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1. Overview

This report draws together good practice and programme examples of interventions designed to prevent or address conflict between refugees and host communities. The next section identifies good practice recommendations from the literature on refugee-host conflict. It also presents good practice lessons from the programme examples described in section three.

The report highlights three main types of programme that have been designed to tackle tensions and conflicts between refugees and host communities. In several cases these programmes overlap:

- **Integrated development programmes** – integrated humanitarian and development programmes that seek to balance assistance to both refugee and host communities, or integrate services provided to them (see the programme examples below from Guinea, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nepal, Lebanon, and Ecuador).

- **Conflict resolution programmes** – programmes that encourage workshops, discussions or regular meetings between both communities. These may involve training in conflict resolution skills or peace education (see Kenya, Ghana, Tanzania, and Sierra Leone examples below).

- **Environmental management programmes** – programmes that seek to improve the management of environmental resources in order to promote co-operation and reduce tensions (see Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Nepal, and Lebanon examples below).
The literature on good practice in this area is patchy and there are few general studies that address these issues directly. Most of the programme examples highlighted below do not provide extended discussion on good practice or key lessons.

**Background**

The presence of refugees can create tensions and conflicts with host communities for a number of reasons. First, refugees are often well served by humanitarian agencies and enjoy better access to water, food, health and education than the host population (OECD 2001, Ikanda 2008, Charny 2009). As well as being poorly served by humanitarian agencies, host communities tend to exist in regions that are often neglected by the state (Dryden-Petersen & Hovil 2003, Ikanda 2008, Agblorti 2011). Due to the physical separation that often exists between refugee and host communities, the benefits enjoyed by refugees may be exaggerated in the eyes of host communities, driving further tension between the two groups (Dryden-Petersen & Hovil 2003).

Second, in certain contexts, the presence of refugees may have a negative economic impact on the host population. The OECD (2001, 151) has argued that the economic benefits generated by refugees ‘seldom outweigh the negative impacts of a large-scale refugee presence over extended periods’. In some contexts the host community can benefit, but the economic rewards can be confined to a small group of elites (Maystadt & Verwimp 2009, Charny 2009). In a quantitative study of the economic impact of Rwandan and Burundian refugees in Tanzania, for example, Maystadt and Verwimp (2009) find that agricultural workers suffered the most from an increase in labour market competition and rising prices.

Third, the presence of refugees can lead to environmental degradation, putting a strain on local resources such as water and firewood. Martin (2005) stresses that resource competition can engender both conflict and cooperative solutions. He states that although environmental degradation is often cited as an important factor in refugee-host relations, in many cases these issues are instrumentalised by political leaders (Martin 2005).

Fourth, host communities may be opposed to the presence of refugees on social or cultural grounds (OECD 2001). These tensions are most significant where cultural ties between host and refugee communities are weakest (OECD 2001). While much of the literature on refugee-host relations focuses on the environmental and economic impacts of refugees, a lack of social interaction can also be a key factor in generating and maintaining tensions between host and refugee communities (Berry 2008).

Fifth, refugees may be seen to pose a threat to the security of host communities by harbouring fighters or by increasing criminality (Salehyan & Gleditsch 2006). More broadly, there is some evidence to suggest that the presence of refugees may increase the risk of intrastate conflict (Salehyan & Gleditsch 2006).

There is wide recognition of these tensions amongst humanitarian agencies, though it is also widely noted that these problems are ineffectively addressed and under-researched (Berry 2008, RSC 2010). One of the main barriers to effective programming in this area has been a tendency for donors to keep humanitarian assistance for refugees separate from broader development assistance. This leaves agencies ‘most acutely aware of the problems of host communities without the resources to address them in any meaningful way’ (Charny 2009, n.p.). This tendency undermines humanitarian
agencies’ ability to support interventions that foster long-term relationships with host populations (Martin 2005).

2. Good Practice

Integrated and Balanced Assistance

Many agencies stress the importance of providing both humanitarian and long-term development assistance to both refugee and host communities, and present this as a key mechanism for reducing tensions and conflicts between the two groups (Jacobsen 2002, Ikanda 2008, RSC 2010). Health and education are often identified as key areas for joint refugee/host provision (OECD 2001). Even in cases where conflict prevention is not a stated or the primary goal, integrated development programmes can help to reduce tensions. Berry (2008) stresses the importance of development projects refugee hosting areas as a whole, not simply in terms of their immediate benefits such as improved healthcare, but because of the impact they can have on reducing tensions between host and refugee populations.

