Who should run the reception facilities?

Local authorities, humanitarian organisations or commercial actors? Experiences from Norway

Historical overview

Market share, per cent

- Private
- NGOs
- Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>30 centres</td>
<td>134 centres</td>
<td>64 centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>153 centres</td>
<td>111 centres</td>
<td>20 centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>70 centres</td>
<td>50 centres</td>
<td>30 centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>40 centres</td>
<td>20 centres</td>
<td>10 centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10 centres</td>
<td>5 centres</td>
<td>0 centres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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General findings

• No systematic quality differences between types of operators
• No difference in price
• The profits are bigger for private actors
• More staff in centres run by municipalities
• Recommendation: Keep the three types, but make market shares more equal

UDI

Quality

• UDI conducts audits regularly
  • The committee analyzed 350 audit reports from 2006-2010
  • UDI has analyzed another 160 reports from 2011-2012
• Same conclusion:
  No systematic differences in quality between types of operators

UDI
Cost

- Centres established according to public procurement regulations
- Type of actor cannot be used as an award criterion
- Three types of actors competing against each other
- No systematic differences in price

Profits and staff

- 250 reception centre accounts (2002-2007): commercial actors have bigger profits
- UDI analysis of another 430 accounts (2008-2012) – same tendency but:
  - overall profit margin is decreased with 1 per cent
  - profit margin for municipalities has increased
  - profit margin for NGOs and private actors has decreased
- Staff is the main cost – bigger profits, fewer staff in centres
UDI’s overall experience

- Three types of actors:
  - Valuable in itself (different perspectives)
  - More flexibility when upscaling
  - Competition gives lower price
  - Develops the field
Humane reception facilities for asylum seekers

Trygve Augestad – tau@npaid.org
Manager - Refugee and Integration department

Why should humanitarian organizations run reception centers?

• Volunteering provides better quality of operations and more interaction with the local community

• Project work, method development and added activities, strengthen the quality of the reception centers

• Humanitarian organizations provide a guaranteed professional development, with strong focus on welfare service
How can non-profit organizations continue to run reception centers?

• Provide a responsible platform and conditions fostering interest from more NGOs in the running of reception centers
• Steps should be taken to assure that a fair percentage of reception centers are provided by NGOs
• Longer contracts ensure stability and sustainability.
• Longer bidding deadlines for NGOs should be considered
• Bidding rounds with increased emphasis to reward volunteering, local integration work and qualified employees
• Separate bidding rounds for NGOs

Who should run the reception facilities?

Municipalities?

- Emil Schmidt
- Charmant – Board of Bjørnebekk reception centre
- Municipality of Ås
Municipality of Ås

- 17,338 inhabitants
- Norwegian University of Life Sciences (4,080 students)
- Bjørnebekk (200 residents)

Bjørnebekk - Organisation

Municipal Council

Board
Municipal management team

Manager - Bjørnebekk

Staff - Bjørnebekk
Board – Municipal management team

- Financial director (Chairman)
- Technical manager
- Manager - Health and social services
- Manager - upbringing and culture

Employees

- 10 employees at Bjørnebekk.
  - Most employees are the primary contact in addition to their assigned tasks.
  - This means that we have the responsibility for a group of residents each.
  - This makes it easier for residents, because they will know which employee to contact at any time.
  - Primary contact follows the resident from the first day, until the day they leave the camp.
Benefits and possibilities

- Cooperation and Integration with other municipal services: Schools, kindergardens health care and culture.
- wide range of competence – access to use of specialists.
- Most of the recipients have special needs. The municipality have the competence to meet these needs.
- Recipients are staying for a long period in the reception center. This increases the complexity of needs.
  - Municipalities have a long term strategy.
- High population growth. If the reception center must close down, due to a reduction in number of applications, the employees can be offered other duties in the municipality.

Challenges

- The contracts are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Contracts are for a limited period..
- This is different from ordinary municipal activities, which are more long term (kindergardens, schools and nursing).
- Municipalities are less flexible than private organisations.