

Report on Key Findings of UNHCR's *Age Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming* Exercise in South Africa

1. Introduction

This report presents the findings of the Participatory Assessments (PAs) which were conducted as part of the building blocks to the UNHCR's Age Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming (AGDM) exercise in South Africa. The PAs took place over two weeks (7-18 August 2006) in four main cities in South Africa namely Johannesburg, Pretoria, Cape Town and Durban, where four of the country's five refugee reception offices are located.

In an effort to bridge some gaps highlighted in past UNHCR evaluations on refugee women, children and community services, UNHCR under the banner of the AGDM, initiated a strategy to meaningfully engage all persons of concern regardless of age, gender and background, in decisions and matters affecting their lives. The process was driven through a Participatory Assessment (PA) exercise that meant facilitating discussions and building partnerships with refugee¹ women and men of all ages and backgrounds, through structured dialogues, observations, spot checks and focus group discussions. Through this process, it was hoped that a joint analysis of the protection risk faced by refugees and asylum seekers could be made.

Given the challenges to refugee protection in South Africa due to the mixed flow of migrants, protecting the almost 160,000 refugees and asylum seekers in the country remains a daunting task for the Government. Registration and refugee status determination is the prerogative of the government while UNHCR and its Partners play a supporting and watchdog role. The PA's were timely in enforcing our monitoring role and providing avenues for effective programmatic and operational response to the findings that were made.

2. Background

The roll-out of the AGDM exercise in South Africa was preceded by several discussions between the UNHCR Representative, NGO Partners and the Government. The nomination of the Coordinator as well as the formation of the Multi-Functional Teams (MFTs) was an important element of this communication. The response from our Partners working with refugees in the cities of Johannesburg, Pretoria, Cape Town and Durban, was positive.

A series of steps were followed in the planning and conducting of the Participatory Assessments, as follows:

2.1. Formation of MFTs

The first step in the process was the formation of the MFTs. Guidance for the establishment of the MFTs was drawn from the AGDM Participatory Assessment Tool. In this regard every attempt was made to pull together a cross-section of staff from the UNHCR Pretoria office, as well as staff from our stakeholders including UNHCR Implementing Partners (IPs). The UNHCR MFT was inclusive of staff from all functional areas including Protection, Programme, Community Services and Public Information. Due regard was also given in striking a balance in terms of gender, as well as in the inclusion of international and national staff in the team.

¹ For the purposes of this document, the term 'refugee' refers to both refugee and asylum seeker, except where the distinction is expressly made.

Every effort was equally made to ensure the participation in the MFTs of UNHCR Implementing and Operational Partners as well as the involvement of Government counterparts working in the areas of documentation, security, health, education. Similar principles of gender equality were adhered to in the formation of the MFT.

Given the vast and diverse areas in which refugees in South Africa reside, it was agreed ahead of time to have four MFTs, each covering the four main urban locations namely Johannesburg, Pretoria, Cape Town and Durban. The final list of MFT members included staff from the Jesuit Refugee Services (JRS), Cape Town Refugee Centre (CTRC), University of Cape Town Law Clinic (UCT), Mennonite Central Committee (MCC), Planned Parenthood Association of South Africa (PPASA), Roll Back Xenophobia Project (RBX), Refugee Rights Project (RRP), Bienvenue Shelter, Doxa Deo Parish, Catholic Welfare Development Bonne Esperance Shelter, Department of Social Development (DSD), Municipality of Cape Town, South African Red Cross, Durban Union of Refugee Women (URF), Agency for Refugee Education, Skills and Advocacy (ARESTA) and the Department of Home Affairs. **(See Annex A for full list of MFT members and contact details.)**

2.2. Preparation for the Participatory Assessments

In preparation for the PAs, members of the MFTs were advised to carefully review all existing documentation on the refugee population in South Africa including Annual Protection Reports and Country Operation Plan (COPs) reports. Members were further provided with the AGDM PA Tool and advised to read and be familiar with it ahead of time. NGOs and Implementing partners in Johannesburg, Pretoria, Durban and Cape Town were assigned as lead organizations for organizing meetings with refugees. Other members of the team including UNHCR staff provided the required support. In this regard, clear directives were given to the organizers on the profiles of the groups of refugees and asylum seekers that were intended to meet.

Prior to the start of the PAs, a facilitation workshop took place in Pretoria, Cape Town and Durban to brief the members of each MFT on the process.

In the context of the South African situation, a few themes were identified as viable for discussion namely, documentation, livelihoods, education and shelter.

2.3 Participatory Assessments Exercise

The PAs were carried out using the following methods of enquiry: observations and spot checks, semi-structured discussions, and focus group discussions. The MFTs attempted to facilitate discussions with as many diverse groups from the refugee and asylum seeker population as possible. These included:

- Subgroups of women/men
- Subgroups of young children, adolescents, young adults and older adults
- Subgroups by age: 10-13, 14-17, 18-40, 40 +
- Subgroups by nationality (i.e. Somali women)
- Groups with individual needs (i.e. female headed household, women-at-risk etc.)
- Groups identified as being at risk (i.e. physically challenged, medical cases)
- Complementary meetings with institutions (i.e. banks, metro police, DSD, refugee community leaders, Department of Health (DoH), refugee women's associations)

2.3.1. Pretoria 7-11 August, 2006

The MFT in Pretoria comprised of a team of 8 persons divided into three sub-teams. Venues like the Marabastad refugee reception centre were visited for observations and semi-structured discussions with officials of the Department of Home Affairs. The team made visits to Struben and Potter House Shelters and many residential areas like Atridgeville, Dries Lilies and Burgerspark. Discussions with the Pretoria Academic Hospital, Pretoria Metro Police and banks were conducted as complementary input from institutions. Focus group discussions with school children took place in Hamilton Primary and Flavuis Mereka High school, all in the Pretoria area. **(See Annex B for full schedule).**

2.3.2. Cape Town: 14-17 August, 2006

The Cape Town MFT was also comprised of UNHCR staff and members of the local Cape Town MFT team. The team had 9 persons in total and was divided into three sub-teams. Visits were made to Hanover Park, Voorspeed Primary School, Cape Town train station, and Greenmarket Square. Structured meetings were held with caregivers at an orphanage; the Muizenberg area of town was visited to capture the concerns of refugees working as car guards there; and, focus group meetings were held with a group of disabled refugees and a group of Somali refugee women. **(See Annex C for full schedule)**