Konyndyk (2005) highlights the need to balance levels of services available to both populations, while engaging the host population in the provision of services to refugees. He argues that this can decrease tensions between the two groups, while creating a concrete incentive for the host population to be more welcoming to the refugees. One form that this can take is the provision of health services through existing local health structures (Konyndyk 2005).

Konyndyk (2005) also suggests that assistance levels to refugee populations should be reduced as vulnerability decreases. At the same time agencies should support activities that promote refugee self-sufficiency. He suggests that this may involve introducing a cost-share approach to some service provision, which could be shared by the host and refugee communities. The goal of promoting integrated approaches has often been undermined by humanitarian agencies’ efforts to promote self-reliance. Dryden-Petersen and Hovil (2003) argue that interventions to boost refugees’ self-sufficiency must be accompanied by interventions designed to socially and economically integrate the refugee population.

The view that donor assistance to refugee populations should also involve a focus on improving refugee hosting areas has long been recognised by the major agencies working in this area. The concept of targeted development assistance (TDA) refers to aid that ‘focuses on the needs of both refugees and host communities through, for example, improving livelihood opportunities, service provision or infrastructure. Its aim is to enhance refugees’ access to rights, self-sufficiency, and, where possible, local integration’ (Betts 2009, 1). This approach does not necessarily seek to prevent conflicts or tensions but nevertheless may help to achieve these aims. Betts (2009, 2) outlines the key determinants of successful TDA:

- ‘Institutional collaboration between UNHCR and development actors;
- Joined-up government and new budget lines that can transcend government department divides; and, most crucially;
- The right kinds of interventions, which are based on an integrated approach, focus on livelihoods, use pre-existing community structures, and use evaluations to monitor and follow-up on project implementations’.
Betts (2009, 2-3) states that the following interventions are necessary to achieve an effective integrated development approach towards refugees:

- ‘A systematic analysis of the lessons from the past practice of applying development assistance to enhance refugee protection.
- Independent consultations with donor and host states to better understand states’ concerns and interests in order to identify the basis of mutually beneficial ‘win-win’ cooperation.
- At the national level, more coherent coordination between ministries of development, home affairs, and foreign affairs, including the creation of new inter-ministerial budget lines for “development assistance and refugees”.
- Development actors such as UNDP and the World Bank should recognise the important potential role played by refugees in national development, and the possible ‘binding constraint’ they pose on development when neglected.
- UNHCR should play a catalytic role in facilitating inter-state and inter-agency dialogue on development assistance and refugees as an important component of its ongoing work on protracted refugee situations’.

An example of this approach is UNHCR’s ‘Agenda for Protection’ (published originally in 2002). The agenda encourages states to consider allocating development funds to programmes simultaneously benefiting refugees and host populations. It also encourages host populations to consider including refugee-hosting areas in their national development plans to achieve the broad goal of sharing burdens and responsibilities more equitably and building capacities to receive and protect refugees.

**Advocacy and Host Government Policy**

The way in which protracted refugee crises are handled by host governments and aid agencies drives conflict with local populations because it discourages local integration and encourages corruption (Aukot 2003). The refugee policies of the host government are a key determinant of refugees’ vulnerability and their ability to pursue livelihoods. In many host countries refugees are treated as illegal migrants, with few rights and little protection (Jacobsen 2002).

Most studies stress that host governments should be clear on their stance towards local integration, meet their responsibilities to improve socio-economic conditions in areas affected by protracted refugee situations, and support the full integration of refugees instead of confining them to camps (Ikanda 2008, Agblorti 2011a). Refugees’ lack of freedom of movement hinders self-sufficiency and creates economic and social seclusion (Jacobsen 2002).

Konyndyk (2005) suggests that donors and humanitarian agencies should increase efforts to persuade governments and host populations to allow refugees fuller access to economic opportunities. Jacobsen (2002) argues that donors should encourage host governments and local authorities to see the value to their own people in supporting and allowing livelihood activities for displaced people. Advocacy might focus on the following key areas: reducing restrictions on the movement of refugees; ensuring existing property rights are available to refugees; and helping negotiate access to land and common resources for refugees (Berry 2008).

