRF, the application of the concept of domestication presented how the relationship between the UNHCR and the government can be considered a dual-partnership, that causes cases of responsibility shifting between both partners. This is especially catalysed by the differing roles the UNHCR exhibits in Uganda and internationally. While their international role is one of a 'moral-mentor', guiding states to improve their strategies on refugee protection, their role in Uganda is argued to have tendencies of surrogacy, by practicing and becoming responsible for functions normally falling under the responsibility of the government. Consequently, the dual role of the UNHCR, as both being in charge of distributing funds but also an immense local presence and authority within the settlements, next to the government who is officially in charge of the framework, creates uncertainties for stakeholders involved, especially refugees, of who is actually responsible due to a lack of a clear central authority.

The roles of, UNHCR and Government sub-contracted INGOs and NGOs stakeholders, which operate between the UNHCR, Government and the recipients, have been analysed in the second part, by applying the concept of brokerage and translation to the role of these actors. The findings further highlighted the issues arising from the lack of a clear coordinating central authority for the work of brokers and translators. The circumstances under which these organisations operate, are argued to have a problematic duality. Traversing this duality, the organisations are reliant on donor funds and government approval of projects, but also need to implement projects which suit the sometimes different demands of both the of the UNHCR, Government and but also the recipients, especially relevant as donors are more willing to follow the development perspective of the CRRF, in what is argued to primarily be a humanitarian situation. This issue, together with the large involvement of over 100 stakeholders in the CRRF, has created circumstances where INGOs and NNGOs are competing over funds, leading to the issue of duplication of work and turf-wars. The latter has argued to be especially an effect of the involvement of both humanitarian and development actors, who have different agendas and

objectives. Furthermore, the findings of the second analysis chapter show how the inclusion of host-communities enshrined in the CRRF, and their role as both brokers but also recipients, can lead to the potential of them manipulating the framework for their own benefit, by default or intentionally.

The findings of the final analysis chapter put the problems discovered in part one and two, into perspective, by connecting the discovered practices to the protection of refugees. The key findings highlight how the dual-face of the UNHCR has caused mechanisms that enables the shifting of responsibility in the dual-partnership with the Government, as well as with the double-agent character of other stakeholders acting as brokers and translators. Additionally, the complexity of the 'whole-of-society', which has translated into coordination issues with duplication of projects and potential turf wars, hinders a comprehensive protection of refugees. A lack of central coordination of projects and responsibility for the overall framework, at both the macro level of the UNHCR/Government and the micro level of NGO's is argued to leave the diversity of refugees' needs unaddressed, as projects first and foremost have to meet donor demands, in times of competition for the scarce financial resources. Furthermore, the dual face of the UNHCR and its tendency to operate as a surrogacy, largely impacts refugees' protection as refugees are put in a situation where UNHCR is in charge of practices normally carried out by the state, but with no official authority. With the practices in the hands of the UNHCR, but official authority with the government, there is a large potential risk that no central authority takes over the responsibility for refugees' protection and paves the way for each part to defer the responsibility. This reduces refugees' trust in their cooperation with all stakeholders involved, also due to main actors abusing their power position illustrated through corruption, instances of duplication of work where donor and organisational demands are prioritised, and the quality of services provided, influenced by a general lack of funds.

A critical perspective, generally missing in the CRRF in Uganda, is the lack of responsibility and protection for urban refugees. Thus, by not receiving much support from the UNHCR nor Government or funded stakeholders, these refugees' protection is first and foremost guaranteed through their own social networks and national organisations working outside of the framework, despite the argued superior self-reliance and resilience of these individuals. The role of national brokers protecting refugees, but especially the underestimated responsibility of host-communities and districts taken over in the protection of refugees have further highlighted how the top-town character of the CRRF might benefit from including more bottom-up initiatives. This would arguably improve the overall protection of refugees, as strengthening the resilience, self-reliance and responsibility of host-communities and districts, have the

potential to also lead to refugee empowerment, as the host-communities and districts are often the first responders and where the majority of the refugees reside.

