

International Development Committee

Oral evidence: Forced displacement in Africa, HC 1433

Tuesday 15 January 2019

Ordered by the House of Commons to be published on 15 January 2019.

[Watch the meeting](#)

Members present: Stephen Twigg (Chair); Richard Burden; Mrs Pauline Latham; Chris Law; Lloyd Russell-Moyle; Paul Scully; Mr Virendra Sharma; Henry Smith.

Questions 100 - 167

Witnesses

I: Harriett Baldwin MP, Minister for Africa, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and Minister for International Development, DFID; Chris Kiggell, Policy Manager, Protracted Crises, DFID; Yves Horent, Senior Humanitarian Adviser, Africa Regional Department, DFID.

Examination of witnesses

Witnesses: Harriett Baldwin MP, Chris Kiggell and Yves Horent.

Q100 **Chair:** Good morning. Can I welcome the Minister and officials? This is the final oral evidence session as part of our inquiry into forced displacement in Africa, during which we have had a particular focus on east Africa. What we are going to try to do over the next hour and a half is cover 15 areas. There is a big advantage to concise questions on our part and reasonably concise answers. If I can kick off, Minister, and give you an opportunity to open, now that the global compacts both on refugees and migration have been signed, what mechanisms will be put in place to ensure that Governments are held to account on the commitments they have made?

Harriet Baldwin: Thank you very much. Can I start by saying how pleased I am the Committee is looking into this, and also that you have been able to go out and visit some of the places? You have probably been more successful than I have in terms of visits. I have brought along two officials with me today. To introduce them, on the policy side we have Chris Kiggell, who is the refugee policy manager; he has been involved with all the policy development around the two global compacts. Yves Horent is the Africa regional development senior humanitarian adviser; he has loads and loads of practical field experience. I thought that would be helpful to have.

In terms of our refugee compact, obviously that is an evolution from what was signed a couple of years ago at the United Nations. A lot of the same wording is in place and my understanding is that there is going to be a meeting next year to look at the first year of progress. There is then going to be a four-year cycle in terms of holding Governments to account. That is the general framework. I would expect that within that four-year framework, there would be an important role for this Committee to play, but also an important role at all of the different United Nations meetings in terms of the world's progress on these compacts, which, broadly speaking, we welcome as being very good, structured frameworks for dealing with two issues that are very much of our age and are going to continue to be major issues for the world to deal with.

Q101 **Chair:** Obviously a number of pretty significant countries did not support the global compact for refugees. They either abstained or even voted against, including the United States and Eritrea.

Harriet Baldwin: If I may pick you up on that, it is the migration one that has been the more controversial one.

Chris Kiggell: It was the US and Hungary that voted against. There was no formal sign up to the refugee one; that was the migration compact.



HOUSE OF COMMONS

Q102 **Chair:** The United States' opposition to a global compact is pretty significant. My understanding—am I wrong?—is that Eritrea, for example, which is a pretty significant country from which people seek refuge, did not support it. I may have that wrong. My understanding is Libya, as well.

Chris Kiggell: Libya, the Dominican Republic and Eritrea all abstained but did not vote against on the refugee compact.

Q103 **Chair:** Certainly from our visit and from some of the evidence we have taken in different ways, clearly a lot of people are leaving Eritrea, Libya is a country that a lot of migrants go to, to seek to come to Europe, and the US is obviously a major player. Is there a concern that this will make it difficult to take forward both global compacts with the levels of opposition that there were from those countries?

Harriet Baldwin: It would certainly be better if we could get everyone to agree on an approach that the whole international community could support and buy into. By and large, we welcome the fact that we have very significant backing for it. Arguably, it is very challenging to get every single country to agree to everything. We had set out what we wanted to achieve in terms of the policy. Very much the clear distinction between migrants and refugees was one of the things we wanted to make sure was in it and also the recognition that it continues to be a sovereign policy decision in terms of the overall approach.

You are right that Libya is on the route, and there are a range of different ways in which we would welcome more engagement from Eritrea in terms of some of the objectives of the international community, not least on human rights, for example. It is pretty comprehensive and, as you know, it is a very live issue in the US as well, in terms of their southern border. There is perhaps a possibility of that changing under a future administration. Chris, do you want to add anything on the policy side of things?

Chris Kiggell: The only thing I would add with regard to the US is that, in their explanation of the vote, they were not removing themselves from the process. They had concerns about specific points of language in the compact but they did reiterate support for the more fundamental aims of the compact. It is a non-legally binding compact. Even for abstentions, a lot of the approaches and ideas in their countries could still look to advance without formally supporting the compact.

Q104 **Mr Sharma:** Good morning. With levels of displacement higher than ever before, experts argue that the global refugee regime is no longer fit for purpose. Do you agree, and, if so, what is the UK doing to encourage reform?

Harriet Baldwin: We agree that it is a significant issue. We support the approach that has been worked on with other countries in terms of this global compact and we think that what we can do in terms of future reform is significant. With the UK having its commitment to point 7 in



HOUSE OF COMMONS

statute, we can anticipate that we will be able to be a significant financial contributor to the refugee response for many years to come. That is a core part of what we should be responsible for within international development, in terms of providing that first level of support and assistance.

In terms of the Committee's specific inquiry with a focus on Africa in this regard, obviously the Committee will be aware that this is a particularly significant issue as far as Africa is concerned. We anticipate that, again from the point of view of our long-term approach within Africa, we will be continuing to increase the amount that we spend on what we think are some of the drivers of refugees, whether that is on conflict resolution, on adaptation to climate change or on demography generally, so the work we do on providing access to modern family planning, for example. That is something we continue to remain committed to.

We fully understand that there are two elements to this: there is the immediate response, and then there is the work that we can programme in that involves tackling the long-term underlying drivers of refugees moving from one place to another. That, we anticipate, will continue to be an increasing focus, particularly within Africa, if we look ahead over years to come. I do not know if either of my panellist colleagues want to add anything to that.

Chris Kiggell: In terms of addressing the drivers and the longer-term issues, there is also the approach in the refugee compact to provide that longer-term support, not just meeting immediate needs, but support for education, livelihoods and infrastructure, delivered in a way that also benefits host countries and communities.

Chair: We are going to come to some of those issues in more detail.

Q105 **Mr Sharma:** What would a refugee regime fit for 2019 look like?

Harriet Baldwin: I would start by saying I do not think that in 2019 we are, as a world, where we ought to be in terms of overall tackling the underlying causes of conflict. The UK, from a foreign policy point of view, is very much trying to use our diplomatic expertise to tackle conflict situations and try to resolve conflict situations via the UN in particular. In addition to that, where there is a refugee crisis, speed of response is absolutely crucial. We have made strides, as a world, in terms of the speed of some of that response.

In terms of the overall approach where we are able to lock in longer-term security in terms of funding, that has very much been a direction of travel and that needs to continue to be a direction of travel, so that there is certainty around the funding, not just with year-to-year fluctuations or uncertainty.

Similarly, over the long term, we need to make sure we understand better how we resolve refugee situations. One of the things—for



example, in the context of education, which I gather you will be coming on to—that I do not think we understand as a world yet how we make sure that in responding to the very real need to deliver education in a refugee context we also make sure that we continue to provide access to education once people have returned home. We as a world need to get better on the issue of returns and making sure that where there is a voluntary desire to return, that process works better.

