

Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

Main Objectives

Serbia and Montenegro

Assist the most vulnerable among the 231,000 registered IDPs from Kosovo and approximately 400,000 refugees, and identify durable solutions; assist refugees to repatriate voluntarily to Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) and Croatia, but help those who do not wish to (or cannot) to integrate locally; assist IDPs to return to Kosovo as soon as the situation permits, and pursue local integration for those who wish to remain; protect and ensure respect for the rights of refugees, returnees and IDPs, and promote the passage of federal legislation to implement the 1951 Convention and establish refugee status determination procedures; maintain the contingency plan to protect and assist some 50,000 refugees from FYR Macedonia and to cope with secondary movements of up to 40,000 Serbs who may leave Kosovo; facilitate the evacuation or return to Serbia of some 2,000 Roma who are currently assisted in FYR Macedonia.

Kosovo

Protect and assist vulnerable refugees, returnees, IDPs and residents at risk, and work with partners to monitor and improve their security. Support reconciliation initiatives as well as reintegration for IDPs returning to Kosovo. Continue to hand over humanitarian assistance, monitoring and reintegration activities to the UNMIK structure, OSCE and specialist development agencies. Focus on core mandate activities: the return of minorities to Kosovo, especially of ethnic Albanian IDPs from southern Serbia to their places of origin; voluntary



repatriation to and from Kosovo, including vulnerable Kosovo Albanian refugees from western Europe and neighbouring countries; the return of minority IDPs from Serbia and Montenegro; and providing protection and assistance to the refugees from FYR Macedonia, and facilitating their eventual return.

Impact

Serbia and Montenegro

- Re-registration, completed in June 2001, showed that there were now 170,000 fewer refugees.
- 200 Serb IDPs from Serbia and 40 Roma-

Ashkalija-Egyptian (RAE) IDPs from Montenegro returned to Kosovo. In 2001, UNHCR organised 30 go-and-see visits to Kosovo for more than 500 people altogether.

- 1,076 refugees from Serbia and 163 refugees from Montenegro returned to Croatia, through UNHCR's repatriation programme. Additionally some 8,000 persons returned spontaneously. 864 refugees from Serbia and 743 from Montenegro were also helped to return to BiH. In addition 1,378 refugees were resettled to third countries during 2001.
- At the peak of the conflict in FYR Macedonia, more than 10,000 refugees, mainly ethnic Albanians, took refuge in FRY. By December 2001, almost all had returned.
- Of the estimated 5,300 ethnic Albanian returnees to Kosovo from southern Serbia, 307 families were assisted (housing repairs, domestic items).

Kosovo

- Some 360 RAE refugees from BiH, Montenegro and FYR Macedonia returned home with

UNHCR assistance. 13 Krajina refugees repatriated voluntarily to Croatia, 18 persons were resettled to third countries.

- A total of 155,716 passengers used the bus-shuttle service between isolated minority communities throughout Kosovo. By the end of June, this service had been transferred to UNMIK.
- A total of 2,115 warm rooms were created to accommodate refugees from FYR Macedonia and IDPs from Southern Serbia. 1,526 refugee families and 1,117 host families directly benefited from this assistance.
- Six multi-ethnic Regional Women's Councils were formed under the Kosovo Women's Initiative (KWI). The Councils reviewed and approved 167 projects. An estimated 30,000 women as well as their families benefited from these projects.
- UNHCR provided legal assistance and counselling, mediation and court representation for 6,178 persons deemed to be at risk. Some 2,500 minorities with extremely limited freedom of movement received fresh food and other essential items throughout the year.

Persons of Concern				
Main Origin/ Type of Population	Total in Country	Of whom UNHCR assisted	Per cent Female	Per cent under 18
FRY (IDPs)	263,600	-	50	32
Croatia (Refugees)	245,300	245,300	51	19
Bosnia and Herzegovina (Refugees)	143,100	243,100	56	21
Local residents at risk	85,000	85,000	-	-
FYR Macedonia (Refugees)	11,300	11,300	55	43
Returnees (from Germany)	9,300	4,800	-	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina (Refugees)	5,400	80	-	-
Returnees (from FYR Macedonia)	4,500	1,600	-	-
Returnees (from Norway)	1,500	1,100	-	-
Returnees (from Switzerland)	1,400	30	-	-
Returnees (from United Kingdom)	940	130	-	-

