

# Serbia and Montenegro

## Main objectives

### Serbia and Montenegro

Provide legal assistance, encourage Serbia and Montenegro (SCG) to adopt a law on refugees, create a national asylum system, and establish fair and efficient Refugee Status Determination (RSD) procedures; assist the most vulnerable IDPs and facilitate their return to Kosovo if possible; ensure consistent integration of the five commitments to women in all UNHCR's assistance programmes; responsibly scale back assistance to post-Dayton refugees by ensuring their inclusion in development programmes and focus on assisting only the most vulnerable (earlier predictions of a more rapid withdrawal were found to be too optimistic by the Assistant High Commissioner's mission to the Balkans in March 2004).

### Kosovo

Contribute towards the creation of conditions which will prevent further displacement of minorities in Kosovo and facilitate the voluntary return and sustainable reintegration of minority IDPs and refugees in their place of origin; and identify and facilitate the attainment of the

most appropriate durable solutions for refugees from Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH).



Persons of concern				
Population	Total in country	Of whom UNHCR assisted	Per cent female	Per cent under 18
IDPs	248,200	13,300	-	-
Croatia (refugees)	180,100	180,100	47	10
Bosnia and Herzegovina (refugees)	95,300	95,300	-	-
Local residents at risk	85,000	85,000	-	-
Germany (returnees)	3,000	3,000	-	-
Switzerland (returnees)	900	900	-	-
FYR Macedonia (refugees)	800	800	53	49

## Impact

### Serbia and Montenegro

- The number of registered refugees dropped from 291,000 at the end of 2003 to just over 275,000 (267,000 in Serbia and 8,500 in Montenegro), while the number of IDPs remained more or less stable at 226,000 (208,000 in Serbia and 18,000 in Montenegro; another 22,000 in Kosovo).
- The number of collective centres fell from 192 in 2003 to 134 at the end of 2004 (accommodating some 5,300 refugees and 7,600 IDPs). A total of 979 elderly refugees were accommodated in homes for elderly or converted collective centres.
- Some 11,500 applicants for reconstruction of homes under the Government of Croatia's programme were helped with documentation. The Office facilitated the collection of applications for the housing care programme and rendered legal assistance to former tenancy rights holders who wished to return to Croatia. UNHCR continued to implement the Protocol on Organized Returns signed by SCG and Croatia in 1998, providing transportation for all refugees with either new Croatian documents or clearance to return (without the documents). Over 2,300 IDPs returned to Kosovo from Serbia and Montenegro.
- One hundred and seventy six families were assisted through the self-help housing programme. Almost 3,700 micro-credit loans were disbursed (benefiting some 18,000 refugees) and 99 families were assisted with in-kind grants, while over 200 individuals benefited from vocational training. Under the local settlement project, over 200 refugee families were accommodated in new housing.
- The Pilot In-kind Assistance Project (PIKAP) for closure of collective centres benefited some 700 refugee families in 2004.
- In the absence of an institutional framework for asylum in SCG, UNHCR continued to conduct RSD

under its mandate and reviewed 50 applications. UNHCR also opened a small office at Belgrade International Airport for the interviewing of asylum-seekers.

- UNHCR participated in the drafting of the framework law on asylum endorsed by the Council of Ministers of SCG.
- A nationwide network was set up to combat SGBV among refugees.
- In Montenegro, UNHCR assisted the Government in drafting the *National Strategy for Resolving the Problems of Refugees and IDPs*, which adopted in March 2005.
- The Office supported the development of a housing strategy and legal infrastructure for micro-financing and the inclusion of refugees and IDPs into the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP).

### Kosovo

- In 2004, over 2,300 members of minority groups returned to Kosovo (37 per cent fewer than in 2003).
- UNHCR took the lead coordination role for the provision, together with NGOs of immediate emergency assistance to 4,200 persons displaced by the March civil unrest. The assistance was maintained for three months. Thereafter, UNHCR continued to ensure the distribution of humanitarian assistance for the most vulnerable (mostly non-food items)
- UNHCR coordinated and was involved in over 100 go-and-see visits (840 persons) and 22 go-and-inform visits from/to Serbia and Montenegro and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYR Macedonia).
- Following intensive communication with refugees on voluntary repatriation (including an assistance package), more than 700 of the remaining refugees from FYR Macedonia returned home (leaving a further 769 who wished to remain in Kosovo).

### Income and expenditure (USD) Annual programme budget

Revised budget	Income from contributions <sup>1</sup>	Other funds available <sup>2</sup>	Total funds available	Total expenditure
27,293,278	4,002,654	23,241,618	27,244,272	27,244,272

<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

## Working environment

### The context

#### Serbia and Montenegro

The political situation in SCG remained fragile. In March, after more than two months of negotiations, a minority coalition government was formed, dependent on the support of the Socialist Party of Serbia (SPS) formerly led by ex-president Slobodan Milosevic. An amendment of the election law finally enabled Serbia to elect a president in June after three failed attempts over the past two years. Following his election, Boris Tadic pledged to lead the country swiftly along the path of democratic change and European integration. However, presidential authority remained limited and collaboration with the Government strained. The situation in and around Kosovo, as well as the fate of the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro overshadowed Serbia's political scene. The consequence in the September municipal elections was a display of atavism by an economically pressed electorate.

In Kosovo, the outbreak of anti-Serb violence on 17 March, which sparked riots in Belgrade and other cities, highlighted the difficulties of moving beyond the present uncomfortable *status quo* in the province (UN administration). The Serbian Government reacted with a Plan for Kosovo, proposing cantonization/decentralization. This received a lukewarm international reception. The October 2004 elections in Kosovo illuminated deep divisions within the political establishment. While President Tadic encouraged Kosovo Serbs to vote, the Government called for a boycott. The latter call was heeded, resulting in the absence of Serbs in the provincial parliament.

Meanwhile, in Montenegro, the leadership repeatedly challenged the existence of the State Union and is exploring the possibility of a separate track to EU membership.

The most easily quantifiable consequence of the political tension was the rapidly waning international investor confidence. By the end of 2004, inflation was running at 13 per cent (twice the projected level) and unemployment at 32 per cent (1.2 million jobless) while the average monthly salary stood at 170 Euros.

#### Kosovo

The civil unrest in March dashed hopes of a strengthening in 2004 of the slow and fragile process of return to Kosovo. An additional 4,200 persons were forced into displacement. Protection of communities and minority returns moved up on the domestic political agenda and led to the adoption of municipal returns strategies and the creation of a new Ministry for Communities and Returns.

Minority returns have remained low. The overall security situation has improved markedly since the March events, but for minority groups a pervasive collective fear of violence remains, aggravated by periodic security incidents. Their fears are compounded by limited freedom of movement, limited access to basic services (most notably education) and extremely poor economic prospects.

### Constraints

#### Serbia and Montenegro

The uncertain political situation in SCG, especially the uncertain future of the State Union, forced UNHCR to pursue objectives at different levels and with various partners. The difficult socio-economic situation, and the withdrawal of major humanitarian actors from SCG, increased the need for UNHCR's assistance. Owing to the absence of a legal and institutional framework for asylum, UNHCR continued to determine refugee status under its own mandate. In Montenegro, local integration was not an option (refugees cannot acquire citizenship). Returns to Croatia were hampered by obstacles to the exercise of property rights, and other rights. Returns to Kosovo slowed down drastically after the events of 17 March. A further difficulty was the lack of a proper legal framework for social housing and micro-credit.

#### Kosovo

The March violence, limited freedom of movement, unresolved property issues, and the persistent lack of economic opportunities were key factors limiting progress on minority return. Furthermore, uncertainty about the final status of the province makes it difficult to argue that IDP communities are able to make an informed choice about their future. UNHCR and key partners made concerted efforts to mitigate

these constraints. But ultimately a substantial increase in voluntary returns cannot be expected without a resolution of the status question – plus sustained improvements in security, human rights and living conditions for the relevant communities in Kosovo.

## Funding

### Serbia and Montenegro

UNHCR had to delay and reduce its activities as a consequence of US dollar depreciation, given that the ExCom-approved budget was fixed at the March 2003 exchange rate. Fortunately many donors responded with flexible funding earmarked at the subregional level.

Collaboration initiated with the Council of Europe Development Bank on durable solutions for collective centre residents raised hopes of substantial involvement on the part of key development actors. The Serbian Commissioner for Refugees provided supplementary funding of approximately USD 60,000 for a pilot in-kind assistance project to cover the cash requirement for refugee families leaving collective centres. The overall rate of implementation for 2004 was 99 per cent.