In a case study from Ghana, Agblorti (2011a) highlights the relationship between the host population and the camp administration as an important factor in determining refugee-host relations. In this case, the host community consistently blamed their difficulties on the administration and believed that the administration was unfairly diverting resources (including resettlement packages) from the host
community. He argues that the camp administration’s relationship with the host population needs to be evaluated and taken into consideration and that regular meetings should take place between the administration and the host community (Agblorti 2011a).

**Unintended positive consequences of conflict resolution and refugee-hosting area programmes – building social relationships**

Several programme examples examined below find that conducting mediation workshops or conflict resolution training led to the resolution or reduction in conflict between host and refugee communities (see for example, Konydnyk 2005, Berry 2008, MDG Achievement Fund 2011). Berry (2008) discusses conflict resolution meetings organised by two NGOs (CARE International and Relief to Development Society (REDESO)) working in refugee camps in North-western Tanzania between 2004 and 2006. She notes that ‘what is particularly significant and useful about these meetings is that they not only allow for discussion about problems or conflicts between the refugees and local communities, but also promote working together to come up with solutions’ (Berry 2008, 15). Some participants stated that these meetings were useful not only in terms of resolving specific conflicts between host and refugee communities but also more generally in building social relationships between the two groups. This was particularly important in a context where Tanzanian refugee law effectively prevented any kind of positive interaction between the two communities.

**Acknowledging unintended negative consequences**

The effect of using income-generating programmes to enhance the economic security of refugees and host community is not very well established (Jacobsen 2002). While Jacobsen (2002) cites some success stories, she also notes that injecting capital and credit into conflict-affected communities can have negative unintended consequences. In some cases, improvements in refugees’ livelihoods may lead to increased resentment by the host community. Imposing inappropriate frameworks for environmental management ‘can easily stimulate rather than prevent unproductive conflict’ (Martin 2005).

**Participatory approaches**

Donors and humanitarian agencies should work with local organisations that are familiar with the political and security context, and can provide guidance about how to distribute resources or implement programmes (Jacobsen 2002). Several of the examples highlighted below demonstrate how by facilitating the participation of both host and refugee communities, programmes can improve social relationships and in doing so reduce tensions (see Martin 2005, UN Trust for Human Security no date, UNDG 2009).

**In-depth analysis**

Several studies stress the importance of disaggregating host and refugee populations, and using a more fine-grained analysis to inform policy (Agblorti 2011, Ikanda 2008). The case of the RARP in Nepal demonstrates the importance of developing a clear empirical and scientifically-informed understanding of the problems that stem from environmental damage before designing a response (UNHCR 1998).
Inclusive, open, flexible and long-term processes

Martin (2005) stresses that environmental management programmes should promote an inclusive and open process since imposing inappropriate frameworks can easily stimulate rather than prevent conflict. He states that it is important that agencies are flexible in their approach and that they take advantage of pre-existing institutional strength (such as camp environmental management committees). Externally-promoted processes should be ‘sufficiently flexible to take advantage of pre-existing institutional strength’ (Martin 2005, 341). A UNHCR peace education in Kenya stated that mediation techniques that produce long-term positive outcomes for all involved are more effective than more intrusive methods with less durable outcomes (UNHCR no date).

2. Programme examples

The programme examples presented below are drawn from both academic case studies and programme descriptions and evaluations produced by donors and humanitarian agencies. They have been categorised by country. The main types of programmes covered in each country are listed in brackets. As mentioned above, most of these examples provide little sustained discussion of good practice.

Ethiopia (environmental management)

In this case study of the Bonga Camp in Ethiopia, the host communities find that resources such as land, forests, and wildlife have become scarcer, and blamed the arrival of refugees for this (Martin 2005). They also complained about refugees stealing crops and water, destroying their irrigation channels, and spoiling traditional grazing lands (Martin 2005). Although both communities had an interest in preserving forest resources, there had been few opportunities for communication that would recognise this mutuality because officially the refugees did not have access to resources outside camp boundaries. UNHCR undertook a pilot project to address this situation, holding a series of meetings between the hosts and refugees in which environmental issues were identified and prioritised. Martin (2005, 340) found that ‘people’s constructions of resource use conflicts did appear to shift as a result of open, inclusive and deliberative processes of thinking through environmental problems’. The case highlights the following key lessons:

