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# A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The report presents the main results of the EEA Grants Asylum and Migration Programme. As regards Outcome 1 the applications submission through the Open Call was due on 17.1.2020. As the FO is in the process of evaluating Project Proposals submitted through the Open Call, Outcome 2: “Capacity of key institutions to ensure protection of vulnerable asylum seekers, particularly UAMs, is strengthened” and Outcome 3: “Operational procedures and capacity of the Greek Asylum Service and Appeal Committees improved” are already being implemented by pre-defined Project Promoters (NRC-NORCAP and UNHCR). Outcome 4: “Orderly and humane voluntary return of migrants or vulnerable groups is secured” is expected to be implemented by IOM as soon as the project contract is concluded.

Regarding the progress of implementation, the project contract under Outcome 2 is in the final stage of signing with NORCAP. While the project contract has not yet been signed, the FO is in close contact with the Project Promoter to keep informed about the progress of the project, as it is implemented **by** 20/02/2019.

As regards Outcome 3, the FO signed the project contract with UNHCR on 24-01-2020, whereas the project is already been implemented by 1.4.2019 and expected to be completed by 29/2/2020.

The project Contracts with UN Organisations and Project promoters located in Donor States, deviate in parts from PIA obligations as in force.

Subsequently FO auditing, monitoring, evaluation planning and some communication requirements need to be adapted for these projects and an amendment in PIA is deemed necessary.

During 2019 no bilateral actions under this Programme were concluded.

The main lessons learned during the first year of the Programme are outlined below:

* UN internal procedures and rules had to prevail in some cases over the EEA Grants ones. Aspects of monitoring and evaluation, project audit, eligibility of expenditures, sustainability and other contractual arrangements had to adjust to the UN internal rules.
* Compliance with the national legal framework and EEA Grants requirements can be underestimated by Project Promoters. Engaging a Project Promoter can also be challenging.

Cooperation with DPP and FMO was paramount in conducting a successful Open Call design and process.

Visibility of the EEA Grants was achieved in part through the communication of the Open Call procedure and through the launch events in Athens and Thessaloniki (October – November 2019). At least, seven dedicated reportages were published online and in physical media. Dedicated social media pages exist on Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn. All material, printed, online, social media posts, etc, had a clear reference in the Funding by EEA Grants.

The “Asylum and Migration” Programme along with the “Local Development and Poverty Reduction” Programme, have their respective English-language website redirecting to one another, soon to be translated in Greek. The website hosted all informational communication material created for the Programme. The website of the programme includes the donor logo visible at first site: <https://www.asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr/>.

The overall risk of the Programme has remained the same, at a score of 2. Some risks occurred relating to significant political events in the second quarter of 2019, resulting in changes in the relevant Ministries. The risks were immediately addressed to reduce the impacts by establishing strong & constructive collaborative relationships with the new key persons. The delays with the signing of the predefined project contracts were also addressed with close collaboration with the Project Promoters, consultation and guidance and also consulting and collaborating closely with FMO to reduce the obstacles.

# B. PERFORMANCE

## 1. Results

### Outcome 2: Capacity of key institutions to ensure protection of vulnerable asylum seekers, particularly UAMs, is strengthened

#### This project is implemented by NRC-NORCAP. Although the project expenditures are eligible as from 20/02/2019 the contract agreement has not been signed yet. To that end, the Project Promoter has not reported any results to the Fund Operator yet. Estimated time of contract signature:  March 2020.

### Outcome 3: Operational procedures and capacity of the Greek Asylum Service and Appeal Committees improved

*This project is implemented by UNHCR Greek office. Although the project expenditures are eligible as from 01/04/2019 the project contract signed on 24/01/2020 and ends on February 2020. An advance Payment to UNHCR has been disbursed of 1.200.000€ on 10-11/2/2020. According to the contract agreement with the Project Promoter Chapter 6. par 1.“The Project Promoter shall submit a final Project Report to the Fund Operator in a format provided by the Fund Operator, in order to provide…” and Chapter 6. par. 2. “The final Project Report shall be submitted to the Fund Operator within three (3) months after completion of the Project and no later than 31/7/2024, if applicable”.*

*To that end, the Project Promoter has not reported any results to the Fund Operator yet.*

### Outcome 4: Orderly and humane voluntary return of migrants or vulnerable groups is secured

#### This pre-defined project is going to be implemented by IOM Greek office. The project contract has not been signed yet and the project expenditures are going to start on 2020.

### Bilateral Outcome: Enhanced collaboration between beneficiary and donor state entities involved in the programme

####  This component has not implemented during 2019. Once most of the project’s contracts are executed, the FO will prepare and publish the call for the bilateral outcome of this programme.

## 2. Implementation

### Conformity with specific requirements

Up until summer 2019, the Greek refugee camps were under the responsibility of the Ministry of Migration Policy. On July 8, 2019 the newly government decided to transfer the control of the camps to the Ministry of Citizen Protection – responsible for Greece's public security services.

Following the parliamentary elections of July 2019, a new international protection bill was passed in October, almost instantly adopted in early November and took effect at the start of 2020. The new law introduces a number of controversial practices, which implications remain to be seen in the following months. What has been observed so far is the accelerated transfer of PoCs, already in waiting list, from the islands to the mainland, to whom no geographical restriction applied due to vulnerability reasons. Unlike what was happening in the past years, nowadays many PoCs are transferred to Athens within a very limited time after their arrival on the respective island.

The law introduced additionally sets out the shutdown of the current RICs and the creation of new detention centers, not only on the islands but also on the mainland.

**1. Financial contribution**

The maximum Project Grant rate shall be [up to] 90% for the open call projects of the total eligible expenditure of the Project.

According to PIA Art 4.6.2 & 4.6.3, the own contribution for the Open Call's project promoters shall include: (a) In-kind contribution in the form of volunteer work (5%) and (b) financial contribution (5%) from other sources of funding provided by the project promoter and the partners.

**2. UN orgs**

As regards the two UN organizations/Pre-defined project promoters (UNHCR and IOM) there are some important aspects in implementation that will deviate from PIA obligations as in force. The amendments to PIA are referenced below.

1. PIA Chapters 8.2, 8.3, 8.5, 9.5, 9.6, 12: These two organizations are expected to submit a final report and a certification that the internal auditing procedures has been followed, practice that is acceptable by the FMO as agreed. Although we plan to put efforts for monitoring on the physical aspects of the implementation, according to the above arraignment it seems that we will not be in a position to apply the standards of auditing, monitoring and evaluation plan for these two, so our obligation as FO for these aspects needs to be adjusted in accordingly in PIA. The verifications shall be based on these respective reports and the payments shall be made accordingly as the FO’s only obligation is to validate these reports.
2. Another issue concerning IOM's project, is "the provision of cash (one-time cash grants)" and the "in-kind reintegration assistance in the country of origin for the beneficiaries of voluntary return". This is an essential part of IOM's project as explained in the approved concept note. As the provision of cash is not considered as an eligible activity and in line with the current PIA according an amendment is deemed necessary

**3. Project Promoters Located in Donor States**

The FO is in the final stage of discussion with NORCAP, in order to proceed to the signing of the contract. As agreed, the financial verifications shall be based in the reports submitted by an independent external auditor to simplify the process and there is no obligation for the FO to commission an external auditor to verify the final report. This is also a point to be amended in the PIA, as Art.9.5 bares an exception only for international organizations and not project promoters located in Donor States

**4. Publicity**

As stated in the Αnnex 3 paragraph 2.3.2., point (d) it is foreseen that "All projects receiving a minimum of € 150,000 support from the EEA and Norway Grants and/or having a Donor Project Partner shall be required to have a dedicated project website with information in English as well as the national language". This is also a point to be amended in the PIA.

### Cooperation with International Partner Organisations (IPOs)

N/A

# C. LEARNING

## 1. Monitoring

The file monitoring and evaluation strategy can summarize the FOs approach on the programmes monitoring.

As regards the Outcome 2: “Capacity of key institutions to ensure protection of vulnerable asylum seekers, particularly UAMs, is strengthened”, implemented by NRC/NORCAP as there is no signed contract yet, there are no monitoring actions for this project. According to the final agreements on reporting and monitoring, a plan will be developed on 2020 by the FO.

As regards the Outcome 3: “Operational procedures and capacity of the Greek Asylum Service and Appeal Committees improved” implemented by UNHCR , as defined in the project contract “The Project Promoter conducts monitoring of its project, in accordance with its rules, policies, procedures and practices to assess results, performance and impact”.

During 2019 there was no project contract executed/signed so no regular project monitoring activities executed. Instead, a meeting was held on 21 of December 2019 in UNHCR premises, to conclude on the terms of project agreement.  That meeting was attended by the FO team members (legal team, manager, M&E coordinator) and the UNHCR focal points.

Other than that, consultations with regards contract’s and its annexes components were conducted via email chain & phone calls from early July to January 2020.

As regards Outcome 4: “Orderly and humane voluntary return of migrants or vulnerable groups is secured” to be implemented by IOM there are no monitoring actions or contract executed so there is no actual plan developed yet.

**Foreseen monitoring plan 2020**

**Outcome 2: Capacity of key institutions to ensure protection of vulnerable asylum seekers, particularly UAMs, is strengthened**

As indicated in Art. 9.2.2 of PIA “*A report by an independent auditor, qualified to carry out statutory audits of accounting documents, certifying that the reported costs are incurred in accordance with this Agreement, the national law and relevant national accounting practices shall be accepted as sufficient proof of expenditure incurred for project partners whose primary location is in one of the Donor States or project partners are international organizations or bodies or agencies thereof…”* . That provision simplifies the verification procedures but does not exempt from performing other types of monitoring (results-based) through quarterly reports review on-the site visits and other “soft monitoring actions”.

To that end, during 2020 and upon the contract execution the FO will invite the PP to establish a routine of **bi-monthly monitoring meetings** attended by the FO’s monitoring team members and Project’s local team and project manager. This process will allow the FO to better understand how that “context sensitive” project operates and what are the apparent challenges deriving from ongoing changes in the asylum legislation and the continuously changing context in the refugee crisis in Greece as well as to support project adjustments and compliance with the agreed project operation.

In that context, during 2020, **at least two on the spot verification** visits will be organised in coordination with the PP, aiming to verify the progress in both partnering public entities that the project directly supports (EKKA and Ministry of migration and asylum).

Risk-based monitoring will not be excepted from the process of monitoring as a semi-annually update on the risk assessment will be provided by the PP and will be subject of discussion during every other monitoring activity. The identified risks will be a subject of monitoring and mitigation measures if needed.

**Outcome 3: Operational procedures and capacity of the Greek Asylum Service and Appeal Committees improved**

As results from the Project Contract  with UNHCR this project will not be a subject of quarterly financial monitoring by the FO: Project Contract paragraph, 4.6:  “*The Project Promoter conducts monitoring of its project, in accordance with its rules, policies, procedures and practices to assess results, performance and impact”, “The Project Promoter conducts evaluations of its projects, programmes and strategies in accordance with its rules, policies, procedures and practices to assess the results, performance and impact. UNHCR’s Evaluation Policy (2016) governs its evaluation practice”.*

To that end, FO monitoring of this project*, will exhaust on* ***the review of the final report*** *from the PP at the end of the project to be submitted by UNHCR “*…in order to provide: an overall assessment of the implementation of the Project including comparison to the plans set out in the Project and any lessons learned; an assessment of the Project’s contribution to its overall objectives and outcomes; specific details in respect of meeting and/or adapting financial plans; and financial information, including a calculation of the final balance”.

The Fund Operator shall review the Final Project Report in order to determine whether it fulfils the substantive requirements”.

The same applies with the financial aspects of project monitoring  *“In line with the single audit principle, the Project promoter shall be audited solely in accordance with the UN Financial Regulations and the UNHCR Financial Rules, All financial transactions and related activities covered by the UN Financial Regulations and the UNHCR Financial Rules shall be subject to audit by internal auditors and the United Nations Board of Auditors… The Project Promoter shall provide the Fund Operator with a summary of an audit report made in accordance with the preceding paragraph regarding, inter alia, the implementation of the Project and, in case of irregularities or financial mismanagement, shall provide the Fund Operator with details of any such findings as well as the measures taken to address them in accordance with UNHCR regulations, rules and procedures” (paragraphs 4&5 Chapter 9 Records and Audits of the project contract).*

**Outcome 4: Orderly and humane voluntary return of migrants or vulnerable groups is secured**

The monitoring plan of this outcome will be determined upon the contract execution. However, it is expected that the main monitoring actions will be desk review of the quarterly progress reports (results-based monitoring) to be combined with other soft monitoring actions.

To that end, during 2020 and upon the contract execution with IOM, the FO will invite the PP to establish a routine of **bi-monthly monitoring meetings**. This process will allow the FO to better understand how the project operates and how the results are achieved. Special focus will be given on the modality of cash provision to the returned beneficiaries as this is an exceptional provision under the EEA and Norway Grants.

A**t least one on the spot verification** visits will be organised in coordination with the PP, aiming to verify the way that the project operates in order to facilitate returns and re-integration of individuals to the countries of origin.

Although the exact plan will be developed upon the contract execution that it is estimated in June  2020, some preliminary ideas on our monitoring approach focus on the sequent steps of the voluntary return process and on-the-spot visits where, in collaboration with the IOM staff,  the FO will monitor the actions taken for :

* Enabling informed decisions on return by beneficiaries (information and counseling at the sites e.g. camps, detention centers, RICs or other). This effort might be restricted by the current “closed doors” policy in the sites operation, especially as regards RICs and detention centers. In such cases, the visits will exhaust with the meeting of IOM field staff assigned in the project and if possible with other stakeholders (e.g. site management).
* Case management cycle and the challenges met by IOM staff to facilitate return process
* Departure process at the departure points (e.g. airport) with focus on the provision of cash assistance to verify how the methodology of repatriation is taking place.
* Developing and implementing individual reintegration plans at the country of origin including cash assistance provision.

Risk-based monitoring will not be excepted from the process of monitoring as a quarterly update on the risk assessment will be provided by the PP along with the progress monitoring report. The identified risks will be a subject of monitoring and mitigation measures if needed.

