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Workshop – Day 1

Welcome & Introductions
Facilitator: Amy Slaughter

Presentation to welcome all participants, including new participants, and a short overview of the objectives of the two-day workshop.

Workshop Objectives
- Gain a common understanding of what we want to measure and why – ‘self-reliance and well-being’ as a way to promote this outcome and the programmatic designs that facilitate this outcome.
- Gain agreement on principles of ‘self-reliance and well-being’ programs and measurement, to ensure that any indicators we agree on are consistent with those principles.
- Develop (or make significant progress towards developing) a common set of core indicators that could be adapted to local use and that we could move forward with piloting.
- Identify programmatic implications of these indicators and opportunities to scale.

Session 1: Stage-Setting
Current refugee landscape, industry trends, rationale and historical context for this effort
Facilitator: Dale Buscher

Presentation (included) of current displacement and industry trends to frame two-day workshop.
- 65 million forcibly displaced
- More than 80% of refugee crises last for 10 plus years and 40% last 20 years or more
- 60% of refugees are in urban areas
- 80% of refugees are in developing countries
- Humanitarian aid budget was 2 billion USD in 2000 and 25 billion USD in 2015

The number of people displaced continues to increase and the resources are not keeping pace with the numbers. We need to rethink our response to refugee crises.

Group discussions around five framing questions
1. When and under what conditions does self-reliance fit into humanitarian response? When do you know when to start?
2. Humanitarian practitioners use a variety of different economic interventions—how do we know which ones work and when?
3. How do we currently measure the success of our programs?
4. How can we promote the uptake of more effective livelihood programs earlier in emergency response and more broadly across humanitarian response?
5. Are we missing critical opportunities for promoting self-reliance?

Plenary – Group work feedback
Question 1: When and under what conditions does self-reliance fit into humanitarian response? When do you know when to start?
- Self-reliance programming should begin at the earliest stages of displacement. Understandably, early interventions are focused on life saving activities, however livelihoods experts need to be
among the first to arrive in a displacement crisis to set the stage for and establish livelihood programs.

- Refugees arrive with skills and experience and this must be documented immediately and supported in programming to match refugees with self-reliance opportunities.
- Connections should be made with the private sector to develop livelihoods opportunities for the displaced.

**Question 2:** Humanitarian practitioners use a variety of different economic interventions, how do we know which ones work and when?

- It is important to define self-reliance and to define success when doing resilience work.
- Once self-reliance is defined then monitoring and evaluation will provide insight into the performance of various interventions.
- Collaborate with development experts to tap into resources for urban areas, learn from research and utilize effective development programming that is relevant in humanitarian settings.
- Host community engagement may create opportunities for partnerships and for refugees

**Question 3:** How do we currently measure the success of our program?

- Focus is on project level measurements at output and outcome levels.

**Question 4:** How can we promote the uptake of more effective livelihood programs earlier in emergency response and more broadly across humanitarian response?

- Involve the host community as much as possible providing room for skills and knowledge exchange between the host communities and the refugee populations for self-reliance; need to understand the role of the government. Involving host communities assists with government buy-in.
- Need to encourage a mindset change toward refugee social economic integration; how do we make the case? Ensure the inclusion of experts to promote self-reliance.
- Develop a deep analysis of refugee opportunities and needs in order to know where to intervene to assist refugees to achieve self-reliance.
- Use success stories among refugee entrepreneurs.

**Question 5:** Are we missing critical opportunities for promoting self-reliance?

- The hosting countries should see refugees as not just a liability but as potential market actors that can/should be economically engaged. Social integration with the local communities for market purposes could be one step toward this.
- Need to promote bridging capital with the local community.
- There is significant duplication and competition among key actors in the refugee arena (collecting baseline surveys, assessment information, etc). Actors should follow the Afghanistan MDI model with common indicators for all actors to collect their needed information.
- It is important to look at the government’s role as a key actor in promoting self-reliance and this should be part of the government’s development plan.
- Support for refugees to enter formal employment and engage in dignified and meaningful employment.
- Refugees should be engaged to identify how they define self-reliance for themselves.
Session 2: What do we mean by “self-reliance” and “well-being”? (Discussion of terminology and what exactly we are trying to measure)
Facilitator: Kellie Leeson

Activity Grounding Exercise: Participants were asked to think of themselves as a refugee and were asked, “What would you and your household want or need?”

Exercise – Numerous definitions of self-reliance taken from various policy and guidance documents were placed around the room. Participants were asked to circle key words and concepts that they think should be included in a common definition of self-reliance.

Various definitions of self-reliance
- **Self-Reliance** – essentially finding ways to offer refugees freedom of movement, the right to work and support in the pursuit of their own economic opportunities pending going home (from “Refugee Economies: Rethinking popular assumptions” Alex Betts et al)
  Key words: freedom of movement, right to work, support, of their own economic opportunities pending going home
- **Self-Reliance** – is the social and economic ability of an individual, a household or a community to meet essential needs (including protection, food, water, shelter, personal safety, health and education) in a sustainable manner and with dignity. Self-reliance as a program approach refers to developing and strengthening livelihoods of persons of concern and reducing their vulnerability and long-term reliance on humanitarian assistance (from UNHCR, Self-Reliance Handbook 2005)
  Key words: ability, meet essential needs, sustainable manner, dignity, as a program approach, developing and strengthening livelihoods, reducing their vulnerability, long-term reliance
- **Quality of life citizen well-being** - equity in the exercise of right/non-discrimination; dignity recognition; autonomy/personal development; participation/civic commitment. (from Council of Europe)
  Key words: equity, right /non-discrimination, dignity recognition, autonomy /personal development, participation/civic commitment
- **Self-reliance** - capabilities, knowledge, goods and assets necessary to live in safety and dignity (from US State Dept)
  Key words: capabilities, knowledge, assets necessary, safety and dignity
- **Self-reliance** - is the ability to have dignified work and to meet one’s basic needs (from The Hunger Project)
  Keys word: ability, dignified, work, meet one’s basic needs
• **Self-reliance**—is the ability of people, households or communities to meet their basic needs and enjoy a level of social and economic inclusion in a sustainable and dignified way *(from UNHCR emergency handbook)*

