

IFRC Management Response to the Real time evaluation of the European migration response 2015-2016

In accordance with the standard IFRC approach to Real Time Evaluations (RTE), this document is the management response to the RTE of the European migration response 2015-2016. This document is the response to the report's recommendations as signed off by the evaluation's commissioner - the Under-Secretary General for Programme Services Division (USG PSD). The management response aims to ensure effective follow-up of the recommendations and points raised in the evaluation through outlining the appropriate actions and timeframes for implementation. The management response and final RTE report are made public on the IFRC website and are shared with key stakeholders.

The management response below outlines **a short summary response to the overall content of the RTE** and then **responds to each recommendation individually**:

- Either the recommendation is fully or partially accepted and therefore the response outlines the action to be taken and the rationale for this action, plus the timeframe and person(s) responsible / accountable;
- or the recommendation is not accepted and no action is to be taken, with the rationale provided for this position.

The template below is used to specifically respond to each of the evaluation's recommendations and the relevant people within the IFRC Secretariat management have been asked to contribute to the drafting of the management response for each relevant recommendation and to the general feedback on the RTE report. An additional virtual meeting of key representatives from the Europe region, involved National Societies and the IFRC Geneva Secretariat was held in October/November 2016 to go through the recommendations in more detail and agree a management response position. This work was subsequently shared with key IFRC Secretariat managers for further management feedback and endorsement. The combination of this feedback forms the final management response document outlined below. When a recommendation could not be fully responded to an explanation has been provided in the comment section. Follow up should be systematically monitored and reported on in a reliable, timely, and public manner. ¹

¹ **IFRC Framework for Evaluation, 2011**

Background information:

The evaluation took place during August 2016 and the report was finalised during September 2016. The RTE was carried out by Team Leader (Jessica Alexander) and Team Members (Scott Chaplowe, Tess Dryza, Raul Paredes).

Background Information: Since 2015, the European continent has experienced population movements on a scale unprecedented since World War II. During the surge, migratory routes and circumstances changed rapidly as many countries along the Balkan route closed their borders. Political agreements such as the March 2016 EU-Turkey Deal resulted in over 50,000 people being stranded in Greece. Although the surge has abated, the situation remains volatile, as ongoing hostilities in countries of origin (primarily Syria, Afghanistan, and Iraq) continue to urge people to flee. This Real Time Evaluation (RTE) of the European Migration Response 2015-2016 was commissioned by the Under Secretary General (USG) of the Programme and Operations Division at the International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC) in Geneva with the purpose to: “assess and provide lessons to inform the IFRC response to the ongoing migration crisis affecting Europe, as well as its response to migrants’ needs beyond Europe. It focuses on the challenges confronted by and opportunities available to National Societies (NS) in their response to a prolonged, cross-border crisis with multiple stakeholders and political sensitivities. Attention will be given to the degree to which NS in European transit and destination countries have been proactive in developing and pursuing approaches to their migration response, including cross-border collaboration and coordination.” The report draws findings from four country visits - Finland, Austria, Greece, Serbia - triangulated with remote interviews with German, Hungarian, Swedish and Italian NS as well as interviews at IFRC (Geneva, Brussels and Budapest).

This RTE will be used by the IFRC to improve delivery in the Migration Crisis related operations and to help plan future strategies and actions. It will also inform all National Societies contributing to the operations, to help improve Movement coordination and integration around this crisis. And finally, as with other RTEs, it will be used to inform future global emergency response operations and improve IFRC approaches and coordination in the many changing operating environments.

Summary of Management Response:

From a review of the RTE final report and the management response to the recommendations made, the main issues covered include:

- As outlined in RTE, the Migration Crisis is complex crisis and shows no sign of abating. On that basis, the IFRC recognises the priorities stressed in the RTE and the recommendations around the importance of clarifying approach and longer-term strategy for the coming years. In particular, the IFRC recognises the need to support National Societies to clarify their longer-term strategies and plans and to reinforce both the human and financial resources to achieve that support. This should not become a “forgotten crisis”.
- It is clear that the RTE has been carried out in a context of strengthening Movement coordination and cooperation and this is very much in line with the current IFRC priorities. It is important that the management response commits to that spirit.
- Several recommendations are very generic (policy making, revision of systems and procedures) and therefor fall under the responsibility of the relevant departments in the IFRC in Geneva. The Europe Regional Office(ERO) and the field office in Greece are ready to contribute and be part of this process.
- Coordination and collaboration is not only an internal issue, coordination with the ICRC and other actors such as UN (UNHCR, UNICEF) is equally important.
- The RTE has not looked into the primary causes (e.g. Syria crisis) of the migration crisis in Europe as it was outside the scope of this evaluation.
- There were some concerns expressed by management that the evaluation team did not provide more fact based data and information on the positive and sizable contributions from National Societies taking on a strong and lead role in their own contexts. It was also felt that more strategic input could have been provided by the evaluators on the future opportunities and challenges for the migration operation.

Preparedness and Planning

Extract, connect and embed existing migration related resources and expertise throughout the Movement

Recommendation 1 IFRC and NS: Operationalize migration policy and guidance documents: During rapid surge, staff at all levels are under pressure to act and need tools and guidance that are user-friendly, actionable and fit for purpose. Ensure guidance is clear and practical, identifies minimum standards, gives examples of good practice and demonstrates what added value looks like. Where these exist, centralize and connect them for easy access for NS.