Of special concern for the FO is the cash assistance provided as part of the reintegration process. As on-the-spot-visits in the countries of origin is beyond FOs capacity the (e.g. traveling in a country of origin might have security or other legal implications) the FO will explore ways to verify that this process is facilitated in an accountable and transparent manner.

These ways include on-the-spot verifications in departure points (airport), while the PP will be asked to provide detailed methodology of the cash assistance modalities (e.g. hand by hand in the airport, through transactions at country of origin etc.) and **verification beneficiaries lists and relevant documentation**. In addition, in consultation with the PP the **post-distribution monitoring** process will be reviewed and possibly a small number of interviews with beneficiaries to be reached through skype or phone calls could further contribute on the verification of the provisions. Timewise, this last component of monitoring, will be possible to be facilitated, once a number of beneficiaries are return in the country of origin/return which is estimated later in 2020 and mostly during 2021.

A detailed monitoring plan is annexed.

## 2. Evaluation

Evaluation will be only performed at the end of the programmes as described in the monitoring and evaluation strategy of the FO. There are no evaluation activities during the first year of the PIA implementation.

## 3. Lessons learned

* As an overall observation, can be said that UN and international organisations assigned as predefined Project Promoters under Asylum & Migration programme, needed unexpected amount of time to elaborate on the requirements set by the FO and respond towards the contract’s execution.
* Flexibility is essential when working with UN and international organisations. Their prevailing internal rules and procedures creates a need for multiple adjustments in Project Agreements.
* Close collaboration with FMO was essential to engage project promoters or achieve agreement in all cases.
* In particular, in the case of UNHCR project (outcome 3), UN internal procedures and rules had to prevail in some cases the EEA Grants ones. For instance, aspects of monitoring and evaluation, project audit, eligibility of expenditures, sustainability and other contractual arrangements had to adjust to the UN internal rules. These alterations agreed also by the FMO will become a basis for a PIA amendment during 2020.
* In the case of IOM (Outcome 4) it was observed reluctance in response and significant efforts had been put to mobilize and engage the project promoter into discussions related to the contract execution.  That is explained by the fact that the selected PP was assigned with large number of funds in 2019 by different institutional sources and it took significant time for their internal coordination to conclude that the project under EEA Grant will only start on 2020.
* As regard the collaboration with NORCAP (Outcome 2), close collaboration has been established early since the assignment of the FO in early 2019. Challenges appeared as regards the willingness of the PP to comply with the standards set by the FO e.g. reporting frequency, annexes of the contracts, eligibility of expenditures, legal documentation of the PP (up to date & translated documents related to legal representation of the organization) operation in Greece and other.  In addition, in order to comply with the national legal framework, it was essential for NORCAP to clarify administrative and taxation issues, for example what is the type of legal entity in Greece, what is the payment pathway that needs to be followed to be compliant with the EEA Grants rules and the Greek legal system.
* Cooperation with DPP and FMO was also essential to conclude on a successful Open Call design and process.
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## Annex 1: Updated results (indicator achievements)