### Kosovo

UNHCR Kosovo conducted stringent and regular reviews of budgets to try to mitigate the effects of the depreciating US dollar. Careful budgeting and consultation with implementing partners minimized the negative impact, enabling less critical activities to be cut, with support from operational partners to cover resulting gaps. UNHCR's total capital investment since 1999 in the development of a local micro-credit scheme was officially handed over to the Kosovo Enterprise Programme (over USD 1.5 million). It is worth emphasizing that, with such limited resources at its disposal, none of UNHCR's objectives in Kosovo could have been achieved without the complementary activities of international organizations and self-funding NGOs.



## Achievements and impact

### Protection and solutions

#### Serbia and Montenegro

From 27 November 2004 to 25 January 2005, UNHCR assisted the Serbian Commissioner for



Serbia and Montenegro: IDPs from Kosovo living in prefab houses built by World Vision with Canadian funds for vulnerable families. UNHCR/Y. Saita

Refugees in conducting a refugee re-registration in Serbia. UNHCR estimates that after the revision of their status, the number of registered refugees in Serbia would not exceed 120-130,000 (about half of the present figure).

Some limited progress has been made on the repossession of property in Croatia belonging to refugees. Following the adoption by the Croatian

Government of the Conclusion for the Provision of Housing Care for Former Tenancy Rights Holders who want to return to Croatia, UNHCR facilitated the collection of applications for this housing care programme through its implementing partners. This programme does not offer a legal remedy involving restoration of lost tenancy rights or adequate compensation. It does however amount to a housing solution for any former tenancy right

holders who wish to return and avail themselves of it.

The greatest progress has been observed in the field of reconstruction of houses belonging to refugees/returnees in Croatia. UNHCR organized the collection of reconstruction applications in advance of the new deadline of 30 September 2004. A total of 11,500 applications were collected. Some 450 refugees were assisted to return; an additional 294 persons were assisted with the transportation of tractors and household belongings to Croatia. One hundred and seventy-seven refugees were assisted to return to BiH with household belongings and tractors. About 430 IDP families participated in go-and-see-visits and 228 IDP participants attended Municipal Working Group/Task Force Meetings in Kosovo.

The new Law on Citizenship of the Republic of Serbia entered into force on 29 December 2004. According to the Serbian authorities, 108,000 refugees had been accorded SCG citizenship since 1997. Only 44,000 persons de-registered: the remainder, who retain refugee status, have not yet requested citizens' ID cards. The main problem remains the inability of the Serbian authorities to deal rapidly with the pending applications. In the Republic of Montenegro, the 1999 Law on Montenegrin Citizenship makes no clear reference to the naturalization of refugees and does not enable refugees to integrate locally through naturalization.

UNHCR actively promoted accession to the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness. Both Serbia and Montenegro expressed positive views on the ratification of the 1961 Convention on the Reduction on Statelessness, as well as the 1997 European Convention on Nationality. The ratification of both instruments is on the agenda for 2005.

The events of March 2004 in Kosovo dealt a blow to the delicate process of return of IDPs. However UNHCR later resumed its earlier activities, concentrating on the provision of reliable information, assistance to IDPs in making an informed choice, provision of legal aid through NGOs and assisting returns when possible. The situation of the Roma IDPs, the most vulnerable segment of the IDP population, continued to require particular attention.

UNHCR established an Inter-Agency Working Group on the forced return from western European countries to Serbia (but not to Kosovo) of minorities originating from Kosovo. UNHCR strongly advocated against the forced return of minorities, in particular Roma and Serbs, in order to prevent secondary internal displacement and in full observance of the right to return to the place of origin.

In Montenegro, despite UNHCR's efforts, persons of concern to the Office remained outside the local social welfare scheme. Refugee and IDP women were involved in the design and manufacturing of ethnic products and some 25 sales exhibitions were organized.

Approximately 6,000 children, mainly the most socially vulnerable, often from single-headed households, benefited from sports activities. Fifty-four mobile teams consisting of a social worker and a psychologist offered psychosocial support to some 35,000 refugees and IDPs in over 160 municipalities in Serbia. Educational and vocational training activities for Roma were aimed at pre-school and school age children as well as other age groups.

## Kosovo

UNHCR played a key role in monitoring and analysing the conditions of minorities (some 85,000 individuals) throughout Kosovo while providing accurate and timely information to IDPs, refugees, local and central authorities, NGOs, donors and host governments through active participation in various coordination forums and coordinated go-and-see and go-and-inform visits. Legal aid and inter-ethnic dialogue activities were pursued to contribute to the creation of favourable conditions for return.

