

www.ifrc.org
Saving lives,
changing minds.

Emergency Plan of Action Final Report

Bosnia and Herzegovina: Population Movement

 International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

DREF operation final report	Operation n° MDRBA010
Date of issue: 23 May 2019	Glide number: OT-2018-000078-BIH
Date of disaster: June 2018	
Operation start date: 28 June 2018	Operation end date: 28 November 2018
Operation budget: CHF 212,733	
Number of people affected: 5,664	Number of people assisted: 3,000
Host National Society: Red Cross Society of Bosnia and Herzegovina (RCSBiH)	
N° of National Societies involved in the operation: Croatian Red Cross, German Red Cross, Italian Red Cross, Swiss Red Cross, Turkish Red Crescent Society, Red Crescent Society of the United Arab Emirates	
N° of other partner organizations involved in the operation: IOM, UNHCR, UNICEF, Caritas, World Vision, Emmaus MFS, MSF, Danish Refugee Council	

A. SITUATION ANALYSIS

Description of the disaster

Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) had received a small number of migrants between 2015 and 2017; however, in 2018, the country experienced a significant increase in the numbers of new arrivals. Most of the migrants came from Pakistan, Syria, Afghanistan, Iran, and Iraq, followed by Libya, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Algeria and Morocco. They arrived in BiH via two different routes: one via Turkey, Greece, Albania and Montenegro; and the other one via Turkey, Greece, the Republic of North Macedonia or Bulgaria, and Serbia. The entry points to BiH were in the areas of Trebinje, Foča and Višegrad in the Republic of Srpska (RS) and Goražde in Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH). The majority of these people moved towards Sarajevo and Una-Sana canton, trying to enter the EU through Croatia.



FA provision. Photo: Red Cross of Bosnia and Herzegovina

In the second half of 2018, the number of migrants in the country continued to rise rapidly, reaching between 70 and 100 entries per day. After being registered, almost all migrants declared an intention to seek asylum, after which they were free to stay legally in the country for 14 days. From January 2018 to 28 November 2018, the Service for Foreigners' Affairs of the Ministry of Security recorded over 23,000 arrivals, out of which 21,000 expressed intention to seek asylum, while only 5 per cent or 1,050 asylum claims were recorded. This means that most of the migrants did not intend to stay in the country but planned to move further to the EU countries. Given their free movement in the country, it is not known how many of them finally left the country and after how long of a period of stay.

Out of the total number of migrants entering the country until 28 November 2018 approximately 90 per cent were men, according to the records of Red Cross in the field.

According to the estimations, in the period from 28 June 2018 to 28 November 2018 there were more than 5,000 migrants staying in the country at a given time, out of which approx. 4,000 were concentrated in Una-Sana Canton,

close to the Croatian border, where they tried to enter Croatia in smaller groups. Given the nature of the situation it was not possible to give the precise numbers of migrants in the area. Part of the migrants were located in the improvised centres in the canton, but many more were sleeping on streets, in private accommodation, or in parks. The biggest number of migrants, some 800, were accommodated in Bihać, in the improvised accommodation in Borići. Following a long negotiation process between the UNHCR, IOM and the governmental authorities a hotel, called Hotel Sedra, was opened to accommodate families and vulnerable groups. Hotel Sedra is located between Cazin and Bihać and was out of use for a long period of time, therefore it needed to be refurbished, for which IOM was in charge. The renovation was done room by room and as soon as one was completed a family was moved in. In the reporting period there were some 400 people accommodated in the hotel. A third group of migrants, approx. 300 people, stayed in Velika Kladusa, in makeshift tents with no infrastructure and with only four showers and four toilets. Accommodation there was below all standards.

The migratory route within Bosnia and Herzegovina shifted during the implementation period of the EPoA. While at the beginning of the increased influx to BiH migrants entering the country both from the south (Montenegro) and east (Serbia) primarily went to Sarajevo and continued their journey to Una-Sana Canton, later on more and more migrants were going directly to Una-Sana canton moving the route more to the north. Most of the migrants were entering the country from Serbia.

One of the three locations of the RCSBiH response as planned under the EPoA was a centre in Usivak near Sarajevo, which was planned to be established and opened in July 2018. However, this only happened in October 2018.

Although winter was approaching, no adequate locations were designated by the authorities in Una-Sana Canton, or at other locations in the country, where larger number of people could have been accommodated. Therefore, mentioned shelters in Bihac, where most of the refugees and migrants were staying, and the ones in Velika Kladusa were far from being suitable for winter conditions, and that required immediate action by the governmental authorities.

Summary of the response

Overview of Host National Society

All but one of the ten migrant centres are located in the territory of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and most of the activities in response to the migration situation were correspondingly implemented by the Red Cross of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. There were three main branches of the National Society involved in the response: Red Cross Branch of City of Bihać, Red Cross Branch of Una-Sana Canton, and Red Cross Branch of City of Mostar.

In Una-Sana Canton, the National Society participated in the response at centres in Borići, Hotel Sedra and Velika Kladusa informal settlement. In Herzegovina-Neretva Canton, the NS supported in the Mostar (Salakovac) area with the provision of food and non-food items (textile and hygiene items) and first aid. Restoring Family Links (RFL) services have been provided with support from ICRC and the DREF operation.

In the City of Bihać, up to 100 volunteers were involved in provision of food, PSS, FA, and distribution of hygiene kits and other NFIs. Many of these volunteers were also working full time since the beginning of the response (for five months) with kitchen staff hours running from 7am to 10pm).