Consequently, as this research is focused on the Ugandan adaptation of an internationally negotiated framework that is supposed to guide future global refugee responses under the principle of responsibility sharing, self-reliance and resilience, the lessons-learned from the Ugandan model in this research speak to a broader global audience. With Uganda being one of the first pilot countries and being labelled as "proof-for-concept" due to its prior progressiveness in refugee management, exploring the practices and outcomes in this country-specific setting, is relevant for implementing similar frameworks elsewhere. In the light of the continuous increase in mass displacement, with the average time of people's displacement increasing as well, refugee responses supported by the international community become more important than ever. Despite the importance of the international community, the examination of the Ugandan model illustrates how refugee responses require an attention shift to bottom-up approaches, that realize the relevance of the agency of refugees and host communities, by including them as co-implementers and negotiators of national and international refugee policies. This is not to state that international actors and national actors, including the government, are irrelevant, as they provide necessary resources and knowledge, however as the Ugandan case showed, the ambivalent loyalties and dual-face these actors obtain in their work in Uganda can lead to a focus on satisfying donor expectations, that might differ from the expectations and needs of the very individuals that these frameworks target. Furthermore, it is not argued that the organisations or other stakeholders that act as brokers and translators within the framework have to be national actors, as there is arguably a need for the expertise and knowledge that these actors bring. However, there needs to be an alignment of actors that are part of the humanitarian-development nexus. As it is also illustrated by the research of this thesis, humanitarian and development actors have different agendas and objectives, which in turn, problematizes progress in refugee protection and responsibility. The aim of the CRRF to harmonize humanitarian and development actors' work, can prove to be difficult considering the need for them to act simultaneously and determine the point in time where humanitarian aid should shift to development aid, especially when the situation varies locally and may not be linear, if a clear structure of aligning these actors is not in place.

Lastly, this research addresses the broader relevance of practicing responsibility globally, by highlighting that the protection of human rights should not be discussed solely in national terms or in terms of state sovereignty vs. human rights. The initiating and implementation of the CRRF has been argued to be situated in the middle of this debate and tries to overcome the

shortcomings of either perspective. However, the argument of Uganda exploiting this framework to gain international recognition and aid, has also been argued by various scholars. In order to address these accusations, in Uganda and in future countries of implementation, there needs to more responsibility taken by the international community and in implementing countries to avoid the *"hypocrisy of the international community supporting the CRRF but have no willingness to adapt it at home"* (interviewee).

Whereas the research conducted in this thesis is positioned within a country specific setting, there is a broader debate in the current international refugee climate, where the relevance of brokerage, domestication, and responsibility could prove profitable. With the CRRF in Uganda accused of being negotiated and implemented as primarily a top-down approach (Hathaway, 2018; Rudolf, 2019), the role of IO's like the UNHCR, within the international community, and their role as both implementer and link between different partners, may consequently muddle the initiatives that are undertaken. The role of IO's with dual perspectives and roles therefore effect the argument that donors and international community are apparently ready to finally support refugee frameworks that enable the self-reliance of refugees (Oliver and Boyd, 2019). In a recent blogpost in "African Arguments", Hovil and Capici (2020) touch on some the perspectives discussed throughout this thesis, from both international and national actors that are part of the framework in relation to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. The perspectives illustrate the shortcomings of the framework in a broader international context. Whether these shortcomings illustrate refugees' need for aid, thereby opening the door to the humanitarian-development nexus, the role of the government in relation to protecting refugees in both urban areas and settlements or the responsibility-sharing of the international community, or lack of, in relation to third-country solutions and the need of funds, they have consequences for the refugees involved. Consequently, the role of the brokers, translators and international community and their responsibility towards refugees on a global level, could be relevant to explore. Especially relevant, considering the international community's global focus on providing refugees with agency, through self-reliance and responsibility-sharing, and the many humanitarian crises currently ongoing.

8. Bibliography

Arendt, H., 1986. *The Origins Of Totalitarianism*. London: Andre Deutsch.

Badescu, C. and Weiss, T., 2010. Misrepresenting R2P and Advancing Norms: An Alternative Spiral?. *International Studies Perspectives*, 11(4), pp.354-374.

Bernard, H., 1994. *Research Methods In Anthropology*. 2nd ed. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Betts, A., Bloom, L., & Omata, N., 2012. *Humanitarian Innovation and Refugee Protection*. Refugee Studies Centre Working Paper Series No. 85

Betts, A., Chaara, I., Omata, N., & Sterck, O., 2019. *Refugee Economies in Uganda: What Difference Does the Self-Reliance Model Make?*. Refugee Studies Centre.

