

CERF Allocations to Responses to Consequences of Chronic Conflict Situations

CERF secretariat
May 2012

A. Background

During its meeting in October 2011 in New York, the Advisory Group requested the Secretariat to provide further analysis on allocations to chronic conflict situations, particularly those which had been consistent recipients of funds for a number of years from the underfunded window, and on allocations for internally displaced persons and refugees, particularly those in camp situations.

B. Definition and methodology

One of the main consequences of a conflict is the displacement of a population, either within the frontier of the country where the conflict takes place or in a neighbouring country which provides asylum to displaced persons. The former are identified as internally displaced persons (IDPs) and the latter as refugees as they crossed an international border to seek protection. In these two instances, the displaced persons could be accommodated in camp settings or through the existing structures in host communities. This paper concentrates on the CERF allocations provided to support the camps hosting IDPs and refugees.

It should be noted that this distinction is not always clearly identifiable in the field. In some, if not most cases, the displacement is addressed through a combination of these two options. Consequently, whilst this paper sought to focus on CERF allocations to support the camps hosting both IDPs and refugees, it was not always possible to clearly isolate funds to camps. The figures used for this analysis are therefore an estimation of the amount allocated by the CERF to camps; there may be some instances, though, in which IDPs and refugees not residing in the camps or host communities were also beneficiaries of CERF-funded activities.

To provide the analysis requested by the Advisory Group members, the CERF secretariat identified the camp situations, which benefited from CERF funding in 2011, as per Table 1, below. This first step aims to provide members with an overall image of the current situation regarding displacement in camps as a result of both protracted and new conflicts. The second step consists of reviewing the table in light of the conflict, which initially prompted the displacement: new, sudden circumstances or chronic, protracted conditions. The review is complemented by a short analysis on CERF-funding trends to countries, which received support in 2011 as a result of a protracted situation.

C. CERF funding to camps situations in 2011

Table 1: CERF allocations in 2011 in camps situation (refugees/IDPs) as a result of conflict induced displacements¹

Countries	Refugees/IDPs	Total CERF allocation US\$	New/protracted Conflicts/ Displacement	Rapid Response US\$	Underfunded emergencies US\$
Benin	Refugees (Cote d'Ivoire)	105,930	New	105,930	0
Togo	Refugees (Cote d'Ivoire)	614,332	New	614,332	0
Guinea	Refugees (Cote d'Ivoire)	390,012	New	390,012	0
Ghana	Refugees (Cote d'Ivoire)	2,121,502	New	2,121,502	0
Liberia	Refugees (Cote d'Ivoire)	5,988,454	New	5,988,454	0
Cote d'Ivoire	IDPs	16,324,871	New	16,324,871	0
Chad	Refugees (Sudan)/IDPs	2,984,612	Protracted	0	2,984,612
Ethiopia	Refugees(Somalia)/ IDPs	11,380,485	New/Protracted	10,030,555	1,349,930
Djibouti	Refugees (Somalia)	284,353	Protracted	284,353	0
Kenya	Refugees (Somalia, Sudan)	4,134,915	New/protracted	3,134,866	1,000,049
Somalia	IDPs	1,500,000	Protracted	0	1,500,000
Pakistan	IDPs	14,737,387	New/Protracted	4,990,394	9,746,993
Sri Lanka	IDPs	1,684,099	Protracted	0	1,684,099
Sudan	IDPs	5,175,065	New	5,175,065	0
Tunisia	Refugees/migrants	3,196,862	New	3,196,862	0
Yemen	IDPs	10,351,500	New	10,351,500	0
Central African Republic	Refugees (DRC)/IDPs	2,300,000	Protracted	0	2,300,000
Islamic Republic of Iran	Refugees (Afghanistan)	2,992,466	Protracted	0	2,992,466
Nepal	Refugees (Bhutan)	1,999,994	Protracted	0	1,999,994
Mozambique	Refugees (Somalia)	1,462,910	New	1,462,910	0
Zimbabwe	Refugees (Regional)	1,247,750	Protracted	0	1,247,750
TOTAL		90,977,499		64,171,606	26,805,893

¹ Estimated figures as for the following countries, the distinction of funding towards camps and outside is difficult to established: Benin, Togo, Guinea, Ghana, Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, Chad, Somalia, Pakistan, Yemen, CAR, Zimbabwe

D. General

The above table indicates that **US\$90,977,499** was allocated in 2011 to camp situations for both IDPs and refugees. This represented some 21 per cent of the total CERF allocation for 2011. Of this amount, **\$63,887,253**, representing 70 per cent, was granted as a result of relatively new conflict or new displacement. The remaining amount, **\$27,090,246**, (30 per cent) was allocated to countries experiencing more protracted displacements. Generally, new displacements received CERF funding through the rapid response window while chronic situations were addressed through the underfunded emergency window.²

In 2011, 21 countries received CERF funding to support populations in camps. Ten countries received funding as a result of relatively recent conflicts and eight countries received funding as a consequence of a chronic and protracted conflict situation. Three countries experienced consequences due to a combination of new and protracted situations.

