6th meeting of the Inclusion and Solutions Working Group (ISWG) | 12 November 2025	
Meeting Details	
Date	*12.11.2025*
Time	*14:00 pm*
Chair	*Iva Vavic (UNHCR)*
Lead	***ISWG**: MLSP, Iva Vavic-UNHCR, Artiom Sici-UNICEF, Andrew Mitchell-WFP* ***LIWG**: Zinaida Adam (UNDP)*
Email	*mdachiswg@unhcr.org*
Agenda	
• SEIS 2025 findings (presented by REACH) • Updates on the ISWG Action Plan • AOB	
Information collection and relevant links	
Click here to subscribe to ISWG mailing list *ISWG page on ODP website* *Link to the interactive presentation*	

Participants

Iva Vavic, UNHCR	Emmanuel Otika, UNHCR	Hanna Ursol, PIN
Andrew Mitchell, WFP	Eugeniu Popescu, UNHCR	Daryna Kovtun, ACTED
Artiom Sici, UNICEF	Ilinka Leger, HEKS	Felicia Bulat, Impact Initiatives/ REACH
Zinaida Adam, UNDP	Irina Stefan, AO LAOLALTA	Ecaterina Chilii, CCR
Andrea Cuisana, UNHCR	Irina Guban, RCO	Natalia Curnic, UNHCR
Yigit Gurer, UNHCR	Iurie Tabuncic, US Embassy	Sara Sivkova, UNHCR
Valeria Socolov, WFP	Marina Zagoret, ACTED	Sarah Delys, Impact Initiatives / REACH
Alina Chirciu, IOM	Natalia Stelea, UNHCR	Senedu Negash, IOM
Domnica Ginu, Lumos Foundation	Tetiana Stoianova, UNHCR	
Eirini Aletra, CRS	Valentina Harovschi, IFRC	
Elena Munteanu-Sagaidashina, MLSP	Svetlana Cirez, CRS	

Meeting Summary: Key Discussions, Decisions, and Action Points

Agenda	Discussion	Decisions/ Action Points
Introduction & Purpose	**Iva Vavic** welcomed partners to **the sixth ISWG meeting** and introduced **Felicia Bulat** from Impact Initiatives/REACH Initiative to present the preliminary analysis of **SEIS 2025.** Iva noted that the presentation is timely and expected to provide useful findings to **help prioritize actions for the next year.**	
Socio-Economic Insights Survey (SEIS) 2025 Preliminary analysis	**Felicia Bulat** from Impact Initiatives/REACH presented the preliminary analysis of SEIS 2025. She explained the objectives, methodology, and limitations of the survey, noting that SEIS is a collaborative process aimed at identifying the most pressing needs of refugees across sectors. The 2025 survey, together with previous assessments, examined key areas such as **demographics, protection, education, socio-economic inclusion and livelihoods, health, and accommodation.** Felicia first presented demographic data and then moved through sector-specific findings: **Protection, Education, Socio-Economic Inclusion and Livelihoods, Health, and Accommodation.** **A detailed Q&A session followed:** • **Legal Status:** Hanna Ursol, PIN, asked about **the 0.1% of refugees** without any legal status and whether reasons were identified. Felicia clarified that this information was not collected, and no **follow-up was done in such cases.** • **Aggressive Behavior:** Another question from Hanna focused on **whether cases of aggressive behavior were geographically classified**. Felicia responded that they were not, as the reported cases represented only 9% overall, but noted that this could be explored further. **Hanna** clarified that if the 9% would be concentrated in one area, this would be important to explore. • **Interview Criteria:** Artiom Sici, UNICEF, had a question on **whether interviews included refugees with only a Ukrainian passport,** not all residents who had residence there before the war. Felicia confirmed that households were included only **if at least one member held Ukrainian citizenship exclusively**, excluding third-country nationals. **Artiom** wanted to clarify why the survey excluded refugees who might hold other passports, given that temporary protection applies broadly, not limited to Ukrainian nationals. **Sarah Delys** clarified that this was based on a request from the **Regional Bureau**. • **Positive Trends: Artiom** noted the decline in discrimination and bullying compared to 2024 and asked **if reasons were explored,** to understand if this is the consequence of the work of development partners or another reason. Felicia explained that the survey **used a structured questionnaire** without a qualitative component, **so deeper analysis was not possible**. **Sarah Delys**	Partners can reach out to **REACH** for any questions or clarifications on the preliminary findings.

	noted that **SEIS is a regional exercise**, which limits questionnaire adaptation, but welcomed feedback on data gaps for future improvements. • **Labor Force Participation: Artiom** addressed the finding that **58% of respondents outside the labor** market did not intend or were unable to work, asking to provide more details on the barriers expressed by the participants. **Felicia** explained that the school age children and retirees are overlapping in this category so it's quite a big share. Also, part of this category are people with disabilities, and students in training. Sarah Delys noted that the classification **followed ILO definitions** and the **Regional Bureau** requirements and that **more detailed data could be shared if needed**. • **Hanna Ursol** asked whether employment labor market participation **was only based on the work in Moldova,** and didn't include other types as online work for other countries; Felicia confirmed the **data refers only to Moldova**. • **Iva Vavic** expressed that it would be interesting to know for UNHCR and REACH on which aspects to follow up as they have regular FGDs on account of which they have their annual participatory assessments. So, if there is anything they should look deeper into, they could, including the reduced tensions findings. • **Iva** asked if in 2024 the sample was comparable. **Felicia** answered – 622 for 2024 and 532 for 2025. I**va** said that it would be interesting to see also per region. • **Comparison with Other Data: Iva** noted that the 59% outside the labor force aligns with JDC results (60%) and **suggested comparing SEIS and JDC findings for deeper insights,** as there were different questions for JDC on barriers. JDC also used 15+ but there was, in comparison, a small percentage of students and 60+. • **Housing Conditions:** Andrea Cuisana, UNHCR, asked about the **93% reporting adequate housing** and how this was calculated, **given field observations of rent struggles**. She was interested in how the question was posed in order to obtain the information. **Felicia** clarified that this was a calculated **variable from the Regional Bureau** and promised to check and provide details on the methodology. • **Coping Strategies: Mary Khozomba,** NRC, asked about coping strategies questions, noting they were included in previous years but missing now. **Felicia** confirmed these questions were dropped in 2025, **so no data is available.** • **Income and Cash Assistance**: **Mary Khozomba** asked whether income-related questions were collected before or after the reduction in cash assistance transfer values. **Felicia** clarified that data collection took place **between May 21 and July 7, 2025**, just weeks after the reduction of transfer, as clarified by **Yigit**. **Felicia** noted that **it would be difficult to isolate the impact of reduced cash assistance** because income sources also include vouchers and remittances. **Yigit** said that UNHCR is now conducting ongoing reassessment interviews for the entire household, and they can compare	

	the **income generation resources** and **cross compare it with last year's results**. It may be the effect of the **reduction of the transfer** value. But somehow it is **25%,** and the measurement may not be easy if the people are engaging in labor market to fill in the gaps, **but it can give an indication.** • **Job Search and Barriers**: Related to employment, participants discussed reasons for refusing job offers. **Yigit** shared the findings from **reassessment activities** (not the latest results) indicate that among those without income and seeking work: ○ **26%** said they would accept any job but could not find one. ○ **31%** cited inappropriate work environments. ○ **10%** mentioned low salary. ○ **14%** noted distance from home. ○ **1%** mentioned family separation, ○ with other reasons below 1%.	
Updates on the ISWG Action Plan	**Valeria Socolov**, **Coordination Officer of ISWG**, updated partners on the progress of the **ISWG Action Plan** and presented a timeline of key milestones. The Action Plan was finalized in **August**, validated with ISWG partners during the **workshop on 16 September**, and partner feedback was integrated in **October**. In the same month, the **Implementation Table** was completed. **Valeria introduced the Implementation Table** and explained its purpose. It is designed to answer critical questions: What are the deliverables? Who is the focal point? What is the timeline? And What was already planned? She emphasized that **an additional layer of detail** is needed before officially launching the Action Plan. Valeria explained that the ISWG Action Plan moves beyond high-level objectives by introducing a practical mechanism for implementation: **Groupings**. These thematic clusters are **created under each Strategic Objective to organize activities into manageable units.** Groupings serve as operational sub-structures within ISWG, consolidating related activities under a common focus area. Each Grouping is linked to specific deliverables, such as policy recommendations, capacity-building modules, or programs. Each Strategic Objective has **1–2 focal points**, who report regularly to ISWG to consolidate progress, address gaps, and ensure coherence across objectives. Valeria then outlined the **next steps**: • Present Groupings to partners during the ISWG meeting. • Upload the Implementation Plan online to gather questions and feedback for validation. • **Focal Points will hold ad-hoc meetings per Grouping** to unpack activities, agree on work plans, and set timelines. • **Draft an external version of the Action Plan**, including a presentation for external audiences and a dissemination plan. • **Organize a formal presentation of the Action Plan** to partners and donors.	The **Implementation Plan** will be placed online for feedback and validation.

	She concluded by inviting partners to provide feedback on the **Implementation Table.**	
Contingency Plan Submissions	**Iva Vavic** reminded partners about the **contingency plan submissions**. She noted that a contingency planning meeting was held last week and emphasized that submissions remain open for a few more days. Currently, nine partners have not submitted their plans; three of these have phased out, leaving at least six partners who still need to provide their input. Iva shared the submission link in the chat and encouraged those partners to complete the process as soon as possible.	
Next meeting:	**TBD**	