The RCSBiH's assistance provision are as follows.

- Food provision and distribution

RCSBiH provided food in all centres where accommodation was managed by the government, namely in Bihac and Salakovac. In Velika Kladusa camp site, RCSBiH took over food provision in July 2018 for one month and resumed the service in September and continued until the unofficial site was dismantled. RCSBiH expanded food provision in Hotel Sedra and Miral production hall (Velika Kladusa). Daily food provision consisted of two warm meals and one dry meal per person. Currently RCSBiH produces food for up to 3,000 migrants daily.

- Hygiene items distribution

RCSBiH is mandated by the Government to provide hygiene parcels to migrants, which RCSBiH has been fulfilling since the beginning of the crisis, following the Sphere standards and using a kiosk system for distribution. Hygiene items were provided in Borići, Velika Kladaša, Hotel Sedra and in Salakovac in the reporting period.

- NFIs (mostly blankets, mattresses, sleeping bags and clothes)

NFIs were distributed at the same locations as hygiene items, as well as being provided to people migrating through transit areas. RCSBiH supported the efforts of the Government to set up the centre in Salakovac by providing heaters. NFIs were partially procured through DREF and the Swiss Red Cross project. Significant quantities were also donated by the Italian Red Cross, Turkish Red Crescent, German Red Cross and Croatian Red Cross. Other humanitarian organizations also made NFI donations to the Red Cross, including UN agencies, such as UNHCR and UNICEF.

- **First aid interventions**

RCSBiH was providing first aid in Borići, on a daily basis when other medical teams were not present. Medical teams of other humanitarian agencies visited the Borići center once per day for two hours. In the remaining time RCSBiH First Aid teams filled the gap. The teams served 20-40 cases per day, depending on the day. In Salakovac, RCSBiH provided first aid until primary health care services were established locally.

As part of the winterization efforts, RCSBiH provided winter clothing to migrants in all locations, including at the newly opened centre in Ušivak. Most migrants arrived unprepared and unequipped for winter conditions, and provision of suitable winter clothing was a priority recognised by all humanitarian actors participating in the response. RCSBiH also provided winterized sleeping bags and blankets. These activities could be intensified in the last two months of the DREF operation thanks to generous support from partner National Societies and IFRC.

The RCSBiH representatives participated in coordination meetings organized by UNHCR and IOM in Sarajevo, where information on implemented activities was shared. These meetings provided a regular exchange of information regarding actual and planned response to the migrant situation in BiH. RCSBiH also participated in the work of the national Coordination Body for Migrations, which was coordinated by the Council of Ministers of BiH and Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees of BiH.

Overview of Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in country

The plan for the provision of immediate assistance was developed in close cooperation with the IFRC Regional Office for Europe (ROE). The RCSBiH had started responding to the migration situation from the outset and the assistance provision continued under the DREF from 28 June 2018 until 28 November 2018. During the reporting period, IFRC ROE representatives paid three visits to Sarajevo and Mostar, and later to Bihac, with the purpose of monitoring the situation and activities on the ground. Besides that, IFRC emergency communication delegate was deployed at the beginning of the EPoA, who assisted the RCSBiH staff and volunteers in handling media, especially the international media. During the reporting period, close cooperation continued to be maintained between the RCSBiH and IFRC ROE and all necessary modifications in the operation was made in mutual agreement.

After an initial assessment, Restoring Family Links (RFL) services were established in Una-Sana Canton with the support of ICRC and RCSBiH Tracing Services. During the DREF operation there was no need to scale up the service in that area. ICRC also supported RCSBiH in volunteer mobilization by providing a house in Bihać and covering costs for volunteers from other parts of the country travelling to and staying in the city.

Large numbers of land mines and unexploded ordnance (UXO) are still present along the migration routes - working with ICRC and the Mine Action Centre in BiH, RCSBiH distributed mine awareness flyers warning of the danger of mines and UXO in the areas of Trebinje (south BiH), Velika Kladuša, Cazin and Bihać (north-west BiH). Flyers were distributed by RC volunteers, who were also placing posters in the border areas. The same flyers were distributed in cooperation with the Montenegro Red Cross on their side of the border.

In addition to the ICRC and IFRC, the National Society has received financial and in-kind support from multiple other RC partners who have long-standing partnerships with RCSBiH and/or have been long present in the country. These include:

- **Croatian Red Cross** donated NFIs and has also offered human resources to support RCSBiH.
- **German Red Cross** donated a mobile kitchen, 1,000 beds, 150 blankets, 200 clothing items, 500 sleeping bags, four tents, kitchen inventory and other related items.
- **Italian Red Cross** made two donations of NFIs consisting of 5,000 winter clothing items, blankets, mats, hygiene packs and one mobile kitchen.
- **Swiss Red Cross** supported RCSBiH through a project providing food in Salakovac (Mostar) and in Bihac (Una-Sana Canton) as well as NFIs in Una-Sana Canton. Swiss Red Cross also approved a Cash Transfer Programme for local people in host communities, to reduce tensions towards migrants for a period of two months (January-February 2019). Swiss Red Cross remains committed to support RCSBiH in further activities.
- **Turkish Red Crescent** was in the process of opening a delegation in Bosnia and Herzegovina at the end date of the DREF operation. It also made a significant donation of 330 tents, two mobile kitchens, 9,000 blankets and 1,000 kitchen sets, and also plans to procure sanitary containers locally.
- **The Red Crescent Society of the United Arab Emirates** donated food parcels to be distributed at the beginning of the crisis, when donor interest was still low, making this contribution of the Red Crescent Society of the United Arab Emirates of particular importance.

