



Integrating livelihoods and protection for displaced persons in urban humanitarian response

Guidance Note for Humanitarian Practitioners

Stronger Cities Consortium

Preface

The *Stronger Cities Initiative* is a consortium of the International Rescue Committee (IRC), the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), and World Vision International (WVI) with technical advice from David Sanderson, University of New South Wales, Sydney. The purpose of the initiative is to produce practical field-tested guidance for humanitarian organisations working in urban conflict, displacement, and natural hazard settings.

This guidance note was developed by the IRC. The IRC responds to the world's worst humanitarian crises, helping to restore health, safety, education, economic well-being, and power to people devastated by conflict and disaster. Founded in 1933 at the call of Albert Einstein, the IRC is at work in over 40 countries and 26 US cities helping people to survive, reclaim control of their future, and strengthen their communities.

This note was written by Laura Gauer Bermudez, MSW, MIPP. The author would like to thank the policymakers and practitioners engaged in urban humanitarian programming that have generously shared their time and input into this review in the form of documents, sharing key contacts and guidance. This includes contributions from David Sanderson, Laura Phelps, Jennifer Rosenberg, Diane Archer, Natalia Strigin, Mario Patino, Jocelyn Knight, Emily Lewis, Tarina Rubin, Tobias Metzner, and Chloe Whitley. Full details of key informants can be found in Annex I. In particular, the author would like to thank Andrew Meaux, Barri Shorey, and Yasin Abbas for their dedicated guidance and support to this project.

This publication was funded with the generous contributions of UK aid from the UK government and EU Humanitarian Aid. This is an independent report and does not necessarily reflect the views of IIED, DFID or ECHO. Any errors are on part of the authors. This document covers humanitarian aid activities implemented with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein should not be taken in any way to reflect the official opinion of the European Union; and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.



Produced by IIED's Human Settlements Group

The Human Settlements Group at the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) works to reduce poverty and improve health and housing conditions in the urban centres of Africa, Asia and Latin America. It seeks to combine this with promoting good governance and more ecologically sustainable patterns of urban development and rural–urban linkages.

This paper is part of a series of research pieces produced under the 'Urban Crises Learning Fund' managed by IIED. Funded by the Department for International Development (DFID), the fund aims to build an in-depth understanding of how the humanitarian sector can most effectively operate in urban contexts.

Published by IIED, June 2017

Bermudez, LG (2017) *Integrating livelihoods and protection for displaced persons in urban humanitarian response*. Guidance note for Humanitarian Practitioners. IIED, London.

<http://pubs.iied.org/10829IIED>

ISBN 978-1-78431-476-7

Cover photo credit: Jacob Russell

International Institute for Environment and Development
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH, UK
Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399
Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055
www.iied.org

@iied

www.facebook.com/theIIED

Download more publications at <http://pubs.iied.org/>

Urban areas are now home to over half the global population as well as two thirds of the world's refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs). Increasingly, cities and peri-urban areas have become the forefront of humanitarian response, diverting from the traditional paradigm of relief provision in rural and camp settings. The protracted refugee crisis in Syria has highlighted unique challenges and opportunities facing humanitarian efforts in complex urban environments, suggesting a need for greater innovation to respond effectively to the evolving economic and protection challenges faced by displaced persons. Economic insecurity, discrimination, and marginalisation increase the protection risk for the displaced as they seek income-generating opportunities, creating a need for a more integrated approach to livelihoods initiatives. This guidance note provides ten core principles that practitioners can follow when aiming to integrate livelihoods and protection programming in urban humanitarian response, with a focus on supporting economic outcomes for beneficiaries. Key actions in programme design, illustrative performance indicators, notes on sustainability, and brief case examples are included. While the note is derived from experiences serving Syrian refugees in Lebanon and Jordan, its principles were chosen from a global desk review of relief efforts in urban humanitarian settings to provide informed guidance that has universal applicability.

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	5
Introduction	6
Definitions	7
Core Principle 1: Mainstream protection concepts within livelihoods interventions	8
Core Principle 2: Promote social cohesion through inclusive livelihoods development	11
Core Principle 3: Develop a complaints and feedback mechanism	15
Core Principle 4: Increase rate and quality of referrals	18
Core Principle 5: Explore a one-stop centre approach	21
Core Principle 6: Engage private sector partners in protection	24
Core Principle 7: Address risks related to documentation	27
Core Principle 8: Respond to child labour within a framework of economic security	30
Core Principle 9: Emphasise women's protection and empowerment	33
Core Principle 10: Transition from acute humanitarian crisis to long-term resilience	36
Bibliography	39
Annex I: Key informants	41

List of boxes

Box 1. Mainstreaming protection principles	10
Box 2. Fostering social cohesion through joint economic endeavours and support	13
Box 3. Partnering with livelihoods actors to initiate complaint mechanisms	17
Box 4. Training livelihoods staff on safe identification and referral	20
Box 5. Offering bundled service provision through a Livelihoods Centre Model	23
Box 6. Promoting small business development with a protection lens	26
Box 7. Finding creative solutions to obtain work permits for refugees	29
Box 8. Addressing child labour through family economic strengthening	32
Box 9. Innovating solutions to livelihoods challenges for Syrian women in Lebanon	35
Box 10. Building partnerships with industrial zones for sustainable refugee employment	38

Abbreviations and acronyms

CSO	Civil society organisation
DFID	Department for International Development, UK
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
ECHO	European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
ERD	Economic Recovery and Development
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit / German Agency for International Cooperation
GPC	Global Protection Cluster
HBE	Home-based enterprise
IDP	Internally displaced person
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
IRC	International Rescue Committee
LCRP	Lebanon Crisis Response Plan
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MOU	Memorandum of understanding
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
PWD	Person with disabilities
SGBV	Sexual and gender based violence
SHLS	Safe and Healing Learning Space
SOP	Standard operating procedure
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
VAF	Vulnerability Assessment Framework

Introduction

Rural to urban migration accompanied by population growth in rapidly developing lower- and middle-income countries has contributed to a high rate of global urbanisation. Urban areas are now home to over half the global population (UNDESA (2014 Revision) as well as two thirds of the world's refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs) (UNHCR/OHCHR/IOM, 2015). For displaced persons fleeing conflict or naturally triggered disasters, cities provide unparalleled economic opportunities, but they are also characterised by social and financial disparities. In urban spaces, the high cost of living necessitates access to income generating opportunities, yet refugees face unique challenges securing safe and sustainable livelihoods. A lack of social capital, including social networks and information on labour markets, language barriers and risks associated with public transport, can make economic integration difficult for new arrivals. In some cases, legal restrictions limit refugees' ability to participate in the formal labour market, with policies often derived from host country perceptions that refugees are part of a broader migratory population that are in competition with local residents for a finite number of jobs. Fears that supporting sustainable employment for refugees might promote long-term stay, thereby overburdening infrastructure and resources and permanently changing national demographics, can also influence policy.

As crises become protracted, refugees residing in cities often face asset depletion and rising debt levels. Opportunities for income generation are typically unstable and unpredictable, with families facing indebtedness to cover the cost of shelter and other basic needs. A survey of Syrian refugees living in Lebanon documented 90 per cent to be borrowing money or receiving credit (UNICEF/UNHCR/WFP, 2016). While receiving credit is not uncommon for many urban dwellers, the relative vulnerability of the displaced puts them at risk of debt bondage.¹ Such profound economic insecurity can compel some families to make perilous choices, including child marriage, human trafficking, commercial sexual exploitation, begging, and street vending.

Livelihoods interventions have the potential to reduce such risks by restoring economic independence, dignity and self-reliance. These programmes typically involve integrating beneficiaries into local markets; yet these markets can also be venues for discrimination, harassment, and marginalisation. While the informal labour market can offer greater flexibility, a lack of regulations makes such markets conducive to exploitation and abuse, with refugees a target for wage theft and sexual violence. Thus, livelihoods programmes intended for such precarious urban economic contexts must be designed, implemented and evaluated with protection as a fundamental component.

This guidance note is part of a larger project that seeks to provide guidance to practitioners and policy makers, at local, national, and international levels for addressing humanitarian crises in urban environments. The note outlines ten core principles practitioners can follow when aiming to integrate protection and livelihoods programming. Each principle provides background as to why it is important to consider the guidance when implementing in complex urban environments; questions to guide intervention design; illustrative indicators to measure programme effectiveness; notes on sustainability; and brief case examples. Links to additional reading are included at the end of each section.

This note was derived from a desk review and case studies of humanitarian and development initiatives for Syrian refugees in Lebanon and Jordan, where over 2 million refugees have fled (1.5 million to Lebanon (LCRP, 2017) and 655,000 to Jordan (UNDP/UNHCR, 2016)), now comprising significant percentages of host country populations. The majority of Syrian refugees resides in urban or peri-urban environments and struggles to meet their material needs, with nine in ten living below the host country poverty line (World Bank/UNHCR, 2016). The enabling environment for refugee self-sufficiency varies between the two case studies. In Lebanon, the mandate to obtain and renew residency permits at annual costs was prohibitive and administratively complex, forcing many refugees into irregular status and inhibiting their ability to apply for a work permit and gain employment in the formal sector (Human Rights Watch, 2017). While this policy has recently been amended to waive permit fees for some Syrian refugees holding UNHCR documentation, severe macro-economic shocks and high domestic unemployment have deterred the Lebanese government from supporting the inclusion of Syrian refugees within the labour market. By contrast, Jordan has received external investment from the World Bank Group, which placed conditions upon the Compact Agreement that displaced Syrians' contribution to Jordan's economic growth. While this has put the emphasis on increasing the number of Syrians who receive work permits for employment in the formal labour market (World Bank, 2016), many refugees continue to pursue informal work.

¹ A person's pledge of labour or services as security for the repayment of a debt or other obligation. The nature and duration of services required to repay the debt may be undefined.

Both cases within the Syrian crisis have highlighted the need for greater innovation and integration on behalf of humanitarian actors to respond effectively to the evolving economic and protection challenges faced by displaced persons in urban settings. While this note features the work of refugee-serving NGOs and multi-lateral institutions within Jordan and Lebanon, its guidance is informed by the broader literature on humanitarian action in urban contexts, with the intention of it being universally applicable to a diverse array of urban settings, forced displacement situations (IDPs or refugees), and relief efforts.

Definitions

Area-based approaches (ABAs) – geographically targeted, participatory, and multi-sectoral strategies for development (Parker and Maynard, 2015). ABAs avoid setting up parallel systems and duplication by engaging with local authorities to ensure complementarity of services. Robust context analyses are encouraged, including mapping of stakeholders and facilities in efforts to mobilise and coordinate with relevant actors to achieve a goal (IRC, 2015). ABAs embrace systems thinking, aiming to understand the underlying interdependencies and linkages that support the functioning of a dynamic urban system, including relationships between municipal authorities, civil society organisations, the private sector, and community residents to gain insight on the barriers inhibiting a desired outcome.

Livelihoods – a means of making a living. This comprises the capabilities, assets, and activities required to meet basic needs. Livelihoods are sustainable when they can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance beneficiary capabilities and assets, and provide sustainable income-generating opportunities for the next generation (Chambers and Conway, 1992 – cited in Jaspars *et al.*, 2007).

Protection – seeks to uphold the rights of individuals in accordance with international humanitarian, human rights, and refugee law, regardless of age, gender, social, ethnic, national, religious, or other background (IASC, 2016). Activities undertaken by the protection sector may be preventative to minimise the risk of violence, abuse, or exploitation by creating a social, cultural, institutional, and legal environment that respects the rights of all people and ensures access to impartial assistance. Activities may also be responsive, using advocacy to compel duty bearers to meet their protection obligations or strengthen capacities of local actors to provide direct services that aim to restore dignity and well-being for affected persons when their rights have been violated. Such activities need not occur solely in protection-focused programming, but rather it is suggested that protection principles, both preventative and responsive, are mainstreamed throughout all humanitarian action.

Below are the four primary protection principles suggested by the Global Protection Cluster (GPC) to be included in all humanitarian activities (Global Protection Cluster, 2017).

1. **Safety and dignity (and avoid causing harm)** – Prevent and minimise as much as possible any unintended negative effects of your intervention which can increase people's vulnerability to both physical and psychosocial risks.
2. **Meaningful access** – Arrange for people's access to assistance and services in proportion to need and without any barriers (eg discrimination). Pay special attention to individuals and groups who may be particularly vulnerable or have difficulty accessing assistance and services.
3. **Accountability** – Set up appropriate mechanisms through which affected populations can measure the adequacy of interventions, and address concerns and complaints.
4. **Participation and empowerment** – Support the development of self-protection capacities and assist people to claim their rights, including – not exclusively – the rights to shelter, food, water and sanitation, health, and education.

Core Principle 1: Mainstream protection concepts within livelihoods interventions

Livelihoods interventions are increasingly critical to promote economic self-sufficiency among refugees in situations of protracted crises, particularly in urban areas where the cost-of-living is high. Due to host government restrictions on access to work, discrimination, language barriers, or simply the need for flexibility and mobility, refugees are often compelled to engage in the informal labour market where exploitation is more likely to occur as workers lack the bargaining power to negotiate fair wages and safe working conditions (Ajluni and Kavar, 2012). The risk of exploitation, ranging from wage theft to sexual violence, is heightened as families struggle to meet basic needs, at times engaging in risky coping strategies for survival (UNICEF, 2012).

The first core principle of this note outlines strategies for mainstreaming protection into urban livelihoods programming. There is a need for livelihoods practitioners to be well versed in protection issues for refugees and also willing to create space for protection actors within their planning, implementation, and evaluation processes. This section highlights IRC's work on mainstreaming protection principles of **safety and dignity, meaningful access, accountability, and participation and empowerment** within their economic recovery and development (ERD) portfolio in Lebanon. Key actions and guiding questions for programme development are included, followed by illustrative performance indicators, notes on sustainability, and resources for further study.



Credit: Kaity Kavar.

KEY ACTIONS	GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. Assess current state of protection integration within livelihoods portfolio.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the potential protection risks that beneficiaries may face as they attempt to access or participate in a given livelihoods programme? To what extent are such protection concerns considered within the design, implementation, and evaluation of livelihoods programmes? Are protection staff consulted during planning processes? Are current and potential future beneficiaries consulted?
2. Mainstream protection principles into livelihood sector work plans and M&E frameworks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can protection principles be best operationalised within the given context? How can safety and dignity or meaningful access be quantified in each livelihood intervention?
3. Co-locate protection and livelihood staff within community outreach centres.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the livelihood programme have a physical location within a community? If yes, how best can protection staff be utilised within this centre? If no, can protection and livelihoods staff be individually teamed when travelling to project sites? How can responsibility and leadership of protection mainstreaming be progressively transferred to livelihoods staff through these teaming arrangements?
4. Include protection principles within the job descriptions and employee evaluations of livelihoods staff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can employees embrace the principle of accountability when operating livelihoods programmes? Are participation and empowerment designated outcomes within a livelihoods programme? If not, what goals can be set for livelihoods staff to encourage the mainstreaming of these principles?
5. Ensure protection risk mitigation is integrated within the strategies of livelihood partners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do livelihood partners plan to address potential risks related to occupational safety and health (OSH), child labour, sexual and gender based violence (SGBV), or physical safety? What are the continued steps that will need to be taken to mitigate risks and how will they be monitored and reported? What protocols are in place to address violations? When offering micro-grants to small businesses, are both protection and livelihoods staff involved in proposal reviews? Are protection concerns scored within the review process?
6. Provide initial and routine refresher training on protection principles for all staff engaged in livelihoods programming.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the primary protection principles that livelihoods staff find the most difficult to operationalise in practice? What techniques do staff find most helpful when learning how to put these principles into practice? Is training best received on an annual basis or in briefer monthly refresher sessions? How can capacity to deliver or co-deliver introductory protection training be institutionalised within livelihoods teams?

Illustrative performance indicators

In order to understand if certain groups lack meaningful access or are more prone to specific protection risks, the disaggregation of data by sex and age, at a minimum, can be highly informative and should be undertaken across each of the ten core principles. Further disaggregation can be helpful to understand protection risks faced by beneficiaries of varying abilities, sexual orientations, religious backgrounds, and ethnic origins.

The following are samples of illustrative performance indicators that can be integrated within a livelihoods programme to assess progress on protection integration:

- Number of staff trained on complaint mechanisms
- Percentage of employers and business owners that have identified and addressed occupational hazards within their work place, and
- Increased accessibility of services for persons with disabilities.

Beyond measuring the uptake of protection principles and the expansion of services, evaluators should also consider if the outcomes of livelihoods interventions have improved as a result of protection mainstreaming. A simple comparative analysis of livelihoods outcomes prior to and after protection mainstreaming can offer an initial glimpse of the influence of mainstreaming on programme effectiveness.

BOX 1. MAINSTREAMING PROTECTION PRINCIPLES

The IRC's efforts to mainstream protection principles within their economic programming portfolio in Lebanon have been far reaching. Listed below are just a few of the ways in which protection has been integrated within a livelihoods workplan:

- Ensure beneficiaries enrolled in apprenticeships and micro-grant programmes are provided with **insurance** policies.
- **Include indicators** for safety & dignity, meaningful access, accountability, participation and empowerment, and Do No Harm within **evaluations** of micro-enterprise grant proposals.
- **Assess apprenticeship sites** and **vocational training spaces** to ensure they meet protection standards
- Train livelihoods centre staff on **safe identification and referral**, and
- Provide basic **OSH** training to employers.

Sustainability

Fostering protection integration within the operational environments of local private sector partners creates a transfer of knowledge and practice that will ideally continue after the partnership with the NGO has ended. Further, by integrating protection concerns into the business strategies of host community partners, local labour protections and regulations are affirmed and operationalised. Partnerships with local government can also offer lasting impact, such as IRC's guidance and capacity building on protection mainstreaming models provided to Lebanon's Ministry of Social Affairs to enhance the country's Social Development Centres (SDCs). Training on protection mainstreaming for government actors as well as the secondment of NGO staff to government departments (and vice versa) can establish protection mainstreaming as a sustained local strategy once humanitarian actors have left a crisis.

Resources

- Global Protection Cluster (2017) *Protection Mainstreaming Training, Toolkit, and Mobile App*. www.globalprotectioncluster.org/en/areas-of-responsibility/protection-mainstreaming.html
- Global Protection Cluster (2014) *Protection Mainstreaming Training Package*. www.globalprotectioncluster.org/_assets/files/aors/protection_mainstreaming/PM_training/1_GPC_Protection_Mainstreaming_Training_Package_FULL_November_2014.pdf
- UNHCR (2011) *Promoting Livelihoods and Self-Reliance: Operational Guidance on Refugee Protection and Solutions in Urban Areas*. www.unhcr.org/uk/publications/operations/4eeb19f49/promoting-livelihoods-self-reliance-operational-guidance-refugee-protection.html

Core Principle 2: Promote social cohesion through inclusive livelihoods development

When a humanitarian crisis results in an influx of displaced persons to an urban setting, tensions over resources including shelter, employment, and access to services may flare between host community residents and new arrivals. Increased labour market supply and higher prices for basic commodities, along with congested spaces and infrastructure challenges can further exacerbate tensions by depressing wages while simultaneously increasing the cost of living. Hostilities can manifest into physical violence, causing threats to the personal safety and security of refugees and their families. This threat of harassment and violence can result in refugees retreating from public spaces and isolating themselves within their domiciles, reducing their access to social capital and social support.

Social cohesion has been defined as ‘the nature and set of relationships between individuals and groups in a particular environment (horizontal social cohesion) and between those individuals and groups and institutions that govern them in a particular environment (vertical social cohesion)’ (Guay, 2016).

When promoting economic self-reliance among refugees in urban contexts, it is important to apply a conflict sensitive approach to avoid unintentional harm, and to foster rather than worsen social cohesion. Doing so may not only improve economic outcomes for refugees, but also mitigate the protection risks that exist in a socially unstable environment. Providing much needed employment opportunities for refugees, while addressing the physical needs of the urban host community can yield mutual benefit for refugees and long-term residents. Programmes that promote joint economic ventures between displaced and host community residents can foster relationship building and expand social networks while pursuing sustainable livelihoods. This section offers guidance on structuring livelihoods interventions to promote social cohesion in urban humanitarian contexts. Key actions and guiding questions for programme development are included, as well as illustrative performance indicators, notes on sustainability, and resources for further study.



Credit: Jacob Russell.

KEY ACTIONS	GUIDING QUESTIONS
<p>1. Conduct a context or conflict sensitivity analysis (at a minimum a Do No Harm assessment).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the political, economic, and social landscape of the implementing area? Who are the actors and groups present in the area and how do they relate to one another? How do individuals residing in the project intervention area define their identity (host, displaced, religion, ethnicity, politics)? What dynamics exist between displaced and host communities and does this differ by sub-populations (women, minors, ethnic or sexual minorities)? What are the dividers and tensions between displaced and host communities? What are the connectors? How will programme activities impact these dividers and connectors? Do displaced individuals have specific legal obstacles to accessing public goods and services, especially with regard to property ownership and employment? What are the social/cultural obstacles that displaced individuals face in terms of accessing public goods and services? What is the extent of access to justice for displaced persons? What is their relationship with the local police? What is the perception of displaced individuals' access to justice among host community members and employers?
<p>2. Conduct a spatial analysis (such as a transect walk).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do the layouts of roads, public spaces, transport and infrastructure systems promote or inhibit social cohesion? How might modifications to these layouts yield long-term benefit towards integrating the social and economic networks of displaced individuals and their host communities? What other participatory assessment tools might be useful to understand how physical space contributes to or inhibits social cohesion?
<p>3. Engage with municipal authorities, local unions, merchants associations, and other local businesses to determine if there are employment needs that refugees can fill.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What guidance does the host country's legal framework provide on refugee employment? How is this guidance operationalised at the local level? Are there opportunities to employ displaced individuals in jobs that would improve infrastructure or services within their residential community? How might displaced individuals employment in water, sanitation, construction, road repair, or neighbourhood beautification be a win-win for displaced individuals, host communities, and overburdened municipal authorities? Are there stigmas associated with those sectors? Are there employment opportunities available that correspond to displaced individuals' average educational level?
<p>4. Expand livelihoods services to include host community members as beneficiaries.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What livelihoods initiatives are currently aimed at displaced individuals and can these be expanded to include the host community? What additional resources might be needed to do so?
<p>5. Assist refugee beneficiaries in entrepreneurial ventures by facilitating connections with host community innovators.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What opportunities exist to partner displaced individuals with host community members in joint entrepreneurial ventures? What monitoring frameworks will be put in place to ensure the partnership is equal and not exploitative? (See Core Principle No. 6).
<p>6. Consider incorporating an apprenticeship model to build marketable skills for refugees, particularly youth, while engaging host community business owners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What skills are in demand in the local market? Would local employers be interested in training an apprentice whose stipend is externally subsidised? What is the appropriate duration for an apprenticeship programme in a given field? Are there opportunities for the employer to hire the apprentice once training is complete? If not, are there opportunities for other local employers to hire the apprentice? Would the apprenticeship yield a formal training certificate of value in the local labour market?

Illustrative performance indicators

Measuring the effectiveness of programmes to achieve social cohesion can be a challenge as universally operationalised definitions do not yet exist. However, innovative methods are being employed to capture the concept. The Social Cohesion and Reconciliation Index (SCORE) is a community level assessment that can serve as a complement to individual level perceptions of social inclusion and connectedness. Similarly, the SenseMaker methodology allows evaluators to connect personal narratives with quantifiable outcomes to obtain trends on complex concepts such as social cohesion.

The following are samples of illustrative performance indicators that can be included within the monitoring framework of a livelihood intervention to assess its effect on social cohesion:

- Number of social interactions between refugee and host community members
- Percentage of host community members (population sample) who consider refugees to be integrated members of their community
- Percentage of host community members who believe they share common values with refugee residents
- Number of host community leaders that have publically advocated for refugee and host community collaboration, and
- Number of conflict incidences within the implementing community.

Sustainability

Where feasible, implementing organisations should continually attempt to identify local or regional donors that see benefit in promoting social cohesion through community spaces and joint economic ventures, increasing the opportunities for financing after foreign assistance ends. Further, by providing assistance and support to both refugee and host communities, local governments are more likely to be collaborative and potentially take up implementation strategies when NGO funding ends. Partnering with local CSOs and/or municipalities in the operation of community centres, economic initiatives, and evaluation of social cohesion outcomes will also further sustain the use of this concept in urban humanitarian contexts.

BOX 2. FOSTERING SOCIAL COHESION THROUGH JOINT ECONOMIC ENDEAVOURS AND SUPPORT

In Jordan, the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), in collaboration with implementing partners, operates three community centres each offering services or referrals related to livelihoods, psychosocial support, health, education, child protection, and legal aid. The centres are run by staff and volunteers, each with a steering committee consisting of refugees and host community members, who determine what activities should be offered. Local community-based organisations (CBOs) are also engaged, occasionally borrowing the facility for training space. Since 2015, the community centres have reached over 12,000 beneficiaries.

“I am starting to see the same children and adults each day but every day there is more of them. They start to walk in with more confidence as if it is their home. Syrians, Jordanians, Palestinians – they all want an opportunity to interact and improve their lives. No one was happy staying in their homes alone.” – Reem al Jabba, Jordan Hashemite Charity Organisation for Relief and Development (DRC implementing partner)

Resources

- Centre for Sustainable Peace and Democratic Development/UNDP–ACT (2015) SCORE Index. www.scoreforpeace.org
- Cognitive Edge (2017) SenseMaker Methodology. <http://cognitive-edge.com/sensemaker/>
- Conflict Sensitivity Consortium (2012) How to guide to conflict sensitivity. www.conflictsensitivity.org/how-to-guide/
- International Rescue Committee (2017) Urban Context Analysis Toolkit Guidance note for Humanitarian Practitioners. IIED, London. Available at: <http://pubs.iied.org/10819IIED>
- International Rescue Committee (2016) Conflict Sensitivity Analysis Tool Kit. <https://rescue.box.com/s/jlegafnquaovngw1j9qdcqwwnm1p9xt>
- United States Agency for International Development (USAID) (2011) People-to-People Peacebuilding: A Program Guide. www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1866/CMMP2PGuidelines2010-01-19.pdf
- World Bank (n.d.) Transect Walk. https://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTTOPPSISOU/Resources/1424002-1185304794278/4026035-1185375653056/4028835-1185375678936/1_Transect_walk.pdf

Core Principle 3: Develop a complaints and feedback mechanism

Complaints and feedback mechanisms are a key aspect of protection and accountability programming, allowing for beneficiaries, staff, and community members to provide their input on local programming, as well as report violations of rights or ethics, giving them voice and agency in identifying concerns. Such mechanisms are particularly important when providing services to vulnerable populations, including livelihoods assistance. Many internal complaint mechanisms are concerned with fraud, abuse, and exploitation within the organisation. Increasingly, organisations also provide beneficiaries with the opportunity to provide complaints and feedback on their programmes. A risk to livelihoods programming is that refugee clients may face exploitation and abuse by employers. Discrimination and harassment of refugees may be particularly prevalent in the informal sector and in urban settings, resulting from host community frustrations over local economic conditions and the burden on public resources. In contexts where informal mediation is the preferred strategy for resolving disputes, complaints and feedback mechanisms may offer beneficiaries the opportunity to informally address grievances, rather than resort to more formalised methods, such as filing a formal complaint with the local labour directorate or police department.

This section offers brief guidance for practitioners aiming to implement such mechanisms organisation-wide as well as in the workplaces of refugee clients. The guidance is informed by the experience of the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), which has successfully implemented its own internal mechanism, while also undertaking a workplace complaint mechanism as a partner to the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ's) *Waste to Positive Energy* programme (see Box 3). Key actions and guiding questions for programme development are included, as well as illustrative performance indicators, notes on sustainability, and resources for further study.



Credit: Jacob Russell.

KEY ACTIONS	GUIDING QUESTIONS
<p>1. Ensure your organisation has a formalised complaints and feedback mechanism that incorporates known protection risks in the community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your organisation have a complaints and feedback mechanism? How are complaints and feedback collected and addressed? Does this mechanism place common complaints within a tiered structure to determine the urgency of response? Does the mechanism provide specific guidance for concerns such as SGBV? Are the common complaints reflective of known protection risks within the community?
<p>2. Disseminate information to the community on project objectives, implementing organisations, and client selection in tandem with the purposes of the complaints and feedback mechanisms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project well understood by the local community? Do refugee and host communities understand the role of the complaint and feedback mechanism? What suggestions does the host community have on how to prevent protection risks for livelihoods beneficiaries?
<p>3. Assess information sessions on humanitarian accountability structures to determine if potential protection risks for livelihoods beneficiaries are well articulated, while leaving space for risks not yet identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do information sessions provide examples of protection risks such as debt bondage, garnishing of wages,² withholding of documentation, bribery, health and safety hazards, and physical, sexual, and verbal abuse at the hands of an employer?
<p>4. If your organisation is predominately a livelihoods actor, consider partnering with a protection specialised organisation to assess options for informal workplace complaints mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are livelihoods actors placing refugees into temporary or informal sectors that lack a mechanism to lodge workplace complaints? If yes, can a complaint mechanism be undertaken by the livelihood organisation or can it join with a protection-oriented partner to do so? What would be the line management and oversight structure for staff working on the complaint mechanism? Are employers made aware of the mechanism? Can complaints be mediated informally? If escalation is required, do relationships exist with the local labour protectorate or police department? How will the informal complaints mechanism function after the NGO project funding ends?
<p>5. Ensure a sufficient amount of information is collected to process feedback and complaints and that a well-organised data management system allows for follow-up and trend analysis while protecting confidentiality as appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happened? Who was involved? Where did it occur? On what date? Who is the individual providing feedback or a complaint (full name, contact information, client ID number)?
<p>6. Notify complainants that their comment has been received and keep them aware of progress made to address a given situation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What methods will be made available for obtaining complaints and notifying complainants that the issue is being addressed (ie SMS, web platform, hotline, hand-written cards, verbal communication)?
<p>7. Address complaints in accordance with standardised procedures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your organisation have standard operating procedures (SOPs) for responding to complaints and feedback? What types of mediation (informal versus formal) are offered? How are relationships with municipalities and chambers of commerce managed throughout the process? What thresholds exist for discontinuing partnerships with local businesses?
<p>8. Analyse trends within complaint data, revise potential employer lists accordingly, and determine if adjustments to programme operations or strategy are required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the most common complaints lodged in the last 3, 6, or 12 months? Have certain types of complaints increased significantly? What circumstances are increasing these complaints and how can programme interventions be modified to address them? Have certain types of complaints decreased significantly? If yes, are programme interventions responsible for this decline or is there another reason why beneficiaries are no longer lodging complaints? Is there an objective quality assurance scorecard that a separate department can utilise to assess the quality of the complaints system?

²Deducting money from an employee's compensation to pay off a debt.

BOX 3. PARTNERING WITH LIVELIHOODS ACTORS TO INITIATE COMPLAINT MECHANISMS

In addition to the routine complaints mechanism that operates within its Accountability Unit, the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) in Jordan operates a workplace complaints mechanism in partnership with GIZ's *Waste to Positive Energy* programme. This mechanism allows cash-for-work beneficiaries participating in environmental and waste management programmes with local municipalities or alternative government agencies to file reports of protection concerns within the workplace. These may range from physical or sexual abuse to hazardous working environments, to the withholding of documentation and non-payment of wages. The mechanism allows beneficiaries to report concerns through hotlines, handwritten forms, and walk-in sessions with a complaints assistant. All complaints are coded for level of severity and addressed accordingly. Complainants receive feedback that their complaint has been registered and followed up on next steps within 48 hours to 2 weeks, depending on the nature of the concern.

Illustrative performance indicators

Below is a sample of illustrative performance indicators to assess the effectiveness of a complaints mechanism:

- Percentage of beneficiaries aware of the complaint mechanism
- Percentage of complaints addressed within the specified number of days/hours
- Percentage change in client satisfaction with the complaint mechanism experience
- Number of complaints lodged, and
- Number of complaints resolved.