Income and Expenditure (USD) Annual Programme Budget and Supplementary Programme Budget					
	Revised Budget	Income from Contributions ¹	Other Funds Available ²	Total Funds Available	Total Expenditure
AB	63,262,856	26,982,660	28,947,477	55,930,137	55,888,800
SB	10,942,290	3,408,324	3,940,563	7,348,887	6,275,078
TOTAL	74,205,146	30,390,984	32,888,040	63,279,024	62,163,878

¹ Includes income from contributions restricted at the country level.

² 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

A positive step taken by the FRY Government in 2001 was the amendment of the Yugoslav Citizenship Act to make it easier for refugees to obtain Yugoslav citizenship. UNHCR welcomed the formulation of a national strategy to resolve refugees' problems in Yugoslavia (UNHCR and other UN agencies had assisted the Government in this endeavour). General conditions in Kosovo did not permit UNHCR to promote large-scale return of IDPs to Kosovo. As the threat of renewed ethnic conflict in southern Serbia receded, UNHCR embarked on an assistance programme to facilitate the return of

ethnic Albanian IDPs to the former Ground Safety Zone (GSZ: a 5 km zone that extended beyond the Kosovo provincial border into the rest of FRY territory).

Kosovo

A new political and institutional environment dominated Kosovo in 2001. In accordance with the Constitutional Framework for Provisional Self-Government in Kosovo, established in May 2001, elections to the new assembly of the PISG (Provisional Institutions of Self-Government) were held in November 2001. The conflict in FYR Macedonia resulted in an influx of 81,000 refugees to Kosovo. Upon signature of the Ohrid Framework Agreement refugees and IDPs started to return spontaneously to their homes. UNHCR facilitated the return of refugees with special needs and those with insufficient FYR Macedonian documentation. It is estimated that only 9,000 FYR Macedonian refugees still remain in Kosovo.

Constraints

Serbia and Montenegro

Although some improvement was evident, insufficient security or freedom of movement remained the principal constraints to return. In southern Serbia, Albanians were still barred from their former jobs and under-represented in public service and the local economy. The property repossession process in Croatia still constitutes a serious obstacle in the way of repatriation. In Montenegro, a major problem was the shortage of alternative accommodation; this severely affected the management of the collective centres, which lacked the funds even to cover their everyday running costs.

Kosovo

The conflict in FYR Macedonia, in southern Serbia and in the Ground Safety Zone constituted major challenges. Through effective inter-organisational mechanisms of protection, emergency assistance was provided to the refugees and IDPs. In some areas

conditions for minority communities have improved somewhat. However, local residents deemed to be at risk continued to face harassment, intimidation, isolation and violence.

Funding

In Serbia and Montenegro and Kosovo, the global funding shortfall led to a 20 per cent decrease of budgets.

Achievements and Impact

Protection and Solutions

Serbia and Montenegro

Following a change in the FRY Citizenship Act in early 2001, refugees obtaining FRY citizenship could also retain the citizenship of their country of origin. Therefore a large number of applications for FRY citizenship were received in 2001. UNHCR continued to implement the Protocol on Organised Return signed by FRY and Croatia. During 2001, a total of 5,354 applications for resettlement were received (compared to 9,857 the previous year). The Country Team for Asylum created under the Stability Pact Initiative on Migration and Asylum met towards the end of the year (Stability Pact for South-eastern Europe). UNHCR prepared a broad



UNHCR and other humanitarian agencies help civilians to return in safety and dignity. Assisting refugees leaving Blace near the Macedonian border. *UNHCR / J. Austin*

assessment of the legislative reform and capacity-building measures that need to be undertaken in developing the asylum system in FRY.

Kosovo

Although the situation in southern Serbia improved, permitting the return of ethnic Albanian IDPs, some 10,000 ethnic Albanians remained. Thirteen refugees returned to Croatia and 18 persons were resettled to third countries. An estimated 2,400 IDPs returned spontaneously to 16 municipalities. The Joint Committee for Return endorsed a framework document, which established a structure for inter-agency co-ordination and a common set of objectives for safe and dignified return. Regional and Local Working Groups on Return were led and chaired by UNHCR. Some 360 RAE requested and received assistance to return to Kosovo, more than twice as many as during the previous year. The majority of RAE returnees (280 persons) came from FYR Macedonia.

