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Main Highlights and Action Points from 3rd Meeting of the DAC Temporary Working Group (TWG) on Refugees and Migration

The following is a summary of highlights and outcomes from the third meeting of the DAC Temporary Working Group on Refugees and Migration, held on the 19th of December:

1. Follow-up Questionnaire on Members’ Methodologies for Calculating Costs (Session 2)

The Secretariat presented the main trends in members’ responses and preliminary orientations for the clarification of the Reporting Directives on in-donor refugee costs. Members’ commitment to this process was evidenced by the high response rate (24 of 30 DAC countries, and additional contributions from non-DAC countries). The Secretariat provided an overview of members’ rationale for including different categories of refugees and for defining certain costs as temporary sustenance or integration. The complexity of differentiating between these two costs was highlighted. It was observed that an explicit statement on the eligibility of certain categories of costs (including combatting trafficking, rescue-at-sea, forced returns, detention facilities and voluntary returns) is needed. Items included in administrative costs and reported as in-donor refugee costs vary widely. In this instance, Secretariat recommended reporting on costs that can be clearly attributed and excluding imputations. Most members signalled that they would welcome a conservative interpretation of administrative costs but some also noted that it was not within the mandate of the TWG to exclude such costs altogether.

The Secretariat emphasised the role of the TWG to clarify what is ODA-eligible and what is not, based on paragraph 12 of the HLM Communiqué from February 2016, which states that members commit to “improve the consistency, comparability, and transparency of our reporting of ODA–eligible, in-donor refugee costs, by aligning the respective methods for calculating these costs”. Members asked the Secretariat to make the orientations more explicit and agreed that the clarification process will imply changes in practice for reporting on ODA in-donor refugee costs, which they should be ready to implement. In its concluding remarks, the Secretariat reminded members that improving the consistency of in-donor cost is part of the effort of making ODA more effective in responding to the refugee crisis and is crucial for maintaining ODA transparency, accountability, and credibility, and providing accurate data accessible to a larger public.

Members will validate the analysis of the survey responses and provide additional information if needed. They will also provide written comments on the proposed orientations. The deadline for responses is January 18th 2017. Upon validation, the Secretariat will circulate the results of the survey to the group. Draft orientations for clarifying the Reporting Directives will be circulated to members for written comments on February 6th, and a revised draft will be circulated to WP-STAT on February 17th ahead of their next meeting (28 February-2 March), where the draft will be discussed.

2. Introducing Swiss and EU proposal for a policy marker or purpose code for refugee-related activities in developing countries (Session 3)

Switzerland presented their current reporting system related to migration activities, noting that within their “multiple sector system” they distinguish 3 sectors of migration-related activities. They
expressed concern that migration work cannot be accurately reflected using existing codes and proposed the introduction of one or multiple migration-specific codes. The EU notes that introducing a stand-alone code would help to quantify expenditures on the migration-development nexus and support migration data management. Several members expressed their support for the proposal, with the majority advocating for a purpose code rather than a policy marker. Some members also noted the need for caution, however, given the complexity of the migration issue.

The Secretariat advised that WP-STAT was reviewing current CRS purpose codes to ensure proper representation of efforts directed towards achieving the SDGs. It pointed to the need for any proposal on migration codes to further clarify (a) whether one code is sufficient or several codes are required for more detailed reporting and (b) which activities are counted as ODA, considering the need to differentiate between migration management and development assistance.

The Secretariat solicits written comments from TWG members by January 18th and will have bilateral conversations with the EU and Switzerland in order to further develop this proposal.

3. Addressing priority areas for better programming to deliver comprehensive solutions to the refugee crisis (Session 4)

This session introduced participants to the proposed format of the guidelines for the delivery of whole-of-government solutions in developing countries that are refugee countries of origin, transit and destination. The Secretariat requested members’ input on the general structure of the Guidance, on how to make the Guidance as practicable as possible and on which regions or countries should be included as case studies.

The vast majority of the members welcomed the current structure of the Guidance and endorsed it. Members noted their preference for the adoption of a coherence approach to guide both the analysis and recommendations and stressed the importance of integrating concepts of fragility and resilience. They emphasised the need to ensure that the Guidance is practical and accessible to field practitioners. They welcomed the inclusion of case studies, lessons learnt (what works but also what does not work) and encouraged the use of a diverse range of examples, covering refugees, IDPs, returnees and mixed migration flows. The Guidance should contribute to shaping realistic expectations on the role of development co-operation in addressing root causes of movements.

It was noted that the outcomes of the Guidance could eventually be considered, and contribute to, the DAC Peer review process. Members also proposed the development of complementary tools for practitioners, for example two-pagers, providing concise and practical thematic recommendations. Some members supported the idea of creating a living repository of knowledge, by developing an online platform but noted that there should be no duplication of existing resources. Members responded positively to the proposal of organising a validation workshop for external experts.

At the end of the session, EVALNET presented their forthcoming work stream, which will incorporate a review and synthesis of evaluation material on migration and refugees. This work will contribute to strengthening the recommendations of the TWG Guidance document.

Members were invited to share any written comments in the outline until the 18th of January and the Secretariat will share the first draft Guidance for comments on February 17th ahead of the 4th TWG Meeting on March 13th 2017.