2.3.3. Johannesburg: 7-11 August, 2006

The assessments in Johannesburg were carried out by an MFT consisting of 9 persons including three UNHCR staff members. The MFT as per the team's preparatory schedule was divided into sub-teams, which allowed for the MFT to conduct numerous assessments over the course of the week. **(See Annex B for full schedule)**. The sub-teams visited primary and secondary schools, women shelters, market places, and living quarters of refugees. Three main areas where refugees reside and usually congregate in Johannesburg were targeted, namely, Yeoville, Hillbrow, and Berea. Observation visits, as well as spot checks, were made to well known residential sites and some market places. The Crown Mines and Rosettenville refugee reception centers in Johannesburg were also given priority as areas where hundreds of refugees could be engaged in discussions. Complementary visits to institutions such as First National Bank, Johannesburg Metro Police and medical clinics were also undertaken with the aim of ascertaining the level of some of the protection risks, and discuss ways with local authorities on how to resolve them

2.3.4. Durban: 14- 17 August, 2006

The MFT in Durban was comprised of 7 persons divided into three sub-teams. Visits were made to the Point and Ushaka areas where many refugees work as car guards, to capture the concerns of several out of school youth struggling to make a living in these areas. Addington, Betchet, Clareville and Cetenary schools which host large numbers of refugee children were areas of priority in the schedule. Furthermore, focus group discussions were held with refugee women and men, and students from the Durban Institute of Technology. Complementary visits were held with officials of the First National Bank, Metro Police, SAPS and staff of Addington hospital. **(See Annex E for full schedule).**

2.4. Analyzing the Findings

By the end of the PA process, each of the MFTs had dialogued or observed refugees and asylum seekers from a broad range of nationalities such as Somalia, Sudan, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Eritrea, Ethiopia, Rep. of Congo, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Rwanda, Burundi, Tanzania, Nigeria and Angola. While it was not obvious to capture all of the diverse ages and genders from the aforementioned nationalities, the balance stroke could be termed representative of the refugee communities in the four urban areas selected.

In terms of capturing and analyzing the information gathered, the four MFTs followed a like process, as prescribed by the AGDM PA Tool. At the end of every day during the PA week, each of the sub-teams of the MFTs took time to record, analyze and prioritize their findings of the day on ‘systematization forms.’ These forms captured the protection risks discussed by the refugees or asylum seekers that were interviewed; the skills and capabilities of the refugees or asylum seekers in relation to these risks; and, the solutions proposed by the refugees and asylum seekers in addressing the identified risks. At the end of the PAs in each location, the information recorded in the systematization forms were analyzed and concisely recorded in the “prioritization forms”. These preliminary analyses were required in order to feed into the final workshop in which all of the findings would be combined and analyzed as a whole. This workshop took place in Durban between 21–23 August, 2006. All four MFT’s as well as UNHCR facilitators (Joan Allison, Abel Mbilinyi, and Bornwell Kantande) came together at this workshop to jointly analyze and prioritize the findings from the PA’s, and to make specific recommendations arising from these findings.

3. Key Findings of the Participatory Assessments

The findings of the PAs revealed a multitude of inter-related protection risks that stemmed largely from the lack of access to asylum procedures, and the lack of documentation for many refugees and asylum seekers.

The findings in this report as related to the protection risks faced by refugees are listed in order of priority.

3.1 Lack of Access to Documentation

3.1.1. Findings

With regard to the issue of documentation, the findings revealed:

- That even though there exist a wealth of capacities within the refugee communities that could be fully exploited to benefit not only the communities but the economic growth of the country as a whole, several obstacles stand in the way of the realization of these potentials. The primary obstacle being the lack of adequate documentation which hampers access to employment, health, education and shelter.
- That even where refugees were in possession of proper documentation, the lack of recognition of these documents by several institutions/systems also acts as a hindrance to the realization of several rights for refugees and asylum seekers.

- That the short validity of the permits issued to asylum seekers especially necessitated frequent renewal visits to the DHA that involved a process of waiting in long queues at the reception centers with a consequential absence from work or school for most asylum seekers.
- That due to several complications created by errors and discrepancies in the issuance of documents issued by DHA, some identity documents or permits could not serve their purposes until they were corrected. It was revealed that the process of correcting these errors were cumbersome and lengthy.
- That the process of applying for travel documents and obtaining them was not only complicated, but also expensive for many refugees. Given that the issuance of a UN travel document to a refugee was dependant on the possession of a valid identity document, many refugees claimed that they were not privileged to possess IDs, and in the case of asylum seekers were not entitled to an ID.
- That many refugees felt that the system for the issuance of travel documents did not take into account travel in situations of extreme emergencies. The average time between applying for travel documents and the receipt of such documents was said to be three to six months.
- That the “bulk of the brunt” lay with the DHA, who were seriously criticized by refugees for undue delays in issuing asylum seekers permits and conducting RSD interviews, for corrupt practices in the whole asylum process, for the inefficiency of its officials, for the lack of capacity at all levels of the department, for its unclear and unharmonious procedures, for the lack of interpreters, and for a perceived lack of total interest in the protection of refugees.

3.1.2. Solutions Proposed by Refugees

To address the problems relating to documentation, refugees and asylum seekers proposed the following solutions:

- That the validity of the ID should be extended for a minimum period of 6 months.
- That asylum application especially for the vulnerable should be automatically fast tracked.
- That all refugee reception offices should have a uniform application of rules.
- That UNCTDs should be issued to refugees as soon as they are granted a section 24 permit.
- That more information relating to the procedures for the renewal of permits should be made available by the DHA to refugees.
- That the DHA should provide refugees with IDs similar to that of South African citizens. DHA current policy of issuing maroon booklets to some and “Smart” cards to others further complicates issues for refugees.
- That all reception centers should have a “customer care” service.

- That the DHA should provide credible interpreters at refugee reception centers.
- That the process for acquiring birth certificates for refugee children should be simplified.
- That the government should decentralize its services by creating more refugee reception centres i.e. at new locations that are now hosting large number of refugees.
- That special access for refugees living in the outskirts of traditional reception centers should be allowed by DHA at least once a month on specific days. This information should be displayed at all reception offices.
- That an amendment of the Refugees Act should be made to increase the validity period of refugee status permits to at least five years. This, it is perceived, would allow for some degree of stability.
- That refugee reception centers should be moved to safer and more accessible locations.
- That the DHA should create systems where files can be easily transferred from one reception centre to another.
- That the waiting areas in refugee reception offices should be made user friendly.
- That disabled and elderly persons, as well as women with children should be given priority at refugee reception centers.
- That there should be regular contact meetings between refugees and DHA officials.