Sustainability

When implementing a workplace complaints programme as a humanitarian actor, there is a need to transition the mechanism to local community entities, whether that be host community civil society organisations, unions, professional associations, and/or management within the private or government sectors.

Resources

- Danish Refugee Council (2008) Complaints Mechanism Handbook. www.alnap.org/resource/8762
- The Smart Campaign (2014) How to Design a Complaints Mechanism: A Tool for Financial Institutions. www.smartcampaign.org/storage/documents/Mechanisms_for_Complaints_Resolution.pdf
- World Vision (2009) Complaint and Response Mechanisms. www.wvi.org/sites/default/files/WVI_Complaint%20and%20Response%20Mechanisms_Guide.pdf

Core Principle 4: Increase rate and quality of referrals

Safe identification and referral is a central component of protection work and a critical initial step to ensuring beneficiaries receive needed support to mitigate potentially harmful situations. The 2016 Operational Strategy of the Protection Working Group in Jordan stated a specific focus on referral system enhancement and quality improvement, with an emphasis on specialised services. These include assistive tools, devices, and rehabilitation for persons with disabilities (PWDs), psychosocial support services, access to legal information and counselling, and emergency financial assistance for those facing immediate protection risk (Protection Working Group, 2016). Increasing the rate and quality of referrals is a goal well suited for an urban implementing context where there exists a wider array of services and providers to which beneficiaries can be connected.

Yet, livelihoods actors are not typically trained in safe identification and referral procedures despite one-to-one interactions concerning job placement or employment counselling. At the same time, protection staff often lack awareness of the livelihoods opportunities that can increase economic security, creating a more protective environment for beneficiaries. Thus, when seeking to integrate protection into livelihoods initiatives in urban settings, increasing the rate and quality of referrals is a primary task. This section highlights the experience of the IRC in Lebanon who, since 2015, have begun systematically training livelihoods staff to identify protection risks and make appropriate referrals. Key actions and guiding questions for programme development are included, as well as illustrative performance indicators, notes on sustainability, and resources for further study.



Credit: Peter Biro.

KEY ACTIONS	GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. Identify services unable to be provided in-house.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are critical services that your organisation cannot provide in-house (ie GBV counselling, SRH, quality psychosocial support, legal counselling, material assistance to PWDs)?
2. Map available services and create working relationships.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who are the service providers in with your area of geographic coverage that offer services your organisation does not offer? How would they like to be contacted for future referrals? How large is their caseload and what is the typical wait time to see beneficiaries? What are the criteria they use to determine eligibility of potential beneficiaries for inclusion? Do they currently serve refugees, why or why not? What barriers might they face to doing so (ie willingness, capacity, need for cost sharing)? What refugee sub-populations would be most appropriately –and safely – referred to which providers?
3. Consider adding 1–2 Referral Officers to livelihoods staff roster.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who will provide training to livelihoods staff on safe identification and referral? Will these individuals be available after training to assist livelihoods staff with integrating this practice into their daily work? Does initiating contact with referral agencies create a time burden for livelihoods staff? If yes, could Referral Officers provide support in making and following up with referrals?
4. Develop well-organised documentation structures that log date of referrals and subsequent follow-up.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there an agreed inter-agency referral form for use within the context? If not, what type of information would be necessary to document referrals and follow-up? On what date was the client referred? Was contact made between the livelihoods employee and the agency of referral? On what date did the client receive service from the agency of referral?
5. Utilise technological innovations to identify, map, connect, and rate service providers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What innovations would be of greatest use to practitioners making referrals? For beneficiaries in need of referrals? For organisations receiving referrals? What barriers exist to beneficiaries or humanitarian actors using new technology? How might these be overcome?
6. Identify trends by analysing referral data .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What protection needs are referred out the most? Are there protection needs that cannot be met by local service agencies? Are certain types of referrals more likely to be completed by beneficiaries than others? For instance, are mental health referrals less likely to be closed successfully compared to legal counselling? Are the agencies receiving referrals responsive to follow up and able to provide the services for which the referral was made? Are there bottlenecks or broken referral pathways that should be escalated to the relevant cluster/sector lead? Are the needs of marginalised sub-populations (ie PWDs or women isolated in their homes) being identified and addressed through referrals when appropriate?
7. Include an indicator on successful referrals within employee evaluation .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many successful referrals has the livelihood employee made in the past six months? What barriers existed to meeting referral goals?

Illustrative performance indicators

Below are samples of illustrative performance indicators that can be integrated within a livelihoods M&E framework to assess the effectiveness of the referral mechanism:

- Number of referrals made
- Number of new, local referral points established
- Percentage of referrals resulting in service provision, and
- Number of days between referral made and referral service provided (when obtaining such data is feasible).

Sustainability

Early and ongoing coordination with municipal and other local actors will strengthen organisational referral mechanisms. Continued dialogue may need to include what supports they need to serve refugee referrals, including resource allocation such as additional staff time or cost sharing. Local CSOs and service providers should be trained on any technological innovations for referrals so that they can be utilised after humanitarian actors depart. Engagement of local technical partners to maintain, troubleshoot, and update ICT innovations after humanitarian operations cease should be considered.

BOX 4. TRAINING LIVELIHOODS STAFF ON SAFE IDENTIFICATION AND REFERRAL

Prior to engagement by protection staff, referrals made by the IRC's Economic Relief and Development (ERD) team in Lebanon were few and far between. After intentional engagement with protection experts, including training on safe identification and referral, ERD staff became more skilled in providing space for clients to discuss needs and concerns beyond or associated with income generation. Between October 2015 and September 2016, ERD staff at the Mt. Lebanon and Akkar Livelihoods Centres in Lebanon have made 1,736 referrals for specialised services, including cash for emergency protection, child protection case management, and referrals for urgent health concerns.

Technological innovations are also expanding the referral landscape. The IRC's ServiceInfo app, piloted in Lebanon, is a cloud-based service provider self-registry that features service user feedback. The software is now being used in Europe as Refugee.Info, a joint initiative between the IRC and Mercy Corps to promote information dissemination among displaced populations.

"Referrals save lives."

–IRC Protection Officer, Mt. Lebanon Livelihoods Center

Resources

- FHI 360 (2016) Practitioner Guide: Organizational Network Analysis & Mapping <http://theliftproject.org/ona-mapping-guide/>
- International Organisation for Migration (2016) National Referral Mechanism (NRM) for the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants in Zambia. www.iom.int/files/live/sites/iom/files/Country/docs/National-Referral-Mechanism-NRM-for-the-Protection-of-Vulnerable-Migrants-in-Zambia.pdf
- International Rescue Committee (2017) ServiceInfo Information Portal. <https://serviceinfo.rescue.org/en/>
- International Rescue Committee/Mercy Corps. Refugee.Info. www.refugee.info/
- Women's Refugee Commission (2016) Service Provision Mapping Tool: Urban Refugee Response. Mapping humanitarian and host community organisations relevant to GBV prevention and GBV risk mitigation. www.womensrefugeecommission.org/images/zdocs/Urban-GBV-Tools-Mapping-Services-Pilot.pdf

Core Principle 5: Explore a one-stop centre approach

Increasingly, humanitarian relief and development actors have acknowledged that offering a package of services, which span technical sectors, is an effective way to address the multi-faceted needs facing beneficiaries. Offering a menu of services to beneficiaries has been a strategy well received among refugee beneficiaries in Lebanon and Jordan, as well as among those displaced by urban disaster in Tacloban, Philippines (DFID, 2014). These bundled services may be organised from an office outside of the implementing area or may be offered from a centralised physical location within the community. Such physical presence provides an opportunity for enhancing social cohesion between refugees and host community residents while achieving specific livelihoods outcomes.

When designing a package of services to be offered through a one-stop livelihoods model, it is important to ensure that it responds to client preferences and abilities, reflects the needs within the given area, and advances clearly defined economic outcomes. Some regions may have a greater demand for highly skilled workers while others do not. Some areas may have greater job competition with local residents and higher social tensions as a result. Protection risks associated with labour market engagement may differ by region. The package of services offered should strategically fit together to respond to the unique needs of each urban environment.

This section provides guidance for developing a physical resource centre that integrates livelihoods and protection interventions relevant in urban humanitarian settings to achieve economic outcomes while considering additional service offerings through virtual or mobile delivery, and features IRC's livelihoods centre model in Lebanon (see Box 5). Key actions and guiding questions for one-stop centre and service development are included, as well as illustrative performance indicators, notes on sustainability, and resources for further study.



Credit: Timea Fauszt.

KEY ACTIONS	GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. Assess both the livelihoods and protection needs of beneficiaries within the local context.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What training and employment services do potential clients want to see offered at a centre? What training services are most marketable within the local context? What protection issues are foreseen? What protection issues have clients identified? How does this differ by sex and age?
2. Consider whether offering livelihoods and protection services from one centre would be efficient and beneficial to the community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do movement restrictions in the host community limit the beneficiary's ability to travel? Is there presently a physical space where beneficiaries receive protection or livelihoods services? If yes, how can such services be integrated within centre operations? Is it foreseen that certain sub-populations would not avail of centre-based services? How can this be remedied? Alternatively, are there certain service offerings that would be more efficient to provide through mobile delivery? How can mobile components and centre-based services be creatively combined?
3. Co-locate protection and livelihoods staff within the same resource centre.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What types of staff are required based on the needs assessment? Legal counsellors, protection officers, job counsellors, micro-enterprise managers, apprenticeship coordinators, mental health professionals, psychosocial facilitators?
4. Ensure centre services are made available to both refugee clients and host communities . Offer a menu of services from which clients can pick and choose based on their needs and the desired outcomes of the programme.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the livelihoods needs within the community? Are these needs the same for host community residents and refugees? What is the feasible package of services to offer that can be strategically integrated to achieve programme goals while responsive to community feedback and market needs? How can clients be made aware of the range of services available both within the one-stop centre and beyond, including services related to sensitive or taboo topics?³
5. Consider the spatial dynamics of the centre.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are private meetings spaces available for clients who wish to discuss a protection concern? Is there stigma associated with a psychosocial counselling session? How can this stigma be reversed, avoided, or minimised?
6. Place informative material on the walls. UNICEF, ILO, UNHCR as well as local and international NGOs have awareness raising materials on protection issues that can be featured within the community centre space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What information is most helpful for clients to visually see at the centre? Information on documentation (residency cards, work permits), labour rights, OSH, child labour, access to basic services?
7. Mainstream protection indicators within livelihoods outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Core Principle No. 1
8. Conduct trend analysis with data from the centre. While some questions are best answered through a tightly controlled randomised control trial, basic analysis of client outcomes can offer glimpses into the comparative value of a one-stop centre offering multiple services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does legal counselling in addition to employment counselling demonstrate better outcomes for clients as compared to legal counselling only? Do clients who receive psychosocial support in addition to vocational training demonstrate better livelihoods outcomes? Are outcomes measurement approaches comprehensive enough to take into account outcomes beyond those strictly related to livelihoods?

