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# A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*The report presents the main results of the EEA Grants, Local Development and Poverty Reduction Programme, restricted to the results of  Outcome 2 “Increased opportunities for integration and social inclusion for vulnerable individuals” which is implemented by the Greek NGO Solidarity Now, through the operation of Athens Solidarity Center.*

*The Programme through ASC’s contribution in Outcome 2:**Increased opportunities for integration and social inclusion for vulnerable individuals produced the following significant results:*

*Access to employment of the vulnerable people is the cornerstone of integration. The outcome was quite successful as 31% of the beneficiaries found a job and 20% passed an interview. Certain types of employment have no requirement of a proper “interview” process e.g. dish washing, car washing, technical jobs, cleaning resulting and that fact explains why the share of interviews is lower than the share of people that found a job. With regards to access to the right for asylum, from the total 88 of asylum and family reunification cases handled by ASCs legal team, 41 were successful, shaping a share of 47% on that outcome indicator, with family reunification largely contributing to that share. The Project provided counselling sessions and psychotherapeutic interventions to vulnerable populations (Greek, migrants and refuge). On average, the team assists 45% Greek or Greek speaking beneficiaries and 55% migrants and refugees, on a monthly basis.*

*During 2019, no bilateral actions have been implemented.*

*Regarding the progress of implementation of the Programme, one project is implemented (Outcome 2), whereas the project contract for Outcome 1 is in the final stage of discussion in order to proceed with signing of the contract and Outcome 3 project component is still to be defined by the Athens Development & Destination Management Agency (Municipality of Athens) since an 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.*

*Concerning Outcome 2, the operational efficiency of ASC is achieved through the implementation of three main activities namely, inter-department/internal coordination meetings, staff training, psychological supervision available to staff.  In particular,13 inter-department/internal coordination meetings, facilitated a more comprehensive understanding of the context and mutual support among team members. The existence and operation of ASC’s CRM system as a basic operational aspect should ensure accountability of the project. However, important technical issues exist with direct impact on the validity of the indicators’ values (underestimated).  That is the case for the output indicator “Number of legal representations (asylum service and court)”. An important concern of the FO relates to the reliability of the reported data and indicators as the CRM is not fully operational while for other indicators  such as “number of organizations which carry out complementary activities in the ASC****”*** *it seems that in the reported indicators, activities under a different grant has been reported even after the request of additional documentation on the collaboration with other actors PP.*

*Regarding the Programme Financial Overview, only 400.000€ were disbursed as advance payment to SolidarityNow of total 6.500.000€. The total expenditure reported to FO until 31.12.2019 amounts to 528.135,13€, whereas the total eligible expenditure verified amounts to 487.263,22€. The FO reported in detail to the PP all ineligible expenditures and the respective justification, providing comments that should be followed up on a future monitoring review.*

*The most important lessons learned during the first year of implementation of the Programme are:*

* *The development of an online platform proved a comfortable modality for the reporting and the developed monitoring and reporting tools have been applied successfully demonstrating efficiency for the needs of project monitoring.*
* *Some of the indicators’ targets are set extremely high e.g. tax numbers issued, successful asylum and family reunification applications. It is assessed that these targets are unlikely to be met.*
* *The FO’s experience with SolidarityNow highlighted the fact that the Project Promoters need support in order to fulfil and comply with the project requirements and to provide sufficient proof of expenditure to document the audit trail by issuing specific guidelines and detailed instructions as far as possible, in order to facilitate the Project Promoters to meet and to comply fully to the requirements of the Project and Programme.*
* *Similarly, PPs are expected to require assistance for the development of a valid data collection methodology to monitor the quality of the service provision through a satisfaction survey (outcome indicators)*

*The visibility of the Programme/Donors was ensured by close interaction with the FO’s Communication Officer. The creative material was consistently checked in order to ascertain that the guidelines and the communication plan are followed. Moreover, the Communication Officer made sure that social media posts are aligned with the guidelines and mention the contribution of the EEA Grants. During the on the spot verification the FO paid attention in making sure that the visual material (signs, billboards and leaflets) was indeed placed in Athens Solidarity Center. Additionally, the second phase of the partnership is effectively communicated, tying EEA Grant funding to a range of services including social protection services, psychological support and counselling, children services and legal services among others promoting the depth and range of activities the grant corresponds to.*

*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 and Municipality. 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 1: Integration of refugee children in Greek schools improved

####  Project Title: Integration of Refugee Children in Greek Schools

*This project is implemented by the European Wergeland Center. Although the project expenditures are eligible as from 23/05/2019 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 2: Increased opportunities for integration and social inclusion for vulnerable individuals

#### Project Title: Athens Solidarity Centre

*The project under this outcome is implemented by the Greek NGO Solidarity Now. The eligibility of expenditures started on 23/05/2019 and the contract signed on 29/10/2019. The first report submitted on 15th of January 2020 with a reference period from 01 June 2019- 31 December 2019.*

*From June 2019 to December 2019 3.802 beneficiaries has been benefited by the services provided by the ASC, more than half of which were asylum seekers (2013), followed by undocumented persons (1060) and 452 recognized refugees. In addition. 184 Greek nationals have been supported and 80 migrants with legal residence permits.  More than 70% of the beneficiaries are males and the rest females. Only 3 beneficiaries are of another gender. The vast majority of the beneficiaries are aged between 18-65 years old, however 416 children has been supported, either UAMs or children that attended the curriculum of the Child Friendly Space (for children of beneficiaries) made available through the project.*

*These people received at least one of the services provided namely: reception, social, accounting, legal and employability services. From the operation of these services during the first six months of the project, 513 people were supported to obtain unrestricted access to social benefits, including accommodation.*

*A prominent achievement from the beginning of the project until today is the successful referral pathway effectively established between Athens Solidarity Center and a great number of other service providers and agencies. More than two thousand referrals of beneficiaries to other organisations (both public and private) indicates a strong contribution of the project in empowering vulnerable population to navigate to the complex, demanding and often inaccessible service provision system,  and thus to their way towards integration into the Greek society.*

***Employability:*** *Access to employment of the vulnerable people is the cornerstone of integration. Through the employability services provided through the project 386 beneficiaries were empowered and received help them to identify their strong and weak skills, set future goals, train them on job search strategies and self – presentation, prepare their job search tools (CVs, cover letters, etc.)  and connect them with the job market and educational and/or vocational opportunities. The outcome was quite successful as 31% of the beneficiaries found a job and 20% passed an interview. Certain types of employment have no requirement of a proper “interview” process e.g. dish washing, car washing, technical jobs, cleaning resulting and that fact explains why the share of interviews is lower than the share of people that found a job.*

***Access to Asylum:*** *As regards access to the right for asylum, from the total 88 of asylum and family reunification cases handled by ASCs legal team, 41 were successful, shaping a share of 47% on that outcome indicator, with family reunification largely contributing to that share. 58 legal representations were undertaken by the legal team: that includes representations to the court (administrative, civil or criminal courts) with a team capacity of 5 lawyers, and a 6th (part-time) deployed in September 2019. This figure is significantly low (2% of the target) as a result of the nature of legal representation as a service that entails a significant number of preparatory sessions, which are not included in the above discussed indicator such as visiting the authorities to ask about the progress of the case, obtaining certified copies of the file etc. drafting supporting documentation.*

***Accounting Services:*** *The ASC is one of the very few Centers providing accounting services all year long and, hence, referrals are received from multiple organizations. The accountants provide information and support to individuals regarding issues with taxes and social security numbers, as well as, they prepare and submit tax declarations. Furthermore, they support the beneficiaries to access benefits they are eligible for.*

*In contrast, with the other outcome indicators, the number of tax numbers issued, at the end of the 2019, remains significantly small with 22 tax numbers issued during the first six months of the project (1% of the final target).  That results from the fact that refugee and asylum seekers beneficiaries that constitute the vast majority of the ASC beneficiaries already obtain tax number at an earlier stage before their transition to the urban environment and during their stay at RICs. Being a resident in RIC or camp provide the basic requirement of having a permanent address in order to obtain tax number. On this ground, accounting services extended their  support in other needed services such as information modification int the tax system (193 cases), production and activation of key number (486 cases) and support accessing on the tax system in Greece including transactions related with the Tax Office. This support is important pre condition of integration  and meeting conditions to access wider social, government benefits, such as discount on the electricity bill (KOT), child allowance, A21, rental allowance, activation of free of charge Athena card etc. Last but not least, the efficiency of the accounting services should be read in combination with the performance at output level (e.g.Number of tax declarations submitted 925).*

***Psychological Support:*** *The Project provided counselling sessions and psychotherapeutic interventions to vulnerable populations (Greek, migrants and refuge). On average, the team assists 45% Greek or Greek speaking beneficiaries and 55% migrants and refugees, on a monthly basis.  team of psychologists receives referrals from other NGO’s but also from public services such as hospitals or privet practitioners. In total, during the first six months of the project, 816 psychological sessions were conducted by the team of 2 full time and 1 part time psychologist (are trained psychotherapists).*

*As regards the* ***quality of service provision****, at the end of 2019, a comprehensive satisfaction survey had not been developed yet. A pilot data collection (n=21) has been implemented and the indicator value provided on this report is based on the pilot data only. The FO will follow up with the PP on the progress of this important activity to make sure that in the next reporting period for this indicator (semi-annually) a valid measurement will be provided.*

***Collaboration between the Athens Solidarity Centre (ASC) and CSO's***

*The* ***enhancement of collaboration between ASC and other civil society organizations*** *is attained through the organisation of complementary activities at ASC by other actors. During 2019 the main such collaboration was organised by the Network for Children’s Rights for children from 3 to 12 years old with a total of 825 beneficiaries in total visited the Center of the Child.  In addition, collaboration with the Social Hackers Academy was initiated in November 2019, offering Computer Literacy Classes of 20-hours curriculum for people with none or little knowledge in using computers (8-12 beneficiaries). Other worth mentioning collaborations include the partnership with CISCO, IT and Networking company, conducting IT classes on a weekly basis at ASC.*

*Furthermore, all ASC staff members participate regularly in external coordination meetings for networking and exchange of valuable information and experience, in working groups organized by the Municipality of Athens and by UNHCR; they also represent SolidarityNow in international fora and experts meetings relevant to each professional field.*

***Improved operational efficiency of ASC:*** *The operational efficiency of the ASC is achieved through the implementation of three main activities namely, inter-department/internal coordination meetings, staff training, psychological supervision available to staff.  In particular, during the 13 inter-department/internal coordination meetings, it was facilitated a more comprehensive understanding of the context and mutual support among team members, by sharing different views, knowledge, experience and potential problematics to which they try to identify joint solutions. By means of this practice, ASC teams manage to reach more well-rounded and well-informed assessments and solutions regarding the cases of ASCs beneficiaries.*

*Investing on the continuous capacity building of the staff and their professional evolution resulted on the participation of 15 employees on 10 different trainings organized by other actors.*

### 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

Following the parliamentary elections of July 2019 and the establishment of a new government, no substantial changes have been observed considering the political picture and the policies followed with regards to the local development and poverty reduction. As of now, no significant changes are expected within the respective national framework, so as to arise any concerns that could jeopardise or influence the overall purpose and implementation of the Programmes.

During the discussions for the conclusion of the contracts and acknowledging the capacity of the Project Promoters, the necessity has arisen to amend specific Articles in PIA in order to meet the needs of the Project Promoters whereas the Fund Operator is compliant with the obligations of the PIA. More specifically:

* **Project Promoters Located in Donor States**

The FO is in the final stage of discussion with EWC, 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.

* **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

*Outcome 2: Increased opportunities for integration and social inclusion for vulnerable individuals*

*As the project of Athens Solidarity Center is the only one for which the contract has been executed, monitoring actions took place only for this project.  Upon the submission of the 1st  financial and progress report on the 15th of January 2020 (exceptionally semi-annual due to the delay on the contract execution) the Fund operator, in accordance to its monitoring strategy implemented a mission of 2- days on-the-spot verification to the Project Promoter’s HQ as well as in the Athens Solidarity Center on the 3rd  and 4th of February.*

*Regarding the Financial Overview of the Project 400*.000€ were disbursed as advance payment to SolidarityNow of total 2.000.000€. As regards the financial verification, the total expenditure reported until 31.12.2019 amounts to 528.135,13€, whereas the total eligible expenditure verified amounts to 487.263,22€. We have reported in detail to the PP all ineligible expenditures and the respective justification, providing comments that should be followed up on a future monitoring review.

***Results of the 1st day verification***

Following the desk and on the spot verification, there are some issues to be resolved, in order to be compliant with the requirements of the Programme as outlined hereafter. For instance the Project Promoter must provide us with the bank extrait, the trial balance covering all relevant accounts, general ledger accounts, sub ledgers etc.), the suppliers ledgers, so as to avoid duplication and prevent overlaps with other funding sources as well as to be able confirm that the accounting system used is adequate for supporting the audit trail of the project and to trace to and within the PP’s accounting and bookkeeping systems the expenditure declared for the project, reconciling the Financial Report to the PP's Accounting System and Records and to ensure no double funding.

In case that the Project Promoter does not provide the abovementioned documentation, an audit report must be provided from the external auditors issuing the annual audit report for financial statements certifying that there is no double funding for the expenditure reported and declared from the EEA Grants funded Project.

The PP signs fixed-term contracts with narrow time limits and proceeds to contract extensions. We would like to draw attention to this aspect, by ensuring that the PP monitors and ensures compliance with labour laws and employment legislation in respect to renewal of such contracts, the maximum overall term of successive contracts.

It was also noted some issues with the signing of the documents e.g. timesheets and internal documents (issue also raised during the on the spot verification). It is suggested to be more cautious with the signing of the documents and submit appropriate documents for approval.

During the on the spot verification, the FO provided guidance and advice in order for the Project Promoter to fulfil its obligations in a timely and accurate manner and assistance in its capacity building. The list of proof of expenditure per budget line to be provided, shall facilitate the PP to document in an appropriate manner the expenditure and avoid any expenditure to be verified as ineligible to the respective reporting period due to missing proof of expenditure.

***Results of the 2nd day verification***

The FO during the on-the-spot visit, focused on the verification of the outcome and output 1 of the project.   The project has progress and attracts important number of vulnerable people. It seems that all services operate smoothly however, some indicators are not going to meet their targets. This is the case for the tax numbers issued and the # of legal representations (asylum service and court). In the first case, that provision is not frequently requested by the beneficiaries at the current context. In the second case, it relates with the nature of legal representation but also with the technical limitations deriving from the design of the existing version of the CRM system.

The existence and operation of the CRM system as a basic operational aspect should ensure accountability of the project. However, important technical issues exist with direct impact on the validity of the indicators’ values (underestimated).  That is the case for the output indicator “Number of legal representations (asylum service and court)”.

An important concern of the FO relates to the reliability of the reported data and indicators as the CRM is not fully operational while for other indicators  such as “**# of organizations which carry out complementary activities in the ASC”** it seems that in the reported indicators, activities under a different grant has been reported even after the request of additional documentation on the collaboration with other actors PP.

Future verifications will focus on the **beneficiaries tracking system** especially those participating in the collaborative activities in order to confirm that a consistent and valid system exist. In addition, future verifications will focus on the performance of the outputs 2 and 3 of the project.

As an overall assessment in a scale from 1 to 4 the results of the verification grade the Project on the 3rd scale point “The situation is satisfactory but there is room for improvements” (see scale in Results Guidelines p.54

***Implications on the risk assessment analysis***

*Upon the finalization of project monitoring review, the FO will suggest to the PP a revision of the gravity of the already identified risks included in the initial risk assessment analysis provided by the PP.  These revisions regards the following operational risks:*

Operational risk 1: Monitoring systems are not adequate to document the work of the flow of beneficiaries at the centre.

This risk is still apparent, and it is assessed increasingly important.  As verified and discussed during the monitoring review, although a CRS is in place, technical issues exist as regards the use of CRM by specific services (e.g. accounting) while data structures are not always appropriate to provide valid calculations (e.g. legal representations for asylum or court, average # of sessions and other). The technical issue affects the objectives of the project   and has an impact on the accountability of the project.

Operational risk 3: Financial controls are too burdensome and do not support the effective operation of the centre.

Although the financial requirements as well as the framework of the administrative & on the spot verifications were thoroughly explained by the FO since the project start, from the reporting and monitoring experience it results that:

* There is insufficient communication and organisational support from HQs towards ASC’s team.
* Personnel was not familiar with reporting requirements; FO shall issue specific guidelines and detailed instructions as far as possible, in order to facilitate the team to meet and to comply fully to the requirements of the Project and Programme.

***Programme Monitoring plan -2020***

According to FOs M&E strategy submitted to FMO R&E unit, each project requires different level and modality of monitoring.

**Outcome 1: Integration of refugee children in Greek schools improved**

For that project, a specific provision in PIA reduces the need for compliance-based monitoring other than reviewing the report from independent auditor and simplifies the verification procedures: 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…”*

To that end, the FO will focus on a risk based and a results-based monitoring for this project during 2020.

As regards the monitoring timeline will follow the standard process of the monitoring a project level as described in FOs MCS by the means of:

* Desk reviews of the reports provided by the Project Promoter (review of the achieved results and their documentation through reports, review of the progress of the M&E plan). One such review is foreseen for each progress report submitted by the PP starting from the first report is expected on 15th of July 2020.
* On the spot visits on important project events (e.g. regional academies, mentoring visits etc). Given the fact that the contract execution performed on April 2020 and the Covid-19 outbreak on the spot verification is expected to be feasible for this project only during the last quarter of the 2020. At least one such visit will be performed.
* Regular monitoring meetings (bi-monthly meetings) with the project team to establish a close collaboration and monitoring or project implementation. Soon after the contract execution the FO will organize such meetings.
* Other soft monitoring actions to establish a direct communication channel with the PP such as email correspondence and skype conferences.

Given the sensitivity of the project on contextual changes, such as institutional reforms and governmental changes that might affect the expected results of the project, a risk-based monitoring approach will be also incorporated into the monitoring process. Main tool for that will be the risk assessment analysis and its updates to be provided in the quarterly reports that will be also a subject of discussion during the monitoring meetings, report reviews and other soft monitoring actions.

**Outcome 2: Increased opportunities for integration and social inclusion for vulnerable individuals**

During the quarterly progress reporting process, monitoring will be performed according to the process described in section the respective chapter of MCS manual (3.1 Monitoring at programme level) and submitted M&E strategy. For this project all the three types of monitoring will be employed (results-based, risk-based, compliance-based monitoring).

* As the FO provides an online platform that expenditures and documentation (e.g. invoices) is submitted by the PPs, at a large extend **compliance-based monitoring** will be performed through desk review (financial checks). To that end, on-site verifications will focus on additional administrative verifications (unclear transactions or procedures), review of the means of verifications (attendance sheets and records) and overview of the operation of the project through discussions with the project stakeholders on the reported progress (e.g. staff, project manager etc.).
* **Results-based monitoring:**  The FO will continue the results-based monitoring having as a basis the reported progress through the quarterly reports. Emphasis will be given to support the PP to establish a concrete M&E strategy especially as regards the collection of feedback on the levels of satisfaction from the services. In addition, quality aspects of the project’s M&E and CRM system will be intensively reviewed to ensure the validity of the reported data. Last but not least, monitoring of underperforming indicators will be followed up to understand the conditions creating these results and possibly suggest results framework adjustments.
* **Risk-based monitoring:** The project extends the operation of an existing project (Athens Solidarity Center) so the risks related with the set up and operation is considered limited as justified by the Project Promoter’s risk assessment analysis. However, the review and update of risk assessment will be part of quarterly update by the PP and review and verification by the FO through the reporting review, on the site verification and other soft monitoring actions (phone calls, skype, meetings). One such monitoring action is related with the criticality exercise requested to the PP for the response on Covid-19 on March 2020.

Monitoring Plan overview for the project:

* Desk reviews of the reports provided by the Project Promoter (review of the achieved results and their documentation through reports, review of the progress of the M&E plan). One such review is foreseen for each progress report submitted by the PP starting from the first report is expected on 15th of July 2020.
* Atleasttwoon-site verification visitswill be performed in 2020. The first has already performed on February 2020 with reference period the Q3 and Q4 of 2019. At least one more on-site verification will be performed focusing both on the administrative/financial and physical/results aspects of the project.
* Regular monitoring meetings (bi-monthly meetings) with the project team to establish a close collaboration and monitoring or project implementation. Soon after the contract execution the FO will organize such meetings.
* Other soft monitoring actions to establish a direct communication channel with the PP such as email correspondence and skype conferences

**Outcome 3:  Municipality of Athens (TBD)**

*A close collaboration is anticipated for the project of Municipality of Athens during the implementation of the project. The standard cycle of monitoring is expected to be applied for this project (results, compliance and risk based monitoring) to be facilitated through the employment of the entire monitoring tool-box (desk review, administrative verification, on the spot visits and soft monitoring actions e.g. meetings and calls) with the timeline of its implementation included in the annex 5 : monitoring plan, under the assumption .*

*At the beginning of the project emphasis will be given on the* ***desk review*** *and the compliance with the specifications of the financial administrative and reporting needs of the project (e.g. existence of a PP’s system to monitor the project progress (financial and results). That will continue during the entire project cycle.*

*During the project, an important aspect to be monitored is the accessibility of the services provided through the project to the target group (vulnerable people residing in the city of Athens) through the monitoring of the eligibility criteria of entering the project. That will be monitored through the PPs reports but also will be verified through on-the-spot visits where the registration is made, and the training is provided.*

*In parallel, we aim to focus on the engagement of businesses into the employability support of vulnerable beneficiaries by monitoring the design and the implementation of the* ***labor market needs assessment*** *and the respective survey involving local businesses. That activity will be monitored through meetings and email correspondence with the PP to review the methodology of the assessment and the achieved results. Again, on-the-spot-verification of this assessment will be essential to verify that this core activity is implemented that the results of this assessment are properly incorporated into the training curriculum and the modality of training provision.  Monitoring of the training provision will be done through on-the-spot visits will follow.*

*Due to the nature of the project emphasis will be given to the communication and dissemination actions envisaged for the project for the citizens engagement to ensure that the project is open to all vulnerable groups. That will be supported by review of the submitted communication and dissemination material, to ensure that are smart and effective to communicate the project existence to the target group, along with verification on the spot of the availability/accessibility of these material to the target group. The timeline of the implementation of this activity will be refined upon the submission of the final time plan of implementation and the contract execution of the PP. Consequently, what is included in the annex 5 is an estimation for 2020 only of one desk review,  three regular monitoring meetings, and one on the spot verification during 2020, assuming that the contract will be executed by the end of July 2020.*

*The monitoring plan is a separate attachment of the report (annex 5)*

## 2. Evaluation

Evaluation will be only performed at the end of the Programme 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

* *The development of an online platform proved a comfortable modality for the reporting*
* *The developed monitoring and reporting tools have been applied successfully demonstrating efficiency for the needs of project monitoring. The PP found the templates and the tools available convenient and helpful for their reporting responsibility.*
* *Close monitoring action is needed focusing on soft monitoring actions and meaningful collaboration on the fields that the PP needs support (eg. See the next bullet).*
* *The existing CRM system in place demonstrated significant weaknesses to produce valid indicator values and it is essential to efficiently monitor the programme process.*
* *There is a need to support the PP for the development of a valid data collection methodology to monitor the quality of the service provision through a satisfaction survey (outcome indicators)*
* *The next monitoring actions should focus on the operational capacity of the ASC and enhancing collaboration with other organisations for the implementation of complementary activities*
* *Some of the indicators’ targets are set extremely high e.g. tax numbers issued, successful asylum and family reunification applications (please see the justification of the results section). It is assessed that these targets will not be possible to be met. The FMO and FO should consult with the PP to review the situation and maybe revise the results framework and adjust it to the current context.*
* *The lack of full capacity of SolidarityNow to meet the reporting requirements as expected, highlighted the fact that the Project Promoters need support in order to fulfil and comply with the project requirements and to provide sufficient proof of expenditure to document the audit trail.*
* *Acknowledging the challenges that lie ahead, as not all project promoters are familiar with reporting requirements, the FO shall issue specific guidelines and detailed instructions as far as possible, in order to facilitate the Project Promoters to meet and to comply fully to the requirements of the Project and Programme.*

# D. ANNEXES

## 1. Updated results (indicator achievements)

## 2. Communication

## 3. Overview of contracted projects

## 4. Risk management

## 5. Monitoring plan

## 6. Evaluation report

## 7. List of individual mobilities

## Annex 1: Updated results (indicator achievements)

|  |
| --- |
| **Objective: Strengthened social and economic cohesion** |
| **Outcome 1: Integration of refugee children in Greek schools improved** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Share of pupils experiencing an inclusive learning environment** | Percentage | N/A | - | -  | - | - | 75.00 % | - |
| **Share of schools experiencing a reduced level of conflicts by the end of the school year** | Percentage | N/A | - | -  | - | - | 75.00 % | - |
| **Share of schools experiencing improved relations with local refugee administration** | Percentage | N/A | - | -  | - | - | 75.00 % | - |
| **Share of trained professionals self-reporting improved capacity to create an inclusive and safe school environment** | Percentage | N/A | - | -  | - | - | 75.00 % | - |
| **Output 1.1: Training provided to school stakeholders focused on the creation of an inclusive and safe learning environment at school** |
| 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 official Coordinators for Educational Work, including on integration policies, trained** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 50 | - |
| Gender |
| Female | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Male | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Number of school directors trained** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 150 | - |
| Gender |
| Female | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Male | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Number of teachers trained** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 3,000 | - |
| Gender |
| Female | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Male | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Output 1.2: Education institutions supported to create an inclusive and safe learning environment for all students** |
| 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 schools implementing a whole school approach for inclusive and democratic school culture** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 150 | - |
| **National network of schools to share experiences and good practice established** | Binary | No | - | -  | - | - | Yes | - |
| **Number of schools taking part in the network** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 150 | - |
| **Output 1.3: Teaching and learning materials and training modules developed and good practices on the integration of refugee children identified** |
| 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 teaching and learning materials for education providers developed and disseminated** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 5 | - |
| **Number of training modules for teachers and school directors designed** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 1 | - |
| **Number of schools where support materials are disseminated and available for use for free** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 300 | - |
| **Outcome 2: Increased opportunities for integration and social inclusion for vulnerable individuals** |
| 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 services provided or improved** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 3,802 | 10,000 | - |
| Age |
| Children and youth (0-17) | - | - | - | - | - | 413 | - | - |
| Young adults (18-29) | - | - | - | - | - | 1,440 | - | - |
| Adults (30-64) | - | - | - | - | - | 1,873 | - | - |
| Elderly (65+) | - | - | - | - | - | 76 | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Gender |
| Female | - | - | - | - | - | 1,128 | - | - |
| Male | - | - | - | - | - | 2,671 | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| **Number of people accessing social benefits (including accommodation)** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 513 | 1,500 | - |
| Gender |
| Female | - | - | - | - | - | 195 | - | - |
| Male | - | - | - | - | - | 316 | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - |
| Age |
| Children and youth (0-17) | - | - | - | - | - | 77 | - | - |
| Young adults (18-29) | - | - | - | - | - | 143 | - | - |
| Adults (30-64) | - | - | - | - | - | 277 | - | - |
| Elderly (65+) | - | - | - | - | - | 16 | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| **Share of employability service beneficiaries who find a job** | Percentage | N/A | - | 120 | 386 | 31.09 % | 25.00 % | - |
| Gender |
| Female | - | - | - | 25 | 83 | 30.12 % | - | - |
| Male | - | - | - | 95 | 302 | 31.46 % | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | 0 | 1 | 0.00 % | - | - |
| Age |
| Children and youth (0-17) | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
| Young adults (18-29) | - | - | - | 37 | 123 | 30.08 % | - | - |
| Adults (30-64) | - | - | - | 83 | 257 | 32.30 % | - | - |
| Elderly (65+) | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | 0 | 6 | 0.00 % | - | - |
| **Share of successful asylum applications and family reunification cases** | Percentage | N/A | - | 41 | 88 | 46.59 % | 50.00 % | - |
| **Share of users who are satisfied with the services provided** | Percentage | N/A | - | 16 | 21 | 76.19 % | 65.00 % | - |
| **Number of tax numbers issued** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | - | 1,800 | - |
| **Output 2.1: Services provided to vulnerable individuals** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **Average number of sessions per beneficiary** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 2.03 | 3 | - |
| **Number of legal representations (asylum service and court)** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 58 | 2,400 | - |
| **Number of psychological sessions carried out (individual and group)** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 816 | 4,000 | - |
| **“Child friendly space” for children of beneficiaries of services provided operational for the duration of the project** | Binary | No | - | -  | - | Yes | Yes | - |
| **Number of tax declarations submitted** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 925 | 900 | - |
| **Number of people attending job interviews** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 76 | 400 | - |
| Gender |
| Female | - | - | - | - | - | 19 | - | - |
| Male | - | - | - | - | - | 57 | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Age |
| Children and youth (0-17) | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Young adults (18-29) | - | - | - | - | - | 19 | - | - |
| Adults (30-64) | - | - | - | - | - | 55 | - | - |
| Elderly (65+) | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| **Output 2.2: Collaboration between the Athens Solidarity Centre (ASC) and CSO's enhanced** |
| 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 organisations which carry out complementary activities in the ASC** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 2 | 25 | - |
| **Number of external referrals made (to services outside the ASC)** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 2,046 | 12,000 | - |
| **Staff participation   in external coordination meetings** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 23 | 150 | - |
| **Output 2.3: Improved operational efficiency of ASC** |
| 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 ASC inter-departmental / internal coordination meetings** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 13 | 100 | - |
| **Number of ASC staff trained** | Number | 0 | - | -  | - | 15 | 28 | - |
| Gender |
| Female | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - |
| Male | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| **Psychological supervision made available to staff** | Binary | No | - | -  | - | Yes | Yes | - |
| **Outcome 3: TBD** |
| Indicator | Unit of measurement | Baseline | Achievements until end of previous reporting period | Achievements until end of December 2019 | Target | Comment |
| Numerator | Denominator | Value |
| **TBD** | Number | TBD | - | -  | - | - | TBD | - |
| **Output 3.1: TBD** |
| **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 | - | -  | - | - | ≥4.5, And an increase on the baseline | - |
| State type |
| Beneficiary State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Donor State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Level of satisfaction with the partnership** | Scale 1-7 | TBD | - | -  | - | - | ≥4.5, And an increase on the baseline | - |
| State type |
| Beneficiary State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Donor State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Share of cooperating organisations that apply knowledge acquired from bilateral partnerships** | Percentage | N/A | - | -  | - | - | ≥50% | - |
| State type |
| Beneficiary State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Donor State | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Bilateral Output 1: Cooperation between donor state and beneficiary state entities facilitated** |
| 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 | N/A | - | -  | - | - | 1 | - |
| Donor State |
| Norway | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Iceland | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Liechtenstein | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not specified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Annex 2: Communication summary

### Visibility of the Grants and the donors

Since May 2019, SoildarityNow has produced several interesting and necessary materials, giving visibility of the programme, the Grants, its objectives and the contribution of the donors:

* Dedicated space in the organization’s [website](https://www.solidaritynow.org/kentro-allileggiis-athinas/)
* Visibility boards
* Signboards
* Information Brochure
* Posters
* Internal & External Publicity
* Social Media Posts

All materials, online and in the space of Athens Solidarity Center have the necessary requirements giving visibility the factors mentioned above.

Key messages focused on the meaning of the programme and its impact to the greek society, presenting (for example) number of beneficiaries through the years.

### Communication with the National Focal Point

Not applicable at the time being.

### Website and social media

The programme has its dedicated webpage in SolidarityNow’s official [website](https://www.solidaritynow.org/en/kentro-allileggiis-athinas/).

It also has social media channels in facebook, LinkeIn and twitter, sharing until now posts on facebook, following the timeline provided through the Communication Plan. Activity on [facebook](https://www.facebook.com/SolidarityNow/?epa=SEARCH_BOX) is dedicated to the important role of the Athens Solidarity Center in supporting people in difficult situation and in need, giving at the same time visibility at the Grants and the contribution of the donors.

(example:  <https://www.facebook.com/SolidarityNow/photos/a.285885491545014/1672827779517438/?type=3&theater>)

### Best practice examples

N/A

### Multimedia

Athens Solidarity Center’s dedicated webpage:

<https://www.solidaritynow.org/en/kentro-allileggiis-athinas/>

## Annex 3: Overview of contracted projects

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome | Projects | # | # of donor project partners | Amount contracted | % of outcome budget contracted |
| **Outcome 1: Integration of refugee children in Greek schools 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 1** | **0** | **0** | **€ 0** | **0.00 %** |
| **Outcome 2: Increased opportunities for integration and social inclusion for vulnerable individuals** | Pre-defined | 1 | 0 | € 2,000,000 | 100.00 % |
| Contracted through open calls | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| Contracted through small grants scheme | 0 | 0 | € 0 | 0.00 % |
| **Total Outcome 2** | **1** | **0** | **€ 2,000,000** | **100.00 %** |
| **Outcome 3: TBD** | 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 %** |
| **Programme** | **Total** | **1** | **0** | **€ 2,000,000** | **33.51 %** |

## 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 | 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 contrat 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 | 4 | 2 | 2.83 | 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, and this was essential in order 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 | 3 | 1.73 | 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 was 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 exteral 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 |  |  |