

# Russian Federation

## AT A GLANCE

### Main Objectives and Activities

Develop an asylum system that meets international standards and identify appropriate durable solutions for refugees; facilitate the local integration of various categories of persons covered by the CIS Conference Programme of Action; and contribute to meeting the protection and assistance needs of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in the northern Caucasus.



### Impact

- The federal migration authorities issued identity cards to refugees and certificates to asylum-seekers, giving them greater security and a better chance of becoming self-reliant. The procedures for determining refugee status were accelerated and improved, leading to an increase in the number of recognised refugees from outside the CIS. The authorities agreed to consider the applications of long-staying and vulnerable asylum-seekers on a priority basis. However, a large backlog of applications still awaited a decision.
- Refugees unable to repatriate, and highly unlikely to integrate locally on account of extreme vulnerability, were screened for third country resettlement.
- Asylum issues received more positive media coverage thanks to UNHCR's mass-media activities.
- A pilot project was initiated with the Moscow Committee on Education to secure access to local schools for the children of asylum-seekers.

#### Persons of Concern

| Main Refugee Origin/Type of Population                            | Total in Country   | Of whom UNHCR assisted | Per cent Female | Per cent under 18 |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Georgia and Other Countries (Refugees) <sup>1</sup>               | 25,870             | 19,700                 | -               | -                 |
| Russian Federation/Chechnya (IDPs) <sup>2</sup>                   | 490,700            | 160,000                | -               | -                 |
| Formerly Deported Meskhetians (FDPs) and Stateless Afghan Orphans | 13,000             | 11,000                 | 22              | 29                |
| Involuntarily Relocating Persons (IRPs) <sup>3</sup>              | 641,600            | 349,000                | 54              | 30                |
| Afghanistan (Asylum-seekers)                                      | 9,233 <sup>4</sup> | 9,233                  | 40              | 38                |

<sup>1</sup>Of whom some 20,000 from Georgia; the others from CIS countries, Afghanistan, Africa and the Middle East.

<sup>2</sup>Includes IDPs from the 1994-96 conflict, as well as roughly 70,000 IDPs who returned to Chechnya in 2000.

<sup>3</sup>According to the CIS-Conference, the term denotes a citizen from a CIS country who has been forced to move to his/her country of citizenship. It applies in particular to ethnic Russians.

<sup>4</sup>This figure represents only "active" cases.

#### Income and Expenditure (USD)

|              | Annual Programme and Supplementary Programme Budgets |  |                                    |                       |                   |
|--------------|--|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
|              | Revised Budget                                       | Income from Contributions <sup>1</sup> | Other Funds Available <sup>2</sup> | Total Funds Available | Total Expenditure |
| AB           | 11,930,035   | 177,649                                | 10,281,413                         | 10,459,062            | 10,445,887        |
| SB           | 10,761,651   | 9,910,708                              | 1,557,524                          | 11,468,232            | 11,222,336        |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>22,691,686</b>                                    | <b>10,088,357</b>                      | <b>11,838,937</b>                  | <b>21,927,294</b>     | <b>21,668,223</b> |

<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.

The above figures do not include costs at Headquarters.

- In view of the improbability of immediate repatriation, Georgian refugees in North Ossetia were helped to integrate locally.
- The micro-credit lending agencies supported by UNHCR achieved financial self-sufficiency during the year.
- Thanks to monitoring of protection and close contacts with the authorities, no cases were reported of IDPs being forcibly returned to Chechnya, and harassment and arbitrary arrests were minimised. UNHCR assisted over 160,000 Chechen IDPs and refugees in Ingushetia and other republics of the northern Caucasus who would otherwise have experienced severe hardship.

## WORKING ENVIRONMENT

### The Context

Asylum-seekers from CIS countries were granted *prima facie* refugee status in the early 1990s, whereas the procedure for non-CIS asylum-seekers started to be applied only in 1997. In 1993, the Russian Federation ratified the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol. A national refugee law was enacted in 1993 and amended in 1997. Since the Law on Forced Migrants (IRPs) came into force in 1995, asylum-seekers from CIS countries have increasingly been encouraged to disregard the asylum procedure in favour of the procedure for acquisition of Russian citizenship. Asylum-seekers encounter several obstacles before and during the asylum procedure, a major concern being police harassment and detention of undocumented asylum-seekers. UNHCR is also concerned about border procedures and asylum practice at airports, which do not meet basic standards of fairness and efficiency.