  **Key words:** ability, basic needs, social and economic inclusion, sustainable and dignified

• **Well-being measured in 5 elements**—sense of purpose; social relationships; financial security; relationship to community; physical health *(from Gallup Healthways Well-Being Index)*

  **Key words:** sense of purpose; social relationships; financial security; relationship to community; physical health

• **Self-reliance**—describes a household generating sufficient income through its livelihoods activities to meet its own needs without our support or the support of others (e.g. agencies, religious institutions, remittances or other help from friends or family). The calculation takes into account a household score on non-economic domains as well since those domains are integral to success in livelihoods and are important aspects of well-being in their own right. *(from RefugeePoint, unofficial working definition)*

  **Key words:** sufficient income, to meet its own needs without our support, the support of others, friends or family, household, non-economic, success in livelihoods, aspects of well-being

**Plenary discussion led to the reactions listed below.**

• There is need for simplified language in the definition.

• Dignity should be understood in any concept of self-reliance as refugees are human beings who deserve to live in dignity.

• It is important to note that refugees are usually just looking for means to cope in their new situation of displacement. The work of humanitarian agencies would thus be to help the displaced on a pathway of moving beyond coping to thriving.

• Most of the definitions are very academic but the definition should be one that people can identify with.

• The definitions lack ‘options’ for refugees. Refugees need access to crucial information for decision making and autonomy.

• Certain crucial rights like the right to ask for asylum are missing.

• With self-reliance, refugees are made a subject not an object of a program, they are engaged on the same footing and they are given the power to be in charge of their own affairs and their own families and they are made to be in charge of their economic and social needs.

• Self-reliance could mean something different for different groups especially those who are professionals. The skills they possessed while back at home should be recognized. Some do not consider self-reliance as dignified as long as their skills are not recognized.

• Dignity is very subjective and difficult to measure. The focus in measuring self-reliance should be on what is essential to a refugee upon displacement. Survival is primary. The needs and wants however change over time in different stages of displacement.

• It is not self-actualization or integration that is being sought in self-reliance but just the ability to cope and be in a position to meet their basic needs. It’s a step towards greater levels of thriving, but is not the highest level we hope refugees will achieve.

• The definition should not seek to reiterate the rights laid out in the 1951 Refugee Convention, but should focus on the fundamentals of self-reliance.

• It was agreed that resilience and self-reliance are different but there are ideas behind resilience that should be considered/included for self-reliance.
• There was the suggestion that the definition should not include rights because often the hosting country does not grant the rights it should and even without rights refugees are still aiming to become and are becoming self-reliant.
• Some priority needs to be given to how to build social capital, how to access government services and crucial information, as well as how to absorb shocks. (There was however a reservation raised that shocks should not be part of the concept of self-reliance because the latter involves not just rebounding from one-off shocks, but surviving in consistently unfavorable circumstances).
• The definition should include time as a factor – i.e. some element of sustainability.

After much discussion, the following working definition was agreed by the group:

Self-reliance is the social and economic ability of an individual, a household or a community to meet their essential needs in a sustainable manner.

Session 3: How are we approaching self-reliance measurement?
Facilitator: Amy Slaughter

Presentations were given by the WANA Institute, Samuel Hall, JIPS and WRC to outline their tools, framed by five questions.
- What was the rationale for developing your tool?
- Who was your target population?
- What were you trying to measure?
- What challenges did you encounter?
- What did you learn?

WANA Institute
Presenter: Erica Harper, by Skype

Presentation of WANA Institute’s work on investment in refugee crises and economic growth. (Presentation included).

The WANA institute is creating econometric models to better understand the relationship between refugees participating in the formal economy, economic growth and investment. Models indicate that investing a proportion of the long-term cost of supporting humanitarian needs is a cost-effective means of enabling refugees to secure livelihoods and promoting overall economic growth of the host state economy.

How WANA intends to use the results of these models:
• An evidential base to enable discussions with investors and host states on refugee livelihoods
• Promoting a broader discussion on more efficient approaches to managing large-scale protracted displacement

WANA Institute is also doing research in areas of such as social cohesion, a Refugee Well-Being Index along with studies to predict protracted versus short term displacement. More will be shared in the future.

Samuel Hall
Presenter: Nassim Majidi

Presentation of the Multi-Dimensional Integration index (MDI). (Presentation included)
• Afghanistan: 76% of Afghans have had an experience of displacement; 1 in 4 Afghans has had an experience of international migration
• Reintegration is the objective of many programming efforts
• The baseline population included 100 host households and 300 displaced households (refugee, returnees, IDPs, economic migrants) with a nuanced definition of community focused on habits and not just physical location.
• The MDI tool was endorsed in March 2017 and will be integrated in routine data collection going forward

What they are measuring?
• The Multi-Dimensional Integration index (MDI) is focused beyond livelihood and vulnerability, the MDI focuses on economic, social and safety dimensions
• In total, they have 40 indicators under economic, social and safety dimensions
• They have both subjective and objective indicators as integration is also a question of perception

Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS)
Presenter: Khadra Elmi

Presentation on JIPS background, indicators and next steps. (Presentation included)

The project aims to create a set of agreed upon indicators, tools and methodologies to measure progress towards durable solutions for IDPs.

The durable solutions indicator library provides governments, humanitarian and development actors with a tool to pursue an evidence-based joint response to support displaced families and communities to achieve durable solutions. In this regard the indicator library can provide:
   A. Comprehensive analysis using the IASC criteria to identify obstacles and opportunities to durable solutions
   B. Progress over time (recurring data collection with compatible indicators and methodologies)
   C. Vulnerabilities linked to displacement (comparative analysis)
   D. Discrimination (comparative analysis and perceived discrimination)

Q: Is the idea to draw from the library of indicators to develop tools for local circumstances? Has that started to happen? Do you think there will be a process to narrow in on common core indicators used everywhere?
A: This project seeks first to explore existing and developing evidence to assess the relevance of common indicators that can be used everywhere. This involves systematically applying the durable solutions indicator library to various contexts in order to identify the most relevant indicators for informing a comprehensive analysis. There are 10 ongoing exercises in which we are piloting the library and drawing lessons on how to improve the indicators and guidance. From this can come the next step: creation of a set of core indicators that can illuminate the conditions necessary for achieving durable solutions for IDPs.