Activities and Assistance

Community Services: In Serbia and Montenegro, approximately 225,000 refugees and IDPs were assisted through various community service activities, which focused mainly on vulnerable individuals and families. In Kosovo, psychosocial assistance was provided to some 1,200 children in Oraovac. Basic assistance was provided to 2,100 members of internally displaced ethnic minorities and refugees accommodated in various Community Shelters.

Crop Production: A number of small-scale greenhouse projects were carried out in 102 collective centres in Serbia and Montenegro. Altogether 7,646 refugees benefited from the project.

Domestic Needs/Household Support: Non-food items distributed in Serbia and Montenegro included blankets, metal beds, cooking stoves, kitchen sets, plastic sheeting and stove heaters. Other non-food items, basic necessities and sanitary material for women were provided. In support of the heating programme, heating oil and coal were distributed. Similarly in Kosovo, various non-food items and sanitary materials were supplied. As part of the "winterization" programme, 15,132 cubic metres of firewood was distributed, and an additional 3,249

cubic metres of firewood went to 1,238 minority families.

Education: In Serbia and Montenegro, vocational training was provided for an estimated 1,500 refugees in the Collective Centres. Many of these beneficiaries have found employment.

Food: In Serbia and Montenegro, one hot meal a day was provided in 404 recognised collective centres, 109 specialised institutions and 42 student dormitories. 1,565 metric tonnes of supplementary food was distributed. A Joint Food Needs Assessment Mission was undertaken with WFP in May/June 2001. It recommended that strict eligibility criteria be applied. In Kosovo, fresh food including dairy products, fruit, and vegetables were provided to isolated and dispersed minorities in urban areas and enclaves, to minority returnees (2,456), minority IDPs (2,097), and refugees accommodated in various community shelters.

Health/Nutrition: In Serbia and Montenegro, 25,079 refugees and IDPs were assisted with various medical services through the Special Medical Programme. In Montenegro, approximately 2,150 persons benefited from the monthly medicine distribution at ten public health centres.

Income Generation: The microcredit programme was successfully implemented in Serbia and Montenegro. 2,500 micro-loans were issued to refugees in the course of the year. In addition, over 1,200 grants-in-kind were made to vulnerable refugees. In Kosovo, microcredits were extended to business entrepreneurs. In all, 4,555 loans were granted. The programme included 36 orientation sessions attended by 330 participants, as well as 175 training sessions for 2,177 clients.

Legal Assistance: Nine Humanitarian Legal Offices in Serbia provided services to 6,783 clients (17,000 consultations). Some 10,000 advisory consultations were held at seven legal aid centres in Montenegro. The Commission on Real Property Claims of Displaced Persons and Refugees (CRPC) continued to register claims. Some 7,685 new claims were accepted, covering 8,813 properties and 10,041 decisions were issued. In Kosovo, free legal aid and information services to IDPs, minorities, returnees and other local residents at risk were provided

through eight centres and mobile teams. 6,178 clients were registered. A local implementing agency provided legal advice, counselling and facilitated legal representation in court to approximately 1,500 women. Some 1,600 women also attended workshops on human rights and property rights.

Livestock: In Serbia and Montenegro, small-scale livestock activities were implemented in 49 collective centres. A total of 7,300 egg-laying hens were distributed. Some 4,394 refugees benefited from this programme.

Operational Support (to Agencies): UNHCR initiated a large public information campaign in Serbia and Montenegro regarding the rights of refugees from Croatia to reclaim property. In Kosovo, an agreement was reached with UNV to provide up to 13 UNVs to strengthen UNHCR operations. UNHCR kept up a public information campaign through radio and the print media, including regular updates in local newspapers.

Sanitation: In Serbia and Montenegro, UNHCR made use of a rapid reaction fund to assist collective centres in need of small-scale repairs.

Shelter/Other Infrastructure: In Serbia, UNHCR met the running costs of 404 collective centres, 109 specialised institutions and 42 student dormitories. Some 86 collective centres were repaired for use by approximately 8,000 beneficiaries. In Montenegro the number of collective centres was reduced from 56 to 44. In Kosovo, a provision of 2,115 rooms with host families was made available for FYR Macedonia refugees, ethnic Albanian IDPs from southern Serbia and Kosovo Albanian IDPs, benefiting some 16,920 persons. Small-scale assistance to 304 families was provided and 247 rigid shelters were distributed.

Transport Logistics: In Serbia and Montenegro, contracts were signed for 8,100 square metres of warehouse space, four trucks and one fuel tanker. Five fuel pumps were rented for storage of transport fuel. In Kosovo, UNHCR provided financial support to the emergency food aid programme and the secondary distribution of food. Logistical support for food, non-food, shelters and other UNHCR assistance continued. Two warehouses, supported by a mechanical workshop, were maintained.

Organisation and Implementation

Management

In Serbia and Montenegro, UNHCR maintained six offices together with the Branch Office located in Belgrade. In early 2001, UNHCR established a presence in southern Serbia. The number of staff fell by ten per cent as posts were discontinued. In Kosovo, UNHCR had one main office in Pristina and five field offices with 106 posts (31 international and 75 national staff). UNHCR also accommodated the Office of the Special Envoy to the Balkans (four international and three national staff) until October, when that function was discontinued. The position of Regional Co-ordinator was subsequently created, based in Sarajevo, covering the entire sub-region.

Working with Others

UNHCR's activities in Serbia and Montenegro were mainly implemented through 21 partners, two governmental bodies, six local NGOs and 13 international NGOs. Mechanisms for inter-agency consultation and information-sharing among the UN sister agencies were well established in FRY, such as Agency Heads meetings, joint donor briefings, and UN Inter-Agency meetings.

In 2001, UNHCR stepped up efforts to encourage new development actors to focus on refugee integration needs. Contacts were made with bilateral and multilateral development agencies and banks. In Kosovo, 21 international and two local NGO partners implemented UNHCR's programme. UNHCR collaborated at all levels with KFOR, UNMIK and other agencies. All UNHCR offices maintained daily contact with municipal and regional authorities, to exchange information and monitor the situation of minorities.

Overall Assessment

In Serbia and Montenegro, a national strategy was drafted to solve the plight of refugees/IDPs. The strategy is the most significant step to date in efforts to work for lasting solutions for refugees and IDPs. UNHCR's expertise played a vital role in

helping the Government to formulate it. Through partner networks, gaps in the provision of humanitarian assistance and development aid were identified; they were addressed at sectoral operations meetings. The collection of reconstruction applications from refugees for reconstruction assistance in Croatia proved a good example of the co-operation between the authorities of FRY, Croatia, and UNHCR. UNHCR's action on behalf of those fleeing FYR Macedonia helped prevent major hardship, as the current state of emergency preparedness in FRY was adequate for small emergencies. In the case of IDPs from Kosovo, the possibility of their return to Kosovo in the near future remained bleak. Reconstruction efforts in Kosovo did not sufficiently target minorities. The system had not been adapted sufficiently to deal with minority situations and needs. In Montenegro, pending clarification on the status of the Republic, large scale and/or longer-term investment by development-oriented agencies was limited. A number of NGO humanitarian projects also faced delays and/or non-response from bilateral funding sources, pending political developments.

In Kosovo, UNHCR's assistance in 2001 focused on protection and the provision of targeted assistance to extremely vulnerable minority communities throughout Kosovo, with a view to preventing further displacement. UNHCR continued its activities to promote the right of return for minorities, drawing attention to obstacles to safe and sustainable return and the measures required to remove them. Extensive dialogues have taken place with Kosovo Albanian political and community leaders to enhance inter-ethnic dialogue and acceptance of minority return. As the UNMIK administrative structures became more conversant with the specific needs and rights of minority communities in Kosovo, certain measures were taken and procedures changed for the benefit of the minorities.

