Interrelations between Civil Society Organisations assisting Refugees

Policy Paper

Think tank *Rights of Refugees* 2016 – 2017

Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest, Hungary
Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

Sanne Aben

Szonja Balogh

Rebeka Katalin Borsi

Bettina Büki

Jody Geerts

Roos Geurts

Zoë Hulsenboom

Dalma Kalácska

Zsófia Maka

Paul Metz

PÁZMÁNY PÉTER
KATOLIKUS EGYETEM

Radboud University

Interdisciplinary Honours Programme for Master's Students

The Radboud Honours Academy offers talented and motivated students at Radboud University the opportunity to take an additional, challenging study programme. Students are selected based on their ambition, potential and study results.

Participants of the Interdisciplinary Honours Programme for Master's Students are stimulated to look beyond the borders of their own field of study. They work together in interdisciplinary think tanks and conduct research on a socially-relevant issue. Their final report is addressed to an external organisation. The extra knowledge and skills that students acquire during the programme are of great value to their personal and academic development, and for their further career. The extra study load is equivalent to 15 ECs.

Executive Summary

In August 2016, the international and interdisciplinary think tank 'The Rights of Refugees', consisting of five Hungarian and five Dutch students, started a research concerning the interrelations between Dutch and Hungarian civil society organisations (CSOs) assisting refugees. This research was conducted for the Dutch and Hungarian offices of UNHCR in order to clarify collaboration and communication between national CSOs. This policy paper is based on results of the interrelations between CSOs within Hungary and the Netherlands and, on a comparison between the two countries. The aim of the paper is to provide UNHCR with a series of recommendations to improve the relation between CSOs assisting refugees, or to improve other subjects put forward by the CSOs themselves in the course of the research.

During interviews with representatives of national CSOs, **three problems** emerged in the collaboration and communication between CSOs and between the CSOs and UNHCR. First, the CSOs argued that the **national role of UNHCR** was not sufficiently visible in both countries. National CSOs stated that they were unaware of the exact role and activities of UNHCR on a national level. Second, CSOs experienced that the **collaboration and communication between CSOs was not always efficient and/or effective**. CSOs also complained about overlapping activities due to miscommunication, and gaps were identified in activities to help refugees. Finally, **Hungarian CSOs reported experiencing financial difficulties** in applying for funds, which limit their functioning.

This policy paper is directed at the Dutch and Hungarian UNHCR and will provide several recommendations to solve the problems mentioned above in order to improve the interrelations between CSOs and UNHCR. We formulated nine, equally weighted criteria, to assess these recommendations. Afterwards, the recommendations have been scored according to their feasibility. For the first problem – improving the visibility of the national role of UNHCR and CSOs' understanding of its activities – we recommend UNHCR to **provide a clear description of its current and upcoming activities on national level on their website**. For the second problem – preventing miscommunication and supporting collaboration between CSOs – it is recommended to **set up a platform for the CSOs providing information about CSOs' expertise and availability, as well as current and upcoming tasks**. In this way, CSOs assisting refugees would have clear access to information on projects that other CSOs are working on and where they can join forces. The main

recommendation for the last problem – concerning financial difficulties experienced by Hungarian CSOs – is that **UNHCR should provide a list of information about available subsidies and a format which explains how to apply for these funds on the online platform** suggested in recommendation two.

To conclude, three recommendations have ultimately been selected: one for each problem. Finally, these three recommendations are combined to create one main recommendation for UNHCR: we recommend UNHCR to **create an online platform describing (1) the national expertise; (2) availability; (3) activities; and (4) way of funding of CSOs and UNHCR itself**. In addition, in Hungary, UNHCR should also provide a list of available funding possibilities and a format of how to apply for these funds.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Since 2015, the number of refugees arriving in the European Union has increased immensely, due to wars, political and religious conflicts and other dangers. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) is one of the main actors in this 'refugee crisis' on an international level, while civil society organisations (CSOs) play a major role in providing help for refugees on a national level by, for instance, providing supplies, housing, legal advice and health care.

Conducted for the Dutch and Hungarian offices of UNHCR, the interdisciplinary think tank 'The Rights of Refugees' examined the possibilities for UNHCR to contribute to a better situation for refugees in Hungary and the Netherlands. This think thank consists of five students from Radboud University (the Netherlands) and five students from Pázmány Péter Catholic University (Hungary).

In open discussions with representatives of Hungarian CSOs, it became evident that communication and collaboration between CSOs was not always optimal, which sometimes led to overlapping activities or even gaps in their activities. Therefore, we decided to assess the interrelations between CSOs in both Hungary and the Netherlands, in order to find room for improvement in the communication and collaboration between CSOs, which will be beneficial to refugees in the end.

In order to assess the interrelations between CSOs assisting refugees in Hungary and the Netherlands, structured interviews were conducted with representatives of nineteen CSOs. The interview questions mainly focussed on interrelations between CSOs, but also on their position within national and international networks, the legal environment surrounding CSOs, their relationships with the government and the EU, and their financial resources and number of employees. Eventually, prominent themes were selected from interview transcripts and compared nationally and internationally between the two countries.

Our research brought to the surface some problems that could be of interest to UNHCR. For instance, the results of our research demonstrated that the national role of UNHCR in Hungary and in the Netherlands is unclear to CSOs. Furthermore, especially Hungarian CSOs would be eager to know to what extent UNHCR has power to influence the Hungarian government or other parties that are involved with refugees. Another problem that appeared from our results is that Dutch CSOs do not have (enough) national meetings and Hungarian CSOs are missing an overview of activities of all CSOs in the field. Even though CSOs in both countries do not perceive this as a major problem, and are actually rather content with the contact they have with other CSOs, they do state that the previously mentioned matters certainly offer room for improvement. A last prominent problem that was highlighted by our research, was that many Hungarian CSOs experience difficulties with the subsidies

awarded on project-basis. It is unclear which subsidies CSOs can apply for, and according to what criteria it is decided if a CSO does or does not receive a subsidy. Also, there is uncertainty about for how many months or years CSOs will get a subsidy when they win it.

The problems highlighted by our research will be elaborated on later in this policy paper and will form the basis of the recommendations for UNHCR to improve this situation. We will discuss the three above-mentioned problems in detail, and for each problem, we will provide two or three possible recommendations. In order to select the most feasible recommendation, a selection of criteria will be used to assess each set of recommendations that is proposed for each of the problems.

Criteria

In order to assess which recommendations provide the best solution to each problem, we established nine criteria. Since not all criteria are relevant for each set of recommendations, different selections of criteria will be used. Recommendations will be evaluated by scoring a set of criteria from 1 to 5, see 'Table 1'. We have weighed all criteria as equally important and gave a score for each criterion, based on our research. However, some criteria may be weighed or scored differently by UNHCR.

Table 1. Scoring the Criteria

1	A very negative quality of the recommendation
2	A mildly negative quality of the recommendation
3	Neutral for the recommendation
4	A mildly positive quality of the recommendation
5	A very positive quality of the recommendation

1. Costs

Costs can take many forms and can be divided into tangible and intangible costs. Tangible costs are material costs, for instance equipment. Intangible costs that are immaterial involve, for instance, extra time or higher work effort. Eventually, both tangible and intangible costs can be expressed in financial terms.

2. Comfort Zone of UNHCR

UNHCR considers itself to be a non-political organisation that is, however, built up by member states, which may complicate its position. Eventually, UNHCR is held accountable by the United Nations General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). When giving certain recommendations, UNHCR may not feel comfortable with the political view or outcome of the activity the recommendation upholds, because it may harm its reputation, legal obligations, its ideals or the ideals of influential parties.

3. Side Effects

Recommendations may not only have an effect on the stated problem, but can also have positive or negative side effects within the same area or in completely different areas.

4. Practicability and Conditions

Some recommendations may ask for certain conditions to be fulfilled or a certain environment that is required for the recommendation to work. If this is not the case, and these conditions are hard to realize or the environment is not present, this may decrease the practicability of the recommendation.

5. Reinforcement or Antagonism Between Recommendations

If UNHCR would implement more than one recommendation for the same problem, these recommendations can reinforce, but also antagonize each other.

6. Effectiveness

A recommendation is meant to solve a problem or improve a situation as much as possible. If the recommendation is similar to an approach or method that has been used before with success, then the recommendation is more likely to work.

7. Sustainability

Preferably, a recommendation should be able to solve a problem permanently, not just temporarily. If the action behind a recommendation needs to be updated continuously, this makes the action less sustainable.

8. Expertise of UNHCR

If a recommendation upholds actions that are similar to activities that UNHCR has done before, then this will make the recommendation easier to execute. Furthermore, if expertise outside UNHCR is needed to execute the recommendation, and this expertise cannot be easily found, then the recommendation is less convenient.

9. Supportiveness of CSOs

Some recommendations may require support or participation of CSOs. Based on our research, we can give an indication of how supportive and involved CSOs will be for a certain recommendation. This supportiveness is, among other things, depending on the urgency of the problem as perceived by CSOs, its costs and benefits, equality in work division, and the goals and strategies of CSOs.

Problem Statement 1: Role of UNHCR

According to our respondents, the national role of UNHCR is not sufficiently visible. This could be explained by the fact that CSOs do not have a clear image of the activities of UNHCR in either the Netherlands or Hungary. The reason for this insufficient visibility of UNHCR could be explained by the fact that most of the work within the two countries concerning refugees is already covered by national CSOs. Therefore, UNHCR may not see the need to interfere in the activities of national CSOs. Additionally, Dutch CSOs stated that they functioned satisfactorily without the interference of UNHCR. Given that the structure of CSOs in the Netherlands is clear, CSOs seem to know where to find each other. Second, another reason for invisibility may be that UNHCR is known to function in crisis regions. Therefore, its role, especially in a country such as the Netherlands, is unclear. The Netherlands did not have to deal with a mass migration problem in the way Hungary did. Because Hungary is a transit state and functions for refugees as the portal towards the European borders, UNHCR has a clearer function in Hungary. However, the concrete tasks of UNHCR are not clear in Hungary either.

These reasons also have a theoretical background. For instance, the coding and decoding communication model (Hall, 1973) can explain the perceived invisibility of UNHCR. Possibly, UNHCR thinks that it is already sufficiently visible. They have a neat and extensive site, both globally and nationally (http://www.unhcr.org/). Also, the name of UNHCR is widely known and used in the context of humanitarian matters. Still, national CSOs do not know what the exact role of UNHCR is in the national countries. This could be due to different perceptions of UNHCR's message; the message UNHCR *thinks* it sends, is different from how their message is *perceived* by CSOs. Therefore, the perceived message can be differently interpreted than the original meaning given to it by UNHCR, which can cause miscommunication and conflict between the messenger and the perceiver.

Mastenbroek, Tibor and Imre (1991) distinguished four types of conflicts between groups. One of these types are instrumental conflicts. These conflicts emerge in case of communication problems, such as task-sharing, misunderstanding and lack of understanding. As the role of UNHCR is not clear to CSOs, a lack of understanding seems to be present caused by instrumental conflicts.

Recommendations

In order to improve the visibility of UNHCR's national role, we have formulated two recommendations. First, UNHCR's website does not provide detailed information about its national activities, neither in Hungary nor in the Netherlands: only a short and general description of UNHCR's global activities are available. We, therefore, suggest that UNHCR should provide a clear description

of its current and upcoming activities on a national level on its website. After a few years, this could turn into an updated archive of past national activities. As a result, CSOs would be able to find detailed information on the past and current role of the national UNHCR. If UNHCR could provide this information clearly and in an easily accessible way, it would prevent misunderstanding about the role played by UNHCR and could stimulate understanding of how UNHCR could help CSOs. Moreover, in this case, sufficient information would reach CSOs, which might contribute to task-sharing between the national UNHCR and CSOs as well.

Second, in addition to information on the website, UNHCR could provide a clear description of its current and upcoming activities on national level in a digital newsletter. Such a newsletter would summarize and highlight the most important current and upcoming events of UNHCR and improve its visibility. This would constitute an accessible way for CSOs to obtain information on the role of UNHCR. CSOs would not have to take any steps, other than opening their mailboxes, alongside their busy daily work schedule. Therefore, this option is a good alternative, instead of searching the internet, to get their information. The newsletter should also refer to the website that could provide additional information of the events. This would prevent the information conflict where CSOs do not receive enough information. The newsletter should be updated regularly, depending on the importance of the news.

Table 2: Scoring of Recommendations for Problem 1

Criteria	Description of activities on website	Newsletter
Costs	5	5
Side effects	4	3
Practicability and conditions	4	2
Reinforcement or antagonism between recommendations	4	4
Effectiveness	4	4
Sustainability	4	2
Supportiveness of CSOs	4	4
Total	**29**	**24**

Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Contact Between CSOs

Even though most CSOs in both Hungary and the Netherlands considered their contact with other CSOs sufficient or even excellent, they also mentioned limiting factors for collaboration and stated that more contact with other CSOs is desirable.

According to social exchange theory, relationships in which benefits exceed costs are most desirable (Gilovich, Keltner, & Nisbett, 2011). As stated by Gazley (2008), benefits include increased access to resources, economic efficiencies, effective response to shared problems, improvements in quality of services delivered to clients, and spreading of risks. Costs of collaboration are loss of autonomy, financial instability, difficulty in assessing organisational results, and loss of time and resources needed for collaborative activities. Our study has indicated that CSOs agree that benefits of collaboration should exceed the costs of collaboration and that CSOs find it important to take this balance into account. Examples of benefits mentioned in our study were reinforcing each other's position and information sharing. While costs of collaboration were not defined as such by our respondents, they did indicate that limited capacity and resources influenced the extent of contact between CSOs.

Game theory, as described by Myerson (1991), can make us consider whether there are certain rules to the 'game' of collaboration. Often-mentioned limiting factors of collaboration in both countries were that CSOs often place their own organisation first, take all credits in joint projects, and consider collaboration with other CSOs as secondary. Rules were not considered to be the most important value of collaboration; in the Netherlands it was even indicated as being least important. In sum, some competition between CSOs seems to be evident, and rules are not considered to be important for collaboration.

Regarding that rules were not considered to be essentially important, informal collaboration was more predominant than formal collaboration in both countries. In the Netherlands, CSOs only had contact with other CSOs when they knew people personally; this may limit CSOs from contacting other CSOs they do not already know. In Hungary, intergroup conflicts (Dahrendorf, 1959) were present. Reasons for intergroup conflicts include structure, interest and working habits of a group. Individual members of a group play a role in the initiation of a group conflict. This seemed to be the case in Hungary as CSOs indicated that collaboration is sometimes hampered because of personal aversion between employees from different CSOs.

In several interviews conducted in Hungary, representatives of CSOs mentioned that certain required tasks that are important when assisting refugees, are not covered by any CSO and that gaps exist in the overall collaboration. According to Hall (1973), collaboration is greatly dependent on having common notions and on a perfect understanding of each other's intentions. If there is a

misunderstanding of the other's role in a project or any form of collaboration, crucial resources might get lost, thereby creating overlaps or gaps in activities.

Another factor that might affect the collaboration between CSOs are instrumental conflicts (Mastenbroek et al. 1991): ineffective or missing communication about labour division between CSOs might result in misunderstandings. In Hungary, the use of a website dedicated to share capacities and resources of CSOs was often mentioned as a best practice to follow, also to cover missing activities or solve overlapping ones.

Equity theory (Adams, 1963; Gilovich, et al., 2011) can also be viewed as a basis for creating a platform that is successful in the long run. Fairness in dividing costs and benefits equally, as well as in following rules, is greatly strived for in any collaboration, hence if participants of such a website find a way to allocate costs between one another, while keeping the costs lower than the benefits, the likelihood of success is higher.

Recommendations

Three recommendations were formulated to enhance collaboration between CSOs. Firstly, the Budapest Migration Roundtable was an initiative launched by the Municipality of Budapest in 2012, with the aim of creating a platform for organisations to connect and, as a result, help the integration process of immigrants. Unfortunately, it was discontinued in 2013, despite the fact that the participating sixty CSOs – including almost every relevant governmental and non-governmental organisation in the field – were content with its operation (Budapest Migration Roundtable, 2015). Our first recommendation for UNHCR Hungary would be to actively support the relaunch of this initiative, as the idea of restarting the Roundtable was genuinely welcomed by the representatives of the interviewed CSOs. As a best practice shown in Hungary, the Netherlands might also implement this recommendation to establish more frequent, more formal, effective and sustainable collaboration between each other. In the Netherlands, there are no gatherings between the most important CSOs on a regular basis at this moment. One way to enhance collaboration is to invite the larger CSOs to meet and share their ideas with one another on a regular – possibly on a half-yearly – basis.

Our second recommendation is to build an online platform or website to provide an opportunity for CSOs assisting refugees to contact each other. Several CSOs in Hungary informed us about a website already being in the process of making. UNHCR might professionally and financially assist in getting in touch with the CSOs involved and in building this website by sharing relevant information (e.g. updates on the current situation, upcoming projects and tenders). Gradually, UNHCR could take a more significant role in directing the activity on the platform.

As for the Netherlands, CSOs could either implement the experience of Hungarian CSOs in

constructing and operating a similar website or take the Partner Portal of UNHCR (https://partner.unhcr.org/) as a scheme to follow, as there is no previous experience in using an online platform for information-sharing between all relevant CSOs. Partner Portal is a web-based tool which aim is to gather all up-to-date information and capacity of organisations assisting refugees and persons of concern (About Partner Portal, 2015). Starting and enhancing partnerships in the Netherlands should be handled on a similar website.

Thirdly, in order to emphasize the importance of rules and, related to that, to prevent intergroup conflicts as they exist in Hungary, UNHCR should take the lead in formalising relationships between CSOs. A best practice in the Netherlands is the formal alliance between IOM and foundation Nidos. These organisations have a covenant in which is written down how they collaborate with each other. This makes collaboration easier, because every participant is aware of the rules and their obligations to each other. Such kind of formal alliance was the only example in both the Netherlands and Hungary. More formal collaboration and more emphasis on rules could prevent CSOs from taking all credits and from considering collaboration with other CSOs as less important.

Table 3: Scoring of Recommendations for Problem 2

Criteria	Re-opening Migration Roundtable	Online platform	Formalising relationships
Costs	2	2	3
Comfort zone of UNHCR	3	3	2
Reinforcement/antagonism between recommendations	4	4	4
Effectiveness	4	5	4
Sustainability	4	5	4
Expertise of UNHCR	5	4	3
Supportiveness of CSOs	5	5	4
Total	**27**	**28**	**24**

Problem Statement 3: Financial Difficulties in Hungary

In Hungary, financial difficulties were mentioned as a problem for CSOs' functioning and collaboration. Nearly all Hungarian CSOs mentioned that regular re-application for different subsidies affects their functioning in a negative way, as it is difficult and hard to predict which projects can be launched again and which ones will cease to exist. In the latter case, several employees' work can become redundant, making it insecure whether they will keep their jobs. Eventually, if the most important and essential projects of CSOs cease to exist, it can even mean the termination of the CSO in question. Moreover, unpredictability of the future of projects may seriously hinder CSOs assisting refugees.

Furthermore, three out of eight CSOs mentioned that it was unclear to them what other CSOs had received their funding for and how they were spending it. They mentioned that they found the lack of transparency regarding the distribution and utilization of subsidies problematic. CSOs assumed that, sometimes, CSOs got funding based on unprofessional reasons rather than objective criteria. Moreover, they stated that they did not possess a clear overview of the achievements of other CSOs, in the sense that there is no clear feedback about how CSOs used the money they received.

Our respondents also mentioned differences between smaller and bigger CSOs in the sense that CSOs with a more extensive financial background had bigger chances to apply for several projects and funding. In case several projects existed, CSOs got the money after the projects had already been launched, making it a requirement to be in possession of their own resources beforehand (which smaller CSOs possess to a lesser extent). In extreme situations, small CSOs do not even have the chance to apply for funding for more than one project, which can even result in the termination of the CSO.

Furthermore, according to IOM, financial difficulties exist due to the fact that funding for CSOs is project-based. As well as instrumental conflicts, Mastenbroek et al. (1991) also distinguished negotiation conflicts. Financial inequity can lead to negotiation conflicts because of an unequal distribution of power. Briefly said, financial differences possibly cause conflicts between CSOs. Following social exchange theory (Gilovich, et al., 2011), funding ('economic efficiencies') is a benefit that will make it more favourable for CSOs to collaborate with each other. Similarly, financial instability (which is more likely when CSOs do not get funding) is a cost that makes it less favourable for CSOs to collaborate. In summary, the financial problem in Hungary is three-fold: (1) Uncertainty exists about the continuity of funding and thus of projects that are financed by it, (2) a lack of transparency is perceived regarding distribution and utilization of funding, (3) funding is received after onset of projects, which is more difficult for smaller CSOs.

As UNHCR has a unique position between governments and CSOs, they might be in the position to improve the financial situation of CSOs. Therefore, we have formulated three recommendations that could help UNHCR improve the financial situation of CSOs in Hungary. The first recommendation is related to preventing informational conflicts (Moore, 1992; Székely, 1995; Szekszárdi, 1995). For example, if information does not flow adequately between CSOs, it can be the reason for ineffective cooperation and communication between them.

An online platform where CSOs can see other CSOs' projects and which CSOs and projects receive funding, provide CSOs with a clear overview of information which will diminish conflicts with an informational cause. Because of the online platform, CSOs would be able to see which subsidies are available for their activities. In case of shared activities, it can be made possible for CSOs to apply together for subsidies, which enhances their chances to be selected for a given subsidy, as the representatives of CSOs confirmed in our interviews. Furthermore, a platform could make it easier for CSOs to compare costs and benefits of collaboration with other CSOs, and it could facilitate the decision whom to work with. As a result of the platform, CSOs would also have knowledge about the internationally available subsidies, in which case they would have better chances - according to our findings - to obtain a secure funding source. As UNHCR has more experience and information about various subsidies, and CSOs could act as 'extended hands' of UNHCR, this would be beneficial to both parties.

The second recommendation is to change annual reports of CSOs. Diminishing informational conflicts is also applicable to this recommendation, as some CSOs do not know what other CSOs do with the money they receive. This is an example of restraining information which may lead to conflicts and accusations. Annual reports are already in use, in which CSOs have to record the total amount of money they received and all activities they performed. We, nevertheless, think it could be beneficial if they would also indicate the amount of money they spend on a given activity, especially as funding in Hungary is project-based. Changing annual reports would increase transparency and diminish accusations and conflicts. In the Netherlands, many CSOs put their annual report on their website so it is available to anyone (e.g. Foundation Gave has a list of their annual reports on https://www.gave.nl/wat-kunt-u-doen/financieel-steunen/jaarverslag). Thus, the Netherlands could function as an example of a best practice.

Our final recommendation for UNHCR is that they should support CSOs by helping them formulate an adequate request for funding. It can do so by writing letters of recommendation for CSOs in case they want to apply for funding. Several CSOs mentioned that the limited number of subsidies and competition caused by this - together with the lack of transparency with regard to receiving money - is an important source of conflict for CSOs. As UNHCR is in a more direct

relationship with the governments compared to CSOs, it is advisable for UNHCR to assist or support CSOs when they apply for funding, by offering recommendation letters for certain projects. However, the fact that several CSOs do not receive a recommendation letter, while other CSOs do, might serve as a source of conflict. In order to avoid problems with the trustworthiness of UNHCR regarding the grant of recommendation letters, we advise to provide objective and accessible criteria CSOs have to comply with to receive a recommendation letter to help them apply for funding. These criteria and subsequent recommendation letters could provide more structure to the funding procedure and might diminish accusations and conflicts.

Table 4: Scoring of Recommendations for Problem 3

Criteria	Online platform	Change annual report	Recommendation letters
Costs	2	4	2
Comfort zone of UNHCR	3	2	2
Reinforcement or antagonism between recommendations	4	4	2
Effectiveness	5	4	3
Sustainability	3	3	3
Expertise of UNHCR	4	2	2
Supportiveness of CSOs	5	2	4
Total	**26**	**21**	**18**

Conclusion

The aim of this policy paper was to point out the most important problems stated by CSOs in both Hungary and the Netherlands, and to give recommendations to UNHCR to tackle these problems, in order to enhance the efficiency of CSOs. Based on our study, in which we interviewed representatives of Dutch and Hungarian CSOs, we highlighted two common problems in both countries and one problem that only occurs in Hungary. To each problem statement we attached recommendations. These recommendations are addressed to UNHCR, either in both countries, or only to UNHCR Hungary. Based on our established criteria and scoring system, we selected the best recommendation for each problem statement.

The first problem was that the national role and activities of UNHCR is unclear to CSOs. According to our criteria and scoring system, our most feasible recommendation is to **provide a clear description of activities on national level on UNHCR's website**. Furthermore, after a few years, an archive should be created, making UNHCR's current and past actions visible on the national level, so that it is easy for CSOs to find, understand, and incorporate what the national UNHCR does and did.

Overall, CSOs in both Hungary and the Netherlands are satisfied with their contacts; however, more frequent and deeper connections are desirable. Also, the interviews have shown that informal collaboration in both countries are more prevalent than formal ones. Subsequently, informal personal relations may be more susceptible to conflicts. In Hungary, gaps and overlaps exist in the activities concerning refugees. According to the scoring system, the most feasible recommendation would be to **create an online platform for CSOs providing information about their expertise, availability, as well as current and upcoming tasks**. UNHCR assists CSOs professionally and financially, but the most important role of UNHCR is to share relevant information with them.

The last problem is only relevant in Hungary: project-based funding is problematic for Hungarian CSOs. As a solution, we recommend **UNHCR to provide information on available subsidies and a format which explains how to apply for these funds**. This may increase transparency and collaboration while reducing conflicts and distrust. Based on the experiences of UNHCR in this field, we recommend UNHCR to take the leading role in this initiation.

Finally, combining all recommendations together, we recommend UNHCR **to create an online platform in which the national expertise, availability, activities and way of funding of CSOs and UNHCR itself are described. In addition, in Hungary, UNHCR should also provide a list of available funding possibilities and a format on how to apply for these funds.**

From the beginning of this research, our aim was to help refugees either in a direct or indirect way. By this policy paper, the possibility is handed to UNHCR to evolve its working system and to improve the collaboration between civil society organisations assisting refugees.

References

About Partner Portal. (2015). Retrieved from
https://partner.unhcr.org/_layouts/15/partnerportal/anonymous/landingview.aspx?ReturnU
rl=%2f_layouts%2f15%2fAuthenticate.aspx%3fSource%3d%252Fdefault%252Easpx&Source=
%2fdefault.aspx

Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *67*(5), 422.

Dahrendorf, R. (1959). *Class and class conflict in industrial society*. Stanford University Press.

Gazley, B. (2008). Beyond the contract: The scope and nature of informal government–nonprofit partnerships. *Public administration review,68*(1), 141-154.

Gilovich, T., Keltner, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (2011). *Social Psychology*. New York, NY.

Hall, S. (2001). Encoding/decoding. *Media and cultural studies: Keyworks*, 166-176.

Mastenbroek, W. F., Tibor, D., & Imre, K. (1991): Konfliktusmenedzsment és szervezetfejlesztés [Conflict Management and Organizational Development]. Budapest: Közgazdasági És Jogi Kiadó**.**

Moore, C. W. (1992): The mediation process: Practical strategies for Resolving Conflict. Jossey - Bass, San Francisco.

Myerson, R. B. (1991). Game theory: analysis of conflict. *Harvard University*.

Székely Gy. (1995): Győzelem vesztesek nélkül. Érdekalapú konfliktuskezelési ismeretek. 3K Alapítvány [Victory without losers. Interest-based conflict management skills. 3K Foundation], Budapest.

Szekszárdi J. (1995): A konfliktuskezelés gyakorlata. Új Pedagógiai Szemle [The practice of conflict resolution. New Educational Review], 5. sz. 86-103.

About the Authors

The interdisciplinary think tank *The Rights of Refugees 2016 – 2017* consisted of 10 Master's students from Radboud University in Nijmegen, the Netherlands, and Pázmány Péter Catholic University in Budapest, Hungary.

Sanne Aben
European Law
Radboud University

Szonja Balogh
Legal Studies
Pázmány Péter Catholic University

Rebeka Katalin Borsi
Legal Studies
Pázmány Péter Catholic University

Bettina Büki
Legal Studies
Pázmány Péter Catholic University

Jody Geerts
Behavioural Science
Radboud University

Roos Geurts
Social and Cultural Science
Radboud University

Zoë Hulsenboom
History
Radboud University

Dalma Kalácska
East Asian Studies
Pázmány Péter Catholic University

Zsófia Maka
Legal Studies
Pázmány Péter Catholic University

Paul Metz
Medical Studies
Radboud University

The think tank was supervised by:

Gaard Kets MA MSc
Political Theory and History, PhD student
Radboud University

Tamás Nyirkos PhD
Political Science, associate professor
Pázmány Péter Catholic University

Prof. Evert van der Zweerde
Social and Political Philosophy, full professor
Radboud University

Orsolya Varsányi PhD
Arabic and Islamic Studies, lecturer
Pázmány Péter Catholic University