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
---------------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------	----------------

<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<p>Already happening with several Plans of Action (London), Response Plan for the Mediterranean and Frameworks for Europe, available or being finalised. There is also the Smart Practices web-site (www.ifrc.org/smartpractices) now providing more than 60 good practices on how to provide assistance, protection and awareness raising at the different phases of the journey, as well as a guide on migration and health to be released soon.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More can be done to mainstream migration into preparedness, response and recovery. This will happen in 2017 through the roll-out of the MICIC guidelines in collaboration with IOM, as well as through the implementation of the Protection Agenda for disaster induced displacement of which IFRC is part. • Migration expertise in Europe region needs to be clearly mapped and channelled in the DM response. • Efforts shall be made that this expertise is efficiently mainstreamed not only in the planning, but also assessment and implementation phases of the migration operations. • The Migration Expert Roster is being developed in ERO. • Relevant modules to be incorporated into the RDRT (integrate modules in the training). • Protection measures to be part of the very first phase of any intervention. 	<p>2017</p>	<p>ERO through migration unit and disaster management unit with the support of migration unit in DCPRR department in Geneva.</p>
<p>Comments: Finnish Red Cross had existing guidance documents prior to the operation, however, they were not fully utilized by all new staff members due to several reasons (lack of internet access in the early days of the operation, lack of knowledge etc.). These barriers have been</p>				

removed as far as possible. The Movement wide policy and guidance documents could be more widely utilized domestically at the district and branch level. Currently they are mostly used at HQs.				
Recommendation 2: IFRC: Consider retaining migration related focal points and key staff by creating longer term positions in Geneva, Brussels and Budapest, to ensure continuity of migration programing and related institutional knowledge.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	Migration is a long term phenomenon which needs a long term flexible approach by appointing experts in Geneva, Budapest and Brussels, related to the specific tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to work as per European Migration Plan for ERO Resource Mobilisation Department to continue working towards achieving funding for key positions and key activities to address longer term assistance and ensure continuity at least until end of 2017. 	Until April 2017	ERO
Comments:				
Recommendation 3: IFRC: Identify and engage the internal and external migration capabilities required for a migration response. Ensure expertise is consistently available to offer input at the outset and throughout appeal and planning processes, followed by collaborative peer review for all relevant stakeholders in a timely and meaningful manner.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	Expertise and its development is a key point to address the right assistance to people in movement and to the NS across the route and in the country of destination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ERO is now putting in place a roster of Migration Experts who could be deployed when needed. They encompass a variety of skills going from legal knowledge, protection expertise, RFL, advocacy, etc. 	Quarter 1	ERO with the support of migration unit in DCPRR

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are also currently efforts to translate available knowledge into learning. A MOOC for Migration, done in collaboration with Queen Rania Foundation and EDRAAK will be developed in 2017 as well as a MOOC on Protection of children on the move, done in collaboration with ISS – International Social Services 		
<p>Comments: a roster of expert is a way to improve capacity building and to share best practice and at the same time ensure flexibility in the movement action</p>				
<p>Assess and plan for migration with a long term, flexible approach</p>				
<p>Recommendation 4: IFRC and NS: Approach migration with a long term perspective. Migration is a protracted situation involving different flows of migrants who will need different types of assistance at different times. At the appropriate time in a migration operation – for example when conditions change resulting in people being ‘stuck’ or ‘stranded’, or when a country is considered a final destination – migration programming should be approached with a long term perspective. When deemed contextually appropriate, but as early as possible, build in areas of social integration and inclusion, protection, CEA, and longer term health care in planning and operations. The Finnish RC’s approach to viewing migrants as people who will potentially stay in Finland for the long term is a proactive approach.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<p>The IFRC ERO and Geneva Management welcomes this recommendation and confirms its high importance and priority for the IFRC.</p> <p>We also understand that the recommendation aims primarily at National Societies but will increase our efforts to ensure support for early integration of migrants with all the National Societies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EU Social Integration Working Group will provide recommendations to affected NS and IFRC on future programming in social integration in Greece. Greece Appeal Revised to include longer term programming 	2017	ERO and IFRC Geneva

	Enabling NS to develop programs in these areas will be a benefit even for an evidence based advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Regional strategy is providing for action related to long term approach to enable the NS to have integration and social inclusion related programs 		
<p>Comments: in the specific case of Greece the upcoming appeal revision will include supporting HRC in longer term programing with migrants. So far it was not possible to include a longer term perspective. Initially (before March 2016) migrants were just on the move; and later (after April 2016) the situation remained very volatile regarding the Government plans and the future prospects of the migrants. The Finnish Red Cross will increase efforts to ensure support for early integration of asylum seekers and focus on the provision of continuous Red Cross support for the asylum seekers from (1) the day of arrival into Finland, (2) during the stay at the Reception Centre/s while their asylum application is being processed to (3) the eventual move to a municipality which will grant them a municipality place and (4) for as long as they wish to be involved in the Red Cross activities, possibly (5) becoming a volunteer themselves.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 5: IFRC and NS: Collectively build and regularly revisit regional contingency plans for the potentially changing scenarios. A number of future scenarios should be considered that can affect the migration response – e.g. border changes, continued instability in Turkey leading to the dissolution of the EU-Turkey deal, surge of migrants in Italy, violence across Europe leading to greater xenophobia, and Brexit. Continue to regularly update scenario plans and build contingencies around them, ensuring necessary resources, SoPs, MOUs are in place to respond to the range of possible scenarios.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	The approach is required for a regional Contingency plan as first step require the elaboration of CP at country level (with RC and actors involved) and IFRC at regional level should elaborate its CP based on scenarios and response capacity of NSs involved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting the revision of the Country Contingency Plan Build a regional contingency plan based in the national Contingency plan 	Q1 2017	DCPRR and migration unit in ERO
<p>Comments:</p>				
<p>Recommendation 6: IFRC: Revisit the appropriateness of the short term ERU model for a protracted situation, and consider deploying people for longer periods to avoid high turnover leading to programs being stalled and institutional memory being lost</p>				