We need to get better as a world in terms of the interaction between refugee populations and host communities. As you know, what we are trying to do is move away from funding specific categories of people—internally displaced refugees and host populations—and trying to provide a more holistic approach based on vulnerability and need.

Those are shifts that are underway, and we should continue to shift in that direction to have a better overall response as a world to this situation. I am going to ask my colleagues if they want to add anything to that.

Chair: I am going to ask you not to, just in terms of time. Thank you.

Q106 **Henry Smith:** Good morning. The UK, of course, signed up to the Grand Bargain, which significantly changes the way that humanitarian support is delivered to refugees and IDPs in Africa. How do you believe this has changed the way that the UK assists such individuals?

Harriet Baldwin: It follows on from the previous point that I was making about the longer-term and more predictable flows of funding. We are very proud of the fact that the UK has a good record as a good donor in terms of the Grand Bargain. I think 99% of our funding is multi-year funding in this context. We try to provide it in a less earmarked way, which is one of the key elements of the Grand Bargain. We have set out in our policy publications our approach to that. That is really the key shift in terms of the Grand Bargain and one that we will continue to move towards.

Q107 **Henry Smith:** If I may follow up particularly with regard to financing, it is understood by the Committee that very little progress has been made on the multi-year financing since 2016. Can you tell us what DFID is doing to alter that?

Harriet Baldwin: It is my bad eyesight: I said 99%; it is actually 89% of our funding that is multi-year. There is another 11% that we can unlock ourselves. Potentially, though, there may be constraints as far as that is concerned. You will never get to 100%, but 89% is quite a significant percentage. It is working with other donors to try to argue for, again, a multi-year approach and also one that is, as I say, holistic and so takes into account the host community as well.

Q108 **Chair:** On the multi-year, is the issue not that however good we are, the big multilaterals like UNHCR just do not operate on that basis?



HOUSE OF COMMONS

Harriet Baldwin: There is an issue around that but with sustained arguing for that change, we can get other donors on to the same page. What is your thought, Yves? You would never be able to get to 100% multi-year financing but is there scope to go up from 89%?

Yves Horent: We are making slow progress. There are two issues. One is other donors. Again, we are making slow progress. The European Union's office for humanitarian aid, ECHO, has now engaged on multi-year funding, which is progress. The second issue is multilateral agencies not translating the multi-year funding we grant them to their partners. Again, on this we are making progress. They are hiding behind administrative reasons and we are gradually going to discuss these administrative issues to try to make sure that they translate this into multi-year funding to their partners.

Q109 **Henry Smith:** As major players in this and major donors, do you think there is more we can be doing to influence? If we are providing funding to other organisations that then are not using a multi-year process, is there more we can do to influence and almost demand that that happens?

Harriet Baldwin: There probably is. There are 53 different donors that are involved in the Grand Bargain so far, are there not?

Yves Horent: Yes. One other thing we can do is build more evidence that multi-year is better value for money and provides more appropriate assistance. Part of what we are trying to do is generate this evidence to try to avoid agencies hiding behind these administrative reasons that I mentioned before.

Harriet Baldwin: I do not know if we will be getting on to this but you will be aware that the UK is the leader on the work stream around cash and cash delivery. You are probably going to be getting on to that later.

Q110 **Henry Smith:** Before we get on to that, developing this theme of funding a little bit more in terms of the localisation of funds that are delivered, particularly in context-specific circumstances, we know the large UN agencies receive about 80% of humanitarian funding. What proportion of DFID's funding for refugees and IDPs is currently channelled through local organisations in Africa, and is there a plan to scale up on that?

Harriet Baldwin: The plan is always to go with who we think is the best person or the best organisation to deliver the support on the ground. That very often will be a UN organisation but not exclusively a UN organisation. I do not think we would want to commit ourselves to a particular amount or percentage on that.

Q111 **Henry Smith:** Do you know what the current percentage is at the moment for DFID?

Harriet Baldwin: It is a quite a high percentage, is it not? It would vary by country. We could probably do the analysis.



HOUSE OF COMMONS

Henry Smith: That was going to be my final question. If you could provide that answer in writing to the Committee afterwards, that would be very helpful.

Harriet Baldwin: I do not know if it is in my vast binder.

Henry Smith: I am struggling with my eyesight as well.

Harriet Baldwin: I would anticipate that it would be in the 60% to 70% area.

Chair: Really?

Harriet Baldwin: I would think.

Henry Smith: If we could get clarification on that, it would be appreciated.

Q112 **Chair:** It would be very, very useful to have that information. To be honest, Minister, I would be surprised if it is as high as 60% but it would be very useful to have that information. On my observation about funding through UN organisations, is there also an opportunity to press the UN to partner more with local organisations themselves?

Yves Horent: It has been for many years already the policy of UNHCR to partner with local organisations. The great majority of the funding is channelled through the UN system and through international NGOs, but there are very few instances where these international partners do not work with local partners. The great majority of them work through local partners. The question then for us is then a question of efficiency. Are we better off funding directly the local partners or are we better off channelling the funding through bodies that effectively fund-manage for us and co-ordinate? Again, we need to look at the position of other donors. If we are act in a certain way and other donors act differently in terms of co-ordination, we may complicate the picture rather than actually help the beneficiaries at the end.

Q113 **Chair:** I understand the point. I guess there is a balance to be struck between efficiency and localisation here, and how confident we are in the UN organisations partnering in an intelligent and effective way with local organisations. It will be very useful to have the figure certainly for direct UK funding, which I guess is relatively straightforward, but also if there are figures for the proportion of some of the UN funding that then goes to local organisations. That might be a harder figure to track down but if you can that would be fantastic.

Harriet Baldwin: Are we including in this the World Food Programme and World Health Organization?

Chair: Yes. Thank you.

Q114 **Richard Burden:** If you were looking at something like DFID's work on education, there is a lot of information in the public domain, it is



HOUSE OF COMMONS

relatively easy to navigate through to see what DFID is doing, to see how much is being spent on what and to track performance. If you are looking at the Government's work on displacement, it seems a lot less transparent and a lot more difficult to navigate than areas like education. Do you accept that and, if so, is there something you think can be done to improve the situation?

Harriet Baldwin: We all accept that where we are working through multilaterals we lose some of that element of visibility. Yes, we do all accept that.

Q115 **Richard Burden:** Work through multilaterals is done on other areas as well. A lot of education spending is spent through multilaterals as well, is it not?

Harriet Baldwin: Yes, but in the global programme for education you could be pretty sure that is all education. Taking, for example, the World Bank, there would be elements of that that would be working on refugee programming. Obviously, the UK is very influential and has significant shareholding in the World Bank but we do all recognise that not only in terms of us as the ministerial team but also in terms of when it is delivered on the ground, the visible link that people might see in terms of UK aid delivery or that we might see in terms of the specific programme that we sign off on here in the UK is obviously one step removed. It goes without saying that therefore we feel there is less visibility for us, yes.

Q116 **Richard Burden:** If I was to ask you how much DFID spent in the last financial year on supporting refugees and IDPs in sub-Saharan African—very specifically that region—would you be able to tell me?

Harriet Baldwin: We would not. There are a number of reasons why that is the case. First of all, there is the question of definition around who is a refugee, who is an IDP and how many of them there are. As you know, we are getting better in terms of biometrics, for example, and making sure we have identification of people who are receiving assistance.

It is also going to be a fluctuating number. Babies are born; people die. It is obviously a number that shifts. People move to and from. The very nature of internal displacement means you can have periods where there are sharp increases or there can be periods of return. That would be the fundamental reason why this is a shifting amount but of course we can look at individual country programmes and give you a good idea of what the amount is, for example in terms of within the Democratic Republic of Congo, where we have, over the five years, £227 million programmed in terms of partnering with multilateral organisations on delivering support to internally displaced people. There is that level of information we can give you but, if you are asking for a precise, one-moment figure on absolutely everything, that is why it can be quite hard to pin down, just because it is such a fluctuating landscape. Yves, do you want to add anything on that?



Yves Horent: To provide this information, we will have to ask all partners to report to us. We need to be careful in terms of incentives we create on messages we send to partners. All current policy is to try to move away from assisting people per status. We are trying to move away from assisting people because they are refugees or because they are IDPs. We are trying to assist people because they are vulnerable and because of their needs. In many parts of sub-Saharan Africa what this means is we are providing assistance to a geographical area. In each geographical area, we are assisting refugees, IDPs and host populations. In some cases, host families are as vulnerable as the IDPs they are hosting. While we do acknowledge that we need to get better at providing statistics and figures, we also need to be careful in terms of messages we are sending to partners. The current push is for assistance based on vulnerability, not based on status. That is what we are currently promoting.

Q117 **Richard Burden:** I do understand that but it can be quite frustrating in terms of scrutiny to find out in detail what is actually happening. If you are able to provide figures country by country, that would be helpful. There would then be a possibility of aggregating some of those figures up. Perhaps if you were able to do that, could you explain how the figures are calculated, and what is included, partly to take into account the things that Yves has been saying?

Harriet Baldwin: Yes. I can provide the Committee with a list that goes through all the main areas where we have programmes and how much we are funding those.

Q118 **Chair:** Let me develop the point that Yves has just made about the approach that the Government is taking. We took evidence from Professor Alexander Betts in which he talked about the importance of anchors, not walls, to enable refugees to be self-reliant. When we visited east Africa in November, we went to see the Kalobeyei Settlement model, which Professor Betts had told us about and which we were very impressed by. Are there plans to extend that kind of approach to other refugee and IDP situations in other parts of Africa?

Harriet Baldwin: It will be the decision of the relevant sovereign country as to the approach that they take. The world has come together in terms of trying to outline the policy elements in the global compact, but there are certainly some very good examples out there, from which we can all learn. We see it as our role within DFID but also within our foreign policy work that where there are some great examples to share that with other countries that are significant hosts as to perhaps some of the changes they could make within their domestic policy to move towards those examples that have been highlighted as good practice. We would certainly be doing that. I am very pleased you were able to go and see a good example.

We have touched on the other issue. I do not think that as a world we have come up with a definitive best practice approach around returns. As



HOUSE OF COMMONS

you know, we will always promote it to be a voluntary process where it is safe for people to do so. That also is an area where, as a world, we have some further learning to do in terms of what constitutes best practice.

Q119 Chair: On Kalobeyei, Minister, you earlier mentioned cash and the cash-based assistance. We saw cash-based assistance being used very effectively there, as we have done in other situations on visits in other parts of Africa. Can you tell us what the Department and UK Government more generally are doing to encourage further scaling up of cash-based assistance to refugees and IDPs? Is that something that is then extendable into the host communities where levels of poverty can be just as great?

Harriet Baldwin: Yes. To answer the second part first, there will be what we call safety net programmes that we are doing in countries where there is not a particularly refugee-hosting population. Within refugee contexts or internally displaced people contexts, we are the global lead and advocate in terms of seeing where there is scope to further extend it. The advantages are very obvious, which is that, first of all, the transaction costs should be significantly less than having to physically bring in other things towards sustenance. That is one big advantage. The second big advantage is that it stimulates markets within the community, so people can make better allocation decisions that help the local economy. That is a second big advantage.

There are also clearly some challenges and potential disadvantages. One of the challenges, where the world does seem to be making big advances, was on biometric identification and the technology used to deliver cash, through mobile phones. That is something that is a work in progress. In terms of delivering assistance through cash, sometimes it will simply not be possible and we do have to rely on just delivering food assistance. That might depend on the security or the existence of a banking sector. The third thing—we specifically looked at this in the context of South Sudan, as to whether we could be doing more there—is that one of the barriers is you would have to bring the money into the country at a Government artificial exchange rate from which elites would profit. There are things that you have to think through in every context, which I hope will make the Committee appreciate that while you can have a general policy to shift more in that direction, it does have to be very context-specific. All I can say is that we do advocate for trying to look at that, rather than having a fixed and definite policy in every situation.

Q120 Chair: This Committee in the past has been very positive about the Jordan jobs compact. In fact, we argued in our report last year on the Rohingya crisis for a similar approach to be taken in Bangladesh. We were very interested to hear about the Ethiopia jobs compact and we know that DFID has provided substantial funding for that—I believe £80 million in DFID investment. Are you confident that it will have a real and sustainable impact? We have received evidence from ODI expressing some concern about the feasibility of the jobs compact to achieve all of



its objectives.

Harriet Baldwin: What we can do and commit to the Committee to do is to make sure that in every review period, typically annually, we are measuring progress against the objectives that are set out in terms of that. We would all agree strategically that one of the big things we are trying to achieve is inward investment in job-creating activities. CDC obviously plays a big role in that. Also, we are trying to deliver, within sometimes very difficult contexts, the skills that will allow people to access those kinds of jobs. That would be the strategic wish but with every programme what you would do is make sure how it is delivering against the goals on an annual basis and be very rigorous about that.

Q121 **Mr Sharma:** In Africa, the primary driver of displacement is conflict. How are the Government linking its work on conflict and stability to its work on displacement?

Harriet Baldwin: That is such a massive question. You would not want to be doing one without thinking about what you can do about the other. The Conflict, Stability and Security Fund is one of the mechanisms through which we can deliver some of the longer-term approaches to conflict resolution. That, again, will be very different in each country. What we are doing in Somalia will be very different from what we are doing, for example, in Nigeria. It will depend, on a case-by-case basis.

We are always open to trying to work in relevant areas, in terms of what we can do, either through the work on the Stabilisation Unit, the work with the Conflict, Stability and Security Fund or with domestic bilateral programming to see what we can do to provide security and ensure that the drivers of conflict are also being addressed. The long-term strategic things we do there are the simple ones around making sure we are investing in the kind of things that help people adapt to climate change, that recognise that demography can also be a significant driver of conflict and of course, thirdly, investing in education so that over time people achieve 12 years of quality education. Those have to be the continued strategic, long-term focuses of the work as well.

Q122 **Mr Sharma:** What progress has been made on developing joint early warning systems and ensuring a global commitment to act upon such warnings?

Harriet Baldwin: We have done some work on early warning systems. I am looking to Chris to see if he can be more specific about that because the work that we have done on early warning systems leads us to this strategic position that I have just outlined in terms of climate change, demography and education. Certainly within the country and the country diagnostics, we do have further work that we have done in terms of early warning systems in particular areas.