In 2004, the Office also pursued durable solutions for the remaining refugees from FYR Macedonia, BiH and Croatia. A total of 725 refugees repatriated to FYR Macedonia, but only 12 to Croatia and none to BiH.

Despite UNHCR's advocacy of continued international protection of ethnic minorities from Kosovo, and an initial decrease in forced returns from third countries, the trend increased again in the third quarter of 2004 with a total of 383 forced returnees recorded by airport monitoring teams (and followed up by UNHCR field offices).

The March events adversely affected the organized return planning process. Rather than identifying new locations, priorities were focused on completion and upgrading of on-going return projects. UNHCR increased training and capacity building activities for partners, local authorities, UNMIK and KFOR.

## Activities and assistance

### Serbia and Montenegro including Kosovo

**Community services:** In Kosovo, UNHCR and its implementing partners provided small-scale grants in support of some 2,500 returnee, minority and IDP women, implemented 137 self-reliance projects, and 23 income generation and infrastructure projects for spontaneous minority returnees and their vulnerable neighbours, and completed 67 community development projects, benefiting minority returnees and majority community members (the latter as a balancing component).

**Domestic needs/Household support:** Various household items were provided to over 10,000 refugees and IDPs. Some 13,000 vulnerable beneficiaries (former WFP food beneficiaries aged 65 and over) received one-time cash assistance. In the 58 collective centres closed in 2004, in-kind assistance was delivered to 355 families (763 persons) under a pilot project (PIKAP). In collective centres planned for closure in 2004, PIKAP was delivered to 136 families (295 persons). In the remaining collective centres, PIKAP was delivered to 153 families (334 individuals).

In Kosovo, non-food items were distributed to minority returnees, IDPs and FYR Macedonia refugees as well as to extremely vulnerable resident minorities. UNHCR established and coordinated the mechanism for distribution of humanitarian assistance to the 4,200 IDPs displaced in March 2004 and provided immediate emergency relief from existing stock through the distribution of blankets, hygienic kits, kitchen sets, jerry cans, mattresses, plastic sheets, soap and sanitary napkins. Extremely vulnerable families had the use of 18 new and 10 used rigid shelters as temporary accommodation while their houses were rebuilt.

**Food:** Over 2,300 metric tons of food were distributed to some 54,300 refugees in Serbia and Montenegro. In Kosovo, UNHCR distributed 950 three-month food rations (wheat flour, beans, oil, sugar and canned meat) for spontaneous returnees.

**Health/Nutrition:** UNHCR launched a pilot social support programme for families at risk (single headed families, or families with a disabled member, alcohol/drug problems, problems of domestic violence, or child neglect/abuse). Over 1,000 of the most vulnerable refugees and IDPs were provided with medication and/or medical services and UNHCR also continued to support and contribute financially to the operation of the UNAIDS Theme Group on HIV/AIDS.

**Income generation:** The in-kind programme benefited 99 families while 232 IDPs participated in vocational training. Under the micro-credit programme, UNHCR distributed some 3,700 loans from the existing revolving fund, benefiting over 18,000 refugees and IDPs (either directly or indirectly).

**Legal assistance:** In Kosovo, local volunteers were recruited by UNHCR's Lead Agency Programme with the aim of monitoring the return and departure of minorities throughout Kosovo and maintaining updated and accurate information on access to services, security and freedom of movement and providing information.

**Operational support to agencies (including public information activities):** Over 300,000 viewers watched television shows produced by UNHCR in the series *A Time to Decide* (aimed at refugees) and *Return* (aimed at IDPs). The refugee magazine *The Right Response* was distributed to refugees, IDPs and vulnerable groups. UNHCR's public information staff in SCG, BiH and Croatia jointly produced cross-border refugee television shows and launched mass information campaigns on the reconstruction of damaged property, repossession of property and the Government of Croatia's housing care Programme.

A media campaign was launched in Montenegro in June with the aim of mobilizing refugees to register. In Serbia, a wide media campaign was launched (November 2004 to January 2005) with the purpose of promoting refugee re-registration.

In Kosovo, the Office endeavoured to raise public awareness of UNHCR's mandate. World Refugee Day events took place in each of the five regions and press releases and magazine articles were published in the Kosovo press. A donation of sportswear from teams of athletes who participated in the Olympic Games in Athens received extensive coverage in the local press.