- ‘Inclusive and open processes can help, in the short term at least, to encourage constructions of resource use conflicts that favour productive rather than unproductive outcomes.
- It is important that any process introduced from outside is sufficiently flexible to take advantage of […] pre-existing institutional strength (such as camp environmental management committees).
- Imposing inappropriate frameworks can easily stimulate rather than prevent unproductive conflict’ (Martin 2005, 341).
- The fact that refugees fall under the auspices of emergency relief also influences the extent to which external interventions seek to foster long-term relationships with host populations. Organisations that are specialised in dealing with emergencies find it difficult to broaden their remit to include long-term ‘development’ strategies. Despite awareness of the need for long-term approaches, relief agencies continue to define ‘problems in terms of their existing institutional capabilities, rather than newly emerging needs of refugees and hosts’.
Although participatory management approaches are recommended, the time and skill required to facilitate these approaches should be acknowledged. The potential for elite capture should also be noted.

UNHCR commissioned the development of methods for participatory environmental management (PEM) in order to support its Framework for Assessing, Monitoring and Evaluating the Environment in Refugee-related Operations (FRAME) programme. FRAME is a three-pillared approach to managing the environment, based on assessment, monitoring and evaluation processes. It is intended that community participation will eventually permeate all three processes, partly to improve the effectiveness of environmental management, but ‘equally as a strategy for alleviating refugee–host conflict’. It is hoped that forms of co-management of resources, involving both refugee and host communities, can foster perceptions of mutuality that relieve the propensity of resource use competition to heighten consciousness of ethnic divisions, inequality and other triggers of violence’ (Martin 2005, 339).

As part of the FRAME programme, UNHCR has developed a tool for ‘Community Environmental Action Planning’:

Guinea (integrated development)

The UN Trust for Human Security (no date) sought to reduce tensions between host communities and refugees in the Forest Guinea region, through a project that aimed to improve access to social services, restore infrastructure and strengthen productive capacities. The project, which targeted 5,000 people, helped to create income-generating opportunities that collectively benefited host communities, refugees, returnees and IDPs. The project sought to do this by setting up Community-based Production Centres (CPCs), which were tasked with providing intensive skills-upgrading training courses, bolstering collective self-help entrepreneurial initiatives and restoring community infrastructures. Through the communal management of the CPCs, the project led to improvements in social cohesion and strengthened the capacities of those living in the Forest Guinea region. The project highlighted the following key lessons:

- ‘The importance of an inclusive and integrated framework that seeks to address multiple insecurities through a human security approach.
- By bringing together host communities and refugees, and through their collaboration, the project exemplified how existing capacities within competing groups could be identified and further developed, thereby leading to mutual respect and positive interdependencies. Moreover, such collaborations provided the foundation for resource-sharing and collective decision-making, thus reducing tensions among the target groups’ (UN Trust for Human Security, no date).

Kenya (conflict resolution, integrated development)

The UNHCR (no date) piloted a Peace Education programme in the Dadaab and Kakuma refugee camps in Kenya. More than 360,000 refugees from different neighbouring countries are hosted in these two camps – Kakuma in the northwest and Dadaab in the northeast. While the refugees receive some international assistance in the camps, the shortfall is met with resources shared with the host communities, sparking conflict between the residents and the refugees over commodities such as water, pasture, firewood and vegetables.
The aim of the programme was to enhance quality of life and prevent violent conflict both in the short term within the camps and in the long term either in respect to local integration or repatriation. The Peace Education programme focused on conflict prevention, and included elements of conflict resolution, opting for mediation techniques that produce long-term positive outcomes for all concerned, in preference to intrusive methods with less durable outcomes. UNHCR states that the programme was very successful - contributing both to the learning and practice of peacebuilding skills in refugee camps and to the reduction of conflict. It notes that ‘in the camps, the formal programme was supplemented by spontaneous initiatives lead by refugees to follow up and spread the Peace Education programme within the host community which would undoubtedly assist local development’ (UNHCR no date, n.p.).

UNDP Kenya (no date) has also conducted a ‘Refugee-Host Community Project’ in and around the Dadaab and Kakuma camps. The main purpose of this project is to reduce violent conflict and improve the living conditions of the targeted affected population. The project aims to mitigate the severe effects of the cyclical droughts common in the host community areas through provision of basic social services, security, peace building, community skills in resource management, sustainable livelihoods, and support to income-generating activities.