Applications for acquisition of citizenship by non-CIS recognised refugees were, until recently, fraught with obstacles. With the adoption and subsequent issuance in 2000 of identity cards to recognised refugees, their access to the citizenship procedure has become easier.

The term Involuntary Relocating Person (IRP) refers mostly to ethnic Russians returning or resettling from other CIS countries and the Baltic States. As of 31 December 2000, there were 641,600 IRPs registered with the migration authorities, a decrease of about 15 per cent since 1997. The Russian Federation has not acceded to the 1954 and 1961 Conventions on statelessness and official statistics on the number of stateless persons do not exist. UNHCR is particularly concerned about two groups of de facto stateless persons: 11,000 formerly deported Meskhetians residing in the

Krasnodar region, and approximately 2,000 Afghan orphans who were educated in the Soviet Union and had no homes to go back to after the war and the collapse of the Soviet-backed regime in Afghanistan.

The hostilities that broke out in the autumn of 1999 in the Republic of Chechnya devastated the lives of hundreds of thousands of people. Most IDPs came from towns which, like Grozny, were very badly damaged in several months of heavy fighting. While some IDPs went to other parts of the Federation, the majority found refuge in the Republic of Ingushetia and required comprehensive assistance. UNHCR launched an emergency programme in the last quarter of 1999, and in 2000, UNHCR created a Supplementary Programme Budget (SB) of USD 16.5 million for refugees and IDPs from Chechnya (northern Caucasus: USD 14.25 million; Georgia: USD 2.25 million). The federal government, through the Federal Migration Service (FMS), was the main provider of humanitarian assistance in the region. This included the provision of food and non-food aid, as well as financial resources, with UNHCR and other UN agencies and NGOs providing other inputs, both in Ingushetia and, security permitting, in Chechnya. Subsequently, the Ministry for Emergencies, EMERCOM, was designated the main partner for UN humanitarian agencies.

Over the course of 2000, the federal authorities focused attention on the return of IDPs to Chechnya and on economic and social reconstruction there. At the end of the year, a registration exercise undertaken by an implementing partner put the number of IDPs in Ingushetia at 155,332 persons.

### Constraints

As part of ongoing governmental reforms, the FMS was dissolved in May 2000. The Ministry for Federal Affairs, National and Migration Policy was designated to take over responsibility for all migration and refugee matters. The dissolution of the FMS led to an increased backlog of asylum applications awaiting a decision.

Staff security remained an overriding concern in the northern Caucasus and needed to be constantly monitored. Security arrangements did however improve somewhat in the wake of the High Commissioner's official visit to the country in October 2000, and after UNHCR requested the support of the Government for a comprehensive security framework. Better co-ordination between the UN agencies was also a significant factor: with advice from the UN Security Co-ordinator (UNSECOORD), security routines became part and parcel of everyday life and work. Co-ordination with Special Forces from the Ministry of Interior and separate



arrangements with private security companies were enhanced both in North Ossetia (Vladikavkaz) and Ingushetia (Nazran). On the other hand, an agreement on the use of radios, vital for improving security, remained blocked. Security constraints affected the mobility of expatriate and local staff, and thus reduced the overall efficiency of UNHCR and its implementing partners.

### **Funding**

The projects in the Russian Federation worst affected by the budgetary reductions imposed in the second half of the year were those promoting the local integration of Georgian refugees and Chechen IDPs from the 1994-1996 Chechnya conflict. Some projects for recognised refugees in the city and region of Moscow had to be put on hold, affecting UNHCR's long-term strategy of improving the prospects of integration for this group. Moreover, several public information activities, initially planned for the second half of the year, were cancelled. By contrast, the Supplementary Programme for IDPs from Chechnya was not short of funds.