**Shelter/Other infrastructure:** UNHCR continued to cover part of the running costs of the collective centres in Serbia. There were 176 collective centres accommodating some 8,000 refugees and 7,500 IDPs at the beginning of 2004. By the end of 2004 this number had decreased to 134 centres accommodating 5,300 refugees and 7,600 IDPs. UNHCR also provided building materials (partial self-help) to 100 families, to collective centre residents and to others in extremely poor private accommodation. The programme was largely covered by earmarked Council of Europe Development Bank funding. UNHCR and its partners also completed over 200 Local Settlement housing units initiated in 2003.

In Kosovo, the Plementina community temporary shelter, hosting 467 mostly Ashkaelia and Egyptian minority IDPs, was managed and maintained by a national NGO. The exit strategy for a phased hand-over to UNMIK and to the local municipality did not succeed due to the fragile security situation for minorities caused by the March civil unrest – only five families left the shelter.

**Transport/Logistics:** Over 300 metric tons of UNHCR non-food items were delivered to refugees and IDPs living in collective centres and private accommodation. In Kosovo, a fleet of 12 UNHCR trucks was maintained and convoys were organized for the delivery of humanitarian assistance.

## Organization and implementation

### Management

#### Serbia and Montenegro

In 2004, UNHCR was represented by the Branch Office in Belgrade, field offices in Novi Sad and Kraljevo, the sub-office in Podgorica and two satellite offices in Bar and Berane. By mid-2004, the

satellite office in Bar was closed, followed later by the closure of the field office in Novi Sad. At the end of 2004 there were 10 international and 65 national posts in the Belgrade Branch Office, the Podgorica sub-office and the Kraljevo field office.

#### Kosovo

UNHCR in Kosovo consisted of the Office of the Chief of Mission in Prishtine/Pristina and five Field Offices - Gjilan/Gnjilane, Mitrovice/a, Peja/Pec, Prishtine/Pristina and Prizren. OCM has 11 international staff, 31 national support staff, three UNVs and one JPO. Field Offices were manned by a Head of Field Office, one international Protection Officer (Peje/Pec, Mitrovica, Gjilan/Gnjilane), and one or two UNV Field Officers (depending on the caseload) as well as 38 national support staff.

## Working with others

### Serbia and Montenegro

UNHCR continued to cooperate with relevant national counterparts at the level of the State Union (Ministry for Human and Minority Rights, Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and the level of the two Republics.

UNHCR also made a significant contribution to the preparation of the CCA/UNDAF signed in the first quarter of 2004 and also actively participated in the UNCT-led advocacy campaigns in both Serbia and Montenegro on the Millennium Development Goals.

#### Kosovo

The UNHCR programme was implemented by eight international and four local NGO partners. Investment in capacity building over recent years permitted the full localization of the partnership activities of the Civil Rights Project-Kosovo, Kosovo Women's Initiative and Mother Teresa Society.

## Overall assessment

### Serbia and Montenegro

The unstable political situation in SCG slowed down progress towards a range of UNHCR's objectives, from the development of legal instruments to the closure of collective centres. The situation in



Kosovo and the unresolved issue of its status not only complicated return but also any integration project aimed at IDPs in Serbia.

The closure of collective centres remains one of the pillars of UNHCR's programme in Serbia, both in terms of resources and visibility. Fewer collective centres were closed in 2004 than originally planned owing to delayed financial support from relevant international development actors and the appointment of a new Serbian Commissioner for Refugees in March 2004.

In the micro-credit programme the focus has been shifted to capacity building of the implementing partners Microfins and Micro Development Fund (MDF). During the first quarter of 2004, Microfins successfully finalized the takeover of the International Rescue Committee's portfolio and staff, while the Danish Refugee Council completed the hand-over of its programme to MDF.

In May and June 2004, a review was undertaken of the local integration activities and of opportunities for local integration in development planning instruments. UNHCR's work in SCG was identified as a good model of Development through Local Integration (DLI). The report specifically highlighted the importance of the inclusion of refugees and IDPs in the PRSP and UNDAF. Finally, the report stressed the positive experience of coexistence between refugees and host communities, whereby refugees were often regarded as a repository of skills, rather than a burden to the host communities.