3.1.3. Recommendations from the Workshop

Giving due regard to the solutions proposed by refugees, the participants at the workshop came up with the following recommendations:

- That DHA should be lobbied to ensure that clear and harmonized procedures relating to access to documentation are put in place.
- That refugees are provided with adequate information relating to such procedures by way of posters and picture formats in major languages displayed at all refugee reception offices.
- That the government should undertake rigorous investigation of corruption allegations by DHA officials.
- That the renewal of travel documents and ID documents should be simplified by adding pages allowing for extensions rather than reproducing new booklets.
- That UNHCR should re-enforce and increase its monitoring role at refugee reception centers.

- That UNHCR and DHA should redouble their training efforts for Refugee Reception Officers (RROs) and Refugee Status Determination Officers (RSDOs).
- That UNHCR should explore with the DHA the possibility of extending the asylum seekers permit to a minimum of 6 months.
- That UNHCR and its Partners should double their efforts to ensure that government honors legislation with regard to permanent residence.
- That all stakeholders especially the DHA should aggressively raise public awareness with regard to refugee documentation and the legality of such documentation.
- That regular dialogue between the DHA and the refugee community is fostered.

3.2. Lack of Access to Livelihoods

3.2.1. Findings

With regard to the issue of livelihoods the findings revealed the following:

- That refugees have marketable talents, skills and abilities which could enable self-sufficiency in South Africa, however these capacities are seriously undermined by the lack of adequate documentation, the lack of implementation of the provisions of national legislations which guarantees refugees certain rights, xenophobic tendencies, as well as the general confusion surrounding the broader legal implications of refugees' right to work by prospective employers.
- That in terms of capacities that exist within the refugee communities, the professionally skilled in the refugee communities range from medical doctors, nurses, engineers, lawyers, journalists, water and sanitation workers, religious leaders to artisans, plumbers, drivers, hairdressers, dressmakers, professional caterers, tailors, and many more.
- That most refugees in South Africa have difficulties sustaining themselves as a result of the lack of livelihoods; that the right to work and to engage in gainful employment even though guaranteed by national legislations, in practical terms is far from guaranteed.
- That delays in the issuance of documentation by the DHA greatly hampers refugees' access to livelihoods. The acquisition of adequate and legally recognized documentation is a major pre-requisite to accessing gainful employment.
- That because of a lack of recognition of some foreign qualifications, refugees face serious challenges in accessing jobs in the formal sector. In some instances, because the process of certifying qualifications by the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) is expensive, and does not in itself guarantee employment, most refugees do not undergo the process.
- That even in the informal sector like street trading and car guarding, where most refugees attempt to work, the lack of recognition of their documentation still bars access to employment in these areas.

- That the lack of credit facilities for refugees attempting to start their own businesses was limited by an inability to fulfill some basic requirements of these lending institutions like proof of a fixed address, and letters of guarantee from employers.
- That a general confusion and suspicion exists amongst potential employers on the broader legal implications of employing refugees and asylum seekers. Most South African and foreign employers appeared uninformed about refugees' and asylum seekers' right to employment.
- That even where refugees possessed some scarce skills like nursing or medical assistants, there still exist difficulties in finding jobs in these fields.
- That many refugees struggle with language barriers. The lack of knowledge of commonly used local languages makes it difficult for most refugees to conduct transactions in market places and in shops, thus limiting their access to livelihoods.
- That because of xenophobic tendencies displayed by prospective employers, refugees could not gain access to employment.
- That most refugees were considered as soft targets for exploitation by dishonest employers. Because some lacked the necessary documentation required by law to access employment, they were particularly vulnerable to a wide range of exploitation in the labour market including exclusion from annual leave, sick pay, and maternity entitlements as well as insurance and pension benefits.
- That given the conditions under which many refugees are employed, they have no legal recourse under employment laws. In the case of some refugees, ignorance as to the existence of their rights under labour legislations was a major problem.
- That exposure to sexual exploitation for refugee women and children by employers and some refugee men, due to their special vulnerability, is a major problem. As a means of survival, it was revealed that women and some young girls were forced or coerced into practices of prostitution. While it is acknowledged that the particular environment where the PAs were conducted did not allow for full discussions on issues of SGBV, it was nonetheless apparent through indicative discussions that it was an issue of concern.
- That refugee women were often precluded from finding work because of their child-rearing responsibilities and that affordable early childcare development facilities were often not available to assist in this regard.
- That because of frequent absences from work specifically linked to issues of documentation (renewal or arrest by police), refugees were bound to lose income.

As was articulated by most refugees during the PAs, due to their creativity as well as a sense of community obligation to assist each other, and the ability to work in groups and create collective business opportunities, their leadership skills and a quest for education and survival in general, some refugees have managed to make headway in society. Apart from work in the informal sector created by refugees for refugees, remittances from family members abroad and donations from churches and charitable organizations go a long way to sustain the refugee population in South Africa.

3.2.2. Solutions Proposed by Refugees

It is important to note that as per the PA findings, refugees in all four locations felt that if they were given access to employment on a fair and competitive footing, sustaining themselves in South Africa and living a meaningful life would be less of a problem. To this end, refugees and asylum seekers requested the following:

- That potential employers should be made aware of refugees and asylum seekers' right to work.
- That the street trading industry, a lucrative means of employment for most refugees at the moment, be open to refugees and asylum seekers with valid permits.
- That refugees should be given access to government skills development programs.
- That IPs should assist refugee women with skills training, and for those refugee women who have children and have access to job opportunities, crèche facilities should be available for them until such time that they establish themselves.
- That night time crèche facilities should be made available to refugee women who can only work night shifts.
- That JRS should re-institute business loan possibilities for refugees and asylum seekers.