## **ACHIEVEMENTS AND IMPACT**

### **Protection and Solutions**

For asylum-seekers and refugees, UNHCR's main aims were to ensure that all were issued with proper documentation at all stages, from the initial stage of the refugee status (RSD) procedure onwards; to improve the quality and speed of the procedure; to help meet basic needs for protection and assistance before and during the entire process; and to address two related problems: the large numbers of asylum applications being rejected, and the lack of official documentation which would facilitate local integration. UNHCR submitted comments and advice on draft amendments to the Refugee Law, and attempted, not always successfully, to stimulate progress in all these matters through a whole range of training, technical assistance and other capacity-building activities. However, a positive development was the issuing of identity cards to refugees, and refugee certificates to asylum-seekers at the outset of the RSD pro-

cedure. Furthermore, the authorities agreed to counter-sign the UNHCR registration document issued to asylum-seekers before their names enter the national RSD procedure, reducing their vulnerability to harassment during the two-three year pre-registration period. The authorities also agreed to consider asylum-seekers who pre-registered in 1993-1994, and vulnerable cases submitted by UNHCR. The Office also started sharing case summaries, with a view to sharing expertise and facilitating the work of the authorities.

UNHCR provided assistance to the most vulnerable asylum-seekers (most of them in the city and region of Moscow) in the form of cash allowances, basic health care, education, vocational skills training, and legal and social counselling. The cash grant programme was further reduced in parallel with efforts to favour longer-term local integration. In cases where this was most unlikely to succeed, voluntary repatriation and third country resettlement were considered. In 2000, 257 persons were accepted for resettlement in third countries (of whom 84 had departed by year's end), and 77 persons returned to their home countries with assistance from the Office.

Throughout the year, the question of undocumented IDPs in Ingushetia was high on the agenda. By working closely with human rights groups and the Special Representative of the President for the Protection of Human Rights and Freedoms in the Chechen Republic, the matter was resolved in the summer when a federal team from the Ministry of the Interior started screening and subsequently issued temporary identity documents in Ingushetia. This initiative was suspended for several months, but finally resumed under the authority of local bodies. Beyond Ingushetia, the freedom of movement of IDPs remained problematic as most of the other republics of the North Caucasus introduced either formal regulations or informal practices designed to restrict the residence of IDPs. Such restrictions affected other categories of persons besides IDPs, such as asylum-seekers and migrants from CIS countries. The UNHCR-sponsored network of NGOs provided legal assistance and challenged illegal administrative decisions in the courts. Small and far-flung spontaneous settlements were consolidated into manageable tented camps and settlements, with better assistance structures and security arrangements. UNHCR and its partners organised several convoys to Chechnya with emergency supplies and reconstruction materials for distribution to IDPs and returnees. Such convoys were only undertaken after a security visit and clearance to travel, and an assessment of the rehabilitation needs.

Some 11,000 de facto stateless Meskhetians in the Krasnodar region continue to face many obstacles on the road to local integration, which is the most realistic long-term solution to their plight. UNHCR provided legal assistance to some 900 of them. Fewer cases of harassment were recorded in 2000, thanks to timely interventions by local UNHCR-sponsored lawyers. Several positive court decisions set a precedent for similar forthcoming cases in other courts. A consultant, the former deputy head of the FMS, was appointed by UNHCR to work with federal and regional authorities to determine how best to legalise the status of Meskhetians in Krasnodar. UNHCR co-operated with the Presidential Commission on Citizenship and the Council of Europe in drafting amendments to the Russian Citizenship Law. A comprehensive study on Afghan de facto stateless orphans was finalised for publication in 2001, its purpose being to provide information and stimulate constructive public debate conducive to a lasting solution.

## Activities and Assistance

*Community Services:* Over the past few years, UNHCR has established community centres in regions accommodating substantial numbers of refugees, asylum-seekers, IDPs, stateless persons and IRPs. These centres are the focal point for a wide range of community activities - many supported by UNHCR - educational, cultural, recreational and vocational (income generation projects). Local integration was promoted through women's support groups, sports, drama, sewing and language classes, baby health checks and other activities. Through its implementing partners, UNHCR organised social and legal counselling for those in need of such assistance. UNHCR also covered living allowances for vulnerable refugees awaiting resettlement. A total of 300 IDP and IRP children participated in three summer camps. Using funds specifically earmarked by donors for developing NGOs in the CIS, 60 local NGOs were helped to establish themselves (some of them providing support and services specifically for IDPs). In Stavropol, an NGO Training and Information Centre was established; 13 training events held there served to assist 200 NGO participants with project development; and cultural and educational activities were designed to build confidence and reconciliation.

*Domestic Needs/Household Support:* In the Moscow region, asylum-seekers and refugees received monthly cash grants. At year's end, the number of recipients was 1,228, roughly half the number at the end of 1999 (2,201). The most vulnerable individuals in the region received food parcels and a range of non-food items

including blankets and winter clothes. UNHCR also paid the funeral expenses of some IDPs and IRPs and provided support for disabled and detained persons. In southern Russia, 33,000 of the most needy persons, including 21,000 children, received relief commodities. Expenditure under the SB covered local and international procurement of 25 non-food items for distribution to IDPs, such as tents, heaters, shoes, winter clothes, beds, bed linen, soap and detergent, plastic sheeting and other items. Some 1,000 IDPs returning to Chechnya received a returnee package.

**Education:** Educational support was extended to people in all the categories of concern to UNHCR through the rehabilitation of schools, including the provision of furniture, equipment and textbooks. In the south of the country, UNHCR funded the training of about 200 teachers (IDPs) who then found employment. In Moscow, 300 children of asylum-seekers gained access to local schools (after persistent lobbying and negotiations). A further 35 refugee students from non-CIS countries were given cash grants from the DAFI Trust Fund to continue their university education.

**Food:** UNHCR, together with the authorities, ICRC, and a number of international NGOs initially assumed most of the responsibility for providing food to IDPs and host families in Ingushetia. UNHCR procured ten basic food items in sufficient quantity to guarantee every recipient the correct daily ration (5,370 metric tons of wheat flour items, 2,120 metric tons of rice, 204.8 metric tons of buckwheat, 361 metric tons of pearl barley, 464 metric tons of millet, 276 metric tons of peas, 57 metric tons of canned beef, 628,631 litres of vegetable oil, 154 metric tons of sugar, and 76 metric tons of salt). In total, UNHCR distributed 9,234 metric tons of food in Ingushetia and 476 metric tons in Chechnya itself. All disbursements were covered under the SB. Later in the year, WFP replaced UNHCR as the primary supplier of basic foods to IDPs, while UNHCR continued to focus on host families.

**Health/Nutrition:** The rehabilitation and improvement of regional medical facilities served as a means of securing access to local medical services for refugees, asylum-seekers, IDPs and IRPs. UNHCR also purchased essential medical equipment for some of these facilities. In Moscow, a local implementing partner provided both preventive and curative medical assistance, with a particular focus on reproductive health, for Moscow-based refugees and asylum-seekers. In the Altai and Nizhny-Novgorod areas, clinics were rehabil-

itated, while in southern Russia, UNHCR's assistance covered rehabilitation, equipment and medical services and referrals.

**Income Generation:** UNHCR's implementing partners offered training opportunities for 150 beneficiaries (56 per cent women) to make them more employable. Several thousand IDPs and IRPs received business development training, loans (micro-credit schemes) and employment advice.

**Legal Assistance:** UNHCR's support in this sector fell into six essential categories of activity: i) UNHCR endeavoured to sensitise government officials and the general public on issues related to refugees, asylum-seekers, stateless persons, IDPs and IRPs through awareness campaigns and media events. These included radio and television programmes, seminars and discussions, and publications. ii) UNHCR provided training for federal and regional authorities, border guards and local NGOs on issues such as RSD, refugee legislation, migration issues and international norms and standards relating to refugee and asylum practices. iii) UNHCR assisted with the development of identity documents with a view to formalising the presence of refugees and asylum-seekers in the country. iv) Legal counselling was provided at the refugee reception centres and community centres so that refugees, asylum-seekers, stateless persons, IDPs and IRPs would be fully informed of their rights and obligations. v) Repatriation assistance was given to 59 Georgian refugees who repatriated. vi) Local integration opportunities were offered to Georgian refugees in North Ossetia, and IDPs and IRPs, through the provision of shelter materials and income generation opportunities. Under the SB, UNHCR covered: monitoring the protection of IDPs; registration; a new counselling centre in Nazran; information campaigns; training for law-enforcement staff, judges and the Prosecutor's Office (including those working in Chechnya); mine-awareness campaigns; summer camps for vulnerable IDP children, rehabilitation of the elderly, and other activities.

