



# Belgium operational plan 2021-2024

## Ex post evaluation report

Prepared by the EUAA's Quality Management and Evaluation Sector

*The sole responsibility for this report lies with the author. The EUAA is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.*

EUAA/EVAL/2024/06/FR; Final

March 2025





## Contents

Contents .....	2
Acronyms and definitions.....	3
Executive summary .....	4
1. Introduction: purpose and scope .....	6
2. Intended results of the action .....	7
2.1. Description of the action and its intended results .....	7
2.2. Points of comparison.....	8
3. Implementation of the action: current state of play .....	9
4. Evaluation findings .....	12
4.1. To what extent was the action successful and why? .....	12
4.2. How did the Agency make a difference through the action? .....	17
4.3. Is the action relevant? .....	17
5. Conclusions and recommendations .....	18
5.1. Conclusions.....	18
5.2. Good practices and lessons learnt .....	19
5.3. Recommendations .....	22
Annex 1: Methodology and analytical models used .....	23
Annex 2: Evaluation matrix .....	24
Annex 3: Intervention logic .....	25



## Acronyms and definitions

Term	Definition
CEAS	Common European Asylum System
EU	European Union
EUAA	European Union Agency for Asylum
Fedasil	Federal Agency for the reception of asylum seekers
OP	Operational plan
TP	Temporary protection
TPD	Temporary Protection Directive

## Executive summary

The European Union Agency for Asylum (EUAA) and Belgium collaborated on an operational plan (OP) from December 2021 to the end of 2024 to support Belgium's reception system. The latter was under significant pressure due to a substantial increase in asylum seekers. The OP aimed to provide support to frontline reception needs, structural approaches to improve reception conditions, and the implementation of the Temporary Protection Directive. The EUAA offered various forms of support, including material assistance, deployment of experts, interpretation, and training.

Regarding **effectiveness**, highlights of the OP included the establishment of 455 new reception places in 2022 and 2023, and the provision of interpretation services to facilitate communication between asylum seekers and the authorities. The EUAA deployed social workers, as well as child protection, information provision and site management experts to reception centres, which were under high pressure. Additionally, the Agency provided training to its experts, interpreters, and staff from the Federal Agency for the reception of asylum seekers (Fedasil), addressing needs such as reception operations, ethics, and psychological support for asylum seekers. The OP achieved most of the intended results, including frontline reception services, training, and knowledge management. However, the complexity and dependence of certain activities on external factors did not allow the Agency to fully deliver on all components and, most notably, on container deployment, which did not meet the expected quality and quantity. The effectiveness of the OP was also impacted by challenges in recruiting and retaining experts (high turnover). OP implementation started quickly and **efficiently**, but was also faced difficulties related to identification of office space, recruitment of experts, and roll out of training programmes and management of the deployment of containers. The evaluation found that the costs of the support provided were justified, given the results, but there were areas for improvement, such as streamlining of administrative procedures and more optimal deployment of experts.

In terms of **relevance**, the OP was timely and addressed the significant pressure on the reception system stemming from the increase in asylum seekers. The OP was relevant and adapted to the realities on the ground, as priorities shifted over time. However, there was limited demand for the Agency's training activities due to the existing comprehensive national training offer. In terms of **coherence**, OP implementation benefited from structured coordination and communication efforts internally and externally. The EUAA adapted to changing priorities and policies within Fedasil and aligned its support with capacity needs on the ground. However, there was at times room for improvement in achieving timely coordination and communication. The evaluation found that the OP demonstrated European Union **added value** by providing a flexible approach and a wide range of support actions. The EUAA's support was viewed positively by the Belgian authorities, and the Agency contributed to enhancing reception capacity and supporting institutional frameworks, in line with the Common European Asylum System.

OP implementation provided lessons learnt that go beyond the specific country context. Considerations include comprehensive pre-assessments, balanced deployment of experts, and early training needs assessments. The EUAA could also strengthen needs assessment and planning and consider a future container framework contract. These lessons can inform a future update of the Agency's reception strategy, enhancing the EUAA's operations and support to reception sectors.



In terms of country-specific recommendations, the evaluation proposes the following for the EUAA's continued cooperation with Belgium:

- Improve operational efficiency. Examples include improving the maintenance workflow for containers in Belgium; prepare interpreters and experts better on logistical challenges when settling in Belgium; explore possibilities for better matching of profiles and performance optimisation of experts;
- Enhance coordination of OP implementation. Examples: ensure sufficient resources for EUAA coordination staff in proportion to the activities of the OP; adhere to clearer workflows and validation processes to improve the development and review of quality-related products; define clear roles and responsibilities among Agency and external stakeholders; strengthen coordination frameworks.



## 1. Introduction: purpose and scope

This report relates to the evaluation of the operational plan (OP) agreed between the European Union Agency for Asylum (EUAA or the Agency) and Belgium which was effective from 16 December 2021 to 31 December 2024<sup>1</sup>.

Following an official request and a rapid needs assessment, the EUAA and the Belgian authorities concluded an OP to support emergency reception needs and provide reception conditions in line with Common European Asylum System (CEAS) standards. The main national counterpart under the OP was the Federal Agency for the reception of asylum seekers (Fedasil). The OP took into account the dynamic context, with evolving national needs and priorities which were considered in its advanced design and implementation. As of May 2022, following the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the OP included support for the implementation of the Temporary Protection Directive (TPD) in Belgium. In 2023, the OP results and activities were reorganised, to make a clearer distinction between frontline and structural reception support in line with the Agency's internal guidance and the needs identified at national level.

The primary purpose of this evaluation was to assess the results of the EUAA's operational measures supporting Belgium. The evaluation took place between November 2024 and February 2025 and was carried out by the Quality Management and Evaluation Sector of the Agency's Institutional and Horizontal Affairs Centre.

The evaluation exercise aimed to facilitate internal learning, knowledge management, transparency, and accountability within the Agency. It assessed the five standard evaluation criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, and European Union (EU) added value) in a balanced manner. Special attention was paid to experiences with deployment of experts, container management, and operational capacity building. Moreover, the evaluation considered external coherence questions such as:

- How has the Agency adapted in response to contextual policy changes?
- Has the OP embedded an exit strategy?
- How was communication and coordination managed?

The evaluation considered new developments at European policy level that guide the Agency's work. Horizontal findings of the evaluation were collected and reported as lessons learnt. The scope of the evaluation was limited to the performance of the Agency as defined by the OP.

This report sets out the intervention logic of the OP and describes the context in Belgium before the operational intervention. Chapter 3 gives an overview of the evolved national context and presents the main results that the Agency achieved during OP implementation. The following chapter connects the different findings by considering the different evaluation criteria. The final chapter presents conclusions and sets out the overall good practices and lessons learned. It also proposes horizontal considerations and evaluation recommendations.

---

<sup>1</sup> The original OP foresaw a duration of 12 months (i.e., until December 2022). Two successive amendments were signed extending the OP's duration until December 2024.

## 2. Intended results of the action

This chapter describes the intended results of the OP and the Belgian context before the start of the intervention as a reference for comparison.

### 2.1. Description of the action and its intended results

The OP 2021-2024 for Belgium included the following three operational measures which evolved through different iterations to align with the evolving context and needs of the Belgian authorities, as well as to reflect broader internal changes in the design and planning of operational support activities. Its results framework was formulated as follows<sup>2</sup>:

#### Result 1. Frontline reception support

- Outcome 1. Enhanced capacity of the Belgian authorities to respond to emergency reception needs (2022-2023) / Enhanced response capacity of the Belgian authorities to provide reception conditions at frontline level in line with CEAS and EUAA standards (2024).
- Output 1: Increased capacity and improved quality of emergency reception response (2022-2023) / Enhanced capacity and improved quality of reception conditions at frontline level (2024).
- Activities included amongst others:
  - Material support to improve the reception capacity in existing and/or new facilities;
  - Provision of training aligned with the EUAA's European asylum curriculum and national needs;
  - Support to vulnerable persons, child protection,, social work, information provision and site management in the reception facilities;
  - Provision of interpretation services for frontline reception activities.

#### Result 2. Structural reception support

- Outcome 2. Enhanced institutional capacity of the Belgian authorities to provide reception conditions in line with CEAS and EUAA standards.
- Outputs 2022:
  - 2.1. Site evaluation for the establishment of a modular emergency reception centre;
  - 2.2. Support in the establishment of a modular emergency reception centre;
  - 2.3. Support for the enhancement of arrival processes.
- Output 2023-2024: support for the enhancement of the reception system.
- Planned activities included amongst others:
  - Support to site planning, site design and quality of reception containers;
  - Support in reception-related workflows, guidance, and information/data management tools;
  - Planning and coordination of information provision processes, including support for information points;
  - Support for planning, coordination and enhancement of the arrival process;
  - Training.

---

<sup>2</sup> The year of OP extension is between brackets.

### Result 3. Support to temporary protection (TP)

- Outcome 3. Enhanced capacity of the Belgian authorities to implement effectively the TPD (May 2021-2024).
- Output 3: support for the implementation of the TPD.
- Activities included interpretation assistance that would facilitate TPD implementation, enhancing coordination with EU standards.

The OP included human resources, material, and financial inputs:

- Human resources: experts (including reception managers, social workers, child protection experts, vulnerability specialists) and interpreters;
- Material support: provision of reception containers.

The intervention logic of the OP, presented in Annex 3 to this report, gives more details on the projected results, activities and inputs, which evolved with yearly amendments.

## 2.2. Points of comparison

This section describes the Belgian context before the start of the OP. It allows a comparison to be made with the data provided in section 3.

In Belgium, applicants for international protection have the right to material assistance (reception) throughout the procedure. The right to reception ends once the procedure for international protection has finished and all possible appeals have failed<sup>3</sup>. Since December 2018, the first reception activities took place at the 'Petit-Château' arrival centre of the Fedasil in Brussels. It brought together the Fedasil teams in charge of first reception and the allocation of applicants to a reception space, as well as the registration service of the Immigration Office.

The reception network managed by Belgium comprised collective and individual reception structures. The collective structures were reception centres managed by Fedasil, the Flemish or Walloon Red Cross, or other partners, with approximately 100 being operational in 2021. The individual structures were housing units managed by the Public Social Welfare centre ('local reception initiatives') or by NGOs.

In Belgium, the annual number of applications evolved from 14 035 to 23 105 and 19 545 in 2017, 2019 and 2021 respectively<sup>4</sup>. This situation exerted increased pressure on the Belgian reception system. Between 2018 and 2020, Belgium's reception occupancy roughly doubled from about 16 000 to over 29 000 persons<sup>5</sup>. The number of asylum applications in 2021 exceeded the maximum absorption capacity (around 2 000 persons per month) of the national reception system. As a result, there was a significant delay in the allocation of new applicants to reception facilities.

---

<sup>3</sup> Information in this paragraph taken from Fedasil's website: <https://www.fedasil.be/en/asile-en-belgique/reception-asylum-seekers>.

<sup>4</sup> Source: Eurostat.

<sup>5</sup> Source: 2022 OP between the Agency and Belgium.





A number of factors put additional pressure on the reception system. The annual number of unaccompanied children applying for asylum in Belgium increased from 735 to 1 220 and 1 780 in 2017, 2019 and 2021 respectively<sup>6</sup>. Their special reception needs stretched the capacity of the system. In addition, the increased share of rejected applicants still residing in the facilities (increased from 2 % to 8 % in 2021<sup>7</sup>) added to delays in the reception outflow. Other drivers of the increased reception needs included:

- The loss of capacity due to flooding in Wallonia in July 2021, which resulted in three facilities no longer being available;
- The resettlement programme that also uses the reception network;
- The temporary suspension of decisions for Afghan applicants, in view of the volatile political situation in Afghanistan, which lengthened their stay in reception facilities;
- COVID-19<sup>8</sup> requirements.

The Belgian authorities were looking at measures to improve the capacity of the reception system and increase their staff for asylum processing. Pending these solutions and in view of the extraordinary pressure, the Belgian authorities officially requested support from the Agency in November 2021. A rapid needs assessment shaped the design of a first OP for Belgium, combining immediate and mid-term support in reception.

### 3. Implementation of the action: current state of play

This chapter describes how the context in Belgium evolved over the duration of the OP and gives an overview of the main achieved results.

There were 19 545, 32 100, 29 260 and 33 050 first-time applications for international protection in Belgium in 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024 respectively<sup>9</sup>. In 2021, 2022 and 2023, the number of unaccompanied children applying for asylum in Belgium remained high at 1 780, 2 270 and 1 550 respectively. Belgium issued 63 355, 15 625 and 13 275 TP decisions in 2022, 2023 and 2024 respectively.

In view of the continued and increased number of arrivals, the national reception system remained under pressure throughout OP implementation. The authorities took different measures to increase capacity which stood at 34 271 places in September 2023. With inflow requests exceeding outflows, there were significant delays in the provision of reception conditions. As housing for women and children was prioritised, single male applicants were placed on waiting lists. As of August 2023, the government made this policy more explicit<sup>10</sup>. In November 2024, the reception network for asylum

---

<sup>6</sup> Source in this paragraph: [Eurostat](#).

<sup>7</sup> Source: 2022 OP between the Agency and Belgium.

<sup>8</sup> Coronavirus disease 2019.

<sup>9</sup> Source: Eurostat.

<sup>10</sup> [https://asylumineurope.org/reports/country/belgium/reception-conditions/access-and-forms-reception-conditions/criteria-and-restrictions-access-reception-conditions/#\\_ftn27](https://asylumineurope.org/reports/country/belgium/reception-conditions/access-and-forms-reception-conditions/criteria-and-restrictions-access-reception-conditions/#_ftn27)

seekers in Belgium had 36 077 places. This was spread out across 107 collective centres (managed by the Fedasil, Red Cross, and other partners) and in individual accommodation managed by the municipalities. Despite this, in mid-November 2024, 2 650 single men were on a waiting list for a reception place<sup>11</sup>.

Operational internal monitoring provided a detailed comparison between annual result targets and achievements. Exceptionally, targets were not set for 2022 due to the emergency and inception nature of the response. This challenged the assessment of the effectiveness of the OP in 2022. Below is a summary of the key findings, organised by result<sup>12</sup>.

#### *Frontline reception support (result 1)*

Internal monitoring at result outcome level suggested that, in 2023 and 2024, the Agency implemented 69 % and 66 % of its planned deliverables.

The EUAA supported eight Fedasil reception sites with material support in 2022: Sugny, Liège, Herbeumont, Charleroi, Bovigny, Koksijde, Arendonk, and Broechem. In 2023, this number fell to 3 (out of the 4 planned).

In 2022, 160 reception places were established to replace existing units in Arendonk and another 290 were put in place within various existing reception facilities. This involved the delivery of 32 and 58 accommodation container units respectively. The annual target for the number of new reception places established was 805 and 750 in 2023 and 2024, respectively. However, the EUAA provided only five places in 2023, and no new reception places were established in 2024.

The EUAA provided social work support to 163, 683 (640 planned) and 250 (480 planned) cases in 2022, 2023 and 2024 respectively. These achievements are correlated with the fluctuating deployments of experts, which ranged from two to six, and their evolving tasks in up to six different reception centres.

Under the OP, 1 311, 5 038 (3 300 planned) and 3 344 (4 900 planned) child protection activities were organised in 2022, 2023 and 2024 respectively. This involved 14 (in 2023) and seven (in 2024; 13 planned) child protection experts.

Similarly, after providing information sessions to 21 552 participants<sup>13</sup> in 2022, the Agency delivered 6 776 (6 700 planned) and 5 998 (4 900 planned) information provision sessions in 2023 and 2024 respectively. Activities were carried out by 13 information provision experts deployed during the period 2022-2023 – a number that dropped to three junior experts by the end of 2024.

The Agency trained 330 participants under result 1 over the duration of the OP. These included mainly EUAA experts and interpreters.

---

<sup>11</sup> Source: [website Fedasil](#)

<sup>12</sup> This chapter compares actual versus planned achievements. The following chapter provides and analyses more in detail contextual challenges and good practices.

<sup>13</sup> The figure 21 552 does not refer to unique participants, but participations. This means that persons are counted each time they participate in a session.

In 2022, the EUAA deployed 22 interpreters (45 planned) and one coordinator in various locations across the country covering the need for nine languages. In 2023, the number of deployed interpreters increased from 25 to 40 covering about 30 locations, a figure that was on average maintained throughout 2024.

### *Structural reception support (result 2)*

The second result area was implemented in 2023 and 2024, when, at outcome level, the Agency implemented 94 % and 100 % of its planned deliverables<sup>14</sup>.

The Agency organised a workshop to draw lessons learnt on the provision of material support (containers)<sup>15</sup>.

A total of 428 participations in training took place under result 2 throughout the OP. This included 284 participations from national authorities and two from non-governmental organisations. In 2024, 77 training sessions (50 planned) were delivered to national authorities and EUAA personnel, on top of another 14 (10 planned) workshops on various topics.

The training sessions delivered under the OP were based on the EUAA's European asylum curriculum and were adapted to the national context and needs. In 2023, the EUAA prepared tailor-made modules for the Belgian reception authorities with the support of two training experts based in Brussels. These included the following:

- A tailor-made module on communication and information provision for staff working in reception facilities (20 sessions for 300 participants planned). This involved the development, adaptation, and translation of the material (Dutch translation undertaken by Fedasil and French by the EUAA). The module was delivered four times in 2024 to a total of 41 participants.
- The online EUAA module 'Introduction to ethical and professional standards' was adapted to a face-to-face modality to consider the Belgian context (i.e., to the code of conduct of Fedasil). It was intended for all Fedasil staff members working in the field (up to 2 500 staff members). The module was delivered seven times (to 45 participants) in Dutch and three times in French (to 44 participants) together with Fedasil.
- A tailor-made training session on psychological problems and addictions in reception, which was developed and delivered two times (once in French and the other in Dutch) in 2024, after it was put on hold due to similar ongoing initiatives funded under the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund. Originally, the plan was to train three persons from every Fedasil reception facility (90 facilities).
- A training session on client-focused approach for front desk and security staff, which was delivered but was eventually deprioritised by Fedasil. Another request to work on group dynamics for unaccompanied children was ultimately withdrawn.

---

<sup>14</sup> In practice, most of the activities were initiated in 2023, following the re-organisation of the results under frontline (result 1) and structural support (result 2).

<sup>15</sup> A collaboration with Fedasil and the Dutch Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum seekers (COA).

In parallel to training, about 15 experts provided support to Fedasil (20 planned) in relation to reception procedures, workflows, guidance and tools. Also, 29 (15 planned) information management products and 61 guidance documents (30 planned) were designed or updated.

#### *Support to TP (result 3)*

The result intended to provide interpretation and additional support to facilitate TPD implementation, enhancing coordination with EU standards. The OP referred to the possible deployment of ten (in 2022) and three (in 2023-2024) interpreters. In practice, the EUAA provided two interpreters as of July 2022. This was increased to three as of 2023 and reduced to two as of mid-2024 in coordination with Fedasil.

## 4. Evaluation findings

Building on the above, this chapter provides an analysis of the evaluation questions. It triangulates evidence from different data sources such as desk research, interviews, and focus group discussions.

### 4.1. To what extent was the action successful and why?

Overall, the Agency delivered upon the intended results during the OP, but with a different timing. Throughout the OP, the Agency shifted its focus from frontline reception support (Result 1) to structural reception support (Result 2). In this sense, there was a swift start in 2022 with the implementation of the **first result** (frontline support), including material support, training, social work support, child protection activities, interpretation, and information provision, followed by a gradual phase-out in 2024 in coordination with Fedasil. The second result (structural support), on the contrary, was in practice rolled out in 2023 and more extensively in 2024, delivering tailor-made training activities, workshops, as well as knowledge management (e.g., tools, guidance documents) in relation to reception frameworks and procedures. The delay was amongst others due to a shortage of coordination resources on both the EUAA's and the authorities' side to ensure the implementation.

Under the **first result** and with regard to material support, the OP was most effective in 2022 when it contributed to the creation of 455 reception places through the procurement of 150 **container units** and their installation in nine different Fedasil reception centres. While the mobilisation of these containers was relatively fast, multiple challenges were faced in their installation and further use, such as:

- Connectivity issues linked to the incompatibility of technical installations, and limited technical preparation and on-site supervision by the EUAA;
- The quality of the material of the containers (in terms of, e.g., isolation, humidity, heating, ventilation, fire resistance), which was more suitable for milder climates and not intended for residential purposes;
- Maintenance challenges that had to be remediated through multiple layers of intermediaries.

Following the delivery of the aforementioned container units and at the request of the authorities, the EUAA planned to further expand its material support and set up new reception facilities ('container

villages') with a capacity of up to 805 new places<sup>16</sup>. Although the EUAA proceeded swiftly with ordering the requested number of containers (522) in late 2022, the relevant authorities were not able to confirm the location or timeline for their installation, due to significant challenges in securing locations, legal requirements (permits) and other technical factors (e.g., completion of preparatory works by Fedasil partners). As these posed significant legal, financial, and reputational risks for the Agency, consistent efforts were made by both parties to identify solutions within the framework of the OP. Nonetheless, in September 2024 the authorities informed the EUAA that an alternative viable solution had been secured, and requested the discontinuation of the activity under the OP.

The experience presents many lessons learnt for the EUAA:

- **Preconditions:** The commitment of substantial funding should only take place when the most critical pre-conditions are met by the involved authorities, such as confirmation of locations and site plans, availability of the necessary permits, clarity on cooperation arrangements, and role of stakeholders involved;
- **Risk management:** The high number of planned places represented a significant commitment on both parties. The activities, therefore, entailed crucial risks which required comprehensive responses and follow-up at multiple levels, thus showcasing the critical importance of solid risk assessment and management throughout the process;
- **Multi-stakeholder coordination:** Despite the time-intensive coordination efforts, the delivery of activities was hampered by different perceptions and prolonged negotiations involving municipal authorities and Fedasil implementing partners (e.g. the Red Cross). Mechanisms to ensure strong coordination and advance planning among all involved stakeholders are thus pivotal to guiding activities and streamlining roles, responsibilities and timelines;
- **Contract management:** The existing container contract of the EUAA had several limitations which should be reviewed for future similar framework contracts.

The Agency has made particular efforts to promote exchange of information and lessons learnt on material support. An example was the thematic workshop organised in 2023 with the participation of the Belgian and the Dutch counterparts. This initiative enabled the three actors to critically explore options for improving container management.

In the area of **child protection, social work and information provision**, the EUAA deployed **experts** with relevant profiles to reception centres which were under high pressure. The nature of the activities depended on multiple factors, such as the needs of the targeted locations (e.g., number and profile of applicants), and the Agency's deployment capacity. Indicatively, the number of child protection and social work results were at times below target due to challenges in the assessment and deployment of experts. The information provision support on the other hand exceeded projections because of the high number of requests from applicants.

The support was initially directed to up to 25 reception centres, but soon it became clear that this created inefficiencies for follow-up and coordination. Progressively, the Agency focused on a more limited number of locations to facilitate coordination and, thus, apply a more targeted approach and maximise its impact. Following the decision of the Belgian authority to limit access to reception centres

---

<sup>16</sup> The activity was introduced in the second amendment to the OP, signed in November 2022.

for single men, the Agency changed its working modalities on information provision. This would ensure that the EUAA is not associated with a policy which is not in line with the CEAS and EU fundamental rights.

The effectiveness of the deployment of experts varied across reception centres. At times, the deployed experts did not always fully integrate in the day-to-day work of the local reception centres, due to different expectations from site management. At times, varying perceptions regarding the needs and role of the experts amongst different stakeholders were in some cases not conducive to the performance of their tasks. Considering the diverse nature of the experts' work, the authorities found junior profiles generally more flexible. In view of changing priorities, the roles, tasks, and deliverables of some experts were adjusted during their deployment in agreement with Fedasil.

Result 1 was supported by training of mostly EUAA experts and interpreters reaching an average completion rate of 77 %. The sessions on ethical and professional standards, legal framework and fundamental rights, and vulnerability tended to have full completion. Some introductory training activities attended by interpreters and information provision experts had lower completion rates (lowest score: 14 %). The average satisfaction score was 87 %, with the introduction sessions for the asylum support team working in reception receiving lower scores (77 %).

**Interpretation support** (averaging 40 interpreters during OP implementation) allowed the Agency's and Fedasil's personnel to better communicate and interact with asylum seekers, receiving very positive feedback from all stakeholders. At times, there was a need to clarify management of overtime, as well as ensure that interpreters had the required basic skills. Language requirements (of up to four languages) and the high cost of living made it, at times, difficult to find suitable candidates. In some isolated cases, there were incidents due to unprofessional behaviour, as well as administrative challenges to meet the legal requirements for interpreters to reside and work in Belgium. These, however, were addressed on time.

Under the **second result**, some deliverables in the field of **knowledge support** exceeded internal planning targets despite the number of experts being lower than planned. As Fedasil went through management changes, the Agency adapted to the shifting priorities. Challenges in the deployment of experts included delays in the EUAA's assessment process, inadequate knowledge of the required languages (French and Dutch), and last-minute rejection of Agency offers by experts. In addition, there was a transition between different contract modalities. The high volume of deliverables requested limited the time necessary for review and quality assurance, at times challenging the completion of work. The high turnover of experts limited overall knowledge of the operational context, impacting consistency and efficiency.

**Training** sessions under result 2 had an average satisfaction rate of 86 %. Some training sessions on management in the context of reception (for EUAA personnel; 61 %) and ethics and professional standards (for Fedasil staff; 60 %) had lower scores. The average completion rate was 89 % but several online sessions and webinars (e.g., communication in emergencies) had lower than 50 % completion rates. A possible reason for this is that many national reception staff did not feel comfortable with the online training modality. The shortage of Dutch-speaking trainers limited outreach to substantial segments of the staff. The scheduling and deadlines for training were at times perceived as rigid as

these needed to be added to the already high workload, also complicated by work shifts. Selected training curriculum adaptation efforts did not generate significant uptake.

The **third result** intended to provide interpretation and additional support to TP. In practice, this was limited to the provision of three (2022-2023) and two (2024) interpreters and their training. The result was below the projected numbers in the OP (up to ten in 2022) and was a small contribution to the capacity required by the Belgian authorities to implement the TPD.

Overall, most of the intended results of the OP were achieved, although to a lesser extent than originally planned. In terms of **cost-effectiveness**, this was matched by the budget which had a consumption rate of 41 %, 92 %, and 60 % for the three results respectively. The respective consumption rates were 29 % and 53 % for the first two results when considering the initial instead of the revised annual budgets<sup>17</sup>. These budget data reflected the ambitious nature of the OP. A significant change related to material support, when important commitments to a container village project did not materialise. Also, the number of deployed experts was about half of the maximum projected number. In 2024, for example, the EUAA deployed on average 36 experts while the deployment of up to 70 experts was mentioned in the OP amendment.

*Table 1. Budget in millions of EUR of the Belgium OP (source: non-validated internal monitoring data)<sup>18</sup>*

	Budget forecast 2022-2024 <sup>19</sup> (EUR mill.)	Allocated budget (%)	Budget consumption 2022-2024 (EUR mill.)	Consumed budget (%)	Consumption rate (%)
<b>Result 1</b>	21.7	85.7 %	8.8	73 %	40.6 %
<b>Result 2</b>	2.6	10.3 %	2.4	20 %	92.3 %
<b>Result 3</b>	0.5	2.0 %	0.3	2.5 %	60 %
<b>Other OP direct costs</b>	0.5	2.0 %	0.5	4.5 %	100 %
<b>Total OP budget</b>	<b>25.3</b>	<b>100.0 %</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>100.0 %</b>	<b>47.4 %</b>

In terms of **internal coherence**, OP implementation was coordinated by the Operational Support Centre and benefitted from close cross-Agency collaboration. While the first and the second results were complementary, there was limited room for establishing closer synergies (e.g., frontline experts could have made better use of the knowledge products developed under result 2). One of the possible reasons was the often, different timeline of their implementation.

Being a new OP, initially coordination was challenged because of inadequate office space and limited knowledge of the context. Nonetheless, as the cooperation with Fedasil progressively evolved and matured, the Agency adapted to the changes and achieved optimal **external coherence** with national priorities and contextual policy changes (priority question). The Agency made additional coordination

<sup>17</sup> Annual revisions ensured the budget was aligned to the evolving needs.

<sup>18</sup> Other direct costs are material costs not result-based serving the purpose of OP implementation. These may include cost of, *inter alia*, translation, infrastructure, transport, ICT equipment, stationery, supplies and consultancy.

<sup>19</sup> Sum of yearly updated budgets as per the respective autumn revisions.



efforts to ensure that evolving for training, material and experts were considered on time. During the implementation of the OP, the Agency consulted closely with the European Commission on specific matters.

While much effort was made in developing different coordination and communication mechanisms, at times there were delays. On some occasions, the Agency needed to carefully balance its efforts to ensure that the OP deliverables aligned to national policies and practices (e.g., material support incompatibilities, coordination of experts, and diverging approaches to training) whilst respecting the CEAS. In this regard, the EUAA adapted its information provision approaches as a result of the Belgian policy towards housing single men, which was considered not compliant with the CEA<sup>20</sup>. The Agency also needed to learn about and adjust to the comprehensive and established Fedasil partnerships (e.g. the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, Red Cross, training centres) to ensure complementarity.

The OP was set up as a rapid response action and initially aimed at providing frontline material and expert support. Progressively, it evolved towards structural and longer-term support. The yearly duration of the OP amendments, however, hampered longer-term planning.

The OP operational preconditions included coordination and collaboration elements. The host Member State would:

- Designate an overall plan and measure coordinators;
- Grant appropriate access to databases and provide information and data;
- Facilitate the provision of appropriate workspace;
- As feasible, provide working files in English;
- Provide input to the Early warning and Preparedness System (EPS);
- Facilitate implementation of the EUAA's survey data collection systems;

The EUAA would:

- Designate a coordinating officer and measure coordinator;
- Provide technical support to experts participating in the OP;
- Provide the required technical equipment and finance the support activities deployed by the EUAA;
- Support the development and implementation of agreed EUAA tools and procedures.

Most of these preconditions were met. Some aspects, such as an early and dedicated workspace in the Fedasil building, could have enhanced the Agency's coordination capacity.

---

<sup>20</sup> Source: [Aida/ECRE](#).



## 4.2. How did the Agency make a difference through the action?

The OP allowed the EUAA to support the Belgian authorities during a period of unprecedented pressure on their reception capacity. The Agency demonstrated added value by applying a flexible approach and providing a wide spectrum of support actions.

The EUAA contributed with child protection expertise, social work, and information provision support. Frontline measures for child protection were particularly well-received, with clear and effective deliverables. The Agency swiftly provided material support in 2022 but thereafter was not able to make more significant contributions because of the reasons mentioned earlier in this report. The EUAA provided training to its experts who filled gaps when Fedasil faced operational overstretch. The training plan agreed in the context of the OP included training for Fedasil staff, addressing needs such as reception operations, ethics, and psychological support for asylum seekers.

The OP gradually evolved from frontline support towards more structural support in order to make a more sustainable contribution. The collaborative development of tools and workflows tailored to Belgium's operational context was a strong point, especially in areas like vulnerability and harmonised intake forms at reception centres. This progressive exit from frontline support was almost completed by the end of the OP. The follow-up OP 2025-26 mainly focuses on the provision of structural support to Fedasil.

## 4.3. Is the action relevant?

The OP was timely in view of the continued high inflow of asylum seekers (increasing from 19 545 in 2021 to 29 260 in 2023<sup>21</sup>) and the mounting pressure on the reception system, with many asylum seekers (in particular single men) remaining outside the reception network. In this context, the EUAA's experts, initially field-based, effectively addressed urgent needs, filling gaps in frontline reception. Interpretation enhanced smooth communication between frontline workers, services and applicants. In parallel, the provision of material support contributed to establishing new reception places. However, the final results were – despite the many efforts – of lower quality and quantity than expected.

As the OP evolved towards more structural support, it reduced dependence of the authorities on emergency measures. Activities and experts adapted to Belgium's operational context, including a shift in priorities to address needs at both central and field levels. Thematic follow-up efforts improved relevance and engagement in some areas of support.

The OP was prepared based on a rapid needs assessment<sup>22</sup> but priorities gradually shifted. Demand for the EUAA's training sessions was limited, as they complemented the already comprehensive Fedasil training plan and staff's availability was hampered by their heavy workload. At Fedasil's request, tailor-made training sessions were designed, developed, and piloted, but also had limited take up.

---

<sup>21</sup> Source : [Eurostat](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat).

<sup>22</sup> The exercise did not include a dedicated training needs assessment.

Belgium was also a recipient of TP applicants, with 63 355 and 15 625 TP decisions in 2022 and 2023 respectively<sup>23</sup>. The interpretation support for TP was useful but remained limited, as per the authorities' request and in line with the needs identified on the ground.

## 5. Conclusions and recommendations

### 5.1. Conclusions

In terms of **relevance**, the OP contributed to addressing the significant pressure on Belgium's reception system, resulting from the increased inflow of asylum seekers. Throughout the implementation of the OP, the Agency adjusted to shifting priorities while considering its limited capacities. It provided timely assistance, initially through frontline support (including material support, interpretation and field-based expert deployments) to fill urgent service gaps. As of 2023, the EUAA started providing structural support. The EUAA also undertook many training initiatives for its deployed experts and national authorities' personnel to build capacities. Nonetheless, the training delivered to Fedasil staff at times met limited demand in view of the nationally available comprehensive offer. The interpretation support provided for TP was relevant considering the high number of TP beneficiaries but remained limited in scope in line with actual needs.

In terms of **effectiveness**, the OP achieved most of the intended results under its three result areas. The OP delivered and met the planned targets in terms of frontline reception activities, such as child protection activities and information provision, despite fluctuating numbers of deployed experts. It provided material support and interpretation. Container deployment, however, did not achieve the intended results in terms of quality and quantity for the reasons mentioned in previous sections of this report. In terms of structural support, although it was initially inactive, as of 2023 the EUAA delivered training and knowledge development. While there were 428 participations (including 284 from Fedasil) in training activities, there were mixed views on training effectiveness. TP support delivered fully on its goals. Overall, the complex nature and diverse support activities of the OP made it very difficult for the Agency to fully deliver on all its components.

The OP had a fast and **efficient** start. However, it was also challenged by multiple inefficiencies related to the need to find an office space, the recruitment and supervision of experts, and the roll-out of training programmes. The procurement and planning relating to material support (containers) was affected by legal requirements, and administrative processes, leading to operational delays and budgetary inefficiencies.

In terms of **coherence**, the OP benefitted from structured coordination and communication efforts internally and externally. Multiple EUAA actors contributed to the OP's implementation with operational, content, learning, and administrative support. The coordination among stakeholders at times did not always result in completed deliverables because of misaligned expectations (e.g., material support, deployment of experts, and training support or development of knowledge

---

<sup>23</sup> Source : [Eurostat](#).

products). The EUAA adapted to changing priorities and policies within Fedasil and aligned progressively its support with needs on the ground.

This intervention bolstered Belgium's response to asylum pressures by enhancing reception capacity, supporting institutional frameworks, and implementing EU reception standards. The intervention's phased activities, from material and frontline support to structural support and capacity building, prepared Belgium to better manage both immediate and long-term reception needs. The frontline support was of **added value** but could have achieved more in terms of expert and material deployments. The structural support started as of the second year of the OP and built on EUAA knowledge and expertise. It allowed the Agency to take stock of different lessons learnt in relation to training delivery and knowledge development. The interpretation support for TP was meaningful but was not of significant added value in view of its limited scope in volume and CEAS-related content.

*Table 2. Evaluation criteria by result<sup>24</sup>*

	Result areas		
	Reception frontline support	Reception institutional support	TPD
Relevance	Very good	Good	Good
Effectiveness	Fair/Good	Good	Good
Efficiency	Fair/Good	Good	Very good
Coherence	Fair/Good	Good	Very good
EU added value	Good	Good	Fair

## 5.2. Good practices and lessons learnt

The implementation of the OP allowed for the following **good practices** to emerge which could be continued or replicated in similar operations:

- Weekly meetings and technical support proved effective in aligning collaboration efforts;
- Centralising information exchange reduced misunderstandings among stakeholders. This fostered better understanding of operational needs, improving task alignment over time;
- Introducing focal points and data systems allowed for better management of vulnerability cases and information workflows;
- With long-term deployments of coordination staff there were gains in communication and reliability;
- The organisation and delivery of reception training modules in French was very well received by the authorities, particularly as the deployed training expert put extra effort in convening and motivating participants;
- The interpretation support was highly appreciated by the authorities. In addition, the Agency set up a mechanism to coordinate interpretation support, which facilitated scheduling, use of online

<sup>24</sup> The five evaluation criteria were rated using a four-point scale (insufficient, fair, good, very good). These ratings are judgements based on the triangulation of different information sources, such as interviews and internal data.



modalities to cover needs on the ground, and the development of a guiding document (manual) describing the role, duties, training, and evaluation of interpreters;

- Thematic discussions dedicated to specific tools or processes improved communication and ensured better alignment between stakeholders;
- Workshops and facilitated exchanges, such as connecting Belgian, Dutch, and Greek authorities, were perceived by the authorities as mutually beneficial;
- Adapting quickly to changing priorities and needs was essential to maintaining relevance and effectiveness.

Moreover, several **lessons learnt** were identified:

- Co-workspace contracts proved efficient and enhanced staff productivity, as opposed to the initial working set-ups that challenged communication and coordination needs with the national partner organisations;
- The premature signing of a substantial order form for material support triggered a number of lessons learnt:
  - Early and regular communication between involved parties, including local actors, can mitigate misunderstandings and enhance cooperation;
  - The choice of budget source can mitigate budget consumption risks, in particular when it provides more flexibility;
  - Requests for containers with higher specifications confirmed the need for stronger joint planning to ensure alignment with national regulations and quality standards;
- Deployment of experts at times was slow for internal (e.g., administrative procedure, acceptances) and external (e.g. coordination and matching challenges) reasons. Sometimes, it was difficult to ensure timely deployment in view of the operational needs on the ground;
- Future operations should prioritise alignment of tasks with agreed profiles for experts;
- Embedding training initiatives within national frameworks and ensuring local authorities take ownership is critical for long-term impact. The collaboration between the EUAA and Fedasil highlighted the need for adaptable training programmes that better reflect field realities;
- In terms of project management, the result output indicators changed across the yearly OP amendments, making multiannual assessment of progress more challenging. Yearly targets for deployments were aligned with the authorities' requests, but were particularly high. A more measured approach to capacity planning, in consultation with internal Agency actors, is essential at needs assessment stage. While flexibility is valuable, it is crucial to set clear limits and avoid overcommitting when minimum requirements are not met.

In addition to context-specific conclusions and lessons learnt, the evaluation identified a number of **horizontal considerations** (and recommendations), which are beyond the scope of the Belgium OP. These should be taken on board in future horizontal assessments:

- At the time of the evaluation, the Agency looked into ways to standardise its procedure on the management of assets and guidelines for the deployment of **containers**. These should consider the following:



- A future container framework contract could explore different options to enhance national ownership and limit risks for the Agency (e.g. orders made directly by EU+ countries, if procedurally/legally possible);
  - Conducting comprehensive pre-assessments of site conditions<sup>25</sup>, legal requirements, and environmental factors before procurement. More attention to structural requirements as well as maintenance needs is essential for smoother implementation;
  - There is a need for an Agency-wide approach combining reception knowledge, engineering-led solutions and contract management. Appointing architects, engineers and technicians within the EUAA for direct local involvement in operations can ensure practical solutions and reduce reliance on intermediaries;
  - Beginning with smaller pilot projects before expanding operations could allow for better adaptation and mitigation of unforeseen challenges.
- In terms of **deployment of experts**:
    - Carefully balancing experts' deployment in line with coordination capacity: it is better to concentrate support to a limited number of priority reception centres and ensure that the work is performed well;
    - There is a need to find a mechanism to avoid re-engaging underperforming experts within and between OPs;
    - Exploring ways to ensure longer-term retention of experts to achieve efficiencies;
    - The remunerated external expert modality works better for specific technical tasks but may lack inherent flexibility for more generic operational support.
  - With respect to **training** in national settings under high pressure:
    - Training needs assessments should take place early (if possible before the agreement of an OP) and in close collaboration with the national authorities to take into account the context and the availability of existing national training offerings;
    - When providing training, ensuring full support for the logistical and administrative processing of participants;
    - Developing a mechanism to evaluate the impact of training programmes;
    - Ensuring the feasibility of training delivery in specific languages at early planning stage;
    - Exploring more agile approaches towards training preparation and delivery, also ensuring participation of diverse audiences, including those with limited digital skills.
  - Strengthening **needs assessment and planning**:
    - Before committing to complex deliverables, conducting detailed needs analyses to ensure alignment with local requirements and expectations;
    - When applying result frameworks for extended OPs, applying the same targeted result indicators over time and if possible, involving the national counterparts in this exercise;
    - Establishing clear agreements and preconditions before committing to major investments, such as container deployments or training programmes;

---

<sup>25</sup> The EUAA's Site and Building Assessment Tool (available at: <https://sat.euaa.europa.eu/>) was introduced in February 2025.

- Prioritising smaller pilot initiatives to test feasibility and refine approaches before scaling up;
  - Recording the activities or deliverables of the interpreters in a systematic manner, when possible, to showcase their added value.
- In 2021, the Agency formulated its first **strategy on reception**. As the Belgian OP was focused on reception, some of the lessons learnt in this evaluation can be of use for a future update of the Agency's reception strategy.

### 5.3. Recommendations

This evaluation proposes the following:

1. Improve **operational efficiency**. Examples include:
  - Improve the maintenance workflow for containers in Belgium. Subject to the Agency's asset management policy (which was under development at the time of the evaluation), possible solutions could include handing over the containers to Fedasil or cooperating with service providers that could be directly contacted by the Fedasil authorities after the end of the EUAA's support;
  - Prepare interpreters and experts better on logistical challenges when settling in Belgium, also considering their contractual conditions;
  - Explore possibilities for better matching of profiles and performance optimisation of experts in reception settings, also involving the authorities at crucial stages.
2. Enhance **coordination of OP implementation**. Examples include:
  - Ensure sufficient resources for EUAA coordination staff in proportion to the activities of the OP, whilst ensuring long-term deployment and presence in the host country;
  - Adhere to clearer workflows and validation processes within the Agency and with the involved authorities to improve the development and review of quality-related products (such as tools, guidance documents). This would also contribute to better integration and use in broader systems such as standardised training programmes, thus fostering their sustainability;
  - Define clear roles and responsibilities among Agency and external stakeholders to streamline decision-making and communication channels;
  - Strengthen coordination frameworks to align activities and deliverables with stakeholder priorities, minimising delays and misunderstandings.

## Annex 1: Methodology and analytical models used

The aim of this exercise was to answer the following evaluation questions, covering the European Commission's Better Regulation standard criteria.

Criteria	Questions
<b>Relevance</b>	To what extent was the action in line with stakeholders' needs and the Agency's objectives?
<b>Effectiveness</b>	Did the OP achieve what was planned? Were there any (unexpected) factors that influenced the results?
<b>Efficiency</b>	To what extent are the costs (including inputs and human resources) of the support justified given the results?
<b>Coherence</b>	To what extent is the operation coherent internally and externally?
<b>EU added value</b>	What is the added value resulting from the operation, compared to what could have been expected from Belgium acting solely?

The evaluation considered good practices and lessons learnt, including those identified in the evaluations of the previous OPs. Special attention was paid to experiences with deployment of experts, container-related risk management and operational capacity building. It looked into external coherence questions such as:

- How has the Agency adapted in response to contextual policy changes?
- Has the OP embedded an exit strategy?
- How was communication and coordination managed?

Looking forward, this evaluation considered new developments at European policy level that guide the Agency's work. Horizontal findings of the evaluation were collected and reported as lessons learnt.

To answer the above questions, the evaluation team used a mixed-method approach covering the triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data sources. These included desk review analysis and individual and group interviews involving 21 individuals.

The evaluation encountered some limitations linked to its remote execution. Interviews were undertaken online and there was no observation of the evaluation team of the activities and deliverables in-country. This made it at times difficult to grasp the nature of the support described by available internal operational monitoring sources. It also challenged the evaluation team to fully understand and sense the context in which the OP took place. In 2022, the results framework had several indicators with no targets specified, and thus their achievements were recorded without comparison. Environmental and social impacts were not addressed in this report. The evaluation team was not able to observe the operations in-country limiting full understanding of their nature and context.





## Annex 2: Evaluation matrix

Sub-questions	Indicators / Descriptors	Norms / Judgement criteria	Sources of evidence
<b>Relevance:</b> How well was the action in line with stakeholders' needs and the Agency's objectives?			
Optional prompt question: Were local needs captured adequately?	Priority areas identified by needs assessment	Comparison needs assessment and OP priority areas with implemented areas	Needs assessment, OP, monitoring and reporting tools, interviews
<b>Effectiveness:</b> Did the operation achieve what was planned?			
Optional prompt question: Were deliverables (workflows and tools) as expected? If not, what are solutions/ alternatives to achieve better results?	Results indicators	Comparison planned targets vs achieved	Results monitoring database
<b>Efficiency:</b> To what extent are the costs (including inputs and human resources) of the support justified given the results?			
What were the good practices/lessons learnt on container management, expert deployment and training design and delivery?	Output and input indicator values	Relationship of achieved outputs vs inputs Qualitative challenges (processes and related indicators)	Qualitative and quantitative monitoring data, financial records, nature of underlying processes needed to achieve the planned results, interviews
<b>Coherence:</b> To what extent is the operation coherent internally and externally?			
Optional prompt: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the OP embedded an exit strategy to enhance sustainability?</li> <li>How has the Agency adapted to contextual policy changes?</li> <li>How were relations managed?</li> </ul>	Nature of activities and coordination processes	Level of coordination and synergies with other national actors/internal Agency actors	Monitoring data; planning documents; interviews
<b>EU added value:</b> What is the added value resulting from the operation, compared to what could have been expected from Belgium acting solely?			
How is the Agency's support viewed and perceived? Which activities were most beneficial according to them?	Existence of elements of EUAA added value	Number and level of added value elements related to financial, technical and material support	Monitoring data; planning documents; interviews





## Annex 3: Intervention logic

Needs/problems		Expected objectives	
Rapid increase of arrivals and temporary protection applications; significant pressure on the reception system		Support following request of Belgium in response to disproportionate pressure on national reception systems	
Result impact			
Provision of effective operational, technical and emergency support through the implementation of the measures in the agreed OP and in line with the Agency’s mandate to enable Belgium to implement its obligations under the CEAS and the TPD			
OP 2022	OP 2023	OP 2024	
Result outcomes			
1. Enhanced capacity of the Belgian authorities to respond to emergency reception needs		1.Enhanced response capacity of the Belgian authorities to provide reception conditions at frontline level in line with CEAS and EUAA standards	
2. Enhanced institutional capacity of the Belgian authorities to provide reception conditions in line with CEAS and EUAA standards			
3. Enhanced capacity of the Belgian authorities to implement effectively the TPD (May 2022-2024)			
Result outputs			
1.1. Increased capacity and improved quality of emergency reception response		1.1. Enhanced capacity and improved quality of reception conditions at frontline level	
2.1. Site evaluation for the establishment of a modular emergency reception centre	2.1. Support for the enhancement of the reception system	2.1. Structural support for the enhancement of the reception system	
2.2. Support in the establishment of a modular emergency reception centre			

## 2.3. Support for the enhancement of arrival processes

### 3.1. Support to the implementation of the TPD

#### Activities

##### Support under output 1.1:

- Provision of material/in-kind support to temporarily expand and improve reception capacity of already existing facilities
- Support to the management and operation of the facilities through deployment of reception personnel to allow further increase in reception capacity.
- Provision of interpretation services
- Provision of training to reception officers

##### Additional as of 2023:

Provision of training to new and experienced personnel, according to their tasks, either based on the EUAA's training curriculum, modules or through tailor-made sessions; support in the delivery of national reception training modules following a jointly conducted needs assessment exercise and establishment of a training plan

##### Support under output 1.1:

- Support with the planning and implementation of activities related to child protection/vulnerability/ social work in the reception facilities where the experts will be deployed. EUAA will further support the development, roll-out and implementation at field level of relevant workflows and guidance, including material developed at HQ level.
- Support in information provision in the reception facilities where the experts will be deployed and through the development of relevant outreach activities, including support to info points.
- Support in site management and operation of the reception facilities.
- Interpretation/cultural mediation services for frontline reception activities.
- Provision of material support and technical expertise to temporarily expand and improve reception capacity of already existing and new facilities.



#### Support under output 2.1:

Provision of support to Belgian authorities for conduct of a joint evaluation of sites available for the establishment of a modular emergency reception facility in line with CEAS and EASO reception standards (identifying possible locations including access to services, site analysis)

#### Support under output 2.2:

- Joint site planning and site design
- Material/in-kind support for the establishment of a modular emergency reception centre according to CEAS and EUAA reception standards
- Support to the management and operation of an emergency reception facility through deployment of reception personnel
- Provision of training to new and experienced personnel, according to their tasks, either based on the Agency training curriculum, modules or through tailor-made sessions; support in the delivery of national (Fedasil) training modules
- Provision of interpretation services

#### Support under output 2.3:

- Support in the review and adjustment of arrival processes
- Study/exchange visits to other MS to identify best

#### Support under output 2.1:

- Support the enhancement of management and coordination structures, including but not limited to, procurement processes
- Support through the provision of expertise for the enhancement of arrival processes, including inter alia deployment of personnel and exchange visits to other MS
- Provision of training to new and experienced personnel, according to their tasks, either based on the EUAA training curriculum, modules or through tailor-made sessions; support in the delivery of national reception training modules following a jointly conducted needs assessment exercise and establishment of a training plan.
- Provide enhanced quality of delivered reception containers through a joint lessons learned exercise of already delivered and installed units.

#### Support under output 2.1:

- Reception management workflows and guidance in particular regarding child protection/vulnerability/social work
- Strengthening capacity on funding, and financial management
- Planning and coordination of the arrival processes, including the design and setting-up of a new arrival centre
- Information and data management
- Planning and coordination of information provision processes, including setting-up info points.
- Training and learning

practices in managing arrival processes.

#### Support under output 3.1

The Belgian authorities are assisted in coordinating assistance to beneficiaries of TP through the following activities:

- Provision of interpretation support
- Additional support for the implementation of TPD related activities, upon agreement between EUAA and the Belgian authorities

### Inputs

Indicative resources, subject to the Agency's budget and human resources availability.

#### Under Result 1

##### Material support:

- Emergency provision of up to a maximum of 150 reception containers
- Human resources:
- Senior reception centre and site management expert: 2
- Junior asylum information provision expert: 8
- Junior social worker: 5
- Senior social worker: 1
- Intermediate reception child protection expert: 4
- Intermediate reception training expert: 1

Provision of interpretation services: 25 interpreters

Equipment, material and operational support

#### Under Result 1

Material support: emergency provision of up to 750 reception containers

##### Human resources:

- Reception experts (including but not limited to social workers, information providers, child protection experts): up to 70
- Provision of interpretation services: up to 45 interpreters
- Material and operational support

#### Under Result 1

Deployment of asylum support teams. Up to 32 experts in total, including:

- Social workers (junior/senior): up to 3
- Asylum information provision experts (junior): up to 11
- Reception child protection experts (junior/intermediate): up to 13
- Vulnerability expert (senior): up to 1
- Reception centre and site management experts: up to 3
- Reception centre construction experts: up to 1

Interpretation/cultural mediation support:

Interpreters/cultural mediators: up to 40

Material support: up to 672 reception containers in total

#### Under Result 2.1.:

- Human resources:
- Reception centre design/construction expert: 1

#### Under Result 2.2.:

Material support: provision of up to 250 reception containers based on thorough joint needs assessment.

Human resources may include:

- Senior reception centre and Site management expert: 1
- Junior asylum information provision expert: 8
- Junior social worker: 5
- Senior social worker: 1
- Intermediate reception child protection expert: 4
- Provision of interpretation services: 25 interpreters

#### Training:

- Provision of training of new as well as experienced staff based on a training needs analysis
- According to the different functions of staff to be trained, EASO can deliver existing EASO modules or can support Fedasil in delivering their modules.
- Sessions may also be tailor-made in line with the needs identified by the authorities.

#### Under Result 2.3.:

- Human resources: reception expert: 1
- EUAA will offer technical advice based on needs and availability of resources

#### Under Result 2:

Human resources: reception experts (including but not limited to, child protection experts, training experts, vulnerability experts, asylum flow management experts, reception centre design experts, reception centre construction experts, reception information system (business analyst) experts, procurement experts): up to 20

Material and operational support

#### Under Result 2:

- Deployment of asylum support teams
- Up to 25 experts in total, including:
- Vulnerability expert (senior): up to 2
- Child protection expert (senior): up to 1
- Senior reception centre design expert: up to 1
- Reception information system (business analysis) experts (intermediate): up to 4
- Structural and EU funding mechanism expert (intermediate): up to 1
- Training support experts: up to 3
- Asylum and/or reception statistics experts (intermediate): up to 4
- Asylum and/or reception operations experts (senior): up to 3
- Organisational development expert (senior/intermediate): up to 1
- Change management expert (senior): up to 1
- Monitoring and evaluation experts (senior/intermediate): up to 1
- Asylum reception financial management experts (senior/intermediate): up to 2
- Asylum information provision expert (senior): up to 1

Provision of equipment, material and operational support



- Provision of equipment, material and operational support

Under Result 3:

- Provision of up to 10 Interpreters
- Equipment, material and operational support

Under Result 3:

- Interpreters/cultural mediators: up to 3

### External factors

Political and military instability in third countries, migratory pressure, national and international laws, policies and practices; availability of financial and human resources; actions by national counterparts, international and non-governmental organisations.