The UNDP has also supported the Joint Host Community Programme (JHCP) since 2007. It works to improve resources for poor communities in and around the two camps by supporting sustainable livelihoods and reducing the pressures that exacerbate conflict by helping host communities use natural resources and specialist farming techniques to make the most of the arid conditions. People outside the camp have seen improvements in their access to food and water. The programme also focuses on strengthening the local institutions responsible for recovery and disaster risk reduction initiatives.

CARE Kenya provides assistance to the local population around the three refugee camps. The focus of the host community development is on water and sanitation, education, and livelihoods. CARE states in a country report that this ‘has contributed immensely towards reducing the inherent tension between the refugees and host community’ (CARE 2009, 2).

**Sudan (integrated development)**

The Transitional Solutions Initiative (TSI) provides a framework for transitioning displacement situations to durable solutions. As a partnership between humanitarian and development actors the TSI prioritizes effective inter-agency partnerships, with specially tailored area-specific interventions to increase self-reliance. Projects are designed to benefit the host populations as well as the displaced, and have a strong component of national ownership and capacity building of local government in order to promote sustainability.

The TSI in Eastern Sudan targets twelve refugee camps in a phased approach aiming to consolidate camps and convert them into viable local settlements. Through comprehensive interventions within the areas of vocational training and business skills, basic services, protection, rural livelihoods, microfinance, environment, gender, and social cohesion the programme aims to enhance self-reliance and assist the socio-economic integration of both refugees and host communities by restoring and expanding sustainable livelihoods opportunities. The programme design emphasises the need for a more coherent and effective approach to the durable solutions of refugees, returnees, internally
displaced persons, and their host communities. It stresses the need for development actors and local governments to coordinate their efforts.

For more information see the UNDP Sudan website: http://www.sd.undp.org/projects/cp16.htm

**Ghana**

This overview of interventions in Ghana does not focus on a specific programme. Instead it is drawn from two academic case studies that focus on refugee-host community relations and on UNHCR’s role, generating some insights that can inform future practice.

In a study of the Krisan Refugee Camp in Western Ghana, Agblorti (2011) argues that many of the tensions that exist between host and refugee communities are caused by misinformation. He suggests that humanitarian agencies should conduct periodic meetings between all stakeholders where issues are discussed dispassionately and solutions found. Such a forum could help to eliminate doubts regarding sources of assistance to refugees and outline areas where the hosts are likely to benefit from the agencies operating in the camp.

In another case study of the Buduburam refugee settlement and the surrounding area in Ghana, Agblorti (2011a) highlights the relationship between the host population and the camp administration as an important factor in determining refugee-host relations. The host community consistently blamed their difficulties on the administration and believed that the administration was unfairly diverting resources (including resettlement packages) from the host community. The study highlights the following policy implications:

- The importance of engaging the host community in discussions around the possibility of local integration in order to ensure broad consensus.
- Acknowledge that the host population are not a homogenous group and should be disaggregated.
- The camp administration’s relationship with the host population needs to be evaluated and taken into consideration. The camp administration serves as the lens through which host populations assess the policies of both government and UNHCR.
- In order to reduce mistrust, there is a need for periodic meetings between the administration and the host community.
- The government needs to be clear on its stance towards local integration and not give off mixed messages in this regard. In particular, clear guidelines for implementing local integration, including readily available information for refugees, is vital.

In another study of the Buduburam settlement, Boamah-Gyau (2008) highlights a disparity between the effective leadership of the refugees and the divided leadership of the host community. This has made it difficult for UNHCR to mediate between the two groups. Boamah-Gyau (2008) also stresses that UNHCR should manage the expectations of both refugee and host communities.

**Uganda** (integrated development)

In Uganda, UNHCR worked with the government to improve living conditions for Sudanese refugees living in the West Nile districts and in 1998 launched an integrated approach, the Self-Reliance Strategy (SRS). Its overarching goal was ‘to integrate the services provided to the refugees into regular government structures and policies’ and, in so doing, to move ‘from relief to development’
Dryden-Petersen and Hovil (2003) criticise the approach taken, however, for advocating self-reliance without local integration. Integration was based primarily on the coordination of services and did not present social and economic integration as a necessary component. The SRS kept refugee and host communities physically segregated through the local settlement structure. They argue that assistance programmes aiming at integration must widen their approach and target refugee-hosting areas as a whole.