Overview of non-RCRC actors in country.

The Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina remained to be focused on the security aspect of the situation and the management of the two centres in Salakovac and Delijaš, leaving the coordination of the humanitarian action mainly to the international humanitarian community at most of the hot spots in the country. The lack of active involvement of the

Government made the humanitarian response a lot more challenging. One of the clear indicators of this was the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees handing over part of the government authority to UNHCR and IOM. As a first step, the Ministry announced that the bi-weekly humanitarian coordination meetings were going to be organized and chaired by UNHCR and IOM. As a continuation, UNHCR and even more IOM became the lead agencies in the entire migration response in the country. They were in charge of renovating the building in Borici (Bihac) and also Hotel Sedra before the winter. IOM and UNHCR were also the main recipients of the largest funds provided by the European Union, ECHO and other donors for the migration operation.

The Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees of BiH activated its refugee centre in Salakovac (Mostar). The Ministry of Security of BiH is in charge of the Delijaš Asylum Centre and detention centre in East Sarajevo. The Ministry of Security also established a centre in Ušivak with IOM overseeing the management of the centre and a range of partners providing support services.

The International Organisation for Migration (IOM) has been the main stakeholder and implementor of the majority of international assistance. As well as supporting food provision implemented by RCSBiH in Una-Sana Canton, IOM also provided shelter for migrants by renting Hotel Sedra in Una-Sana Canton as well as water and sanitation facilities in areas, where there was no established infrastructure.

UNHCR was in charge of health care provision to migrants, as well as providing protection and accommodation in hostels and private accommodation to vulnerable people. RCSBiH received two field warehouses, six housing units, 7,000 blankets, 500 sleeping bags, 700 mats, 6,100 clothing items, 400 bags and other related items in smaller quantities from UNHCR.

The Mayor of Bihac, with the support of the local RC Branch, made a former student dormitory in Borići, near Bihac available as additional shelter for migrants.

Pomozi.ba, a local volunteer group, organized food distribution for migrants sleeping rough in Sarajevo. They were also in charge of food provision in Ušivak, which was opened in October 2018.

Danish Refugee Council and MSF were providing health care to migrants in Una-Sana Canton. MSF also provided one container which was used by RC first aid teams in Borići.

MFS Emmaus hosted vulnerable groups in Duje, near Doboj, a total of less than 30 persons.

The situation at the Government Centres

Sarajevo Area: Asylum Centre Delijaš, Immigration Centre East Sarajevo

An increased number of migrants, including families with children, were sleeping in the streets, parks and abandoned buildings, especially in Sarajevo and at hot spots in Western BiH. UNHCR and IOM increased the provision of temporary accommodation for particularly vulnerable migrants in the other locations. Besides IOM, UNHCR and UNICEF, there were other international organizations in BiH, such as Caritas, MSF, Emmaus, CRS, Save the Children, Danish Refugee Council, however with rather low visibility in the field. In addition, local NGOs were providing support in the form of accommodation to small number of families and of food distributed, for example, at Sarajevo railway station.

About 115 migrants resided in Asylum Centre in Delijaš (Trnovo municipality) managed by the Ministry of Security of BiH. The centre (situated around 40 km from Sarajevo) was the only facility in BiH accommodating migrants with international protection. Despite the efforts of the camp management to separately accommodate families, they often shared rooms with "single men", which caused security concerns, and often resulted in families leaving the centre. The Delijaš Asylum Centre continued to work almost at full capacity, therefore the capacity of the centre remained a challenge.

For asylum seekers accommodated in the Asylum Centre in Delijaš, food was provided by the Ministry of Security of BiH in accordance with recommendations made by a nutritionist at the Sarajevo Federal Institute for Public Health. Food was also provided for irregular migrants placed in the Immigration Centre in East Sarajevo. There were enough resources to cover food needs as well as basic hygiene until the end of the reporting period. Primary health care, including pregnancy care, was provided both at the Asylum Centre in Delijaš and in Immigration Centre in East Sarajevo. Water and sanitation were provided in both centres, as well as the basic hygiene necessities.

Mostar: Salakovac Refugee Centre

The Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees of BiH activated the Refugee Centre in Salakovac near Mostar and accommodated around 250 migrants. The centre is a solid building, with all the necessary infrastructure. Although in some periods the number of migrants residing in the centre was lower at times, at the end of the implementation period it stood at around 270 (most of them as families), assumingly due to the upcoming winter period.

The RCSBiH branch of Mostar ran a soup kitchen with capacities that were significantly larger than the needs for additional meals, therefore provision of hot meals in the centre did not mean any challenge for the RC Branch of Mostar. The RCSBiH provided two meals per day for all people accommodated in the centre. The infrastructure was in place,

but there were no back-up plans for electricity. Frequent storms happening in 2018 caused many electrical breakdowns, which jeopardized the distribution of meals. The RCSBiH organized medical examination for all the migrants by medical doctors volunteering for RCSBiH. Subsequently, the Ministry of Security of BiH was covering the costs for medical treatments on a case-by-case basis and preparing the protocol with the local Healthcare Centre on providing health care to migrants in the area. The protocol was yet to be signed. Water, sanitation and basic hygiene necessities were provided in the centre

Una-Sana Canton: Bihać, Velika Kladuša

Migrants rarely spent more than 24 hours in the same location, except in Una-Sana Canton, which served both as transit area and a place of prolonged stay. Crossing to Croatia was difficult, therefore most of the migrants intended to spend a longer period in the area waiting for the opportunity to continue their journey to the EU countries.