Offices

Serbia and Montenegro

Belgrade

Bar
Beranje
Krajlevo
Nis
Novi Sad
Podgorica

Kosovo

Pristina

Gnjilane
Mitrovica
Pec(Peje)
Prizren

Partners: Serbia and Montenegro

Government Agencies

Commission for Real Property Claims
Serbian Commissioner for Refugees
Montenegrin Commissioner for Displaced Persons

NGOs

Alter Modus
American Refugee Committee
CARE International
Danish Refugee Council
Hi Neighbour
Humanitarian Centre for Integration and Tolerance
Humanitarian Law Centre
International Council of Voluntary Agencies
International Rescue Committee
International Orthodox Christian Charities
InterSOS
Italian Consortium of Solidarity
Japanese Emergency NGOs
Norwegian Refugee Committee
OXFAM
Serbian Democratic Forum
World Vision International

Others

IFRC
Red Crescent Societies
IOM
Swiss Humanitarian Agency
UNVs

Partners: Kosovo

NGOs

Acteurs de Solidarité
Action Against Hunger
Agence d'aide à la coopération technique et au développement
American Refugee Committee
CARE
Caritas Secours International (Belgium)
Children's Aid Direct
CONCERN
Council for the Defence of Human Rights and Freedoms
Danish Refugee Council
Handicap International
International Catholic Migration Commission
International Rescue Committee
Italian Consortium of Solidarity
Malteser Hilfsdienst
Mercy Corps International
NORMA
Norwegian Church Aid
Norwegian Refugee Council
Première Urgence
Triangle Génération Humanitaire

Others

IFRC
UNMIK
UNVs
WFP

Financial Report (USD)						
Expenditure Breakdown	Current Year's Projects			Prior Years' Projects		
	Annual Programme Trust Funds	Supplementary Programme Budget	Total	notes	Annual Programme Budgets	notes
Protection, Monitoring and Co-ordination	11,367,627	668,102	12,035,729		295,317	
Community Services	2,884,087	304	2,884,391		1,809,549	
Crop Production	78,431	0	78,431		92,496	
Domestic Needs / Household Support	2,167,222	2,534,547	4,701,769		2,119,239	
Education	61,175	0	61,175		45,923	
Food	6,101,348	11,001	6,112,349		3,561,923	
Health / Nutrition	1,133,221	0	1,133,221		766,993	
Income Generation	2,131,398	0	2,131,398		1,231,357	
Legal Assistance	2,852,538	19,213	2,871,751		630,679	
Livestock	66,571	0	66,571		157,925	
Operational Support (to Agencies)	1,224,405	39,649	1,264,054		583,468	
Sanitation	132,692	0	132,692		35,588	
Shelter / Other Infrastructure	6,161,370	683,801	6,845,171		3,370,272	
Transport / Logistics	3,892,165	70,507	3,962,672		3,010,602	
Water	0	282,352	282,352		0	
Transit Accounts	2,425	0	2,425		36	
Instalments with Implementing Partners	8,410,952	1,378,362	9,789,314		(12,850,317)	
Sub-total Operational	48,667,627	5,687,838	54,355,465		4,861,050	
Programme Support	3,569,621	0	3,569,621		36,866	
Sub-total Disbursements / Deliveries	52,237,248	5,687,838	57,925,086	(3)	4,897,916	(5)
Unliquidated Obligations	3,651,552	587,240	4,238,792	(3)	0	(5)
TOTAL	55,888,800	6,275,078	62,163,878	(1) (3)	4,897,916	

Instalments with Implementing Partners

Payments Made	32,798,487	2,406,842	35,205,329		6,125,385	
Reporting Received	24,387,535	1,028,480	25,416,015		18,975,702	
Balance	8,410,952	1,378,362	9,789,314		(12,850,317)	
Outstanding 1st January	0	0	0		14,315,719	
Refunded to UNHCR	0	0	0		2,092,341	
Currency Adjustment	0	0	0		627,830	
Outstanding 31 December	8,410,952	1,378,362	9,789,314		891	

Unliquidated Obligations

Outstanding 1st January	0	0	0		6,480,520	(5)
New Obligations	55,888,800	6,275,078	62,163,878	(1)	0	
Disbursements	52,237,248	5,687,838	57,925,086	(3)	4,897,916	(5)
Cancellations	0	0	0		1,582,604	(5)
Outstanding 31 December	3,651,552	587,240	4,238,792	(3)	0	(5)

Figures which cross reference to Accounts:

- (1) Annex to Statement 1
- (3) Schedule 3
- (5) Schedule 5