3.2.3. Recommendations from the Workshop

To address the plight of refugees related to livelihood, and in taking into consideration the solutions proposed by the refugees, workshop participants recommended the following course of action:

- That the media should be used to promote refugees' right to work.
- That UNHCR and its partners should undertake active advocacy, lobbying and awareness raising with regard to refugee rights.
- That language training, business skills training, small business loans and income generating activities should be made available to refugees through UNHCR's IPs.
- That UNHCR should advocate for a practical implementation of refugee laws and policies relating to right to work.
- That UNHCR and its partners should upgrade and share the refugee skills database with government, NGOs and the private sector.
- That UNHCR and its partners should advocate for an expansion of government programs including the SETA learnership programs to include refugees.
- That UNHCR and its partners should assist refugees with registration at professional boards e.g. South African Nursing Council.

3.3. Lack of Access to Shelter

3.3.1. Findings

The guarantees of freedom of movement offered by the non-encampment policy in South Africa, even though consistent with international and national legislation, raised several questions during the PAs. It was felt by some refugees that an encampment policy would guarantee their rights to shelter, food and other basic amenities. In all four cities where the PAs took place, the magnitude of the problem of accommodation for refugees was worrying. More specifically, the findings revealed the following:

- That in some locations, especially in Johannesburg and Pretoria, the majority of refugees were living in overcrowded, run-down buildings where amenities like electricity and running water was a real luxury. Many refugees advised that all they could get in a room was sleeping space and no more. Many refugees mentioned that at one point in their stay in South Africa they had spent nights outside because of a lack of accommodation.
- That the lack of adequate accommodation generated several health and security related concerns. By way of example, in Berea, Johannesburg, in a particular high-rise building known as Corona Garden, the MFT described the 13 floor apartments as having no lifts, having dark corridors that could encourage criminal activities, no electricity, broken balconies where children could fall through easily, and no running water. More than 500 persons, the majority of them refugees lived in this particular building.
- That as a result of lack of accommodation several protection risks emerged including issues of exploitation from landlords who charged excessive rents and some refugees who were sub-letting to others at exorbitant prices. In this regard, it was revealed that sub-letting from SA citizens and other refugees at a higher price was the only way most refugees could secure accommodation.
- That Government's policy relating to subsidized housing for the underprivileged excludes refugees and asylum seekers.
- That at a certain level most landlords gave preference to South African citizens as opposed to foreigners and refugees in renting their properties.
- That most refugees were obliged to live in high security risk areas because of lower rents due to lack of gainful employment.
- That refugees living in high risk areas especially women and young girls were further exposed to sexual and physical abuse by landlords and other tenants.
- That most shelters that accommodated vulnerable women and children did not have basic security features, thus further exposing them to other protection risks.
- That because refugees lacked proper documentation especially IDs, most landlords were wary to rent to refugees. Furthermore, the delays in processing documentation at the level of DHA meant that many refugees go for extended periods without documentation, thus making it difficult for them to rent from landlords who require ID documents and permits as proof.

- That in some instances, estate agents and landlords required legal documentation like bank statements, and references from employers or former landlords, guarantees that refugees can rarely provide.

3.3.2. Solutions Proposed by Refugees

With regard to the issue of shelter and accommodation refugees proposed the following as solutions:

- That the Government should provide refugees with free accommodation or subsidized housing.
- That vulnerable groups should be allowed to stay in shelters for extended periods.
- That unaccompanied asylum seeker and refugee children should be allowed to stay in shelters until completion of matriculation education.
- That the security around refugee residential areas should be improved.
- That UNHCR and service providers should provide special housing grants to refugees.
- That UNHCR should advocate for the DHA to regularize the status of those who qualify for permanent residence with immediate effect so as to allow access to subsidized housing.

3.3.4. Recommendations from the Workshop

The recommendations from the workshop included the following:

- That UNHCR should increase funding to IPs to cater for income generating activities.
- That IPs should increase or extend the assistance provided to vulnerable refugees with payment of rentals.
- That efforts should be made by IPs for more refugees to access more shelters in times of crisis.
- That UNHCR should redouble its efforts towards the search for durable solutions including local integration and resettlement for refugees deserving of these solutions.

3.4. Lack of Access to Education

3.4.1. Findings

In all four locations, concerns relating to access to education were linked mostly to financial difficulties of the parents, and to a certain extent, to the lack of documentation rather than to any discriminatory practices that denied refugee children access to education. It must be noted that in all primary/secondary schools that were visited, empathy towards the plight of refugee children was highly demonstrated, and some attempts had been made to address the financial constraints of refugee parents *albeit* with some limitations. The findings of the PAs demonstrated the following:

- That refugee children were at risk of not attending school because of lack of adequate learning materials caused solely by the lack of income of parents.

- That some refugee children could not afford to pay school fees on time or pay at all, had no school uniforms, lacked stationary and lacked transport money to school.
- That, by the same token, children equally lacked lunch money, and in an attempt to raise money, they were obliged to work after school hours.
- That as a result of some of the aforementioned difficulties refugee children were not in a position to perform well at school.
- That given the initial difficulties refugee children face with lack of language skills, their self confidence is affected and they are labeled as different. This leads to several xenophobic attacks and isolation at school. However, it must be acknowledged that several schools have made an effort to address issues of xenophobia at school.
- That because of the traumatic experiences of some of these children, they remain withdrawn, reserved and unwilling to participate fully in school activities. This has a negative impact on their overall performance.
- That with regard to children with asylum seeker permits, in certain provinces they had to miss school almost every month to accompany parents to DHA to renew their permits. Teachers in school equally raised this as a serious concern stating that some children had even missed out on examinations as a result.
- That refugee children without adequate ID documents faced difficulties in registering for their matriculation exams.
- That because some refugee children had to travel very long distances to school, sometimes on foot, the risk of being attacked on their way to and from school was high.
- That access to tertiary education was one of the most challenging aspects of education for refugees. Where refugee scholars had all the necessary requisites to gain access to tertiary education, they lacked the necessary income to pay for education at this level. In this regard, it was noted that the lack of sponsors, lack of bursaries and the limited DAFI scholarship programmes for refugees and asylum seekers further aggravated the problem.

3.4.2. Solutions Proposed by Refugees

During the PAs, refugees proposed the following solutions as a way of addressing the difficulties related to education:

- That education at elementary level for refugee children should be free.
- That schools should provide uniforms and better feeding programs for disadvantaged children.
- That refugee children should also benefit from bursaries that are available to South African children.
- That entry into some good schools should be on a competitive academic basis so that refugee children with academic excellence can equally benefit.