**Tanzania** (conflict resolution)

Berry (2008) discusses conflict resolution meetings organised by two NGOs (CARE International and Relief to Development Society (REDESO)) working in refugee camps in north-western Tanzania between 2004 and 2006. Attendees included village leaders and representatives, refugee leaders and representatives, UNHCR staff, camp management officials, Tanzania's Ministry of Home Affairs and District Natural Resources Offices employees and other NGO staff.

She notes that ‘what is particularly significant and useful about these meetings is that they not only allow for discussion about problems or conflicts between the refugees and local communities, but also promote working together to come up with solutions’ (Berry 2008, 15). Some participants stated that the overall relationship between the refugees and locals has improved as a result of the conflict resolution meetings. These meetings were useful not only in terms of resolving specific conflicts between host and refugee communities but also more generally in building social relationships between the two groups. This was particularly important in a context where Tanzanian refugee law effectively prevented any kind of positive interaction between the two communities. Similarly, Berry (2008) stresses the importance of projects that target hosts and refugees, not simply in terms of their immediate benefits such as improved healthcare, but because of the impact they can have on reducing tensions between host and refugee populations.

**Sierra Leone** (conflict resolution)

The Foundation for International Dignity (FIND), a West African NGO, has conducted mediation workshops between refugees and host communities in camps in Sierra Leone. These workshops have resulted in agreements between refugees and their host communities on resource-sharing issues such as the use of agricultural land. FIND’s work demonstrates that, when actively addressed, these rivalries can be eased. Indeed, engaging the host community more extensively in producing goods for the refugees, while also supporting joint refugee–host community business enterprises, could provide tangible economic benefits to the host communities, creating new consumers for local goods, generating jobs, and spurring local economic activity (Konydyk 2005).

**Afghanistan** (integrated development, environmental management)

The Income Generating Project for Refugee Areas (IGPRA), which was set up in 1984 by UNHCR and the World Bank, focused on both the economic needs of the refugees, and on repairing the environmental damage resulting from their presence. The programme sought to create employment and generate income for both refugees and host communities through labour intensive rural projects. It also sought to repair environmental damage caused by refugees and to prepare refugees for work through on-the-job training. The programme focused on reforestation and soil conservation, road improvement and watershed management.
Over a period of more than ten years, close to 300 sub-projects were implemented with financing principally through a trust fund administered by the World Bank, at a total cost of over US$86 million. Much of this work has created lasting assets for the host country by attacking soil erosion and flood hazards, and by reducing the loss of productive land and the pressure on remaining forests. New and improved roads have increased access to isolated areas and to urban markets. The programme demonstrates how a Resource Management Regime (RMR) can encourage long-term management through co-operative approaches involving all stakeholders and thus reduce the potential for conflict. An OECD (2001, 153) summary of this and other programmes highlights the following key lessons:

- ‘Generally, the better a RMR is in recognising major stakeholders, the better equipped it is to resolve conflict between parties.
- ‘A strong RMR uses ideas and scientific understanding to shape the development of issues and options. It plays an entrepreneurial role by using its negotiating skill to influence the ways in which issues are approached and “contracts” defined for the benefit of all parties. It can act in the name of these parties to devise effective ways of bringing resources and expertise into agreed solutions’.
- ‘Sharing research between stakeholders can often diminish tension and promote the idea of a common problem with a solution lying in co-operation instead of conflict’.

**Pakistan** (integrated development, environmental management)

UNDP has implemented a Refugee Affected and Hosting Areas programme (RAHA) in Pakistan since 2009. The programme aims ‘to promote regional stability and compensate for the social, economic and environmental consequences wrought on Pakistani communities by the presence of more than 3 million Afghans’ (UNDP Pakistan no date, n.p.). The programme adopts an integrated bottom-up participatory approach involving activities such as providing contributions to school fees; providing collections for salaries of guards and maintenance people, water distribution and water supply repair teams, community-based health workers, and birth attendants (UNDG 2009). The programme also supports small- and medium-scale community infrastructure programmes, and environmental rehabilitation programmes that involve employment and income-generating activities. The programme involves a range of activities to promote community harmonisation including ‘conflict management and community arbitration training, youth programmes and sports events, among others’ (UNDG 2009, 9).

The programme’s website states that the programme is ‘leading to stronger social cohesion and co-existence among the two populations i.e. local Pakistani communities and the refugees’.

**Nepal** (integrated development, environmental management)

The arrival of some 90,000 Bhutanese refugees in south-eastern Nepal led to some resentment on the part of local people and the government. Pressure on forests was already severe and the refugee influx quickly brought environmental concerns to the fore. At the request of the government and local communities, and in consultation with concerned government technical departments, UNHCR developed a portfolio of project ideas - The Refugee-affected Areas Rehabilitation Programme (RARP). The RARP objectives were to contribute to sustainable development, reduce and repair environmental damage, provide labour opportunities and improve infrastructure. Unofficially, it was hoped that this multi-sectoral programme would also improve local working relations and achieve some balance in levels of service offered to local people and refugees.
RARP developed into a set of investment projects focused on infrastructure. The projects were proposed and supported through a process of solicitation with local leaders and government. There was a focus on road improvement, river bank protection and the construction of sub-health posts, all development priorities of the local people. Another component directed through the District Forest Offices assisted with the development of plantations, tree nurseries, ranger posts, fencing and strengthening of operational capacity.

Overall, this programme assisted in easing tensions between refugees and local people, and between UNHCR and the Nepalese government. This has been aided by other factors such as the compatibility with local people (ethnic, religious and social), sympathy with the refugees’ democratic cause, and the physical spread of the caseload over many relatively small camps.

This example makes it clear that problems that seem to stem from environmental damage need to be carefully investigated before a response is introduced. As in this case, dissatisfaction may be expressed as a concern about environmental damage, but closer investigation reveals broader ill feelings associated with disproportionate levels of service, loss of jobs to refugees, or other more general problems (UNHCR 1998).

Lebanon (conflict resolution)

A joint UN programme aims to mitigate tensions between Palestinian refugees and their Lebanese hosts. It seeks to foster economic development, improving Palestinian self-governance and promoting peace-building in conflict-prone communities by creating better institutional dialogue mechanisms, a vibrant civil society and more active youth and women. The specific objectives are:

- Identifying and promoting sustainable conflict-prevention tools to ease inter- and intra-communal tensions between the Palestinian and Lebanese communities;
- Closing the socio-economic gaps between these communities by implementing equitable development programmes;
- Promoting the active participation of youth and women in local level development (MDG Achievement Fund, no date).

The programme achieved some positive results in establishing a positive dialogue between the Lebanese communities and Palestinian refugee self-governance Popular Committees and improving students' tolerance and knowledge of peaceful conflict resolution. Implementation of the programme was significantly delayed, however, which threatened to undermine the credibility of the programme and its effectiveness (MDG Achievement Fund 2011). The delays were due to design constraints, internal management issues and external political variables. An evaluation conducted in 2011 made the following key recommendations (MDG Achievement Fund 2011, iv):

- ‘Ensure adequate leadership of State institutions in the strategic management of the Programme and participation of local actors in defining the content and methodology of operational activities, so as to enhance ownership and sustainability.
- Take quick action in establishing the Lebanese-Palestinian dialogue forums by gathering local stakeholders around the planning and implementation of tangible services to be delivered by the JP within the time and resources available’.
**Ecuador** (integrated development)

The World Food Programme (WFP) implements a project in Ecuador to diffuse tensions between refugees and Ecuadorian communities and promote integration in both urban and rural areas. The project supports the food and nutrition security of refugees and Ecuadorians, in alignment with government priorities, with a special focus on women. The operation is planned for three years and aims to assist annually 45,015 beneficiaries at a yearly cost of US$ 3.5 million. The programme has the following key components:

- Differentiate responses based on the food security, nutrition, and protection needs of Colombian refugees and Ecuadorian host communities.
- Promote integration, with a view to diffuse tensions between refugees and Ecuadorian communities, and a strong gender focus.
- Strengthen skills and capacities of decentralized government partners, and promote joint implementation and cost-sharing.
- Link small holders with community school activities and other safety nets.
- Combine food transfers with vouchers for the purchase of nutritious foods for asylum seekers and vulnerable refugee families.

For more information see this WFP factsheet: [https://www.wfp.org/sites/default/files/2%20page%20PRRO.pdf](https://www.wfp.org/sites/default/files/2%20page%20PRRO.pdf)
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