Chris Kiggell: We would have to check and come back to you on the current state of play on specific early warning mechanisms. There is support for preventative measures. There are a couple of examples:



HOUSE OF COMMONS

£10 million a year to the UN Peacebuilding Fund; we are providing £1 million of the annual £10 million budget for UNDP's programme to strengthen national capacities for conflict prevention. We are supporting wider programmes aimed at conflict prevention.

Yves Horent: In terms of our internal processes, we do have a systematic process to review all situations of concern on a monthly basis. That is done in consultation with partners. When we anticipate a situation to deteriorate, this is escalated through the system in DFID, reaching, when necessary, ministerial level. We do have an internal process. That is done with partners. It is also done in consultation with the FCO when required. We can provide you with a few examples of these early warning documents. They are produced systematically on a monthly basis.

Externally, we are supporting partners to do the same. One of the partners so far that has made the most progress in this direction is the Start Network. The Start Network has a group working on early warnings. Interestingly, they have managed to expand the group to include UN agencies and the Red Cross. This is not limited to only UK-based NGOs now. We are also working on supporting organisations like ICG, International Crisis Group, and others that independently issue warnings.

Q123 **Chair:** That answer is encouraging. Are we learning lessons from the many, many examples where there were early warnings and yet the international system failed? You can think of Rwanda, Darfur and the Rohingya crisis, where there were plenty of people warning about what was going to happen and not enough was done. Is there a sense that the system is at least slowly learning those lessons?

Harriet Baldwin: The system is very good at thinking about some of these long-term structural underlying threats. The Ministry of Defence even provides some very, very good strategic documentation but the challenge comes when you can see a crisis developing; where your threshold is for intervening on what can sometimes be a domestic dispute can be where the challenge occurs. When do you cross a threshold? We just crossed a threshold in Cameroon, for example, where we have announced that we are going to fund the UN and UNICEF to deliver some immediate humanitarian assistance to the internally displaced people. There have been big, clear signs of that building crisis for some time and we have been trying to lobby the Government to deal with that domestically through dialogue. Indeed, that is what their stated objective is but that is where it becomes really difficult.

Chair: That is a really interesting answer, which might suggest that early warning is less the issue in terms of weakness in the system; it is what happens once the warning has been received, in terms of how ready the architecture of both diplomacy and development is to respond in a way that hopefully prevents another Rwanda or another Darfur? Thank you.



Q124 Chris Law: I want to look a little bit at the longer-term situations for refugees, from integration through to repatriation. For integration to be a viable option for refugees, most countries, of course, need to receive significant financial support. How is the UK working to ensure genuine responsibility sharing on this? Give examples if you have them.

Harriet Baldwin: Again, I would probably draw the Committee's attention to the work in in Uganda. Uganda is a country that has not only the largest population of refugees in Africa but also has taken, from a policy point of view in terms of the Ugandan Government's approach, a very accommodating and progressive approach to hosting refugees. In the programmes that we have been delivering through primarily the UNHCR, the work that we have done there has been on making sure that we get a better handle in terms of the numbers and the biometrics, and making sure that the delivery within the country is being done in a well-controlled way in terms of the services. It is a good example of working away from definitions according to the different categories of people and working more towards dealing with the whole community, based on vulnerability. Yves, would you add any examples to that?

Yves Horent: The biggest opportunity we have now is the World Bank's eighteenth IDA Sub-Window for Refugees. That, by very far, is the biggest change recently. It is \$2 billion, so a significant amount of money. That is linking policy with practice, including particularly on the integration of refugees and the economic integration of refugees. That is the biggest change now. Discussions on the nineteenth IDA window have started now and will carry on this year. With opportunities comes risk, as often, but so far the initial indications is that this is making a difference in multiple countries and basically shifting the position of multiple countries. We are trying to do two things. One is to use all resources directly to influence this, like in Uganda but we are also trying to leverage the World Bank, which has significant power to try to improve this in multiple countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

Q125 Chris Law: Have there been any even earlier development stages in other countries that have taken up the example of Uganda? If the financial support is coming, are there encouraging signs elsewhere?

Harriet Baldwin: It varies. There are some discouraging examples that the Committee will be aware of. For example, in Burundi a lot of NGOs have been asked to leave and are having to reapply to deliver within Burundi. Would you say that other countries have moved in that direction?

Yves Horent: It is a mixed picture. We have examples. In Cameroon, for central Africa refugees this is already making a difference. There are examples but it is a mixed picture, even in Cameroon. If you go to the far north, where the Nigerian refugees are, they are applying an encampment policy. If you go with the central Africa refugees in the east, we can see more and more integration. While we cannot attribute



HOUSE OF COMMONS

this exclusively to the World Bank IDA programme, it does contribute to this.

Q126 Chris Law: Opportunities for resettlement in other countries have reduced in recent years despite an increase in need. Will the UK be increasing opportunities for resettlement here and encouraging other countries to do the same?

I want to make a note on this. I have noticed the UK's current settlement programme is 750, which is nowhere near enough compared to what the UNHCR would say would be a requirement of 10,000 places annually.

Harriet Baldwin: Do you mean into the UK?

Chris Law: Yes.

Harriet Baldwin: In terms of resettlement programmes, as I said, we will support voluntary programmes where it is safe and secure to do so. For example, within country you can have situations like in Darfur where you have internally displaced people who have been living in camps now for many, many years and where the work continues through UNAMID to try to leave behind, as they withdraw, a security situation that allows people to feel safe enough to return home within their country. As far as the work the UK does in terms of refugees here, on the programme in terms of Syrian vulnerable people we are ahead of schedule in terms of the 20,000 vulnerable people and of course the 3,000 children. That has been a programme with more of a Home Office lead, but from the point of view of the Department for International Development, it is one where it has demonstrated some very good practice in terms of identifying the very vulnerable people who will be able to become supported here as refugees.

Q127 Chris Law: The Syrian programme has been successful. There has been lots of arguments about the number but, regardless, it has been quite successful. I am going back specifically to the number. Given the current numbers of where the UK is, it is not even meeting 10% of the needs of what UNHCR has highlighted. What progress has the UK made towards trying to get somewhere near that figure, if any, and if it has not, what is it doing in order to try to achieve that?

Harriet Baldwin: Again, we are ahead of schedule in terms of the numbers that have been committed to in legislation. In due course, it will be up to this Parliament to have a look again at the numbers post 2020 to assess whether that is something that the UK will want to shift in terms of policy decision.

Q128 Chair: There is the aspect of our responsibility and I think it is shocking how few people we take for resettlement. There is also an issue of the expectations we are putting on very poor countries in Africa like Uganda, which you rightly praised, Kenya, which we have talked about, and Ethiopia, and yet we are taking 750 people. The message that sends to



HOUSE OF COMMONS

those Governments and people when we are expecting them to do so much, when we are reluctant to do even a fraction of what they are doing, must make the job harder, must it not?

Harriet Baldwin: We fund very extensively the work in country. Very much the premise and philosophy around the whole approach that the world is taking is that you do want to ensure that people remain as close as possible to where they can then return home from. We are very committed to providing that support. Where people, as in the case of the Syrian Vulnerable Person Resettlement Programme, have been identified as specifically needing that support, the UK has been proud to play that role.