Women’s Refugee Commission
Presenters: Kellie Leeson & Dale Buscher

Presentation of the Well-Being & Adjustment Index background, development process, and general lessons learned. (Presentation included)
The Well-Being & Adjustment Index was developed from a practitioner’s point of view following the identification of the gap in measurement tools for refugee resilience/self-reliance/well-being (most monitoring is at the project level but not at the household level to understand the collective impact). The development of the tool included engaging refugees, numerous stakeholders and field practitioners.

The Well-being & Adjustment Index has 12 domains (documentation, health, income, employment, education, safety, well-being, education, transport, housing, utilities and community involvement).

How WRC intends to use the results of the pilot:
- The main goal was to test whether a simple tool could measure change in resilience over time and that same tool could work in a variety of settings and concluded that this is possible. The lessons learned report highlights what worked and needs to be improved. [https://www.womensrefugeecommission.org/wellbeingindex/](https://www.womensrefugeecommission.org/wellbeingindex/)

Q: You were considering eliminating some of the indicators (which ones) and weighting some more (which ones)?
A: Felt utilities could be dropped and the education question was too complicated.

**Session 4: UNHCR Livelihoods indicators presentation**
*Facilitator: Amy Slaughter*
*Presenter: Theresa Beltramo, by Skype*

*Presentation of UNHCR’s livelihoods monitoring framework, programs and indicator development. (Presentation included)*

- UNHCR faces the “Goldilocks problem” of monitoring at UNHCR to get enough information to adequately inform programming but not too much that it overwhelms clients and staff. The question is always how to monitor the program on the ground and optimize the use of resources.
- UNHCR’s livelihoods monitoring is focused on three main livelihoods program areas:
  - Agriculture, livestock, fisheries production
  - Self-employment
  - Wage employment
- The monitoring indicators were field-tested and overall the indicators received positive feedback from the field operations on the tools and the results, and teams requested more training and capacity building. Feedback highlighted that some indicators need revision due to an overly complex and difficult measurement. Feedback also highlighted the need for simplicity and support for mobile data collection (MDC) systems.
- Based on lessons learned with piloting the indicators, the survey questionnaire will be simplified, with only “need to know” data and not “nice to know.”
- Sample data was shared, which reflected the % of refugees employed or self-employed, and the % reporting increases in income and savings.
- These indicators are a step to moving from output indicators to impact indicators.
- The indicator measurement timeframe is twice a year.
- UNHCR is rolling out these indicators to 20 operations in 2017, with data collection happening between April and December.
- Aside from livelihoods indicators, UNHCR also undertook a desk review of methods for measuring “resilience,” a.k.a. social empowerment, self-esteem, self-determination, self-confidence, well-
being and optimism (different agencies call it different things or focus on slightly different concepts). UNHCR looked at components of tools created by Trickle Up, UNHCR’s integration model in Ecuador, RefugeePoint, the Graduation Model, CGAP/Ford and the WRC Well-Being and Adjustment Index. This is something that UNHCR will continue to explore how to measure in the future.

Session 5: Identifying commonalities & differences among our efforts
Facilitator: Kellie Leeson

Participants provided short overviews of their organizations’ approaches to self-reliance.

Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS)
- ReDSS is focused on a solutions framework.
- ReDSS does not do primary data collection but takes advantage of data collected by partners for further analysis and provides guidance on continued support through a traffic light system on physical, legal and safety measures.

International Rescue Committee (IRC), Nairobi Office
- IRC’s new urban livelihoods program in Nairobi targets refugees between 18 to 35 and includes members of the local population.
- The program focuses on skills development to prevent negative coping strategies, including how to access income, saving, health, food security, and other skills that facilitate income generation.
- Program includes advocacy for favorable legislation to increase refugee protection.
- IRC works with partners for client referrals.

IKEA Foundation
- IKEA Foundation has a new self-reliance pillar in addition to their humanitarian pillar. This new pillar is still under formation and they are interested in what indicators their partners are developing to support their self-reliance programming.
- Planning to convene partners to provide input into a multi-year livelihood strategy for the Foundation.

Danish Refugee Council
- DRC is gradually moving from care and maintenance to focus on self-reliance and are looking to diversify their livelihood programs and include start-up capital, scholarships for higher education, and market linkages.
• DRC advocates for a conducive regulatory environment. They are currently involved in advocacy around the Kenyan Refugee Bill and work closely with ReDSS. They are particularly interested in indicators around housing, land and property.
• They are building their understanding of resilience and self-reliance frameworks.

**US Department of State**
• They provide livelihoods support and promote refugees’ right to work in host countries is an important part of their work.
• They engage and invest in other multilateral and bilateral initiatives to broaden the support for refugees through USAID, ILO (right to work laws), IDA, etc., and supports implementation of the Global Refugee Compact.

**Mercy Corps**
• MC is focused on resilience and use the Strategic Resilience Assessment (STRESS) methodology as a system approach and to identify resilient pathways for communities.
• MC provides support to country teams to develop theories of change and capacity building around resilience analysis and programming.

**Trickle Up**
• Trickle Up is focused on refugee livelihoods using a graduation approach and is partnering with DOS/PRM and UNHCR to expand the number of locations using the graduation approach for refugees.