Bierschenk, T., J.P. Chaveau, & J.P. Olivier de Sardan., 2002. *Local development brokers in Africa: The rise of a new social category*. (Working Paper 13).

Blake, M., 2001. Distributive Justice, State Coercion, and Autonomy. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 30(3), pp.257-296.

Bohnet, H., & Schmitz-Pranghe, C., 2019. *Uganda: a role model for refugee integration?* (BICC Working Paper, 2/2019). Bonn: Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC).

Clements, K.T., Shoffner, T., and Zamore, L., 2016. "Uganda's Approach to Refugee Self Reliance," *FMReview 52* (May): 49-51

Crawford, N., O'Callaghan, S., Holloway, K. and Lowe, C., 2019. *The Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework Progress In Uganda*. [online] Humanitarian Policy Group/Overseas Development Institute. Available at: <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12937.pdf> [Accessed 2 January 2020].

Creswell, J., 2009. Writing strategies and ethical consideration. In: J. W. Creswell, ed., *Research design, qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications: 73-94.

Crisp, J. and Long, K., 2016. Safe and Voluntary Refugee Repatriation: From Principle to Practice. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, 4(3), pp.141-147.

Crisp, J. and Slaughter, A., 2009. *A Surrogate State? The Role Of UNHCR In Protracted Refugee Situations*. Switzerland: The UN Refugee Agency Policy Development and Evaluation Service.

Cunliffe, P., 2010. Dangerous duties: power, paternalism and the 'responsibility to protect'. *Review of International Studies*, 36(S1), pp.79-96..

Degnan, C. and Kattakuzhy, A., 2019. *Money Talks: Assessing Funding Flows To Local And National Actors In Uganda*. Development Initiatives and Oxfam.

deMunck, V. and Sobo, E., 1998. *Using Methods In The Field: A Practical Introduction And Casebook*. Walnut Creek, Calif: Altamira.

Dolan, C. and Hovil, L., 2006. *Humanitarian Protection In Uganda: A Trojan Horse?*. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Dowd, R. and McAdam, J., 2017. International Cooperation and Responsibility-sharing to protect refugees: What, Why and How?. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 66(4), pp.863-892.

Dryden-Peterson S, Hovil L. 2004. A remaining hope for durable solutions: local integration of refugees and their hosts in the case of Uganda. Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees 22:26–38.

Eriksen, T., 2001. *Small places, large issues*. 2nd ed. London: Pluto Press.

Ethics Blog., 2012. Ethics Blog » Full Text of the 2012 Ethics Statement. (online) Available at: http://ethics.americananthro.org/category/statement/ (Accessed 21 Aug. 2019).

Faist, T., 2008. Migrants as transnational development agents: an inquiry into the newest round of the migration–development nexus. *Population, Space and Place*, 14(1): 21-42.

Forichon, K. (2018). *Financing refugee hosting contexts: an analysis of the DAC's contribution to burden-and responsibility-sharing in supporting refugees and their host communities*. OECD Development Co-operation Working Papers, No. 48. Paris: OECD

Gammeltoft-Hansen, T. and Tan, N., 2017. The End of the Deterrence Paradigm? Future Directions for Global Refugee Policy. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, 5(1), p.28.

Gammeltoft-Hansen, T., 2018. The Normative Impact of the Global Compact on Refugees. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 30(4), pp.605-610.

GoU (2018) *Road map for the implementation of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework in Uganda, 2018-2020.* Kampala: Government of Uganda

GoU (2019) *Revised CRRF road map.* Kampala: Government of Uganda

Haldorsen, J., Javed, R. and Thomas, M., 2017. *Putting The CRRF Into Practice General Issues And Specific Considerations In Tanzania And Uganda*. Plan International.

Hayden, S., 2019. Asylum for sale: Whistleblowers say U.N. refugee agency does not always address corruption. *NBC*, [online] Available at: <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/asylum-sale-whistleblowers-say-u-n-refugee-agency-does-not-n988391> [Accessed 5 March 2020].

Hovil, L, Kaiser; and Lomo. Z., 2005. "*We Are All Stranded Here Together: The Local Settlement System, Freedom of Movement, and Livelihood Opportunities in Arua and Moyo Districts,*" Refugee Law Project Working Paper No. 14, 2005, p. 22. Available from www.refugeelawproject.org/working_papers/RLP.WP14.pdf.

Hovil, L. (2007). Self-settled Refugees in Uganda: An Alternative Approach to Displacement?. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(4): 599-620.

Hovil, L. (2016). *Refugees, Conflict and the Search for Belonging*. Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland.

Hovil, L. and Capici, V., 2020. Neglected refugees find themselves even more neglected during COVID-19. [Blog] *African Arguments*, Available at: <https://africanarguments.org/2020/05/12/neglected-refugees-find-themselves-even-more-neglected-during-covid-19/> [Accessed 18 May 2020].

Hovil, L. and Okello, M., 2008. *Only Peace Can Restore The Confidence Of The Displaced*. [online] Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre & Refugee Law Project. Available at: <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/35090DBE5D00EAC98525721000649188-idmc-uga-31oct.pdf> [Accessed 22 April 2020].

Hovil, L., 2018. *Uganda's Refugee Policies: The History, The Politics, The Way Forward*. International Refugee Rights Initiative.

Huang, C., Charles, S., Post, L. and Gough, K., 2018. *Tackling the realities of protracted displacement: case studies on what's working and where we can do better*. Center for Global Development/International Rescue Commitee. Available at: https://www.cgdev.org/publication/tackling-realities-protracted-displacement-case-studies-whats-working

Hurwitz, A., 2009. *The Collective Responsibility Of States To Protect Refugees*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ilcan S, Rygiel K. 2015. "Resiliency humanitarianism": responsibilizing refugees through humanitarian emergency governance in the camp. International Political Sociology 9: 333–351. https://doi.org/10. 1111/ips.12101.

Jacobsen, K., 2002. Can refugees benefit the state? Refugee resources and African statebuilding. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 40(04).

Kaiser, T., 2016. 'Moving up and down looking for money': Making a living in a Ugandan Refugee Camp. In *Livelihoods at the Margins*: 215-236. Routledge.

Kawulich, B., 2005. Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research Sozialforschung*, Volume 6(No. 2, Art. 43).

Khan, F. and Sackeyfio, C., 2018. What Promise Does the Global Compact on Refugees Hold for African Refugees?. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 30(4), pp.696-698.

Kreibaum, M., 2016. Their Suffering, Our Burden? How Congolese Refugees Affect the Ugandan Population. *World Development*, 78: 262-287.

Kvale, S., 2007. *Doing Interviews*. Sage Publications.

Latham, R. , 2001. "Identifying the Contours of Transboundary Political Life," in Intervention and Transnationalism in Africa: Global-Local Networks of Power , ed. Thomas Callaghy, Ronald Kassimir and Robert Latham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 89.

Latour, B. 2000. When things strike back: A possible contribution of science studies. British Journal of Sociology 5(1):105–123.

M. Dewalt, K., R. Dewalt, B. and B. Wayland, C., 1998. Participant Observation. In: H. Russell Bernard and C. C. Gravlee, ed., *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*, 1st ed. Lanham, MD: Atlamira Press: 259-300.

Mackenzie, C., McDowell, C. and Pittaway, E., 2007. Beyond 'Do No Harm': The Challenge of Constructing Ethical Relationships in Refugee Research. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(2): 299-319.

McAdam, J., 2007. *Complementary Protection In International Refugee Law*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Merry, S., 2006. Transnational Human Rights and Local Activism: Mapping the Middle. *American Anthropologist*, 108(1), pp.38-51.

Miller, S., 2017. *UNHCR As A Surrogate State*. Routledge.

Montemurro, M. and Wendt, K., 2017. *Whose Responsibility? Accountability For Refugee Protection And Solutions In A Whole-Of-Society Approach*. [online] Geneva: Danish Refugee Council for HERE-Geneva. Available at: <https://drc.ngo/media/4267546/whose_reponsibility-accountability-in-wosa_drc_feb2018.pdf> [Accessed 8 February 2020].

Moreno-Lax, V., & Lemberg-Pedersen, M., 2019. Border-induced displacement: The ethical and legal implications of distance-creation through externalization. *Questions of International Law*, *56*, 5–33

Mosse, D. and Lewis, D., 2006. *Development Brokers And Translators: The Ethnography Of Aid And Agencies*. Kumarian Press.