Q129 **Chair:** You have hit on the point. In the case of Syria, we have rightly invested in enabling people to live safely in Jordan, Turkey and Lebanon but we recognise there are refugees with vulnerabilities that we can support to come here. Surely that same principle should apply to a refugee from South Sudan, as it does to a refugee from Syria.

Harriet Baldwin: That may be what the Committee recommends. All of the work we have done around the global compact has been about us being very generous in the amount of support we provide for people to be much closer to their home environment. Chris, do you want to add anything?

Chris Kiggell: The UK actually has four resettlement schemes, so the 750 figure is just under one of those. Figures yearly in total tend to be closer to 5,000 to 6,000 globally, varying year to year, but around those numbers.

Q130 **Chris Law:** There has been widespread concerns that refugees have been returned to countries such as Somalia and not to mention the push to try to have Rohingya to go back to Burma, with continuing instability and insufficient support, risking further displacement and increasing tensions with the country of origin. Do you think the UK is doing enough, in collaboration with other Governments and UNHCR, to safeguard against this?

Harriet Baldwin: Do you mean to safeguard against people being forced to be resettled?

Chris Law: Where they have been resettled back to countries that are currently still unstable.

Harriet Baldwin: In an involuntary way?

Chris Law: Yes.

Harriet Baldwin: We would certainly always be against involuntary returns. I am sure that the Committee would be right in saying we could do more in that regard. We would always be against that kind of approach through our delivery partners, through the UN system and



politically, but, as you have rightly pointed out, there have been some examples that we have been very unhappy about.

Q131 Richard Burden: Although the number of people internally displaced in Africa dwarfs the number of refugees, funding for IDPs seems to be miniscule in comparison, taking into account my earlier questions about the difficulty of tracking where funding is going anyway. What is clear is that the need for protection, humanitarian assistance and so on is the same whether you are internally displaced in country or whether you are a refugee who has travelled across a border. Could you explain why that differential of funding seems to be there, and what action the UK is taking to try to level that playing field?

Harriet Baldwin: The top line would be that you will not capture all of the different things that we are delivering. To go back to the original question that you asked, we do not always capture in that the longer-term assistance that will be coming through in terms of either the education programmes or the health programmes. The point is made about the fact that there are more internally displaced people than there are refugees and that it would be helpful for the Committee if we were able to be clearer in terms of which proportion of those in-country bilateral programmes is helping internally displaced people, which is not being comprehensively captured at the moment. Yves, would you add anything to that?

Yves Horent: I just have two very brief points. One is that for refugees, the international community has a higher responsibility. Therefore, we ought to share the burden with the hosting country more than we do for IDPs, where the primary responsibility lies with the Government of the country.

The second thing is that in many contexts for IDPs—and unfortunately this is increasingly the case—we do have an access problem to these populations. There are many, many contexts where we would like to be able to provide more assistance to IDPs but we simply cannot reach them. This is rarely the case for refugees. For refugees, we tend to have access. We tend to have fewer constraints. There is a gap and we are trying to bridge this gap as much as possible.

Harriet Baldwin: The statistic I have here, which again I am happy to send on to the Committee, is the total number of internally displaced people in sub-Saharan Africa where DFID has a programme is 20.1 million people and the total number of refugees in sub-Saharan Africa where we have a programme is 6.3 million people. That gives you a flavour of what we are trying to capture in terms of some of those broader programmes.

Q132 Richard Burden: That bears out what I was saying. In terms of the numbers of people, there are many, many more IDPs than there are refugees, but the existence of programmes itself does not mean that there is a level playing field in terms of the support provided. Given what



HOUSE OF COMMONS

you were saying before—that you are trying to target support based on vulnerability rather than on status—if that is not carrying through, whether bilaterally or indeed in the international system, and IDPs are not getting the same level of attention as refugees, what can we do to change that, whether that be bilaterally or in the international system?

Harriet Baldwin: I am not sure that we can do anything specifically to say, “We are going to try to target this group of people more”. We have to stick to the approach that we are going to try to target people based on their vulnerability. Over time, that will mean we are working more extensively with countries such as, for example, the Democratic Republic of Congo, where we have a lot of internally displaced people; it is the world’s most forgotten humanitarian crisis.

Q133 **Richard Burden:** All the evidence suggests that IDPs are not getting, in practice, the level of international support and assistance that refugees get. As you said, Yves, there are global compacts for refugees and the Refugee Convention. Nothing like that exists for IDPs. If the result of that is that people who are highly vulnerable and in high levels of need are not getting the assistance, does that not suggest the international community should say that there is a problem here around IDPs, complicated by things like access problems and so on, that needs to be addressed? Does that not need to be targeted as an issue in its own right?

Harriet Baldwin: As in a separate global compact?

Richard Burden: It could be that. It could be other things.

Harriet Baldwin: It is a very valid point. We have a role to play in terms of continuing to advocate for that. We will continue to.

Chris Kiggell: Briefly, the UK is one of a number of member states, led by Norway, which have requested that the UN Secretary-General initiate a high-level panel on exactly that issue and some of the challenges linked to it. That would be a real chance to address some of these issues.

Chair: This is huge, is it not? We will certainly return to it in our report but I just want to emphasise that this is such a massive challenge. I can see that there are presumably political considerations here. When we were in Ethiopia, it is probably a lot easier to have a conversation with the Ethiopian Government about refugees crossing the border from Eritrea than about their own internally displaced people, but the need for something big, whether it is a compact or something else, is self-evident now.

Q134 **Chris Law:** Evidence suggests that UNHCR requires significant reform in order to fulfil its mandate. As the numbers of people on the move continue to increase, why is the pace of change so slow and what is the UK doing to encourage reform within the UNHCR?

Harriet Baldwin: Do you mean the UNHCR specifically?



HOUSE OF COMMONS

Chris Law: Yes.

Harriet Baldwin: We believe the UNHCR plays a very important role in terms of delivery for us. We are one of the core funders of the UNHCR and we have remained very consistent in our support for that core funding. The amount of programming we will support in any given year with the UNHCR can fluctuate considerably depending on the number of programmes that they are delivering for us. For example, they were delivering for us within Syria. That then ended, did it not? We have two situations at the moment that the Committee is probably aware of where we have suspended funding through the UNHCR. One is in South Sudan, and the other is where we are trying to get to the bottom of the situation in Uganda, which was highlighted in a recent published report in terms of the management of that programme. Within country, where we are programming with them, we will be working very closely with them to ensure that the reforms and the delivery that we ask them to do are meeting our objectives and requirements. They are a supplier we will evaluate in terms of delivery on an ongoing basis. The amount that we will deliver through UNHCR will fluctuate from year-to-year as a result of that.

Q135 **Chris Law:** On that note, do you see UNHCR as the key partner that you work with on the ground?

Harriet Baldwin: They probably would be the key partner. They are one of our most significant delivery partners but they are certainly not our only partner.

Q136 **Chris Law:** I was just concerned when you said that you suspend funds during an inquiry, in terms of what impact that might have if they are your key partner.

Harriet Baldwin: It is clearly the case that we would want to see those issues resolved very quickly.

Q137 **Chris Law:** Is UNHCR focusing sufficiently on protection of refugees and IDPs, rather than delivery of services to those displaced? Are current levels of funding for protection actually enough?