³While not a specific offering at the IRC Lebanon centre, this may include, but is not limited to, sexual violence, physical abuse, reproductive health, divorce, sexuality, and sex work. It is important that practitioners build their skills and capacities to address these issues so that beneficiaries have information and a range of rights-based referral options from which to choose.

Illustrative performance indicators

When offering a package of interdisciplinary services, M&E frameworks used to provide initial assessment, continual project monitoring, and post-intervention evaluation should equally span disciplines. Standardised tools such as the Vulnerability Assessment Framework (VAF) enable humanitarian actors to obtain comprehensive insight on clients while also offering comparability across regions and agencies. Free and open source software, such as Kobo Toolbox, can assist practitioners with creating surveys, mobile data collection, and analysis in challenging environments.

Below is a sample of illustrative performance indicators to assess service provision from a one-stop or bundled service approach:

- Percentage of clients who received job matching services are still employed after six months
- Percentage of clients who attended vocational training who are earning income from that vocation after six months
- Percentage of clients satisfied with service provision to meet their basic needs, and
- Percentage of clients that accessed more than one service through the centre.

Sustainability

With regard to the sustainability of integrated programming models, practitioners should consider how to institutionalise integration so that all future programme proposals reflect the new model. Practitioners must also consider how a community centre as described above can continue to operate once donor funding ends. Relationships built with the private sector should explore the possibility of future financing while simultaneously inviting local community leaders to be engaged with centre operations. Further, as physical centres can be costly and difficult to sustain in the long term, many NGOs have begun to explore mobile options. Such solutions also provide alternative options for hard-to-reach populations that may be isolated in their home. Implementers will need to determine how mobile and centre-based services can be combined to be more cost-effective without losing the broader social support and social networking that often occur within a physical centre.

BOX 5. OFFERING BUNDLED SERVICE PROVISION THROUGH A LIVELIHOODS CENTRE MODEL

IRC's **Livelihoods Centre Model** is used in Mt. Lebanon and Akkar, offering clients a range of services from employment assistance to legal counselling to skills training to financial management, while also offering mediation for housing disputes and guidance on residency permits, all in one location. Host community business owners and entrepreneurs can access capacity-building services, mentorship opportunities, and start-up support. Protection is mainstreamed within centre activities, such as the employment assistance programme, where all job matching is undertaken after potential employers are vetted. Jobseekers are advised on their rights as workers and on the working conditions they should expect. Continued monitoring of employers assures clients that there is someone looking out for their dignity and well-being.

"The only place I felt like a human was here"

—*Syrian refugee describing the Livelihoods Centre in Mt. Lebanon*

Resources

- Introducing the Vulnerability Assessment Framework (VAF) (2014) <http://reliefweb.int/report/jordan/vulnerability-assessment-framework-vaf-jordan-guidance-note>
- Kobo Toolbox (2016) www.kobotoolbox.org

Core Principle 6: Engage private sector partners in protection

Urban areas offer greater access to markets and more options for employment making them ideal locations for livelihood programming. At the same time, refugees face a multitude of risks when seeking employment, including discrimination, exploitation, SGBV, and the increasing concern of bonded labour as landlords serve as employers and creditors. Livelihoods actors who engage with the private sector to address humanitarian crises within cities have the opportunity to forge non-traditional partnerships for protection.

Where the legal environment allows refugees to engage in income-generating activities, such partnerships can attract investment to economically depressed areas, increasing livelihoods opportunities for the displaced and host communities. Such partnerships can also support workplace protections, expanding the realm of safe and decent work opportunities for refugees seeking economic security in both formal and informal markets. This section provides guidance to humanitarian actors seeking to partner with the private sector to increase the economic security, safety, and dignity of potential refugee employees. Key actions and guiding questions for programme development are included as well as illustrative performance indicators, notes on sustainability, and resources for further study.



Credit: Timea Fauszt.

KEY ACTIONS	GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. Conduct a thorough analysis of protection risks and benefits as part of broader market assessments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the labour market dynamics of the host country? Is there a labour surplus and/or severe economic shocks? What are the most effective market-based strategies to secure livelihoods for refugees in such contexts? What jobs provide meaningful access to women? What are the associated protection risks and benefits that accompany these strategies? (See Core Principle No. 1)
2. Where feasible, develop partnerships with industrial parks or special economic zones where goods are manufactured for export and labour standards may already be well regulated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What industrial sectors exist within the host country that export goods? What are the labour and OSH mandates for operating within the park? How are these standards monitored? Is the park geographically accessible for refugee communities?
3. Develop MOUs that incorporate protection principles as a condition for refugee job or apprenticeship placement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What generic protection principles should be highlighted in the MOU? Are there protection risks specific to the employer that should be specified?
4. Provide OSH incentives for private sector partners who avail of financial management trainings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What goods or equipment would improve workplace safety for a partner employer (fire extinguisher, first aid kits, improved ventilation)?
5. Use skilled facilitators to provide information on protection principles, labour law, and basic workplace safety in training sessions with potential private sector partners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the labour laws and policies specific to the implementation context? What are the most frequently occurring workplace hazards? How can employees be made aware of relevant laws and common hazards? What are examples of protection principles carried out in a workplace environment?
6. When pairing clients with businesses, seek geographic proximity to avoid the financial burden and potential protection risks associated with transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do security risks exist in travelling to a place of employment? Will clients be able to return home within daylight hours? What is the cost of safe and secure transport? Do movement restrictions exist that would prevent travel to/from the place of employment?
7. Where formal labour inspectors are few and the regulatory environment does not extend to the informal sector, obtain client feedback and conduct informal spot checks to ensure the safety and health of beneficiaries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there health or safety risks within the work environment that have not been addressed despite warnings?
8. Maintain tracking system of employers , documenting violations. If exploitation or abuse arise, remove employer from partnership and seek formal recourse.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have employers withheld payments or devised pay structures that would create indebtedness for employees? Have discrimination, exploitation, or abuse been reported?

Illustrative performance indicators

Below is a sample of illustrative performance indicators to assess partnerships with the private sector:

Number of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) partnered with refugee and host community members for employment trained on protection principles

- Number of international companies partnered with refugee and host communities for employment
- Percentage of beneficiaries (both refugees and host community members) who report optimism about their employment prospects
- Percentage of beneficiaries engaging in paid employment, and
- Percentage of beneficiaries reporting satisfaction with their employment.

Sustainability

Working with the private sector to advance decent work is critical for addressing protection concerns among refugees in urban settings and has the ability to have a sustained effect if businesses formalise protection principles as part of their company policy or SOPs. At the same time, broader advocacy is needed to foster an enabling environment for economic opportunity and refugee self-sufficiency. The sustainability and effectiveness of livelihoods interventions are heavily influenced by the local economy and favourability of the legal framework to support decent work for refugees.

BOX 6. PROMOTING SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT WITH A PROTECTION LENS

The Danish Refugee Council in Jordan offers micro-grants to community residents as a means of promoting small business development. As part of the application process, business owners must identify protection risks to be assessed as part of the viability for funding score. For those businesses where risk is identified, business owners are mandated to provide a risk mitigation plan and report quantifiable actions made under the plan over the course of the funding period. Such intentional integration demonstrates commitment to protection principles in a tangible and practical way.

Resources

- Betts, A, Bloom, L and Omata, N (2012) Humanitarian Innovation and Refugee Protection. Refugee Studies Centre www.rsc.ox.ac.uk/files/publications/working-paper-series/wp85-humanitarian-innovation-2012.pdf
- Harvard Humanitarian Initiative (2015) Private sector engagement in humanitarian response <http://hhi.harvard.edu/podcasts/private-sector-engagement-humanitarian-response>
- Solutions Alliance (2016) Engaging the Private Sector Thematic Group. www.solutionsalliance.org/private-sector

Core Principle 7: Address risks related to documentation

Under-resourced urban spaces are often physically congested, with crowded areas making it easy for vulnerable individuals or families to go unnoticed and avoid registration or enumeration efforts (UNHCR, 2009).

Yet registration cards and residency permits can be a critical component in protecting against arrest, detention, and refoulement, as well as a requirement for accessing many basic rights and services. In countries where residency permits are required, refugees risk falling into irregular status as documentation expires. Children whose births are not registered face statelessness and adults without proper documentation are forced to limit their movement, complicating their ability to access income-generating opportunities. Lack of formal documentation in the labour market can increase risk of exploitation and abuse at the hands of an employer, including withholding wages and debt bondage.

While it is clear that a lack of documentation decreases mobility, physical safety, and economic security, and is one of the most widespread protection risks facing refugees in urban contexts, obtaining proper documents can be challenging. Costs can be prohibitive and mandated application requirements impractical. There is a need for humanitarian actors to articulate to refugees their rights and responsibilities for documentation, at the same time identifying barriers to obtain such documentation and advocating for an enabling environment for refugees to achieve economic self-reliance through safe and decent work. This section underscores documentation as a primary protection risk and offers insight on integrating documentation concerns within livelihood programming. Key actions and guiding questions for programme development are included, as well as illustrative performance indicators, notes on sustainability, and resources for further study.



Credit: Timea Fauszt.

KEY ACTIONS	GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. Assess the documentation needs of beneficiaries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are clients registered with UNHCR, if appropriate? Are residency permits required in the host country? Are work permits required? What is the process for obtaining such permits? What is the process for renewal if they expire? Is it possible for a refugee to formally register a business? If yes, what are the requirements to do so?
2. Conduct regular group information sessions for beneficiaries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the most effective way to articulate the process of obtaining documentation? How often have these policies been updated? How many introductory and refresher sessions are required to help beneficiaries navigate a potentially evolving process of obtaining documentation? Can refresher information or policy changes be communicated via SMS or other ICT platforms?
3. Offer one-to-one legal counselling for complicated cases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do clients prefer this service to be provided on site, at a resource centre, or via phone? Do mobility restraints hinder clients from accessing on-site legal services? What services should legal staff provide – one-to-one counselling, mediation, information sessions on documentation?
4. Identify barriers for beneficiaries in obtaining proper documentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are costs prohibitive? Are there mandated components of a permit application that are not feasible to obtain? Are health screenings required? Is travel to a government office to process the application difficult? Is it a challenge to obtain employer sponsorship, and does such sponsorship increase risks of exploitation? Are barriers gendered? Are certain family members privileged to obtain documentation? Who has physical possession of documentation papers/cards?
5. Determine what services your organisation can offer to offset these barriers .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there concern over cost, transportation, or inability to understand the filing requirements? How do these barriers differ by sector? By gender and age? For persons with disabilities or LGBT persons? Is it possible for your organisation to address such challenges? If not, are there agencies to which you can refer the beneficiary for such assistance?
6. If the beneficiary is working for a municipal authority in a pseudo-formal arrangement but without a work permit, request formalised identity badges be issued to protect against arrest and detention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are livelihoods beneficiaries who work in pseudo-formal arrangements with municipal authorities or other government agencies facing harassment, discrimination, arrest or detention? Can a photo ID be issued to these employees to mitigate those risks?
7. Advocate for changes to host country policies that create widespread and systematic barriers to formal documentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the systematic barriers to documentation for the majority of beneficiaries? Who are the policy makers capable of modifying current procedures? What incentives exist for policy makers to make changes to existing procedures?