**Operational Support (to Agencies):** The Office covered the operational expenses of partners implementing UNHCR's programme for refugees, asylum-seekers, stateless persons, IDPs and IRPs, both under the Annual Budget and the Supplementary Budget. It also covered the participation of some NGOs in CIS Conference follow-up meetings, and the hiring of a firm of accountants to audit 1999 projects. Hundreds of public information events were also organised, such as bi-weekly television programmes and 102 radio broadcasts.

**Sanitation:** Under the SB, sanitary facilities were provided at the tented camps and spontaneous IDP settlements. High population densities necessitated attention to sanitation facilities as a matter of urgency. The SB covered the construction of 320 latrines, the collection of 835 cubic meters of garbage weekly, vector and pest control, and training of IDPs by local medical staff. Garbage and sewage collection was facilitated through the provision of trucks for IDP camps.

**Shelter/Other Infrastructure:** UNHCR's shelter assistance in 2000 was primarily focused on the IDP population in Ingushetia and covered from the SB. UNHCR built two tented camps and upgraded over 100 spontaneous settlements in Ingushetia for the benefit of some 30,000 IDPs. In the rest of the country, UNHCR assisted in rehabilitating schools, community centres, health facilities and some office premises for regional migration authorities.

**Transport/Logistics:** In 2000, the SB covered more than 100 convoys of relief assistance for IDPs in the northern Caucasus. There were eight repatriation convoys of Georgian refugees. The SB also covered warehousing in various places, logistical assistance to other agencies shipping relief supplies, and distribution.

**Water:** To prevent the outbreak of water-borne diseases and ensure adequate drinking water for the IDPs, 142,000 litres of drinking water were trucked daily to more than 100 IDP locations. Emergency water bladders were procured, installed and maintained in 56 sites. UNHCR also implemented the first phase of a comprehensive plan to increase the capacity of the local water distribution network in Ingushetia, which would otherwise have been overwhelmed by the sudden 50 per cent increase in population represented by IDPs. Some 70 water pumps were installed to increase the extraction rate from boreholes, and six km of new pipes were installed. As a result, a water crisis during the very dry summer was avoided.

## ORGANISATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

### Management

The UNHCR Regional Office in Moscow covers the field offices in Stavropol, Vladikavkaz and Nazran. It also supervises UNHCR's office in Belarus. UNHCR's presence in St. Petersburg was withdrawn at the end of the year at the demand of the central authorities. The office worked with 46 international staff (including six UNVs, three consultants and three persons on loan from donor governments) and 84 national staff.

### Working with Others

UNHCR worked with 60 national NGOs and eight international NGOs. Operational co-operation involved UNICEF, WHO, UNAIDS, ILO, WFP and UNFPA. Close liaison was maintained with OCHA, UNSECOORD, ICRC and other agencies engaged in the humanitarian operation in the northern Caucasus. The main non-UN inter-governmental partner organisations for UNHCR in Russia were OSCE, the Council of Europe, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the European Union's Technical Assistance for the CIS (TACIS) and IOM. Collaboration with OSCE and the Council of Europe was mutually beneficial and instrumental in promoting human rights and international norms in the treatment of refugees, in drafting the citizenship law and finding durable solutions to the displacement issues in the northern Caucasus, Krasnodar region and elsewhere. Swiss Disaster Relief worked in the northern Caucasus under UNHCR's security and operational umbrella to implement a Compensation for Shelter Programme in Ingushetia. Other important partners of UNHCR in the Russian Federation are bilateral development agencies and a number of private foundations concerned with political and economic stability and the development of civil society. UNHCR's Representative in Moscow was also the UN Humanitarian Co-ordinator for UN Inter-Agency Assistance in the northern Caucasus.