- That the government should open schools specifically aimed at educating refugee children and incorporate their respective curriculum, if repatriation is envisaged.
- That refugee children should be treated with love and compassion by their teachers and fellow learners.
- Refugee children in some schools proposed that their parents be offered jobs so that they can be given food allowances and transport money.
- That refugee children should be given transport and lunch money by IPs.
- That refugees should be given access to bursaries at the tertiary level.
- That UNHCR should increase the number of scholarship available to refugees and the number of current places in the DAFI scholarship should be increased.

3.4.3. Recommendations from the Workshop

The recommendation from the workshop on the issue of education touched on the following:

- That UNHCR must advocate with DHA to allow for parents to renew permits for children in all reception centers in the country.
- That issues of employment for the parents including small business loans and grants from IPs should be looked at more seriously.
- That UNHCR and IPs should lobby the private sector and fund raise in attempt to increase the number of bursaries to refugee children.
- That where possible NGOs should lobby educational institutions to provide a exemptions for school fees and other related expenses for refugee children

3.5 Complementary Discussions with Service Providers, Institutions and DHA.

Based on the discussions held with officials of the DHA in all four locations, many of the above challenges were highlighted. However, in particular and with regard to the DHA, the following concerns were raised: high staff turn over in the staff at DHA due to inadequate salaries, a failing IT system, the lack of basic orientation and training for incoming staff, and an abuse of the asylum process by several asylum seekers. The issue of lack of interpreters working for the DHA and the insufficient number of voluntary interpreters from the refugee communities came out strong from both refugees and DHA officials as a constraint in effectively carrying out the asylum process.

Discussions held with Officials of ABSA and First National Banks in Pretoria and Durban respectively crystallized the difficulties that refugees face in opening bank accounts due to lack of documentation. These banks relayed their limitations in properly identifying refugee documents and expressed the need to have clear guidance on how to deal with the maroon ID books and the smart cards issued to refugees as forms of identification. They advised that the current smart card seems to be incompatible with several banking systems. The FNB banks so far appeared to be the only refugee-friendly banks as they are reasonable flexible in accommodating refugees and asylum seekers who wish to open bank accounts.

Officials from the Department of Health and from hospitals mentioned the difficulties in accessing ARVs for asylum seekers. The Metro Police re-iterated its concerns about refugees who sell goods on the streets without permits, and stated that under such circumstances they are forced to confiscate the goods as a matter of law and principle, the plight of refugees notwithstanding.

On the whole, these discussions confirmed that the lack of identity papers greatly limits refugees' right to security, freedom of movement and access to some basic services. Equally, the lack of implementation or delays in the implementation of refugee legislation especially with regard to the right to permanent residence has denied several refugees the right to welfare provisions that they could otherwise benefit from.

4. Additional Findings

4.1. Xenophobia

Mindful of the numerous efforts that have been made by all stakeholders in refugee protection to address issues of xenophobia in South Africa, the findings nevertheless revealed that xenophobia remains a big concern within the communities that refugees live and work. In all four locations, refugees raised the issue of xenophobia as one of the main impediments to the realization of their economic, social and cultural rights. Irrespective of their demonstrated willingness to integrate wholeheartedly into the South African community, the findings suggest that refugees and asylum seekers were treated with disdain as part of the unwanted migrant populations. While it is acknowledged that the South African government has made some strides in tackling this issue, refugees and asylum seekers still feel that a more aggressive approach is needed to halt the growth of xenophobic tendencies within communities.

4.2. HIV/AIDS and Access to Anti-Retroviral (ARVs)

According to the findings, access to basic health care did not seem to pose a challenge as most refugees felt that access was dictated more by where one went and who was met at the clinic or hospital rather than as a general policy of no access at all.

During the PAs, disclosure of HIV/AIDS status of refugees did not occur, even though several issues concerning access to proper medical facilities for HIV/AIDS patients were raised.

Some asylum seekers with disabilities propounded by the HIV virus indicated that they experienced enormous difficulties with accessing long term health care facilities, including access to proper nutrition and sometimes access to ARVs. However, it was revealed that in general, most asylum seekers had access one way or another to ARV treatment even if not through the public hospitals.

The findings further suggest that access to social grants for refugees with disabilities remains a big concern, leaving the physically challenged unable to cope in the current environment.

4.3. Unaccompanied Refugee and Asylum Seeker Children and Foster Parenting

The exploitation of children under foster care arrangements was a concern that was raised by some educational institutions. It was revealed that most separated children (mainly girls) who are forced to live with distant relatives are being used as house girls to do the cleaning, cooking for the entire households, thus affecting their overall performance at school. While the children were

not willing to raise these issues directly during the PAs, these concerns were brought up by some teachers and principals of schools. Urgent follow up action by the IPs on these issues formed part of the draft work plan for the MFT members.

It was also apparent during the PAs that problems relating to unaccompanied asylum seekers and refugee children were not adequately addressed by the DSD who were quick to pass on refugee and asylum seeker children to NGOs rather than refer them directly to the Children's Court for an inquiry.

It was also revealed that many UAMs were living in shelters or emergency accommodations based on arrangements made by NGOs with no long term plans in place for them.

4.4. Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV)

While it was not easy to identify individual cases of SGBV during the PAs, it however was apparent that many refugees were sexually exploited by landlords in exchange for access to accommodation. With regard to documentation, it was also revealed that because many refugee women and girls had to spend long nights in queues outside DHA offices in the presence of several male strangers, they were exposed to SGBV situations. Furthermore, in exchange for favors to renew documentation, it came out clearly that some refugee women were victims of sexual violence. In the absence of livelihoods for most refugee families, women and girls could be forced into prostitution or pornography as a means of earning a living.

5. The Way Forward

In addition to the specific recommendations made at the Durban workshop it was agreed that the following courses of action must take place:

- UNHCR and MFT have to provide adequate feedback to all participants on the findings of the PAs.
- UNHCR to ensure that the concerns raised and the specific recommendations made in this report will given due regard by way of follow up and implementation, and eventual incorporation by UNHCR and its Implementing Partners into the project submissions for 2007.
- UNHCR and MFT's to ensure that the comprehensive work/implementation plans covering the period September 2006- September 2007 as prepared during the Durban workshop would be stringently followed by all MFTs.
- That the nominated local coordinators of the MFTs would be tasked to play the role of focal points to ensure that the systematic dialoguing approach of the AGDM process remains alive and on-going in the respective locations, as a way of capturing the voices of the unheard. However, the over all coordination of the process will remain in the hands of the Coordinator.
- UNHCR and MFT's to ensure that the need to capture more voices is carefully balanced with providing adequate feedback to the refugee population, and also by way of taking concrete steps to address the problems indicated in the findings. To this end, ensure that all MFT members undertake adequate steps to follow up on issues that were raised during the PAs.

