

# Serbia and Montenegro

## Main objectives

### Serbia and Montenegro (SCG)

In 2005 UNHCR's objectives were to continue to advise the Government on the adoption of national legislation on asylum and the creation of a national asylum system in the two constituent Republics (Serbia and Montenegro) and at the State Union level, in cooperation with other relevant actors; promote and assist the voluntary repatriation of refugees to Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) and Croatia and maintain a regional dialogue on the issue; provide assistance to the most vulnerable refugees; facilitate the local integration of refugees unable or unwilling to return; facilitate, where possible, the voluntary return of internally displaced persons (IDPs) to the province of Kosovo; promote respect for the rights of IDPs, in particular through the development of an inter-agency strategy to support UNHCR's gaps analysis on IDPs in Serbia and Montenegro; provide and advocate for basic humanitarian assistance to the most vulnerable IDPs; and ensure a gradual and responsible phase-down of assistance to "Dayton refugees" by ensuring their inclusion in development programmes implemented by the Government, national NGOs and international agencies as well as through bilateral arrangements, e.g. in housing, socio-economic integration and microcredit.

### Kosovo

UNHCR's main objectives in Kosovo in 2005 were to contribute towards the creation of conditions which would prevent further displacement of minorities in Kosovo, and facilitate the voluntary return and sustainable reintegration of minority IDPs and refugees back home; monitor and supervise the prospects for safe and dignified return and sustainable reintegration of ethnic minorities in Kosovo, enabling refugees and IDPs to make an informed decision on whether or not to return to their homes or to settle elsewhere; and identify and facilitate



the attainment of the most appropriate durable solutions for refugees from The former Yugoslav Republic (fYR) of Macedonia, BiH and Croatia; develop an appropriate legal and institutional framework for the treatment and protection of third country nationals who are seeking asylum in Kosovo; and integrate the gender and age perspective through all advocacy, protection and operational activities, factoring in protection and programme strategies by identifying and addressing protection gaps, as well as age and gender-based opportunities and constraints impacting durable solutions.

## Impact

### Serbia and Montenegro

- UNHCR actively contributed to the drafting of the Framework Law on Asylum adopted by the SCG Parliament in March 2005. The Framework Law lays down the basic principles of refugee protection, and the rights and obligations of asylum-seekers and

refugees, as well as minimum procedural safeguards of asylum. However, the enforcement of legislation, the establishment of adequate structures and the identification of refugee status determination (RSD) competencies are to be devolved to the level of the two constituent Republics. Thus, the Framework Law has no direct executive powers and is therefore not in itself a comprehensive solution. The draft Law on Asylum of the Republic of Serbia is expected to come into effect in early 2006. The draft Montenegrin Law on Asylum was finalized and its adoption by the Parliament is expected in 2006.

- At the end of 2005, there were approximately 148,000 refugees in Serbia and Montenegro, according to the preliminary results of a re-registration exercise carried out in SCG. The revision process continues and at the time of publication final results were still pending; however, the reduction of the refugee caseload by roughly 127,400 can be attributed to a mix of voluntary repatriation, local integration and resettlement.
- UNHCR continued to facilitate the voluntary repatriation of refugees to Croatia and BiH. In 2005, more than 4,700 refugees returned in total, of whom over 1,000 were assisted by UNHCR.
- As part of their endeavour to promote the full realization of IDPs' rights and the implementation of the *UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*, the Serbian authorities implemented several important recommendations of the gaps analysis on IDPs. This included calling on the authorities to enable the provision of documents for IDPs by mail and without the issuance of a power of attorney; calling for a 70 per cent reduction in administrative fees related to access to documentation; and recognizing the status of those displaced as a result of the events of 17 March 2004.

#### Kosovo

- In 2005, durable solutions were found for roughly 2,100 individuals belonging to ethnic minority groups who returned to 25 municipalities in Kosovo.
- The sustainable reintegration of returnees was accomplished through a variety of interventions. Over

21,800 returnees benefited from 43 community development projects throughout Kosovo as part of a reconciliation and reintegration initiative for spontaneous minority returnees in their places of origin.

- UNHCR incorporated gender equality more systematically into its protection and programme activities in line with a gender gap analysis of programming and institutional response undertaken in early 2005. Sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) issues were also addressed as part of a wider and long-term gender strategy. UNHCR distributed 21,000 leaflets and 1,000 English, Albanian and Serbian-language posters throughout Kosovo to disseminate information on women's rights and to make available information on referral systems to combat SGBV.
- UNHCR training initiatives increased the knowledge and competencies of various partners. Twenty-nine workshops on the *UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*, UNHCR's mandate and activities in Kosovo, civil registration, and inter-ethnic dialogue and tolerance were carried out, with the participation of 526 local officials (police and municipal authorities), international authorities (United Nations Mission in Kosovo–UNMIK), and NGOs. UNHCR also trained 227 Kosovo Police Service officers on reception of asylum-seekers, refugee status determination and refugee protection issues.

## Working environment

### The context

#### Serbia and Montenegro

The overall working environment for UNHCR in Serbia and Montenegro in 2005 remained complex and fragile. The issue that dominated the political agenda in 2005 was the future status of Kosovo. While there was no repetition of the March 2004 violence, the situation of minorities remained precarious. At the same time, the Montenegrin authorities continued their preparations to hold a referendum on independence in 2006.

Persons of concern					
Type of population	Origin	Total in country	Of whom UNHCR assisted	Per cent female	Per cent under 18
IDPs		246,000	-	50	27
Refugees	Croatia	101,000	101,000	-	-
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	47,000	47,000	-	-
	fYR Macedonia	600	600	51	39
Local residents-at-risk		85,000	85,000	48	-
Returnees	From Germany	2,500	800	-	-
	From Switzerland	900	100	-	-
	Various	2,400	700	-	-
Returnees (IDPs)		2,500	-	49	-



This Roma family of 16 people aged between one and 74 returned in April 2005 to Radivojce village in Kosovo. They lived in a flimsy hut of wood and plastic sheeting provided by UNHCR while their new three-storey home (pictured here) was being built. UNHCR / V. Winter

The State Union began its talks on signature of the Stabilization and Association Agreement with the European Union (EU) on 7 November 2005. Due to the country's political structure, three teams participated in the talks (representing Serbia, Montenegro and the State Union). Subsequently, despite the country's substantial political, institutional and economic difficulties, the conclusions of the European Commission's feasibility study for the State Union's accession to the European Union, published in April 2005, were positive.

### Kosovo

During the reporting period, the political process related to Kosovo's final status gained momentum. In June 2005 the United Nations Secretary-General appointed a Special Envoy to undertake a comprehensive review of the situation in Kosovo. In his report to the United Nations Security Council, the Special Envoy concluded that the time had come for the next phase of the political process. Following his recommendation, in October 2005 the Security Council launched the negotiations to determine the final status of Kosovo and appointed Martti Ahtisaari as Special Envoy charged with leading the process. The status talks, which are expected to culminate in 2006, have heightened a sense of uncertainty

among the minorities remaining in Kosovo, and the potential for further unrest and displacement remains. This prompted UNHCR to review its emergency response preparedness.

## Constraints

### Serbia and Montenegro

Apart from the generally depressed economic situation and the overall reduction in already limited humanitarian funds, the main constraints were at the level of political institutions. These constraints included uncertainty about the State Union's continued existence; the absence of a legal and institutional framework for refugee protection in conformity with international standards; the difficulty faced by refugees in Montenegro in acquiring citizenship; and the inadequate legal mechanisms for the restoration of housing and property rights in Croatia.

### Kosovo

In addition to the fundamental uncertainty about Kosovo's eventual status, and despite some improvement in overall conditions in Kosovo, several obstacles to return remained. These included security problems;

limited economic opportunities; restricted freedom of movement; shortage of housing; unresolved property issues; and problems of access to health and educational services. While the security situation generally improved in 2005, minorities in Kosovo continued to suffer from security incidents, such as intimidation and harassment. Kosovo's authorities did not seem able to take definitive measures to protect ethnic minorities, with the result that confidence in the law enforcement and judicial bodies, both international and local, remained low. Moreover, the competencies of relevant bodies within the Provisional Institutions of Self-Government (PISG) remained underdeveloped. While strong engagement of the Ministry for Local Government Administration has had positive confidence-building effects on minorities, the Ministry of Communities and Returns, which was created in February 2005 and could have served as a close and effective counterpart to UNHCR, had neither the general nor the financial management capacities to develop or implement credible policies and projects to bring refugees and IDPs home.

## Funding

### Serbia and Montenegro

At the beginning of the year, the Office had to cope with unforeseen costs related to refugee registration. The burden of the funding shortfall was largely borne by UNHCR's governmental counterpart, the Serbian Commissioner for Refugees. The Serbian Commissioner for Refugees had to postpone covering one month's running costs for 70 collective centres during the winter. The collective centres housed the most vulnerable of UNHCR's beneficiaries.

### Kosovo

Due to funding constraints, the operational budget for Kosovo operations in 2005 was reduced from USD 4,275,000 to USD 3,860,000. This affected UNHCR's limited, yet strategically important interventions in key areas such as self-reliance, community development and inter-ethnic dialogue.

## Achievement and impact

### Protection and solutions

#### Serbia and Montenegro

In Serbia, a re-registration of refugees was completed in January 2005, with more than 141,000 refugees registered. However at the end of the year, no official statistics were released due to delays in the appeals process and in the issuance of new refugee identity cards.

Within the framework of the Sarajevo process, also known as the "3x3 Initiative", which aims to find durable solutions for post-Dayton refugees by the end of 2006, Serbia finalized its "road map", while Montenegro presented its own country-specific action plan to be combined with others in the region. Some progress was observed in the repossession of occupied private property in Croatia. However, there is still no mechanism for a comprehensive solution to the issue of the tenancy rights (long-term protected housing leases) terminated by the Croatian Government.

UNHCR continued to promote accession to the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, and both Serbia and Montenegro expressed an interest in ratifying it, alongside the 1997 European Convention on Nationality. The newly-adopted Law on Citizenship of the Republic of Serbia offers a naturalization process to refugees and other citizens of the former Yugoslavia. According to the Serbian authorities, 360,000 people have acquired Serbian citizenship since 1997, but there is no data on how many were previously registered as refugees. This problem should be resolved with the conclusion of the refugee re-registration exercise. In Montenegro, UNHCR was involved in the drafting of the new Law on Citizenship.

Given the increased number of reported SGBV cases among the refugee and IDP populations, UNHCR provided legal and psychosocial assistance and shelter for survivors. Two round tables for professionals on domestic violence and six SGBV regional training workshops were organized in 13 Serbian municipalities to raise awareness of these issues. In Montenegro, three regional training workshops and a regional conference were held under the auspices of the Office for Gender Equality.

UNHCR actively contributed to the drafting of the Roma National Action Plans (NAPs). The implementation of four Roma NAPs (Housing, Education, Employment and Health) started under the umbrella of the Roma National Strategy (which dovetails with the "Decade of Roma" programme).

### Kosovo

UNHCR continued to play a key role in creating conditions conducive to return for about 22,000 IDPs within Kosovo, and 225,000 IDPs in Serbia and Montenegro. UNHCR's field offices had a major impact on the municipal working groups and ensured that governmental strategies were developed in line with the principles of voluntary repatriation. UNHCR monitored almost 85,000 local residents at risk.

In 2005, some 2,100 members of ethnic minorities voluntarily returned to their places of origin, compared to some 2,400 in 2004. Of these, 35 per cent returned spontaneously, 43 per cent through facilitated returns,

and 22 per cent through organized return projects. UNHCR drew attention to those return projects with the greatest potential for sustainability. While the majority of government-funded return projects revolved around organized Kosovo Serb returns, UNHCR focused on the needs of spontaneous returnees and on other ethnic minorities, such as the Roma, Ashkaelia and Egyptians, who often returned unassisted by authorities.

UNHCR actively participated in various working groups under the Strategic Framework for Return and chaired the working group on overall returns issues, providing policy guidance and expertise on principles and procedures for return. Field offices participated in all 30 municipal working groups. Close to 90 per cent of these working groups adopted a municipal returns strategy. In five areas of responsibility, more than 200 community profiles were updated with basic information on potential or existing minority communities.

UNHCR provided the United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) with a draft administrative direction to implement the refugee/asylum section of regulation 2005/16 on the movement of people into and out of Kosovo, which entered into force on 1 July 2005. This established a framework for the movement of migrants (regular or irregular) and asylum-seekers. UNHCR continued to conduct RSD pending the establishment of an RSD body within the Provisional Institutions of Self-Governance.

UNHCR contributed to a strategy that identified short- and long-term solutions for the displaced Roma, Ashkaelia and Egyptian populations living in three lead-contaminated camps in northern Kosovo. An alternative campsite in northern Mitrovicë/a was identified as a short-term solution. Construction materials were provided, enabling the group to establish 20 family accommodation units, a children's playground, a combined recreation, community and youth centre, and a women's protection/family education clinic.

At the beginning of 2005, over 600 refugees from fYR Macedonia were registered in UNHCR's database. A total of 117 returned to fYR Macedonia spontaneously, while 20 integrated locally. A durable solutions survey was conducted on the prevailing protection needs of the 319 refugees from BiH and Croatia. Seventy per cent of those surveyed chose resettlement in Serbia as their preferred durable solution.

## Activities and assistance

**Community services:** More than 46,000 refugees and IDPs in SCG were provided with specialized care, including referrals to the Centres for Social Welfare. Services in social

institutions were regularly monitored. Through 54 operational mobile teams, each consisting of a social worker and a psychologist, more than 32,000 refugees in 162 municipalities received psychosocial services.

UNHCR assisted approximately 1,200 of the most vulnerable refugees in need of specialized care who lacked family support. UNHCR partially covered the costs of specialized care, meals and accommodation. More than 1,400 cash grants were provided to other extremely vulnerable refugees and IDPs.

In Kosovo, UNHCR concluded six years of institution building and support to the Kosovo Women's Initiative. Minority membership exceeded 32 per cent in 2005, while eight new women's groups were formed within returnee, IDP and minority communities. The Office also organized a series of campaigns, and training and outreach activities for women. UNHCR also continued working to create conditions conducive to sustainable return through the promotion of inter-ethnic dialogue between returnee communities and potential minority returnees.

**Domestic needs and household support:** Following the closure of 31 collective centres in SCG, almost 400 families received a combined assistance package consisting of non-food items and financial support. To assist local integration, 110 refugee families (499 people) were provided with agricultural inputs. More than 2,000 refugees and IDPs were provided with humanitarian assistance in the form of various non-food relief items. UNHCR distributed firewood to over 200 refugee and IDP families.

In Kosovo, essential relief items were distributed to over 2,900 minority returnees, IDPs and refugees and vulnerable minorities. Self-reliance projects provided much needed support to a total of 388 beneficiaries.

**Food:** In Kosovo, UNHCR distributed food rations for a three-month duration to over 600 spontaneous returnees in order to cover their immediate basic needs. UNHCR distributed additional food items to some 2,800 vulnerable families on the basis of field assessments. Food aid was also provided to all 453 residents of Plemetina camp.

**Education:** Some 600 internally displaced Roma children benefited from educational activities designed to help them integrate into the local school system. More than 300 IDPs participated in vocational and curriculum-based training.

**Health and nutrition:** More than 780 of the most vulnerable and needy refugees and IDPs in SCG were provided with medical services and medicines.

**Income generation:** In Montenegro, five internally displaced families at risk saw their situation improve due to their involvement in small-scale income generation activities.

In Kosovo, 17 income generation projects were implemented, benefiting over 100 returnees. However, there was some concern regarding their impact and success in light of the economic situation in Kosovo.

**Legal assistance:** In 2005, almost 400 notification letters were forwarded to applicants to the Croatian Government's Reconstruction Programme. Over 1,000 applications for assistance were also forwarded to the Croatian Government's Programme for Housing Care. Although this did not offer a legal remedy for lost tenancy rights, it did provide a housing solution to any former holders of tenancy rights who wanted to return.

In Kosovo, UNHCR's implementing partner provided legal assistance and counselling. The focus was on assistance and support for minority returnees to obtain all necessary personal documentation and settle outstanding claims. Over 3,700 legal cases were processed, benefiting more than 7,100 persons of concern. Furthermore, as part of its responsibilities for the continued protection of those in need, UNHCR monitored arrivals and forced returns through a 24 hour, seven days a week airport monitoring team.

**Operational support to agencies (including public information activities):** In SCG, two separate 30-minute weekly broadcasts were aired on national and satellite television for IDPs from Kosovo and refugees. These broadcasts provided systematic information to these two groups, which enabled them to make a more informed choice regarding their future. The positive effects of the programmes were regularly measured not only in terms of official ratings but also in the number of refugees and IDPs approaching UNHCR and its partners after each broadcast.

In an attempt to promote understanding of refugee issues, to support interaction between refugees and the local population, and to break stereotypes, 25 performances by refugee, IDP and local children were staged in local schools, public halls, theatres, and orphanages around Serbia and Montenegro. A UNHCR national website launched in Serbian has become a reference point for refugee and IDP issues in Serbia and Montenegro.

In Kosovo, efforts were made to raise awareness of UNHCR's mandate and activities by disseminating leaflets and posters on World Refugee Day; submitting press releases and press advisories to the media; publishing articles on the UNHCR website on the situation of IDPs

in Kosovo; organizing field trips and interviews for journalists and photographers; and providing information for television programmes, each of which was seen by some 290,000 viewers.

**Sanitation:** In order to maintain healthy living conditions for 1,600 displaced people of Roma, Ashkaelia and Egyptian origin living in Konik camp, UNHCR's implementing partner organized awareness-raising activities on public hygiene and waste management. In addition, basic material support was provided and the repair and maintenance of water and sewage infrastructure was carried out.

**Shelter and infrastructure:** As part of their local integration in SCG, 76 families were provided with building materials to reconstruct or rehabilitate their homes. In addition, 20 IDP families living in collective centres scheduled to close in 2005 were provided with shelter materials. UNHCR contributed towards the running costs of three collective centres in Montenegro, two of which were closed by the end of 2005.

In Kosovo, significant progress was made in identifying and implementing durable solutions, with a view to the closure of Plemetina camp. Owing to funding constraints, the closure of the camp was postponed for 2006. UNHCR's advocacy with donors secured funding for the construction of two social housing projects in Plemetina to accommodate the IDPs living in the camp. Moreover, the emergency shelter repair programme provided shelter assistance for over 100 spontaneous returnee families. Special attention was paid to older returnees, extremely vulnerable individuals and female-headed households who received assistance in the form of labour in addition to construction materials. Furthermore, 11 prefabricated houses were installed throughout Kosovo as temporary accommodation for 83 extremely vulnerable minority returnees, pending the reconstruction of their houses.

**Transport and logistics:** In SCG, an international NGO partner implemented logistics activities in 2005. This included the transport of returnees and their belongings to Croatia and BiH. UNHCR took charge of warehousing and the distribution of relief items.

In Kosovo, UNHCR's international NGO partner in charge of logistics maintained a fleet of 12 UNHCR trucks and organized convoys for the delivery of humanitarian assistance. It also managed the UNHCR warehouse and mechanical workshop.

## Organization and implementation

### Management

#### Serbia and Montenegro

As in 2004, there were significant staff reductions over the course of 2005, albeit at a slower pace. At the end of 2005, there were nine international and 63 national staff members in Belgrade, Sub-Office Podgorica and Field Office Kraljevo. The satellite office in Berane, Montenegro, was closed in April 2005. The offices in Belgrade, Kraljevo and Podgorica continued to organize field monitoring in their respective geographical areas.

#### Kosovo

In 2005, UNHCR in Kosovo consisted of the Office of the Chief of Mission in Pristina, including Field Unit Pristina, and four field offices, in Gjilan/Gnjilane, Mitrovicë/a, Peja/Pec and Prizren. In addition, Field Office Mitrovicë/a has a permanent field presence in the northern municipalities. UNHCR employed 19 international and 60 national staff, nine UNVs and one JPO.

### Working with others

#### Serbia and Montenegro

UNHCR continued to cooperate with national counterparts at both the State Union and Republic levels, in particular with the relevant ministries, the Serbian Commissioner for Refugees, and the Montenegrin Commissioner for Displaced Persons. UNHCR also continued to cooperate closely with development agencies in its effort to ensure that all sectors of development work in the country take full account of refugees and IDPs. UNHCR focused on further building the capacity of its local implementing and operational partners. UNHCR continued its engagement in the UN Country Team, which supported the Serbian Government inter-ministerial group for the preparation of the Millennium Development Goals strategy.

#### Kosovo

In view of the focus on minority returns and durable solutions, UNHCR's office in Kosovo worked in close cooperation with the other offices in the sub-region, particularly Skopje and Belgrade. Cooperation with Belgrade included regular field visits on both sides, joint Representatives' and protection meetings, thematic discussions and meetings, working with IDP associations and harmonizing planning assumptions on both sides of the border. UNHCR actively participated in a range of return and standards-related working groups under the auspices of UNMIK. Furthermore, UNHCR made significant progress

in establishing working relations and exchanging information and strategies with the Ministry for Local Government Administration, an interlocutor of pivotal importance to returns policy. At the field level, UNHCR continued to consolidate its partnership with the local authorities.

## Overall assessment

#### Serbia and Montenegro

UNHCR's operations in SCG continued to feel the pressure of two conflicting imperatives: budget reductions (phasing down), and preparation for new challenges anticipated in 2006. These challenges included the situation in Kosovo and the uncertainty regarding its status, as well as deficiencies in the functioning of the State Union. The former had a negative impact on realizing durable solutions for the Kosovo IDPs, while the latter slowed down the implementation of the Framework Asylum Law. The progress of the "3x3" regional initiative was behind schedule due to various remaining unsolved issues, in particular the disagreement over tenancy rights in Croatia.

In Montenegro, UNHCR continued, within an inter-agency context, to advocate with the Government for clear and transparent policy guidelines on IDPs. Among the issues of special concern is the political acceptance of the integration of IDPs who are unable or unwilling to return. This is linked to the issues of freedom of choice of residence, as well as access to basic social assistance and to documentation.

The in-kind and cash assistance programme was originally introduced as a temporary solution, aimed at providing an incentive and assisting those who moved out of the collective centres. According to the results of a survey to evaluate its longer-term impact in terms of durable solutions, 85 per cent of respondents adapted well to their new living conditions. Clearly this programme not only functioned as a short-term tool, but contributed to building self-reliance.

UNHCR closed an important chapter of the self-reliance programme by handing over the microcredit portfolios to its implementing partners. The five-year history of this programme has been a success story in terms not only of the capacity building of local structures but also the provision of sustainable access to finance for refugees, returnees, IDPs and the local population in Serbia (6,000 beneficiaries in all). Most importantly, socially concerned financial institutions, which are slowly entering the SCG market, recognized the value of former UNHCR partners and made them stakeholders in their development efforts. UNHCR successfully adhered to the Development through Local Integration framework, making an important link with development assistance.

## Kosovo

By focusing its very limited operational means on the return and reintegration of spontaneous returnees in 2005, UNHCR played an important role in the complex and politicized return arena in Kosovo. UNHCR had a positive impact on the well-being of some of the neediest minority returnees. Despite the relatively low number of returns in 2005, UNHCR's programmes were of strategic importance and relatively successful. A participatory review undertaken with partners revealed, however, that there was room for improving the effectiveness of UNHCR's programme through a variety of structural and practical changes.

In light of the difficult economic situation in Kosovo, and UNHCR's own challenging financial situation, its operational interventions, while strategic in nature, are much too small to exert a significant impact unless conceived and implemented in concert with other actors' programmes. The budget cuts imposed in 2005 reduced UNHCR's operational leverage to a minimum. Any further reduction will unavoidably weaken the programme, thereby affecting UNHCR's relevance and credibility as an effective provider of durable solutions and protection in the future Kosovo.

### Offices: Serbia and Montenegro

**Belgrade**  
Kraljevo  
Podgorica

### Partners: Serbia and Montenegro

**Serbia**  
**Government agencies**  
Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs  
Republic Statistical Office of Serbia  
Serbian Commissioner for Refugees

**NGOs**  
Amity  
Danish Refugee Council  
Hi Neighbour  
Humanitarian Centre for Integration and Tolerance  
International Orthodox Christian Charities  
INTERSOS  
Italian Consortium of Solidarity  
Micro Development Fund  
MicroFins  
Network of Humanitarian Legal Offices  
*Praxis*  
Serbian Democratic Forum  
UNION

**Others**  
UNV

**Montenegro**  
**Government agencies**  
Montenegrin Commissioner for Displaced Persons  
Montenegrin Ministry of Interior  
Montenegrin Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare

**NGOs**  
American Refugee Council  
Community Development Centre  
German HELP  
Network of Humanitarian Legal Offices

**Others**  
Red Cross of Montenegro

### Offices: Kosovo

**Prishtine/Pristina**  
Gjilan/Gnjilane  
Mitrovicë/a  
Peja/Pëc  
Prizren

### Partners: Kosovo

**Government agencies**  
Housing and Property Directorate (HPD)  
Provisional Institutions of Self-Governance (PISG)

**NGOs**  
American Refugee Council  
Civil Rights Project  
Council for Defence of Human Rights and Freedoms  
Danish Refugee Council  
Developing Together  
GOAL  
International Catholic Migration Commission  
Kosovo Women's Initiative  
*Malteser Hilfsdienst*  
Mercy Corps Scotland  
Mother Teresa Society  
Norwegian Church Aid

**Others**  
Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration  
Council of Europe  
Kosovo Force  
Kosovo Police Service  
Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe  
UN Kosovo Team  
United Nations Mission in Kosovo / Office of Communities, Returns and Minority Affairs  
UNMIK/Department of Civil Administration  
UNMIK Civilian Police  
UNV

## Budget, income and expenditure (USD) Annual programme budget

Final budget	Income from contributions <sup>1</sup>	Other funds available <sup>2</sup>	Total funds available	Total expenditure
24,873,779	2,410,061	20,301,633	22,711,694	22,711,694

<sup>1</sup> Includes income from contributions earmarked at the country level.

<sup>2</sup> Includes allocations by UNHCR from unearmarked or broadly earmarked contributions, opening balance and adjustments.

## Financial Report (USD)

Expenditure breakdown	Current years' projects Annual Programme Budget	Prior years' projects Annual and supplementary Programme Budgets
Protection, monitoring and coordination	8,029,581	0
Community services	1,710,114	645,380
Domestic needs and household support	1,024,973	414,412
Education	283,714	74,265
Food	90,794	17,422
Health and nutrition	106,640	129,341
Income generation	24,352	114,634
Legal assistance	2,407,486	953,134
Operational support (to agencies)	1,572,579	35,058
Sanitation	5,038	1,969
Shelter and infrastructure	1,826,410	995,919
Transport and logistics	1,186,622	223,433
Instalments with implementing partners	2,651,113	(3,604,967)
<b>Sub-total operational activities</b>	<b>20,919,416</b>	<b>0</b>
Programme support	1,792,278	0
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>22,711,694</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Cancellation on prior years' expenditure</b>		<b>(202,923)</b>
<b>Instalments with implementing partners</b>		
Payments made	10,573,300	
Reporting received	(7,922,187)	
<b>Balance</b>	<b>2,651,113</b>	
<b>Prior years' report</b>		
<b>Instalments with implementing partners</b>		
Outstanding 1 January		3,976,310
Reporting received		(3,604,967)
Refunded to UNHCR		(278,629)
Adjustments		(62,931)
<b>Balance</b>		<b>29,783</b>