## OVERALL ASSESSMENT

UNHCR played a central role in promoting and strengthening the asylum regime in the Russian Federation, seeking to ensure the observance of minimum international standards in the protection of, and assistance for, asylum-seekers and refugees. Although there were a few notable achievements in terms of Russia's international commitments to fair and accessible asylum procedures and the protection of, and assistance for, refugees (a higher rate of formal recognition of asylum-seekers as refugees, issuance of proper documentation, positive decisions by the courts) only sustained efforts in this vital, long-term process will overcome the country's unfortunately quite formidable shortcomings in the area of protection.

In various regions, micro-credit agencies supported by UNHCR reached a state of independent financial viability, i.e. the revolving funds will continue to service their beneficiaries without the need for any further injection of capital. UNHCR's material assistance does not appear to have softened the attitudes of regional

authorities towards Meskhetians and the focus will remain on legal assistance. UNHCR's focus on NGO development over the past few years has resulted in the extension of the collaborative network to cover nearly all the regions where displaced populations reside. The need remains for external support in two areas: building the capacity of NGOs so that they can become implementing partners; and the diversification of their sources of funding.

In the northern Caucasus, the most urgent needs of IDPs from Chechnya were met. UNHCR's presence and contingency stocks were largely responsible for the smooth start of the emergency operation. Through systematic and timely protection interventions in Ingushetia, UNHCR prevented forced return and evictions of IDPs, and ensured the largely unhindered access of all displaced people to assistance.

The needs of the population in Chechnya remained largely unmet, although during the second half of the year aid organisations expanded their operations in Chechnya. Limited access to the area (because of poor security) was the main obstacle to timely and properly planned aid. The urgency of basic needs tended to draw the attention of all parties concerned away from long-term resolution of the conflict through reconstruction, the enforcement of law and order and support for a political settlement. Joint inter-agency appeals have laid a solid foundation for co-operation, clearly defining the tasks and sectoral responsibilities of the various agencies. However, more funding is needed for economic and social reconstruction, and for capacity-building. UNHCR is promoting such longer-term goals by supporting the legal structures within Chechnya and training judges and lawyers.

---

## Offices

### Moscow

Nazran  
St. Petersburg (closed end of 2000)  
Stavropol  
Vladikavkaz

---

## Partners

### Government Agencies

EMERCOM (Ingushetia)  
Government of North Ossetia-Alania  
Ministry for Federal Affairs, National and Migration Policy  
Ministry for Nationalities of North Ossetia-Alania  
Ministry of Education  
Ministry of Health  
Ministry of Labour and Social Protection  
Moscow Committee on Education/Moscow School No 729  
Municipal Evening Lyceum, Stavropol  
Regional Migration Service  
State University of Management

---

### NGOs

Association of Media Managers (ARS-PRESS)  
Children's Fund  
Civic Assistance  
Committee of Russian Lawyers in Defence of Human Rights  
Co-ordinating Council for Assistance to Refugees and Forced Migrants  
Danish Refugee Council  
*Dobroye Delo* (Krasnodar)  
*Doveriye* (North Ossetia-Alania)  
*Equilibre-Solidarity*  
Faith, Hope, Love (Pyatigorsk)  
Forum of Migrants Organisations  
Fund of Mercy and Health (Stavropol)  
Gratis  
Guild of Russian Filmmakers  
International Rescue Committee  
Magee Woman Care International  
Memorial  
Moscow Peace Fund  
*Nadezhda* (Perm)  
Opportunity International/Russia  
Partner Foundation  
People in Need Foundation  
*Pomostch* (Kabardino-Balkaria)  
Smolensk Centre for Social Assistance and Employment for Young People  
St. Petersburg Red Cross  
*Vesta*  
Voice of the Mountains  
*Vozrozhdeniye* (Krasnodar)  
*Vozvrascheniye* (Saratov)

---

### Other

International Labour Office  
International Organisation for Migration  
United Nations Volunteers