Due to the 1992–95 conflict, many mine fields are still active, also in the areas where migrants were trying to cross the border. According to UNICEF, BiH is at the top of the global list in mine contamination per square mile. Even the local population is not familiar with the locations of the mine fields. This presented serious security threat for migrants. In order to reduce the threat of accidents caused by mines, RCSBiH with the support of ICRC distributed leaflets and placed posters in the centres raising migrants' awareness on the minefields.

In Bihać, the number of migrants was more than 1,500, increasing with more than 20 migrants per day. Migrants were accommodated in a former dormitory, a building without doors, windows, water and electricity. This was the decision of the local authorities as a short-term solution. Although the building was reconnected to the electricity grid and works on the sewage system were underway, it remained below humanitarian standards for shelter. In the reporting period OM was providing NFIs in the improvised shelter, while the RCSBiH branch (of Una-Sana Canton and City of Bihać) was in charge of food and additional NFIs.

Local authorities in Bihać, on the initiative of the Mayor, and in cooperation with the RCSBiH, started to provide meals to migrants. The first meals were provided on 26 April. In the reporting period, the RCSBiH was delivering warm meals three times per day for 1,000 persons (3,000 warm meals). A team from the Healthcare Centre in Bihać examined all migrants and attended to their injuries. Moving forward, in collaboration with the local authorities, an emergency vehicle visited the shelter for migrants on a daily basis and provided medical care. IOM installed 14 mobile toilets and was procuring two additional sanitary containers (with toilet and shower), washing machines and driers for a temporary accommodation facility managed by the City of Bihać in the former student dormitory in Borici. The local water company was overseeing cleaning and disinfection in the dormitory, which they did once in every three days.

In Velika Kladuša, the number of migrants was around 300. There was no official system to support migrants, including provision of shelter. Therefore, people were completely dependent on support from the local communities. A range of civil society actors and local volunteer groups regularly provided food to migrants in various locations throughout the country, including a local restaurant in Velika Kladusa that provided around 200 hot meals a day. Migrants in Velika Kladusa did not have primary health protection. Health care services were provided on a case-by-case basis by IOM.

Given the above described situation and necessitated mainly by decisions beyond the control of the Red Cross Society of Bosnia and Herzegovina (RCSBiH) two minor revisions were made to the EPoA since the beginning of implementation:

- Delay in opening one of the target locations (Usivak centre), where food provision was planned to be implemented under the EPoA. The centre was finally opened in October 2018 and the food was provided by a local organization, Pomozi.ba.
- Food was provided by the charity Emmaus in Velika Kladusa at the time of planning, however they ceased the distribution at the beginning of June. Red Cross of Una-Sana Canton stepped in and took over this activity for the month of June.
- The Swiss Embassy covered the food groceries supply from 15 July until 31 August in Salakovac.

As a result of the above changes, a total of CHF 19,700.60 was re-allocated from Usivak to Velika Kladusa, which did not change the purpose, but the location of utilizing these funds.

During September, IOM announced that it would cover the food groceries provision and all preparation costs until the end of 2018 in all locations, including the ones where RCSBiH was active. Despite this decision, there was still a major gap in service provision, such as first aid, psychosocial support, sanitation, hygiene, etc. However, due to the lack of governmental decisions on the location of a more permanent shelter for migrants, it was difficult to develop a long-, or even a mid-term plan. Therefore, RCSBiH requested a two-month no-cost extension of this DREF operation to be able to continue with implementation.

Due to the delay in opening the centre in Usivak, as well as to the announcement of IOM, CHF 42,546.33 were expected to be left over at the end of the implementation period of the original EPoA. Under the no-cost extension, these funds were utilized to procure winterized sleeping bags, which were greatly needed considering the coming winter period, as well as for some operational costs, such as renting warehouses, volunteer costs, fuel, etc. In addition, an operations

review was conducted, whose outcomes served to substantiate a longer-term plan, which was expected to be developed in the modality of an emergency appeal.

In all the above-mentioned locations, staff and volunteers encountered a large number of individuals, who experienced traumatizing events during their journey and had shown signs of depression, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and other mental health issues. According to the Ministry of Security, heavy drug addicts had been identified among migrants from northern African countries. In Velika Kladusa and Bihac, IOM agreed to procure products for disinfection, insect and rodent control to the local medical centres.

Needs analysis and scenario planning

The government had been taken unprepared by the unexpected increase in the number of migrants. Therefore, the initial actions taken by government ministries focused on addressing the immediate basic needs of the migrants including shelter, food and hygiene.

Overall, the role of RCSBiH in this operation was to provide food in three centres for a period of one month as well as hygiene items for three months in three centres, namely in Bihac, Salakovac and Usivak, which were the official sites managed by the respective ministries of the Government. The RCSBiH was running these activities in a more ad hoc manner, therefore this role was to be formalized in an agreement between the Ministry of Security of BiH and the RCSBiH, which was under preparation at the end of the reporting period. In addition, RCSBiH was in charge of reception and distribution of all humanitarian aid donated by the public, small companies as well as by UNHCR. RFL, as mandated by the Red Cross law, was also provided in all centres, supported by ICRC in the form of human resources. Other necessary equipment for RFL, such as tablets and tents, were covered from this operation.