E. CERF funding for new camps situations

As mentioned above, 10 countries benefited from CERF funding as a result of displacement related to relatively new conflicts.

The post-election crisis in **Cote d'Ivoire** has prompted significant population movements inside and outside the country. Consequently, CERF used its rapid response window to provide \$25.5 million to **Cote d'Ivoire** and neighbouring countries, including **Benin, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia** and **Togo**. Most funding was used to support displaced population in camps.

Financial grants were also allocated to the **Republic of Sudan** for newly internally displaced persons in north Darfur; to **Tunisia** to address the displacements related to the crisis in Libya; to **Yemen** following the new displacements resulting from internal strife and the conflicts in the north; and for **Mozambique** to help the country team to accommodate new refugees and asylum seekers who originated from the Horn of Africa.

All of the above situations received funding from the rapid response window for the first time. Unless there is a dramatic deterioration of these humanitarian situations, additional CERF-funding from the rapid response window is not anticipated.

In addition, **Ethiopia, Pakistan** and **Somalia** received sizeable grants to support both new and protracted displaced populations, primarily in camps. Support to Ethiopia and Somalia was provided for populations displaced mainly because of the dramatic deterioration of the situation in Somalia, i.e. rising food insecurity and worsening of physical security. These newly displaced groups were added to existing, older displaced populations in camps who also required CERF funding. A similar situation happened in Pakistan with the parallel establishment of new camps due to recent displacement and the continuation of older camps. The new situations were supported by the CERF through its rapid response window while the older situations received support from the underfunded mechanism (see below).

F. CERF funding for protracted camps situation

As mentioned above, eight countries benefited from CERF funding as a result of displacement related to protracted conflicts.

² Djibouti represents an exception as the support to Somali refugees in camps originated from the rapid response window albeit being there as a result of a chronic conflict, owing to the significant and sudden deterioration of the situation.

The situations of the refugees from **Darfur** and IDPs in **Chad** are defined as protracted due primarily to the length of their displacements: refugees have been displaced since 2003 while IDPs have been displaced since 2006. In 2011, Chad was identified as one of the most underfunded humanitarian emergencies. During the process, the Humanitarian Country Team agreed to allocate some \$3 million of a total \$8 million to support refugees and IDPs mainly residing in camps (37 per cent). This represents a reduction when compared to 2010: \$8 million of a total \$15 million (53 per cent) was allocated to camps from the underfunded grant.

Djibouti constitutes the only situation in 2011 where rapid response funds were used to support refugees in a protracted situation. This was the result of a significant and sudden deterioration in circumstances and the need to quickly intervene, which corresponds to the CERF rapid response.

IDP camps in **Sri Lanka** have received somewhat significant support mainly from CERF's rapid response component. Sizeable allocations were made in 2009 and 2010 though no rapid response allocations were requested in 2011. However, the country was identified as an underfunded emergency by the Emergency Relief Coordinator and as a result IDPs camps benefited.

The **Central African Republic** regularly received CERF grants from the underfunded emergency window since its inception, including in 2011. Unlike previous years, no funds from the rapid response window were allocated in 2011. IDPs and refugees in the Central African Republic serve as a strong example of protracted and underfunded situation.

The **Islamic Republic of Iran** benefited from CERF funds as part of the 2011 first round of underfunded allocations. The country team prioritised this grant to the support Afghan refugees residing in camps – a long-standing protracted situation.

A similar approach was used in **Nepal** to help benefit Bhutan refugees.

Zimbabwe is a specific case as it has benefited from rapid response grants, including in 2011, and underfunded grants. During the allocation of underfunded grants in 2011, the country team decided to provide a portion of funds to refugees and asylum seekers – a group suffering from one of the country's protracted humanitarian situations.

G. Conclusion

While it is difficult to establish a clear pattern with a limited number of countries, the above data indicates that CERF support to protracted displacement situations in camps as a result of chronic conflict is relatively limited. Such support has the tendency to reduce and be supplemented by funding from transitional and developmental resources. CERF generally uses the rapid response window to provide support to newly displaced populations or in response to the deterioration of a camp setting.

However, it has been noted that in some instances, the country team decided to allocate CERF support to more protracted displacements situations which were clearly underfunded. The data also show that the allocation from the underfunded window to these specific cases is not repeated year after year but is utilised to fill specific funding gaps at a given time.