Transnational Exchange III – Case studies

Findings regarding the reintegration of vulnerable returnees
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1. Introduction

Within the project Transnational Exchange III the idea of a small case study emerged: up to 10 return cases should be supported individually to gain more information and knowledge on the challenges vulnerable returnees face in the reintegration phase. In general, there is a lack of data in the field of return and reintegration assistance. Respective research was rarely done until the 1980s; since then, research on return migration has increased to more than 1,100 contributions in this field. Although several aspects of the return process have been investigated, there are still several topics in need of further research: various types of migration and different reasons for migration results in different types of return. Due to this huge variety research on return migration is still only in the beginning. There are many impact factors and country specific challenges which impede research and the definition correlations in this field. Especially in the context of vulnerable migrants returning publications are rare.

In order to understand the diversified process of reintegration better, more research and long-term studies are needed. The small Transnational Exchange III case studies will not be able to contribute comprehensive and quantitatively significant findings but rather point out certain aspects which could be considered when counselling vulnerable returnees. Instead of offering generic advice, the intention of this summary is to make counsellors and reintegration partners more aware of challenges and possible obstacles as well as to add food for thought to the ongoing discussion how vulnerable returnees can be assisted in the best way possible.

2. General structure of case study and guiding questions

The case studies within the Transnational Exchange III project were conducted with an explorative approach and can be seen as qualitative research on the reintegration assistance for vulnerable returnees.

For the case study cooperation agreements with different partners were made. The choice of the six target countries of return which were included in the study was made according to return numbers and return countries of returnees staying in Germany which were by that time not yet part of the ERIN project in order to avoid double funding of return. The following partner organizations joined the project and were ready to assist returnees for the study: AG CARE (Ghana), Caritas Ukraine (Ukraine), Caritas Moscow (Russian Federation), Caritas Liban (Lebanon), Caritas India (India). German counsellors sent a first request to either Micado Migration or to the Transnational Exchange III staff to discuss if the client matched the criteria and could be supported within the framework of the case studies.

After having taken the client’s history, the Transnational Exchange III staff presented the case to the reintegration partner in the country of return and the vulnerability of the potential returnee was discussed. If the reintegration partner accepted to work with the returnee, the return was prepared and a first contact between returnee and reintegration organization before departure was established. In the counselling procedure the main needs and the needed financial assistances were discussed and listed. Within the case studies clients were able to receive a financial assistance up to 2500€. The case studies budget included an option for additional funds for aftercare in case unexpected circumstances occurred or the situation of the returnee deteriorated.

Every counsellor who applied for reintegration support could choose the purpose of the financial assistance:

- Reintegration budget needed for stabilization in the CoR / covering the first needs after arrival
- Reintegration budget needed to develop a long-term perspective in the CoR

The following table shows the purpose and the support category of the reintegration budget of the ten cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim of the financial support</th>
<th>Number of supported return cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stabilization after return</td>
<td>X, X, X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a long-term perspective after return</td>
<td>X, X, X, X, X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support category (multiple categories per case are possible)</th>
<th>Number of supported return cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interim aid</td>
<td>X, X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>X, X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business start-up</td>
<td>X, X, X, X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical care</td>
<td>X, X, X (aftercare), X, X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>X (aftercare)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The partners monitored the reintegration process (two and six months after return). They were also interviewed about the cases by the Transnational Exchange III staff in order to get additional information and expertise. The results of the monitoring, the interviews as well as observations noted by the Trans III staff are summarized in this report. The notes and the audio recording were analyzed following the approach of qualitative content analysis (Philipp Mayering).

The guiding questions for the analysis were the following:

1. Which factors can change the vulnerability after return? What aspects might reinforce the vulnerability of a returnee, which aspects might help the returnee to deal with the vulnerability in the best way possible?
   Are there additional indicators for vulnerability criteria in the specific CoR?

2. What factors enable a sustainable return of vulnerable clients?
   What assistance is needed to build up a long-term perspective in the CoR, what assistance can be considered as bridging the first needs after arrival?
   How and to what extent can vulnerable returnees build up a long-term perspective through business start-ups and other support measures?

The anonymized cases are described in the annex of this summary.

3. Supporting vulnerable returnees: how to find the “right” beneficiary? The challenge of definition and local circumstances

3.1 General definition of vulnerability

Who can be categorized as vulnerable? The English Oxford Dictionary points out that the word “vulnerable” derives from the Latin word “vulnus” meaning wound. It defines “vulnerable” as being “exposed to the possibility of being attacked or harmed, either physical or emotionally”. Vulnerable people are “in need of special care, support, or protection because of age, disability, or risk of abuse or neglect”. In the Decision No 575/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council Article 5 (2) of 23rd of May 2007 the following people were mentioned as vulnerable in the context of return assistance: “minors, unaccompanied minors, disabled people, elderly people, pregnant women, single parents with minor children, and persons who have been subjected to torture, rape or other serious forms of psychological, physical or sexual violence”.

---

2 https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/vulnerable
A more detailed list can be taken from the manual of the ERSO SURE project\(^4\):

- “Children
- Unaccompanied children (UAC)
- Single parents with children
- Elderly people
- Pregnant women
- People with physical disabilities or learning difficulties
- People with physical or mental health problems or illnesses
- People who are expected to face major challenges in reintegrating and finding a sustainable solution due to their individual background (e.g. illiteracy, little education and lack of a social network)
- Traumatized people
- Victims of violence (e.g. persons who have been subjected to torture, rape or other serious forms of psychological, physical or sexual violence)
- Members of specific communities facing repression, prejudice or other forms of discrimination or discriminatory violence in their country of origin
- Women (and men) who are in danger of becoming victims of forced marriages, genital mutilation or trafficking for sex, domestic servitude and/or labour purposes
- Single women/female headed households returning without any family support (to certain countries)

The authors of the manual point out that each returnee should be assessed individually. It is also stated that vulnerability criteria are country-specific. A close cooperation with the reintegration partners is, therefore, recommended.

The selection of vulnerable returnees was based on this definition of vulnerability; nevertheless, the intention of the study was to also include the option of identifying new vulnerability criteria. Noteworthy points are summarized in the following chapters.

3.2 Meeting the vulnerability criteria

*Influencing factors: individual situation, conception in country of return and the family network*

The findings of the case studies indicated that the mentioned definition of vulnerability could be complemented. It clearly showed that the individual assessment is essential for identifying vulnerable clients. Even if a client is categorized as vulnerable according to the definition, it is very important to assess the individual situation: depending on the situation in the country of return (CoR) and the available support in the CoR the client might be less affected by his or her vulnerability. But it is also possible that the individual vulnerability might impair the reintegration procedure to an unexpected high degree. The vulnerability criteria of being a single parent for example can be considered a big challenge if there is no extended family network with relatives in the CoR who are willing to support the single parent; the situation will change completely. The described vulnerability criteria from the manual of the ERSO SURE project can, therefore, differ when applied to individual situations but, of course, also when applied to different countries; without knowing detailed information about the social structure of the society in the CoR and the available support there, it will be difficult for the return counsellor to rate the impact of the vulnerability.

Not only the known facts about the returnee should be considered when assessing the individual vulnerability but also the local context and the conception of the society in the CoR. A European return counselor might assess a client as vulnerable; according to the assessment of the reintegration partner the returnee might not be vulnerable, however. A second example is that an alcohol-dependent person might not be defined as vulnerable if the consumption and misuse of alcohol is commonly accepted and broadly spread in the society in the CoR. Also the definition of “aged” or “elderly person” cannot be commonly agreed upon: the country’s retiring age and the social definition of age differ depending on the CoR.

Vulnerability could be differentiated between “temporary, changing, chance for improving” and “permanent, long lasting, incurable”. The situation of a single parent might change over time when the

---

\(^4\) Caritas Austria, ERSO SURE project *Manual: Reintegration of Disadvantaged and Vulnerable persons in Mongolia, Pakistan and Iraq* April 2014, p.6
children grow older, a physical illness or mental distress could improve and the person recovers. Certain, long-term or chronical illnesses or disabilities, however, remain the same independent from the location (e.g. an amputated limb or terminal cancer).

The main factor attenuating the vulnerability and potential negative effects is the family network. Family members and relatives play a crucial role in the reintegration process. Especially for vulnerable returnees the assistance of the family in the CoR is of great importance (see chapter 4.4).

Aside from that, caring for a vulnerable person renders the entire family vulnerable regardless of the fact whether the family returns with the vulnerable person or the family receives the vulnerable person after return. The vulnerability of one person will add challenges on the reintegration process of the whole family or could create new challenges for the family members who remained in the CoR, maybe already facing hardships and difficulties in the daily life. Taking care of a vulnerable person, for example, might be costly in terms of medicine or doctor’s visits. In most countries the family members or relatives would need to offer finances or practical assistance which might limit their time for income-generating activities for themselves.

### Long absence from the CoR

The manual of the ERSO SURE project also points out that a long absence from the CoR can be considered a vulnerability criterion⁵. A long absence from the CoR can be seen as a strong indicator that the returnee will have problems adapting to and reintegrating in his or her CoR, especially if the person didn’t stay touch with the former social network (see chapter 4.4). Having lived in a different system and culture for an extended period of time, it might be difficult for the person to readjust to the local customs and procedures. Cultural structures and conduct might have changed over the time of absence. “If the person has elder age, it is very difficult for them especially if this person lived many years abroad from Russia. It is very difficult for them to reintegrate in Russia. They live[ed] in one country, but they return to another country” (Interview 4: 16).

Living in a different system in Europe might also change the self-view and expectation of a person: having experienced the provision of a functioning social welfare system, it could pose a great challenge to assume full responsibility for their lives again and not to rely on governmental support anymore:

“Because many of them are coming here from Europe especially if they stay many years there, and they say: ‘the state needs to give me this, this, this. I stayed in Germany for example or Belgium, and there my children have all benefits, I don’t pay for the flat. Why do I need to pay now here in Russia?’ Many of them don’t understand that they don’t have the status of a refugee here. They have only one status: citizen of this country. They need to be responsible” (Interview 4: 57).

But how can long absence from the CoR be defined? The Transnational Exchange III case studies cannot provide an answer to this question, but the different supported return cases (case 3, 8 and 9) hint at the following points:

- Absence is not limited to the years spent in the host country. Clients might have spent years on the move or in other countries. It can therefore be difficult to provide prove for the entire duration of absence if this is necessary for specific funds
- If a person was absent from the CoR for a long period of time but managed to stay in close touch with friends and relatives, to be informed about the current situation in the CoR and to still be involved in the family network, he or she might not be considered vulnerable due to a long absence from the CoR. This vulnerability criterion “long absence of CoR” could better be described as “social and emotional absence from the social network in the CoR”. Not only should the duration of physical absence be considered, but also the degree to which the person is still connected to the social network in the CoR. The case studies showed for example that returnee 8 (6 years absence) was more vulnerable than returnee 9 (27 years absence) and had greater difficulties in the reintegration process.
- A long absence can affect the ability of a person to restart a business or to find work, if jobs are found by pulling strings. Having strong personal connections, which the person might have lost during the stay abroad, is often the only way to find a job in most CoRs.

⁵ ERSO Sure Manual: 9
3.3 The challenge of having evidence

It can be very difficult to provide evidence for certain vulnerability criteria. Often the assessment is based on the details and information provided by the client, e.g. accessibility of family network in CoR, contact to friends and relatives in the CoR. As mentioned beforehand, the family network can make a big difference and attenuate the vulnerability. Nevertheless, it is very difficult or nearly impossible for the counsellor to verify the situation as described by the client: "When the returnee stays abroad from Russia, they can say that they don't have any support in Russia, any relatives, etc. (...) When they come to Russia, we have another story: They have relatives, they have a flat, etc. In this case, the situation changes." (Interview 4:6)

In general, it is challenging to differ between true information and overstatements. People might have been influenced and encouraged to "create stories" which were told to be helpful in the asylum seeking procedure for example. This was underlined in the conducted interviews:

"No, I think, you have to differentiate between the information that they give you guys in Europe. We have this problem ...They come from the Netherlands or other places. For the purpose of getting the paper they tell a lot of things but things are different here." (Interview 2: 151)

A trustful relationship with a counsellor can help to distinguish the "stories" from the real situation and to encourage the client to speak honestly in order to offer the best support, e.g. by contacting the family members before departure.

Under certain circumstance traumatized people or clients with mental health problems might not be able to provide a doctor’s report in the host country to prove their vulnerability: shortage of time, non-availability of medical specialists, lack of trust or shame and fears which might hinder the client to see a doctor. Based on the narrative and the impressions the client is giving in the counselling session the counselor can give a first estimation whether the client is mentally distressed or ill or not and can discuss carefully with the client how she or he feels. In regard to the experience of case 7 the counsellor, working with the client for a longer period of time, was able to detect first signs about the affected mental health and the low subjective well-being of the client. A counsellor could then try to link the client to a professional service, but as described it will often not be possible to get a quick appointment and time can be the most pressing factor when organizing the voluntary return. In these cases it is recommended that the local authorities should extend the preparation time for return to get an official diagnosis. If a diagnosis can’t be provided, the counsellor could document personal statements of the client expressing his or her discomfort as a first documentation of vulnerability.

Especially in regard to mental disorders or stress-related symptoms the situation can change after return when the client finds himself or herself in familiar surroundings and is embedded in a supportive and stable social network again. Several studies have shown in the past that social relationships, particularly family relationships, can have a positive impact on one's mental health if they provide companionship and emotional support. In the return case 7 the client's mental health improved after return:

"He said, while I was there I was not doing well. But now I can eat. He is still skinny [from anorexia]. His situation has improved now." (Interview 2: 160).

---

4. Long-term vs. short term reintegration assistance: factors for a sustainable return of vulnerable clients

This chapter focuses on the findings with regards to the reintegration assistance provided and its impacts. The case studies indicated that aside from the financial assistance the social network is the main factor for a successful reintegration of vulnerable clients. In order to be able to rely on the social network the returnee has to meet the expectations of the remaining family members. How and in which ways this can affect the reintegration process will be described in this part of the findings. The case studies also showed that a careful assessment of the needs and the assistance in the pre-departure phase as well as after return are recommended for vulnerable returnees explicitly.

4.1 Receiver of the assistance

Any kind of reintegration support is specifically allocated to the returnee himself or herself. The returnee either discusses the use of the funds with the return or reintegration counsellor in the pre-departure phase or determines the exact use with the reintegration partner after return. When it comes to the return of vulnerable people, the most beneficial use of the reintegration support seems more challenging, since the finances are usually quite limited. In some cases the vulnerable person might not be able to make good use of the reintegration budget himself or herself. Starting a small income-generating activity might not be possible for a vulnerable person due to his or her physical or mental limitations. In these cases it should be optional to involve another family member (in case of a family returning) and to grant the assistance to him or her. Empowering the “strong” person within the family could lead to a higher chance of financial success and, therefore, be also beneficial for the vulnerable returnee. This option is only feasible, however, if the reintegration budget is not being spent on necessary life-sustaining medication.

Still, the following questions remain:
- How to ensure that the person assisted will take care of the vulnerable member after return?
- Should the entire family be considered vulnerable officially because the responsibility for the vulnerable person leads to a higher vulnerability of the family members (additional expenditures, limitation in the choice of housing, care taking instead of paid work)?
- How can family members in the CoR be involved in that?
- Could the financial assistance rather be a way to help the vulnerable person to become a shareholder of an already existing business in the CoR than starting a business for him or herself?

4.2 Purpose of the assistance

How to define needs: expectations and social desirability

The definition of needs and the allocation of the financial support before the actual return is a difficult task. Nevertheless, in most cases (if not ERIN) it is required that the returnee is making a choice how the funds should be spent. What makes it so difficult to decide about the use of the funds prior to departure?
- Returnees might not be fully aware of the situation in the country or struggle to imagine their personal situation after return. Non-substantiated expectations lead to false assumptions of needs. After return, the client might find himself or herself in a different situation than expected: “Because he returned with his wife, he didn’t expect that he cannot obtain the full help from the state right away” (Interview 4: 22).
- Aside from that, returnees might chose a destination for return where they expect a better living situation. This can be a false estimation: “They thought, it will be easier to live in xxx region because it is really big city. So it will be easy to find the psychologist. Because as I told, they have no friends or relatives in xxx region and also not at first in the xxx region. They just thought it would be easier to work and live in xxx region.” (Interview 3:95)
- Certain reintegration measures can only be planned after return: choosing a therapist for example in a case of mental disorder can’t be done prior departure since it requires a personal contact, understanding and a bond of trust.

Besides the financial assistance the partners in the CoR are able to offer a variety of services and counselling. The returnees might not be aware of the services provided in the CoR and therefore will not announce such a need prior to departure. These additional services could help the returnee to
reintegrate more easily or to reconnect with the family network if the reintegration partner is offering counselling for the family members as well. The reintegration partners emphasized that the financial assistance can only be seen as one part of a successful reintegration assistance: “It has its own part. Not everything. It helps but it is not everything. The counselling, talking to them and the social support also help here.” (Interview 2: 11). Additional services may include counselling, connecting the client to other services like child care, home care for elderly, but also providing extra training or connecting to potential business-partners. “If we feel, the person is willing to listen to us, we usually make connection to this person to work with them in the area of marketing and the different skills needed to sell the product.” (Interview 2: 38)

Nevertheless, only few returnees from the Transnational Exchange III case studies made use of this additional assistance. One reintegration partner described the situation as following:

O.: We always try push if they ask us for help and provide it. In most cases the person just wants to receive financial support. This is a really big problem.

Trans III: So you would say that you as an organization have more to offer, you could give more assistance but most of the time the returnees only want the money.

O.: Yes, yes, yes. We can provide such big amount of different services. But if the person doesn’t want to, we cannot force them to receive it. (Interview 3: 27)

Further studies could focus on the expectations of the returnees regarding the support of the reintegration partner and potential barriers hindering returnees from making better use of these provided opportunities.

In two cases (case 4 and 6) financial assistance was requested to cover the needs of children (therapy, kindergarten); after return the returnees discussed with the partners how they could instead spend more money on accommodation than on therapy or kindergarten. In case 2 the family never mentioned any needs for tutoring of the children in the pre-departure counselling, but after arriving in the CoR the children were not able to attend school directly and the family requested additional assistance. According to the reintegration partner the family was aware of the situation of the children and the expected difficulties, but before departure the focus of the family was a business start-up.

The case study wants to emphasize the influence of social desirability but also the impacts of the hierarchy of needs when the purpose of financial assistance is discussed with a client. As the examples show clients will not always speak openly about their needs. Either the needs are not yet known or pushed to the back of the returnee’s mind or perhaps they were not mentioned in the presence of the counsellor due to the so called Social-Desirability-Response-Set. Returnees are often very aware of the system on the host country and the terms of conditions for social support. If the counsellor discusses the vulnerability of the client, there is a high chance that the client will react in the way he or she feels is appropriate or expected. The client might think that it is viewed favorably by the counselor if the returnee is focused on support for medical treatment, therapy and others instead of basic needs.

After return the basic needs usually are considered a higher priority. For case 4 the reintegration partner described the needs of the returned family as following:

O: I think, you made the right choice because if they use the funds within the scale of rent. Later I don’t think that they will try to find some funds for the therapy for the psychologist. But this is just my thought.

Trans III: When you talk to the family, I mean, you also discussed with them the procedure of finding a therapist, they never said “Ok, the therapy is not so important to us.” Or “The therapy is important to us but we need to cover our basic needs such as rent or food”. Did you never talk about this?

O: I talked about it. But first of all they want to find funds to cover the basic needs and after they will find the psychologist. I can understand them. (Interview 3: 115)

4.3 Financial assistance: a drop in the bucket or a stepping stone?

One guiding question for the case studies was asking what kind of assistance is needed to create a long-term perspective in the CoR and what kind of assistance can be considered as interim aid. Analyzing the cases, four main conclusions were drawn:

- Financial assistance for accommodation helps returnees to have an easier start and provides a “safe place to start from”
In cases of long-lasting vulnerabilities, especially in cases of medical needs, the financial assistance can only bridge the first gap. Linking the returnee to available structures in the CoR is essential. The payment procedure for disbursing the financial assistance can differ and force the returnee to rely on other financial help in the first months after arrival. Without having relationships in the CoR, this can be difficult. Business start-ups can work out even for vulnerable returnees but is not the standard.

**Accommodation**

As mentioned in the introduction three cases requested support for accommodation. During the monitoring interview it was confirmed that accommodation is essential for the reintegration process. Governmental support usually requires an address and a registration of the client before it is accessible. The search for cheap accommodation causes extreme stress and problems for the returnee, for example, if he or she has to move several times before being able to settle. Moving can impede access to doctors or medical services.

Case 9 spent a bigger part of the reintegration budget on accommodation: “That was a big relief in terms of reintegrating them because they were assured that they would get at least one year accommodation.” (Interview 1: 17). In his case the returnee used part of his personal savings to cover rent for another year. In knowing that he would have a place to stay for the next two years, he felt able to focus on other aspects of reintegration such as work or health. The importance of accommodation was underlined by other cases: "This financial support really gives a push right after return so they can start for example to rent some flat so they can already think about the future." (Interview 3: 17)

In three cases (case 4, 5, 6) the monitoring reports showed that housing remained a challenge even six months after return. The high rental prices still placed a great burden on them.

**Availability of support structures in the CoR**

The case studies also indicated that several aspects regarding medical care are recommended to be discussed in the pre-departure counselling:

- Certain vulnerability criteria will not change over time or cannot be attenuated by once-only payments like the reintegration budget. Especially chronically ill returnees (such as cases 5, 10) use the reintegration budget to cover costs for medical treatment or medication after return. The reintegration budget is usually intended to be spent within the first six months of return but the need for medicine may not be consistent or the medication can’t be bought and stored at once due to the expiration date. In cases of chronically ill persons returning the category "medical care" is usually a short-term reintegration measure. For a long-term perspective it is necessary to link the returnee to the local health system and to use the governmental health system. Sometimes the reintegration budget can be useful to provide a quicker access to the health care system or to receive private medical care until the governmental system can be accessed (after a certain waiting period). Detailed information and knowledge shared by reintegration partner prior to the return helps the returnees to be better prepared and to be more aware of the challenges in the health system as well of the expected costs. Sometimes returnees do not anticipate minor health problem to become a big challenge after return or the minor health problem was not at the center of attention while preparing the return due to the numerous other tasks. Two returnees mentioned during the monitoring: “I did not budget for my medical expense which is now posing a challenge to my finances” (Monitoring case 8). “His knee problems were not an issue in the pre-departure phase” (Interview 1:178).

- The availability of family members and their resources need to be discussed; if the governmental structure in the CoR is not able to provide extensive care for the explicit health problem, the family will become a crucial factor. Also the expected life span can become part of the discussion: "For example if the doctor says, it is impossible to help people and he has for example one or two years of life, I think, it is better for people to return. In the same time it depends on the situation of the family. Many family cannot receive sick parents or people" (Interview 4: 131).
How to cover the time until the funds are disbursed?

The first idea for the case studies included a payment arrangement as lump sums. The lump sums should enable the client to spend the reintegration budget in a more flexible way and according to the needs as well as to reduce the administrative procedure for the accountability on the side of the reintegration partner. The reintegration partners, however, insisted on keeping the regular procedure of reimbursing the payments.

The partners stated that the preliminary payments were not too burdensome for the clients as assumed.

“No. No we didn't have because with Mr. I. I paid and got his receipt and came to the office on the same day, twenty-first of December last year, and I reimbursed him the same day.” (Interview 1: 41)

“If the individual does not have money to pay the finance, they always bring the invoice of which we write the check to the supplier. But where the returnee has money to do it, they pay it and we give refunds”. (Interview 1: 51)

“So far from our experience the returnees usually find the funds. So far we didn't have the problem.” (Interview 2: 17)

Nevertheless, counsellors should take into account that this procedure can be challenging for people without a strong social network from which they can borrow money. They will have to rely on other sources to pre-finance the reintegration assistance and might end up paying interest rates for credits.

“If the person trusts us or if the person has no own costs or friends, relatives, he or she can just borrow some money after we can reimburse them. It depends on the trust”. (Interview 3: 54)

Beside the internal arrangement on how the reintegration budget is distributed the payment procedure can be highly affected by national regulations. Counselors need to be aware about the regulations in the CoR and how they will affect the payment procedure of the reintegration budget. The reintegration budget for the returnees to the Russian Federation could only be disbursed after six months of return for example. Returnees would have to pay a higher tax (non-citizen income tax) if they wanted to receive the financial assistance directly after return. These regulations can make the first steps after return very difficult. In other countries like Ukraine the reintegration assistance is legally regarded as income which is therefore subject to taxation. So in some cases a payment prior to the departure could enable the client to receive more financial assistance compared to the amount he or she would be able to receive in the CoR.

The case studies also showed that for long-term needs like therapy it is very difficult to arrange the payment procedure: it might be necessary to have a contract with the local therapist and to determine the duration of the therapy and the payment intervals.

Business start ups

Business start-ups are an option for vulnerable returnees to support themselves after return. The Transnational Exchange III project organized a workshop about this specific topic in June 2017 and the specific challenges for this target group were discussed in detail (see homepage of the project). It is understandable that depending on the vulnerability criterion a business start-up is in certain cases more reasonable than in others. As described in chapter 4.1 this kind of assistance might require the inclusion of additional business partners or the need to change the receiver of the assistance towards a less limited family member. Joining an already existing business can be an effective way to create a positive financial perspective after return:

Trans III: So they started a cooperation because Mr. I brought the money and the other person had the skills?
G.: the other person has the skills. Mr. I has the skills but he was not familiar with the terrain in Ghana. So I has taken him as somebody to work with. He is now helping him, even when they want to buy the tools, he went with him and they went and then they selected those ones good for the Ghanaian environment and then they brought the invoices (Interview 1: 154)

The case studies confirmed several commonly known challenges when it comes to business start-ups:
- A business plan in the pre-departure phase can only be considered a first draft. The detailed information needs to be filled in by the reintegration partner and discussed after return. In the cases 1 and 2 the idea for the business was discussed before departure, but the detailed plan could only be made after return (availability of detailed information, bargaining, etc.). Some clients might be able to prepare a very detailed plan for their business (for example case 7)
but most of the people are not experienced as entrepreneurs. Also the “language” of the business plan is challenging; European counsellors might expect a detailed description of risks and factors of success whereas the returnee will only provide a rough outline of the business idea. A reintegration partner with international experience will be able to bridge the gap and to “translate” the expectation regarding the business plan for the client.

- The funds must often be determined in advance without having the detailed business plan available.
- For preparing a business plan before departure it is necessary to have detailed information about the expected costs in the CoR. Depending on the source of the information these details might not be reliable and revisable.
- When discussing business plans of returnees, the success of a business is hard to tell beforehand and requires the experience and assessment of the local partner.

To become more than just a drop in the bucket, the financial assistance needs to be embedded in the greater context of available support structures in the CoR. The support structures not only include the structures provided by the government, the reintegration partner and other NGOs but also provided by the family network. The family network is the basis for a successful reintegration.

“Social networks are very important for the person who reintegrates apart from the help he received from the professional counsellor. The family helped him a lot. This next kin helped him a lot to connect. And now he starts to join the communities”. (Interview 2:64)

The following chapter summarizes the indicators for this assumption taken from the case studies.

4.4 Social network

What kind of help is provided by the social network?

The following description was taken from the monitoring report of case 9 and gives a very lively description of the way the family was part of the reintegration process as well as what was needed to be able to rely on the family:

“The community was happy upon seeing him because they were not expecting to see him after several years of absence. The community according to him requested that he settles with them in the village, but he opted to stay in A. and assured them he will be visiting them intermediately likewise his biological mother and siblings could not express their joy upon seeing him. The family and community expectations were to see him one day alive and healthy. The returnee has successfully connected to his mother and the extended family as well as friends and some former professional colleagues he worked with prior to his migration. They are assisting him to link up to lost friends. Out of that social network, he got his current accommodation. He was allowed to live in it before the funds were made available for payment. He also has his nephew living close to him in the neighborhood who also gives him all the necessary assistance when there is a need. He took the initiative to contact AG Care and informed them of his arrival in Ghana. he took the step to visit his hometown K. visit his family and friends, his acceptance to meet with the medical doctor arranged for him (Monitoring form case 9)"

The family in this case helped the returnee to find accommodation, to arrange appointments for his medical treatment prior to return and to link him to other people in the community who became his business partners. Especially if people need medical care and the governmental health system is limited, the family plays an important role; in general, it can be concluded that in countries with low or without any social security systems the family is the main guarantor for social security. Especially vulnerable returnees rely heavily on the family network:

“So if the biggest reason to return is if they have relatives. Anyway the elderly will receive state pension but again it only covers basic needs. If something bad happens, medical problems, without relatives or friends, it will be really bad situation.” (Interview 3: 198).

“Where the family attends to your vulnerability it actually reduces to the minimum. But where the family rejects due to the vulnerability, it increases.” (Interview 1:5)

Due to urbanization and social changes (marriage patterns, importance of kinship and extended family networks) family networks are shaking up drastically. Still, it is important to take a close look at the mechanisms, the role and the characteristics of family networks. Several migration studies confirmed the important role of the family for emigration as well as for arrival and integration in the country of destination but only little research focused on the impact of the family for return migration,
reintegration and re-emigration. This summary will not provide elaborate answers for this topic but rather raise questions for further research and emphasize on the importance and influence of the interpersonal social networks across borders.

How to remain part of the social network?

The social network as described above “involve(s) information, assistance and obligation and impact both individuals and groups. The participation of individuals in social networks may be a source of social capital (…) individual migrants benefit from their involvement in social networks by gaining access to social capital which may be converted in other forms of capital, notably financial and human capital”. According to this definition the social network involves obligations and conditions to get access to the social capital.

As described in the beginning of this chapter it is important for migrants to stay in touch with the relatives in the CoR on a regular basis. Even if the returnee lost touch with the family members, he or she could try to reactivate the family ties before returning. In the return case the returnee supported his family members financially and offered emotional assistance in form of pieces of advice. The family members stated that he was very supportive and stayed in touch with the network even from abroad. In his case the family expected less money and gifts from him.

The case studies showed that the expectations from the family members can be very challenging for the returnee and prevent him or her from reconnecting with the family network. The following statements illustrate that obstacle:

“You see, in both cases it is expectations. Both families expected them to return with more, coming back with 5000 Euros. They expected a lot from them. That expectation usually plays against them – against their reintegration process. But the returnee didn’t really have enough to meet the expectations – financially and other things” (Interview 2: 70)

“The expectation is huge, no matter of you have a loan or not. They see you as a failure. That you come back with really nothing. 3000 or 4000€ is nothing. They expect more from you. (…) You will be excluded from celebrations…They think you are hiding something. How come you didn’t come back with a 100000 Euros. That is what they think” (Interview 2: 178)

This expectation of receiving something is not only articulated by close family members but can also be expressed by the community and distant relatives who are demanding gifts and money.

“But the issue was the social expectation. People asked him: Oh you have come. When are you going back? Which he didn’t like. The second thing was also: Oh, you have come back. What did you bring for me? As a result he just stayed away for one month. He was indoors. He didn’t go anywhere. Until that time he felt like he should be going to the mosque. (Interview 1: 118)

“There are still some family members he hasn’t gone to to say hello. Because he feels when he goes there, they will definitely demand something from him and he is not financially sound to visit them. So he has not visited him. These are the challenges when it comes to the social network” (Interview 1:128).

What are strategies to meet these expectations and to get reconnected?

In three cases from the case studies the returnee received help from a family member who acted as a “reconnector” or intermediary. This person might be the one talking to the other family members and explaining the situation of the returnee, the difficulties he or she faced while living abroad and why the expectations cannot be met: “His uncle helped him a lot to reintegrate. to come back to the system by talking to him and by explaining what happened to him. His past, the route to take to Sudan, packing up and arriving in Germany.” (Interview 2:75).

---

7 Fleischer, Annett: The role of the family for return migration, reintegration and re-emigration in Armenia. 2012. https://iuspp.org/sites/default/files/event_call_for_papers/The%20role%20of%20family%20%20for%20return%20migration%2C%20reintegration%20and%20re-emigration%20in%20Armenia_Fleischer.pdf:
8 See above
Determining factors for the success of the intermediary as well as for the returnee to reconnect can be:

- **Time factor:**
  The family realizes after a while that the person has come back for good and will not re-migrate. "It was time, anyhow. He had to accept himself because the expectation was there already. He can’t do anything about the family. He gradually has to talk to them. As time goes, they start understand him. He cannot change anything. If things are working for him, it will be better. A reality, the family just has to accept" (Interview 2:82)

- **Expectations in rural area vs. urban area and better understanding of the migration process:**
  According to the reintegration partner in Ethiopia people in the urban area might be less demanding and might have a better understanding for the reasons the returnee came back with less money than expected: "When he is in the town, people understand more you and you can easily return to the community. But in the rural areas here it is difficult to reintegrate. They don’t understand, you are a failure until you proof that …Now he is doing his business and shows that he can work" (Interview 2:96).

- **Proof of a different kind of success:**
  To debilitate the prejudice of being a failure, the returnee has to establish a successful business. Returning empty-handed is usually equated with laziness and incapability.

- **Migration experience:**
  If a family member has migration experience, he or she will understand the returnee better and will also be able to explain the situation to the other family members in a better way: “For what I understand this person is better off, he also has some experience of living abroad and he is better off financially. He has also been away, he lived in the States. He understands the situation far more better than the rest of the family living in the rural areas” (Interview 2: 98).

- **Extended family network:**
  Not only close family members can be a resource, but also the extended family can be involved: “He does not have biological children; he does not have a wife. But at least the extended family he does. So his own mother is still alive. His sister’s and his brother’s children are also around and they were actually those who came with him [to see the reintegration partner]” (Interview 1: 76).

- **Being prepared for the reentry ceremony in the community:**
  The returnee could calculate before departure what kind of “social costs” might be necessary to meet the expectations of the family members and the community upon first encounter: ‘Gifts as well as paying for drinks, bottles of water. (…) Because the wife didn’t have enough money so he has to cover those costs. People come to your home and you need to understand that when somebody comes from far place, a lot of friends and family come and visit you and there are some costs for that. They come to your home and you feed them. There are all sorts of costs “(Interview 2:134).

One needs to be aware that these kinds of expectations and mechanisms in the family network are not universal but could strongly differ. When forwarding the question to the reintegration partner in the Ukraine, a surprising answer was given leading to further research questions about the country-specific access to social capital:

*Trans III:* I hear all the time that the returnees need to depend on their social network. The question is: What kind of expectations do families or does the social network have whenever a returnee comes back from Europe?

*O:* There is not a problem. (…) for Ukraine.

*Trans III:* The family is happy to take them in no matter if they come with empty hands?

*O:* No matter. Even the family invested money, they will receive them without any hesitation”. (Interview 3: 209)

This point of view might be based on the fact that migration is very common in Ukraine. For many families migration is a way to improve the financial situation and material status. In general, the economic situation in Ukraine is challenging and people might struggle to cover their basic needs. Therefore the migrant is expected to provide additional income – in case of failure the migrant is still an accepted member of the family with rights and obligations and is welcomed by the family again.
5. Challenge of working internationally: when a simple task becomes a giant endeavor

The case studies included a close cooperation with the reintegration partner in the CoR. This chapter highlights challenges which arose during the cooperation and the assistance of the cases. Naming these challenges shall raise awareness for the difficulties of working internationally as well as for a better understanding of how clients can be accompanied throughout the return and reintegration procedure when several parties (the returnee, the return counsellor, the mediator and the reintegration partner) are involved.

The courses of action might be specific to the operational structure of the case studies (counsellor contacts project workers, project workers take over the case and hand it over to the reintegration partner, counsellor remains involved to create the contact between returnee and reintegration partner), but nevertheless could show up in different constellations when it comes to international cooperation.

5.1 Communication and basis for decision making

Determining the purpose and use of the reintegration assistance is only possible with the assessment of the reintegration partner. The following challenges arose during the decision making process:

- The prospects of a business start-up are difficult to determine in the host country. It requires trust in the experience of the partner and in the assessment of the partner. A business plan will also not enable the return counsellor to judge the prospects of success due to many unknown factors in the CoR. The reintegration partner relies heavily on past experience and more detailed information about the situation in the country – but the return counsellor might be expected to give evidence or detailed information to the donor why the business is considered to be successful. This evidence is hard to provide if the decision to fund the business start-up relies mainly on the experience of the reintegration partner.
- Reintegration partners usually work with different partners from the sending countries. Therefore, they are confronted with different requests and procedures which are time-consuming and costly in terms of labor. Resulting from the high work load the reintegration partner might lack time for a detailed response and assessment of the returnee’s case. The expectations of the elaborateness of the responses might differ between return counsellor and reintegration partner.
- Additional information might be needed for a detailed assessment of the case. It can be difficult to arrange who will be responsible for providing the information e.g. about costs of medicine: the local partner might have the better and faster access to practical firsthand information but the return counsellor might be forced to hand in estimates of costs from the pharmacy, the hospital, the landlord, the wholesaler, etc.

5.2 Differing administrative structures and time

Differing administrative structures can be challenging for a cooperation in the field of return: the kind of documentation demanded in each organization might be different, also the requested evidence can vary. Especially if a reintegration partner is working with different European partners in various programs the partner might be confronted with very different templates and administrative demands. The transfer of funds can also add some challenges: international financial transactions can pose many possible pitfalls (necessary bank information, transfer costs, money-laundering-laws, etc.; during Workshop II of the Transnational Exchange III Project these practical issues of reintegration assistance were discussed in detail).

Sometimes it might be necessary for the returnee to open an account in the CoR before receiving the reintegration funds. This could also take lot of time depending on the requirements and needed documents. If clients expect a quick transfer of the funds and are confronted with a delay due to the mentioned reasons, the client might repeatedly contact the return counsellor about the procedure instead of trusting the information given by the reintegration partner. In general, returnees tend to contact the return counsellor in the host country if things do not work out.
5.2 Hand over: how to manage the shift from return counsellor towards reintegration partner

In several cases the returnees turned to the European return counsellor after arriving in the CoR, which created misunderstandings and unnecessary work. Although it was discussed prior departure that the reintegration partner in the CoR will be the contact person for the continuing procedure, some clients still approached the return counsellor in the host country first. In three cases the returnees requested a quicker payment of the reintegration funds or doubted the length of the payment procedure or the taxation rules. It was necessary to clearly confirm the role of the reintegration partner in these cases and to emphasize on the close contact between return counsellor and reintegration partner so that the returnee could accept the responsibility of the reintegration partner in the further procedure.

As phone call with the reintegration partner prior departure can help to build trust and to ensure the returnee that the reintegration partner will take over the case after return. Hereby it can also be helpful if the return counsellor can bring in personal experience with the reintegration partner to strengthen the trust.

In two cases the returnees had difficulties reaching the partner organization after arrival in the CoR. This situation and the uncertainty of receiving the funds led to frequent phone calls to the return counsellor and the project worker in Germany. Providing different contact details and phone numbers helped to solve these situations.

6. Suggestions for pre-departure counsellors

Based on the observations and findings from the case studies the following advice can be suggested to pre-departure counsellors. The advice should be seen as an option and as suggestions and can be applied when desired. In general, the following statements shall mainly raise awareness about certain challenges and offer practical suggestions.

Vulnerability and social network

- The individual vulnerability of a client should be discussed with the local partners in detail. A client may be vulnerable, even if he or she does not meet the established criteria of vulnerability (e.g. definition of elderly person, definition of single parent).

- In case of a chronically ill client it is essential to overhaul the possibilities of the health care system and to get the confirmation of family members to fill the gaps of the public health system.

- The social network is crucial for a successful reintegration. If the returnee alleges to not have a social network in the CoR anymore, the return and reintegration counsellor should encourage the client to rekindle old relationships. The counsellor could also suggest the returnee to think of family members or friends who used to live abroad or have some sort of migration experience since they might be more understanding of the return and the struggle abroad. This person could mediate between the returnee and the remaining family.

- Questions about the need of paying back money to family members or the expectations of family members can be sensitive, but the topic should be addressed during the counselling session: what is required to become part of the family network again? Might it be necessary to use part of the reintegration funds to meet these expectations in order to be accepted by the family network again?
The counsellor should double-check with the partner about income or donation taxation. The local taxation might reduce the reintegration budget noticeably which in turn the returnee needs to be prepared for.

- The counsellor should talk to the returnee about the length and procedure of registering in the country of return. Being registered is usually the precondition for social benefits and support.

- The counsellor needs to be aware of the returnee having to cover basic needs first after return. Secondary needs such as therapy or non-life-sustaining treatments or business start-ups will only be dealt with by the returnee after the basic or primary needs are taken care of. This renders the question of how the reintegration budget should be spent. If possible, it is recommended to keep the purpose of the reintegration funds quite flexible to enable the returnee and the reintegration partner to tend to the practical needs after return.

- Keeping the concept of social desirability in mind is the first step to distinguish expressed needs from real needs and to detect discrepancies.

- The counsellor should ask the reintegration partner to talk to the returnee about rental prices and provide him or her with current information. Housing is one of the basic needs. If a returnee cannot live with a family member, rent will be the greatest challenge.

- The counsellor should encourage the returnee to really make use of the offers of the reintegration partner and not to use the reintegration partner only as financial disbursement center.

- If possible business plans should be kept quite flexible – in most cases they will be adjusted after the return, therefore a first draft prior to departure is more recommendable than an elaborate plan, especially if the client needs a lot of assistance from the counsellor to do so.

7. Topics for further research and case studies

As described in the introduction chapter reintegration can be considered a diversified process. Due to the explorative approach of the case studies the findings naturally lead to further questions. This final chapter points out topics for further research without claiming those topics to be unnoted so far.

- "More than disbursing funds": how can returnees be encouraged to make better or full use of the opportunities and services reintegration partners provide? What are potential barriers, what are the expectations of the clients towards the reintegration partners? And finally, what kind of support do reintegration partners need in order to provide services as best as possible?

- Family network and expectations: the case studies showed that expectations from the side of family members might differ depending on the CoR, the living situation (urban, rural) and other factors. Further studies could focus on the factors favoring the re-entry into the family network and the regional distinctions. The presumption of feelings of shame and failure as a part of return could also be analyzed in this context.

- Family network and the burden of integrating a returnee: especially in vulnerable cases a returnee might heavily rely on the support of the family. The impacts and challenges of reintegrating a vulnerable family member for the family in the CoR could be explored further. Also the expected changes due to urbanization and changes of family pattern can be topics for further studies.

- Prospects of success: in five cases the reintegration assistance was used for business start-ups: What are influencing factors and what makes the business successful? What hindered
people to start a similar business before the migration process or what convinced them to open the business after return?

Annex: Description of cases

Case 1: Wife with disabled husband and three children returning to Chechnya (Russian Federation)
Mrs. M. spent almost four years with her disabled husband (hemiplegia, mental instability) and her three children (16 years, 12 years, 1 year) in Germany before she decided to return to Chechnya. She became vulnerable due to her family setting and is dependent on support. As the sole breadwinner of the family she has to provide for the general expenses of her entire family as well as for the rehabilitation of her husband after return. Her return and reintegration counsellor applied for 2500€ for a business start-up for cattle-raising with the focus on supporting Mrs. M. with creating a long-term perspective after return.
After return Mrs. M. used 2250€ to purchase two cows and two calves to start the cattle-raising. During the monitoring she mentioned that she was in great need of an electrical wheel chair for her husband and that she had to pay for tutoring and books for her kids before they could enter school. Therefore, the Transnational Exchange III reintegration budget was extended to 3000€ (500€ aftercare). With the remaining 750€ a used electrical wheel chair was bought.

Case 2: Disabled man (leg amputation, degree of disability: 70%) with wife and two children returning to Chechnya (Russian Federation)
Mr. M. spent one and a half years in Germany with his family before he decided to return. His return and reintegration counsellor applied for 2175€ for cattle-raising with the intention to enable Mr. M. to build a long-term future in his home country. Mr. M. grew up on a farm and possesses extensive knowledge about cattle farming. He wanted start the farm with his wife after return splitting the tasks into administrative and strategic parts, which he took care of, and manual tasks, which were covered by his wife.
After return Mr. M. arranged for two cows, two bulls and three calves to be purchased. During the monitoring Mr. M. explained the unexpected high costs for tutoring of his children. They could not enter school due to differences in the schooling program and lack of Russian language command. Therefore, Mr. M. was granted 500€ aftercare to cover the fees for tutoring for his children.

Case 3: Man with long absence of country of origin returning to Ethiopia
Mr. B. left Ethiopia in 2006 in order to find work and a better life – first in Sudan, then in Libya and finally in Germany. In 2017, he decided to return voluntarily due to the lack of a future perspective in Germany after 11 years of absence from his home country. He did not stay in touch with his family and the village which rendered him without a social network. His return and reintegration counsellor applied for 500€ interim aid and for 2000€ for a brick manufacturing business since he had gained working experience in this field of work in Sudan.
After return he managed to spend the reintegration budget as planned and opened the brick manufacturing business successfully.

Case 4: Traumatized child returning to Ukraine with parents
The boy D. fled with his parents from the inner Ukrainian conflict to the Netherlands in 2014. While seeking asylum there, the boy was kidnapped from day care and raped for the production of pornographic material. The boy was returned on the same day of the kidnapping according to the parents. A Dutch psychiatrist confirmed the trauma resulting from the rape. The parents did not feel safe anymore in the Netherlands and fled to Germany. The family did not have the legal right to stay in Germany and decided to return voluntarily to Ukraine rather than returning to the Netherlands. The parents were highly overwhelmed and concerned about the health of their son and requested reintegration assistance in form of therapy. The return and reintegration counsellor, therefore, applied for 2500€ medical assistance.
After return the family struggled to find adequate housing and work since they did not have a social network to rely on. This is why they requested the reintegration budget to be reassigned to 1000€ for therapy and 1500€ for rent. In total, the family moved three times after return before they could settle down. It was also very challenging to find an appropriate psychiatrist who would work with the child and accept the cooperation condition of the reintegration partner. Almost ten months after return an apt psychiatrist was found and the therapy began.
Case 5: Man with terminal prostate cancer returning to Russia

Mr. M. came to Germany in 2015 in order to receive better treatment for his terminal illness (prostate cancer). Even though the medical care was better in Germany, he decided to return in 2017 because he missed his family and his health would never restore. The return and reintegration counsellor applied for 2500€ for medical treatment and medication.

After return the health of Mr. M. deteriorated and he spent several months in hospital. Nevertheless, he said that return was the right choice. The reintegration partner could help him to see the necessary doctors quickly. The reintegration budget was spent as planned.

Case 6: Single mother with two children returning to Ukraine

In 2016, Mrs. P. came to seek a better life in Germany for herself and her children (3 years, 1 year). Due to the lack of perspective she decided to return voluntarily to Ukraine a year later. She did not have a supportive family to which she could return. Her return and reintegration counsellor, therefore, applied for 300€ interim aid, 2080€ rental money and 120€ child care money.

After return Mrs. P. told the reintegration counsellor that she struggled to pay rent and that she would like to use the child care money also for rent, which was granted. Therefore, she received 300€ interim aid and 2200€ for rent. Even after the reintegration budget was spent, she was still not well integrated and would have needed a lot more support.

Case 7: Man with anorexia and depression returning to Ethiopia

In 2015, Mr. G. arrived in Germany fleeing political persecution. Despite his high level of education he was not able to work in Germany while still going through the asylum seeking procedure. He fell ill emotionally not bearing the living circumstance in Germany and missing his family. Therefore, he decided to return to Ethiopia. His return and reintegration counsellor applied for 2500€ for a jewelry production and sales business for him. He taught himself the technique of jewelry production through youtube and wrote a detailed business plan of how he wanted to realize his business idea.

After return the money was spent as planned.

Case 8: Man with long absence of home country returning to Ghana

After six years of staying in Germany Mr. I. decided he wanted to return to his home country because he did not have a future in Germany. His immediate family had died and he did not stay in contact with other family members and friends because he wanted to hide the fact that he was not doing well in Europe.

His return and reintegration counsellor applied for 2500€ for a welding shop since he had acquired welding skills even before his departure to Europe.

After return he found a skilled welder and opened a shop with him together. The reintegration budget was spent as planned.

Case 9: Elderly man with Asthma and a long absence of home country returning to Ghana

Mr. M. left his home country 27 years ago. He suffered from asthma and several age-related illnesses with 65 years. He did not want to continue living as a rejected asylum seeker in Germany anymore even though it meant he would give up sufficient medical care. He stayed in touch with his family and wanted to spend the last years of his life with them. His return and reintegration counsellor applied for 500€ interim aid for food for the first months after return, 1000€ for rent, since rent is the biggest challenge in Accra (Ghana) and 1000€ for medication in order for him to be safe medically as long as possible.

After return the reintegration budget was spent as planned and it was sufficient.

Case 10: Mr. Y and Mrs. Y, an elderly couple with health-related medical issues returning to Ukraine

The elderly couple Mr. Y and Mrs. Y spent a little over three years in Germany with their daughter. They wanted to spend their last couple of years, especially Mr. M.’s health was really instable, in Ukraine. This is why the reintegration counsellor applied for 1300€ for medication. 650€ were spent on medication for six months in Germany, the rest was spent on medication for another six months.
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