The Ministry of Security of BiH set out a plan to open a new facility in Usivak, near Sarajevo, for migrants located in Sarajevo Canton. The facility used to be a military base with several solid buildings that could be used for this purpose. However, adaptation was necessary, therefore the initial camp was going to be set up as container settlement with the capacity of 700 beds and projected to increase up to 1,000 after the adaptation. The Federation Civil Protection Agency was going to provide the necessary tents. Although it was planned for July-August 2018, the centre was finally opened in October 2018. Despite the initial agreement between the Central Government of BiH and the RCSBiH, food was provided by a local NGO, Pomozi.ba, with whom IOM made the contract.

In Una-Sana canton, the Ministry of Security was planning to use the space that used to be food-production factory Agrokomerc. Facilities of the company consisted mainly of big halls. Significant adaptation of the facilities was necessary. The adaptation was to be carried out in cooperation of the Ministry of Security of BiH and the IOM engineering units. The government planned to shelter around 3,000 people, while the capacities of Agrokomerc were much bigger. However, instead of Agrokomerc another facility, a former factory in Bihac, called Bira, was opened in November 2018. The role of the RCSBiH was to provide food, together with basic hygiene items and hygiene promotion at the site. The necessary capacity to carry out this activity was ensured partially from the support of the Swiss Red Cross, which also covered most of the operational costs for 3 months and the food for 15 days.

At the refugee centre in Salakovac, near Mostar, the Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees of BiH provided shelter for up to 250 persons. The role of the RCSBiH in the centre was to provide food and basic hygiene items, as well as NFIs according to needs and resources.

RCSBiH was also encouraged by the Ministry of Security of BiH to initiate discussions with the Coordination Body for Migration Issues of the Council of Ministers of BiH to develop at least a mid-term plan as soon as the situation allowed. There was no follow-up afterwards on this issue due to the fact the Council of Ministers was in the technical mandate after the October 2018 State elections.

Since Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina were in a comparable position in the migration context, a mid-term evaluation of the two DREF operations (the present operation and [MDRME007](#)) was organized on 30-31 August 2018 in Budva, Montenegro, with the goal of sharing the experience and lessons learned across the operations, as well as the ideas for planning ahead. Representatives of the Hungarian Red Cross, the Red Cross of Serbia and the Red Cross of the Republic of North Macedonia joined in on the second day, when the migration trends and projections in each country were discussed, giving an overall picture on the current situation along the Balkan route. This then served as the basis of defining the priorities in the migration response in the West Balkans.

Following the above planning workshop, an Operations Review was conducted by the IFRC in October 2018, the outcomes of which was expected to substantiate a longer-term plan, which was expected to be developed in the modality of an Emergency Appeal. The report of the Operations Review was communicated with the RCSBiH and with their consent shared with the Partner National Societies and ICRC.

Target beneficiaries

Through this operation, RCSBiH aimed to address the food and hygiene needs of altogether 3,000 migrants residing in IOM-managed centres in Una-Sana canton (with a capacity up to 3,000), in government-led centres in Sarajevo area (with a capacity up to 1,000) and in Salakovac (with a capacity up to 250). Majority of the migrants came from Pakistan, Syria, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Algeria and Morocco. According to the assessment,

90 per cent of the migrants were men, and 10 per cent women. Since the beginning of 2018 until 28 November 2018 there had been 59 unaccompanied minors. The data on total number of children was not available. No specific beneficiary selection criteria were developed, as they were all in need of food and hygiene. The table below shows the breakdown of migrants by country of origin.

The sentiment of the local population towards the migrants was positive in Una-Sana Canton, where the majority of migrants were located, as well as in Salakovac. Although there were couple of incidents recorded during the reporting period, no concerns about overall security was raised.

Scenario planning

The trend of around 70–100 new entries per day was expected to continue throughout the implementation. However, the average number of arrivals per day in the reporting period was as follows: 11 in June, 29 in July, 60 in August, 52 in September, 105 in October and 76 in November. At the same time, the number of migrants managing to get to Croatia was reducing due to the tightening border control, therefore migrants in Una-Sana Canton and in the entire country, spent longer period in BiH, however with continuous attempts to cross the border.

According to the expectation of the Ministry of Security of BiH, the migrant situation in the country would last for several years.

Operation Risk Assessment

A detailed risk analysis would be conducted at a later stage of the operation. In the reporting period the below factors were seen as constituting as potential operational risk for the National Society:

- Heavy workload of NS staff / volunteers and resulting psychological stress/burnout of NS staff / volunteers;
- Unclear situation without a certain end date of the crisis;
- Long-term commitment is not easy for some volunteers for personal reasons;
- Depleted stocks and resources;
- Arising stigma against the migrants/asylum seekers and the people who try to help them.

RCSBiH reached vulnerable groups in the refugee center of Salakovac, where families with children were accommodated. A center for vulnerable groups with the capacity of 30 was run by Caritas in Sarajevo. However, the capacity of the NS to reach out to the most vulnerable groups (children and women) was partially limited due to the language barriers (less than 10 per cent of migrants were able to communicate in English) as well as the different cultural backgrounds (e.g. hampered interaction between female migrants and male volunteers). Cultural awareness and safety-security were addressed in the operation by providing relevant trainings and briefings to all RC staff and volunteers in addition to a basic communication tool in several languages.

B. OPERATIONAL STRATEGY

The overall operational objective was to provide basic emergency services (food and basic hygiene items) and restoring family links services for up to 3,000 migrants over a period of 5 months in total.

No further assessment was conducted, as the situation was stable since the beginning of July. RCSBiH was monitoring the situation using daily reports from the ground. In Bihac, RCSBiH included migrants in keeping hygiene standards up to the highest possible level in the Borici dormitory. They were also taken to a local football game, which was greatly appreciated by participants. In Mostar, a couple of migrants, who were cooks by profession, were participating in the food preparation, which also provided the opportunity to prepare food that was more suitable for migrants culturally. Following some complaints about the food provided by IOM in Bihac some items were removed from the menu. In Hotel Sedra, RCSBiH designed the menu in consultation with the migrants and invited some of them to help in the preparation.

In Salakovac and in Hotel Sedra, access to the Red Cross services was not an issue. In Bihac, a relatively small number of women and children were present, however their access to the services before others was always ensured.

Although IOM took over the coverage of the costs for food preparation from 1 October until the end of 2018 in all locations where RCSBiH was active – and has indicated the intention to continue in 2019 – there were still major gaps in service provision, including first aid, psychosocial support, sanitation, hygiene, etc. However, due to the lack of governmental decisions on the location of a more permanent shelter for migrants, it was very difficult to develop a long- or even a medium-term plan. Consequently, RCSBiH was granted a two-month no-cost extension of this DREF operation to be able to continue implementing the project.

Human resources

The local capacities of the RCSBiH implementing branches were limited. Branches mobilized additional 100 volunteers and staff to support the implementation of the operation. Within this operation, the RCSBiH was providing insurance

coverage for these volunteers. The National Society made sure that only insured volunteers were deployed in the operation.

To strengthen its capacities, the National Society also engaged additional volunteers in the field kitchens in Bihac and Mostar (Salakovac). In City of Bihać, up to 40 volunteers were involved in the response (food, PSS, FA, distribution of hygiene kits and other NFIs). Many of these volunteers had been working with the migrants or in the kitchen full time (the kitchen staff from 7am to 10pm) since 26 April 2018, the beginning of the response. As a result, they were exhausted, and their capacities were stretched to their limits. In the RC Branch of Mostar six volunteers were involved in the DREF operation. Additionally, the RCSBiH appointed a head of field operations in each location.

Furthermore, an emergency communications delegate was deployed for two weeks through the surge mechanism. The main aim of the deployment was to support the NS with positioning, working with international media in the country, producing digital content for use across NS and IFRC channels, reputation management and media training of volunteers and staff.

To ensure appropriate financial and logistics management of the operation RCSBiH covered the costs of a finance officer and a logistics officer through this DREF allocation. In addition, the National Society engaged four staff members from the structure of RCSBiH who assisted in the development of the DREF and other related plans as well as in the coordination of the implementation at the centres, where RCSBiH carried out its activities.

Logistics and supply chain

The procurement of the required products within this operation was conducted in compliance with the Procurement Procedures of the RCSBiH and IFRC, following Sphere standards for food and other NFIs procured under this operation.

Communications

RCSBiH was posting daily updates on social media (Facebook page) about the activities carried out in this operation. Progress reports related to the operation were uploaded to the organization's webpage. Situation updates were shared during weekly coordination meetings with key stakeholders engaged in the emergency operation. The weekly updates were also shared during multi-stakeholder coordination meetings.

Security

As there were cultural differences and elements of frustration among the target beneficiary groups, it was expected that some tensions could arise, which could result in violent incidents. Some incidents had already been registered in Bihac (over 19 where the police had to intervene). The RCSBiH provided security and cultural awareness briefing for the volunteers and staff involved in the operation. The Ministry of Interior Affairs of Una-Sana Canton also started to provide security personnel during lunch distributions in Bihac.

The hygiene and health related challenges increased safety concerns (higher risk of infectious diseases). To reduce the vulnerability of the volunteers and staff working in the migrant centres, the RCSBiH provided safety briefings, personal protective equipment, and sanitizers for its 100 staff and volunteers, which were covered from local resources. Protective outfits covered from the DREF contained the following items: protective clothes (RC vests, trousers, T-shirts, RC hat, sweatshirt and raincoats); protective gloves; bactericidal wet wipes; antiseptic hand gel (50 ml).

C. DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN

 <p>Livelihoods and basic needs People reached: 1,000 Male: 900 Female: 100</p>		
Indicators	Target	Actual
# of people reached with food assistance	1,000	1,000
Narrative description of achievements		
<p>1,000 beneficiaries were reached with the support of DREF operation. Each person received three meals per day (two hot meals and one dry meal) in Mostar and in Una-Sana Canton.</p> <p>Furthermore 28,761 meals were distributed in Salakovac and Velika Kladusa (14,481 in Salakovac and 14,280 in Velika Kladusa) with the support of IOM in Salakovac and by Swiss RC in Una-Sana canton.</p> <p>Usivak was not opened until October 2018, however, when it was opened food was provided by a local NGO, Pomozi.ba, with whom IOM made the contract.</p>		

Re-allocation was done to cover Velika Kladusa for food needs for the month of June. In Salakovac, the operation was implemented as planned. In Bihac, a total of over 270,000 meals were distributed, but funded from different resources (IOM and Swiss Red Cross). Part of the preparation costs, however, was covered from DREF.