## Kosovo

The needs of persons of concern were largely met through constant UNHCR monitoring, advocacy and coordination with all actors. Financially, UNHCR's input remained too limited. The Office was forced to continually review and reprioritize as a consequence of the steady decrease in resources eroded by exchange rate losses, the March violence, the decrease in returns (notably Kosovo-Serbs) and increased pressure to identify new return locations

(whether spontaneous, facilitated or organized). Broader economic policy changes are needed to ensure the long-term development of both minority and majority communities.

While continuing to provide humanitarian assistance, UNHCR played a catalytic and supervisory role with respect to minority returns.

The unexpected surge of violence against Kosovo-Serbs and other minority communities in March had a profoundly negative effect on the return of minorities to Kosovo. Although the security situation had greatly improved by the end of the year (thanks to the constant efforts of KFOR, UNMIK and the Provisional Institutions of Self-Governance (PISG)) it is far from a restoration of trust between communities. As a result, very few IDPs are returning, and there are fears that renewed displacement could easily be caused by political agenda. Undoubtedly the recent focus on the implementation of the Kosovo Standards (dealing largely with the improvement of living conditions and the human rights of minorities) has led to broad improvements, but UNHCR believes that it is the settlement of the final status of Kosovo which will offer a real choice to IDPs (and ultimately determine the scope of minority returns).

Offices
<b>Serbia and Montenegro</b>
<b>Belgrade</b>
Kraljevo
Podgorica
<b>Kosovo</b>
Gjilan/Gnjilane
Mitrovice/a
Peja/Pec
Prishtine/Pristina
Prizren

## Partners: Serbia and Montenegro

### Serbia

#### Government agencies

Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs  
Serbian Commissioner for Refugees

#### NGOs

Amity  
Danish Refugee Council  
Group 484  
Hi Neighbour (Serbia)  
Humanitarian Centre for Integration and Tolerance  
International Legal Alliances  
International Orthodox Christian Charities  
Intersos  
Italian Consortium of Solidarity  
Micro Development Fund  
Microfins  
Norwegian Refugee Council  
Serbian Democratic Forum  
Union

#### Others

Red Cross of Serbia  
Republic Statistical Bureau  
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation  
UNV

### Montenegro

#### Government agencies

Montenegrin Commissioner for Displaced Persons  
Montenegrin Ministry of Interior

#### NGOs

American Refugee Council  
Community Development Centre

#### Others

Red Cross of Montenegro  
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation  
UNV

## Partners: Kosovo

### Government agencies

Housing and Property Directorate  
Provisional Institutions of Self-Governance

### NGOs

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

### Others

Council of Europe  
IOM  
KFOR  
Kosovo Police Service  
OCHA  
Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe  
UNMIK Civilian Police (CivPol)  
UNDP  
UNHCHR  
United Nations Mission in Kosovo / Office of Returns and Communities and Office of Community Affairs  
United States Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration  
UNV

## Financial Report (USD)

Expenditure breakdown	Current year's projects	Prior years' projects
	Annual programme budget	Annual and Supplementary programme budgets
Protection, monitoring and coordination	8,036,871	0
Community services	1,900,039	1,061,161
Domestic needs / household support	1,378,267	311,708
Education	206,274	13,512
Food	133,101	15,190
Health and nutrition	300,441	116,675
Income generation	207,711	378,780
Legal assistance	2,296,567	508,419
Operational support (to agencies)	1,685,696	61,907
Sanitation	8,711	3,768
Shelter and infrastructure	3,638,725	2,635,505
Transport and logistics	1,566,417	440,970
Instalments with implementing partners	3,866,619	(5,547,596)
<b>Sub-total operational activities</b>	<b>25,225,439</b>	<b>0</b>
Programme support	2,018,833	0
<b>Total disbursements</b>	<b>27,244,272</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Instalments with implementing partners</b>		
Payments made	14,089,043	
Reporting received	(10,222,424)	
<b>Balance</b>	<b>3,866,619</b>	
<b>Prior years' report</b>		
<b>Instalments with implementing partners</b>		
Outstanding 1 January		4,140,057
Payments made		1,788,210
Reporting received		(5,547,596)
Refunded to UNHCR		(270,710)
<b>Balance</b>		<b>109,961</b>
<b>Unliquidated obligations</b>		
Outstanding 1 January		2,514,179
Disbursements		(2,126,654)
Cancellations		(387,525)
<b>Outstanding 31 December</b>		<b>0</b>