



**NOVA
GENERACIJA**



Recommendations for CSOs in providing services to migrants on the Serbia – Bosnia route

Support to projects of Civil Society Organizations (CSO) – social service providers in SEE in scope of the project

„IRIS NETWORKing – CSOs for protection sensitive migration management “

This publication was produced with the financial assistance of the EU. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of Association of citizens Sigma Plus and the Association Nova Generacija. The publication does not represent the official state of the European Union.

Author's word

The recommendations at your disposal are the result of research that was intended to assist the work of civil society organizations (CSOs) working in the field in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Seen from the perspective of migrants as beneficiaries, as well as CSO representatives, the authors wanted to draw a parallel and a kind of self-assessment is the fieldwork of the organizations recognized by the migrants, and is it considered useful?

Given that state institutions are primarily responsible for the registration and reception of refugees and asylum seekers, we need to carefully set and build our position to become a reliable pillar of support that both the state and beneficiaries can count on. In this coordination, mutual praise and constructive criticism are a necessary prerequisite for progress, in order to create the conditions for qualitative and quantitative improvement of the overall efforts to overcome the migrant crisis that had its biggest breakthrough in 2015.

The research did not aim at assessing the work of state structures, on the contrary, but overview and analyze services provided by CSOs, bearing in mind that the role of CSO is not only providing direct help, but also the role of mediator in referring beneficiaries to an already existing institutional framework of support and services.

With the best intention of helping and doing our job well, we forget to evaluate our work by those who are being helped. Equally important, an evaluation of our work is needed by others who provide this assistance, which may be the object for some future research.

With sincerely hope that these Recommendations can be of use to you as a CSO representative, we thank you for your time.

Association of citizens Sigma Plus – Nis, Serbia
Association Nova Generacija – Banja Luka, BiH

February 2020.

The content:

Chapter I: Introduction - Explanation, theme and objective, methodology and structure

Chapter II: Context - Identification of Existing Services and Targeted Population

Chapter III: Comparative Analysis of Existing Services Provided in Serbia and BiH

Chapter IV: Conclusions and Recommendations

Chapter I: Introduction - Explanation, theme and objective, methodology and structure

From the outbreak of the migrant crisis in 2015, hundreds of thousands of migrants passed the so-called *Balkan route*. Almost one million people passed through Serbia in 2015 and 2016 only. In March 2016, the route was "stopped", but it quickly turned out that it was still functioning and had only been diverted. In the spring of 2019, an unexpectedly high influx occurred and held that trend until near fall. As the road to Hungary was restricted and attempts to enter Romania and Croatia were unsuccessful, entry into BiH was one of the most common transport "channels" used by migrants.

Most migrants in Bosnia and Herzegovina have previously traveled through Serbia or even stayed there for one month to 2 years. The needs of the beneficiaries, whether they are families or singles, by nature, change over time, voluntarily or necessarily. Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina are the last two non-EU countries in the so-called *Balkan route* and as such the last stop before possible entry into the EU. In these circumstances, the beneficiaries are changing their priorities either in the short or long term, after unsuccessful attempts to cross the border with Croatia and Hungary. In this context, it is important to address the current needs of migrants and avoid implementing collective solutions. Although the minimum standards of quality of service provided are prescribed, it is important to emphasize that in most cases they relate to primary existential services. It is necessary to individualize problems and solutions on small sample, as not all solutions are acceptable for everyone.

On the other hand, CSOs need to find ways to overcome the gap between legal solutions and practices that still do not recognize the important role of CSOs in migration flows. The research conducted within the project was aimed to show the real status, current needs of beneficiaries and the services they need, as well as the role of CSOs in providing these services, all with the goal of increasing the quality of the same.

In order to create conditions for improving the existing services provided to the migrant population in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, we have established an initial point of view in which bilateral cooperation in the current migration flows in the region, takes place at the highest levels of the states as well as at the levels of high positions in the non-governmental sector, and further defined the need for networking at the level of the organizations themselves, not only for the purpose of monitoring trends and facilitating access to information, but also for identifying factors that can influence the improvement of the quality of services provided to migrants.

A comparative dual approach was applied to identify the current needs of beneficiaries in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina over a relevant period of time, taking

into account the fact that access to information was difficult and that migrants were in high transit.

The geographical area was selected due to the fact that the largest number of migrants in BiH had previously been to Serbia, as well as the trend of changing needs. CSOs, on the other hand, continue to have an inadequate level of recognition as an important actor in the field, hence it is important to consider the work, attitudes, resources and experiences of the organizations themselves.

Methodology

Serbia / Bosnia and Herzegovina

1. Analyzing practices and legislation
2. Analyzing migrants' and CSOs attitudes in the form of structured questionnaires

Research period: 2 months, mid-September - mid-November

The period is defined by the need to follow the trend of fluctuation over a continuous period of time in the selected geographically connected area.

The aim of the researchers was to analyze the attitudes of migrants accommodated in reception centers in both countries. However, due to bureaucratic obstacles, it was not possible to obtain a permit to operate/access at center in Bihac (BiH), although it was submitted in a timely manner. Respondents from BiH were interviewed outdoors at a central bus station in the city of Tuzla.

Structure

1. Analyzing the attitudes of migrants
1. Analyzing the attitudes of CSO representatives

Structure of respondents: 100 surveyed migrants in two countries; 50 CSOs representatives surveyed in two countries.

Chapter II: Context - Identification of Existing Services and Targeted Population

Serbia

Serbia's response to the migrant crisis was assessed as good. Following the closure of the route, people in transit were forced to stay in Serbia and most of them were accommodated in reception centers in the West and North of the country with free movement and the possibility of applying for asylum. The needs of accommodated ones at center were adequately met, but a significant number of people remained at unofficial locations. In the first years, Serbia received more than € 20 million EU and international donors for

implementing measures aimed to provide basic assistance at refugee assistance points, which included health services, temporary accommodation, warm clothing, food and water, as well as the provision of childcare facilities and protection. Subsequently, assistance was directed towards improving living conditions at official reception sites.

Currently, about 3.500 refugees and asylum seekers reside in Serbia, accommodated in the reception centers of Kikinda, Sombor, Subotica, Adasevci, Principovac, Sid, Obrenovac, Pirot, Bosilegrad, Presevo, Bujanovac and Vranje, as well as in the asylum centers Tutin, Sjenica, Bogovađa, Krnjaca and Banja Koviljaca.

The services provided to migrants located in the centers are:

- Accommodation in rooms of 3,5m² - 5,5m²,
- Meals in appropriate kitchen/dining areas,
- Medical treatment (in most cases in a dispensary located in the center),
- Non-food items,
- Services provided by CSOs (from translation, through assistance with the inclusion of children in the school system, educational and recreational workshops, to inclusive and integration-oriented services and durable solutions).

Leading service providers who have worked closely with the Serbian authorities since the beginning of the crises are UN agencies and other humanitarian actors, most notably partners and donors such as UNHCR, UNICEF, International Organization for Migration, Danish Refugee Council, CARE, Doctors of the World, national societies of Red Cross.

The exact number of civil society organizations operating locally ranges between 20 and 40.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Bosnia and Herzegovina's response to the migrant crisis is generally adequate and in line with, for BiH, the emerging situation. Crossing land borders from Serbia and a smaller part from Montenegro, it is estimated that in 2019, 10.595 illegal crossings were registered. The number of registered migrants changes day by day and it is difficult to make an accurate estimate of the number of refugees. People on the move are accommodated in official camps most often established by the International Organization for Migration, the Ministry of Security, the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees, or in informal settlements. Camps Bira, Miral and Sedra in Una-Sana Canton, Asylum Center in Trnovo Municipality, Refugee Reception Center in Salakovac, and Usivak in Sarajevo and an independent center known as House of All, currently have the capacity to accommodate about 4.500 refugees. In addition to the camps, refugees also remain in informal settlements such as Djacki dom Borici and field in Trnovo, Velika Kladusa. A large number of refugees located at open areas have also been gathering in the Tuzla Canton in the past, where local community assistance is still lacking, and refugees are mostly provided with services by local CSOs and local citizens. The population of refugees in the open areas and in informal settlements is very unpredictable; sometimes there are 1,000 refugees in these settlements, in very poor health conditions,

without accommodation and health care. During 2019, 196 asylum applications were submitted in BiH.

Services provided to migrants accommodated in official camps are:

- transportation,
- translation services,
- free legal aid,
- protective sensitive accommodation,
- psychosocial support,
- child protection,
- prevention and protection against gender-based violence,
- referral to health care,
- food, water and non-food products.

In addition to these services, fieldwork is also organized in informal locations with the aim of providing as many of the above services as possible. A large number of organizations such as UNHCR, UN, UNICEF, IOM, Save the Children, World Vision, Doctors of the World, OSCE and a number of local CSOs cooperate with competent ministries in providing refugee services in the field. It is estimated that 128 institutions and organizations are cooperating in BiH to tackle illegal migration. It is estimated that between 15 and 30 local organizations provide daily services in direct work with refugees.

The target population of project activities are CSOs and migrants in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

CSOs in Serbia and BiH have varying degrees of recognition of the role of relevant actors in the field. The climate in Serbia is more favorable and the impression is that CSO activities are receiving greater acceptance from state institutions, which again does not mean that there is no space for progress and improvement. Quantitatively, the number of CSOs present in the selected areas cannot be expressed, because there is no consistency in work, which specifically means that in addition to several permanent ones, new organizations and new networks of organizations are being registered, CSOs change their field of work and likewise.

Migrants, as a target group and end beneficiaries, currently residing in the territories of Serbia and BiH, are mostly from Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Syria. There are different educational profiles, equally from urban and rural areas. Religious and ethnic backgrounds are different. Most of them in Serbia are accommodated in reception centers for an average of 9 months, while a smaller number for a year and a half. The average time they spent on the road is between one week and one year. The structure includes families, with an average of 3 to 8 members, and singles, who according to the latest trend, are increasingly arriving. According to data available in Serbia, there are currently over 3.000 migrants accommodated in the centers, not counting those who reside in public areas. In the first three months of 2019, over 4.000 migrants tried to enter BiH, of which almost 2.500 were returned from the border. It is important to note that it is difficult to keep track

of how many migrants who move from Serbia to BiH return after a certain time (about 140 registered).

Chapter III: Comparative Analysis of Existing Services Provided in Serbia and BiH

III.1. Beneficiaries from the migrant population

Based on the survey of a total of 100 beneficiaries from the migrant population in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the following results were obtained:

An equal number of respondents from both countries participated in the survey.

Most of the respondents currently residing in Serbia have been there for a month. In BiH, the highest percentage of surveyed beneficiaries in that country has been there for only 5 to 10 days.

<i>Country of current residence</i>	
Serbia	50%
BiH	50%

<i>Are you registered by the police?</i>			
	Total	Serbia	BiH
Yes	82,5%	93,8%	68%
No	17,5%	6,2%	32%

How long have you been in your current country of residence?

	Total	Serbia	BiH
5 – 10 days	29,9%	9,4%	56%
Longer than 10 days	17,5%	/	40%
1 month	17,5%	31,3%	/
2 months	7,0%	12,5%	/
3 months	15,8%	28,1%	/
4 months	5,3%	6,3%	4%
5 months	1,8%	3,1%	/
1 year	1,8%	3,1%	/
3 years	3,5%	6,3%	/

Respondents are mostly already registered by the police in the country where they currently reside - 82,5% of the total sample. In Serbia, 93,8% of migrants are registered, while in BiH a slightly smaller percentage of migrants is registered - 68%.

Respondents from both countries who are not registered by police, cite the lack of documentation as the reason - "torn papers", "I don't have papers", "I don't have documentation".

Regarding to the services that beneficiaries receive upon arrival (health care, food, assistance with clothing, footwear, hygiene packages and other non-food items), the results are as follows:

Health protection

In Serbia, the percentage of those who received adequate health care upon arrival is 84,4%, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina 86% of beneficiaries. As there are no significant discrepancies here in the results obtained from the two countries, it is concluded that the vast majority are beneficiaries who, upon their arrival in the country of their current residence, were provided with health care.

When asked if they needed medical help and could not get it, the largest percentage of beneficiaries answered "no", which accounts for 70,2% of the total sample, of which 59,4% are residents in Serbia, and 84 % of those residing in BiH. However, 29,8% of the total number of surveyed beneficiaries answered in the affirmative, 40,6% from the territory of Serbia and 16% from the territory of BiH.

Food

Upon arrival in the country of current residence, all respondents received food assistance - 100% each from Serbia and 100% from Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In most cases, the food in Bosnia and Herzegovina was provided by some of the non-governmental organizations, while in Serbia the largest number of respondents did not answer this question - 87,5% of the sample from Serbia.

Non-food items

Assistance in clothing, footwear and hygiene packages was provided to all respondents in Bosnia and Herzegovina, mostly by "people" and volunteers, while in Serbia 53,1% of respondents said that they did not receive this kind of help, which makes the majority of respondents from the territory of Serbia.

CSO services

When asked "*Have you been contacted by any CSO?*" the largest number of respondents answered in the negative - 56,1%, 40,6% from Serbia and 76% from BiH. On the other hand, when asked "*Did any CSOs provide you with any form of support?*", the majority of surveyed stated that CSOs from their countries of residence provided some form of support - 80,7% of the total sample, of which 68,8 % of respondents from Serbia and 96% from BiH. The largest number of surveyed said they needed assistance in the form of accommodation/shelter - 45,8% of the total sample, of which as much as 100% were from the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In Serbia, the highest percentage of beneficiaries did not answer this question - 68,8%, but those who most said they needed help in clothing and footwear for the winter - 12,4%.

Note: The following results come from a survey of beneficiaries accommodated in one of the transit/reception centers. As it was difficult, and ultimately impossible to obtain approval to visit a reception center in Bihac, BiH, the results below are from surveyed ones accommodated in centers in Serbia, which makes it impossible to access a comparative analysis, although in itself it raises further questions for acting as well as responses to address such obstacles.

All surveyed migrants from Serbia are currently accommodated in one of the reception/transit centers.

Beneficiaries who are not accommodated at official locations – 100% of surveyed ones from BiH - cite unanimously **the absence of such a center on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina.**

Accommodation, house rules and rules of conduct and life in transit/reception centers, reception

When asked “How long has it been since you entered the country to your placement in the center?” the largest number of respondents from this sample - 31%, said they were placed in a reception center after a month spent in Serbia. A slightly smaller percentage are sent to the centers after one day, and the least are those who waited 2-3 days or 3 months for accommodation - 7% each.

As many as 93% of the surveyed ones upon arrival at the reception center were given a room with beds, linens and towels, while 7% said they did not receive this service without specifically stating what they did not receive. Upon arrival at the reception center, 72% of the surveyed migrants were referred for a health examination. Of the total surveyed, 31,6% were supplied with clean clothes, shoes and personal hygiene products, while as many as 68,4% said that these items were not supplied with. The vast majority of surveyed say that they adhere to the maintenance schedule of common rooms and yards in the reception center - 96,5%. All surveyed say that they take care of their room cleanliness - 100% of the sample, stating that as many as 78,9% of them clean it daily, a slightly smaller number once a week - 17,6%, and only 3,5% do it once a month.

When asked “When you arrived at the reception center, were you familiar with the house rules?” the vast majority of respondents upon arrival at the reception center were familiar with the house rules that apply - 93%, and only 7% said they were not familiar with the house rules. The highest percentage of respondents is familiar with the home order of the reception center in which they currently reside orally - 89,5%, a slightly smaller number, both orally and in writing - 7%, and the least of those who are familiar with the home order of the center only in writing - 3,5%, of these, more migrants were familiar with rules in a language they understood - 82,4%, while a smaller percentage - 17,6% - did not understand the instructions for respecting the center's housekeeping order.

In the event of an illness, the respondents stated that as many as 96,5% of them notify the employees of the center.

Of the total number of respondents in Serbia, 70,2% of those polled said that there are no common rooms with leisure equipment (radio, television, computer ...) in the center where they reside, while 29,8% said that such premises have.

Recreation time organizing/integration and inclusion

The majority of respondents - 72% - believe that representatives of civil society organizations are sufficiently present in the center where they reside.

According to beneficiaries' responses, representatives of CSOs mostly provide legal support - 24,6%, then counseling on asylum procedures- 18,6%, and last is psychosocial support to beneficiaries - 11%.

Do you need additional support and assistance from CSOs and which one?

	Serbia
Winter clothes and shoes	12,4%
Accommodation/shelter	/
More food and water	9,4%
Asylum	3,1%
Money	3,1%
Ophthalmologist	3,1%
No answer	68,8%

Surveyed beneficiaries in Serbia would mostly like to receive more support in the form of organizing sports and/or social activities, and the smallest percentage of them believe that counseling on asylum procedures and psychosocial support should be stepped up, although it is rated as the least represented (by 8,6%).

As many as 70,2% of the surveyed ones say that there are no organized social and/or sports activities in the center where they reside. The vast majority of respondents from Serbia did not have any contact with the locals upon arrival - 83,4%, while 16,6% of the surveyed ones had some kind of contact with the locals upon their arrival in Serbia. When asked, "Since your stay in this country, did you feel that you were not safe because of the behavior of the locals?" none of the surveyed migrants in this sample felt threatened.

III.2. Representatives of CSOs

Based on the survey of 50 CSOs representatives in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the following results were obtained:

You provide support, assistance and customer service to:

	Total	Serbia	BiH
In center	22,4%	45,8%	/

Out of center	34,7%	/	68,0 %
In and out of center	42,9%	54,2%	32,0%

As can be seen in the table, there are no persons working exclusively outside the centers and those working exclusively in the reception/transit centers in Serbia, as many as half of the surveyed CSO representatives are present at the centers and outside them at the same time. As many as 34% of out-of-center organizations are local organizations whose projects are not closely related exclusively to the migrant population and carry out their actions indirectly through CSOs present in the centers.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, there are no respondents who work exclusively in reception/transit centers, with the majority of them working outside the centers, while a third are present in centers and out.

In the territory of Serbia, 25% of CSOs surveyed work once a month in the reception/transit center, 4,2% once a week, 29,2% twice a week, and as many as 41,6% of the sample of respondents in Serbia daily.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, 4% of respondents provide services to the centers once a month or twice a week, 20% do so on daily bases, while most are present once or twice a week.

Physical access to beneficiaries is not difficult for the vast majority of respondents in Serbia (95,9%), while in Bosnia and Herzegovina most respondents agree that they do not have difficulty accessing migrants of their services. However, the survey itself was limited precisely by not obtaining a permit to work in one of the centers in Bihac, making the BiH organization co-authoring the project among 3% of CSOs who had difficult access to beneficiaries accommodated in reception centers. This statement by the majority may also apply to access to migrants outside official locations, in which case access is not really difficult as they are located outdoors.

When discussing access to beneficiaries regarding concrete work and activities, the interviewed CSO representatives stated that they had problems with the lack of interest in work by migrants, their irregularity in workshops and inactivity.

Listed below are a total of **10 types of assistance** that our respondents provide to beneficiaries:

	Total	Serbia	BiH
Counselling regarding seeking asylum	40,0%	50,4%	32,0%
Psycho - social support	26,0%	42,0%	12,0%
Legal aid	18,0%	37,8%	/
Organizing sports and/or social activities	26,0%	54,6%	/
Interpreting services	51,0%	54,6%	48,0%

Education	34,0%	67,2%	4,0%
Providing food	26,0%	4,2%	48,0%
Providing NFI	48,0%	12,6%	84,0%
Medical aid	24,0%	8,4%	40,0%

32,7% of the respondents consider assistance in integration with the local population as the highest priority, most of them from Serbia and a negligibly small percentage of respondents from BiH.

Assistance in non-food items is considered the most priority by only 8,2% of the total sample, most of whom are respondents in Serbia, which is interesting if we see that only 12% provides this assistance.

In the territory of Serbia, CSO representatives see assistance in integrating with the local population and providing legal assistance as the highest priority, which is in line with the current migration climate in the country that became host country, instead of the transit country, while in Bosnia and Herzegovina the need for assistance in the form of providing adequate accommodation and nutrition, which is ranked the lowest in Serbia.

The cooperation between CSOs in which our respondents work, and other CSOs from the country and the region is in the most cases rated as good or satisfactory. In Serbia, the largest number of respondents rated this type of cooperation as excellent, while in BiH the majority of respondents rated cooperation with other CSOs as satisfactory.

Cooperation between the government sector and the CSOs sector was largely estimated as good - 28,6% of the total sample. However, at the national levels, the largest number of respondents in the territory of Serbia considers this type of cooperation as good (37,.9%), while in BiH the largest number of respondents believe that this type of cooperation does not exist at all (32%).

The vast majority of respondents believe that CSOs do not have a satisfactory role as the relevant actor in decision-making and action processes in providing assistance and support in the field. At the level of the whole sample, the majority is 73,5%, of which 70,8% on the territory of Serbia and 76% on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Out of the 36 respondents who believe that CSOs in their country do not have a satisfactory role as a relevant actor in decision-making and action processes in the field of assistance and support, as many as 35 believe that CSOs should have greater competencies in providing support 71,4%. The vast majority of respondents agree that CSOs should advocate a stronger role in migration flows - 91,8% of the total sample, with 83,3% of respondents from the territory of Serbia and all 25 respondents from BiH unanimously saying they should.

There is a discrepancy between the sample from Serbia and the sample from BiH when asked *"Do you think there is a sufficient number of CSOs in the field?"* Namely, as many as 95,8% of the total number of respondents in Serbia consider that there are enough CSOs present in the field. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, most respondents said that there were not enough CSOs in the field - 60% of the total sample from this territory.

Most of the respondents from this survey received some type of training to work with the migrant population - 79,6% of the total sample. All respondents from Serbia claim that they have received this type of training, while 15 out of 25 respondents have received this type of training, which is 60% of the sample from BiH.

Absolutely all respondents who took part in this research believe that additional strengthening of human resources of CSOs is needed to work with migrants in both Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina - 100% of the sample.

The majority of respondents consider that the quality of the provided services to the beneficiaries by the CSO associates is good to satisfactory. In the territory of Serbia, the quality of the provided services is mostly assessed as good, while in Bosnia and Herzegovina the quality of the provided services is mostly rated as satisfactory but also unsatisfactory. Since the distribution of other answers to this question in BiH is such that there are both "good" (24%) and "high" (12%) answers, but the answer "low" is completely missing, it can be said that the majority of respondents in this area nevertheless believes that the quality of the services provided by CSOs to their beneficiaries at a satisfactory level is more good than bad.

The largest number of respondents agrees that in order to improve the quality of work of CSOs in their countries, better cooperation between the governmental and non-governmental sectors in the redistribution of competencies is paramount.

In Serbia, the most important factor for improving the quality of the services is the better cooperation in the redistribution of competencies between the governmental and non-governmental sectors, as well as greater financial support for CSOs working in the field. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the same improvement factors are singled out as the most important, but with a slightly smaller percentage.

Chapter IV: Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the results of a survey of beneficiaries from a migrant population in two countries, we can create a profile of migrants located in BiH, outside official locations, as well as a profile of migrants located in Serbia in reception centers.

Migrants in BiH were in the country of survey between 5 and 10 days at the time of completing the survey, which is a standard transit period spent at a place other than the official receiving location. Almost half of them were not registered, for what they say, for lack of documents.

Migrants accommodated in reception centers in Serbia stayed in the country of survey for about a month at the time of completing the survey, which is an average duration of stay before leaving the center in an attempt to cross the border with another country or be transferred to an asylum center because of applying for asylum. Almost all of them are registered by the police.

The results support the general statistics that a step forward has been made in the registration process in Serbia, and that despite the shortage of staff, police have been able to establish dynamics during arrivals and registration, while in BiH it is more difficult due to migrants' moving and staying in unofficial locations.

Upon the arrival in **BiH, migrants** received the necessary health care, as well as food assistance provided by "the people" and volunteers, as well as assistance with clothing, shoes and hygiene packages.

On arrival, **migrants in Serbia** received the necessary health care and food assistance, while they did not comment on assistance with clothing, shoes and hygiene packages.

Migrants from both countries stated that they had received some form of assistance from CSO representatives, but that CSOs generally did not attempt to contact them. On the other hand, they believe there are enough CSOs present in the field.

Formulated and analyzed in such a way, it can be concluded that upon arrival in the country, both in Serbia and BiH, CSOs are not sufficiently visible in the field according to migrants' criteria and that the possibility of restructuring and working methods should be considered in order to have first contact. On the other hand, we should consider and further examine beneficiaries' perceptions of CSOs - whether migrants recognize them as service providers other than governmental sector.

When further analyzing the services provided to migrants, once again bearing in mind that the surveyed beneficiaries from BiH are congregated outside the centers and the

beneficiaries in Serbia are at the reception centers, the priority assistance stated by migrants located in BiH is accommodation/shelter. As a reason for staying at the unofficial site in BiH, where the survey was conducted, 50 respondents stated unanimously that "there is no such center in BiH".

Given that there are 7 official reception centers in BiH, as well as several informal settlements, we conclude that at key points where migrants are located in BiH, which are known as unofficial sites, CSO representatives may consider informing migrants of the existence of the centers, as well as the procedures for accommodation.

As it was unmanageable to interview migrants located in centers in BiH, the results below relate to migrants located in Serbia.

Upon arrival at the reception center, migrants in Serbia were accommodated in a room with beds, linens and towels, food and health care, and the vast majority became familiar with the center's housekeeping rules, either orally and orally and in writing, in a language they understood. Of the 50 surveyed ones, 7% said they did not receive a furnished room without specifically stating what they did not receive, and 17% said they did not understand the instructions for respecting the house rules.

In order to contribute to the improvement of these services, regardless of the fact that they are not provided by CSOs, there is room for additional support by CSOs, as well as stronger cooperation with other providers in informing newcomers of rights and obligations in order to achieve 100% impact.

Of the total number of respondents in Serbia, 70,2% of those interviewed said that there are no common rooms with leisure equipment (radio, television, computer ...) in the center where they reside, while 29,8% said that there are such premises.

According to a personal insight into the units that the centers in Serbia have, we can conclude that the centers have common rooms with the aforementioned equipment, which are located in the dining rooms where it is possible to use the space and outside the time provided for the meal, or in separate rooms, thus the statement of almost two-thirds of surveyed beneficiaries that these premises are missing remained unclear. A possible solution would be to establish a more detailed strategy for informing beneficiaries of the possibility of using these premises and their purpose.

All surveyed said that they take care of their room hygiene- 100% of the sample, stating that as many as 78,9% of them clean it daily, a slightly smaller number once a week - 17,6%, and only 3,5% do it once a month.

Unfortunately, by our direct observation, we have to refute the results and state that the hygiene of the rooms in which the beneficiaries are accommodated and of which they care

for themselves is at an unenviable level in many cases. The solution lies in defining the root of the problem, which may be a lack of cleaning supplies or poor hygiene habits, and further finding ways to overcome issues through procurement of supplies and controlled distribution and use, as well as organizing educational workshops to improve hygiene habits.

The majority of respondents (72%) believe that CSO representatives are sufficiently present in the center where they reside. Most often, they are providing legal support and counseling regarding the asylum procedure, and psychosocial support to the beneficiaries is least represented. When it comes to meeting basic needs, most respondents said yes, but the secondary needs that reflect the social quality of life of the respondents staying at the center, most respondents felt that they were not met. As many as 70,2% of the surveyed beneficiaries said that there are no organized social and / or sports activities in the center where they reside. The question arises why this is so, if in the second poll where respondents were representatives of CSOs, we see that most CSOs are engaged in organizing such activities?

A potential solution may be in reorganizing CSOs' activities to be based on the results of conducted focus groups, where beneficiaries could define the design and the content of such activities, as well as carrying out not only group but also individual activities.

Based on the results of CSOs' surveys in two countries, we can compile an overview of CSOs' work in the field.

CSOs in Serbia, on average, work mostly in the centers, make contact with beneficiaries on a daily basis and do not have difficulty to access beneficiaries at the place of their accommodation/residence.

CSOs in BiH mostly work with beneficiaries outside the centers and make contact with them on a daily basis, and when they are present in the centers, they do so twice a week on average. Physical access to users is not difficult.

Representatives of CSOs in Serbia state that they have difficult access to migrants in terms of their lack of interest in joining the activities, regularity and activity at the workshops.

From the above answers we can see that the reasons for the difficult access to beneficiaries do not relate to the way CSOs and their associates work, but to the very motivation of beneficiaries to participate in the activities provided by CSOs. Difficult access to beneficiaries, in this case, implies more difficult reaching out to them in terms of making interpersonal contact rather than difficult physical access that is, entering a reception/transit center. The reasons for the reduced motivation of the migrants have not been examined on this occasion, but it can be assumed that, due to the extremely unfavorable life circumstances and the certain anxiety and depression that these circumstances may cause, they are clearly not adequately cooperative with the CSOs who work with them. This assumption may be tested in one of the following studies. For the time being, a possible solution may be

directing the work of CSOs to overcome beneficiaries' demotivation and find the right ways to increase their participation. It also refutes the first sentence of the conclusion - that it is precisely the CSO's way of work do not meet the needs of beneficiaries in the field and that as such it must be modified.

In the overall sample, the most common types of assistance provided by CSOs from the two countries to the beneficiaries are translation services, assistance with non-food items and asylum counseling. At the individual level, assistance in education, translation services, organizing sports/social activities and counseling in the asylum procedure are dominant in Serbia, while in Bosnia, non-food assistance; translation services, food assistance and medical assistance are dominant. According to the representatives of CSOs themselves, in Serbia the highest priority is assistance to beneficiaries in integrating with the local population, while in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the priority is to assist beneficiaries in the form of providing adequate housing and nutrition, which leads to the conclusion that in Serbia CSO activities are directed towards integration in BiH to meet basic needs.

These results indicate that CSOs involved in providing assistance to migrants in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina operate completely differently. What is the highest priority in Serbia is the lowest in BiH, and vice versa. From the above we can assume that the basic needs of migrants in Serbia are met (accommodation, food, non-food items), so CSOs can deal with higher hierarchical needs (the need to belong to a group, the need to be accepted which makes inclusion a precondition for integration). In Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is predominantly a transit country, despite the existence of reception centers, CSOs are logically most oriented towards meeting the basic needs (the need for food, water, accommodation ...). At the moment, they consider integration with the locals the least priority, because there is a lot more basic that they, unfortunately, have not been able to provide to the beneficiaries.

Although the problem as such cannot be defined here because only the current situation is stated, a possible preventive recommendation for CSOs in BiH is to define a strategy for potentially needed inclusive activities that will be imposed as a need at one point of time, modeled on identical activities that are already implemented in Serbia.

Representatives of CSOs in both countries have stated that mutual cooperation with other CSOs is at a satisfactory level, but this cannot be said for cooperation with the government sector and to a greater extent in BiH, where it is even said that there is no cooperation at all, but in Serbia. CSOs in both countries find that their role in migration flows is not recognized as sufficiently important and significant and it is needed to advocate.

Following the example in Serbia, the recommendation for CSOs in BiH to improve co-operation with the government sector lies in the strategy of defining coordination through local meetings, mapping available resources and establishing closer co-operation, first formally through co-operation memorandum and then practically through concrete actions and activities.

Although the majority of respondents have undergone some of the trainings, workshops, seminars to work with the migrant population, absolutely all respondents who took part in the survey believe that additional empowerment of CSOs to work with the beneficiaries is necessary despite assessing the quality of the provided services to the beneficiaries as good to satisfactory.

The largest number of respondents agrees that in order to improve the quality of work of CSOs in their countries, better cooperation between the governmental and non-governmental sectors in the redistribution of competencies is paramount. In Serbia, the need for increased financial support for CSOs working in the field was also highlighted. The situation is the same in Bosnia.

We conclude that CSOs are able to identify the positives and negatives of their work and positions in migration flows, as well as to be able to propose solutions to overcome challenges and that is why this potential and resource must be harnessed.

Summary:

Joint recommendations for CSOs in Serbia and BiH

- Increasing the visibility of CSOs at key points of entry into the country or at the centers themselves to facilitate first contact with beneficiaries;
- Initiating the exchange of experience and knowledge between CSO representatives in the region;
- Initiating networking of CSOs in two countries with the aim of gathering information and monitoring trends;
- Advocating for the adoption of a Strategy on the role of CSOs in migration flows in order to enhance cooperation between governments and civil society at the republic and regional levels;
- Individual approach to defining and organizing activities for migrants (individual interviews, focus groups, etc.);
- More workshops on understanding cultural differences, raising awareness among migrants of the need to adapt to current circumstances, customs and lifestyle in current country of residence;

Recommendations for CSOs in BiH

- Strengthening the activities of informing migrants about official reception centers and procedures for their accommodation (information flyers, info desks, etc.);
- Advocating closer cooperation with government structures through memorandum of cooperation and joint actions and activities;

Recommendations for CSOs in Serbia

- Strengthening the activities of informing migrants about the house rules of the centers in which they are accommodated, as well as their rights and duties, in cooperation with the centers 'administrations;
- Transparency in the work of CSOs regarding planned activities to avoid overlaps with other CSOs;
- Conducting participatory research on beneficiaries' needs and ways of meeting them with the aim of planning activities and engaging resources effectively.

Abbreviations:

EU - European Union

CSOs - civil society organizations

BiH - Bosnia and Herzegovina

UN- United Nations

UNHCR - UN High Commissioner for Refugees
(UN Refugee Agency)

UNICEF - UN Children's Fund

CARE - A global charity to fight poverty

IOM - International Organization for Migrations

OSCE - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe