Participation

# of respondents: 22

Meeting participation of respondents

Satisfaction

Satisfied with meeting coordination

Satisfied with the agenda

Overall satisfaction with meetings

Agenda - content suggestions
- better structuring between broader, strategic topics and topics related to daily operations
- involvement of ‘crucial stakeholders’
- more ‘technical discussions on criteria for assistance’
- coordination and exchange of information among organizations
- referral pathways
- joint reporting mechanisms for complaint and feedback
- update on the situation at the border
- views of local Ukrainian organizations
- winterization
- preparedness

Meetings - coordination suggestions
- more interactive and inclusive meetings
- partnership approach
- more predictable scheduling

Frequency and duration

Frequency of meetings

Duration of meetings

Frequency of meetings (by meeting)

Duration of meetings (by meeting)
**Translation need**

**Simultaneous translation needed by partner**

- 6 (27%)
- 16 (73%)

**Location**

**Location of meeting appropriate?**

- do not know  no  yes

**Relevant coordination bodies**

**Most relevant bodies for respondents’ intervention**

- 1st choice  2nd choice  3rd choice

**Meeting choices by attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice / attendance</th>
<th>BN</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>EDU</th>
<th>MHPSS</th>
<th>PROT</th>
<th>PSEA</th>
<th>RCF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFUGEE COORD. FORUM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPSS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC NEEDS WG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFUGEE COORD. FORUM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPSS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC NEEDS WG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFUGEE COORD. FORUM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPSS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main issues to work on**

**ASSISTANCE**
- access to healthcare
- food and non-food provision
- helping with concrete issues, e.g. providing translators
- more joint information campaigns in coordination with or targeting non-humanitarian actors particularly outside of Budapest

**COORDINATION**
- better direct communication between partners
- Child Protection WG and Education WG should be merged again. A workshop-like, issue-based structuring of the cooperation would be more effective.
- circulation of more detailed information
- common action plans on problematic issues
- cooperation between different WGs
- coordination of activities and services
- less ‘rotation’ of UNHCR senior staff/chairs
- less bureaucracy/working load imposed by UNHCR
- more jointly organized advocacy initiatives
- more practical discussions and follow-up
- theoretical and practical cooperation

**INCLUSION**
- approaching more actors
- involvement of government
- involvement of local actors
- involvement of municipalities
- involvement of state agencies
- more room for local NGOs to participate and bring their insights
User frequency of IM tools

- 1 - weekly
- 2 - monthly
- 3 - quarterly
- 4 - never

- 2022 RRP activity reporting form: 32%
- 2022 RRP funding reporting form: 73%
- 2023 RRP project submission form: 64%
- New site submission form: 73%
- Service mapping also sheet (Budapest): 50%
- Site visit tracker: 55%

User experience of IM tools

- 1 - bad
- 2 - neutral
- 3 - good

- 2022 RRP activity reporting form: 52%
- Site visit tracker: 78%
- 2023 RRP project submission: 38%
- Service mapping also sheet (Budapest): 88%
- 2022 RRP funding reporting form: 83%
- New site submission form: 83%

Information Management / Products

User frequency of IM products

- 1 - weekly
- 2 - monthly
- 3 - quarterly
- 4 - never

- Border crossings and TP applications dashboard: 34%
- ODP: 34%
- Operational presence db.: 36%
- Overview of RRP achievements: 36%
- Protection profiling factsheet: 41%
- Service mapping dashboard: 41%
- Site mapping dashboard: 32%

User experience of IM products

- 1 - bad
- 2 - neutral
- 3 - good

- ODP: 94%
- Border crossings and TP applications dashboard: 87%
- Operational presence dashboard: 79%
- Overview of RRP achievements: 86%
- Protection profiling factsheet: 66%
- Site mapping dashboard: 64%
- Service mapping dashboard: 52%

SUGGESTION FOR PRODUCTS:

- border crossings data also in Excel format
- completion of service mapping, including validation of information
- include contact details of focal points in the Operational Presence dashboard or ways to reach out to the different organizations on operational level (maybe by connecting it with the service mapping)
- ‘one-stop online space instead of multiple tools’ for more user convenience
- promote / raise awareness of the different tools and products (eg. explain purpose of the Site mapping dashboard)
- technical training on accessing tools and products