*Plenary discussion to identify common and dissimilar features of the approaches shared by partners.*

**Outline of commonalities and differences here.**
• Specific time horizons for data collection/client follow up (commonly every 6 months)
• Instead of re-inventing the wheel, they are looking to what others are doing
• Capacity building – assessing existing capacity and building on it for better results
• Indicators- some have many indicators and some very few
• For most, self-reliance is not just an economic indicator but also includes social indicators
• Attention to value for money or prudent use of resources, programming with the reality of resource reduction in mind; opening up to new partners
• Evidence based use of data and the promotion of policies of self-reliance and highlighted importance of market and context analysis
• Interest and effort to move from outcome to impact

**Session 6: Development of common principles of self-reliance/well-being**
Subtitle: “Ensure that this Handbook does not sit on a bookshelf”
*Facilitator: Amy Slaughter*

*(Presentation included)*

The goal of this session was to explore what principles, core assumptions, or standards should undergird any survey tool, indicators, or program designs we might consider. The draft principles presented for deliberation were drawn in part from principles already put forth in related policy and guidance documents, with new ones added. The documents drawn from include:
c. UNHCR policy on refugee protection and solutions in urban areas 2009)
d. Promoting Livelihoods and Self-Reliance: Operational Guidance on Refugee Protection and Solutions in Urban Areas (UNHCR 2011)
e. UNHCR Global Strategy for Livelihoods (2014)

Group work to identify Overarching, Program Design, and Measurement principles to guide future self-reliance programing and measurement indicator development.

Activity: Each group was provided a first draft of principles (see below) to discuss and debate with the following questions as guidance: Do you agree with these principles, not agree with them, any new ones to add? What are the 3 most important/essential in each category? Anything missing? What can we eliminate easily?

Overarching Principles
1. Do no harm - do not minimize complexity, variety of refugee situations and diversity of refugees within those situations; do not insist on a false universality.
2. Prioritize well-being and dignity of clients rather than discontinuation of aid
3. Continually advocate for refugee rights and access to national services (even while proceeding pragmatically in the absence of those rights)
4. Introduce self-reliance as early as possible
5. Incorporate self-reliance goal/ethos into all types of programming
6. Involve refugees in program and measurement design and implementation, with regular feedback loops

Program Design Principles
1. Appropriate for local context
2. Consider protection/legal environment and ensure program supports the protection agenda
3. Time-limited assistance (renewable, if necessary)
4. An exit strategy built into program design
5. Client-developed plan for self-reliance
6. Integration and coherence of various program elements (e.g. laddering support in a deliberate, coordinated way)
7. Case management (coordinated care) to link needed supports together to maximize their effectiveness (whether support comes through multiple providers or a one-stop-shop).
8. Link with development poverty-reduction efforts when possible

Measurement Design Principles
1. Simplicity – ease of use
2. As few indicators as possible (need to know vs. nice to know)
3. Clearly phrased, easy to translate, culturally appropriate
4. Scoring criteria should be clear and objective
5. Adapted, as necessary, for local context
6. Beware of perverse incentives when designing indicators (i.e. impact results that look good on paper but don't translate into benefits for refugees)
7. Adequate I.T. infrastructure to store and analyze data and ensure its utility for program managers
8. Prioritize indicators that assist in program management -- that actually guide decision-making and allocation of resources

The discussion groups debated the principles, and excluded, combined, and reworked them to conclude with the recommendations listed below.

Overarching Principles
1. Adhere to the principle of “Do no harm” and prioritize the well-being and dignity of clients.
2. Continually advocate for refugee rights, access to national services and employment opportunities (even while proceeding pragmatically in the absence of these)
3. Introduce self-reliance strategies early in the displacement cycle and incorporate them into all types of programming (i.e. not only livelihoods)
4. Collaborate and partner with locally relevant groups such as refugee organizations, religious groups, development actors, and government actors and service providers
5. Involve refugees in program and measurement design and implementation, with regular feedback loops
6. Consider how the protection and legal environment supports or undermines self-reliance and client safety.

Program Design Principles
Self-Reliance programming should be designed through...
1. A comprehensive systems and gender analysis that is appropriate for the local context
2. A client-driven plan for self-reliance inclusive of an exit vision/goal developed with clients
3. Integration and coherence of various program elements (e.g. laddering support in a coordinated way, using a case management model if possible)
4. Appropriate evidence-based programming and policy

Measurement Design Principles
Self-Reliance measurement should...
1. Be simple and easy to use
2. Be adapted, as necessary, for the local context
3. Be aware of perverse incentives (i.e. indicators that yield results that look good on paper but do not translate into benefits for refugees)
4. Clarify who will store, manage and use the information collected. Information should be analyzed and shared with both clients and program managers for a fruitful feedback loop.
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Session 7: Building consensus on common core indicators
Facilitator: Dale Buscher

Activity: Assessment domains (listed below) from a number of self-reliance, integration or well-being measurement tools were placed around the room. The participants were asked to vote (8 votes per person) on the items that they felt were essential to measure self-reliance, as defined on Day 1.

The domains and votes received are listed below.

- WASH - 0
- Social adjustment - 0
- Basic needs - 9 Could include WASH, Shelter is basic need/ change it to WASH
- Human dignity - 0
- Quality of life - 0
- Expenditures - 4
- Utilities - 0
- Community involvement/participation - 9
- Education (primary and secondary) - 16
- Psychosocial support
- Safety/Protection - 16
- Health care - 19
- Shelter - 19
- Child protection - 0
- Employment - 7
- Income - 16
- Food security - 12
- Savings (12)
- Access to information () –
- Documentation
- Self-determination /wellbeing (hope for the future) - 5
- Household supplies and furnishing

The participants discussed the domains that should be dropped, were confusing, could be combined and made cases for certain domains to be included even though the votes were not sufficient.

1. Income, savings and employment concerns – Savings means you have income and extra income. There are those with savings but no income and no employment. Income can come from all manner of sources. Some people are stuck in a debt cycle. Some people have employment but the work is poorly paid so people cannot meet their basic needs. Some employment is less steady/sustainable than something like remittances. Some people have savings but no employment and so savings are not sustainable.
2. Access to information questions - Key knowledge on where to go, where they can get education, where they can get government services, how to locate their own family members in case of separation, how they can stay protected could form part of crucial information.
3. Documentation concerns - Documentation differs from country to country. In some places people need documentation for work and in others they need it for services. In other places they serve little purpose. In some places the documentation is provided by UNHCR and the government and in
others by just one or the other. Participants noted that while documents are often very important for refugees, they may not be a critical component of measuring self-reliance.