No specific selection criteria were applied because all the migrants needed most basic needs, including water and food.

The groceries procured under the DREF covered one-month period, while the operational costs of the kitchen paid under the DREF covered the entire reporting period. The National Society covered groceries from another source (IOM) later.

Besides that, 242 pieces of sleeping bags were purchased and distributed.

Challenges

- Complexity of the structure both at governmental and National Society level provokes slow decision-making processes
- Limited experience on population movement response activities
- Coordination constraints within the NS structure
- Volume of the work and limited human resources (trained staff and volunteers)
- Not sufficient support from other RCSBiH branches in country. No clear mechanism in place to centralize the support.
- Delay in opening one of the target locations (Usivak centre), therefore it was not possible to develop a consistent plan
- Food was provided by the charity Emmaus in Velika Kladusa at the time of planning, however they unexpectedly ceased the distribution at the beginning of June. RCSBiH was requested to step in to cover the gap, which was not planned in advance.

Lessons learned

- RCSBiH capacity needs to be enhanced in the field of preparedness and response
- It is necessary to increase the number of volunteers and organize the training for the BiH RCSBiH staff and volunteers on response activities, as well as in the area of PMER. Number of volunteers need to be increased and trained as required.
- There is a need to establish and strengthen coordination mechanisms within the RCSBiH structure.



Water, sanitation and hygiene

People reached: 3,000

Male: 2,700

Female: 300

Indicators	Target	Actual
# of people provided with a set of essential hygiene items	3,000	3,000

Narrative description of achievements

In total 4,145 hygiene parcels were distributed to migrants located in two of the centres out of the total, where RCSBiH was active: Salakovac (near Mostar) and Bihac (Una-Sana Canton). The basic hygiene package consisted of the following items: 250 g soap, 75 ml of toothpaste, 1 toothbrush, 250 ml of hair shampoo, and 200 g of washing powder, which was distributed to all beneficiaries once a month. In addition, a package of sanitary towels was distributed to female beneficiaries on a monthly basis, as well as disposable baby diapers. Given the very low number of babies their hygiene needs were addressed upon individual requests. Additionally, a package of razors and shaving cream were distributed to male beneficiaries once in three months.

Challenges

- RCSBiH capacity in the field of preparedness and response
- Complexity of the structure both at governmental and National Society level provokes slow decision-making processes.

- Not sufficient support from other RCSBiH branches in country. No clear mechanism in place to centralize the support.
- No clear roles and responsibilities within RCSBiH.
- Volunteer management: difficulties in retention of volunteers (due to better salaries, volunteers switch to IOM)
- Lack of interest from non-affected branches of the National Society to mobilize volunteers to affected areas.

Lessons learned

- RCSBiH capacity needs to be enhanced in the field of preparedness and response
- It is necessary to increase the number of volunteers and organize the training for the BiH RCSBiH staff and volunteers on response activities, as well as in the area of PMER.
- Number of volunteers need to be increased and trained as required.
- There is the need for establishing and strengthening coordination within the RCSBiH structure.



Migration

People reached: 3,000

Male: 2,700

Female: 300

Indicators	Target	Actual
# people assisted through restoring family links activities	3,000	3,000

Narrative description of achievements

Ten tablets and one tent were procured, and two RFL trainings were conducted for 44 volunteers in September 2018, anticipating that the need for RFL services would increase. ICRC's assessment concluded that there were no needs for systematic RFL response at the time of the DREF implementation. RFL services were implemented in two different locations: Salakovac (near Mostar) and Bihac (Una-Sana Canton). Migrants were helped to establish contacts with their families through the RCSBiH. In total, 3,000 people were provided with RFL-related services. The RCSBiH RFL volunteers were engaged in distribution of posters and leaflets in migrant centre and near the transit roads. The leaflets were provided by the ICRC. In addition to the leaflets, ICRC supported the RFL activities of RCSBiH by covering the salaries of additional RCSBiH RFL staff members.

Challenges

- Complexity of the structure both at governmental and National Society level provokes slow decision-making processes
- Limited experience on population movement response activities
- Coordination constraints within the NS structure
- Volume of the work and limited human resources (trained staff and volunteers)

Lessons learned

- RCSBiH capacity needs to be enhanced in the field of preparedness and response
- It is necessary to increase the number of volunteers and organize the training for the BiH RCSBiH staff and volunteers on response activities, including PMER.
- Number of volunteers need to be increased and trained as required.
- There is the need for establishing and strengthening coordination within the RCSBiH structure.

Strengthen National Society

Indicators:	Target	Actual
# of sets of individual equipment purchased	60	77
# of volunteers insured	100	100
Narrative description of achievements		
The local capacities of the RCSBiH implementing branches were limited. Branches mobilized additional 40 volunteers and staff to support the implementation of the operation. Within this operation, the RCSBiH was providing insurance coverage for these volunteers. The National Society made sure that only insured volunteers were deployed in the operation. 77 volunteers were provided with uniforms including (T-shirts, trousers, RC vests, hats, sweatshirt with RC print)		

D. THE BUDGET

The budget for the initial three months of the operation was CHF 212,733, which was followed up by two months no-cost extension. Upon finalisation of activities, there remains a balance of CHF 9,638 which will be returned to the DREF account per standard IFRC regulations. Please refer to the final financial statement – [appended to this report](#) – for further details.

Contact information

Reference documents



Click here for:

- [Emergency Plan of Action \(EPoA\)](#)
- [DREF Operation Update No.1](#)

For further information, specifically related to this operation please contact:

In the Red Cross Society of Bosnia and Herzegovina

- **Rajko Lazić**, Secretary General, +387 33 263 925, secretary.general@rcsbh.org
- **Branko Leko**, Emergency Appeal Coordinator, +387 63 329 537, branko@rcsbh.org

In the IFRC Regional Office for Europe

- **Seija Tyrninoksa**, Head of Country Cluster, Central and South-Eastern Europe, seija.tyrninoksa@ifrc.org
- **Seval Guzelkilinc**, Disaster Management Coordinator, seval.guzelkilinc@ifrc.org
- **Henriett Koos**, Disaster and Crisis Response Snr. Officer, henriett.koos@ifrc.org

In IFRC Geneva

- **Antoine Belair**, Senior Officer, Operations Coordination - Response and Recovery, antoine.belair@ifrc.org

For IFRC Resource Mobilization and Pledges support

- **Louise Daintrey**, Head of Partnerships and Resource Development a.i., louise.daintrey@ifrc.org

For In-Kind donations and Mobilization table support:

- **Igor Dmitryuk**, Team Lead, IFRC LPSCM Budapest, igor.dmitryuk@ifrc.org

For Performance and Accountability support (planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting enquiries)

- **Dorottya Patko**, PMER Manager, dorottya.patko@ifrc.org

How we work

All IFRC assistance seeks to adhere to the **Code of Conduct** for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's) in Disaster Relief and the **Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response (Sphere)** in delivering assistance to the most vulnerable. The IFRC's vision is to inspire, **encourage, facilitate and promote at all times all forms of humanitarian activities** by National Societies, with a view to **preventing and alleviating human suffering**, and thereby contributing to the maintenance and promotion of human dignity and peace in the world.

The IFRC's work is guided by Strategy 2020 which puts forward three strategic aims:



Save lives.
protect livelihoods,
and strengthen recovery
from disaster and crises.



Enable **healthy**
and **safe** living.



Promote **social inclusion**
and a culture of
non-violence and **peace.**

DREF Operation

FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

Selected Parameters			
Reporting Timeframe	2018/06-2019/04	Operation	MDRBA010
Budget Timeframe	2018/06-2018/11	Budget	APPROVED

Prepared on 22/May/2019

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

MDRBA010 - Bosnia and Herzegovina - Population Movement

Operating Timeframe: 28 Jun 2018 to 28 Nov 2018

I. Summary

Opening Balance	0
<u>In-Kind Personnel</u>	0
The Canadian Red Cross Society	0
<u>Funds & Other Income</u>	212,733
DREF Allocations	212,733
<u>Expenditure</u>	-203,095
Closing Balance	9,638

II. Expenditure by area of focus / strategies for implementation

Description	Budget	Expenditure	Variance
AOF1 - Disaster risk reduction			0
AOF2 - Shelter			0
AOF3 - Livelihoods and basic needs	143,491		143,491
AOF4 - Health			0
AOF5 - Water, sanitation and hygiene	23,614		23,614
AOF6 - Protection, Gender & Inclusion			0
AOF7 - Migration	7,683	203,064	-195,381
Area of focus Total	174,788	203,064	-28,276
SFI1 - Strengthen National Societies	32,622		32,622
SFI2 - Effective international disaster management	5,323	31	5,292
SFI3 - Influence others as leading strategic partners			0
SFI4 - Ensure a strong IFRC			0
Strategy for implementation Total	37,945	31	37,914
Grand Total	212,733	203,095	9,638

DREF Operation

FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

Selected Parameters			
Reporting Timeframe	2018/06-2019/04	Operation	MDRBA010
Budget Timeframe	2018/06-2018/11	Budget	APPROVED

Prepared on 22/May/2019

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

MDRBA010 - Bosnia and Herzegovina - Population Movement

Operating Timeframe: 28 Jun 2018 to 28 Nov 2018

III. Expenditure by budget category & group

Description	Budget	Expenditure	Variance
Relief items, Construction, Supplies	143,751	120,088	23,663
Shelter - Relief	4,000	4,560	-560
Clothing & Textiles	6,060	16,444	-10,384
Food	107,070	77,332	29,738
Water, Sanitation & Hygiene	22,173	19,528	2,645
Other Supplies & Services	4,448	2,224	2,224
Logistics, Transport & Storage	10,398	10,294	104
Storage	3,213	4,179	-966
Distribution & Monitoring	1,785	1,785	0
Transport & Vehicles Costs	5,400	4,329	1,071
Personnel	36,264	49,097	-12,833
International Staff	6,820		6,820
National Society Staff	25,874	27,129	-1,255
Volunteers	3,570	21,968	-18,398
Workshops & Training	714	475	239
Workshops & Training	714	475	239
General Expenditure	8,622	10,745	-2,123
Travel	3,600	6,007	-2,407
Office Costs	2,824	2,747	77
Communications	1,752	1,752	0
Financial Charges		16	-16
Other General Expenses	446	223	223
Indirect Costs	12,984	12,395	588
Programme & Services Support Recover	12,984	12,395	588
Grand Total	212,733	203,095	9,638