Illustrative performance indicators

Below are a sample of illustrative performance indicators that can be used to understand the extent of documentation concerns and the effectiveness of addressing such concerns within a livelihoods programme:

Percentage of programme participants that are registered with UNHCR

- Percentage of programme participants that have obtained residency permits issued by national authorities
- Percentage of programme participants who desire work permits and have obtained them
- Number of arrests
- Number of forced relocations, and
- Number of incidences of harassment, abuse, or security incidents.⁴

BOX 7. FINDING CREATIVE SOLUTIONS TO OBTAIN WORK PERMITS FOR REFUGEES

During the 'Supporting Syria and the Region' donor conference held in London in February 2016, the government of Jordan signed onto the Jordan Compact, aiming to reach 200,000 refugees with work permits by 2019.

In the newly expanded space for formalised work, the International Labour Organization (ILO) has begun collaborating with targeted sectors to facilitate permits, addressing barriers to refugee willingness to obtain work permits, such as the one-year employment contract, a mandate impractical for seasonal agricultural workers. With approval from Jordan's Ministry of Labour, the ILO worked to initiate agricultural cooperatives, establishing employment coordination offices within the cooperatives to assist with work permitting. This pilot project moved the number of work permits in agriculture from 200 to 10,000 within six months, demonstrating the effectiveness of innovation and flexibility on behalf of the ILO and the government of Jordan. The next initiative for the ILO is creating space for Syrians in construction to work formally as self-employed labourers by facilitating local accreditations and organising cooperatives and other entities to apply for work permits.

Sustainability

The goal of most livelihoods programmes is to identify and secure sustainable employment for beneficiaries. When considering the issue of mass displacement and humanitarian crisis, broader policy efforts must also be undertaken to advance an enabling environment for refugees to pursue self-sufficiency and decent work.

Resources

- Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion/Norwegian Refugee Council (2016) Understanding Statelessness in the Syria Refugee Context. www.syrianationality.org/pdf/report.pdf
- International Rescue Committee (2016) Overview of Right to Work for Refugees. Syria Crisis Response: Lebanon & Jordan. Policy Brief. www.rescue.org/report/policy-brief-overview-right-work-refugees-syria-crisis-response-lebanon-and-jordan

⁴ Data on arrests, forced relocation, harassment, abuse, or other security incidents is often highly sensitive and may be difficult to obtain from clients. Such information is very useful for understanding if protection risks related to documentation have increased or declined, but collection of this data should be carried out with sensitivity.

Core Principle 8: Respond to child labour within a framework of economic security

In urban environments where refugees may face precarious residency status and limited mobility, children may be compelled to engage in income-generating activities with the parental belief that they will be less likely to face deportation or return to refugee camps than their adult family members. Children who engage in the informal urban labour market are often exposed to injury-inducing workplace hazards and are at a greater risk of violence, exploitation, and abuse. Children who are economically active often see their right to education limited or denied as families become dependent upon their financial contributions for survival. In a recent assessment of refugee livelihoods in Jordan, nearly half of the households sampled with one or more working family member relied in whole or in part on the income generated by a child (UNHCR, 2016). Similarly, in Lebanon, approximately three-quarters of street-based working children are Syrian refugees who are at a higher risk of being in conflict with the law (Save the Children/UNICEF, 2015).

Given the interconnectedness between household economic security and caregiver decisions to engage children in the informal labour market, the eighth core principle of this brief outlines strategies for reducing child labour and transitioning youth of legal working age into safe employment through livelihoods interventions designed for an urban environment. There is a need for livelihoods actors to understand the risks posed by child labour, including how those risks differ depending on sex and age, in order to design and implement interventions in such a way to mitigate those risks. Key actions and guiding questions for programme development are included, as well as illustrative performance indicators, notes on sustainability, and resources for further study.



Credit: T. Breur.

KEY ACTIONS	GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. When engaging employers and adult workers in trainings, include child labour law and awareness as components.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are private sector partners familiar with child labour regulations on minimum age, hazardous work, and the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL)? Are employers able to provide relevant protective gear and training for working adolescents? Does your organisation have a child safeguarding policy available to share with potential employers of adolescents? What products have strict regulations on child labour when importing to Europe and how can this information be used to disincentivise child labour across various value chains?
2. Ensure community venues where livelihoods interventions are housed have Safe Healing and Learning Spaces (SHLS) for children where appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If spaces are offered, have protection staff been involved in designing a SHLS? Will the community centre have dedicated management for the SHLS (including at least two adults participating in any activities involving children)? Have background checks been conducted for potential SHLS staff and volunteers? Have SHLS staff and volunteers been trained on core concepts of child protection, early identification, and safe referral? Can management of SHLS be taken on by trained refugee clients as an income-generating activity? How will quality control be assured? Are parents aware of available complaints and feedback mechanisms?
3. Collaborate with protection and education staff to assess the rationale for refugee children/ youth not attending school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have children been victims of bullying by other students or administrators? Is the lack of financial resources of primary concern? Is the lack of appropriate documentation the key driver?
4. Once strategies for returning children to school have been exhausted and after completing screening procedures and background checks of employers, link children of working age with apprenticeship programmes .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What skills are marketable in the local economy and should be prioritised for out-of-school youth? Will stipends be provided to apprentices? What stipend rate is sufficient incentive to keep children off the streets? Are apprenticeship venues close enough to a child's home to avoid transportation costs? How frequently should staff follow up to ensure the work environment is safe and healthy?
5. Pair life skills training, positive parenting, and case management with livelihoods interventions for a holistic approach .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your organisation offer case management services for child protection cases? If yes, how can these case managers better communicate and collaborate with livelihoods staff to offer a holistic package of services for the refugee family? Are livelihoods staff trained on early identification and safe referral? Are child protection staff trained on livelihoods services and eligibility criteria? Are all staff fully aware of child protection case management referral pathways?
6. Advocate for the use and potential expansion of existing Child Labour Monitoring Systems (CLMS) to encompass a wider array of child protection concerns.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the host country have a National Action Plan for child labour? What directives does this policy provide? Does the host country have a functioning CLMS? If yes, who are the users? What barriers exist to routine use of the CLMS? Once children and families are identified, what follow-on support services exist? Is there an operational referral system?

Illustrative performance indicators

Below is a sample of illustrative indicators to assess the effectiveness of livelihoods interventions in addressing child labour risks. Data can be collected from households participating in livelihoods programmes and should be disaggregated, at a minimum, by sex and age:

- Percentage of children aged 5–14 engaged in economic activities
- Percentage of children aged 15–17 engaged in non-hazardous economic activities
- Percentage of children enrolled in school, and
- Percentage of children retained in school.

Sustainability

Short-term livelihood interventions are a temporary fix for working children and their families but often not sustainable. Multi-year donor funding is preferred to offer the specialised service provision needed in complex child protection cases. As such, humanitarian actors may find benefit in collaborating with organisations implementing programmes through longer-term development assistance. Further, investments towards the strengthening of existing national and community-based child protection monitoring systems would yield broad and lasting benefit.

BOX 8. ADDRESSING CHILD LABOUR THROUGH FAMILY ECONOMIC STRENGTHENING

The IRC's **Street and Working Children programme** in Beirut engages parents and caregivers of children found in the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) in economic strengthening activities. Such activities have included cash-for-work schemes that contributed to the beautification of a local Palestinian refugee camp, including light installation, refuse collection, and recycling. This programme served three purposes: the economic empowerment of parents and caregivers; reduction of WFCL; and social cohesion through small-scale public works projects.

For adolescents aged 15–17 found working on the street, the IRC links them with the apprenticeship programme operated by the ERD unit where they are paid a stipend and taught a transferrable skill in a safe and healthy environment. Follow-up with employers and apprentices is weekly, more frequently than during a routine apprenticeship due to the relative vulnerabilities of former street and working children.

Resources

- Global Protection Cluster (2014) Responding to the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Emergencies. http://cpwg.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2014/12/Review_Responding_to_WFCL_in_Emergencies_final.pdf
- Inter-Agency Guidelines for Case Management and Child Protection (2014) www.alnap.org/resource/21786
- Save the Children (2016) Child Protection Mainstreaming Case Study Series <http://resourcecentre.savethechildren.se/library/child-protection-mainstreaming-case-studies-series>
- UNICEF (2012) Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action www.unicef.org/iran/Minimum_standards_for_child_protection_in_humanitarian_action.pdf
- UNHCR (2011) Ensuring Access to Education: Operational Guidance on Refugee Protection and Solutions in Urban Areas. www.unhcr.org/4ea9552f9.pdf

Core Principle 9: Emphasise women's protection and empowerment

The effects of displacement are often different for women, men, girls, and boys – each face unique protection risks within an urban humanitarian context. Cultural norms and societal expectations can restrict the mobility of females, inhibiting their ability to engage in the labour market, perpetuating social exclusion. In a nationwide survey carried out in Jordan, 20 per cent of Syrian women indicated they were working, but only 2 per cent had obtained formal work permits. Childcare and household chores were the predominant rationale for not engaging in paid employment (UN Women/REACH, 2016). Cultural norms surrounding women's work combined with caregiving responsibilities have created a context where home-based enterprises (HBEs) are seen as the most viable option for women to generate income. While the flexibility and informality of such enterprises benefit women's needs in the given context, the work remains without legal protections under the law and can perpetuate the social marginalisation of women. The Jordanian government is currently in discussions to amend a dated law governing handicrafts that would provide protections for HBEs, responding to advocacy for the formalisation and legitimisation of women's work. Such issues are not limited to Jordan. Globally, there is a continued need to consider alternative and flexible income-generating schemes that address the caregiving responsibilities of displaced women. At the same time, efforts must be made to integrate women into safe and decent work opportunities that offer greater promise for advancement and societal participation.



Credit: Timea Fauszt.

When operating within an urban context, there is a need to initially understand the barriers to participation in the labour force for women and determine how those barriers can be addressed. Livelihoods initiatives must take into account women’s caregiving responsibilities as well as the societal norms that influence their integration (or lack thereof) within the labour market. The promotion of economic inclusion for all beneficiaries of legal working age must consider the varying risks and liabilities based on age and gender identity. This section provides insight for designing integrated livelihoods and protection programmes, with a specific emphasis on women’s protection and empowerment. Key actions and guiding questions for programme development are included, as well as illustrative performance indicators, notes on sustainability, and resources for further study.

KEY ACTIONS	GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. Ensure livelihoods and market assessments include a gender analysis and gendered appraisal of protection risks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What jobs are available to women? In what sectors do women typically work? Do they work alone or in pairs? Do they experience particular risks en route to work/home? Are there socially constructed or legal restrictions to movement for women and girls? Do women have access and control of livelihood assets? How might household dynamics shift if females become engaged in the formal labour market? Do changing dynamics pose a protection risk for women? Are there safety risks for women associated with certain employment sectors that require additional protection monitoring and mitigation? How do childcare responsibilities affect access to employment? Would the availability of crèches improve labour market participation?⁵ Based on market information, what income-generating activities appeal to female beneficiaries? What barriers exist to participation within these labour sectors?
2. Ensure livelihoods staff are trained on safe identification and referral for issues of SGBV.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are clients made aware that they can confidentially disclose SGBV? Are private spaces available if a client wants to disclose to a staff member? Are livelihoods staff trained to understand the signs of SGBV and do they know the correct way to respond? Is a strong referral system in place which livelihoods staff are comfortable navigating?
3. Emphasise childcare as a component of livelihood strategies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can a SHLS within a community-based centre be more accommodating for permanent childcare needs? What staff would be required to operationalise such a childcare option? Can refugee clients be trained as childcare providers? What legal certifications are required? Can private sector partners be incentivised to include childcare on site for employees? Is it possible to include childcare vouchers as a component of a livelihoods intervention? How can livelihoods staff collaborate with child protection and education teams to address the issue of childcare?
4. Encourage sector-based collectives to reduce social isolation and enhance support networks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can women working within the same sector be joined together to form an informal cooperative to advance collective marketing or pricing negotiations? Would such a structure positively affect their individual incomes? How can such groups address unmet needs in the market? Does the cooperative-style organisation yield better outcomes for social inclusion and perceived social support?
5. Consider how interventions can be more gender transformative . ⁶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there opportunities to offer non-traditional employment opportunities to women? Are there refugee or host community women who have excelled in non-traditional spaces that can serve as mentors or role models for other women?
6. Advocate expanded formalisation of HBEs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are HBEs and other self-employment ventures protected under formal labour law within the host country? If not, what barriers exist to formalisation? Is formalisation administratively burdensome for vulnerable groups? Would formalisation procedures pose significant challenges to women operating in informal markets and threaten legal repercussions for those outside of the law? If yes, how can advocates push for formalisation in such a way that protection risks for vulnerable groups do not increase?

⁵ This list is illustrative and not exhaustive.

⁶ Gender transformative programming creates opportunities to actively challenge prevailing gender norms and address power inequities.

Illustrative performance indicators

In order to analyse the combined effects of protection and livelihoods programmes on women effectively, all data must be disaggregated, at a minimum, by sex and age. Further disaggregation can be helpful to understand protection risks faced by women of varying abilities, sexual orientations, religious backgrounds, and ethnic origins. Below are samples of illustrative performance indicators that can be used to evaluate programme effectiveness:

Number of protection incidences reported by women

- Percentage of women participating in the labour market (formal or informal)
- Percentage of female beneficiaries obtaining formal work permits
- Percentage of female beneficiaries reported social isolation
- Percentage of female beneficiaries who report control over their financial assets
- Percentage of female beneficiaries who report agency in household decision making, and
- Number of women entering non-traditional employment sectors.

BOX 9. INNOVATING SOLUTIONS TO LIVELIHOODS CHALLENGES FOR SYRIAN WOMEN IN LEBANON

Female users of the IRC's Livelihoods Centre in Mt. Lebanon identified photography as a marketable skillset on which they wanted training. For refugee women from Syria, cultural norms dictate that males do not photograph female bridal parties, creating an opening in the market for female photographers. The current course trained both Lebanese and Syrian women and awarded top performers with cameras as productive assets after the training was complete.

Sustainability

The pursuit of economic security poses protection risks that differ by context, gender, and age. While a gendered risk analysis is critical to identify and mitigate such risks within livelihood programmes, there is a need for gender transformative efforts that promote gender equality and would serve to reduce risks over the long term. As a crisis becomes more protracted and programmes transition their strategies to reflect community resilience and stabilisation, there is often an opportunity to both cement the changing gender norms that result from a crisis as well as expand gender transformative work to further challenge norms of inequitable rights and access.

Resources

- International Rescue Committee (2017) Gender Analysis & Program Design Toolkit. <https://rescue.app.box.com/s/pdqfhee2tm1q5pwe0uqxs5pymkgebv2>
- Women's Refugee Commission (2016) CLARA: Cohort Livelihoods and Risk Analysis Guidance. <file:///C:/Users/Admin/Downloads/CLARA-Livelihoods-Gender-Guidance-2016.pdf>
- Women's Refugee Commission (2016) Urban Gender-Based Violence Risk Assessment Guidance: Identifying Risk Factors for Urban Refugees. www.womensrefugeecommission.org/gbv/resources/document/download/1464

Core Principle 10: Transition from acute humanitarian crisis to long-term resilience

The Syrian refugee crisis serves as an example of urban humanitarian emergencies becoming protracted, creating a need for cities to determine how to address the needs of vulnerable people within a framework of sustainability and long-term planning. While temporary livelihoods assistance is required in the immediate term to enable refugees to access income-generating opportunities, promote self-sufficiency, and foster dignity, such interventions must evolve as crises become protracted. Greater efforts to mainstream refugees into the formal labour market and addressing stress to public infrastructure and services are two key components. Further, nuanced and ongoing labour market analyses must be carried out to design more effective training programmes, while prioritising the institutionalisation of protection principles by local livelihoods and private sector actors, and an enabling legislative and policy environment for refugee protection and economic self-sufficiency serves as the fundamental advocacy platform.

To create such successful approaches in urban settings that transition from acute emergency to long-term social and economic stability, there is broad consensus that efforts must combine experts from both the humanitarian and development sectors with the aim of securing livelihoods and building resilience of individuals and city systems (Pavanello, 2012). Humanitarian budgets are typically not designed to support this type of collaboration, indicating a need for greater advocacy for multi-year, interdisciplinary funding mechanisms to appropriately address the complex dynamics of protracted crises in urban contexts. This section will provide guidance for designing integrated livelihoods and protection programming in such a way that programmes can appropriately transition from responding to an emergency context to fostering sustainable and inclusive economic growth within a protective environment. Key actions and guiding questions for programme development are included, as well as illustrative performance indicators and resources for further study.



Credit: Jacob Russell.

KEY ACTIONS	GUIDING QUESTIONS
1. Initiate partnerships with development implementers and donors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can partnerships with development actors who are engaged in long-term, multi-year strategies to foster economic and social development be forged in the proposal writing phase? Would development donors allow for joint proposals between development and humanitarian actors for longer-term impact? How can initial skills training for refugees feed into broader value chain development projects?
2. Engage directly with host governments at national, regional, and local levels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do refugees fit within the development plans of the host country/ community? What is the most efficient way for multiple humanitarian actors to coordinate projects with local authorities? Could secondments of relevant staff between local government agencies and humanitarian organisations assist with interdisciplinary efforts? Would salary support for a municipal liaison to the humanitarian and development communities prove beneficial? Should the cluster systems be restructured to more directly reflect the existing government structure and be more inclusive of local actors? Would this contribute to sustainability from the outset?
3. Design livelihoods programmes to ensure sustainability after emergency funding ends.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What makes the livelihood intervention unique? What niche does it fill within a given market, taking into account over supply of labour and other macro-economic factors? Are the skills acquired by beneficiaries of training programmes of long-term utility within the local market? Can certifications be acquired that increase the legitimacy of the worker's skills locally?
4. Assess evolving protection risks .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the evolving landscape for refugee work authorisation affect protection risks? Which risks have changed and which have stayed the same? Is re-training of staff, modified information sessions, or ongoing advocacy required to address these risks? How can risk mitigation strategies be shared across, and jointly benefit, refugees and host communities?
5. Design livelihoods interventions that build local community resilience and stabilisation .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there existing large-scale, labour-intensive, infrastructure projects that would benefit from refugee labour? Will the injection of capital and training support local markets and the demand for labour, goods and services? Can the visibility of refugee employment in high impact projects promote social cohesion while meeting local economic development objectives?
6. Advocate for host communities to create an enabling environment for refugee self-sufficiency and dignity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What financial barriers exist to formal work permitting and can these be waived? What structural barriers exist to formal work permits and how can they be addressed? What, if any, formal labour safeguards apply to informal workers and can these be strengthened?
7. Advocate for multi-year/ multi-sector projects that transition beneficiaries from cash assistance to a more sustainable economic security.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What donors might be amenable to multi-year, area-based approaches? What partnerships among implementing organisations can be forged to further this advocacy effort?

Illustrative performance indicators

Monitoring beneficiaries over time in humanitarian contexts is a distinct challenge due to frequent mobility. Follow-up after three to six months can prove difficult, even more so after three to four years. While SMS tracking has proven useful in some settings, in other contexts cell phones are often sold or exchanged, making them a less reliable source for long-term follow-up. Client tracking in urban settings is one area where greater collaboration between humanitarian and development actors can be forged. Organisations implementing development funding are mandated to report on outcomes over the course of four to five years and may be able to offer innovative ideas. Further, there is a need for more scientifically rigorous evidence on the impact of livelihoods programmes in humanitarian response. Partnerships with longer-term development programmes often offer longer implementation periods and expanded resources to invest in research methodologies that can examine the impact and cost-

effectiveness of integrated livelihoods and protection programming. Where feasible, linking datasets between humanitarian and development efforts may provide unique opportunities to analyse progress as clients transition from cash assistance to value chain integration to financial inclusion.

BOX 10. BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS WITH INDUSTRIAL ZONES FOR SUSTAINABLE REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT

The Danish Refugee Council in Jordan has sought to develop relationships with industrial parks to place refugees into employment. Industrial zones that produce products for export are typically governed by strict worker protections including OSH provisions, offering decent work opportunities for refugees while also benefitting the Jordanian export sector. While the broader policy landscape for such partnerships is often brokered at a higher level, humanitarian actors should advocate for these types of innovative solutions that offer mutual benefit for refugees and host communities. Similarly, livelihoods actors should be well informed of the evolving policy environment, designing programmes with enough flexibility to modify strategies as doors open for new partnership opportunities.

Resources

- Group u.r.d. (2011) *Humanitarian Aid in Urban Settings: Current Practice, Future Challenges*. www.alnap.org/resource/7853.aspx
- International Rescue Committee (2017) *In Search of Work Creating Jobs for Syrian Refugees: A Case Study of the Jordan Compact*. www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/1343/insearchofworkweb.pdf
- Landau, L, Wanjiku-Kihato, C, Misago, J-P, Edwards, B (2016) *Becoming Urban Humanitarians: Engaging Local Government to Protect Displaced People*. The Urban Institute, Center for International Development and Governance. www.urban.org/research/publication/becoming-urban-humanitarians
- Truelove, S, Shorey, B, Swift, A, Noronha T, Pelly, I and Long, C (2016) *Labour Market Analysis (LMA) in Humanitarian Contexts: A Practitioner's Guide*. Mercy Corps, Save the Children, IRC. www.alnap.org/resource/21754



Credit: Jacob Russell.

Bibliography

- Ajluni, S and Kawar, M (2012) *The Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on the Labour Market in Jordan: A Preliminary Analysis*. The International Labour Organization (ILO). www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---arabstates/---ro-beirut/documents/publication/wcms_242021.pdf
- Chambers, R and Conway, G (1992) *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st Century*. *IDS Discussion Paper 296*, IDS, Brighton, UK. www.ids.ac.uk/publication/sustainable-rural-livelihoods-practical-concepts-for-the-21st-century
- Department for International Development (DFID) (2014) *Humanitarian Response to Urban Crises: Workshop Report*. www.alnap.org/resource/12750
- Feinstein International Center (2012) *Refugee Livelihoods in Urban Areas: Identifying Program Opportunities*. <http://fic.tufts.edu/publication-item/refugee-livelihoods-in-urban-areas-identifying-program-opportunities/>
- Global Protection Cluster (2017) *Protection Mainstreaming*. www.globalprotectioncluster.org/en/areas-of-responsibility/protection-mainstreaming.html
- Grünewald, F, Boyer, B, Kauffmann, D and Patinet, J (2011) *Humanitarian Aid in Urban Settings: Current Practice, Future Challenges*. Groupe URD – Groupe Urgence Rehabilitation Developpement – URD. www.alnap.org/resource/7853.aspx
- Guay, J (2016) *Social Cohesion Between Syrian Refugees and Urban Host Communities in Lebanon and Jordan*. www.wvi.org/disaster-management/publication/social-cohesion-between-syrian-refugees-and-urban-host-communities
- Human Rights Watch (2017) *Lebanon: New Refugee Policy a Step Forward*. www.hrw.org/news/2017/02/14/lebanon-new-refugee-policy-step-forward
- Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) (2016) *IASC Policy on Protection in Humanitarian Action*. https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/iasc_policy_on_protection_in_humanitarian_action_0.pdf
- International Labour Organization (ILO) (2016) *Results of Focus Group Discussions on Work Permits with Syrian Refugees and Employers in the Agriculture, Construction & Retail Sectors in Jordan*. www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---arabstates/---ro-beirut/documents/publication/wcms_481312.pdf
- International Rescue Committee (2017) *In Search of Work Creating Jobs for Syrian Refugees: A Case Study of the Jordan Compact*. www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/1343/insearchofworkweb.pdf
- International Rescue Committee (2017) *Urban Context Analysis Toolkit Guidance note for Humanitarian Practitioners*. IIED, London. Available at: <http://pubs.iied.org/10819IIED>
- International Rescue Committee (IRC) (2016) *Finding Economic Opportunity in the City*. www.rescue.org/report/finding-economic-opportunity-city
- International Rescue Committee (IRC) (2015) *Humanitarian Action in a New Urban World*. www.rescue-uk.org/sites/default/files/document/917/urbanprinciples6blackweb.pdf
- Jaspars, S, O'Callaghan, S and Stites, E (2007) *Linking livelihoods and protection: A preliminary analysis based on a review of the literature and agency practice*. HPG Working Paper. Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute. www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/2362.pdf
- Landau L, Wanjiku-Kihatu C, Misago J, Obot D, and Edwards B (2016) *Becoming Urban Humanitarians: Engaging Local Government to Protect Displaced People*. The Urban Institute, Center for International Development and Governance. www.urban.org/research/publication/becoming-urban-humanitarians
- Parker, E and Maynard, V (2015) *Humanitarian Response to Urban Crises: A Review of Area Based Approaches*. London, IIED. www.alnap.org/resource/20505
- Pavanello, S (2012) *Rethinking the Humanitarian Response: Emerging Approaches for Engagement in Urban Crises*. www.alnap.org/resource/20067

Protection Working Group (2016) Jordan Refugee Response Protection Sector Operational Strategy for 2016. <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/43783>

Save the Children/UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) (2015) *Small Hands, Heavy Burden: How the Syria Conflict is Driving More Children into the Workforce*. <http://reliefweb.int/report/syrian-arab-republic/small-hands-heavy-burden-how-syria-conflict-driving-more-children>

Truelove, S, Shorey, B, Swift, A, Noronha, T, Pelly, I and Long, C (2016) *Labour Market Analysis (LMA) in Humanitarian Contexts: A Practitioner's Guide*. Mercy Corps, Save the Children, IRC. www.alnap.org/resource/21754

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) (2014 Revision) World Urbanization Prospects. <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/Publications/Files/WUP2014-Report.pdf>

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)/ UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2016) 3RP Regional Refugee & Resilience Plan 2017-2018: Regional Strategic Overview. www.3rpsyriacrisis.org/the-3rp/strategic-overview/

UNHCR (2016) *Protection in Livelihoods Programming*. Draft.

UNHCR (2012) *Livelihood Programming in UNHCR: Operational Guidelines*. www.unhcr.org/uk/publications/operations/4fbdf17c9/livelihood-programming-unhcr-operational-guidelines.html

UNHCR (2016) *The Future of Syria: Refugee Children in Crisis*. <http://unhcr.org/FutureOfSyria/>

UNHCR (2009) *Challenges for Persons of Concern to UNHCR in Urban Settings*. www.unhcr.org/uk/protection/hcdialogue%20/4b0ea8f89/challenges-persons-concern-unhcr-urban-settings-26-november-2009.html

UNHCR (2009) *Designing Appropriate Interventions in Urban Settings: Health, Education, Livelihoods, and registration for Urban Refugees and Returnees*. www.alnap.org/resource/6468

UNHCR/Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (OHCHR)/International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2015) Migration and Refugees in Urban Areas. Habitat III Issue Paper. www.alnap.org/resource/20547

UNHCR, UNDP, ILO (2015) *Finding a Future – Enhancing Sustainable Livelihoods for Syrian Refugees in Jordan: Perspectives and Policies for Jordan's Resilience, Stability and Development*. <http://reliefweb.int/report/jordan/finding-future-enhancing-sustainable-livelihoods-syrian-refugees-jordan-perspectives>

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (2012) Children's Rights in Urban Settings. In UNICEF (2012) *The State of the World's Children 2012*, Chapter 2. www.unicef.org/sowc2012/pdfs/SOWC-2012-Chapter-2-Childrens-rights-in-urban-settings.pdf

UNICEF/UNHCR/World Food Programme (WFP) (2016) *Vulnerability Assessment of Syrian Refugees in Lebanon*. <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/ena/wfp289533.pdf>

UN Women/REACH (2016) *Jordanian and Syrian Women's Labour Force Participation and Perceptions on Employment*. <http://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/51796>

Women's Refugee Commission (2014) *Unpacking Gender: The Humanitarian Response to the Syrian Refugee Crisis in Jordan*. www.womensrefugeecommission.org/resources/gender-issues/985-unpacking-gender-the-humanitarian-response-to-the-syrian-refugee-crisis-in-jordan

World Bank/UNHCR (2016) *The Welfare of Syrian Refugees: Evidence from Jordan and Lebanon*. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/23228>

Annex I: Key informants

Ali Taha, Tal Hayat Municipality – Lebanon

Annabella Skoff, International Labour Organization – Lebanon

Barri Shorey, International Rescue Committee – United States

Bastien Revel, United Nations Development Programme – Lebanon

Bryn Boyce, Danish Refugee Council – Jordan

Dib Kassar, Bebnine Municipality – Lebanon

Elissar Ashmar, International Rescue Committee – Lebanon

Emily Lewis, Danish Refugee Council – Jordan

George Abirizk, Ministry of Social Affairs – Lebanon

Jafar Sarayreh, Directorate of Labour – Karak, Jordan

Jocelyn Knight, International Rescue Committee – Lebanon

Julia St. Thomas, International Rescue Committee – London

Kifah Kassar, Bebnine Municipality – Lebanon

Laura Buffoni, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees – Jordan

Maha Kattaa, International Labour Organization – Jordan

Mario Patino, International Rescue Committee – Lebanon

Mohammed Bustanji, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) – Jordan

Muneer Al-Zuregat, Jordan Industrial Estates Cooperation

Nadine Saba, Akkar Network for Development – Lebanon

Omar el Hayek, Kwaykhat Municipality – Lebanon

Patrick Daru, International Labour Organization – Jordan

Rachel Einholz, Oxfam – Lebanon

Sabine Farah, Ministry of Social Affairs – Lebanon

Sara Sannouh, International Rescue Committee – Lebanon

Staff, Clients, and Volunteers of the Karak Community Centre, Danish Refugee Council – Jordan

Staff and Clients of the Akkar Livelihoods Centre, International Rescue Committee – Lebanon

Staff and Clients of the Mt. Lebanon Livelihoods Centre, International Rescue Committee – Lebanon

Tarina Rubin, Danish Refugee Council – Jordan

Yasin Abbas, International Rescue Committee – United States



Knowledge
Products

Toolkit

June 2017

Urban

Keywords:

Urban crises, stronger cities, disaster, livelihoods, protection

Urban areas are now home to over half the global population as well as two thirds of the world's refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs). Increasingly, cities and peri-urban areas have become the forefront of humanitarian response, diverting from the traditional paradigm of relief provision in rural and camp settings. The protracted refugee crisis in Syria has highlighted unique challenges and opportunities facing humanitarian efforts in complex urban environments, suggesting a need for greater innovation to respond effectively to the evolving economic and protection challenges faced by displaced persons. Economic insecurity, discrimination, and marginalisation increase the protection risk for the displaced as they seek income-generating opportunities, creating a need for a more integrated approach to livelihoods initiatives. This guidance note provides ten core principles that practitioners can follow when aiming to integrate livelihoods and protection programming in urban humanitarian response, with a focus on supporting economic outcomes for beneficiaries. Key actions in programme design, illustrative performance indicators, notes on sustainability, and brief case examples are included. While the note is derived from experiences serving Syrian refugees in Lebanon and Jordan, its principles were chosen from a global desk review of relief efforts in urban humanitarian settings to provide informed guidance that has universal applicability.

IIED is a policy and action research organisation. We promote sustainable development to improve livelihoods and protect the environments on which these livelihoods are built. We specialise in linking local priorities to global challenges. IIED is based in London and works in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and the Pacific, with some of the world's most vulnerable people. We work with them to strengthen their voice in the decision-making arenas that affect them – from village councils to international conventions.

International Institute for Environment and Development
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH, UK

Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399

Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055

www.iied.org