Harriet Baldwin: There has been a theme that has come through in terms of the unmet need. The Committee has rightly highlighted the fact that with the numbers involved, particularly in internally displaced people, there is still a funding gap for the system. The UK plays a significant role in funding the system but certainly there is still an unmet need out there. There is no question about it.

Q138 **Chris Law:** On our visit to Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia, we heard increasingly that the unfulfilled gap of funding is getting larger year on year. Is that being fed back to DFID and is that something you are seeking to meet?



HOUSE OF COMMONS

Harriet Baldwin: Yes, it is being fed back to us. I mentioned the importance of the multi-year funding, and I speak specifically of the recent situation with the threat of the four famines and the UK trying to take the lead in making sure that enough funding was raised to prevent those. By and large, that was successful, although of course the situation in terms of delivery in Yemen continues to be very challenging. Yves, do you have anything to add in terms of the specifics?

Yves Horent: The gap between the funding and the needs is growing. That is unfortunately happening all around the world. There are only three things we can do. One is we try to improve the efficiency of a system. Working through cash, for example, does help to improve efficiencies. The second one is, where possible, to try to prevent and anticipate. It is easier for natural hazards than it is for conflicts, as already mentioned. The third thing is to try to make sure the donor base increases. That is not a gap that the UK alone, or any country or donor alone, can meet. The gap is growing because the needs are growing but the commitments—the international commitments—are not growing.

Q139 **Chris Law:** On that note, because you said that you are trying to meet the numbers, looking at DFID's official figures, their bilateral funding to UNHCR reduced quite significantly between 2015 and 2018—significantly almost to the point of 50%. Can you explain why that is?

Harriet Baldwin: Those were the points that I made earlier about the Syria programme, the Uganda programme and the South Sudan programme.

Q140 **Chair:** Those three explain that big reduction.

Harriet Baldwin: By and large, that is my understanding, yes.

Q141 **Chris Law:** During the inquiry we have been alerted to a worrying number of investigations into corruption and fraud in UNHCR operations. You have touched on them already slightly. Has UNHCR's response to these cases been sufficient and been timely as well? What impact has this had on your working relationship with UNHCR?

Harriet Baldwin: Overall it is a good relationship. With these particular situations, clearly we have not been very happy about the developments. We would love to resolve them really quickly and faster.

Q142 **Mr Sharma:** Every displaced person goes through different issues when they are displaced and have different vulnerabilities. Particularly women and girls go through different things and suffer more than other displaced groups. What is DFID doing to ensure that refugees and IDPs in Africa have appropriate protection and support?

Harriet Baldwin: You like to ask the massive questions. This is, again, a massive question. It was brought to the world's attention last year how much room for improvement there was in terms of delivery around the world. The UK has very much been trying to take a lead in making sure



HOUSE OF COMMONS

that, as a world, we improve safeguarding, policies around safeguarding and action around safeguarding in the delivery and provision of assistance. The Committee will have seen specific examples when you have been out in the field of ways in which we are trying to improve the delivery of that but it is always the case that there is still room for improvement in this area. We held a big safeguarding conference in October where 22 different organisations, about 90% of our spending, all signed up to much more rigorous objectives in terms of delivering assistance in a context where women and girls and safeguarding are very much at the forefront. We will all be familiar with too many awful examples that show that we still have a long way to go in terms of that.

Q143 Mr Sharma: Is there any DFID planning to include more women's organisations in the responses to forced displacement?

Harriet Baldwin: Every single programme that we commission within the Department for International Development will always have that particular focus on gender. It is always in every single business case in terms of thinking through the impact in terms of women. It is central to the work that we do. It could not be more central. Nevertheless, there is always room to be more inclusive and we can be proud of the leadership that the UK shows on this, whether it is in the Girls' Education Challenge or whether it is in the programming that we do around gender. There will be many, many examples of programmes that are working well in that regard. It is absolutely core to what we do in international development because countries that are safe for women and girls are countries that are safe for everybody. If you get the policy right in country for women and girls, you get the policy right for everyone.

Q144 Mrs Latham: I apologise for being late. It is a bit of a crazy day today. Can you tell us what protections are currently in place to ensure the safety of those very vulnerable refugees and IDPs that we, as a country, support in Africa?

Harriet Baldwin: The Committee will have, in the site visit, seen examples. Very often it is around trying to create a safe space. It is around being able to create clear points of contact where people can go with concerns or worries and action will be taken. It is around making sure that, within the organisational structures of the organisations that are delivering the assistance, these things are factored in and built into their policies but also, importantly, into their implementation. It is a journey. The fact we had to have the big safeguarding conference where people had to sign up to these commitments shows there is still room for significant improvement in this area.

Q145 Mrs Latham: There is still room because IPPF—the International Planned Parenthood Federation—have got a case pending but we are still giving them millions of pounds. Post conference, I thought we would stop funding until any cases had been sorted out. This does not appear to be the case with the IPPF.



Harriet Baldwin: I can look into that specific case. I do know that with some of the other organisations that were in the spotlight, we do look every single time we ask to sign a check for one of their programmes. It does go to Ministers for that level of approval. I will have to get back to you on that particular organisation and example.

Q146 **Mrs Latham:** I think we do need to look at it, because it has been known about. It has not been sorted out; they said they were going to but they have not. This is in many countries throughout the world and mainly in Africa. There is a lot of money going into them within Africa. As well as them, are you sure that other implementing partners are behaving appropriately on the ground, particularly in emergency situations? Obviously they are not, but there are a lot of emergency situations. Are you absolutely sure that the implementing partners are behaving appropriately?

Harriet Baldwin: What I am absolutely sure about is that we are doing everything to try to push the system to get better in this area. What I will send the Committee is the 22 organisations that signed up to the new commitments at the safeguarding conference. I do not know if you have done a specific inquiry on this but it would be helpful for the Committee to have that, in terms of the various different internal changes that are happening. Ditto within the UN system, they have made very big strides but there is still further scope for better whistle-blowing, better escalation, more examples of pursuing some of these situations through the courts and more visible behaviour that is challenged. Definitely there continues to be a lot more to be done. The Committee should be very confident that the UK has really been trying to take the lead on this and drive the system to improve.

Q147 **Mrs Latham:** I have to say I am quite surprised, given the plethora of organisations that work in the development field—it is a complete industry—that only 22 organisations have signed up to it.

Harriet Baldwin: I may be quoting the wrong number.

Mrs Latham: I hope it is a lot more than that.

Harriet Baldwin: Do not take my memory for it, but I think it was that number that signed up at the safeguarding conference to the range of commitments. I could be wrong on that and I will make sure that you have the exact organisations that took those steps last October.

Mrs Latham: It is not enough.

Q148 **Chair:** Earlier we spoke about the importance of local organisations, and Virendra asked about engagement with women's organisations. It has been put to us in a meeting that I think Pauline and I were both at that it would make a lot of sense if women's organisations took the lead in refugee camps and some of the other efforts to deliver support to refugees and IDPs. It is perhaps not really a question but it is just to put to you to reflect on: that if more women—local women—were directly



HOUSE OF COMMONS

involved in the delivery of some of these programmes, that might contribute more to safeguarding than a lot of the other things we have talked about.

Harriet Baldwin: It is a really important suggestion. I would wholeheartedly endorse that. This massive power imbalance in these situations where you have very vulnerable people fleeing from very vulnerable situations is one where we still have some really intrinsic challenges to deal with. I completely endorse that point of view.

Q149 Lloyd Russell-Moyle: Related to that and segueing into my education question, one of the things that has been brought to our attention in Britain is the case of period poverty and the difficulty that causes young women and girls accessing education. There was a study conducted by Global One on Syrian refugee camps in Lebanon, which said that 60% of female refugees did not have access to clean underwear and sanitary products. It was one of the biggest factors of girls there not going to school. I wondered what DFID's particular targeting there is, in terms of trying to make sure that that is something we are tackling from both a health and education perspective?

Harriet Baldwin: It is a really big factor. If you look at the points at which people drop out of school globally, it is predominantly women and it is predominantly around the age where they begin to menstruate. It is a lot of the theory behind the Girls' Education Challenge, and a lot of the programmes that have been funded by the Girls' Education Challenge have had that as one of their objectives, in terms of addressing those barriers that will prevent particularly girls, as they start their teens and their periods, from going to school. Again, that is something, if the Committee is interested, that I can share with the Committee. There is a range of different programmes that we will be funding around the world. I do not know specifically within a Syria context but I am sure it is likely that there will be some we are funding there as well.

Q150 Lloyd Russell-Moyle: 60% who do not have access seemed extremely high to me. It is one of those things that did strike me when we went to camps in Kenya and Uganda. People are given money they can only spend on food and then for other sanitary products often resort to some kind of bartering scheme of selling some of their food off to get some of the other basics.

Harriet Baldwin: That is another advantage of a cash programme as well.

Q151 Lloyd Russell-Moyle: That is another advantage. I wonder if that is something we need to be pushing a bit more in terms of making sure of access to some of those things, not just soap.

Harriet Baldwin: Segregated toilets as well can be a really big factor. There will be loads of those that UK aid is funding. Clearly there is more to do but the Committee should be reassured that we are making a big contribution in that area.



HOUSE OF COMMONS

Q152 **Lloyd Russell-Moyle:** Substantively on education, what is being done to ensure children who are displaced within Africa, within their own country or across borders, are able to complete their 12 years of education?

Harriet Baldwin: We will be delivering education programmes in a lot of these situations. As the Committee will have seen when you visited projects, it can also be the case that there are some fairly arbitrary lines drawn in terms of the programme parameters. There will be some children who are included and some children who are not included. We do need, as a world, to find a way to fund more education. We are proud of the work we are doing in this area and we are proud of the way in which the world has stepped up its contributions in this area, but the statistics are startling. There are far too many children who are not getting education. A lot of them will be in these situations.

Q153 **Lloyd Russell-Moyle:** Is the Department doing anything in particular for children who have been refugees or have been displaced, who may have missed periods of their education, are now beyond the age where they would be expected at school but providing catch-up activities, follow-on vocational or further education, so that they are able to restore what they should have had in their lives? Are we doing anything particularly around some of that?

Harriet Baldwin: We are. It will be different country by country but there will be specific people who are being helped in exactly that way. Again, there will still be unmet need.

Q154 **Lloyd Russell-Moyle:** When we visited Uganda and Kenya, one of the things that I was particularly struck by was how some of the schools were integrating local children side by side with refugee populations. Local communities were advantaging from better upskilled education just as much as refugees were. Is the Department looking to seek to roll that out to other places and other countries so that host communities and refugees equally benefit, particularly when the country is a developing country, which is where most refugees are?

Harriet Baldwin: That goes to the heart of what we were saying at the beginning of this session in terms of delivering on the basis of vulnerability and trying not to categorise people by particular categories, whether they are refugees, IDPs or in the host population. I am really pleased to hear that there have been some good examples that the Committee has seen of where that is happening well.

Q155 **Lloyd Russell-Moyle:** I wanted to know about what lessons the Department may have learnt from Syrian refugees in Lebanon and Jordan, particularly in conversations we might have had with those people, and how that might translate into different contexts in Africa.

Harriet Baldwin: I am going to hand that one over to Yves because I have not done anything in the Syria, Jordan and Lebanon context.



Yves Horent: I am also not best placed to answer because I have to say that my knowledge outside African context is rather limited. One thing I can say is that we have agreed to support a £26.5 million funding package to research what works in terms of education in conflict situations and crises. I would anticipate this research programme will identify the lessons learned in contexts such as the ones you have mentioned and see to what extent these are applicable and can be adapted in an African context.

Q156 **Lloyd Russell-Moyle:** One of the things that the British Council report on educating Syrian refugees points out is that those refugees who have further and higher education—so not just primary education—are more likely to be more resilient, are more likely to be able to integrate back in to their home countries or back in to host communities more easily and more likely to be able to stand on their two feet quicker. How are we then promoting, in terms of education, access to higher and further education so as to enable more to be resilient? I guess that is one of the learnings that we could try to take.

Harriet Baldwin: I would not disagree with the point that the British Council is making. From our programming point of view, though, we have had to make choices and the choice that we have made has been to focus on 12 years of quality education, trying to ensure we meet some of the unmet need in that area as we grow those programmes. Some of the British Council programmes will be funded indirectly through UK aid, but our mantra has been the 12 years of quality education, focusing on teacher training and so on.

Q157 **Lloyd Russell-Moyle:** When we visited some of the camps in Kenya, they were pairing up with international universities to try to support that. There were no British universities on that list.

Chair: They were hoping to but there were not any yet.

Lloyd Russell-Moyle: I wonder if that is something. Again, it is not a case of necessarily providing direct aid but it is about providing linking-up, technical skills that we might have in Britain. Top US universities were involved in those programmes. I wonder if we can do a bit there.

Harriet Baldwin: We do have some of those programmes. In Somaliland, we have a link between King's College medical school and a medical school in Hargeisa. Those things do exist. The Civil Society for Engineers does some work in terms of engineering and so on. They do not not exist. In terms of DFID programming, we have taken the view that we want to focus on the 12 years of quality education, although there will be ones we are supporting through other programmes and universities.

I would certainly want to encourage universities to get involved and I would also want to highlight to the Committee that we are increasing significantly the number of Chevening Scholarships that we do, which are Master's degrees for African students. That is going up by something like



HOUSE OF COMMONS

40% in terms of our programming. We now have 50,000 people from around the world who have gone through Chevening Scholarships in the UK.

Q158 Richard Burden: When we have taken evidence from Professor Alexander Betts, he has told us that in his opinion too often the Home Office, DFID and the FCO were pulling in different directions relating to refugees and displacement. Do you think that is a fair comment?

Harriet Baldwin: We work quite well together on all of this, Chris, but I am sure we have our arguments at times. No, generally speaking, it functions well and it is well joined up. I am sure there will be specific examples. Chris, can you think of anything in particular where we could be working better together?

Chris Kiggell: If anything, the direction of movement is towards working more closely together. Certainly on issues such as migration in the Mediterranean, underlying causes, modern slavery or economic development in Africa, we are very closely aligned with the FCO and the Home Office as it links through to resettlement here, the Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme being a particular example of that.

Q159 Richard Burden: One of the things behind this is that reducing regular migration to Europe appears to be a key objective of the UK's work on forced displacement migration in Africa, including through the EU trust fund. I think the concern—and it is one a number of us share—is this: does that not indicate that there could be a risk that that becomes the primary objective and clouds what should be the primary objective, which is the protection of people on the move.

Harriet Baldwin: From a DFID point of view, our priority will always be to deliver, based on vulnerability, the support that is needed. Our programming will continue to reflect that and is likely to continue proportionately to increase as far as Africa is concerned. I do not see them as conflicting objectives. The whole point of the compact is to try to reduce irregular, unmanaged activity. That is what the world signed up to effectively, is it not?

Chris Kiggell: Absolutely, and to give people options. Bearing in mind, a lot of these journeys are dangerous and life-threatening, it is to give people alternatives. Certainly in the refugee context, where the majority, for a range of reasons, will be looking to remain closer to home and often have only crossed one border, it is to give viable alternatives to them there, rather than them being forced to make dangerous secondary onward journeys.

Q160 Richard Burden: I think what Professor Betts is probably getting at, though, is that whilst, if you look at DFID, which has a clear core mission overall, that does translate through to what it sees as the priority in terms of migration and refugees in Africa, his point is that that core mission is not necessarily shared across Government. Some of the



HOUSE OF COMMONS

evidence we have had suggests that if there are going to be tensions there about where the priorities for different Departments lie, could that not mean that what is needed is an open national refugee displacement strategy, so that it can be clear what the primary objectives are, what the secondary objectives are and that efforts to co-ordinate and harmonise across Government are maximised?

Harriet Baldwin: Approaching this in a longer-term strategic way, I would draw the Committee's attention to the speech that the Prime Minister made in South Africa over the summer, in terms of a new approach, particularly an approach where the UK, as we have heard numerous times this morning, will continue to be a key funder in terms of support to refugees and internally displaced people.

Also, there is a key role that the UK can pay. We know that we will not meet sustainable development goals based on development finance alone. We will absolutely need to crowd in trillions of private sector funding and the need for the UK, because we are at this meeting place in terms of the world's investment flows, to play a key role in trying to drive that shift. That is something that is happening across the whole of Government. That is the strategic narrative that runs through the whole approach across Government. Indeed, we can be counted on to continue to be a key supporter for refugees at the point of need but also a key driver of that inward capital investment that the developing world needs to develop further.

Q161 **Richard Burden:** Could I give an example of one area where there is concern about whether we are getting our priorities right and indeed whether our policies are consistent? We are working quite closely on migration with regimes where there are really significant concerns about significant human rights abuse, examples being Libya and also Sudan, which has obviously been in the news in the last few days. Is there not a concern there that is valid that working with those countries can have unintended consequences and we could end up breaching the "do no harm" principle, which in turn could end up emboldening authoritarian leaders in those countries and encouraging more of their own citizens to flee as a result?

Harriet Baldwin: No. Obviously, on the foreign policy side we will continue to do the same intense work in terms of advocating for human rights around the world. Of course we will. Very often, we can find ourselves working more effectively with countries when we are doing it in this particular context as well. That is something that we stand for in the world, in terms of that rules-based international order, that important role for human rights and our important role in terms of both the work we do within international development and within other mechanisms of soft power, to champion change in that direction. That is a really important part of what we do.

Q162 **Richard Burden:** If we are closely involved with a regime, say, that has a questionable human rights record, not just generally but in terms of its



HOUSE OF COMMONS

treatment of refugees and migrants passing through its borders, is there not a risk that internationally, reputationally and perhaps in some individual cases legally, we could be held to be complicit in that?

Harriet Baldwin: I am not sure that I see this through the same prism. If you take Darfur, for example, and you take Sudan, it is absolutely right that the UK ended up providing not only significant funding to the internally displaced people there but is also advocating towards, and funding work through the work with UNAMID, to try to create better and better-trained local policing that will provide human-rights-compliant security to people in Darfur. Does that mean that we have to have conversations with people within the Government of Sudan? Of course it does. That does not mean to say that we should not be doing that important work. It is absolutely crucial that we continue to do that kind of work, through foreign policy but also through what we do in DFID.

Q163 **Chair:** Do you recognise that there is huge concern about this, particularly with regards to Sudan and the Khartoum protests? You sound very optimistic about the difference that we might be making but I have to say I would be very sceptical that we are making that big of a difference to the human rights of Darfuris through that process.

Harriet Baldwin: I was not drawn particularly on the Khartoum protests but I think I was being drawn on whether or not you should engage with a Government where you have significant concerns about its human rights. You should engage and you should be raising those points, yes.

Q164 **Chair:** The point about the Khartoum protests is that we are not just engaging with them. I agree with you in principle: you try to engage with people, but they are our partners in a process that is to do with migration. That, for me, is what raises very severe concerns and strikes at the heart of Richard's original question. The protection of refugees and IDPs might be in the DNA of DFID but I struggle to believe it is in the DNA of the Home Office. I do not invite you to comment on that.

Harriet Baldwin: Shall we leave that there?

Q165 **Mr Sharma:** We have heard evidence of the damaging effects of negative public perceptions towards refugees. What can DFID and the UK Government do to better communicate their work in this area and the reality faced by those who are forced to leave everything behind?

Harriet Baldwin: There is certainly more that we can do to communicate. We have played a very important role in the work we have done with Syrian refugees. I am sure that there is more we can be doing there with the British public to explain what we have been doing. With these vulnerable people who have come from Syria, I am sure in everyone's community we have all had great examples of local people organising welcomes, committees and so on, enabling that to work very well. It is something we should be proud of. I am quite sure we should be doing more to communicate it.

Q166 **Chair:** Before we finish, as we have you here as Minister for Africa, can I



ask you to comment on the DRC presidential election and what the UK view is of the declared outcome of that election?

Harriet Baldwin: Yes. How long do you have? The UK view is that we understand that an objection was lodged yesterday with the election commission. We think that should report within seven days of it being lodged, so by this weekend. It is clear that the UK played a role in terms of funding half of the observers, so we funded 20,000 of the 40,000 observers. They have come back observing many flaws in terms of the electoral process. The Foreign Secretary yesterday called for the electoral commission to try to do more to show its workings. We also contributed that view to the United Nations Security Council meeting that happened last Friday. There is an enormous prize here, which is for the first peaceful transition of power within the Democratic Republic of Congo in history, but all of the intelligence that we have received on the ground from our incredible team in post throughout this period has been that they do think there is further clarification that could be given to reassure people in terms of the granularity of the election result.

Q167 **Chair:** It is fair to say that is a much more cautious response than the French and Belgian Governments, and indeed, the Catholic Church, who have basically suggested that a different candidate won the election.

Harriet Baldwin: The Catholic Church has said that the results were different from what they had perceived to be on the ground. We really want the electoral commission to show their workings because, based on the information that we have gathered so far, it appears that there is a disconnect between what observers saw and what the outcome declared was. I would be delighted if Parliament was to perhaps ask for an adjournment debate on this subject where I could give a fuller view. That might be a topical thought for the Committee.

Chair: Thank you, Minister. That is a very good idea. As you rightly said in your earlier evidence, it is one of the greatest humanitarian crises in the world that does not get much focus and attention.

Harriet Baldwin: It is really one of the forgotten crises but it is not forgotten by us and is one of our biggest areas of programming.

Chair: That is very fair. You have finished with a challenge to us, which I am sure we can pursue. Thank you very much indeed, all three of you, for your evidence today.