4. Self-determination /well-being (hope for the future) - (Where do you see yourself in 2 years- the answer gives an indicator whether the person feels there is opportunity in the current place). It is a tricky one – people can be very hopeful for the future but still rely on aid – is this the “want to know” versus the “need to know?” Participants suggested that it could be integrated with community involvement and participation or with the psychosocial domain. In the end it was combined with psychosocial support. Is it a proxy that is measurable?

5. Household supplies and furnishing- It was suggested that if people have a good income, they can take care of these needs, so that it might not be necessary to measure this separately.

**Following discussions and debate, the participants agreed on the following list of indicators.**

1. Income
2. Employment
3. Shelter
4. Food/Nutrition
5. Health care
6. Education
7. Community Involvement
8. Safety/Protection (Access to information)
9. Well-Being/Hope for the future/Psychosocial
10. WASH

**Session 8: Tackling the Indicators** – Small group work on individual indicators, discussing what we want to measure and how within each assessment domain

*Exercise:* Participants were asked to work in small groups to define indicators for each domain. A few of the domains were interrogated by two different groups. The groups were asked to think about simplicity, measurability and replicability. Groups discussed/debated the domains and indicators from different perspectives and the group outputs below reflect the fact that the groups landed in different places in terms of the specificity of their recommendations.

1. **Shelter**

*Discussion*

- Determined that WASH should be subsumed into the assessment of the adequacy of shelter (i.e. presence of—or safe access to—clean water and sanitation facilities within a reasonable distance, perhaps drawing on SPHERE standards or other applicable local standards or regulations)
- Discussion of how this domain would be assessed in a camp context, i.e. in situations where refugees are given their shelter and do not need to pay for it. We decided that we should focus on non-camp context, but it’s possible that the same measure could be used for camps, with refugees in camps expected to score lower on this domain.
- Defining what we mean by “adequate” shelter is the main challenge. We decided that the concept of adequate should incorporate the following considerations:
  - size of shelter vis-a-vis size of family
  - quality of shelter and building materials (i.e. does it protect the household from the weather and intruders?), and durability
  - access to WASH facilities
- presence of sufficient household furnishings and supplies (assuming that this is not a separate indicator)

- In assessing all the elements of adequacy above, reference would be made to applicable local standards (e.g. electricity when locally appropriate) or SPHERE standards, or any other relevant objective guidance.

- Affordable meaning can the refugee household cover the housing costs through their own resources.

**Indicator recommendations**

- Is the housing adequate and affordable?
  - 1 (lowest): Inadequate and unaffordable
  - 2: Adequate but unaffordable
  - 3: Inadequate but affordable
  - 4 (highest): Adequate and affordable

2. **Safety/Protection (Access to information)**

**Discussion**

- This group was tasked, in part, with determining whether “Access to Information” should be its own domain or whether it could be subsumed under Safety/Protection, or some other domain. The group fairly quickly agreed that Access to Information is integral to all of the domains (e.g. knowing where to get health care, where to register for legal documentation, etc.) and therefore should not stand alone as a domain.

- The group agreed that Safety and Protection (both in the legal and physical senses) were important to retain as part of the measurement of self-reliance, though they considered examples of refugees who did not feel legally or physically safe yet managed to achieve financial self-reliance (e.g. many Oromo and Somalis in Kenya). Nevertheless, physical safety is such a fundamental need that measuring it feels important. It’s possible that refugees will still meet the threshold of “self-reliance” on the measurement scale even with a low score on Safety and Protection.

**Indicator recommendations**

- “Does the household or any member of it have serious legal or physical safety/protection concerns?”
  - The group did not get into the details of how to rank this indicator. Below is how RefugePoint has done it, though this combines a look not just at vulnerability, but offsetting assets in the form of community protection. We might want to consider whether this approach is effective or combines too many variables under one indicator.
    - At least one person has serious protection concerns and has no community or family protection
    - At least one person has serious protection concerns but has community or family protection
    - No serious protection concerns, though the person has no community or family protection (e.g. person is alone)
    - No serious protection concerns, and has community and/or family protection

3. **Well-Being/Hope for the future/Psychosocial**

**Discussion:**

- Consensus seemed to be that this is an important domain but there was some doubt that it was necessary. Some wondered if it could be a potential proxy for a measure of "sustainability".
- Participants discussed whether the measure should be about "initiative". i.e. is the client a "self-starter": someone who can take advantage of opportunities, has a positive attitude. The group expressed concern about how to measure these qualities, even though they may be important to see if a client will be able to be successful.
- Some ways to measure "well-being" - did the client enroll in a program; how connected are they to their community; what is their support network that will help them deal with crises.
- It was agreed that psychosocial support should be included with health
- Need to look for other ways to measure "well-being" other than asking: "Do you have hope for the future" Or "Where do you see yourself in 2/3 years"

**Indicator recommendations:**
- Do you feel your life has improved in the last 6 months?
- Looking ahead, how do you perceive your life/future?

4. **Food security/Nutrition**

*Discussion*
- Some noted that the WFP, UNICEF and others have definitions/standards of what constitutes "food security" - though some wondered if these were appropriate for the urban refugee population and self-reliance.
- In our context, some noted that food security can only be measured in context of location/host community (but how to define that community) - noting that in some cases host communities do not themselves enjoy "food security".
- Basic elements of "food security" might be dietary diversity; availability; accessibility (affordable) - number of meals per day is good statistic but may be misleading. Better to describe where food is purchased, how it is purchased, and typical meals. What are the sources of food - how much is purchased, how much is obtained through other sources.

**Indicator recommendations:**
- Availability question
- Accessibility (affordable)
- How many meals a day do members of your household consume?
- Where is the household’s food purchased?
- What is included in a typical meal?

5. **Income/Savings**

*Discussion*
- Source of the income can be an issue (loans, etc) along with the frequency of an income.
- Total amount is relevant along with the regularity or frequency or predictability of the income.
- How long has the person been receiving the income? How reliable is the source?
- What role does savings have; how to measure savings. If there are savings, what could be the possible use for those savings? Would it go to supporting family not living with the client? Are there needs that are going unmet in order to create savings?
- Is debt important to measure? Would be if it is “extraordinary” or there is some obligation hanging over client that can’t be discharged?
- How is the income (if any) used by the client? What percentage goes to what expenses?
How should income be interpreted, it is very difficult to quantify? Though not measurable, participants suggest asking the specifics of the income but how would that be interpreted? It would clarify how a household is getting their income.

Income information would need to be pegged on periodic monitoring- one month is not enough to tell

Indicator recommendations:
- Do you have any sources of income?
- Is that income sufficient to meet your household needs/basic needs? Or, Can you consistently meet your needs?
- What is the source of your income?
- Do you carry more debt than the household income in a month?
- Are there needs that are going unmet in order to create savings?
- How is the income (if any) used by the client? What percentage goes to what expenses?

6. **Employment**

Discussion
Decision needs to be taken about subjective vs objective questions.

Indicator recommendations:
- How many members of your household have an income generating activity?
- What type of activity? (Self, wage, other)
- Do you have access to employment? *perception

7. **Health care**

Discussion
Have a check list of the items listed below along with a score for each area.

Indicator recommendations:
- Access-
  - Reliability/dependable
  - Availability
  - Physical/attitude (Attitude – measured by experience- what has it been like when you visited? Are you comfortable going to the facility?)
  - Distance
- Affordability – health care should be financially manageable for the recipient
- Availability of health safety nets such as sustainable insurance schemes
- Tracking of and support for existing conditions (persistent, chronic conditions), conditions that impede self-reliance

8. **Education**

Indicator recommendations:
- Does the house have children of school going age?
- If yes, are they accessing?
- If not accessing, why not?
9. **Community involvement**

Discussion
There was not a consensus about what constitutes strong social networks. It was also felt that the questions could be interpreted in different ways.

**Indicator recommendations:**
**Community Involvement & Access to Information**

Discussion
- Both teams independently concluded we should fold “Access to Information” into “Community Involvement,” as information enables community involvement, and in fact enables most of the other indicators as well. Basically, we decided to eliminate it and consider it embedded in our understanding of all of the indicators.
- Finally, the combined groups concluded that it would be useful to research tested indicators of social capital, since a lot of good work has already been done around this. And we also concluded that we were not sure whether this indicator is a “must have” in measuring self-reliance, or is just “nice to have.”

**Indicator recommendations:**
**Community Involvement & Access to Information**

1) “Degree of integration,” with a scale from 1-5, no integration to well-integrated (there was no discussion of how you would define integration or how the assessor would rate it).
2) “How much a refugee understands and makes use of social structures (such as churches, etc.)”
3) “Does the household (on the whole, not necessarily every member) have frequent positive social interactions with the local community, including host country nationals?” The rating scale would be as follows:
   1. No relations or bad relations with both refugee and host communities
   2. Positive relations with refugee community, but no or bad relations with host community
   3. Some positive interactions with both refugee and host community
   4. Very good relations with both refugee and host community

Session 9: Plenary debrief & discussion of indicators work
- Where did we land on how to measure each parameter?
- Discussion of scoring methodology & best practices
- Outstanding questions and concerns

Facilitators: Dale & Ly

Exercise: “Battle of the bands” – two different groups that were given the same indicator to work on presented their arguments to each other and tried to come to agreement on how to measure the indicator.

Group 1 to agree on the best indicators to measure Income/Savings and Group 2 to find consensus on the best indicators for Community Participation.
Recommendations from the meeting of two groups resulted in the indicators listed below.

A. Income:
✓ What are your sources of income? (provide a list: employment, remittances, savings, cash vouchers, begging, etc)
✓ Have you had enough income to meet your basic needs in the last xx months (since we last met)?
   Never, Sometimes, Most of the time, Always; OR Never, Sometimes, Always

B. Community networks was changed to Social capital:

Discussion Points
- How difficult it is to measure a subjective sense of belonging, safety and community involvement;
- How difficult it is to distinguish between what refugees face and what nationals face (what should we expect refugees to achieve given local circumstances);
- How difficult it is to define community now with virtual networks through social media and global connectivity (do those count, or must they be physically present?); and
- Whether community involvement is essential to self-reliance. The participants discussed refugees who live their lives in ethnic enclaves and have little need to learn the local language or interact with locals (examples from both Eastleigh in Nairobi and enclaves in the U.S.), and yet are self-reliant. The participants also debated how this measure applies to refugee camps where refugees are often isolated from nationals and yet might be able to achieve self-reliance. Participants questions whether that sort of self-reliance, without networks with the host community could be sustainable, and if not this would fail to address the sustainability part of the definition we agreed on. Again time horizons were in question and whether humanitarian work necessarily has a shorter time horizon than development perspectives.
- Finally, the groups agreed that the concept of “social capital” was more relevant to the notion of self-reliance than “community involvement,” and proposed to change this indicator to Social Capital.
- Once the decision was made the indicators were reconsidered as to how to best to measure social capital.

Finally, we settled on two less precise questions:
✓ “If you had an emergency and needed help, do you have contacts who could help you?” (here again we’d need to define “contacts.” Would this include family, or is that a given and what we’re really asking about is friends, neighbors and other acquaintances? Also, would receiving remittances from family abroad count here, or do we only mean local contacts physically present?) This would be rated on a Likert scale: strongly disagree to strongly agree.
✓ “How strong are your social networks?” Rated from very weak to very strong, and would require guidance to the assessor on what to consider.
✓ “If you had an emergency OR needed to borrow one month’s rent would you have someone to call who would lend you the money?”

It was reiterated that, as a group, there seemed to be broad consensus on 8 of the indicators for measurement (employment, income/savings, shelter, education, healthcare, food security, safety/protection, and community involvement/participation). There was also interest in an indicator around well-being/self-determination/hope for the future although there was less consensus around this as it is more subjective, harder to measure, and may not be a reliable measure for self-reliance. That is, one
can be self-reliant without feeling hopeful about your future especially if it appears that there is no near-term end to your displacement.

There also seemed to be some coalescing in the working groups around simple ranking scales for measuring each indicator. Ranking scales of from 3 – 5 lowest to highest seemed to be emerging for a system of scoring.

There was then discussion around scoring methodology and best practices. Ly provided very helpful guidance around ensuring that each score only asked or measured one thing and that each rank or score was mutually exclusive. Ly noted that language such as sometimes and occasionally could be understood and scored differently by different people. Each rank needs to be completely distinct from the other options.

**Session 10: Expanding Self-Reliance Programming**
- Next steps in self-reliance measurement
- Promoting the uptake of self-reliance strategies
- New partners to engage: programmatic & funding

_Facilitator: Amy Slaughter_

*Presentation and remarks by Sasha Chanoff (by Skype) and Amy Slaughter to the group on next steps for this initiative.*

Where do we go from here? We believe that self-reliance programming should expand and we think measurement and goal-setting is key to that. We think it should happen earlier in the displacement cycle and that an ethos of self-reliance can be embedded in or inform all sorts of interventions and not just livelihoods. Let’s collectively brainstorm the workplan for the Community of Practice. What should be the next steps in terms of tool development, validation and piloting? What might an influence strategy look like to gain greater uptake of these principles/indicators? Should we be looking at coalition-building and joint action plans? Which funders might we approach; where might we present these ideas; which operational partners should we be engaging; is there a way to track progress on this globally and what would that take? These are the questions that we would like to tackle in this session.

There is urgency and opportunity to collaborate. We can learn from one another and save our collective resources in this time of unprecedented displacement. Together we can reach millions of refugees with services that facilitate self-reliance.

**Exercise:** Participants were asked to reflect on how we can build momentum/uptake of this initiative and participants broke into groups to address five questions (questions highlighted below) to recommend next steps for this initiative. **Recommendations outlined below.**

1. **How can we build momentum/uptake of this? Are there other efforts we should link into (e.g. Sphere standards, SDGs)?**
   - Finalize and pilot the indicators.
   - Use the indicators within all of our organizations to show success and grow out from experience. Introduce indicators to development actors to be able to compare host/IDP/refugee population outcomes.
   - Better/More representation of other sectors such as govt/state actors, host community, World Bank. Review of self-reliance of host communities.
• Incorporate self-reliance principles into country development plans
• Continue community of practice
• Link to other learning events such as the Rift Valley Institute, SDGs, Sphere standards, UNHCR livelihoods standards, etc. RefugePoint and WRC should facilitate some sort of knowledge management and sharing.

2. **What barriers exist to uptake of self-reliance programming and measurement? Ideas for overcoming them?**
   • Understanding of how this could be beneficial - Develop PR strategies (messages and targets) for the initiative. Focus on mechanisms that will help institutions or this group by trying to develop public relations on how this would benefit organizations and their work. Have a road map of goals for the initiative. Show the way forward to change mindsets about the reality of refugee situations (e.g. not necessarily temporary). Highlight the need to focus early on in a refugee situation on self-reliance. Establish a team of experts to act as advisors.
   • Insecurity due to terrorism that affects decisions on refugee assistance, which is link to instability (political/ economic) – advocacy with donors, government agencies, partnership amongst agencies to support self-reliance measurement through collaborative efforts to share tools, etc.
   • Capacity of staff and resources to undertake self-reliance measurement and long-term/consistent funding for self-reliance.

3. **Where and how should we spread the word of this effort (e.g. places to present this work)?**
   • Opening up the community of practice – open it up to more people e.g. research/academic/data institutes, ALNAP, data experts.
   • Present it to key fora e.g.: summit on aid and development, IAWG (especially quality and accountability sub group)
   • Use social media platforms to promote the initiative (Twitter, Facebook etc.)
   • Link with ALNAP and other communities of practice and their focal points to share info through partner social media platforms.

4. **Which potential funding and operational partners should we try to involve?**
   • Two phase approach should be adopted. In the short term, refine the tools to be used in the next six months using research that is already being implemented by agencies and researchers in related areas, such as the MDC Index. Secondly, encourage donors to support the initiative through the integration of these indicators as part of their measurement tools. Provide seed money for pilots.
   • Think through links between self-reliance and resilience. How does self-reliance fit within existing resilience frameworks? Need to articulate the linkages.
   • Potential funding: IKEA Foundation, DFID, Humanitarian Innovations Fund

5. **How might we track progress of self-reliance program expansion globally?**
   • Mapping to identify all organizations working on self-reliance issues
   • Identification of other entities under which this initiative can/should sit (coordinate with the Solutions Alliance or the CRRF/Global Compact?) or figure out a structure that builds buy in and consensus (replicate the ReDSS structure?) or endorsement (IASC?)
   • Creation of online platform for information gathering and data management
   • Validate tool to get buy in
• Identify easy to use, dynamic and both formal (email) and informal (tools such as Slack?) means of sharing information and, in addition to sharing documents, share photos, video, etc.; Maintain quarterly calls
• Clarify responsibility so that momentum continues
• Information sharing about the initiative through related fora, ALNAP and other learning networks even if not directly associated with this group

Workshop closing
Facilitators: Dale Buscher & Amy Slaughter

Plenary recap and thank yous.

The closing highlighted the workshop journey with a review of where we started on day one to the workshop consensus outcomes by the end. The recap included an overview of what participants can expect from the organizers (outcomes document, report and community of practice follow up).

In addition, a sincere thank you was expressed to the RefugePoint staff in Nairobi for sharing their programs with us on the observation day and for organizing the logistics of the event and to Catherine Tangai and Kellie Leeson for coordinating. And a warm thank you to all the participants who took the time to roll up their sleeves and collaboratively work on this issue.
# APPENDIX I

## Meeting Agenda

### Monday, March 20

**Observation Day at RefugePoint**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:20</td>
<td>Welcome &amp; Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20 – 10:00</td>
<td>Background and overview of program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:45</td>
<td>The Self-Reliance Measurement Tool (SRMT) &amp; how we use it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 – 11:00</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:40</td>
<td>Group 1: Tour of Office / Overview of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2: Observation of SRMT Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40 – 12:20</td>
<td>Group 1: Observation of SRMT Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2: Tour of Office / Overview of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20- 12:35</td>
<td>Plenary debrief from SRMT Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:35 – 1:30</td>
<td><strong>Working lunch with refugee entrepreneurs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 2:30</td>
<td>Observation of Case Management Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 3:30</td>
<td>Observation Electives (choose one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Case plan development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Livelihoods training curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conducting an SRMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Backend data handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 – 4:00</td>
<td>Plenary debrief &amp; wrap up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 -</td>
<td>Happy hour (no host) at Best Western rooftop bar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tuesday, March 21

**Day 1 of Workshop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:30</td>
<td>Welcome &amp; Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:30</td>
<td><strong>Session1</strong>: Stage-setting - Current refugee landscape, industry trends, rationale and historical context for this effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:00</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 2</strong>: What do we mean by “self-reliance” and “well-being?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discussion of terminology and what exactly we are trying to measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1:00 – 2:15  **Session 3:** How are we approaching self-reliance measurement?
- Brief presentations of tools by Samuel Hall, WANA Institute, JIPS and WRC
- Reflections from each entity on how their work intersects with self-reliance
- Open discussion and Q&A

2:15 – 3:00  **Session 4:** UNHCR Livelihoods indicators presentation

3:00 – 3:15  *Coffee Break*

3:15 – 3:45  **Session 5:** Identifying commonalities & differences among our efforts

3:45 – 4:45  **Session 6:** Development of common principles of self-reliance/well-being

4:45 – 5:00  Recap and Wrap up Day 1 of Workshop

6:30 - 6:50  Dinner at Cedars Restaurant (compliments of RefugePoint)

   Depart from hotel at 6:00pm

---

**Wed., March 22**

**Day 2 of Workshop**

9:00 – 10:00  **Session 7:** Building consensus on common core indicators

10:00 – 11:15  **Session 8:** Tackling the Indicators (Part 1): small group work on individual indicators, discussing what to measure and how within each assessment domain

11:15 – 11:45  *Coffee Break*

11:45 – 1:00  Tackling the Indicators (Part 2)

1:00 – 2:00  *Lunch*

2:00 – 3:30  **Session 9:** Plenary debrief & discussion of indicators work
- Where did we land on how to measure each parameter
- Discussion of scoring methodology & best practices
- Outstanding questions and concerns

3:30 – 3:45  *Coffee Break*

3:45 – 4:45  **Session 10:** Expanding self-reliance programming
- Next steps in self-reliance measurement
- Promoting the uptake of self-reliance strategies
- New partners to engage: programmatic & funding

4:45 – 5:00  Workshop closing
## APPENDIX II

### Measuring Refugee Self-Reliance Participant List  
**Mar-17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Email address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Senior Economist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:beltramo@unhcr.org">beltramo@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>RefugePoint</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bonyo@refugeepoint.org">Bonyo@refugeepoint.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Women's Refugee Commission</td>
<td>Senior Director of Programs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DaleB@wrcommission.org">DaleB@wrcommission.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fchege@mercycorps.org">fchege@mercycorps.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khadra</td>
<td>Joint IDP Profiling Service</td>
<td>Durable Solutions Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elmi@jips.org">elmi@jips.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Director of Regional Resilience Initiatives</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cforster@mercycorps.org">cforster@mercycorps.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Trickle Up</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lfried@trickleup.org">lfried@trickleup.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>RefugePoint</td>
<td>Associate, Resilience Assessment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nyokabi@refugeepoint.org">nyokabi@refugeepoint.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>RefugePoint</td>
<td>M&amp;E Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gitau@refugeepoint.org">gitau@refugeepoint.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisha</td>
<td>US State Dept/BPRM</td>
<td>Policy Officer - BPRM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GuffeyAD@state.gov">GuffeyAD@state.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>West Asia-North Africa Institute</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harper.ERICA@ME.COM">harper.ERICA@ME.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:P.kiara@drceay.org">P.kiara@drceay.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shezane</td>
<td>Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat</td>
<td>Knowledge Management and Policy Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.kirubi@drceay.org">s.kirubi@drceay.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellie</td>
<td>RefugeePoint &amp; Women's Refugee Commission</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kcleeSON@GMAIL.COM">kcleeSON@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>RefugeePoint</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lehnerG@pepperlaw.com">lehnerG@pepperlaw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassim</td>
<td>Samuel Hall</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nassim.majidi@samuelhall.org">nassim.majidi@samuelhall.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karene</td>
<td>Solutions Alliance</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmelloul@hotmail.com">kmelloul@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
<td>Economic Recovery and Development Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emukami@kenyayouth.rti.org">emukami@kenyayouth.rti.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Danish Refugee Council</td>
<td>M&amp;E Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.mungai@drckenya.org">s.mungai@drckenya.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>IKEA Foundation</td>
<td>MEL Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ly.nguyen@ikeafoundation.org">ly.nguyen@ikeafoundation.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Global Livelihoods Expert</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nyambaka@unhcr.org">nyambaka@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nao</td>
<td>Senior Research Officer</td>
<td>Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford</td>
<td><a href="mailto:naohiko.omata@qeh.ox.ac.uk">naohiko.omata@qeh.ox.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Assistant Livelihood Officer</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oduor@unhcr.org">oduor@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Deputy Director - PRP/BPRM</td>
<td>US State Dept/BPRM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:PerkinsKK@state.gov">PerkinsKK@state.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Chief Strategy Officer</td>
<td>RefugePoint</td>
<td><a href="mailto:slaughter@refugepoint.org">slaughter@refugepoint.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Migration Research Assistant</td>
<td>Samuel Hall</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pauline.vidal@samuelhall.org">pauline.vidal@samuelhall.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>RefugePoint</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karanja@refugepoint.org">karanja@refugepoint.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karanja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>