|  |
| --- |
| **Objective: Functioning national asylum and migration management systems ensured and the right to seek asylum safeguarded** |
| **Outcome 1: Improved quality of accommodation and other services provided in open reception centres** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Open reception centres are in line with EU Directives’ minimum standards for the reception of vulnerable asylum seekers, especially un-accompanied minors (UAMs)** | Binary | No | - | -  | - | - | Yes | - |
| **Number of unaccompanied minor asylum seekers (UAMs) receiving services.** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 2,250 | - |
| Gender |
| Female | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Male | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Number of non-unaccompanied minor asylum (UMA) beneficiaries provided with services** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 750 | - |
| Gender |
| Female | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Male | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Output 1.1: Accommodation places provided in open reception centres for vulnerable asylum seekers, in particular UAMs** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Number of accommodation places provided in open reception centres.** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | ≥300 | - |
| **Number of the new accommodation places reserved for UAMs** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 225 | - |
| **Annual average monthly occupancy rate in the supported centres** | Average | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 90% | - |
| **Output 1.2: Close interaction and cooperation between non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and relevant public entities is established** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Number of open reception centres where the NGOs and public entities formally and informally cooperate (Memorandum of Understanding or common activities implemented)** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | >3 | - |
| **Outcome 2: Capacity of key institutions to ensure protection of vulnerable asylum seekers, particularly UAMs, is strengthened** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Number of decentralised sites operated by Reception and Identification Service (RIS) that implement national standard operating procedures (SOPs) for reception centres** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 6 | - |
| **Output 2.1: Expert support provided to key Reception and Identification Service (RIS) departments, to critical Reception and Identification Centres (RICs), to Ministry of Migration Policy (MoMP) and to the National Centre for Social Solidarity (EKKA)** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Number of NORCAP staff seconded to RIS and MoMP** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 14 | - |
| **Number of NORCAP staff seconded to EKKA** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 3 | - |
| **Number of months of secondment from NORCAP** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 522 | - |
| **Outcome 3: Operational procedures and capacity of the Greek Asylum Service and Appeal Committees improved** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Number of beneficiaries of legal aid services** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 4,500 | - |
| Gender |
| Female | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Male | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Output 3.1: Expert support provided to the Greek Asylum Service** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Number of Associate Asylum Experts deployed to the Asylum Service all over Greece** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 18 | - |
| **Number of staff deployed to the Asylum Service centrally (e.g. Legal Advisor, Legal Liaison Officers, Documentation Experts)** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 5 | - |
| **Output 3.2: Free legal aid provided to vulnerable asylum seekers related to first instance asylum procedures** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Number of lawyers that have been involved in the free legal aid component** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 40 | - |
| **Outcome 4: Orderly and humane voluntary return of migrants or vulnerable groups is secured** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Reduced waiting time from application to voluntary return achieved** | Binary | No | - | -  | - | - | Yes | - |
| **Output 4.1: Financial reintegration support system established, with differentiated levels of support** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Number of migrants departed through IOM for voluntary return** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 290 | - |
| **Bilateral Outcome: Enhanced collaboration between beneficiary and donor state entities involved in the programme** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Level of trust between cooperating entities in beneficiary states and donor states** | Scale 1-7 | TBD, Survey to be carried out by the FMO | - | -  | - | - | ≥4.5 and an increase on the baseline | - |
| State type |
| Beneficiary State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Donor State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Level of satisfaction with the partnerships** | Scale 1-7 | TBD, Survey to be carried out by the FMO | - | -  | - | - | ≥4.5 and an increase on the baseline value | - |
| State type |
| Beneficiary State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Donor State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Share of cooperating organisations that apply the knowledge acquired from the bilateral partnerships** | Percentage | N/A | - | -  | - | - | ≥50% | - |
| State type |
| Beneficiary State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Donor State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Bilateral Output 1: Partnerships between beneficiary and donor state entities supported** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Number of projects involving cooperation with a donor project partner** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 4 | - |
| Donor State |
| Norway | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Iceland | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Liechtenstein | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Bilateral Output 2: Partners from Beneficiary State and Donor States participate in international networks on migration and asylum together** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Number of new networking activities where partners from Greece and the Donor States participate together** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 8 | - |

## Annex 2: Communication summary

### Visibility of the Grants and the donors

The visibility of the EEA Grants was fulfilled through the communication of the Open Call procedure and through the launch events in Athens and Thessaloniki (October – November 2019). At least, seven dedicated reportages were published not only online but also in printed media.

From October 30 until January 17th, the Open Call was running for organizations which wanted to express interest on undertaking programmes and several social media updated were created.

### Communication with the National Focal Point

Not applicable at the time being.

### Website and social media

The “Asylum and Migration” Programme has a dedicated [website](https://www.asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr/call/) (along with the Local Development and Poverty Reduction Programme), redirecting to one another. The website is held in English and will be soon translated in Greek as well. Though this website begun all informational communication material created for the Open Call.

Moreover,  dedicated social media pages exist on [facebook](https://www.facebook.com/Local-Development-Poverty-Reduction-Asylum-and-Migration-EEAGrants-105088347573332/?modal=admin_todo_tour), [twitter](https://twitter.com/local_eea) and [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/showcase/local-development-poverty-reduction-asylum-and-migration-eeagrants/?viewAsMember=true). During the Open Call running season, the Fund Operator used the cannels described above to inform publicly on alterations on the procedure, deadlines and latest news. In addition, both launch events in Athens and Thessaloniki took a lot of visibility, especially through twitter.

### Best practice examples

The Fund Operator is currently in the process of evaluating the proposals gathered by the Open Call phase. In the next report, we will be in the happy position to present interesting programmes and their communication purposes.

### Multimedia

Not applicable at the time being.

## Annex 3: Overview of contracted projects

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome | Projects | # | # of donor project partners | Amount contracted | % of outcome budget contracted |
| **Outcome 1: Improved quality of accommodation and other services provided in open reception centres** | Pre-defined | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| Contracted through open calls | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| Contracted through small grants scheme | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| **Total Outcome 1** | **0** | **0** | **€ 0** | **0.00 %** |
| **Outcome 2: Capacity of key institutions to ensure protection of vulnerable asylum seekers, particularly UAMs, is strengthened** | Pre-defined | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| Contracted through open calls | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| Contracted through small grants scheme | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| **Total Outcome 2** | **0** | **0** | **€ 0** | **0.00 %** |
| **Outcome 3: Operational procedures and capacity of the Greek Asylum Service and Appeal Committees improved** | Pre-defined | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| Contracted through open calls | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| Contracted through small grants scheme | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| **Total Outcome 3** | **0** | **0** | **€ 0** | **0.00 %** |
| **Outcome 4: Orderly and humane voluntary return of migrants or vulnerable groups is secured** | Pre-defined | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| Contracted through open calls | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| Contracted through small grants scheme | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| **Total Outcome 4** | **0** | **0** | **€ 0** | **0.00 %** |
| **Programme** | **Total** | **0** | **0** | **€ 0** | **0.00 %** |