- UNHCR, MFTs and all partners to redouble efforts toward a speedy and concrete implementation of the recommendations outlined, and thereafter put in place an information strategy to the refugee population before further assessments can be done.

Prepared by Monique EKOKO
 Coordinator AGDM- South Africa
 14 October, 2006

ANNEX A

AGDM SOUTH AFRICA

Multi-Functional Team Members

Name	Gender	Organization	Contact details
PRETORIA			
1. Mmone Moletsane	F	UNHCR	moletsane@unhcr.org 012 354 8316
2. Yuan Schoucheng	M	UNHCR	Yuan@unhcr.org 012 354 8312
3. Ernest Ndaba	M	UNHCR	ndaba@unhcr.org 012 354 83227
4. Lethabo Maredi	F	JRS	012- 341 9185 lethabo@jrssa.co.za
5. Mmatshwana Makoti	F	JRS	012- 341 9185 0835843965 nonky@jrssa.co.za
6. Dikeledi Ramongane	F	PPASA	083 312 9510 dikelediramo@webmail.co.za
7. Freddie Ramphisa	M	DHA (Gov)	012-327 3500 freddy.ramhpisa@dha.gov.za
8. Benoit Kamanda	M	Doxa Deo	076 6581024 benoitk@doxadeo.co.za
9. Fanie Nonda	M	Refugee Woman's Organization	083 712 9491 No Email
CAPE TOWN			
1. Mmone Moletsane	F	UNHCR	moletsane@unhcr.org 012 354 8316
2. Yuan Schoucheng	M	UNHCR	Yuan@unhcr.org 012 354 8312
3. Ernest Ndaba	M	UNHCR	ndaba@unhcr.org

			012 354 83227
4. Julaine Olkers	F	CTRC	021-762 9670 julainectrc@telkomsa.net
5. Tal Schreier	F	UCT	021- 650 2678 tschreie@law.uct.ac.za
6. Charles Mutabazi	M	ARESTA	021- 633 8762 coordinator@aresta.org.za
7. Estelle Neethling	F	ICRC	021-418 6640 eneethling@redcross.org.za
8. Nzwakhi Mshengu	F	Bonne Esperance	021-691 8664 esperance@mweb.co.za
9. Nomphiwe Gatya	F	DHA	076 050 8412 nomphiwegatya@dha.gov.za
10. Marie Louw	F	DSD	082 428 0372 mjlouw@pgwc.gov.za
11. Kemal Omar	M	City of Cape Town	021 -400 1302 Kemal.Omar@capetown.gov.za
12. Sylvanus Dixon	M	Scalabrini	syldixon@webmail.co.za
JOHANNESBURG			
Monique Ekoko	Female	UNHCR	ekoko@unhcr.org 012 354 8322
Flore Hiensch	Female	UNHCR	hiensch@unhcr.org 012 354 8322
Pumla Rulashe	Female	UNHCR	rulashe@unhcr.org 012 354 8361
Blaise Mzuzi	Male	JRS	blaisenzuzi@hotmail.com 011 331 0037
Patricia Hassen	Female	DHA	011 435 4715 patricia.hassen@dha.gov.za
Katrina Mseme	Female	RBX	012 322 7553 rbx@ncra.org.za
Abale Ebalo	Male	RCP	011 333 9266 rcp@webmail.co.za
Melecea Magkolo	Female	JRS	011 331 0037 melleciamakgolo@yahoo.co.
Emmanuel Bihune	Male	Bienvenue Shelter	011 339 1960 bihune@webmail.com
Bornwell Kantande	Male	UNHCR	kantande@unhcr.org
DURBAN			
Monique Ekoko	Female	UNHCR	ekoko@unhcr.org 012 354 8322
Flore Hiensch	Female	UNHCR	hiensch@unhcr.org

			012 354 8322
Pumla Rulashe	Female	UNHCR	rulashe@unhcr.org 012 354 8361
Yasmin Rajah	Female	MCC	yasmin@mennonite.org.za 031 310 3578
JP kalala	Male	MCC	JP@mennonite.org.za 031 3103578
Sindy Louvie	Female	MCC	sindi@mennonite.org.za
A. Madiba	Male	DHA	Alec.madiba@dha.gov.za 083 355 6152
Jeanine Bamurange	Female	URW	minanididas@yahoo.com 031 332 62 65
Greeta Schuler	Female	Talk English	Gschuler07@cmcx.edu 079 183 9594
Bornwell Kantande	Male	UNHCR	kantande@unhcr.org 41 22 739 8906

Facilitators:

**Joan Alison
Abel Mbilinyi
Bornwell Kantande**

ANNEX B

MEETING SCHEDULE- PRETORIA

Day1- Pretoria

Monday 8 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days prior	Brief the bank officials about participatory assessment	Brief refugee men and women traders on participatory assessment	Brief refugees communities about participatory assessment
Day 1	Day 1	Day1	Day 1
09:00-12:00	Briefing by facilitators (Pretoria and Johannesburg Team)	Briefing by facilitators (Pretoria and Johannesburg Team)	Briefing by facilitators (Pretoria and Johannesburg Team)
Venue	UNHCR Meeting Room	UNHCR Meeting Room	UNHCR Meeting Room
12:00-13:00	Lunch (UNHCR)	Lunch	Lunch
13:00 -15:00	Meeting with ABSA Bank Management on documentation	Observation at the market	Observation in residential areas – where refugees and asylum seekers resides
Venue	ABSA Bank – Branch to be confirmed	Church Street , Sammy Marks Square	Drie Lillies and around Burgerspark
15:00-16:00	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization
Venue	UNHCR Meeting Room	UNHCR Meeting Room	UNHCR Meeting Room