---

| Financial Report (USD)                      |                         |                   |                   |                       |                  |  |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| Expenditure Breakdown                       | Current Year's Projects |                   |                   | Prior Years' Projects |                  |  |
|   | AB                      | SB                | Total             | notes                 | notes            |  |
| Protection, Monitoring and Co-ordination    | 1,917,570               | 847,816           | 2,765,386         |                       | 5,752            |  |
| Community Services                          | 537,784                 | 0                 | 537,784           |                       | 337,590          |  |
| Domestic Needs / Household Support          | 1,195,790               | 1,141,810         | 2,337,600         |                       | 4,234,601        |  |
| Education                                   | 313,878                 | 0                 | 313,878           |                       | 265,719          |  |
| Food  | 0                       | 1,446,057         | 1,446,057         |                       | 997,940          |  |
| Health / Nutrition                          | 500,924                 | 0                 | 500,924           |                       | 528,769          |  |
| Income Generation                           | 313,987                 | 0                 | 313,987           |                       | 296,126          |  |
| Legal Assistance                            | 1,002,745               | 499,628           | 1,502,373         |                       | 760,080          |  |
| Operational Support (to Agencies)           | 617,875                 | 353,340           | 971,215           |                       | 883,759          |  |
| Sanitation                                  | 0                       | 82,063            | 82,063            |                       | 83,311           |  |
| Shelter / Other Infrastructure              | 58,933                  | 609,694           | 668,627           |                       | 651,941          |  |
| Transport / Logistics                       | 13,047                  | 684,139           | 697,186           |                       | 690,179          |  |
| Water                                       | 0                       | 293,163           | 293,163           |                       | 263,678          |  |
| Transit Accounts                            | 0                       | 3,027             | 3,027             |                       | 0                |  |
| Instalments with Implementing Partners      | 1,375,798               | 980,856           | 2,356,654         |                       | (4,711,686)      |  |
| <b>Sub-total Operational</b>                | <b>7,848,331</b>        | <b>6,941,593</b>  | <b>14,789,924</b> |                       | <b>5,287,759</b> |  |
| Programme Support                           | 2,415,472               | 124,294           | 2,539,766         |                       | 31,971           |  |
| <b>Sub-total Disbursements / Deliveries</b> | <b>10,263,803</b>       | <b>7,065,887</b>  | <b>17,329,690</b> | (3)                   | <b>5,319,730</b> |  |
| Unliquidated Obligations                    | 182,084                 | 4,156,449         | 4,338,533         | (3)                   | 0 (6)            |  |
| <b>Total</b>                                | <b>10,445,887</b>       | <b>11,222,336</b> | <b>21,668,223</b> | (1) (3)               | <b>5,319,730</b> |  |

#### Instalments with Implementing Partners

|                                |                  |                |                  |  |                    |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|--|--------------------|
| Payments Made                  | 5,221,988        | 2,135,544      | 7,357,532        |  | 888,936            |
| Reporting Received             | 3,846,190        | 1,154,688      | 5,000,878        |  | 5,600,622          |
| <b>Balance</b>                 | <b>1,375,798</b> | <b>980,856</b> | <b>2,356,654</b> |  | <b>(4,711,686)</b> |
| Outstanding 1 January          | 0                | 0              | 0                |  | 5,484,951          |
| Refunded to UNHCR              | 0                | 0              | 0                |  | 163,507            |
| Currency Adjustment            | (48)             | 0              | (48)             |  | 11,345             |
| <b>Outstanding 31 December</b> | <b>1,375,750</b> | <b>980,856</b> | <b>2,356,606</b> |  | <b>621,103</b>     |

#### Unliquidated Obligations

|                                |                |                  |                  |     |                  |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|-----|------------------|
| Outstanding 1 January          | 0              | 0                | 0                |     | 6,000,177 (6)    |
| New Obligations                | 10,445,887     | 11,222,336       | 21,668,223       | (1) | 0                |
| Disbursements                  | 10,263,803     | 7,065,887        | 17,329,690       | (3) | 5,319,729 (6)    |
| Cancellations                  | 0              | 0                | 0                |     | 676,394 (6)      |
| <b>Outstanding 31 December</b> | <b>182,084</b> | <b>4,156,449</b> | <b>4,338,533</b> | (3) | <b>4,054 (6)</b> |

Figures which cross reference to Accounts:

(1) Annex to Statement 1

(3) Schedule 3

(6) Schedule 6