## Annex 4: Risk management

|  |
| --- |
| **Programmatic risks** |
| **Risk description** | Risk related to | Likelihood | Consequence | Risk score | Response type | Risk N/A? |
| Project Promoters cannot reach indicators/numbers of the Open Call due to contextual factors (e.g. delays in relocation and family reunification proceses, delays in other accomodation programmes | Reducing social and economic disparities | 4 | 3 | 3.46 | Accept | No |
| **Description of planned response** | In consultation with EKKA, re-assessment of the situation across the different projects funded and across other shelters funded by other sources. Concepts to be considered are indicatively:review of asylum seeking situation in the country (with emphasis on UAMs), average duration of residence in shelters, factors delaying exit, needs assessment of the UAM, drop-out rates, consultation with alternative or transition programmes to mitigate the delays in transiting to other programmes.  |
| **Description of actual response** | The risk has not been occurred during 2019, since the Selection process will be conducted by March 2020. |
| **Planned future response** | In consultation with EKKA, re-assessment of the situation across the different projects funded and across other shelters funded by other sources. Concepts to be considered are indicatively:review of asylum seeking situation in the country (with emphasis on UAMs), average duration of residence in shelters, factors delaying exit, needs assessment of the UAM, drop-out rates, consultation with alternative or transition programmes to mitigate the delays in transiting to other programmes. |
| Delays in the contracting with the Pre defined Project Promoters  | Reducing social and economic disparities | 4 | 2 | 2.83 | Avoid/Terminate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | Legal constrains to be overpassed via intensive guidance to the PPs on the steps to take to provide the adequate legal documentation required for the contract signature. |
| **Description of actual response** | Consultation with Project Promoters & step by step guidance so that obstacles would be reduced; Close collaboration with FMO was essential to engage project promoters or achieve agreement in all cases.  |
| **Planned future response** | Consultation with Project Promoter & step by step guidance so that obstacles will be reduced; Close collaboration with FMO  |
| Changes in the relevant -to the refugee issues- Ministries. NFP internal changes due to the new governement, which took the office on July 2019 elections.  | Reducing social and economic disparities | 4 | 2 | 2.83 | Accept | No |
| **Description of planned response** | It is given that we have many changes with the public sector associates at almost all levels it is important to maintain a strong collaborative relationship carried to the new persons so there are no delays or miscommunications. Hints: see early a new person in his position.  |
| **Description of actual response** | Establishment of strong & constructive collaborative relationships with the new key persons |
| **Planned future response** | Establishment of strong & constructive collaborative relationships with the new key persons |
| EU Turkey statement collapses, wars continue in the M. East causing more bumerous flows of persons to the EU through Greece. | Reducing social and economic disparities | 2 | 2 | 2.00 | Accept | No |
| **Description of planned response** | It is beyond these programmes to take actions against international risks. Programmes will not be affected by these issues only reputation may be needed to communicate why the programmes continue as planned instead of adjusting to the new needs due to new high numbers of arrival.  |
| **Description of actual response** | Risk has not been occurred during 2019; it remains a risk for 2020 |
| **Planned future response** | Programmes will not be affected by these issues only reputation may be needed to communicate why the programmes continue as planned instead of adjusting to the new needs due to new high numbers of arrival. |
| Athens Development & Destination Management Agency organogram changed after the New Mayor was elected; A revised project was submitted, with lack of clarity regarding the implementation frame, which may delay the signing of the contract.  | Reducing social and economic disparities | 1 | 3 | 1.73 | Mitigate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | Very important to mitigate this risk by briefing and working with the new Mayor and the team amd FMO so as to ensure speedy implementation. |
| **Description of actual response** | Successive meetings & communications have been conducted with Mayor’s office & his team’; Provision of guidance to the Project Promoter. Close collaboration with FMO |
| **Planned future response** | Provision of guidance to the Project Promoter Close collaboration with FMO |
| Establishment of a new Ministry of Migration and Asylum by the Government as well with the new legislative developments; | Reducing social and economic disparities | 1 | 3 | 1.73 | Mitigate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | This would be very critical if no permits or existing permits are suspended eg for NRC and other project promoters this would mean inability to continue the project. It is prudent to maintain a continuous relationship and sharing of information with RIC or the applicable permitting authorities so as to reduce and mitigate such a possibility. |
| **Description of actual response** | Although project’s contract has not been executed during 2019, a close collaboration with NORCAP was established, so that the situation would be monitored.  |
| **Planned future response** | Tracking ministerial developments in collaboration with NORCAP; Adjust programmatic elements of the project’s content, so that the outcomes of the project will be achieved.  |
| Ministry of education denies permit for schools for the educators for the project or approves and then delays / suspends. | Reducing social and economic disparities | 2 | 3 | 2.45 | Mitigate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | It is important to secure the access MoU for schools before any changes at the Ministry of Education and before any funds are spent. However, it is also possible that the Ministry would stop or cancel the MoU therefore very important to continue during the duration of the project to have a working positive relationship with the Ministry to avoid delays or even termination of the project. |