Mosse, D., 2005. Global Governance and The Ethnography of International Aid. In: D. Mosse and D. Lewis, ed., *The Aid Effect : Giving and Governing in International Development*. London: Pluto Press.

Ndonga Githinji, E. and Wood, T., 2018. Prospects for the Global Compacts in Africa: Combining International Solidarity with Home-Grown Solutions. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 30(4), pp.699-703.

Oliver, M. and Boyle, P., 2019. In and Beyond the Camp: The Rise of Resilience in Refugee Governance. *Oñati Socio-legal Series*.

OPM, 2020. *Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework Uganda*. [online] Office of the Prime Minister. Available at: <https://opm.go.ug/comprehensive-refugee-response-framework-uganda/> [Accessed 17 April 2020].

Rossi, B., 2006. Aid Policies and Recipient strategies in Niger: Why Donors and Recipients Should Not Be Compartmenltalized into Separate "Worlds of Knowledge." In: D. Mosse and D. Lewis, ed., *Development Brokers And Translators: The Ethnography Of Aid And Agencies*. Bloomfield, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.

Rudolf, M., 2019. Share the Burden or Pass it on?. *International Migration*, 57(6), pp.208-223.

Schiltz, J., Derluyn, I., Vanderplasschen, W. and Vindevogel, S., 2018. Resilient and Self-reliant Life: South Sudanese Refugees Imagining Futures in the Adjumani Refugee Setting, Uganda. *Children & Society*, 33(1), pp.39-52.

Skinner, J. (2013). A Four-part Introduction to the Interview: Introducing the Interview; Society, Sociology and the Interview; Anthropology and the Interview; Anthropology and the Interview. In *The Interview, An Ethnographic Approach*. (Association of Social Anthropologists Monographs). London: Bloomsbury Publishing: 1-50.

Stamnes, E., 2016. Rethinking the Humanitarian-Development Nexus. *Norwegian Institute of International Affairs*, [online] 24. Available at: <https://nupi.brage.unit.no/nupi-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2405657/NUPI%2bPolicy%2bBrief-24-16-Eli%2bStamnes-2.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y> [Accessed 21 April 2020].

Thomas, M., 2017. *Turning The Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework Into Reality | Forced Migration Review*. [online] Fmreview.org. Available at: <https://www.fmreview.org/latinamerica-caribbean/thomas> [Accessed 22 April 2020].

Türk, V. and Garlick, M., 2016. From Burdens and Responsibilities to Opportunities: The Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework and a Global Compact on Refugees. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 28(4), pp.656-678.

Ufm.dk., 2002. Vejledende Retningslinier for Forskningsetik i Samfundsvidenskaberne. (online) Available at: https://ufm.dk/publikationer/2002/filer-2002/ssf-etik.pdf (Accessed 21 Aug. 2019).

UNHCR, 2017. *Bringing the New York Declaration to Life: Applying the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF).* Geneva: UNHCR (https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/64532)

UNHCR, 2018. *South Sudan Regional Refugee Response Plan*. [online] UNHCR.

UNHCR, 2019. *Uganda Refugee Response Plan. January 2019-December 2020.* Geneva: UNHCR (https://www.unhcr.org/comprehensive-refugee-response-framework-crrf.html)

UNHCRa, 2019. *Global Trends: Forced Displacement In 2018*. [online] Geneva: UNHCR. Available at: <https://www.unhcr.org/5d08d7ee7.pdf> [Accessed 17 April 2020].

UNHCRb, 2019. *UGANDA: 2018 Refugee Response Plan For South Sudan, Burundi And Democratic Republic Of The Congo*. [online] UNHCR. Available at: <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/69030> [Accessed 18 May 2020].

UNHCR, 2020. *Financials | Global Focus*. [online] Reporting.unhcr.org. Available at: <http://reporting.unhcr.org/financial#_ga=2.175599522.1828216769.1589374980-233692971.1573036140> [Accessed 14 May 2020].

UNHCRa, 2020.*Uganda Refugee Response: 2019 Q4 Performance Snapshot and Operational Presence*. [online] UNHCR. Available at:<https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/75061> [Accessed 18 May 2020].

Welsh, M. 2014. Resilience and responsibility: governing uncertainty in a complex world. The Geographical Journal 180:15–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12012.

World Bank., 2016. *An assessment of Uganda's progressive approach to refugee management.* Washington.