

www.ifrc.org  
Saving lives,  
changing minds.

# Emergency Appeal Final Report

## Costa Rica and Panama: Population Movement

 International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Emergency Appeal Final Report</b>  | <b>Emergency appeal no. n° MDRCR014</b>  |
| <b>Date of issue:</b> 31 December 2017  | <b>GLIDE No. OT-2015000157-CRI</b>   |
| <b>Date of disaster:</b> November 2015  | <b>Expected timeframe:</b> 18 months; end date 22 May 2017.  |
| <b>Operation start date:</b> 22 November 2015   | <b>Operation Budget:</b> 560,214, Swiss francs, of which 41 per cent was covered (230,533 Swiss francs). |
| <b>Host National Societies presence (n° of volunteers, staff, branches):</b> The <b>Costa Rican Red Cross</b> (CRRC) has 121 branches grouped into 9 regions. The Costa Rica's Regions 8 and 5 provided the assistance through its large structure of volunteers, ambulances and vehicles. The <b>Red Cross Society of Panama</b> (RCSP) has 1 national headquarters and 24 branches. At the national level, there are approximately 500 active volunteers.           |  |
| <b>Number of people affected:</b> 17,000 people   | <b>Number of people assisted:</b> 10,000 people  |
| <b>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement partners actively involved in the operation:</b> Costa Rican Red Cross, Red Cross Society of Panama, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and the American Red Cross.   |  |
| <b>Other partner organizations actively involved in the operation:</b>  |  |
| <b>In Panama:</b> Ministry of Health, National Civil Protection System (SINAPROC), National Border Service (SENAFRONT), National Navy System (SENAN), International Organization for Migration (IOM), Christian Pastoral (PASOC), Ministry of Interior, Immigration Service, Social Security Service, protestant churches, civil society, private sector (farmers), and Caritas Panama, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN-OCHA). |  |
| <b>In Costa Rica:</b> National Commission for Risk Prevention and Emergency Assistance (CNE) along with all the institutions that comprise it, Ministry of Health, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), and United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), National Child Welfare Board (PANI) and Caritas Costa Rica.   |  |
| On behalf of Costa Rican Red Cross and Red Cross Society of Panama IFRC wishes to thank the following contributors to this Emergency Appeal: The American Red Cross, Bulgarian Red Cross, Japanese Red Cross Society, Mexican Government, Red Cross of Monaco.  |  |

## A. Situation Analysis

### Description of the Situation

In November 2015, a group of more than 1,000 Cuban nationals were reported in the border area between Costa Rica and Panama in the community of Paso Canoas, Corredores Canton. Since these people did not meet the migration requirements to enter Costa Rica, a significant build-up of migrants occurred on the Panamanian side of the border as they began to settle in the streets, waiting on a solution to their legal immigration status.

The solution for these Cuban citizens arrived several months later when an airlift was organized so that they could bypass Costa Rica and travel directly to El Salvador; however, considering the diverse needs detected from the first few days of this intervention until its conclusion, the Costa Rican Red Cross was determined to provide humanitarian assistance to this group, which in turn inspired other government institutions, churches and organized communities to join them. Working

together, these disparate organizations opened 37 collective centres, met food, water and sanitation needs, provided health services and the national government organised and funded the airlifts, benefiting an estimated of 8,000 people.

The National Emergency Commission reported that there was a total of 5,800 Cuban migrants who received emergency accommodation, 43 temporary collective centres were established, 33 communities hosted the migrants, 15 Municipal Emergency Committees were activated, more than 500 volunteers participated and funds equal to the amount of USD \$5 million were allocated for operational and administrative maintenance in the first phase of the operation (Nov 2015 – April 2016); however, the total number of Cubans registered in collective centres that received assistance from the Government of Costa Rica and the Costa Rican Red Cross totalled 6,180, according to data provided by the Costa Rican General Directorate of Migration and Immigration in mid-April 2016.

Following the departure of almost all the Cubans in March 2016, a group of Haitians and people from different countries outside of the Americas (mostly of African origin) were reported in the border zone with Panama; the African migrants came from Burkina Faso, Congo, Ivory Coast, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Senegal and Somalia, among others. Once again, a build-up of people began to occur in the streets of the border community due to Costa Rica's visa requirements, which meant they were not allowed to enter Costa Rica and the Panamanian authorities would not allow them to legally re-enter Panama. The migrants who managed to evade the police began to gather in different zones along the Costa Rican border with Nicaragua, specifically in the Peñas Blancas sector, which had equally unsuitable conditions in terms of shelter, drinking water, food and hygiene, and so forth.

On Tuesday, 12 April 2016, these migrants were forcibly returned in transport provided by the Ministry of Public Security to the border with Panama in Paso Canoas, which began to increase this problem given the precarious conditions that the migrants were experiencing and the number of people detained at this point. To address this situation, several institutions agreed to establish a "humanitarian care post" to evaluate the migrants' health conditions and support their basic food and hygiene requirements; the Costa Rican Red Cross later administered and operated this post.

The country's immigration authority established a temporary detention centre where approximately 1,380 irregular migrants in the country were accommodated while their immigration status was resolved. It is important to note that this occurred while the Nicaraguan police and members of the national army maintained a heavy presence along the country's border with Costa Rica to prevent these migrants from entering the country.

From April to June 2016, a humanitarian care post was established in Paso Canoas, which was managed by the Costa Rican Red Cross, the Migration Office and public security agencies; in this post, the CRRC provided assistance in the form of first aid, food and hygiene (showers and sanitary cabins) to meet the basic needs of migrants in transit. However, this place did not provide enough humanitarian assistance to meet the demand. In addition to this post, there was a second site in the Buenos Aires sector of Puntarenas, where attention was provided to individuals or family groups travelling with children. In La Cruz de Guanacaste, two collective centres were operational during the crisis: El Jobo and Las Vueltas; both had the capacity to accommodate about 150 migrants each. However, the daily population varied widely, ranging from 80 migrants in the morning and increasing to 200 migrants in the evening, which was largely because most migrants used the people smuggling networks at night / dawn to continue their journey.

In addition, an area of land along the border known as Deldú was made available to the migrants, which was administrated by the Costa Rican government to maintain order. Due to the proximity of this area with the border, facilities were installed including potable water, sanitary cabins and a communal kitchen (an area that was used by migrants to charge their cell phones). In addition, three large sun-shades were installed. All these initiatives, which the Costa Rican government led and funded, were implemented to avoid an increase in tension between migrants and residents in the area and not to establish the site as a collective centre; nevertheless, up to 4,000 migrants were registered as living at this site.

Panama also faced a rapid build-up of Cuban migrants in May 2016, when the Costa Rican government stopped issuing transit visas to migrants, which forced 4,000 migrants to congregate in Paso Canoas, where they lived in hotels, apartments and houses; this situation continued until late June 2016, when migrants began to catch flights out of the country or identified informal routes to travel across the remaining Central American countries.

From the beginning of July 2016 to the end of the operation, the Costa Rican Red Cross administered two Migrant Assistance Posts in coordination with the CNE, the Migration Office, public security agencies and the Costa Rican Social Security Institute services (CCSS); one of the centres was at Km 20, Río Claro de Puntarenas, which is in the southern part of the country, and it served a fluctuating population of 300 people. The second centre, called La Cruz de Guanacaste was in El Cruce a Santa Cecilia, which is in northern Costa Rica; these aid posts provided temporary accommodation, food, first

aid assistance, transport to medical centres, a supply of clean water and hygiene items, as well as psychosocial support (PSS).

From November 2015 to the first week in July 2016, the CRRC attended:

- Period of Cuban migration: 6,180 migrants
- Period of extra-continental migrants and others: 19,763 migrants

At the end of July 2016, Colombian media outlets observed a rise in the number of migrants concentrated in the Urabá Antioqueño and Chocó areas of Colombia, which are near Panama's Darién province. Moreover, while only 35 Haitian migrants were registered by Colombian migration authorities in July 2015, a year later the number of Haitian migrants had increased significantly, surpassing the total of Cuban migrants registered months before. Though the Panamanian government had declared its borders as closed by May 2016, it permitted a controlled entry and exit of migrants. By August 2016, thousands of migrants were en route to North America; many of them having started their journeys in Brazil and later travelling through Colombia, Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala and Mexico.

Panamanian authorities established a migrant's reception centre in Nicanor for those entering Panama from Las Blancas, Peñitas or Yaviza on the Colombian-Panamanian border. The entry of migrants at the Colombian-Panamanian border increased in October 2016; per health authorities, an average of 300 to 500 migrants entered Panama per day, and around 100 migrants per day left this point by bus provided by the Panamanian authorities, from where they were transported directly to the border with Costa Rica. This meant a serious accumulation of migrants, which overwhelmed the temporary reception centre in Nicanor's capacities, especially since the migrants' average stay in Nicanor was 4 to 6 weeks.

It is important to note that due to Hurricane Otto, the number of migrants registered in Panama and Costa Rica in the Darién and Paso Canoas areas in December 2016 decreased significantly from 120 to 50 people a day to approximately 150 people per week.

## Summary of the response

### Overview of the Costa Rican and Panamanian Red Cross National Societies:

Since the beginning of the crisis, the RCSP and CRRC provided support to the migrant population at Panama's and Costa Rica's border crossings through first aid, pre-hospital care, ambulance transfers, health promotion and communicable disease prevention, as well as psychosocial support and the distribution of individual hygiene kits and blankets. The CRRC actively engaged with the Costa Rican authorities and assumed important roles in support of the management of in-country collective centres. Both the CRRC and the RCSP, as sister National Societies, developed a local network of coordination and support within their respective branches in the border area, thereby complementing their actions mainly in the provision of pre-hospital care and referrals to medical centres with enlarged capacities.

### Overview of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in the country

**IFRC:** Meetings and field visits were held with National Society and ICRC staff, to maintain continuous communication with the work teams along both borders and each National Society's headquarters; in addition, the IFRC has supported National Societies since the start of these operations through technical and operational support. The deployment of a Regional Intervention Team (RIT) Health and WASH delegate from the Canadian Red Cross Society, who helped the CRRC's Guanacaste branches address needs in Kilometro 20 in the Golfito canton, Puntarenas, is worth mentioning; her work was vital in extending the CRC's auxiliary role through advocacy to different government organizations, improving the conditions of migrants in shelters, and, she supported the initial training provided to CRRC personnel and volunteers.

Regarding the RCSP, two delegates were deployed at different times during the operation; the first at the beginning of the operation to support awareness raising actions and organize the provision of care and the humanitarian aid distribution. The second RIT was deployed in November 2016 to support the organization of the last activities planned in the plan of action and to train personnel and volunteers in temporary accommodation with a protection approach. In addition, due to the presence of the IFRC's operations team in Panama and the increased movement of the extra-continental migrant population in Panama, the RCSP could be more directly involved in assessing humanitarian needs on the ground in August 2016. Lastly, the Migration Unit in Geneva funded the production of a mini-documentary accompanying migrants on their route from Panama and Costa Rica and Nicaragua.

**ICRC:** In July 2016, a field visit was made to assess the Care Stations at La Cruz de Guanacaste and Kilómetro 20, in Golfito Canton in Puntarenas province's conditions. In addition, continuous communication was maintained with the National

Societies in support of Restoring Family Links (RFL) and providing vital information to the migrants; the ICRC also undertook the translation of material for migrants on self-protection measure, making it available in Spanish, English, French and Creole.

## Overview of non-Red Cross Red Crescent partners in country

### Costa Rica

**Government:** The CRRC continuously coordinated with the CNE through its emergency operations centre (EOC) and its Municipal Emergencies Committees to manage the Cuban and the transcontinental migrant crisis. In addition, CRRC coordinated with all the mechanisms in the National Emergency System, of which it is a member; these meetings organized the main operational actions to meet the different service points' various needs.

Meetings were held with the Office of the President, the Ministry of Communication and the Ministry of the Presidency, where activity planning and decisions were made at the central political level; in addition, communication was maintained with the General Directorate of Migration and the public security forces (National Police) for the coordination and control of the service points and migrants' safety.

In July 2016, as part of the CRRC's coordination actions with the CNE, the provision of administration and technical support to two temporary collective centres and that the CRRC would provide pre-hospital care and transportation to medical facilities for the beneficiaries of all the collective centres were agreed upon: 1) El Jobo, located in the La Cruz Canton, Guanacaste province, and 2) Kilometro 20, located in the Golfito Canton, Punta Arenas province; For its part, the CNE contributed food, water, the payment of the rent for the buildings used as collective centres and sleeping items (blankets, mats). The El Jobo collective centre was later closed on 22 November 2016, but the Cruce a Santa Cecilia shelter, which the CRRC and the National Directorate of Migration and Immigration (DGME) administered, was kept open in La Cruz de Guanacaste until May 2017, when the CRRC took over the full operation of this collective centre, and the Kilometro 20 collective centre in the south of the country with resources from the government of Costa Rica through the signing of an agreement between parties.

**Other organizations:** There was constant communication with the United Nations Resident Coordinator's Office, which contributed USD\$6,000 to CRRC's operational expenses. Other international agencies such as IOM and UNHCR monitored the standards of the humanitarian assistance provided to migrants and acted as cooperating partners for these actions, while the United Nations Population Fund coordinated the distribution of hygiene kits with CRRC in November 2015.

The CRRC participated in the "Workshop on cultural awareness in the provision of assistance to migrants from other continents in their transit through Costa Rica", which was coordinated by the National Emergency Commission (CNE) and the University for Peace; the CNE funded this workshop, which was held on 13 July 2016, with the participation of different local and national organizations. The workshop addressed the topics of migrant culture, food preparation and livelihoods to provide assistance that was in accordance with their needs and culture.

In June 2016, an interinstitutional agreement was signed among DGME, UNHCR and the Costa Rican Red Cross, channelling USD\$80,000 worth of funds to improve the Temporary Care Centre for Migrants (CATEM for its acronym in Spanish) Km 20 collective centre, specifically for the:

- Purchase of double beds
- Purchase of kitchens
- Improvements to the showers
- Improvements to the laundry area
- Purchase of fans
- Construction of an area where people can receive medical assistance

These actions were completed on time, generating substantial improvements in the conditions of the migrants that were sheltered in the CATEM Km 20 centre.

### Panama

**Government:** Since the beginning of the operation, the RCSP coordinated with SINAPROC, which maintained a permanent staff presence in the Paso Canoas area (Panamanian border with Costa Rica), establishing the communication lines and

coordinating the temporary collective centres for migrants. SENAFRONT provided security for all the collective centres. Likewise, Panama's National Police maintained a permanent staff presence at the border crossing points, providing security to the entire migrant population as well as to the Panamanian citizens residing in these localities. During the week of 4 to 8 April, a workshop on Security, Dignity and Privacy Considerations for Migrants was held in the collective centres, with the participation of the Panamanian and Costa Rican National Societies as well as authorities from the Panamanian and Costa Rican government.

SENAFRONT oversaw the management of the collective centres and on the provision of transportation to migrants from Meteti to David, preventing them from passing through Panama City, which had occurred for a few weeks from July to August 2016, when many migrants could be seen camping out for days at the main bus terminal; also, this was part of the national strategy for "controlled" migration. In August 2016, the Vice Ministry of Security, through the Red Cross Society of Panama, purchased 1,000 tents without emblems from the IFRC's Regional Logistics Unit (RLU), which were sent to the Nicanor migration centre.

SENAFRONT held meetings with IOM to identify complementing capacities to support the border control agency's efforts to maintain peace and tranquillity in the collective centres, provide safe spaces for children and so forth; SENAFRONT requested the meeting due to the migrants' lengthy stay of 3 to 5 weeks in the collective centres before they were moved to the border region between Panama and Costa Rica.

The Panamanian government's Ministry of Health deployed RCSP medical staff and an ambulance from July to August 2016 to provide primary healthcare services and first aid; furthermore, the Ministry of Health oversaw the provision of this attention, mainly through vaccination campaigns, primary clinical care, epidemiological surveillance and referrals to the hospital in Chepo for cases that required additional care.

**Other organizations:** Caritas and IOM contributed supplies to improve the quality of care, especially to the Cuban migrants (May to April 2016). In the second period of heightened population movement in the Panamanian border in Darién, the OIM and the Norwegian Refugee Council coordinated an inter-agency initial assessment mission, in which the Red Cross Society of Panama and the IFRC were involved (July-August 2016). Lastly, the UNFPA supported the emergency shelter with emphasis on protection training and UNOCHA-Panama organized the Darién and inter-agency coordination on migration and protection meetings.

## Needs analysis, beneficiary selection and planning according to scenarios

The initial needs analysis conducted in November 2015 in Costa Rica confirmed the significant number of Cuban citizens staying in the border region between Panama and Costa Rica, specifically in the Paso Canoas sector; However, if one considers the entire timeline for the implementation of this action plan, several important moments occurred that didn't just require a needs assessment but adjustments to the intervention and in turn affected the implementation of the plan. Some of these situations included:

- November to December 2015: a massive influx of Cubans arrived at the Paso Canoas sector in the southern area of Costa Rica on the border with Panama. Figures estimated that as of 15 December, about 8,000 Cubans had entered the city, of which 6,180 were in the 33 collective centres were established for that purpose; the other Cuban migrants were living with relatives or acquaintances who had settled in the country. On 15 December 2015, both the Costa Rican and Nicaraguan governments declared that their borders were officially closed because of this massive population movement.
- January to April 2016: An airlift between Costa Rica and El Salvador is established, which reduced the number of Cuban migrants in the border areas between Panama and Costa Rica and Costa Rica and Nicaragua; this decrease accelerated exponentially between the second and third week of February, a trend that had not been predicted by the CNE and the Costa Rican Red Cross, which resulted in many collective centres being left empty, and halted many of the infrastructural improvement actions that had already been planned and were about to be implemented. Immediate actions were urgently redefined, with a reduction in the number of collective centres in operation from 33 to just 1 in El Roble de Puntarenas.
- July to August 2016: A second wave of a mass migration occurred; this time with migrants of different nationalities. Initially, it was identified that most of the migrants were African; however, after visits and support received from diplomatic missions from African countries present in the country, it was possible to identify that most of these migrants were Haitian and had begun their migration route in Brazil. This phase of the operation generated great challenges for both National Societies and respective governments due to language, cultural, religious barriers and even their personal motivations for migrating. Two collective centres were established in Costa Rica: Las Vueltas and El Jobo; however, some migrants decided to settle in a vacant lot known as Deldú. The Costa Rican government built some facilities, but the conditions were not suitable for the migrants, which in turn meant that

increased efforts were required from the different actors to provide assistance in this area. The CRRC conducted a re-examination of the intervention's actions and priorities. In August, the situation stabilized and the CRRC was managing two migration centres: Km 20 in Golfito, Puntarenas and El Cruce, in La Cruz, Guanacaste. In the case of Panama, this period also presented significant challenges and the RCSP's limitations were evident in its lack of subsidiary agencies in the Darien zones.

- October 2016 to January 2017: Heavy rains occurred in both countries, mainly in November 2016 due the passage of Hurricane Otto, caused a sharp decline in migrants entering Panama and Costa Rica. On average, the number went from 150 migrants arriving each day to 200 migrants arriving per week. which continued from January 2017 until the end of the operation.

### Beneficiary selection

Although all the migrants required support, priority was given to vulnerable groups with specific needs from within the migrant population, i.e. children, pregnant women, the elderly, dehydrated persons and people in need of medical and psychosocial care.

### Risk assessment

The security incidents during the operation were very specific to the context. In the case of Costa Rica, there were two scenarios:

- In El Jobo, there were incidents of occasional violence involving the migrant population in the collective centre furthest from populations centres; nonetheless, this situation was resolved by maintaining a police presence in the collective centre. It should be clarified that most of the disturbances were related to cultural differences and religious aspects linked to food preparation and storage.
- The only security incident that took place involving the CRRC staff was in the southern zone of the country in the migrant assistance centre in the border zone; the incident consisted of a threat made by third parties against the physical integrity of CRRC staff, who were working to provide assistance to migrants. This situation caused an acceleration of the move to the CATEM Kilometre 20 facilities, which diminished tension in the border zone, and no other incidents of this type occurred afterwards.

In the case of Panama, , there was a large number of migrants in the Nicanor shelter in the Darien from August to October 2016, and during this time, local authorities and IOM staff identified occasional incidents between the migrant population due to difficulties in accessing services as a result of the high number of migrants in the local area; however, the permanent presence of SENAFRONT ensured that there were sufficient levels of security for the people staying in the collective centres, and there were no security incidents RCSP staff.

In terms of natural risks, there was heavy rain from October to November 2016, which resulted in flash flooding during the passage of Hurricane Otto. Costa Rica was more affected by this hurricane than Panama, and some precautions were taken in terms of the sites of the CATEMs.

- El Cruce CATEM in La Cruz Guanacaste was dismantled due to being in the path of the hurricane and because it was a camp-type collective centre; the migrants were temporarily moved to a collective centre established in a school in the zone, which was in a safe area, and the CATEM in El Cruce was reassembled once the weather improved.
- CATEM Kilometre 20 was slightly affected by rain; however, it was not necessary to evacuate the collective centre, and normal operations continued uninterrupted during the inclement weather.

## B. Strategy and action plan

### General objective

Meet the urgent basic needs of the 10,000 migrants (Cubans in Panama and migrants of various nationalities in Costa Rica) being housed in the government-run collective centres and with host families in the border regions in Costa Rica and Panama through health, water, sanitation and hygiene promotion, food security and disaster preparedness actions.

The CRRC and RCSP achieved the general objective, and the expected results have been surpassed in some areas such as health, shelter, water and sanitation.

It is important to mention that during the first eight months of this operation, the migrant population that arrived at the Costa Rican border and the assistance CRRC-administered centres were suffering serious health problems such as ulcerated

lesions on their feet and legs and chronic diseases; however, as the migratory flow from the Darien border zone in Panama to the country's border with Costa Rica began to intensify in June 2016, the migrants that had stayed in the collective centres in the Darien were in excellent health, which reduced the level of primary health assistance and first aid that was required in the collective centres on the Costa Rican side of the border.

### Proposed strategy

The CRRC and the RCSP were responsible for delivering food, hygiene kits, pre-hospital care and promoting disaster preparedness actions within their respective countries, which meant that the RCSP provided care to the Cubans that were stranded in Panama, and the CRRC provided aid to the migrants of various nationalities stranded in Costa Rica. The National Societies' actions are further defined below:

- Disaster preparedness and emergency response preparedness: The aim was to coordinate work with local authorities to establish the foundation for an improved response in border areas, especially in the sector of pre-hospital care services that were provided to the migrant population at the border posts.
- Health and Care: The CRRC and RCSP provided pre-hospital care to the migrant population staying in collective centres, border areas and with host families through the mobilization of ambulances, volunteers and paramedics; the health activities were complemented with PSS actions, which targeted adults and children through the "Return to Happiness" methodology that began during the CRRC's Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) operation.
- Water and Sanitation: Hygiene kits were provided to the migrant population. These kits were put together based on the vulnerable groups' needs (women, men and children). A total of 3,300 kits (for 15 days) were distributed (kits for men and women) and 150 kits for children through the DREF operation; through this emergency Appeal, a second and third distribution took place, increasing the number of kits to 6,350 (adults and children). The personal kits were designed to last for one month per person, and their distribution was complemented with hygiene promotion activities and the improvement of water supply and storage through the delivery of jerry cans. In addition to the government's efforts, which were geared toward improving water storage conditions-, the Costa Rican Red Cross worked on the management of grey waters produced at distribution points, showers and hand washing stations.
- Shelter: Food were provided by the government of Costa Rica, and CRRC volunteers were trained in shelter management to support the coordination and management activities in the centres. The CRRC operated a mobile kitchen in three of the collective centres in La Cruz during the operation's first phase of the operation, when the migrant population was mainly Cubans; with funding from UNHCR, the CRRC made improvements to the mobile kitchen to ensure it was fully operational. Moreover, it provided three gas kitchens, with four gas burners each, including full kitchen utensils, and the conditions of the showers were improved, seven laundry sinks were made operational, and there was an area for nursery.

### Operational support services

#### Human resources

For this plan of action, the CRRC established a multidisciplinary technical team to ensure the implementation of the activities:

- Two field offices (one in Peñas Blancas and another in Paso Canoas).
- Two Information Officers (one in Peñas Blancas and another in Paso Canoas).
- One Logistics, Security and Operations Officer based in Peñas Blancas.
- Psychosocial Support Officers (2 National Disaster Response Teams [NDRT]) based in Peñas Blancas.
- Support of the Administrative/Accounting department at the National Society's headquarters.
- Support and guidance for the Relief and Operations Department and its respective units.
- Support for the Procurement department on purchases, warehousing and fleet.
- Support for the Communication department.
- Support for the information technology (IT) department.
- Full engagement of volunteers from the Southern region, Puntarenas, Alajuela, the Northern region and Guanacaste.

The planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting (PMER) accompaniment was provided through the Relief and Operations department, in direct coordination with the CRRC's general director, who supported the tackling of any strategic or high-level challenges. The Costa Rican Red Cross' headquarters has a PMER team for financial reporting, which was responsible for ensuring the quality of the mid-term and final report.

The RCSP implemented its activities with the support of volunteers from the Barú branch and staff from the National Society's headquarters in Panama City. A RIT delegate was deployed to support the Barú branch on the initial assessments and non-food item (NFI) distribution from April to May 2016, and a second RIT team member was deployed to support the RCSP on the appeal's activities from November to December 2016. The Human Resources Officer of the RCSP supported the management of the operations activities from April to July 2016; and RCSP's deputy director provided financial and administrative support to the operation.

The disaster management coordinator for Central America provided technical and operational support to both National Societies until August 2016, when the head of the Central American cluster took over the management of the operation. From the regional office for the Americas (ARO), the IFRC's senior liaison officer supported the head of the country cluster support team (HCCST)'s monitoring of the RCSP's compliance with the operation's plan of action.

### **Logistics and supply chain**

The operation did not include nor require the purchase of items internationally; all required purchases were made in-country, as the necessary items were available locally at competitive prices.

The CRRC has a procurement department and a central warehouse through which all supplies and equipment needed by branches were purchased and stored for distribution. The RCSP has stock at ARO's warehouse; therefore, the IFRC's RLU provided direct support to the National Society on procurement, purchases and stock management.

### **Communication**

The CRRC's telecommunications department supported its activities through its very high frequency (VHF)/ ultra-high frequency (UHF) radio network, which has national coverage; the CRRC constantly monitored the radio network's functionality.

The CRRC's communication strategy for this operation was based on three main components:

- 1) Internal communications: a steady flow of internal communications was maintained (from the analysis of reports prepared by the volunteers in the field to the information gathered by EOC components).
- 2) External communications: the results of the internal communications guided the production of press releases for media and social networks; the principal purpose was to sensitize the national and international community regarding the consequences and impact of migration and its risks and to do fundraising.
- 3) Communications within the Movement: Relevant reports and assessments (Disaster Management Information System [DMIS] and others) to keep Movement partners updated and engaged. The information produced was shared through FedNet, the National Societies' and the IFRC's websites.

The communications initiatives within this operation supported the public awareness and advocacy for future complex emergencies of this sort. The accompaniment and support of the ICRC and IFRC were crucial for this line of action; the ICRC produced materials (leaflets and brochures) with self-care messages for migrants, which were used in Mexico; The materials were adapted to the Central American context and translated into English, French and Creole. Lastly, the IFRC's Migration Unit supported the development of a short-documentary on the Central American migration corridor, which accompanied several migrants during their journey from the border of Panama (Darién) until Costa Rica's border with Nicaragua; the documentary was released in May 2017.

It is important to highlight the National Societies' joint work on this appeal, served as an important example and good practice that was showcased during the Toluca Regional Conference on Migration that was held in November 2016; this meeting resulted in the adoption of a regional declaration and the development of a Strategy on Migration for the Americas.

### **Security**

The implementation of the operation in both countries was done in compliance with the Stay Safe regulations, Code of Conduct and the National Societies' internal security policy.

### **Planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting**

The CRRC's Relief and Operations department oversaw the PMER accompaniment to the plan of action, specifically to the activities implemented by the CRRC. In the case of the RCSP, the IFRC's ARO provided this support directly, taking advantage of its proximity to the National Society's headquarters.

### **Administration and Finance**

The CRRC's Financial and Accounting department provided support to the areas of work included in the plan of action; this department's strategy focused on the following:

- Availability of the departments staff to support the technical and operational team working on the plan of action's implementation.
- Supporting compliance with the issuance of reports, the financial monitoring and proper use of budget allocations.
- Keeping the coordinators of the plan of action sectorial technicians informed on the proper use of the resources allocated to their actions.

The RCSP had the support of its Finance and Administration department to prepare the financial reports and invoices, which were reviewed directly with the National Society's finance counterpart at the IFRC ARO.

## C. DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN

Before detailing the emergency plan of action's activities, it is important to mention that while most of the migrants passed through Panama, they were situated on the Costa Rican side of the border; therefore, most of the collective centres were established in Costa Rica during the operation. There was briefly (July to October 2016) a group of migrants in the Panamanian province of Darién, which borders Colombia, prompting the Panamanian government to establish two collective centres to control the influx of migrants to Panama; however, since the Panamanian government provided all the services in the collective centres, the RCSP only supported activities in which the government requested its assistance, resulting in the Red Cross Society of Panama's low rate of implementation during the appeal.

### Health

**Needs analysis:** Health authorities in Panama and Costa Rica were concerned about the possibility of outbreaks of non-endemic diseases or the appearance of diseases that had not been previously registered in the region; moreover, diseases that were thought to be previously eradicated reappeared with the arrival of the migrants.

Panama's Ministry of Health reported that many migrants arrived with injuries, dermatological infections caused by fungus and/or bacteria, gastroenteritis, respiratory infections, male and female reproductive tract infections, snake bites and so forth; a significant number of pregnant migrants were also observed, and there were some cases of sexually transmitted infections (STIs), such as gonorrhoea and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).

| Outcome 1: Immediate health problems among the migrant community are treated through pre-hospital care and psychosocial support in Costa Rica and Panama. | Outputs                 |  | % achieved    |
|---|-------------------------|--|---------------|
|   | Output 1.1              | Members of the migrant community showing symptoms or signs of illness receive pre-hospital care      | 100%          |
|   | Output 1.2              | Psychosocial support is provided to the affected migrant population in Peñas Blancas and Paso Canoas | 100%          |
|   | Output 1.3:             | Community-based prevention and health promotion provided to the target population                    | 100%          |
| Activities  | Implementation on Time? |  | % of Progress |
|   | Yes                     | No   |               |
| Pre-hospital Care   | X                       |  | 100%          |
| Key self-health care messages are provided  | X                       |  | 100%          |
| Hiring of psychologist in Panama and Costa Rica   |                         | X  | 50%           |
| Replenishment of first aid items  | X                       |  | 100%          |
| Deployment of a National Disaster Response Team specialized in psychological support for 3 months   | X                       |  | 33%           |

|  |   |   |      |
|--|---|---|------|
| Reproduction of health materials focused on the migrant population | X |   | 100% |
| Distribution of 8,000 condoms for 5 months                         |   | X | 0%   |
| Production of materials on sexually transmitted infections         | X |   | 100% |

## Achievements

### Pre-hospital care

#### Costa Rica

A total of 5,217 migrants received assistance during the operation; of which, nearly 3,800 received medical assistance at different levels of health clinics in the zones where the collective centres and assistance centres were located. Moreover, the migrants had full access to health services in the country, and the population was not just assessed in the CATEM, but it was also referred to Medical Centres in the zones where they were located to receive emergency treatment, treatment for chronic diseases, assistance with childbirth, hospitalization and even surgery when it was considered necessary; the CRRC coordinated all its pre-hospital care actions with the Costa Rican Social Security Institute services (CCSS).

#### Panama

During the operation, pre-hospital care has been provided in support of the healthcare centres near the collective centres; the support has mainly been through the transport of patients from the temporary collective centres to local health centres. The symptoms/conditions of the patients that were transported to the health centres were primarily: arterial hypertension, hypoglycaemia, back pain, a suspected heart attack, diabetic shock, possible fractures, pregnancy, appendicitis and children with less three years of age stricken with high fevers.

### Psychosocial support

#### Costa Rica

Costa Rica's Ministry of Health and PANI assigned specialized psychosocial support to each one of the collective centres; nevertheless, the National Society contributed CRRC volunteers trained in psychosocial support, who coordinated with the Ministry of Health staff. A total of 1,506 people (27 children and 1,479 adults) participated in the psychosocial support activities, which included the "Return to Happiness" methodology, professional psychological assistance and the promotion of recreational activities; the CRRC implemented these activities in direct coordination with the Ministry of Health and its psychosocial department, as well as with the support of volunteers from the its subsidiary branches in La Cruz, Liberia, Upala, Ciudad Neilly and Laurel. In the case of the children, the National Child Welfare Agency established a collective centre at the start of the emergency, which focused exclusively focused on assisting children and their families; for example, the CRRC designated an area within the CATEM in El Cruce de La Cruz in Guanacaste as a children's play area.

### Key self-health care messages are provided

#### Panama

An orientation with health prevention and promotion messages was conducted with migrants using the Community-based health and first aid (CBHFA) methodology. Two talks were delivered, and a total of 60 people attended the first talk and 40 people attended the second one. Another way to reach the population was individually, and 1,241 people received the messages in this manner; the topics that were discussed with the migrants on an individual basis were: sexual health and reproduction (prevention of STIs), handwashing, prevention of epidemics (dengue and other endemic diseases) and the prevention of respiratory infections.

### Hiring of psychologist in Panama and Costa Rica

#### Costa Rica

PANI and the Ministry of Health assumed responsibility for the provision of psychosocial support, which that it was not necessary for the CRRC to hire a psychologist; additionally, CRRC youth volunteers implemented "Return to Happiness", a programme directed toward children affected by disasters emergencies, which also made it unnecessary to hire PSS personnel.

#### Panama

The RCSP hired a psychologist to provide PSS care in Paso Canoas.

### Replenishment of first aid items

The CRRC and RCSP completed this activity on time.

#### **Distribution of 8,000 condoms for 5 months**

Due to the appeal's lack funding, activities had to be prioritized, and this activity was not among them; nonetheless, the Costa Rican Ministry of Health distributed some condoms during an unspecified period of the operation.

#### **Reproduction of health materials focused on the migrant population/Production of materials on sexually transmitted infections**

##### Costa Rica

Based on ICRC-provided material, the CRRC distributed health materials to each one of the collective centres and the border zones; the materials contained key messages in different languages on healthy practices and disease prevention.

##### Panama

RCSP volunteers have provided PSS workshops to the migrant population, and care has been provided by professional psychologists. A PSS team comprised of 4 psychologists made two visits to the central headquarters in Gualaca in the province of Chiriquí to conduct mental health and psychosocial support actions; using a recreational methodology, the agenda covered topics such as assertive communication, emotional management, tolerance, stress management, building self-esteem and tools to facilitate coping mechanisms. The population was divided into three large groups: children, adolescents and adults (with a few elderly group members); the groups consisted of both men and women, and the actions with adults were done interactively in the dormitories, as they did not want to meet elsewhere because they did not want to lose sight of their belongings for fear of losing them. Activities in this sector allowed expressing emotion, which generated empathy. Only Cuban migrants participated in this activity. With the children, motivation for returning to a safe place was generated using games, playing games to relieve stress, manage free time, strengthen self-esteem and strengthen the ability to coexist among them, as the children were not socializing with others and tended to stay with their own nationals; moreover, their parents joined their children's activities, which led to socialization among the adults. The tools that were used during this activity were from the violence prevention strategy; a total of 47 children, 61 adults and 15 adolescents benefitted from this activity.

#### **Challenges**

The main challenge concerned sustaining the operation. Some branches were affected economically by not being able to achieve the sale of services to support themselves, as they were focused on assisting the migrants. The most serious case was the La Cruz de Guanacaste branch in Costa Rica, which had almost all its staff focused on assisting the migrants, and during the fourth month of the emergency, the branch suffered a financial crisis, from which it is still recovering.

The second challenge was the reduction in the number of CRRC volunteer staff, which affected the operations, as there was a need to transfer staff from different regions to facilitate the continued implementation of the operation, thereby increasing operational costs.

RCSP personnel need to strengthen their knowledge and training in the IFRC's psychosocial support tools. In health promotion and prevention, the challenge has been logistical difficulties and access issues, and the health interventions have been limited to the visits in which Ministry of Health personnel were present. The same challenge has befallen pre-hospital care, as the migrants were in remote areas.

#### **Lessons learned**

It is necessary to establish strategic partnerships that help provide a low-cost quality service for migrants and can be promoted by the agencies and organizations responsible for health services in Costa Rica such as the CCSS and the Ministry of Health; this strategy worked in Paso Canoas, where the doctor working for the Ministry of Health assisted and attended patients, which reduced costs and optimized resources.

Communication between all stakeholders is fundamental to achieve common objectives and jointly strengthen resources.

## **Water, sanitation and hygiene promotion**

**Needs analysis:** There was no access to safe water in reception centre in Nicanor, Panama because it had to use a water treatment plant that could not cope with the demand; the available water was analysed, and it was murky and had coliforms.

Lastly, the extra-continental population produced a lot of waste; as a result, work had to be done with them to raise awareness and prevent the generation of excess waste.

| <b>Outcome 2: Immediate risk of contracting diseases related to water, sanitation and hygiene are reduced by improving safe water storage, distribution and handling conditions for 10,000 migrants.</b>   | <b>Outputs</b>   |                                |    | <b>% achieved</b>    |
|--|--|--------------------------------|----|----------------------|
|  | <b>Output 2.1</b> Personal hygiene kits, which meet Sphere standards, are provided to 10,000 people.         |                                |    | 100%                 |
|  | <b>Output 2.2</b> The sanitation systems in the collective centres are strengthened                          |                                |    | 100%                 |
|  | <b>Output 2.3</b> Knowledge of hygiene measures, sanitation, safe water and community health is strengthened |                                |    | 100%                 |
| <b>Activities</b>  |  | <b>Implementation on Time?</b> |    | <b>% of Progress</b> |
|  |  | Yes                            | No |                      |
| Distribution of personal hygiene kits to 10,000 people (men, women and children)   |  | X                              |    | 100%                 |
| Repair micro structure sanitation  |  |                                | X  | 20%                  |
| Safe water, hygiene, and sanitation awareness-raising campaign   |  | X                              |    | 100%                 |
| <b>Achievements</b>  |  |                                |    |                      |
| The implementation of water, sanitation and hygiene promotion sector's activities was limited due to the appeal's limited coverage.  |  |                                |    |                      |
| <b>Distribution of personal hygiene kits to 10,000 people (men, women and children)</b>  |  |                                |    |                      |
| <u>Costa Rica</u>  |  |                                |    |                      |
| A total of 6,100 personal hygiene kits were distributed between December 2015 and January 2016; these kits were acquired with International Appeal funds (3,700 kits), support from the United Nations Population Fund (1,000 kits), the Cuban community of Miami (1,200 kits) and local donations (150 kits for women and 50 for children). The kits were prepared in compliance with the Sphere Project minimum quality standards and were designed separately for men, women and children since many of the migrants were travelling alone. |  |                                |    |                      |
| <u>Panama</u>  |  |                                |    |                      |
| A total of 1,241 people benefited from 2,482 personal hygiene kits (2 per person due to the migrants' needs); the deployed RIT supported the distributions. Standard hygiene parcels were purchased and divided to assemble them into personal hygiene kits. The distribution was carried out using the Open Data Kit System, which facilitated data collection.   |  |                                |    |                      |
| The RIT member deployed to support distribution carried out the following activities:  |  |                                |    |                      |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Induction provided to Barú District volunteers on ODK-Mega V system's use</li> <li>• Individual characterization in ODK and delivery of Mega V cards</li> <li>• Dissemination of actions and coordination on the ground with the national ombudsman and the director of Panama's National Civil Protection Service</li> <li>• Delivery of personal protective gear to the volunteers that provided support during the distribution</li> </ul>   |  |                                |    |                      |
| <b>Repair micro structure sanitation</b>   |  |                                |    |                      |
| <u>Costa Rica</u>  |  |                                |    |                      |
| CRRC made improvements to the solid waste disposal in the collective centre in Delude; however, it did not make any improvements in other collective centres due to lack of funding.   |  |                                |    |                      |
| <b>Safe water, hygiene, and sanitation awareness-raising campaign</b>  |  |                                |    |                      |
| <u>Panama</u>  |  |                                |    |                      |
| The RCSP provided hygiene talks during the distribution of the hygiene kits in Barú.   |  |                                |    |                      |
| <b>Challenges</b>  |  |                                |    |                      |

There were few achievements in this section due to the following issues:

1. When the operation was about to renovate the collective centres, the Cuban migrants started to leave the country; thus, only two of the collective centres were successfully renovated: the sanitary facilities, drains and laundry facilities were repaired in Parrita, Puntarenas, and the drainage, laundry facilities and showers were repaired in the shelter in El Roble de Puntarenas.
2. Going from several collective centres at the beginning to managing 4 collective centres shelters and later 2 CATEMs made it difficult to determine where to invest funds due to the short amount of time available for actions.
3. Engaging in advocacy actions to improve the migrants' conditions. Although local authorities were aware of the Sphere Project standards, the conditions in Costa Rica did not necessarily adapt to the Humanitarian Charter, and this was the main challenge; this mostly concerned water and sanitation issues, which always involved many discussions; however, having fewer collective centres made it easier to engage in advocacy actions to help achieve these improvements.

#### Panama

In Barú, due to logistical challenges, the hygiene talks had to be conducted on the same day as the delivery of the hygiene kits.

The number of people initially targeted for the receipt of hygiene kits was 1,401 people; however, 1,241 people received hygiene kits in the end due to fluctuations in the collective centres' population.

#### **Lessons learned**

It is important to train National Society staff on the Humanitarian Charter and Sphere Project standards to work adequately not just on the migrant issue, but also the collective centres and advocacy for migrants and their conditions. Additionally, there needs to be a specialist work team focused on water, sanitation and hygiene promotion, which can guide actions that need to be implemented and adequately monitor migrants' conditions.

### **Shelter and settlements (and household items)**

**Needs analysis:** In terms of shelter in Costa Rica and Panama, it is important to strengthen the collective centres and the reception centres in hygiene and other processes to ensure the migrants' dignity.

|  | <i>Outputs</i>  |   | <i>% achieved</i> |                      |
|--|---|---|-------------------|----------------------|
|  | <b>Outcome 3: The immediate shelter needs of the target population are met.</b> | <b>Output 3.1</b> Essential non-food items are provided to the target population. |                   | 0%                   |
| <b>Output 3.2</b> The scope and quality of National Society services in the collective centres is improved |   | 100%  |                   |                      |
| <i>Activities</i>  |   | <i>Implementation on Time?</i>  |                   | <i>% of Progress</i> |
|  |   | <i>Yes</i>  | <i>No</i>         |                      |
| Procurement and distribution of 3,500 blankets (2,500 in Panama and 1,000 in Costa Rica)                   |   | X   |                   | 100%                 |
| Workshop to strengthen the volunteers' expertise in shelter management, protection and Sphere standards    |   | X   |                   | 100%                 |
| Management workshop for branch volunteers involved in the management of collective centres                 |   | X   |                   | 100%                 |

#### **Achievements**

##### **Procurement and distribution of 3,500 blankets (2,500 in Panama and 1,000 in Costa Rica)**

#### Costa Rica

CNE has provided all the collective centres with blankets; the items are delivered to the CRRC, which is then responsible for their distribution. The National Society has delivered more than 8,000 blankets, which were provided by the Costa Rican government, in the various CRRC administered collective centres since it began caring for the migrants in November 2015.

**Procurement and distribution of 2,500 blankets**Panama

The purchase was made through the IFRC's Global Logistics Service (GLS), and the blankets were delivered directly to the beneficiaries at the distribution point once they have been registered via ODK. The distribution was conducted with Mega V. A total of 2,482 blankets were delivered to 1,241 beneficiaries in the collective centres in Bunker, Milenium, Hotel Morenita, Hotel Imperial and Hotel Galicia in David, Chiriquí.

**Workshop to strengthen the volunteers' expertise in shelter management, protection and Sphere standards**Costa Rica

The IFRC's social inclusion senior officer and emergency shelter and disaster management senior officer facilitated a shelter workshop on protection and violence prevention for the CRRC in August 2016.

Panama

An official from UNFPA and IFRC's executive liaison senior officer facilitated a workshop in November 2016 for the RCSP on protection and sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV), while the CRRC volunteers that were trained in August facilitated the workshop's shelter component.

**Management workshop for branch volunteers involved in the management of collective centres**Costa Rica

The CRRC covered this during the workshop held in Ciudad Neilly (August 2016) strengthening their capacities in shelter management.

Panama

Since the RCSP did not manage any collective centres during the operation, this activity was deemed unnecessary.

**Challenges**

The lack of training in shelter management was a major challenge, as the paucity of staff with shelter management knowledge meant that they were overwhelmed by the demand for services in the centres.

The lack of economic resources was another of the challenges faced in the provision of the assistance required by the migrants; however, strengthening the efforts of everyone involved helped generate contributions that improved the migrants' conditions in Costa Rica and Panama.

**Lessons learned**

The shelter management workshops carried out in the southern zone of the country with participating members from the RCSP provided significant support to this operation; however, this training should be incorporated into the institution's own learning processes to build capacity throughout the RCSP's branches.

**Food Security, nutrition and livelihoods****Needs analysis:**

The stores in the local communities near the reception centre in Panama were increasing the price of food for the migrants, while in Costa Rica, the extra-continental migrants preferred to cook with firewood despite the presence of kitchens in the collective centres, which posed a risk to their health and complicated the administration of food in the centres.

| Outcome 4: Administration of food is facilitated in Red Cross-managed collective centres | Outputs   |  | % achieved    |
|--|---|--|---------------|
|  |   | Output 4.1 Food that meets minimum Sphere standards is distributed to 2,000 people |               |
|  | Output 4.2 Mobile kitchens in the collective centres in Costa Rica and Panama are well maintained |  | 100%          |
| Activities   | Implementation on Time?   |  | % of Progress |
|  | Yes   | No   |               |
| Maintenance on mobile kitchens in Costa Rica and Panama                                  | X   |  | 100%          |
| <b>Achievements</b>  |   |  |               |

**Maintenance on mobile kitchens in Costa Rica and Panama**Costa Rica

The mobile kitchens were operational in various collective centres during the wave of Cuban migrants (the Costa Rican government provided the supplies for the mobile kitchens); however, it was not necessary to use the mobile kitchens once the extra-continental migrants began arriving because the collective centres had permanent installations by this time.

Panama

Since the RCSP did not manage any collective centres during the operation, this activity was deemed unnecessary.

**Food distribution for 2,000 people for two months in Panama and Costa Rica**Costa Rica

Approximately 100,000 hot meals were prepared and distributed since November 2015. The migrants received three meals a day in the collective centre in Buenos Aires; the Costa Rican government provided the food, while the CRRC distributed it to the migrants. Appeal funds were also used to provide meals to migrants.

Panama

The RCSP provided lunch and dinner to 800 people in Paso Canoas daily; the Panamanian government provided the food for the migrants. Improvements were made to the kitchens' infrastructure, including the building of tables to place the prepared food, the fixing of the lighting and provision of covered containers for transporting the food.

**Challenges**

Maintaining the established standards for the provision of the minimum quantity of daily calories to the migrants and receiving support from the government in the form of donated food items were challenges.

Costa Rica

Registering people has proven to be a challenge due to the constant rotation of people in the collective centres; however, coordination has been maintained with Costa Rican immigration authorities to keep track of the list of people who have been housed and received food.

**Lessons learned**

A plan that considers migrants' varying food preparation methods and religious and cultural differences must be put into place to enable them to prepare their own food.

**Quality programming – A common factor in all sectors**

| Needs assessment  |            |   |               |
|---|------------|---|---------------|
| Outcome 5: The operation's implementation is managed in a coordinated manner, with an adequate implementation and monitoring system | Outputs    |   | % achieved    |
|   | Output 5.1 | Initial and multi-sectorial needs assessment is conducted in coordination with beneficiaries  | 100%          |
|   | Output 5.2 | The project has been monitored and implemented as per the timeframe established in the Emergency Plan of Action (EPoA)  | 100%          |
|   | Output 5.3 | Document the migrants' situation to produce materials for public visibility and sensitization   | 100%          |
|   | Output 5.4 | Ensure migrants' and communities' access to information   | 50%           |
|   | Output 5.5 | A communications strategy within the Institution, and in coordination with the various Red Cross National Societies located in countries along the migrants' route, is developed, which allows National Societies to respond to the population's specific needs | 50%           |
| Activities  | I          |   | % of Progress |
|   | Yes        | No  |               |

|   |   |   |      |
|---|---|---|------|
| Rapid assessment of the emergency   | X |   | 100% |
| Monitoring visits from headquarters   | X |   | 100% |
| Multi-sector detailed assessment per collective centre  | X |   | 100% |
| IFRC multi-sector field detailed assessment mission   | X |   | 100% |
| Meetings with authorities and diffusion at the community level                                      | X |   | 100% |
| Development of a communication campaign as part of the advocacy strategy                            | X |   | 50%  |
| Development of material that will include press release, key messages, video and diffusion material | X |   | 100% |
| National capacity building workshops  | X |   | 100% |
| Binational coordination workshop  | X |   | 0%   |
| Diffusion and capacity building activities at the community level                                   | X |   | 0%   |
| Produce two videos on the operation   | X |   | 100% |
| Beneficiary satisfaction survey (at least 10 collective centres)                                    | X |   | 100% |
| Develop a community mobilization strategy   | x |   | 100% |
| Development of tools that combat stigmatization and xenophobia                                      | X |   | 0%   |
| Production of informative materials for the migrants developed by ICRC                              | X |   | 100% |
| Develop a communication strategy  |   | X | 0%   |
| Two Regional Intervention Team (RIT) deployments  | X |   | 100% |
| Monitoring visits from the IFRC   | X |   | 100% |
| Preparation of internal progress reports  | X |   | 100% |
| Lessons learned workshops in both countries   | X |   | 100% |
| Hiring of a general operations coordinator for the CRRC   | X |   | 100% |
| Hiring of a general operations coordination for RCSP  |   | X | 0%   |
| Acquisition of an ODK and Mega V kit  |   | X | 0%   |

### Achievements

The following activities were not implemented due to limited funds:

- **Binational coordination workshop**
- **Diffusion and capacity building activities at the community level**
- **Development of tools that combat stigmatization and xenophobia**
- **Develop a communication strategy**
- **Acquisition of an ODK and Mega V kit**

### Development of a communication campaign as part of the advocacy strategy

#### Costa Rica and Panama

While the National Societies held meetings with municipal committees, they were able to implement this activity in a structured manner; therefore, they did not develop a communication campaign.

### Two Regional Intervention Team (RIT) deployments

#### Costa Rica

During the operation's first phase, the IFRC deployed a health RIT to assist the CRRC in La Cruz of Guanacaste with the health brigades and provide basic training to CRRC staff and volunteers; the RIT also participated in the regional sectorial roundtables in support of the CRRC's auxiliary role.

#### Panama

The IFRC deployed a RIT (May to April 2016) to support the RCSP on its initial assessments and food distributions. Subsequently, the IFRC deployed a second RIT specialized in water and sanitation, which was funded by the Canadian

Red Cross Society, to support the RCSP on the finalization of its activities, including assessing the functionality of RCSP's two potabilization plants and organizing the capacity building training.

### **Preparation of internal progress reports**

Seven emergency operation reports have been submitted since November 2015 (Disaster Relief Emergency Fund [DREF] Plan of Action in November 2015, DREF update in December 2015, International Appeal in January 2016, a Revision of the Emergency Appeal in May 2016, a Six-Month Emergency Appeal Operations Update in July 2016, Emergency Appeal Operations Update no. 2 in October 2016 and a 12-Month Emergency Appeal Operations Update no. 3 in December 2016).

### **Produce two videos on the operation**

#### Costa Rica

The CRRC produced a video entitled "Migrants" (a trailer version and long version), which included testimonies from migrants that received assistance from the Costa Rican Red Cross, the RCSP and the IFRC during their journey through Panama and Costa Rica. The video also includes short interviews with DGME and CNE personnel; the president of Costa Rica, Costa Rica's Migration Director, CNE's president and the CRRC's president attended its premiere at the National Centre of Culture (CENAC) in San Jose, Costa Rica. <https://youtu.be/jQ2dEOk20nk>

### **Hiring of a general operations coordinator for the CRRC**

In December 2015, the CRRC hired an operation coordinator for three months, who was responsible for coordinating the collective centres and CRRC branches at the border points as required.

### **Hiring of a general operations coordination for RCSP**

Given the appeal's limited funding for the activities, the IFRC decided to directly support the RCSP from its regional office for the Americas in Panama, nullifying the need to hire an operations coordinator to support the National Society. The HR focal point of the RCSP was assigned functions to manage the operation.

### **Challenges**

The lack of experience in working with migrants and managing migration flows was the main challenge the National Societies faced. Since Costa Rica and Panama were often not the migrants' final destination, the migration patterns were unusual, as unique the number of migrants in the countries could considerably diminish in less than a week, or there could be a surge in the population in a single location if there was a sudden influx of migrants; these rapid changes in the population required swift deployments of personnel and provided little time for planning, which proved to be logistically challenging.

The language barrier was a very significant challenge; originally it was not a problem because the migrants were mainly native Spanish speakers; nonetheless, when the trans-continental migrants began arriving, it caused serious issues, as number of different languages spoken by the migrants swelled to five (Spanish; English; French; Portuguese; and Creole).

### **Lessons learned**

1. Migration is a dynamic phenomenon with very specific conditions and needs.
2. Migrants have rights and obligations and must collaborate on the maintenance of the facilities that provide them with support.
3. The Red Cross Red Crescent Movement needs to learn more about migrants and position this issue as a cross-cutting area in its strategic development plan.
4. It is necessary to provide training to Red Cross staff on migrants and issues related to working with this population.

---

## **Contact information**

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

**In the IFRC Americas regional office in Panama:**

- Iñigo Barrera, head of disaster and crisis prevention, response and recovery department, phone: +507 6679 3238 email: [ci.barrera@ifrc.org](mailto:ci.barrera@ifrc.org)
- Diana Medina, communications unit manager for the Americas, phone: +507 317 3050 email:

[diana.medina@ifrc.org](mailto:diana.medina@ifrc.org)

- Roxana Trigo, senior executive liaison officer; email: [roxana.trigo@ifrc.org](mailto:roxana.trigo@ifrc.org)
- Nelson Aly Rodriguez, head of country cluster support team for Central America; email: [nelson.alyrodriguez@ifrc.org](mailto:nelson.alyrodriguez@ifrc.org)

#### For Resource Mobilization and Pledges:

- Marion Andrivet, emergency appeals and marketing officer, phone: +507 317 3050; email: [marion.andrivetiv@ifrc.org](mailto:marion.andrivetiv@ifrc.org)

#### For Logistics support:

- Stephany Murillo, regional logistics senior officer, phone: +507 317 3050; mobile: +507 6679-9674, email: [stephany.murillo@ifrc.org](mailto:stephany.murillo@ifrc.org)

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

- Priscila Gonzalez; planning, monitoring and reporting team coordinator; phone: +507 317 3050; email: [priscila.gonzalez@ifrc.org](mailto:priscila.gonzalez@ifrc.org)

#### In Geneva:

- Cristina Estrada, response and recovery lead; +41 22 730 45 29; [cristina.estrada@ifrc.org](mailto:cristina.estrada@ifrc.org)

---

## How we work

The International Federation's activities that are focused on providing assistance to the most vulnerable people adheres to the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement's Code of Conduct on the provision of assistance during disasters, as well as to the Humanitarian Charter and minimum humanitarian response standards during disasters (Sphere Project).

The International Federation's vision lies in constantly inspiring, encouraging, facilitating and promoting the implementation of all types of humanitarian activities by the National Societies in order to prevent and alleviate human suffering and to contribute to maintaining and promoting dignity and peace in the world.



The International Federation's work is governed by the 2020 strategy, which establishes three strategic objectives:

1. Save lives, protect livelihoods and strengthen recovery following disaster and crisis situations.
2. Guarantee safe and healthy livelihoods.
3. Promote social integration, a culture of peace and the fight against violence.

## Disaster Response Financial Report

## MDRCR014 - Costa Rica - Population Movement

Timeframe: 22 Nov 15 to 22 May 17

Appeal Launch Date: 18 Jan 16

Final Report

## Selected Parameters

|                         |              |           |          |
|-------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|
| Reporting Timeframe     | 2015-2017/11 | Programme | MDRCR014 |
| Budget Timeframe        | 2015-2017/12 | Budget    | APPROVED |
| Split by funding source | Y            | Project   | *        |
| Subsector:              | *            |           |          |

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

## I. Funding

|                                      | Raise humanitarian standards | Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people | Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development | Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work | Joint working and accountability | TOTAL          | Deferred Income |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|---|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| <b>A. Budget</b>                     |                              |   | 560,214                                      |   |                                  | 560,214        |                 |
| <b>B. Opening Balance</b>            |                              |   |  |   |                                  |                |                 |
| <b>Income</b>                        |                              |   |  |   |                                  |                |                 |
| <b>Cash contributions</b>            |                              |   |  |   |                                  |                |                 |
| <i>American Red Cross</i>            |                              |   | 23,964                                       |   |                                  | 23,964         |                 |
| <i>Bulgarian Red Cross</i>           |                              |   | 992  |   |                                  | 992            |                 |
| <i>Japanese Red Cross Society</i>    |                              |   | 21,200                                       |   |                                  | 21,200         |                 |
| <i>Mexican Government</i>            |                              |   | 173,389                                      |   |                                  | 173,389        |                 |
| <i>Red Cross of Monaco</i>           |                              |   | 10,988                                       |   |                                  | 10,988         |                 |
| <b>C1. Cash contributions</b>        |                              |   | <b>230,533</b>                               |   |                                  | <b>230,533</b> |                 |
| <b>C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)</b> |                              |   | <b>230,533</b>                               |   |                                  | <b>230,533</b> |                 |
| <b>D. Total Funding = B + C</b>      |                              |   | <b>230,533</b>                               |   |                                  | <b>230,533</b> |                 |

\* Funding source data based on information provided by the donor

## II. Movement of Funds

|   | Raise humanitarian standards | Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people | Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development | Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work | Joint working and accountability | TOTAL    | Deferred Income |
|---|------------------------------|---|--|---|----------------------------------|----------|-----------------|
| <b>B. Opening Balance</b>               |                              |   |  |   |                                  |          |                 |
| <b>C. Income</b>                        |                              |   | 230,533                                      |   |                                  | 230,533  |                 |
| <b>E. Expenditure</b>                   |                              |   | -230,344                                     |   |                                  | -230,344 |                 |
| <b>F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)</b> |                              |   | 190  |   |                                  | 190      |                 |

## Disaster Response Financial Report

## MDRCR014 - Costa Rica - Population Movement

Timeframe: 22 Nov 15 to 22 May 17

Appeal Launch Date: 18 Jan 16

Final Report

## Selected Parameters

|                         |              |           |          |
|-------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|
| Reporting Timeframe     | 2015-2017/11 | Programme | MDRCR014 |
| Budget Timeframe        | 2015-2017/12 | Budget    | APPROVED |
| Split by funding source | Y            | Project   | *        |
| Subsector:              | *            |           |          |

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

## III. Expenditure

| Account Groups                                   | Budget         | Expenditure                  |   |  |   |                                  | TOTAL          | Variance |
|--|----------------|------------------------------|---|--|---|----------------------------------|----------------|----------|
|  |                | Raise humanitarian standards | Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people | Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development | Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work | Joint working and accountability |                |          |
|  | A              |                              |   |  |   | B                                | A - B          |          |
| <b>BUDGET (C)</b>                                |                |                              |   | <b>560,214</b>                               |   | <b>560,214</b>                   |                |          |
| <b>Relief items, Construction, Supplies</b>      |                |                              |   |  |   |                                  |                |          |
| Construction Materials                           |                |                              |   | 143  |   | 143                              | -143           |          |
| Clothing & Textiles                              | 20,489         |                              |   | 10,434                                       |   | 10,434                           | 10,055         |          |
| Food   | 12,529         |                              |   | 8,356  |   | 8,356                            | 4,173          |          |
| Water, Sanitation & Hygiene                      | 75,995         |                              |   | 45,935                                       |   | 45,935                           | 30,060         |          |
| Medical & First Aid                              | 39,406         |                              |   | 7,004  |   | 7,004                            | 32,402         |          |
| Teaching Materials                               | 68,633         |                              |   | 2,197  |   | 2,197                            | 66,436         |          |
| Utensils & Tools                                 | 5,503          |                              |   | 2,080  |   | 2,080                            | 3,423          |          |
| Other Supplies & Services                        |                |                              |   | 775  |   | 775                              | -775           |          |
| <b>Total Relief items, Construction, Sup</b>     | <b>222,557</b> |                              |   | <b>76,925</b>                                |   | <b>76,925</b>                    | <b>145,631</b> |          |
| <b>Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</b>        |                |                              |   |  |   |                                  |                |          |
| Distribution & Monitoring                        | 5,281          |                              |   | 1,270  |   | 1,270                            | 4,010          |          |
| Transport & Vehicles Costs                       | 20,735         |                              |   | 8,853  |   | 8,853                            | 11,882         |          |
| Logistics Services                               | 8,793          |                              |   | 2,700  |   | 2,700                            | 6,093          |          |
| <b>Total Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</b>  | <b>34,808</b>  |                              |   | <b>12,823</b>                                |   | <b>12,823</b>                    | <b>21,985</b>  |          |
| <b>Personnel</b>                                 |                |                              |   |  |   |                                  |                |          |
| International Staff                              | 7,862          |                              |   | 2,165  |   | 2,165                            | 5,696          |          |
| National Staff                                   | 2,260          |                              |   | 7,867  |   | 7,867                            | -5,607         |          |
| National Society Staff                           | 70,067         |                              |   | 34,546                                       |   | 34,546                           | 35,521         |          |
| Volunteers                                       | 33,999         |                              |   | 16,729                                       |   | 16,729                           | 17,271         |          |
| Other Staff Benefits                             | 12,775         |                              |   | 461  |   | 461                              | 12,314         |          |
| <b>Total Personnel</b>                           | <b>126,963</b> |                              |   | <b>61,767</b>                                |   | <b>61,767</b>                    | <b>65,195</b>  |          |
| <b>Consultants &amp; Professional Fees</b>       |                |                              |   |  |   |                                  |                |          |
| Consultants                                      | 13,758         |                              |   |  |   |                                  | 13,758         |          |
| Professional Fees                                | 983            |                              |   | 272  |   | 272                              | 711            |          |
| <b>Total Consultants &amp; Professional Fees</b> | <b>14,741</b>  |                              |   | <b>272</b>                                   |   | <b>272</b>                       | <b>14,468</b>  |          |
| <b>Workshops &amp; Training</b>                  |                |                              |   |  |   |                                  |                |          |
| Workshops & Training                             | 57,918         |                              |   | 14,096                                       |   | 14,096                           | 43,823         |          |
| <b>Total Workshops &amp; Training</b>            | <b>57,918</b>  |                              |   | <b>14,096</b>                                |   | <b>14,096</b>                    | <b>43,823</b>  |          |
| <b>General Expenditure</b>                       |                |                              |   |  |   |                                  |                |          |
| Travel   | 14,741         |                              |   | 17,167                                       |   | 17,167                           | -2,427         |          |
| Information & Public Relations                   | 33,187         |                              |   | 18,031                                       |   | 18,031                           | 15,156         |          |
| Office Costs                                     | 7,075          |                              |   | 1,927  |   | 1,927                            | 5,149          |          |
| Communications                                   | 6,486          |                              |   | 3,360  |   | 3,360                            | 3,126          |          |
| Financial Charges                                | 4,127          |                              |   | 5,176  |   | 5,176                            | -1,049         |          |
| Other General Expenses                           | 2,064          |                              |   | 48   |   | 48                               | 2,016          |          |
| Shared Office and Services Costs                 | 1,356          |                              |   | 4,692  |   | 4,692                            | -3,336         |          |
| <b>Total General Expenditure</b>                 | <b>69,036</b>  |                              |   | <b>50,401</b>                                |   | <b>50,401</b>                    | <b>18,635</b>  |          |
| <b>Indirect Costs</b>                            |                |                              |   |  |   |                                  |                |          |
| Programme & Services Support Recover             | 34,191         |                              |   | 14,059                                       |   | 14,059                           | 20,133         |          |
| <b>Total Indirect Costs</b>                      | <b>34,191</b>  |                              |   | <b>14,059</b>                                |   | <b>14,059</b>                    | <b>20,133</b>  |          |
| <b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)</b>                     | <b>560,214</b> |                              |   | <b>230,344</b>                               |   | <b>230,344</b>                   | <b>329,871</b> |          |
| <b>VARIANCE (C - D)</b>                          |                |                              |   | <b>329,871</b>                               |   | <b>329,871</b>                   |                |          |

**Disaster Response Financial Report****MDRCR014 - Costa Rica - Population Movement**

Timeframe: 22 Nov 15 to 22 May 17

Appeal Launch Date: 18 Jan 16

Final Report

**Selected Parameters**

|                         |              |           |          |
|-------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|
| Reporting Timeframe     | 2015-2017/11 | Programme | MDRCR014 |
| Budget Timeframe        | 2015-2017/12 | Budget    | APPROVED |
| Split by funding source | Y            | Project   | *        |
| Subsector:              | *            |           |          |

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

**IV. Breakdown by subsector**

| Business Line / Sub-sector                                | Budget         | Opening Balance | Income         | Funding        | Expenditure    | Closing Balance | Deferred Income |
|---|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>BL3 - Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development</b> |                |                 |                |                |                |                 |                 |
| Migration   | 560,214        |                 | 230,533        | 230,533        | 230,344        | 190             |                 |
| Subtotal BL3  | 560,214        |                 | 230,533        | 230,533        | 230,344        | 190             |                 |
| <b>GRAND TOTAL</b>  | <b>560,214</b> |                 | <b>230,533</b> | <b>230,533</b> | <b>230,344</b> | <b>190</b>      |                 |