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected	We should not consider deploying people for periods longer than 4 months because it is against the ERU SOPs (see annex VIII regarding deployment offers and ToR for ERU). After this period the functions of the ERU could be replaced by an agreed IFRC field structure to support any ongoing assistance to the National Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present the recommendation n.º6 to the next global surge working group for details discussion and possible modification of ERU SOPs. 	2017, once the GSWG date will be decided.	DCPRR
Comments: The revision of the SOP for ERU will be discussed in the next GSWG in 2017				
<u>Assistance and Relief</u>				
<i>Ensure delivered goods and services are relevant to migrant needs</i>				
Recommendation 7: NS: Deliver material items on the basis of what and how much is needed, as opposed to what is available (i.e. overstock in a warehouse). Pre-negotiate with donors to allow for migrants on the move to take what is needed as opposed to obliging strict beneficiary counts that require each person to be given a relief item that they do not need.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	Material assistance is already needs-based. The recommendation is not as relevant for destination country NS as for transit country NS			
Comments: As mentioned during the revision of the draft from several operational staff the decision of which items will be distributed are based on need assessment. We might have found situations where the needs changes, but in general (and talking about 26 NSs involved in this response) it seems not relevant for the overall response				
Recommendation 8: NS: Adjust services to be culturally appropriate and relevant to the preferences and situation of migrants. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. For food and NFIs: Be mindful of food and beverage preferences, religious considerations, WASH practices. (The Hellenic RC's use of the Syrian food pipeline is a good example where food delivery was adjusted to meet the preferences of migrants). For migrants in transit, consider food sources that are portable, high energy and do not require any or much preparation time; for stationary 				

migrants, consider communal kitchens and distribution of permanent water bottles/thermoses for water storage and use, rather than bottled drinking water.

- ii. **For health:** Continue to provide first aid for migrants in transit, coupled with longer-term health and PSS services which address the needs of stationary migrants.

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> (i) Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> (ii) Accepted	<p>(i) Food preferences and other culturally sensitive matters have been considered at the Reception Centres to ensure the services are acceptable and meet the needs of the asylum seekers. Feedback mechanisms have been created and increased focus will be placed on the development of feedback mechanisms in the future.</p> <p>(ii) According Finnish Red Cross has proposed to provide first aid services in any future Registration Centre that may be established in Finland</p>	See comments below.		
<p>Comments: The answer to the recommendation 8.i is another example where having 26 NSs caring of cultural matters have been considered so the report could have been more specific.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 9: NS and IFRC: Promote the use of cash as a relief modality for migration. Address the organizational and procedural obstacles that CTP presents at the NS level so that cash can be a fast and easily available option for migrants. Ensure that cash programs include a component for the host community, as has been planned by the Hellenic RC.</p>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<p>Organisational and procedural obstacles need to be addressed both at NS and IFRC levels so that cash can be a rapid response option.</p> <p>Cash programs need to be designed with the host community in mind whether it is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue and expand CTP preparedness activity for NS • Integrate from the beginning an integrated approach to relief and cash so that they are not 	Ongoing	Cash Team in country Cash Team in DCPRR

	<p>to include them as part of the response (when appropriate) or aligning with local regulations and policy (e.g. minimum wage) to garner acceptance and minimize tension</p>	<p>designed and implemented in silo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue roll-out and promotion of the Cash in Emergencies toolkit to encourage minimum standards and quality programming 		
<p>Comments: Organisational and procedural obstacles to implementing CTP does not only lie at the NS level, but also at the IFRC level. The current systems do not allow for a rapid and flexible response with cash as it was built based on the traditional approach of distributing in-kind goods. In Finland cash allowance is already used as part of normal practice (legal obligation) for asylum seekers. The inclusion of component for the host community is not relevant as part of the particular cash programme. The FRC provides many activities that benefit the host community as well.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 10: NS and IFRC: Provide greater investment in two-way communication with migrants and respond to their feedback and complaints</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. NS: Expand and support innovative approaches for two-way communication with migrants. This includes the use of mobile applications and other forms of social media, safe centers, in-person interviews and group meetings, and PSS services. Tap into rather than duplicate communication mechanisms that already exist. For example, consider the Finnish RC’s potential partnership with Ground Truth to administer, short, user-friendly feedback surveys at different stages of the migratory route to better understand the needs and issues facing migrants, as well as improve cross border information and collaborative planning among service providers. ii. NS: Ensure that a complaints mechanism exists at migrant camps and registration centers and respond to grievance, including quality of service, and especially the conduct and behavior of service providers, and any incident of misconduct. Feedback and complaints mechanisms should be tailored in different formats and outlets so that they are culturally and linguistically appropriate. iii. IFRC and NS: Once lessons from the Virtual Volunteer pilot have been gathered, consider expanding it as a local, regional and global approach to building greater information sharing and continuity of experience for people planning a journey and those on the move. 				

iv. IFRC: Invest in and leverage the diverse language skills within the Movement to provide translation services for migrants. Identify from where translation surge can be sourced and where necessary negotiate a visa waiver clause for specialized services to expedite translation services.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> (i) Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> (ii) Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> (iii) Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> (iv) Accepted	<p>i. Ground Truth is already on going with ITRC and potentially with ARC.</p> <p>ii. Complaints mechanisms are being used, however, the Finnish RC intends to ensure a coherent approach to the issue, as part of a wider feedback development of feedback mechanisms. As IFRC secretariat will ensure that in all the future operations and in the revision of the current EA a similar approach as Finnish Red Cross will be share and disseminated with the other National Societies.</p> <p>iii. This is happening already with several examples in Greece and Italy for instance with Walkie Talkie project. But also and mainly through the Virtual Volunteer an online platform which will expand to many countries in 2017 and is currently available for Greece, Sweden and Italy soon. For the time being the two-way functionality is not there</p>	See decision rationale and comments below.	2017	ERO

	<p>yet but will be included in future developments see www.virtualvolunteer.org A position to work on the VV is secured for the next 12 months. This is project done in collaboration with IBM.</p> <p>iv. This already happening through an MoU with Translation without Borders</p>			
<p>Comments: (i) For example the involvement in the Ground Truth pilot phase was unfortunately not possible for the Finnish RC at this stage. The FRC is developing its PMER system for the Reception Centres, incl. accountability mechanisms. All this points mentioned in the previous sentence showing the commitment of our members to provide as much is possible Community Engagement and Accountability.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 11: IFRC: Revise operational support systems to be more timely and efficient for protracted emergency operations such as the European Population Movement response. Support services, including logistics, procurement, finance, legal, human resources and administration, play a critical role along the supply chain for human and material resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Revise the IFRC Procurement Manual with attention to length and format so that it is more user-friendly, and better clarifies protocol (SoP) exceptions for emergency operations to facilitate more timely procurement, (with a timeline delineating when an operation and resultant procurement SoPs transition from emergency to recovery). ii. Embed a module in all ERU trainings on support services. ERUs understanding and appreciation of basic support services procedures will support more timely and consistent practice, helping to diffuse delays due to non-compliance with SoPs. Embedded training modules need not be excessive in length and content, but clarify key messages and point to where ERU members can find additional resource and guidance. 				
<p>Management Response</p>	<p>Decision Rationale</p>	<p>Action/s to be taken</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>Responsibility</p>

<p><input type="checkbox"/> (i)Partially Accepted</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> (ii) partially rejected</p>	<p>(i) The existing procurement manual explicitly elaborates the ‘exceptions for calling bids and proposals’ as per the extract embedded in here.</p> <p>The revised procurement manual that is at present undergoing an endorsement process by IFRC Senior Management will elaborate further the exceptional provisions and how they shall apply in exceptional situations.</p> <p></p> <p>Exceptions.docx</p> <p>(ii) ERU modules are standardized and we cannot change them so easily. However, we are conscious that we need more support services during emergencies and we have evidence from the RTE and end of mission reports from FACT/ER/ HeOPs that this is an issue that has to be resolved.</p>	<p>(i)</p> <p>1) Procurement policy that highlight the main principle of procurement is under review by Senior Management. The revised procurement manual has been shared with the Senior Management and the key stakeholders (Finance, Audit; legal) for the agreement and endorsement.</p> <p>2)Translate the Procurement in to other IFRC official languages.</p> <p>3)Develop a user-friendly short leaflet in all IFRC official languages with the key requirements for operations to be aware off and disseminate further as required.</p> <p>4)Contract a consultancy to develop a mandatory procurement course for the operations stakeholders to complete.</p> <p>(ii) Present the recommendation to the global surge working group. The surge desk is working with the GSWG to improve competencies for surge regarding the IFRC system and procedures to manage</p>	<p>Q1 2017</p> <p>Q3 2017</p> <p>Q3 2017</p> <p>Q4 2017</p> <p>2017, once the GSWG date will be decided.</p> <p>March 2017: pilot a training on IFRC system and procedures funded by</p>	<p>(i) Director of Logistics Procurement Unit manager</p> <p>(ii) Surge desk in DCPRR</p>
---	---	--	--	---

		operations and a training module is being proposed by the Canadian Red Cross.	Canadian Red Cross	
<p>Comments: (i). For timely delivery of required supplies and services, it is important a close operation coordination with the procurement right from the planning phase, hence the procurement can be done more efficiently. We have as part of our exceptions the possibility to authorize emergency procurement on the basis that the emergency is fully elaborated and sound justification provided. Also please note that no one from Global Logistic service has been interview during the Real Time Evaluation focus in migration and the recommendation is based on partial view of the situation.</p>				
<p>Protection</p>				
<p><i>In line with the European Migration Framework, demonstrate the commitment to protection with greater urgency and dedicated resources, ensuring that it is a central measure of the success of RCRC's efforts and is embedded in migration operations from the outset.</i></p>				
<p>Recommendation 12: IFRC and NS: Clarify what the IFRC can offer in terms of protection and embed mechanisms which ensure basic protection measures at all points of contact with migrants in accordance with minimum protection standards, Core Humanitarian Standards and Sphere, and the Minimum standard commitments to gender and diversity in emergency programming. For example, consider basic prevention mechanisms, such as the distribution of whistles for women and girls, instituting a community watch service, ensuring adequate lighting around WASH facilities, functioning locks on toilets, safe women and children's wash areas, and separate women and families from single men.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<p>There is an immediate and on-going need to ensure that existing standards are mainstreamed and implemented in all operations and programming in the region. Tailored measures should be developed for specific contexts and a clarification of IFRC approach and added value in protection to promote a unified understanding and approach to activities should be facilitated and promoted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IFRC has appointed a Protection Delegate within the Migration Surge Team in ERO to strengthen the regional focus on and response to protection needs by supporting the NS with technical expertise and coordination and the IFRC, strategically Regional Protection Workshop is organized to 	<p>From Q2 2016 -On going</p> <p>Q4 2016/Q1 2017</p>	<p>ERO</p> <p>Country Office/BRC/ERO</p>

		<p>identify NS protection focal points, National Societies needs for support, clarify protection activities and develop plan of action for a unified approach to protection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SoP Template for Protection minimum response is developed, piloted and launched in the region and a training of trainers in Protection mainstreaming, based on existing standards as mentioned above, is developed and conducted • IFRC is appointing a Protection consultant in Greece to better support implementation of protection measures • Support is provided regularly for NSs in developing and integrating protection activities and cross-cutting measures in: trainings, assessments, planning, programming and appeals 	<p>Q4 2016</p> <p>Q1 2017</p> <p>Q42016</p> <p>On going</p>	
<p>Comments: Finnish Red Cross welcomed the possible IFRC support in putting minimum protection standards into action at national level, as relevant to the national context. Current protection action has focused on the Reception Centres and services provided while asylum seekers are waiting asylum decisions. Future needs are expected to emergence from within people who receive negative decision, but nevertheless decide to stay in Finland.</p>				

Recommendation 13: IFRC: Ensure that migration response plans identify protection outputs and outcomes, with key performance indicators Operational planning instruments around protection should include clear actions that prioritize the physical and emotional safety and wellbeing of migrants.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	The Regional Migration Plans for 2017 aim to identify the Protection needs and support the NS in this key approach/activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultations between DM, Protection adviser and National Societies are conducted in planning process and technical tools and support is provided to ensure protection outputs and outcomes are included 	Ongoing	ERO and NS
Comments:				
Recommendation 14: IFRC: Provide greater technical capacity and support to NS for protection services, “demystifying” protection and offering implementable actions that can be undertaken by NS. This includes embedding personal safety and protection material (for all levels: volunteers, staff and leadership) in NS training. Provide training on RFL practices for all staff and volunteers who are in contact with migrants to ensure families are not separated in transit.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Accepted	<p>IFRC and migration team is ow part of the RFL group led by ICRC as an example of mainstreaming these practices into our programming</p> <p>This recommendation is addressed in Recommendation 10, 11 and 13. The necessity of “demystification” as well as development and provision of more tools and examples of feasible activities, naturally interlinks with the process of clarification and the other action points</p>	See decision rational and comments below.		

	<p>provided. However; increasing technical capacity depends on resources in terms of both financial and human resources, and IFRC has its limitations in this regard.</p> <p>“Personal safety and protection material (for all levels...)” is considered a natural part of protection and thus included in all actions described. It is however, not considered to be sufficiently incorporated in current procedures, trainings or planning and should be better mainstreamed and implemented, as protection perspectives in general should.</p>			
<p>Comments: Recommendation to provide technical support and trainings in RFL should be directed at ICRC as this is within their mandate and not the IFRC.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 15: NS with support of IFRC: Document and create an evidence base of protection-related incidents and issues to advocate for and respond to. Capitalize on any existing mechanism internal to or external to the Movement to document and report on incidents/issues; see Recommendation 3c.ii on complaints mechanisms. As noted by the Federation’s Protection, Gender and Inclusion: Mapping Report 4 of National Societies 2016, “Until the Movement has a consistent and reliable form of data collection that can capture this information, our credibility in advocating to reduce these violations, whether by authorities or as a result of xenophobia in the community, and increase safety for migrants will be limited.”</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Accepted	<p>This is considered to be a complex issue as it relates to many aspects of operations and humanitarian considerations such as confidentiality, qualitative reporting, the principle of “do no harm”, maintaining access to individuals trusted space, resources, expertise and capacity within NS and security issues etc. The IFRC regional office for Europe does recognize</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methods for collecting an evidence base, such as effective incident-reporting will be assessed and tested (through SoP Template described above and other methods) and in coordination with regional IM 	<p>Q4 2016 – ongoing</p>	<p>See decision rationale</p>

	its responsibility in this regard, but will be limited in terms of human resources and conditioned by collaboration and implementation by NS	delegates as well as NS focal points for Protection		
Comments:				
<p>Recommendation 16: NS: Working with partners, ensure accurate messaging and awareness raising is done for migrants as well as RCRC personnel who work with them. This includes using messaging in many formats (audio announcements, visual displays (especially while waiting in lines), on-line messaging, and in-person communication to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Ensure migrants are informed of their rights and options at all points along the migration pathway. Ensure too that staff and volunteers who are in contact with migrants are aware of these rights and options and can properly communicate these to migrants. ii. Raise awareness amongst migrants, staff, volunteers and authorities about family separation risks and good practices to keep families together. 				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> (i) Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> (ii) Accepted	<p>(i) National Societies has produced a variety of communication material and shared existing relevant materials, and intends to continue production in different languages.</p> <p>(ii) All National Societies has focused on family reunification and restoring family links by organizing training, sharing materials and communicating regularly to different branch and in the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Regional Plan is increasing the assistance to migrants from the protection prospective and using the CEA tools to provide for a better way of communication to people on the move. 	Ongoing	ERO and NS

	different place where migrants are hosted			
Comments:				
Recommendation 17: NS: Ensure background checks are conducted on RCRC staff and volunteers working directly with migrants, especially women and children. Deliver minimum protection related training for staff and volunteers who have direct interaction with migrants in any context.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Accepted	In our experience, each NS has its own procedures and they are usually a product information/data system that is or is not available from the authorities for checks'.	Training and workshops related to the protection and volunteering management is part of ERO plan for 2017.	Throughout 2017	ERO
Comments: According to Finnish Red Cross guidelines, the background check must be done for all staff and volunteers who are working with children.				
Recommendation 18: Ensure updated security/risk assessments are done in all migration camps/centres for staff and volunteers, and develop comprehensive security plans that are regularly monitored, revised and communicated to staff. Security plans should include evacuation procedures with multiple entry and exit points, and basic safety protocols for staff and volunteers which are incorporated into training.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Accepted	As security differs from safety, so does the expertise required to ensure mitigation and response. This expertise should be embedded in each NS and considered in all operations, Security and DM units share a responsibility, with NS, in ensuring this and in further developing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that an integrated approach between security and operations will be in all the response • Monitoring the situation via NSs • Updating security plan every 6 months 	ongoing	ERO security focal point Country office in Greece

	and strengthening the security of staff and volunteers			
Comments: In the case of Greece this has already been done since April 2016.				
<u>Social Integration and Inclusion</u>				
<i>Facilitate practical support for transitioning from a short term emergency response to a longer term integration approach including co design practices with the host community.</i>				
Recommendation 19: IFRC and NS: Taking into consideration the contextual realities of each country, and that migrants may remain in-country due to a variety of factors, embed and operationalize social cohesion and integration activities as early as possible. This includes advocating with government so that asylum seekers are not situated in isolated centres where they are separated from the host community; and facilitating access as early as possible to integration related activities (such as language courses, public service work with non-profit and public organizations, cross cultural social connections, volunteering, and employment readiness).				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<p>The need to prioritize social inclusion/integration is recognized – many European NSs have programmes in place. ERO plans to build on these, share best practice and provide support to NSs to develop and refine activities. Training/skill sharing will be the backbone of ERO approach.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd Advocacy Workshop on Migration with European NSs to support them in advocating with their respective governments and other stakeholders • Supporting the NSs in Europe in embedding and operationalizing social cohesion and integration activities through knowledge sharing, peer to peer support and disseminating relevant guidance, procedures, best practices 	<p>November 2016</p> <p>On going</p> <p>Q4 2016</p>	<p>ERO</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showcase the existing projects and approaches through internal and external communication • ERO Representation on Global Social Inclusion Working Group of the IFRC • IFRC is now represented on Greece cross-sector advocacy working group – working on messaging, policy briefings for Greek government with regard to protection, inclusion and humanitarian standards. • IFRC has appointed a humanitarian adviser in Greece to support Hellenic Red Cross and ERO in advocacy work with the government. 	<p>From Q4 2016</p> <p>From July 2016</p>	
<p>Comments: This is considered very important and early integration activities should start immediately. Many of the Reception Centres were located in remote rural areas with limited possibilities for integration related activities. Red Cross volunteers have made special efforts in those locations to facilitate access to integration activities.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 20: IFRC and NS: Undertake a plan of action to transition from short-term relief distributions to longer assistance modalities that facilitate social integration and inclusion. Where migrants are stranded, recognize that they will be so for a prolonged period of time, and adjust services accordingly. Undertake a gap and capacities analysis of the related needs and aspirations of asylum seekers to build on migrants’ individual skills and resources and empower them to become active members of society. Combine this analysis with insights on the domestic absorptive capacity, NS capacity, political climate, level of community awareness and acceptance. .</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility

<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Accepted	Essentially our NSs are providing to two types of cohesion activities – in camps and within camp communities and outside of official camps and within host communities. Thus, distinct approaches to these different sets of circumstances must be taken.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan of action to transition from short-term relief distributions to longer term assistance is the core of the regional migration response for 2017 	2017	ERO
<p>Comments: In Greece the upcoming appeal revision will include supporting HRC in longer term programming with migrants. So far it was not possible to include a longer term perspective. Initially (before March 2016) migrants were just on the move; and later (after April 2016) the situation remained very volatile regarding the Government plans and the future prospects of the migrants.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 21: IFRC and NS: Outline ways to capitalize on external partnerships to combat xenophobia and promote solidarity using media outlets (including social media), and activating the volunteer network to ‘myth bust’ and further support acceptance of migrants.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	The increasing xenophobia is a concern that needs to be faced by all NS Helping them in this important communication area is a key activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ERO to work with European Red Cross Red Crescent European Youth Network (RCRC EYN) on identifying opportunities for closer collaboration in relation to migration and anti-xenophobia. Collaborate with the European Youth Forum on anti-xenophobia initiatives through the RCRC EYN. • Sharing best practices and building capacities in Youth Engagement in NSs 	2016-2018 (see EYCC work plan to be finalized October 2016) From Q4 2016	ERO and IFRC Geneva (PSK and DCPRR)

		<p>Migration Activities is a main priority of the European Youth Coordination Committee (EYCC) for 2016-2018. ERO delivers secretariat support for roll-out of EYCC work plan for 2016-2018 and ensures alignment with Comms and Migration-planning for 2017 onwards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ERO to work with European Red Cross Youth Network on identifying opportunities for closer collaboration in relation to migration and anti-xenophobia. • ERO to explore partnerships with media outlets – with specific reference to digital and online media • Promote the role of asylum seekers and refugees with RCRC movement e.g. as volunteers etc. externally • ERO to explore partnerships with think tanks/research facilities/higher education institutes 	Ongoing	
--	--	--	---------	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify capacity building/skill sharing opportunities for NSs with specific focus on migration messaging and use of social media. Roll-out of second phase of Protect Humanity, Stop Indifference campaign 		
Comments:				
Recommendation 22: IFRC and NS: Capitalize on the humanitarian sector's current recognized need for new approaches to protracted crises and to the global refugee situation (e.g. initiatives that emerged from the World Humanitarian Summit) for more flexible funding models that blend emergency and development financing to promotes resilience and social cohesion.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
Disagree	We cannot 'capitalize' on a recognized gap, i.e. on the recognized need for new approaches. So we can't commit to this recommendation.	-		
Comments:				
Recommendation 23: NS: Ensure regular NS activities for local population are not diverted by migration activities. Maintain a balance so that local people in need are also served. For example, cash transfer programs should be careful not to neglect local poverty and need, and it may be prudent to allocate a percentage of cash transfers to the local community population				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	This is a broad recommendation which has been taken on board.			
Comments:				
<u>Advocacy</u>				

Engage in targeted advocacy to address the critical and evolving migration issues in Europe

Recommendations 24: IFRC and NS: Identify and communicate positions on priority domestic and regional advocacy issues, for consistent and realistic advocacy campaigns. For example, consider issues such as asylum process, shelter and settlement conditions, protection, non-refoulement, trafficking, family reunion, resettlement quotas, complex case support for UAMs, work rights for asylum seekers, relocation scheme, safe access to the EU and to effective asylum procedures and greater protection for people living in camps and centres.

Related, prioritize quality versus quantity of messages relative to existing principles, policies and standards at both the organizational level (e.g. RCRC Code of Conduct) and international level (e.g. Core Humanitarian Standards), and to issues already addressed by partner organizations

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	ERO fully supports this recommendation as has already prioritized it through its current approach and next year's plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to plan for pan European anti - xenophobia campaign, the ERO has recently analysed the NS's needs in terms of combating xenophobia, stigma and fostering social inclusion given the current political climate in Europe and possible IFRC support. • Based on the preliminary review and internal discussions it seems feasible for the IFRC to be able to support NS's in these issues in 2017. The extent and type of the support (e.g. messaging, campaign) will need to be further determined during the upcoming planning phase as existing plans and ideas are further reviewed. 	Ongoing	ERO Migration/Communication team

Comments:				
Recommendation 25: IFRC and NS: Invest in evidence based advocacy, ensuring that information and accounts from the field are documented, collated and reported. This includes the number and type of safety and protection threats and incidents as well as feedback and complaints from migrants. (As per recommendation 3c.ii).				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	Evidence-based advocacy is vital but we have limitations in terms of funding, resources and expertise within the IFRC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ERO to increase use and analysis of secondary data • Work towards identifying trends and changes within data gathered from NSs and aggregated by ERO IM team. • Work towards a standardisation of indicators, with particular focus on xenophobia and protection issues. • Working with NSs, stakeholders, partners to develop evidence bases on specific issues within areas of focus is developed – working with research experts/consultants and supporting NSs to conduct their own research through surveys, questionnaires etc. 	2017 Ongoing Ongoing Ongoing	ERO

<p>Comments: This was already part of the recommendations made by the High Level Mission (5th of August) and since then IFRC has been actively engaged in advocacy efforts in Greece. A Roving Humanitarian Advisor has been deployed in Greece to increase understanding of key humanitarian and protection issues amongst Red Cross staff and volunteers and to inform programmatic decision-making and advocacy efforts.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 26: IFRC: Engage RCRC actors and partners in the IFRC Humanitarian Diplomacy Policy to specify roles, responsibilities and actions for migration advocacy. This entails careful relationship management, and regular monitoring and adjusting planned actions according to regional and national political interests and policies, and the NS auxiliary role</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Agreed	<p>The ERO is in full agreement with this recommendation as humanitarian diplomacy is crucial persuading decision makers and opinion leaders to act, at all times, in the interests of vulnerable people, and with full respect for fundamental humanitarian principles.</p>	<p>External relationship advisor position (previous humanitarian diplomacy position) with focus on advocacy and migration will be advertised soon at the ERO</p>	<p>On going</p>	<p>ERO</p>
<p>Comments:</p>				
<p>Recommendation 27: IFRC: Consider organizing a dedicated donor conference to advocate for the need for more flexible in reporting requirements as well as multi-year funding streams that are in line with the realities of a migration response. Distribution modalities should be flexible and appropriate for needs, not to the reporting requirements set by donors who want to know numbers of people reached.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<p>The report makes no concrete reference to the type of donors – e.g. bilateral to National Societies or multilateral through the IFRC - that imposed strict reporting requirements, nor does it provide any evidence to demonstrate situations when donors were approached to change reporting requirements hindering and limiting</p>	<p>-</p>		

	<p>operational effectiveness and consequently turned the requests down. At no point had this issue been raised with PRD and consequently no discussions with donors about reporting requirements took place. Without having specific information and examples it is not possible to develop a response action for this recommendation. The experience of the ERO Partnership Team was rather different as far as donor reporting is concerned. No donor requested specifically information on the numbers of people to be assisted. An example relates to one of our largest donors expressing a positive surprise that the IFRC was able to report on the numbers of people as other organisations could only report on numbers of distributed items. This was the key feature in the operations and well known to all donors</p>			
<p>Comments: While the ERO Partnerships Team was interviewed and was available for further interviews, the RTE team has not discussed these issues with the Partnerships Team and therefore has not triangulated this information before reflecting it in the report. While this finding is contrary to our experiences as the donor reporting has not affected operational freedoms to design relevant response actions, the challenge existed in the sheer number of reports required by donors. Seven Emergency Appeals – without Turkey International Appeal – received over 300 pledges that required submission of over 200 reports. This is definitely the issue that requires further analysis and needs to be addressed with donors, operations and PMER teams.</p>				
<p>Volunteer Engagement</p>				
<p><i>Ensure that volunteer engagement is carefully planned and managed</i></p>				
<p>Recommendation 28 NS: Develop Volunteer Management Plans (VMPs) tailored to today’s volunteer profile that can be rolled-out rapidly to respond to the unpredictable frequency and magnitude of migrant flows. This can include recruitment, capacity building and induction tools and</p>				

resources that make use of social media, e-learning, online communities of practice, peer-learning/sharing, and a buddy-system where experienced volunteers are teamed up with new and less experienced volunteers				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	The volunteer management system has been developed as a result of lessons learnt and continues to be developed to better engage ad-hoc volunteers.	See decision rationale.		
Comments:				
Recommendation 29 NS: During operations, ensure a volunteer focal point and set of messages exist, for spontaneous volunteers especially, that clearly identifies and communicates roles and responsibilities (including distinguishing what are staff vs. volunteer roles), to avoid conflicting messages and directives.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	Specific guidance exists.	See decision rationale.		
Comments:				
Recommendation 30 NS: Listen to, support and recognize volunteers for their empowerment, well-being and retention. Solicit their opinions about their work, conditions, and physical as well as emotional needs. This includes provision of psychosocial services to volunteers when appropriate. Use individual medals, certificates and rewards such as embolic items (RCRC jacket) to recognize, celebrate and encourage volunteers for their time and commitment.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	This belongs to the FRC quality standards for the reception of asylum seekers. The need for psychosocial services to support volunteers has increased and the FRC will be developing new ways to respond to that need.	See decision rationale.		

Comments:				
Recommendation 31 NS: When possible, utilize migrants as volunteers, for example in supporting environmental sanitation in camps/centres, awareness raising and education within communities, translation services. This can be empowering and reinforce social cohesion, while providing valuable services to the migration response.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	This has already been done and will be continued	Already done.		
Comments:				
Recommendation 32 NS: Ensure protection measures are taken with regards to volunteer recruitment and training.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	Recommendation taken on board.	See decision rationale.		
Comments:				
<u>Coordination and Collaboration</u>				
<i>Identify and engage the internal and external migration capabilities required for a migration response.</i>				
Recommendation 33 IFRC: Ensure key decision makers including Head of Migration (Budapest), Head of Unit – Migration (Brussels), DM Coordinator (Budapest), Migration Lead (Geneva), Team Leader Information Management and Surge Resourcing (Geneva) are brought together for planning.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	The ERO is in full agreement with this since the well-coordinated approach is crucial for the most effective and efficient response	Regular consultations are in place with all relevant actors	Ongoing	All parties involved (ERO, IFRC Geneva)

Comments:				
Recommendation 34 IFRC: Identify migration-related competencies within the Movement and finalize the surge support roster with the relevant technical expertise to respond to the fluid and changing needs of a migration response				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to be able to share and channel migration expertise to the operations, there is a need to better understand and increase Movement expertise on migration and identify if the relevant experts could be available for assessment, planning and implementation purposes in migration operations in the future. The Migration Expert Roster would also facilitate and strengthen peer-to-peer support possibilities between National Societies in the region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalise Migration Expert Roster and share within European RC migration Networks to facilitate peer-to-peer exchange possibilities Encourage Migration Experts to strengthen dialogue with DM departments, especially when IFRC surge requests and training possibilities are shared Coordinate with IFRC ERO DM when alert is shared on migration surge requests Develop migration-specific curricula for surge trainings and coordinate the facilitation with Migration Experts from the Roster 	2017	ERO
Comments:				

Recommendation 35 NS with support of IFRC: Continue to foster and strengthen peer NS relationships built during this response. Facilitate NS exchanges, forums (e.g. Vienna Meeting for Operations Managers) and other peer-learning events for greater future collaboration.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	This approach is very much incorporated into the ERO's approach and work with the NSs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned workshop will be organized with the NSs involved in the migration response • Health and PSP related workshop with numerous NSs focusing on migration response have been held throughout autumn/winter 2016. • Regional Advocacy workshop is organized by ERO for December this year • RDRT refresher programme has started in order to revitalize regional support and cooperation among the NSs 	Ongoing April 2017	ERO
Comments: The Finnish Red Cross organized a meeting for Nordic and Baltic NS in Helsinki and welcomed further sub-regional/regional exchanges and collaboration				
Recommendation 36 NS: Develop SoPs which ensure cohesion between international and national departments with regular exchange of program information so that each is aware of each other's capacities, areas of work and how they will collaborate during a population surge				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	The mechanisms to utilized international expertise and situational data	See decision rationale.		

	domestically have been developed, but need further development			
Comments:				
Recommendation 37 NS with support of IFRC: Pre-negotiate and develop MoUs with government and other external actors on roles and responsibilities for handling both a migration surge but also a broader scope of migration services.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	Recommendation has been taken on board.	See decision rationale.		
Comments:				
Recommendation 38 NS: Develop a locally tailored 'Guide to Giving' for private individual and companies to help channel useful resources when they are presented. This would have helped NS who, during the surge, were unable to respond to all of the offers of assistance from organizations from across the private and public sectors				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	Most of the NS have already this type of guide and relationship with private donors and IFRC would be willing to provide support if is needed.	See also comments below.		
Comments: The IFRC would be willing to provide or coordinate capacity building support – where necessary - to ensure that Terms of Engagement are developed, however, the RTE will need to provide additional information highlighting the challenges that were faced by National Societies that lead to this specific recommendation. The IFRC can support National Societies - as and when needed or requested - to define their own desired terms of engagement with corporate partners as a starting point for negotiation and dialogue. Such terms of engagement would be based on best practice benchmarks and learnings within the RC Movement.				
<i>Establish rapid and streamlined information sharing protocols for NS migration response.</i>				
Recommendation 39 NS with support of IFRC: Determine how information will be generated, managed and shared amongst countries of destination, transit and origin to better inform service delivery. Do not duplicate other information sharing platforms (like those provided by				

UNHCR), and build on what already exists (IM Portal), and identify what areas that would be most useful for NS planning and service delivery for example: observed needs, preferred services (kinds of food, drink, WASH practices for example), particular vulnerabilities. Information shared could also include political decisions pertaining to and public opinion affecting migrants.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	It is a priority for IM to develop and foster information sharing across the region, especially between destination countries. For those NSs, however, it is more about sharing best/smart practices for long-term programming and planning, rather than relief service delivery.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IM portal is continuously improved via an iterative process. Feedback from NS and from coordinators of the various sectors are used to prioritize new products or improvements of existing products. The current list of Regional indicators will be revised to also cover Protection, Integration, Social Inclusion and Advocacy. In this process, besides NSs, also IFRC networks, like PERCO, will be consulted. 	Q4 2016 – throughout 2017	ERO
Comments: The mention of info sharing from origin countries would require collaboration with MENA or Africa regions, which is a valid point and should/will be looked into, but the realities of who would coordinate this information network or be responsible for managing would probably fit under a global umbrella, not merely ERO.				
Recommendation 40 NS with support of IFRC: Identify barriers to this kind of information collection and sharing and take measures to address them.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility

Accepted	<p>Identifying barriers is good practice to improving services. However, measures to address them can only be taken if these are in the remit of ERO</p> <p>The ERO has started discussion with Head of Country Cluster from MENA Region, based in Tunis about establishing better connections between the two regions in order to respond more effectively to the migration.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We want to advocate for and promote the content on the IM portal within the Movement. • Together with the NS the need for (sub)regional IM workshops or exchange of best practices will be identified and (if requested) organized • Meeting to be held next year between MENA Region, Europe Region and Libyan RC. 	Q4 2016 – throughout 2017	ERO
Comments:				