| **Description of actual response** | The risk during 2019 has not been occurred; On the contrary, Ministry of Education, was supportive to the project.  |
| **Planned future response** | Continue during the duration of the project to have a working positive relationship with the Ministry to avoid delays or even termination of the project. |
| Far right racist attacks increase to staff and / or beneficiaries in addition to the growing xenophobia for refugees and negativity on funding programs for refugees. | Reducing social and economic disparities | 1 | 3 | 1.73 | Avoid/Terminate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | Mitigate the risk with proper security for staff and beneficiaries; good positive collaboration with police and authorities; security exercises for any such attacks and crisis scenarios for staff and beneficiaries. |
| **Description of actual response** | Risk has not been occurred during 2019 |
| **Planned future response** | Mitigate the risk with proper security for staff and beneficiaries; good positive collaboration with police and authorities; security exercises for any such attacks and crisis scenarios for staff and beneficiaries. |
| No cooperation with international organizations like the UNHCR and IOM on the contracting side and operational reporting. | Reducing social and economic disparities | 2 | 2 | 2.00 | Mitigate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | Hesitation / decline by international organizations to accept a consultant company and an ngo to have the position of a fund operator. Mitigation by stressing the short projects and the need to have a smooth relationship for the funding to be paid and projects successful. Also stressing the role of the FO purely technical not programmatic. |
| **Description of actual response** | There were delays in contracting UNHCR & IOM. FO was in close collaboration with FMO was essential to achieve agreement with UNHCR & IOM. |
| **Planned future response** | Consultation with IOM & step by step guidance so that obstacles will be reduced; Close collaboration with FMO |
| Less flows thus less funding for NGOs with an effect that shut down operations and lose staff and capacity. | Both objectives | 2 | 3 | 2.45 | Avoid/Terminate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | In the scenario flows greatly reduced and all asylum seekers in Greece are adequately protected and integrated, large funding by donors would stop therefore create economic sustainability issues to ngos and therefore create issues of long term sustainability to our project promoters. Continue to communicate with project promoters and encourage revisions of sustainability business plans as well as identification of alternate funding sourses to create more flexibility and sustainability. |
| **Description of actual response** | Risk has not been occurred during 2019 |
| **Planned future response** | Continue to communicate with project promoters and encourage revisions of sustainability business plans as well as identification of alternate funding sourses to create more flexibility and sustainability |
| No interest in bilateral activities   | Strengthening bilateral relations | 1 | 2 | 1.41 | Mitigate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | Communication actions to create awareness for the bilateral funding available and potential more funding from the NFP as well as insights and clear explanations of the process so as to encourage applications. |
| **Description of actual response** | Bilateral component has not implemented during 2019. Once most of the project’s contracts are executed, the FO will prepare and publish the call for the bilateral outcome of this programme. |
| **Planned future response** | Communication actions to create awareness for the bilateral funding available and potential more funding from the NFP as well as insights and clear explanations of the process so as to encourage applications. |
| **Operational risks** |
| **Risk description** | Risk related to | Likelihood | Consequence | Risk score | Response type | Risk N/A? |
| Deliverables missed no impact from the funding clearly seen - negative feedback from Donors.  | Both objectives | 1 | 3 | 1.73 | Mitigate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | On the spot visits and extensive monitoring and assesment program required in working with project promoters. Important to set and revise targets so that they are realistic and current. Preventive actions should be taken by the FO during the project and as soon as such issues are detected rather than wait towards the end of the project when it will be too late for adjustments. |
| **Description of actual response** | On the spot visits and extensive monitoring and assesment of the projects will be conducted from Q1 of 2020. |
| **Planned future response** | On the spot visits and extensive monitoring and assesment program required in working with project promoters. Important to set and revise targets so that they are realistic and current. Preventive actions should be taken by the FO during the project and as soon as such issues are detected rather than wait towards the end of the project when it will be too late for adjustments. |
| Double Funding not disclosed by the project promoters.  | Both objectives | 1 | 2 | 1.41 | Mitigate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | Having the project promoter provide a declaration of no double funding by any source for the particular project. Very helpful for the FO to understand sources of funding and other projects and timelines for the project promoter. During auditing scanning the expenditure listings for any trips not included in the project or use of incorrect project references. Helpful to have project promoters use dedicated bank account for this project only.  |
| **Description of actual response** | Risk did not occur during 2019 |
| **Planned future response** | Having the project promoter provide a declaration of no double funding by any source for the particular project. Very helpful for the FO to understand sources of funding and other projects and timelines for the project promoter. During auditing scanning the expenditure listings for any trips not included in the project or use of incorrect project references. Helpful to have project promoters use dedicated bank account for this project only. |
| Consortium Failure for the FO and inability to continue its role.  | Both objectives | 1 | 4 | 2.00 | Avoid/Terminate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | The FO has formulated a detailed and comprehensive consortium legal agreement in good faith and runs continous meetings to mitigate any conflicts and grievances on the overall collaboration. Also important for the FO to seek external arbitration and / or support gudiance from the FMO before any terminal actions. |
| **Description of actual response** | No such risk occurred during 2019 |
| **Planned future response** | The FO has formulated a detailed and comprehensive consortium legal agreement in good faith and runs continuous meetings to mitigate any conflicts and grievances on the overall collaboration. Also important for the FO to seek external arbitration and / or support gudiance from the FMO before any terminal actions. |
| Limited proposals open call for Program II - not enough projects selected or not enough qualitative projects and sustainable project promoters.  | Both objectives | 2 | 2 | 2.00 | Mitigate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | FO should use all communication channels available to him and project partners / stakeholders to promote and distribute information on the open call and application process as well as dealines. Actions like sponsored social media notifications to ngos to apply and workshops on the application process would be helpful to increase applications received wheras workshops would increase the quality of such applications. |
| **Description of actual response** | The deadline for the submission of the proposals for the Open Call was 17/1/2020; This risk was not met; FO received 10 proposals |
| **Planned future response** | This risk was not met; FO received 10 proposals |
| Selection process complaints and issues of interest conflicts in the process.  | Both objectives | 2 | 3 | 2.45 | Avoid/Terminate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | The main risk during the selection process is that evaluators have some form of direct or indirect interest with applicants eg have a salary association or are competitors with other applicants for the same funding.The evaluators and members of Selection Committee must sign conflict of interest declarations. FO should adequately use a third evaluator when justified and FO should document very transparently each aspect of the detailed published process especially any changes to the process. |
| **Description of actual response** | Selection process will start after the expiration of the deadline for proposals submission (17/1/2020) |
| **Planned future response** | The main risk during the selection process is that evaluators have some form of direct or indirect interest with applicants eg have a salary association or are competitors with other applicants for the same funding.The evaluators and members of Selection Committee must sign conflict of interest declarations. FO should adequately use a third evaluator when justified and FO should document very transparently each aspect of the detailed published process especially any changes to the process. |
| Communications gaps with projects due to complexity of projects or delays in reporting communication actions to the FO.  | Both objectives | 2 | 2 | 2.00 | Mitigate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | As the programmes are large and complicated with various logos from each project promoter there should be constant communication by the FO internally and externally to make sure communication plans by each project promoter are carried efficiently and Donors are properly recognized via projects. Special attention to correct logos and exclusivity with Donors funding. |
| **Description of actual response** | No such risk occurred during 2019.  |
| **Planned future response** | As the programmes are large and complicated with various logos from each project promoter there should be constant communication by the FO internally and externally to make sure communication plans by each project promoter are carried efficiently and Donors are properly recognized via projects. Special attention to correct logos and exclusivity with Donors funding. |
| Segregation of staff duties by the FO and delegation of duties to qualified personnel.  | Both objectives | 2 | 2 | 2.00 | Mitigate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | Very important for the FO to ensure adequate segregation of tasks among its staff to assure quality of work and avoid internal conflicts. There should be enough controls in place eg to ensure payments to project promoters are not approved by staff involved in selecting and approving projects. |
| **Description of actual response** | No such risk occurred during 2019 |
| **Planned future response** | FO will ensure adequate segregation of tasks among its staff to assure quality of work and avoid internal conflicts. There should be enough controls in place eg to ensure payments to project promoters are not approved by staff involved in selecting and approving projects. |
| Attacks on field staff FO/project promoters and stakeholders. These could cause suspension of work and / or create more negative public opinion.  | Both objectives | 2 | 4 | 2.83 | Avoid/Terminate | No |
| **Description of planned response** | As most project promoters with have management and staff in the field exposed to risks of riots between beneficiaries and / or external threats, FO should have a clear system of communication and warning in place with project promoters for such incidents stressing the life and safety of all involved and crisis management plans in the case of such an episode. |
| **Description of actual response** | No such risk occurred during 2019 |
| **Planned future response** | FO should have a clear system of communication and warning in place with project promoters for such incidents stressing the life and safety of all involved and crisis management plans in the case of such an episode. |
| **Overall risk of the programme** |
|  | Likelihood | Consequence | Risk score |  |  |
| OVERALL RISK OF THE PROGRAMME | 2 | 2 | 2.00 |  |  |