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AGENDA

• Introductions (5 minutes)

• Gerts presentation on the final evaluation report and the previous comments (15-20 minutes)

• Discussions: final Q&A on the report or comments (25 minutes)

• Action points identified from the discussion (if any) towards finalizing the report (5 minutes)

• Wrap up (5 minutes)
Presentation of the evaluation report
Evaluation of ‘Action of Red Cross on Integration of Relocation and Resettled People (ARCI) Project’
Before we start, a massive “Thank you” to all those, who were involved in the ARCI-Project itself and who supported this evaluation!

Without the 24/7 availability of translators, social mediators (often with double responsibilities), their tireless efforts, their compassion, ingenuity and dedication, the ARCI-project would not have achieved the results, it has.
Some framework conditions

ARCI and Evaluation

- Extremely low number of interviews possible
- Expected numbers far lower than expected
- Partly unachievable, unrealistic, unverifiable project objectives
- Limited number of needs assessments
- 2 of the 3 countries were transit countries
- Resettlement had ended a few months after project start

2 of the 3 countries were transit countries

Resettlement had ended a few months after project start

Expected numbers far lower than expected

Partly unachievable, unrealistic, unverifiable project objectives

Limited number of needs assessments

2 of the 3 countries were transit countries

Resettlement had ended a few months after project start

Expected numbers far lower than expected

Partly unachievable, unrealistic, unverifiable project objectives

Limited number of needs assessments
Relevance / Appropriateness

- ARCI activities were highly relevant and appropriate, but given the scale of the migration crisis, by no means “sufficient”.

- Although project results were very positive, the project itself was ill-timed and the intervention was too short-term.

- All implementing partners identified appropriate and most suitable means of dissemination of information (printed, electronic)

- In Bulgaria and Croatia, ARCI significantly contributed to a strong positioning of the NS vis-à-vis government., fostering good relationships and identifying a highly relevant and useful supplementary role to existing government support.
The evaluation found that the most relevant ARCI activities were:

- **Needs assessments** [though of variable quality and, by circumstance, extremely low quantity]

- **Dissemination of information** [with excellent printed and electronic examples in all three implementing counties]

- **Translation services**

- **Cultural mediation / socio-cultural activities** [with amazingly ingenious activities and inclusiveness]
Relevance / Appropriateness (cont’d)

- **Language courses** [with some interesting audio-visual productions]

- **Personalised / customised services** [e.g. job fairs, job searches, schooling for children]
Effectiveness

• At the time of the evaluation virtually all deliverables had been supplied.

• With the exception of employment-related successes (30 – 85%), all other indicators of objectives 1-4 were either fully achieved (100%) or vastly exceeded initial expectations (300 – 1,000%) [For details, please, refer to pages 35-36 of the report.]

• Some existing myths could not be dispelled. This would require much more in-depth cultural work, starting already in the home countries of refugees, and a longer term project. No “quick-fix” solutions.
Effectiveness (cont’d)

• Significant achievements in terms of preparing host countries, front-line service providers, and local authorities, particularly in Bulgaria and Croatia.

• Although Red Cross NS have a long-standing experience of catering for refugees, the ARCI-Project has successfully contributed to a significant increase in organisational and operational preparedness and capacity building.
Efficiency

- Personnel changes halfway through the project created some adverse affects and time delays, requiring several adjustments of the project.

- All three NS established in the shortest of time efficient internal administrative set-up and established National Advisory Committees.

- Different organisational set-up in one NS made it difficult to verify the definite positive affects at local level.

- These NACs comprised of NS reps, reps of relevant civil society organisations, independent advisors, other organisations supporting migrants, and academia members.

- A detailed financial audit was not within the scope of this evaluation. Final financial information was not yet available at the time of the evaluation.
Movement Coordination

• IFRC ensured the link between ARCI and AVAIL projects.

• IFRC coordinated the exchange projects. While generally a useful way of learning, the usefulness of these exchange visits was generally regarded as limited. Visits could have been better organised, with clearer objectives. [In the “Recommendations” section, the evaluator suggests also real practical “hands-on” exchanges rather than “visits”.

• IFRC ensured and coordinated regular face-to-face meetings, monthly telephone conferences, the final ARCI/AVAIL conference, and other related communications, all of which were viewed very positively by project partners.

• The role and efforts of the Project Coordinator(s) was commended, while there could have been possibly some more general interaction between NSs and the IFRC RoE.
Goals and objectives - eradicate myths and strengthen solidarity across the EU.

Goals and objectives must be realistic and attainable.

Funding mechanisms - funded untimely and without needed flexibility.

Funding mechanisms need to respond with speed and flexibility to a rapidly changing migration environment.
Opportunities for operational capacity building good but not utilised by all.

Community Engagement and Accountability proved to be the right way.

Opportunities for operational capacity building and sustainability need to be maximised.

CEA should be further maximised involving existing and traditional structures among migrants if possible.
CEA needs to be balanced.

For integration to work, CEA must include host communities.

Exchange visits, though theoretically helpful and useful, were of limited use only.

Exchange visits require more focused objectives, thought, planning and hands-on experience.
Excellent ideas were developed but often in isolation.

Sharing products and ideas can prevent the “re-inventing of the wheel”

Quality and extent of assessments varied and posed a challenge.

Quality and extent of assessments should adhere to well-tested standards.
Information given to migrants was vital, well designed and well disseminated.

Information to migrants needs to be provided in a timely manner with appropriate and flexible access. ARCI outcomes important for future crises.

Long-term strategies to interact with and involve government authorities have paid off.

Strong, active and regular engagement with authorities proves the right way forward and should be strengthened.
ARCI has revealed certain organisational areas that could benefit from changes or further improvements.

Organisational areas could benefit from changes (as discussed in more detail in the report).
FINAL REMARKS/ACTION POINTS

- Actions towards finalising the project
- EC factsheet
- Amended project agreements
- Final reporting
THANK YOU!!