Day 2- Pretoria
Tuesday 9 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days prior	Brief girls, school authorities adolescents and elderly people on participatory assessment Obtain consent from parents for girls to be part of PA	Brief boys, school authorities, women and elderly people on participatory assessment Obtain consent from parents for girls to be part of PA	Brief adolescents, school authorities and men on participatory assessment
Day 2	Day 2	Day 2	Day 2
08:30-10:30	Focus group with girls (10-13 yrs)/ Observe school and semi-structured discussion with local children at the same school	Focus group with boys (10-13)/ Observe school and semi-structured discussion with local children at the same school	Focus group with adolescent girls(14-17)
Venue	Esikihisni Primary School	??? Primary School	Flavius Mareka High School
11:00- 13:00	Focus group with adolescent boys (14-17)	Focus group with women (18-40)	Focus Group with men (18-40)
Venue	Flavoius Mareka High School	<i>Venue to be confirmed</i>	JRS
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00 -16:00	Elderly refugee men (50+)	Elderly refugee women (50+)	Refugee men with disabilities (18-40)
Venue	Doxa Deo Church <i>Please fill in the address</i>	Doxa Deo Church <i>Please fill in the address</i>	<i>Venue to be confirmed</i>
16:00-17:00	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization

Day 3- Pretoria
Thursday 10 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days prior	Brief hospital and police authorities, personnel at the shelter children.	Brief primary health care officials , METRO police and personnel on the participatory assessment	Brief DHA officials and personnel at the shelter and refugee men on participatory assessment
Day 3	Day 3	Day 3	Day 3
08:30-10:30	Observe public hospital and hold focus meeting with hospital officials	Observe primary health care/ semi structured discussion with refugees/ and semi structured meeting with clinic officials	Observe Marabastad Refugee Reception Office/ semi- structured discussions with asylum seekers and refugees
Venue	Pretoria Academic Hospital	Skinner Clinic	DHA Marabastad
11:00- 13:00	Focus group with SAPS/ Observation	Metro Police	Focus group with DHA officials
Venue	Pretoria Central Police Station	Venue to be confirmed	Marabastad
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00 -16:00	Observation – shelter for children	Observation – shelter for women	Observation -Shelter for Men
Venue	Attridgeville (confirmed)	Potters’s House	Strubben Shelter
16:00-17:00	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization

Day 4 - Pretoria
Friday 11 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days prior	Brief refugee service providers about participatory assessment	Inform NGOS about participatory assessment	Brief leader of refugee communities and of refugee organization about participatory assessment
Day 4	Day 4	Day 4	Day 4
08:30-10:30	Focus group with Coordinators Refugee Service Providers JRS, LHR, NCRA,	Focus group with Welfare NGOs (e.g. Child Welfare, SAVF, Catholic Women's League)	Focus group meeting with leaders of refugee communities/or organizations
Venue	LHR	JRS	Doxa Deo???
11:00- 13:00	Systematization(3 teams together)	Systematization (3 teams together)	Systematization(3 teams together)
Venue	UNHCR	UNHCR	UNHCR
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00 -16:00			
Venue			
16:00-16:30			

ANNEX C

MEETING SCHEDULE- CAPE TOWN

Day 1- Cape Town
Monday 14 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 1	Day 1	Day 1	Day 1
09:00- 12:00 Activity	Briefing by facilitators at UCT; CTRC to provide transport and transport money to be issued.		
Venue	UCT		
12:00-13:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
13:00 -15: 00 Activity	Observation Henover Park	Voorspoed Primary School in Retreat Observation	Observation/semi structured interviews Residential Areas
Venue	Cape Town Station	Green Market Square	Point Area
15:00-16: 00	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization

Day 2- Cape Town
Tuesday 15 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 2	Day 2	Day 2	Day 2
08:30-10:30	Systematization of previous day.	Systematization of previous day.	Systematization of previous day.
Venue	UCT	UCT	UCT
11:00- 13:00 Activity	Focus Group of women at BE Ages: 18-25 and 26-40		
Venue	Muizenberg	Car Guards DHA	Observation at Nyanga and Cape Town.
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00 -16: 00 Activity	The Ark: Boys 14-17 and 18-25 Retreat Day Hospital Bank	Traffic Department	Security
16:00-17: 00 Activity			
Venue	UTRS at CTRC		

Day 3- Cape Town
Wednesday 16 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 3	Day 3	Day 3	Day 3
08:30-09:30 Activity	Systematization of previous day.	Systematization of previous day.	Systematization of previous day.
Venue	UCT	UCT	UCT
10:00- 12:00 Activity	Pastor Mbemba	Observation Elderly men and women – Starting age 55	
Venue	Traffic Department		
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00 -16: 00 Activity	Orphanage and staff structured meeting with caregivers.	CTRC Focus group with Somali men age 26-40	CTRC Focus group with Somali women age 26-40
Venue	Zubeida	Zubeida	Zubeida
16:00-17: 00 Activity	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization

Day 4- Cape Town
Thursday 17 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks Prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 4	Day 4	Day 4	Day 4
08:30-10:30 Activity	Systematization of previous day.	Systematization of previous day.	Systematization of previous day.
Venue	UCT	UCT	UCT
11:00- 13:00 Activity	Community leaders Focus group 18-25	Mixed Group Focus group 18-40 Women group sewing	English men Paarl: Brice Focus group of men and women
Venue			
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00 -16: 00 Activity	Learders of the refugee community Stellenbosch	Observation business people	
Venue	UCT	UCT	UCT
16:00-16: 30	Systematization of this day	Systematization of this day	Systematization of this day

ANNEX D

MEETING SCHEDULE- JOHANNESBURG

Day 1- Johannesburg
Monday 07 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 1	Day 1	Day 1	Day 1
09:00- 12:00 Activity	Briefing by facilitators (Pretoria and Johannesburg Team)		
Venue	UNHCR Meeting Room	UNHCR Meeting Room	UNHCR Meeting Room
12:00-13:00	Lunch (UNHCR)	Lunch	Lunch
13:00 -15: 00	Documentation Bank manager/customer care/ teller Observe & semi-structured discussion. Or observe at Market	Livelihood M & F adults. Observation & semi-structured discussion	Documentation /Livelihood. Observation/semi structured discussion.
Venue	ABSA & FNB Banks, JHB CBD or Yeoville Market	Residential area in Mayfair.	Metro Police on Loveday and Market at Jeppe & Troye.
15:00-16: 00	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization
Venue	JRS	JRS	JRS

Day 2- Johannesburg
Tuesday 8 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 2	Day 2	Day 2	Day 2
09:00-11:00 Activity	Education. Focus group Male & Female: (10-13 yrs) one hour each per gender Underprivileged environment	Education. Focus Group. (10-13 yrs) Privileged environment.	Education. Focus Groups. (10-13 yrs) Male & Female (Somalia)
Venue	I.H. Harris Primary, Doornfontein	Phoenix School, Braamfontein	Mayfair/Faraday
11:00- 13:00 Activity	Education. Focus group Adolescent out of school youth Male & Female	Education. Adolescents. Male & Female Privileged setting.	Education. Focus Groups M& F Somali Adolescents.
Venue	Coronia Gardens, Berea & Bertrams	Phoenix Secondary School	Mayfair/Faraday
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00 -16: 00 Activity	Livelihood Focus Group. Women 17-40	Livelihood Focus Group. Men 17-40	Livelihood Focus Group. Male & Female 18-40 (hour each)
Venue	Bienvenue Shelter, Bertrams and surrounds	JRS OFFICE	JRS OFFICE
16:00-17: 00 Activity	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization
Venue	JRS	JRS	JRS

Day 3- Johannesburg
Thursday 10 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 3	Day 3	Day 3	Day 3
09:00-11:00 Activity	Documentation. Observation/semi structured discussion. Male & Female Adults	Livelihood Observation & semi-structured discussion	Livelihood Observation & semi-structured discussion
Venue	Rosetenville Home Affairs Office	JHB General or Parktown Hospital	PHC Esselen or Hilbrow Clinic
11:00- 13:00 Activity	Documentation Semi discussion with DHA Head of Office and RSDOs	Livelihood. Semi structured discussion with Superintendent, nurse & receptionist	Observation and Semi structured discussion with Senior and Junior nurses.
Venue	Rosetenville Home Affairs Office	JHB General or Parktown Hospital	PHC Esselen or Hilbrow Clinic
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00 -16: 00 Activity	Livelihood Male & Female Adults	Documentation. Observatio/semi structured discussion.	Education/Livelihood. ABET Adults Male & Female
Venue	Papillion or Catholic Diocese	Commissioner St. Police Station	St Francis de Sale, Doornfontein
16:00-17: 00 Activity	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization
Venue	JRS	JRS	JRS

Day 4- Johannesburg
Friday 11 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks Prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 4	Day 4	Day 4	Day 4
09:00-11:00 Activity	Documentation/ Livelihood/Education. Focus Group. Coordinators & refugee service providers.	Documentation/ Livelihood/Education. Focus Group. Welfare NGO's , Salvation Army, DSD	Documentation/ Livelihood/Education. Focus Group. Refugee Community Leaders, Male & Female
Venue	JRS	Catholic Diocese	Yeoville Primary School or CBRC
11:00- 13:00 Activity	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization
Venue	JRS	JRS	JRS
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00-16: 00 Activity			
Venue			
16:00-17: 00	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization
Venue	JRS	JRS	JRS

ANNEX E

MEETING SCHEDULE - DURBAN

Day 1- Durban

Monday 14 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 1	Day 1	Day 1	Day 1
09:00- 12:00 Activity	Briefing by facilitators		
Venue	Diakonia Centre		
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00 -16: 00 Activity	Observation visits/semi structured interviews banks	Focus Group: Somali Women	Observation/semi structured interviews Residential Areas
Venue	STD, FNB, Smith Street, DBN Central	MCC OFFICE	Point Area
17:00-18: 00	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization
Venue	MCC	MCC	MCC

Day 2- Durban
Tuesday 15 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 2	Day 2	Day 2	Day 2
09:00-11:00	Focus group Boys: (09-10 yrs) Girls: (10-11 yrs) Age: 10-13 years	Focus group Boys: (09-10 yrs) Girls: (10-11 yrs) Age: 10-13 years	Focus group Boys: aged (14-17 yrs)
Venue	Addington	Claraville School	Centenary School
11:00- 13:00 Activity	Observatio/semi structured interviews: Out of school youth: 18-25	Observatio/semi structured interviews: Out of school youth: 18-25	Girls: 14-17 years
Venue	Ushaka/Point	Market	Betchet School
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00 -16: 00 Activity	Focus Group: Tertiary Students: male	Focus Group: Tertiary Students: female	Focus groups: Men with skills: 14-15 years Women with skills: 15-16 years
Venue	DLT	MCC OFFICE	URW Creche
16:00-17: 00 Activity	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization
Venue	MCC	MCC	MCC

Day 3- Durban
Wednesday 16 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 3	Day 3	Day 3	Day 3
09:00-11:00 Activity	Observatio/semi structured interviews: Home Affairs with refugees/asylum seekers	Observatio/semi structured interviews: Home Affairs with refugees/asylum seekers	Observatio/semi structured interviews: Employment Group
Venue	Umgeni Road	Moore Road	SANZAF
11:00- 13:00 Activity	Observatio/semi structured interviews: Out of school youth: 18-25	Observatio/semi structured interviews: Poly Clinic	Focus Group: Males: 17-40 years
Venue	Ushaka/Point	Addington	Parish Centre
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
14:00 -16: 00 Activity	Observatio/semi structured interviews: Disable and elderly	Observatio/semi structured interviews: Alexander Shelter	Focus groups: Women: 17-40 years
Venue	DLT	MCC OFFICE	URW Creche
16:00-17: 00 Activity	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization
Venue	MCC	MCC	MCC

Day 4- Durban
Thursday 17 August 2006

Office	Team A	Team B	Team C
Weeks Prior	Multifunctional team discuss mapping diversity, methods, themes, facilitating discussions, ways to inform people of concern, ways for urgent follow up, splitting up into smaller teams		
Days Prior	Briefing of Refugees and Asylum seekers		
Day 4	Day 4	Day 4	Day 4
09:00-11:00 Activity	Focus Group: Department officials	Focus Group: NGO's	Focus Group: Refugee Leaders
Venue	The Well: Diakonia Centre	MCC OFFICE	Parish Centre
11:00- 13:00 Activity	Systematization	Systematization	Systematization
Venue	Diakonia Centre	Diakonia Centre	Diakonia Centre
13:00-14:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch