
Module 1: An integrated approach to reintegration

Key Messages:

- Return migration takes place in a number of ways and under different conditions, which can create challenges and opportunities for the reintegration process.
- Sustainable reintegration is achieved when returnees have reached levels of economic self-sufficiency, social stability, and psychosocial well-being that make their further migration decisions a matter of choice, rather than necessity.
- IOM's integrated approach to reintegration recognizes that the complex process of reintegration requires a holistic and a needs-based response at the individual, community and structural levels.
- Returnees, their families and their communities should be supported to drive and take ownership of the reintegration process, through active participation and empowerment.
- Reintegration programmes should be developed, implemented and adapted using continuous assessment and learning to understand the wider environment and build on existing initiatives, programmes or services.
- Establishing strong partnerships with key stakeholders results in more efficient and sustainable reintegration processes.

Introduction:

Target Audience:

Programme managers/ developers, Case managers/other staff, Service providers, Local Government, National government, Implementing partners, Donors, M&E Officers

1.1 Understanding return migration

Return migration is an integral part of human mobility. "Return" is the act or process of going back or

being taken back to the point of departure. It is also often associated with the process of going back to one's own culture, family and home¹. This could be within the territorial boundaries of a country, as in the case of a person who has been internally displaced returning home; or across international boundaries, between a host country and a country of origin. This might be the context for migrant workers, refugees, asylum seekers or irregular migrants.

Return migration, like migration in general, is a complex phenomenon. However, it is by no means exceptional. When people leave their countries, it is often with the expectation that they will return at some point. This is true for people who migrate for positive reasons such as education or work, but perhaps even more so for those forced to migrate, whose return is usually conditional upon an improvement of the situation that forced them to leave. Some migrants never return. But many others do and under a variety of different circumstances.

However, the mere fact that someone returns to a country or place where they have previously lived does not mean that reintegration is seamless. For some returnees, return is fraught with challenges (*see Case Study 1, below, for one example of this*).

In recent years there has been greater recognition of the challenges, such as those described in Case Study 1, that confront returning migrants. There is more awareness of the need for support to make reintegration sustainable and beneficial for returnees and their families, and for their communities and countries of origin. Understanding the multi-dimensional and multi-level nature of the reintegration process that accompanies return migration is necessary for developing and implementing successful reintegration assistance.

Case Study 1:

Cultural orientation in El Salvador

Some migrants returning to El Salvador have spent many years abroad and lack support networks in their communities of origin. Sometimes these returnees speak only English, and don't have Salvadoran identification papers. They may have a criminal record in the United States and may have returned to El Salvador because they were deported. All these factors affect returnees' economic self-sufficiency. They also impact their psychosocial well-being and capacity for social insertion and, ultimately, hinder their sustainable reintegration.

To assist this subset of uprooted returnees, IOM El Salvador set up a pilot programme that addresses their specific needs. However, assisting them is particularly challenging: they are only a small share of the overall number of returning migrants and because of this can go unidentified. This hinders targeted assessments of their needs.

IOM supports this vulnerable group once the national General Directorate for Migration has referred them after a specific rapid referral protocol.

These returnees often have no personal networks that they can tap into upon return, so assistance includes an emergency package made up of food, clothing, transportation vouchers and accommodation for three months. Returnees can also receive support to obtain documentation. IOM then complements this direct assistance with language classes and cultural orientation workshops conducted in both English and Spanish. Such sessions include cultural information on El Salvador

and guidance on budgeting, accessing housing and entering the job market. IOM provides them with psychosocial assistance in the form of individual counselling or support groups and workshops. These sessions help beneficiaries establish new links with their communities and with the services available there.

Tips for success:

Consider reinforcing the capacity of psychosocial aid providers as part of the initiative.

1.1.1 Return types and motivations

There are no universally agreed classifications of return. Yet various subcategories of return are linked to intended duration of the return, level of assistance received in the return process (if any), the various ways in which the return is implemented, as well as subcategories which describe who is participating in the return.

- **Intended length of stay:** Return can be permanent or temporary. For highly skilled migrants, for instance, who wish to contribute to the development of their country of origin by passing on knowledge and experiences they have gained abroad, temporary return may be the preferred option.
- **Return with or without support:** Spontaneous return occurs when individuals decide upon and implement the return themselves. Assisted return occurs when the State or a third party offer returnees financial and logistical assistance for the return, and sometimes for reintegration measures.
- **Involuntary or voluntary return:** Involuntary or forced return is the act of returning an individual, against his or her will, to the country of origin, to a place of transit or to a third-country that agrees to receive the person, generally carried out on the basis of an administrative or judicial act or decision. Voluntary return is the assisted or independent return to the country of origin, transit or another country based on the voluntary decision of the returnee². However, a migrant's decision to return does not necessarily mean that return is the migrant's unambiguous wish. It is possible that other options are limited, for example if economic opportunities are scarce or if a migrant has no legal entitlement to remain on a State's territory³. There is no agreed definition of voluntary return⁴. Some actors consider return to be voluntary only when migrants still have the possibility of legally remaining in their host countries. According to these actors, when a migrant has the legal obligation to leave the host country and chooses to return of their own volition, return should be described as obliged, mandatory, compulsory or accepted return. Others consider that voluntary return should be understood in a broader sense: that migrants can express their will, even in the

absence of legal options to remain in a host country, as long as other conditions are met. Specifically, for IOM in the context of Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVRR), voluntariness is assumed to exist if two conditions apply: (a) freedom of choice, which is defined as the absence of physical or psychological pressure to enroll in an AVRR programme; and (b) an informed decision, which requires the availability of timely, unbiased and reliable information upon which to base the decision⁵. This Handbook follows the latter approach.

Regardless of the legal frameworks that govern their return, migrants can opt for return for a variety of reasons. A migrant's return decision is often complex and influenced by a variety of sometimes overlapping considerations. These may include improved political, economic or social conditions in the country of origin, as well as family and other private considerations. Some migrants return according to a plan, after having completed their education or work contract or achieved a specific objective. Difficulties in the host country may also lead to the decision to return, such as lack of economic opportunities, language difficulties, social isolation, discrimination, or unfamiliar cultural environments. Some people return in order to spend the last part of their life at home. Often, familial duties (care of sick or elderly relatives, protection of vulnerable family members) are cited as reasons for returning.

Return motivations are dynamic and therefore subject to change. For instance, an asylum seeker might have difficulties adapting to life in the host country and miss family at home and then decide, after receiving a negative decision on his or her asylum application, to return home rather than appeal the decision.

The various motivations for returning can greatly influence a returnee's reintegration experience. This Handbook illustrates reintegration initiatives that can be applied to various types of return, whether forced or voluntary. However, IOM maintains that voluntary return should be the preferred option and that it should be promoted over forced return: it not only gives migrants a choice, but also allows them to prepare for their return, thus positively contributing to the reintegration process⁶.

This Handbook also asserts that reintegration starts before a migrant's return to the country of origin. Whenever possible, migrants and reintegration partners and organizations should be assisted with the preparation for reintegration before departure. Such preparation can include individual assessments and initial reintegration counselling in the host country as well as the preparation of referrals or partnerships in the country of origin. Returnees who are not able to adequately prepare for their return prior to departure may need further assistance with their reintegration in the country of origin.

Return migration is an integral part of human mobility. "Return" is the act or process of going back or being taken back to the point of departure. It is also often associated with the process of going back to one's own culture, family and home¹. This could be within the territorial boundaries of a country, as in the case of a person who has been internally displaced returning home; or across international

boundaries, between a host country and a country of origin. This might be the context for migrant workers, refugees, asylum seekers or irregular migrants.

Return migration, like migration in general, is a complex phenomenon. However, it is by no means exceptional. When people leave their countries, it is often with the expectation that they will return at some point. This is true for people who migrate for positive reasons such as education or work, but perhaps even more so for those forced to migrate, whose return is usually conditional upon an improvement of the situation that forced them to leave. Some migrants never return. But many others do and under a variety of different circumstances.

However, the mere fact that someone returns to a country or place where they have previously lived does not mean that reintegration is seamless. For some returnees, return is fraught with challenges (see *Case Study 1, below, for one example of this*).

In recent years there has been greater recognition of the challenges, such as those described in Case Study 1, that confront returning migrants. There is more awareness of the need for support to make reintegration sustainable and beneficial for returnees and their families, and for their communities and countries of origin. Understanding the multi-dimensional and multi-level nature of the reintegration process that accompanies return migration is necessary for developing and implementing successful reintegration assistance.

Case Study 1:

Cultural orientation in El Salvador

Some migrants returning to El Salvador have spent many years abroad and lack support networks in their communities of origin. Sometimes these returnees speak only English, and don't have Salvadoran identification papers. They may have a criminal record in the United States and may have returned to El Salvador because they were deported. All these factors affect returnees' economic self-sufficiency. They also impact their psychosocial well-being and capacity for social insertion and, ultimately, hinder their sustainable reintegration.

To assist this subset of uprooted returnees, IOM El Salvador set up a pilot programme that addresses their specific needs. However, assisting them is particularly challenging: they are only a small share of the overall number of returning migrants and because of this can go unidentified. This hinders targeted assessments of their needs.

IOM supports this vulnerable group once the national General Directorate for Migration has referred them after a specific rapid referral protocol.

These returnees often have no personal networks that they can tap into upon return, so assistance includes an emergency package made up of food, clothing, transportation vouchers and accommodation for three months. Returnees can also receive support to obtain documentation. IOM then complements this direct assistance with language classes and cultural orientation workshops conducted in both English and Spanish. Such sessions include cultural information on El Salvador and guidance on budgeting, accessing housing and entering the job market. IOM provides them with psychosocial assistance in the form of individual counselling or support groups and workshops. These sessions help beneficiaries establish new links with their communities and with the services

available there.

Tips for success:

Consider reinforcing the capacity of psychosocial aid providers as part of the initiative.

1.1.2 Evolution of assisted voluntary return and reintegration programmes

In an increasing number of settings, States are offering administrative, logistical or financial support for voluntary return to migrants who are unable or unwilling to remain in the host country. Assisted voluntary return and reintegration (AVRR) programmes provide administrative, logistical and financial support, including reintegration assistance, to migrants unable or unwilling to remain in the host or transit country and who decide to return to their country of origin⁷. IOM has been implementing AVRR programmes worldwide since 1979 and has provided humane and dignified support for the return and reintegration of over 1.6 million people throughout the world. Often conceptualized as a way to address irregular migration, for governments assisted voluntary return is usually a more cost-effective and administratively expedient alternative to other actions such as detention or deportation. For the migrant, voluntary returns allows for a more humane alternative to forced return. It can also provide a solution for migrants in an irregular situation who are particularly vulnerable to discrimination, violence, exploitation and abuse and are in danger of being exploited by crime organizations involved in human trafficking and migrant smuggling. For the country of origin, voluntary return is generally more politically palatable and less sensitive than forced return.

Beneficiaries of AVRR programmes could be migrants in both regular and irregular situations. They could include, for example as stranded migrants; asylum seekers who, having claimed asylum, subsequently choose not to pursue their asylum claim; migrant workers at the end of their contracts; or visa over-stayers. Throughout the years, AVRR concepts and practices have undergone major changes, mainly because of the evolving contexts in which AVRR programmes are implemented⁹.

AVRR has gradually expanded beyond Europe and is now embedded in national policies and return migration practices in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, the Americas and the Western Balkans. At the same time, there are an increasing number of voluntary returns from so-called transit countries and higher volumes of voluntary South–South returns, particularly within the Middle East and on the African continent, as well as increased vulnerabilities to which migrants are exposed because of dangerous migration routes. Furthermore, there has been a growth in the last few years in the number and variety of actors funding or implementing voluntary return and reintegration programmes.

Importantly, there has been renewed interest among development actors in supporting sustainable

reintegration. AVRR was not originally conceived as a tool to generate development in countries of origin, but rather as a migration management instrument to facilitate the humane and dignified return of migrants who were unable or unwilling to remain in host countries. For this reason, ministries of the interior or their equivalent at the regional or international level have traditionally been the main donors to AVRR programmes. Throughout the years, though, reintegration support has been progressively added to AVR interventions, first in the form of limited cash assistance and then as more comprehensive packages to support returning individuals. This positive evolution reflected the realization that assistance to migrants upon return is necessary to facilitate their sustainable reintegration.

Recent interest from development actors has reshaped thinking about the ultimate goals of AVRR. As a result, more attention is now devoted to the role that communities of origin can play in designing and implementing successful reintegration programmes for the benefit of all. This change has brought a greater focus on the need to enhance the ownership of local actors and reinforce structures and capacities for return- and reintegration-related services, in line with established development plans.

¹ Migrants may not return to their own communities of origin but to other locations within their home country. Furthermore, return migration can also include 'return' to a third-country, one not of a migrant's country of origin. However, for the purposes of this Handbook, we will be referring to return and reintegration in the country of origin only.

² IOM, Glossary on Migration 2019a.

³ States must adhere to the principle of non-refoulement. Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVRR) programmes need to take into account safety considerations, such as the general level of security, and operational challenges that may affect the provision of return and reintegration assistance. Returns to certain regions or countries may need to be limited or suspended if one or a combination of these factors amounts to a situation that poses a threat to the safety of returning migrants and/or staff involved in the provision of AVRR assistance.

⁴ Newland, K. and B. Salant, [Balancing Acts: Policy Frameworks for Migrant Return and Reintegration](#). Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute (2018) and European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE), Voluntary Departure and Return: Between a Rock and a Hard Place. [ECRE's Analysis of European Practices in the Area of Return Including "Voluntary Departures" and Assisted Return, with its Recommendations to the EU](#) (2018).

⁵ For more information see IOM's [Framework for Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration](#) (2018).

⁶ IOM is prohibited by its constitution from being involved either directly or indirectly in forced return. However, it recognizes that migrants who are forcibly returned may find themselves in vulnerable situations and in need of assistance with socioeconomic reintegration, as much as any voluntary returnee IOM assists under its AVRR programmes ([see section 1.1.2](#)). In the contexts where IOM is not involved in organizing and facilitating the return, IOM may still be involved at the post arrival stage with reintegration activities.

⁷ IOM's work on AVRR is guided by its [Framework for Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration](#), which builds on its long-standing contribution in this area and marks an important milestone in the Organization's engagement in AVRR.

⁸ States must adhere to the principle of non-refoulement. AVRR programmes need to take into account safety considerations, such as the general level of security, and operational challenges that may affect the provision of return and reintegration assistance. Returns to certain regions or countries may need to be limited or suspended if one or a combination of these factors amounts to a situation that poses a threat to the safety of returning migrants and/or staff involved in the provision of AVRR assistance.

⁹ The following paragraphs are adapted from: Gravano, N. and N. Darbellay, "A framework for assisted voluntary return and reintegration," Migration Policy Practice, 9(1):9–14 (January–March, 2019b).

1.2 Understanding reintegration

Reintegration is generally understood as a multidimensional process enabling individuals to re-establish the economic, social and psychosocial relationships needed to maintain life, livelihood and dignity and achieve inclusion in civic life¹⁰.

The notions of return and reintegration are intimately interlinked with that of sustainability. While there is no universally agreed definition of sustainable reintegration, as part of its integrated approach to reintegration, IOM defines sustainable reintegration as follows:¹¹

"Reintegration can be considered sustainable when returnees have reached levels of economic self-sufficiency, social stability within their communities, and psychosocial well-being that allow them to cope with (re)migration drivers. Having achieved sustainable reintegration, returnees are able to make further migration decisions a matter of choice, rather than necessity."

This definition is based on trends identified in existing literature, on IOM's practice, and on a review of complementary approaches outside the traditional scope of AVR. It recognizes that returnees need to participate fully in the economic and social life of their return communities, and that developing a sense of psychosocial well-being after return is crucial to their successful reintegration. Consequently, sustainability of reintegration is not only dependent on the returning individual, but also on the local community and the structural situation the environment of return.

Economically self-sufficient returnees are able to provide for themselves and their families, and develop a capacity to participate in and benefit from local economic activities in a dignified manner. It is equally crucial that the returnee feels a sense of belonging: that they enjoy strong social relationships and engaged in the immediate community of return. The migrant's return should have a positive influence on – or at least not worsen – conditions in the community of return (families and other actors). A migrant's psychosocial wellbeing rests on a minimum sense of safety and security and on availability of basic services (education, housing, water and sanitation, health care). The returnee's positive attitude towards recreating a sustainable lifestyle in the place of return also forms a crucial cornerstone to all other reintegration efforts.

IOM asserts that reintegration support can only be successful if there is a level of re-inclusion across all economic, social and psychosocial dimensions. This can require different levels of interventions. At the individual level, the specific needs of beneficiaries (and when relevant, family members or households) should be covered and support for these provided upon return. At the community level, concerns of families and the non-migrant population in the community of return should be addressed by strengthening social links and increasing the absorption capacity of communities in regions with high levels of return. At the structural level, ensuring access to adequate local public services fosters an environment for re-establishing a dignified existence.

This definition also implies the absence of a direct correlation between successful reintegration and further migration after return. Further migration can still be a choice regardless of whether reintegration is successful, partially successful or unsuccessful. On the other hand, returnees are unlikely to reintegrate if they find themselves, for example, in situations where moving again or relying on a family member abroad is considered necessary for their physical or socioeconomic survival and well-being.¹²

The IOM definition reflects the broader understanding of the reintegration process and the need for various levels of intervention. IOM recognizes the misconception of directly comparing a returnee to members of the local population: if the community of origin cannot sustain stable livelihoods and already defies migratory pressures, it is much more unlikely that a returnee to this environment will be reintegrated in a way that is sustainable. Attaining sustainable livelihood levels comparable to the local community will not be possible if push factors remain strong, or if returnees' aspirations are not fulfilled. Especially in more unstable or underdeveloped environments, access to basic services and safety might be limited for all, providing little opportunities for sustainable reintegration. If such structural factors are not addressed, they will continue to result in migration as a coping mechanism for actual or perceived inadequate standards of living, insecurity and lack of opportunities.

¹⁰ [IOM. Glossary on Migration 2019a.](#)

¹¹ For more information see IOM's paper [Towards an Integrated Approach to Reintegration in the Context of Return](#) (2017).

¹² While the reintegration elements of the integrated approach are part of the development strategies in countries of origin, development aid should not aim to limit further migration. It is widely acknowledged that improvement in development indicators generally leads to increased mobility in the short term, as a result of broadening opportunities and the opening of regular migration channels. In the context of return, however, a positive change in structural factors affecting reintegration allows individual returnees to make a genuinely free choice, rather than opting for (largely irregular) re-migration out of necessity.

1.3 An integrated approach to reintegration

With the aim of achieving sustainable reintegration as it is defined above, and based on its years of experience, IOM conceptualised its integrated approach to reintegration in 2017. The basic premise of this approach is that the complex, multidimensional process of reintegration requires a holistic and needs-based approach. Such an approach takes into consideration the various factors that can affect reintegration, including economic, social and psychosocial dimensions. It responds to the needs of individual returnees and the communities to which they return in a mutually beneficial way, while also

addressing the structural factors at play.

To meet these objectives, IOM's integrated approach deploys three levels of support:

- The **individual level** has initiatives to address the specific needs and vulnerabilities of returnees and returning family members;
- The **community level** encompasses initiatives that respond to the needs, vulnerabilities and concerns of communities to which migrants return, including returnee families and the non-migrant population.
- **Structural level** initiatives promote good governance of migration through engagement with local and national authorities and stakeholders and supports continuity of assistance through adequate local public services.

Within each of these levels, IOM's integrated approach addresses three dimensions of reintegration:

- The **economic dimension** covers aspects of reintegration that contributes to re-entering the economic life and sustained livelihoods.
- The **social dimension addresses** returning migrants' access to public services and infrastructure in their countries of origin, including access to health, education, housing, justice and social protection schemes.
- The **psychosocial dimension** encompasses the reinsertion of returning migrants into personal support networks (friends, relatives, neighbours) and civil society structures (associations, self-help groups, other organizations and civic life generally). This also includes the re-engagement with the values, ways of living, language, moral principles and traditions of the country of origin's society.

Note that these levels and dimensions are not clear-cut, nor are they mutually exclusive. They overlap and are interconnected by their nature. The economic, social and psychosocial dimensions can influence one another, sometimes on different levels. For example, a community's attitude towards returnees can affect a returnee's physical and mental health which in turn can affect their livelihood and economic opportunities. Ensuring that a reintegration programme addresses the full range of factors that affects reintegration is more important than classifying specific activities for these categories.

The diagram below provides a visual summary of the integrated approach to reintegration.

INTEGRATED APPROACH TO REINTEGRATION

An integrated approach to reintegration should also address cross-cutting issues such as promoting migrant rights, gender equality, partnerships and cooperation as well as improve data collection and monitoring and evaluation of reintegration. Such an approach typically falls under the responsibility of a variety of different stakeholders, whether national and local governments in host countries and countries of origin, international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations (CSOs) that have various roles in the reintegration interventions.

1.4 Establishing a comprehensive reintegration programme

The reintegration process is not linear and the integrated approach to reintegration reflects the dynamism of the reintegration context. Therefore, reintegration programmes should aim to address the individual, community and structural levels simultaneously and take into account how each level can affect the others.

This chapter presents an overview of key considerations, appropriate assessments for the country of origin and operational staff based there, as well as budget aspects to guide the development and implementation of reintegration programmes.

This information is complemented by Annexes [5](#), [6](#) and [7](#), which provide practical tools that can be used and adapted to each context.

1.4.1 Key considerations for reintegration assistance

1.4.2 Assessing the return context

1.4.3 Developing a reintegration assistance programme

The chart below highlights the proposed steps to take when designing a reintegration programme.

1.4.1 Key considerations for reintegration assistance

The information below covers the key considerations for developing and implementing a

comprehensive reintegration programme in line with the integrated approach to reintegration. These considerations underpin all the guidance and interventions described in this Handbook.

Migrant-centred

Reintegration programming should always promote the returnee's ownership of and active participation in the reintegration process. Reintegration assistance should be designed and delivered in collaboration with returnees, whose autonomy and agency should be promoted. The rights and needs of the returnee should be at the forefront. Assistance should be gender- and age-sensitive. It should be provided without discrimination or prejudice on the basis of age, race, skin colour, sex, gender, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, or birth or other status.

Sustainable

Reintegration assistance programmes should always consider how to support sustainable reintegration processes even after assistance is no longer necessary or available. This requires promoting local and national ownership and strengthening capacity and systems at the community and structural levels.

Organizations providing reintegration assistance should also consider the environmental sustainability of their programmes and interventions in line with international standards. Where possible, programmes should directly contribute to preserving or restoring the environment.

Multidimensional

As described in the integrated approach to reintegration, reintegration assistance should include economic, social and psychosocial dimensions.

Reintegration interventions can address several dimensions simultaneously. For example, a community-based income-generating activity that involves both returnees and community members might impact the economic dimension through the creation of livelihoods, whilst the psychosocial dimension might be impacted by the fostering of social cohesion between returnees and community members.

Strategic and tailored

Reintegration assistance should be designed based on an analysis of the unique circumstances of the return environment. Such an analysis should focus on: the overall context and services available ([see section 1.4.2](#)), individual capacities and needs ([see section 2.2](#)), wider challenges and opportunities in high-return or key communities ([see section 3.1](#)) and structural conditions, stakeholders and coordination mechanisms ([see Module 4](#)). Analyses should be continually updated because conditions can change over time. Programmes should be adaptable to a changing environment.

Using this contextual knowledge, reintegration assistance initiatives should develop a programme theory, or theory of change, that clearly articulates the desired results an intervention aims to achieve and how it aims to achieve them, in the specific context in question. This theory of change provides an overall strategy to guide the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme. [See](#)

Adequately resourced

Programmes require adequate human and financial resources. Reintegration teams that have expertise in a wide range of areas (for example psychosocial experts, livelihood experts, medical staff) should be mobilized or recruited, and when possible, both in host countries and countries of origin ([see section 1.4.3 for more detail on relevant staff profiles](#)).

Budgeting processes should take into account the need to remain flexible and adaptable by allocating for unforeseen changes or adjustments. While funding availability may limit comprehensive reintegration assistance, reintegration programme managers should promote community-based approaches and structural interventions that complement individual level assistance. Where funding is not adequate enough to provide comprehensive assistance to everyone, programmes should prioritize returnees in vulnerable situations.

Delivered through coordination and partnership

The integrated approach to reintegration requires developing coordination, complementarity and coherence with all stakeholders. These can include governmental and non-governmental, public and private, local and international actors in host countries and countries of origin. Partnerships and good coordination enhance the range and quality of reintegration assistance and can make assistance more efficient by reducing duplication of effort. Coordination should occur:

1. Between local and regional actors who work directly with returnees and their communities in host countries and countries of origin. These actors could include authorities, NGOs, religious and community leaders, employment centres at the local or regional level and between this local/regional level and the national level.
2. Across various sectors and among relevant ministries and State agencies holding different mandates (such as interior, foreign affairs, labour, social affairs, humanitarian assistance and development), as well as non-State stakeholders. It is important to mainstream sustainable reintegration into existing coordination mechanisms for migration policies or cross-sectoral mechanisms rather than create new systems that risk being disconnected from other processes.
3. Between host countries and countries of origin, at both national and local levels through decentralized cooperation dynamics. For example, host countries and countries of origin should work together to agree on a shared analysis of the local context for return.

Institutional dialogue between partners can promote a common understanding of the challenges related to return and reintegration and can inform and influence policy development. Interdisciplinary forums for exchange and discussion can unearth cooperation opportunities.

Practitioners and stakeholders can also exchange information and best practices to identify opportunities for synergies and scaling up (for example, through implementation of joint initiatives at the transnational level).

Evidence-based

Systematic monitoring and long-term evaluation to assess effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact

and sustainability should be part of reintegration assistance programming at all three levels of intervention ([see Module 5 for details on setting up a monitoring and evaluation system in reintegration programmes](#)). Data collected during the monitoring of direct assistance to returnees, including their feedback, is an important source of information on the effectiveness, impact and sustainability of reintegration measures. Long-term monitoring and evaluation also helps assess the impact of different types of reintegration support on the individual returnee and the community as a whole.

Systematic and continuous data collection, while preserving the right to privacy and protection of personal data, and monitoring and evaluation help stakeholders, especially programme managers, understand the impact of reintegration interventions, verify the theory of change and inform ongoing and future programme design. Feedback mechanisms allow returnees, communities and other beneficiaries to express their views on the assistance received in an open and confidential manner.

Anchored on confidentiality and “do no harm”

Programmes must take measures to protect the personal data of returnees in the reintegration process. This is essential in order to preserve the privacy, integrity and human dignity of the returnees. All personal data must be collected, used, transferred and stored securely in accordance with international data protection standards.¹³

The “do no harm” approach should be adhered to in reintegration programming at all levels. Support for returnees should cause no harm to the returnees themselves and no harm to their communities. Analysing sources of tension, power dynamics and conflict issues at the onset of programming and then monitoring them continuously, will identify key dividers and connectors within communities and help show how the programme can avoid exacerbating conflict or harm to individuals or groups.

Situated within a migration governance strategy

It is important to remember that reintegration is not an isolated process but part of a larger migration governance strategy. Strengthening reintegration support at the national level can enhance good migration governance and contribute to other development and governance goals.

The drivers that resulted in a migrant’s initial decision to migrate and the factors influencing their ability to re-integrate into the country of origin are two sides of the same coin. If these factors are not addressed, the result will continue to be outward migration as a coping mechanism for actual or perceived inadequate standards of living, a lack of opportunities and insecurity. Reintegration programming should therefore be fully integrated, nationally and locally, into existing development plans and migration strategies.

The reintegration process is not linear and the integrated approach to reintegration reflects the dynamism of the reintegration context. Therefore, reintegration programmes should aim to address

the individual, community and structural levels simultaneously and take into account how each level can affect the others.

This chapter presents an overview of key considerations, appropriate assessments for the country of origin and operational staff based there, as well as budget aspects to guide the development and implementation of reintegration programmes.

This information is complemented by Annexes [5](#), [6](#) and [7](#), which provide practical tools that can be used and adapted to each context.

1.4.1 Key considerations for reintegration assistance

1.4.2 Assessing the return context

1.4.3 Developing a reintegration assistance programme

The chart below highlights the proposed steps to take when designing a reintegration programme.

1.4.2 Assessing the return context

When establishing a reintegration programme, it is important to undertake initial assessments and analyses around the return environment. Understanding the political, institutional, economic, security and social conditions at the local, national and international levels that inform return patterns can help stakeholders develop appropriate supports for sustainable reintegration.

This section guides programme development and management staff through the suggested assessments that should take place in countries of origin. These include mapping policies, laws, labour markets and social conditions, stakeholders and services available to support the sustainable reintegration of returnees. At the end of this initial mapping process, reintegration providers are encouraged to synthesize this information into a project-specific feasibility grid for use during reintegration planning at the individual, community and structural levels, as detailed in [section 1.4.3](#).

Assessments described in this section are highly recommended, especially at the onset of reintegration assistance programmes. Nevertheless, it is also very important to consult them throughout the programme and the project cycle, because they may change.

After the assessment phase, potential reintegration initiatives should be prioritized according to available budget. Whenever possible, responsibilities and costs should be shared by various stakeholders. Note that some reintegration initiatives are not necessarily cost-intensive but require coordination and adaptation to existing mechanisms.

Situation analysis for return and reintegration in the country of origin

A situation analysis in the country of origin details the return and reintegration context and trends as well as the wider policy framework.

Specifically, it should include the:

- **Return and reintegration context**

- Key return migration trends, including an assessment by geographic patterns (which localities migrants mostly return to and originate from, concentration of migrants);
- Assessment of past reintegration support projects to identify relevant reintegration strategies and sectors that effectively supported the development of local communities and the sustainable reintegration of returnees (including from an environmental perspective);
- General historical, social, cultural and economic characteristics of the country and how these affect migration;
- Socioeconomic situation of returnees across different time intervals after initial return, by geographic area, age, sex, gender, skill level, support received, in comparison to local population.

- **Policy framework**

- Mechanisms, processes, policies and legislation (at local, national, regional and international levels) that are relevant to return and reintegration;
- Government structure, decision-making processes, levels of decentralization and responsibilities;
- Existing migration and development framework and how it affects reintegration outcomes.

- **Political and security situation**

- Political climate including any upcoming elections or deadlines and main actors;
- Security situation including any access restrictions and major security risks in the country and in different areas within the country.

To reduce costs and enable a holistic approach to return and reintegration in the wider migration and development context, the situation analysis should be linked with other development planning strategies or frameworks (such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper poverty diagnostics, ILO Decent Work Country Programmes or UN Development Assistance Framework or Common Country Assessment). Rather than starting from scratch, situation analyses should build on existing information, including information about current and expected future returns and community assessments. This information could include studies of past reintegration beneficiaries to assess the effectiveness of any existing reintegration support frameworks information on the reintegration-development nexus; and local level service provision. Ideally, a situation analysis should be performed by a team of local and international experts using a participatory approach. It should solicit perspectives of a wide range of stakeholders, including return migrants and non-migrants in areas of high return, to elicit comprehensive information and foster ownership and sustainability of the process.

Understanding the frameworks, regulations and policies of service provision

Before mapping existing services and resources and planning for the details of reintegration assistance programming, it is important to be aware of the local, national, regional and local rules and systems for service provision.

Reintegration programming should be developed with a clear understanding of the country's legislation regulating service provision, its frameworks and policies and any referral systems that are already in place (such as for mental health care or to assist victims of trafficking).

The example below guides staff in understanding the context of mental health-care provision. Similar questions can and should be asked in all service areas relevant for reintegration, such as housing, education and employment.

Table 1.1: Sample questions for mapping health-care frameworks, regulations and policies

Legislation and Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the legislation and the policy in force at national level for mental health care?
Financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Do central, regional or local authorities finance mental health-care services?
Partnerships/Referral Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are there local, regional, national partnerships between organizations, private sector and the government for the provision of mental health care?• Is there a formal and operational national referral system for mental health?
Insurance and coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are mental health services free? If yes to what extent? If not, how much do they cost?• Are there insurance schemes providing free care?• How much do they cost?• What are the requirements to access the insurance scheme?
Drugs and medications	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is there a national list of drugs and medications?• Are drugs and medications, especially psychotropic drugs, available at every care level (primary, secondary and tertiary)?• Are they to be paid by the patients?
Categories of caregivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In terms of human resources, what are the professional categories of caregivers working in the mental health sector?
Traditional care system	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is a traditional care system available and what kind? :• Are these practices regulated and or assessed?

Stakeholder mapping

The involvement of national and local authorities and other private and non-public stakeholders is instrumental to the success of reintegration programmes. In order to engage with actors who are or should be relevant to the reintegration of returnees, it is essential to conduct a mapping of actors in areas with a high incidence of return migration. Stakeholder mapping provides a comprehensive assessment of the capacity, needs, willingness and potential for partnerships of different stakeholders at the national and local level. A comprehensive stakeholder mapping is required for establishing the scope of a reintegration programme. Guidance on using the stakeholder mapping to develop engagement strategies, capacity-building initiatives and coordination and cooperation mechanisms is included in Module 4.

Relevant stakeholders can include a variety of different public, private and civil society actors, including government ministries and agencies, local governments, municipal stakeholders, private sector entities, CSOs and NGOs, migrant associations and diaspora organizations, and international organizations active at the local level. These could be at work in a range of policy sectors, according to the country context (for instance in the development, migration, environment or humanitarian sectors).

- Never conduct a stakeholder mapping in isolation. Before starting a stakeholder mapping exercise, the lead reintegration organization should engage with partner organizations (such as key government ministries, UN agencies, international NGOs and so on) as well as community leaders and local authorities who are active in the area and have first-hand experience with relevant stakeholders. This can facilitate the mapping exercise and reduce its time and cost. It also enables the transfer of informal knowledge on the roles, expectations, capacity and intentions of stakeholders that may not be accessible through direct engagement with the stakeholders themselves. Local authorities can play a key role in this information-gathering.
- Whenever possible, information about stakeholders' capacity, interests and motivations should be validated using other sources to take account of different perspectives and eliminate potential bias, intentional or otherwise.
- Finally, stakeholder mappings should be continuous. They should yield a growing network of actual and potential national and local partners that evolves over time as new stakeholders emerge, reintegration programme objectives evolve and return flows change.

Table 1.2 below provides step-by-step guidance for conducting a stakeholder mapping exercise for reintegration programmes.

Table 1.2: Conducting a stakeholder mapping for reintegration programme implementation

Step	Activities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prioritize local areas with high incidences of current and/or expected future returns. The budgets of reintegration programmes are often limited, and therefore cost- and resource-intensive stakeholder mapping exercises should be conducted primarily in

Step	Activities
2. Identify	<p data-bbox="903 120 1493 389">contexts which do or will accommodate larger inflows of returnees. National authorities such as the Ministry of Interior or the National Bureau of Statistics can often provide relevant information on localities registering a higher demand for reintegration-related services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="874 398 1522 1070">• Identify entities or groups present at the national and local level who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="979 479 1522 824">◦ have the potential to i) improve the delivery of services to return migrants and/or ii) provide support to the economic, social and psychosocial reintegration of returnees (such as the local municipality, private sector actors, relevant suppliers and so on); and/or <li data-bbox="979 833 1522 1070">◦ are likely to be affected by the return and reintegration of returnees, for instance local communities or small-scale entrepreneurs who may be affected by increased competition. <li data-bbox="874 1079 1522 1227">• Include key cross-cutting issues, such as gender and environmental sustainability, and relevant actors in the stakeholder mapping. <li data-bbox="874 1236 1522 2065">• Analyse the role, expectations, willingness to collaborate, capacity, and needs of each identified stakeholder. Some stakeholders have the potential to affect the performance of the reintegration programme more than others. A possible way to assess this is to ask the following questions for each identified stakeholder: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="979 1554 1522 1751">◦ What are the principal functions and the role of the stakeholder in the national/local context that are relevant to the reintegration programme and its performance? <li data-bbox="979 1760 1522 2065">◦ What are the key motivations of the stakeholder in relation to the reintegration programme and its foreseeable outcomes? Who has a financial stake/interest? Who has a political interest? If the stakeholder is disinclined to engage with or support the reintegration

programme, what are the key reasons? Can they be addressed or mitigated?

- Is the capacity of the stakeholder adequate to become engaged with the reintegration programme and its beneficiaries? If not, what support would they require in order for this to become the case?
- Where present, stakeholders' existing strategies and development plans should be assessed and used to guide the design of reintegration interventions. The legitimacy and institutional role of national and local stakeholders should be respected and existing initiatives and resources complemented and supported, rather than creating separate structures and strategies.
- Finally, it is important to map both the main supporters and the key potential obstructors to collaboration. Using a matrix and then mapping stakeholders ([see Annex 6 for a sample](#)) according to their role, expectations, capacity and willingness, enables the lead reintegration organization to create a picture of stakeholders' level of involvement and therefore the type of engagement that will be required with them. Assessing their motivations also provides insights in to how to successfully engage them for partnerships and collaborations.
- Assess the relevance of different stakeholder categories in the light of the stakeholder mapping, identified reintegration challenges, capacities and foreseen reintegration planning. Prioritization is key to maximizing engagement with the most relevant stakeholders and to avoid wasting time and resources by communicating to stakeholders who do not require it. The relative importance of different categories of stakeholder depends greatly on:
 - **Reintegration programming parameters.** The lead reintegration organization's budget and capacity greatly affects which stakeholders

Step	Activities
	<p>are most relevant in a given context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Number and profile of returnees. The higher the number of returnees, the greater the strains on the provision of essential services and the potential risks of tensions with local non-migrant communities. In cases of high inflows of returnees, pay particular attention to targeting and engaging providers of essential services and local non-migrant communities, who are a strategically important stakeholder category for the success of any reintegration programme. The profiles (skills, age, gender) of current and future returnees, to the extent that they are known at the stage of the initial stakeholder mapping, greatly affect the relative importance of national and local stakeholders. For instance, a group of returnees mainly consisting of young migrants is likely to shift the stakeholder prioritization to partnerships with stakeholders that can support the socioeconomic reintegration of youth. ◦ Socioeconomic and environmental context. Understanding the current situation in the national and local area (such as inadequate provision of essential services, post-conflict context, structural oversupply of labour, volatile business environment) can point to specific sectors where partnerships will be needed to address challenges or opportunities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an engagement strategy. Building on the prior steps, the lead reintegration organization will have defined strategic objectives and prioritized relevant stakeholders. The interrelation of these two aspects will define the choice of engagement and communications' strategy

Step	Activities
	for the different groups of mapped stakeholders (see section 4.1 for instructions on developing a stakeholder engagement strategy).

A sample Stakeholder Mapping Matrix is included in [Annex 6](#) which can be adapted to the context and analysis needs.

Service mapping

When planning a reintegration programme, it is crucial to know what services are available to the local population in the country of origin that returnees can access during their reintegration process. Service mapping is the identification and recording of providers and services in a systematic way. It details what local services are available to local populations and returnees, the criteria for accessing those services, who offers those services, the quality of the services and any risks associated with accessing the services.

At the individual level, this mapping is essential for case managers when directly assisting returnees and their families to meet specific needs. Service mapping is also a preliminary step in assessing the communities to which migrants return since it can not only help identify gaps in services provision but also potential strategic and operational partners. It is a good first step towards creating networks at the community level. At the structural level, this is the first phase of establishing or strengthening national or local referral mechanisms ([see section 4.1.3](#)).

Consulting service mapping by other partners should be undertaken prior to conducting a new mapping. During the mapping, national staff who are familiar with the sectors, local area, and speak the local language should collect the information.

While there are different ways to approach service mapping, efforts should ideally include:

- An organization or a provider's contact information
- Type of service provided
- Information regarding service times
- Typical wait times for appointments
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participating in a service
- Costs of service
- Regulations regarding payment
- Location and accessibility

-
- Safety of location
 - Information on relevant public transport options and directions
 - Barriers to access
 - Language capacities
 - Any potential cultural and religious aspects, gender or age implications of these characteristics
 - Professionalism and quality of care
 - Experience supporting returning migrants
 - Perceptions and trust in service providers by the local population

A service mapping should also identify barriers to access (such as eligibility or intake criteria that exclude certain returnees, the location and distance of service delivery, safety and security concerns, time and financial constraints, and documentation requirements) or where services are lacking. Such barriers should be noted so that they can potentially be addressed as part of the reintegration interventions.

Service maps should be regularly updated once the reintegration programme is in place. As such, service organizations or case managers should build in dedicated time and budget resources to update service maps at regular intervals over time. Following up with returnees regularly and systematically recording new information provided through their experiences, can be part of this updating process. Frequently asking about changes in a service provider's contact information, operating hours, costs, eligibility criteria, transportation options and service availability can help a service map stay accurate and improve reintegration planning.

A matrix is provided in [Annex 8](#) that outlines the major services relevant to reintegration programming that should be mapped, as well as sector-specific considerations.

Labour market analysis

Assessment of local and national labour markets, market systems and value chains is essential for identifying economic reintegration opportunities. It is instrumental to the success of both individual-level and community-based reintegration approaches. Information on available livelihood opportunities and key employment sectors, the skills employers are seeking, as well as the available mechanisms for finding work in a local labour market are crucial for reintegration programme beneficiaries. Absence of this information and poor market knowledge can lead to economic failure of returnees' livelihood projects.

Labour market assessments (LMAs) include analyses, research papers and reports that assess the composition, nature, growth and accessibility of labour markets and market systems. These

assessments look at both national and subnational data. LMAs are generally performed by external contractors, so this section only provides a concise overview of the different approaches to LMAs. Before undertaking an LMA, it is important to research whether an up-to-date assessment already exists (perhaps undertaken by another partner or the government).

In the context of reintegration programming, LMAs generally aim to:

- **Determine high-potential growth sectors** which may provide employment or self-employment opportunities for returnees, including opportunities for “green jobs” (for more information on green jobs see *the Tip below*);
- **Identify skills’ needs and skills’ mismatches** (the gap between an individual’s or population’s competencies and skills and the skills’ needs of the labour market) by sector and occupation;
- **Identify relevant regulations** and sector-specific legislative provisions such as working hours, legal work age, mandatory benefits, accessibility and equal opportunity provisions;
- **Assess business start-up costs and registration procedures**, including legal assistance, to adapt business support to local contexts; and
- **Identify constraints and opportunities** in a market system, including:
 - The supporting services or functions (such as access to market information) that may enable individuals to find steady work;
 - The roles that informal and cultural norms, including gender norms, play in the labour market.

There are various approaches and methodologies for assessing labour markets and market systems. They differ in their resource intensity, comprehensiveness and level of detail of findings. Before choosing a tool or approach, determine the purpose of the LMA. Is it to collect broad information about a population or market? Or to gain additional information on a specific sector or local labour market? Clarify budget requirements for LMAs at an early stage of project development, as comprehensive LMAs can be very expensive. Once available, LMA findings should be shared with potential beneficiaries early on during the pre-departure process.

An overview of relevant approaches for labour market and market assessments is provided below. These tools are not necessarily alternative approaches to LMA but can also complement each other when implemented within a single reintegration programme. For instance, a Rapid Market Assessment can provide an overview of high-potential markets, which can subsequently be assessed in greater detail through a comprehensive market system analysis. Finally, all three tools not only function as analysis tools, but, due to the way they engage local stakeholders (through interviews, workshops, focus groups and so on), they can also build a foundation for long-term cooperation and partnerships for community-based projects.

Table 1.3: Overview of different labour market and market assessment tools¹⁴

Tool	Use case	Methodology	Duration	Resource intensity
------	----------	-------------	----------	--------------------

Tool	Use case	Methodology	Duration	Resource intensity
Participatory appraisal of competitive advantage	<p>Provides an action-oriented appraisal of a local economy, looking at economic potentials and at the motivation and capacity for action of local stakeholders</p> <p>Provides information on local competitiveness and economic opportunities, and which activities and subsectors are most relevant to a project's target territories</p> <p>Motivates local stakeholders to participate in a collaborative assessment of local needs and in the design of the resulting projects</p>	Mixed approach combining desk research, stakeholder workshops, semi-structured interviews	Short (2-4weeks)	Low
Partnerships/Referral Systems	<p>Provides an overview of high-potential markets to determine their relevance to target groups, the opportunities for economic reintegration and the feasibility of intervening</p> <p>Engages with local stakeholders to assess sectoral needs and opportunities and can lead to long-term collaboration</p>	Mixed approach combining desk research, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, field visits	Medium (2-4months)	Medium

Tool	Use case	Methodology	Duration	Resource intensity
Value chain analysis/market system analysis	Provide detailed insight on a prioritized set of subsectors, including comprehensive information on sector performance and value chains	Mixed approach combining desk research, field research, case analysis, stakeholder consultations and stakeholder workshops	Long (4+months)	High
	Provides insights into "how" to intervene in a : given value chain or market system, leveraging ' opportunities and avoiding disruptive effects			

- In order to also account for the socioeconomic needs of a community, identify possible local partners and assess the potential effect that return migration will have on communities, LMAs for reintegration programming should systematically be combined with community profiles ([see section 3.1](#)). Combining the findings of an LMA with a community profile, positions reintegration programme managers to:
 - Identify key sectors in the economy that should be targeted;
 - Determine promising programme design options and economic interventions that can maximize the opportunities of a market system while avoiding disruptive socioeconomic effects); and
 - Match suitable returnee profiles for each sector or subsector and project.

The reintegration process is not linear and the integrated approach to reintegration reflects the dynamism of the reintegration context. Therefore, reintegration programmes should aim to address the individual, community and structural levels simultaneously and take into account how each level

can affect the others.

This chapter presents an overview of key considerations, appropriate assessments for the country of origin and operational staff based there, as well as budget aspects to guide the development and implementation of reintegration programmes.

This information is complemented by Annexes [5](#), [6](#) and [7](#), which provide practical tools that can be used and adapted to each context.

1.4.1 Key considerations for reintegration assistance

1.4.2 Assessing the return context

1.4.3 Developing a reintegration assistance programme

The chart below highlights the proposed steps to take when designing a reintegration programme.

1.4.3 Developing a reintegration assistance programme

Reintegration staff profiles

While a comprehensive human resources guide for organizations providing reintegration assistance is beyond the scope of this Handbook, this section provides an overview of crucial staffing considerations for various reintegration programming contexts.

When deciding the staffing structure and recruitment approach for a reintegration project, the following considerations are important:

- **Programme framework:** The programme framework agreement specifies the implementation process and operations that should be carried out for a successful reintegration programme. It generally specifies the roles, mandates and responsibilities of the lead reintegration organization and implementing partners; sets the available financial resources; and directs reporting and coordination processes. Because it defines the organization's role, responsibilities and external resources (including those of implementing partners), the programme framework has a decisive impact on the staff make-up required for the programme.
- **Contextual and structural factors:** Contexts vary! Preliminary assessments, detailed in [section 1.4.2](#), can identify contextual and structural challenges, such as conflict or instability, inadequate provision of basic services or the absence of psychosocial care providers. The assessment can help determine what additional expertise is needed to undertake programming in these areas or deal with obstacles during implementation.
- **Implementing and operating partners:** In countries where many partners can provide effective economic, social and psychosocial reintegration support services, staff roles will shift from direct assistance to focusing more on referrals, supervision and follow-up. By contrast, in implementing contexts where partners are few or lacking adequate capacity, reintegration staff members may need to provide a variety of different functions directly, which requires

greater financial and human resources.

- **Beneficiary-to-case manager ratio:** While good reintegration programming seeks to maintain the beneficiary-case manager ratio at sustainable levels,¹⁵ unforeseen spikes in returns can temporarily increase the number of returnees that reintegration case managers need to take care of. Case managers need awareness around self-care to prevent their burnout, and to keep staff turnover low.
- **Profiles of returnees:** The psychosocial, social and economic needs of returnees differ. General characteristics of returnees (such as sex, gender, age, ability, ethnicity) need to be considered when planning staffing. The degree and type of support that the average returnee requires affects ideal staffing profiles and training. For example, in scenarios where most beneficiaries have experienced significant psychosocial stress, case managers require adequate training to sustainably provide high-quality care for returnees' psychosocial needs.
- **Capacity and expertise versus number of staff:** In some programmes, the budget can fund staff with specific expertise in certain areas of reintegration (such as psychosocial, economic and social counselling and support). In other programmes, staff may need to fulfil a wide range of economic, social and psychosocial counselling and support functions in all three areas. They might need to i) assess needs, ii) develop an individual reintegration plan, iii) implement the intervention and coordinating services and care and iv) monitor the beneficiary's access to services, their use of services and their progress over time. The different roles and responsibilities associated with each position need to be clearly defined in staff terms of reference prior to the hiring process.

Each of the above factors feeds into what type of reintegration staff is needed or possible (given budgets). [Annex 9](#) provides an overview of potential staff profiles. While the functions provided are not exhaustive, they feature the major groups of staff who could be represented in reintegration projects.

Both male and female staff should be employed within any office to provide returnees with a choice between working with female or male staff, as well as provide a balance in gender perspectives. All staff should be trained in and adhere to ethical principles, standards and guidelines for the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse, and in a gender- and age-sensitive response to returnees.

Selecting relevant individual, collective and community interventions

Given the wide degree of interventions possible in reintegration programmes, once a programme theory of change, logical framework and resources have been put into place it is necessary to set up a mechanism for selecting activities based on individual, community and structural needs. A feasibility grid is a tool that can guide this process by targeting and tailoring interventions for specific likely scenarios. Based on the assessments, the project developer can identify which interventions are appropriate for the context and define a feasibility grid specific to their programme.

The feasibility grid outlines all possible local interventions within the scope of the reintegration programme; criteria for the application of these interventions for specific cases; and conditions for feasibility at the community and structural levels. Once developed, the feasibility grid can help case managers identify which specific intervention to choose for a particular returnee or community. The full feasibility grid is found in [Annex 5](#).

In short, though, the feasibility grid contains the following components:

- **Intervention** – The grid includes all interventions which can be implemented by the reintegration programme, as well as all services available locally through referrals.
- **Scenario For each intervention, the grid should specify a scenario** – a situation, status or condition, under which such intervention would be appropriate.
- **Criteria** – individual, community and structural. The grid specifies the conditions of feasibility for each type of intervention. Conditions could include individual characteristics or attitudes of returnees, characteristics of the community or structural factors necessary for successful implementation of the intervention (such as favourable labour market conditions). The criteria should always be carefully adapted to local conditions to identify reliable, locally appropriate interventions.
 - **Individual criteria:** Information on the returnee and their family from assessments. The returnee’s general profile, needs, skills, reintegration score (if using the Reintegration Sustainability Survey) and eligibility should inform the identification of individual risk factors and opportunities that affect reintegration (see column “Individual criteria” in the feasibility grid). This helps case managers and beneficiaries tailor a reintegration plan to the beneficiary’s circumstances.
 - **Community criteria:** Information on the community where the returnee lives, including any ongoing collective and community-based interventions. This information could cover the i) labour market situation; ii) structure and size of markets and value chains; iii) availability, capacity and accessibility of technical vocational education and training (TVET) providers, health services, education facilities, financial management training, life skills’ programmes; iv) intra-community availability and distribution of resources and services, with equity factors an important determinant of potential intra-community tension due to perceived preferential treatment of returnees over other community members. Once these criteria have been considered, the project developer and project manager can narrow down a tailored set of adequate interventions from a community-sensitive standpoint.
 - **Structural criteria:** The structural environment affecting the returnee’s reintegration, including all available reintegration services provided within the given area of coverage. These are the overall conditions in which the individual and or community-level reintegration pathways are embedded. Structural criteria include i) presence and capacity of institutional, material, economic and financial infrastructure; ii) structure and nature of market systems; iii) nature of regulatory, legal and policy environment; iv) presence of cultural or other sensitivities. Structural factors are overarching and affect the feasibility of interventions in similar ways. However, fundamental criteria such as business regulation and cultural appropriateness need to be cross-checked regularly.

¹³ This includes, among other elements, the principle of lawful and fair collection of data for a specified and legitimate purpose, the principles of consent, confidentiality, access and transparency and data security. For the IOM Data Protection Principles, see: [IOM Data Protection Manual \(Geneva, 2010\)](#).

¹⁴ ILO, 2016; ILO, 2017 and Meyer-Stamer, J., [Participatory Appraisal of Competitive Advantage \(PACA\): Effectively Launching Economic Development Initiatives](#), Mesopartner (Duisburg, Germany, 2006).

¹⁵ The sustainability of the beneficiary-case manager ratio is itself context-specific, as it depends on the average level of support and counselling that beneficiaries require. In a scenario where returnees have fled a country of origin in a situation of conflict, they may suffer from specific vulnerabilities during the return and reintegration which may place additional burdens on case managers. Programme managers should carefully monitor the psychosocial dimension of the workload of case managers in order to establish a contextually adequate ratio of beneficiaries to case managers.
