

## Final Evaluation Report

# **“Capacity Building of Institutions Involved in Migration Management and Reintegration of Returnees in the Republic of Serbia”**

The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the IOM. This report has been prepared as a result of an independent assessment by the consultant contracted by IOM.

---

## PROLOGUE

---

This report is done within the monitoring and evaluation strategy of the IOM's "Capacity Building of Institutions Involved in Migration Management and Reintegration of Returnees in the Republic of Serbia" project (CBMM project), to promote organisational learning, assess results achieved within the project and recommend relevant future steps.

Basic evaluation criteria, including; *relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability* had been examined, through documentary analysis of project outputs, project reports, other relevant sectoral documents and materials, and interviews with the main parties, stakeholders and final beneficiaries. The analysis also took into the account the mid-term evaluation report, produced in July 2012, by the same author.

The report has been prepared in February 2013 and reflects the situation at the final stage of the project, through the implementation that lasted from 13/09/2010 to 28/02/2013, following the last non cost extension.

The author would want to particularly thank the IOM's CBMM project team and the management of the beneficiary institution – Commissariat for Refugees of the Republic of Serbia (CRS) currently transformed into the Commissariat for Refugees and Migration, for sharing their views on the progress and discussing quality criteria.

The views expressed in here are the sole responsibility of the author and are based on discussions, documents comparison and wider exploration of the topic of migration management in Serbia.

**Purpose, as per the TOR:** *"Building upon already performed mid-term evaluation of the project, the purpose of this consultancy is to conduct the final evaluation of the "Capacity Building of Institutions Involved in Migration Management and Reintegration of Returnees in the Republic of Serbia"*

**Objective, as per the TOR:** *"The objective of the consultancy is to conduct an overall evaluation of, and produce a final report of the progress of the CBMM project, i.e. to assess the outcomes of the activities implemented and provide recommendations for future engagement in this field."*

**Period covered, as per the TOR:** 12 September 2010 – 28 February 2013

**Methodology foreseen as per the TOR:** *"A mix of quantitative and qualitative analysis will be drawn from written documentation, interviews with key informants and focus group discussions, including the review of all relevant documents (CBMM Mid-term Evaluation Report including) covering the program activities and interviews with key stakeholders."*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Prologue .....	2
Executive Summary.....	4
Main report.....	6
Background/Relevance analysis.....	6
Adequacy of Project Initial Design .....	10
Analysis of Project Efficiency .....	11
Analysis of Project Effectiveness.....	18
Analysis of Project Sustainability .....	<del>2021</del>

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Evaluation Aspects	Summary of Findings	Recommendations
<p>Is the project's design adequate to address the problem(s) at hand?</p>	<p>The mid-term evaluation identified already that the <i>"The initial design has not fully taken into account the analysis of the institutional features such as obligation, justiciability, existence of legal norms, sanctions, and/or enforcement staff."</i> The initial design over-relied on the plans of the line strategies, and as they were not met, implementation delays occurred and the need for mitigation. Consequently, these omissions were rectified, in particular towards the end of the project with the enactment of the Law on migration management.</p>	<p>For DEU – ensure that the analysis of the institutional features such as obligation, justiciability, existence of legal norms, sanctions, and/or enforcement staff is taken into account when institution building projects are developed.</p>
<p>What internal and external factors have influenced the ability of beneficiary groups and IOM to meet projected targets?</p>	<p><b>External.</b> Initial lack of legal binding documents was the main external factor that influenced the ability of IOM to undertake activities as originally planned. This situation has been rectified partially in April 2012, when the adoption of the new systematization of the main beneficiary (when 80% of approved project time has already passed), and at greater extend in November 2012, following the approval of the Law on Migration management (when 88% of amended project time has passed). Still after 100% of passed project time the bylaw on data sharing mechanism is not endorsed, which is another legally binding document needed to implement planned activities.</p> <p><b>Internal.</b> The indicators provided in the project's log frame are not SMART, as was noticed by the external project monitors, which theoretically prevents efficient risk management as it disables sequenced internal monitoring. Also, IOM faced difficulties in recruiting the team members that has also caused initial delays.</p>	<p>For IOM – ensure SMART indicators are used in project intervention logic in future programming efforts.</p>
<p>Does the project remain relevant considering possible changes in context?</p>	<p>The project is dealing with the policy area that is important for Serbia's socio-economic development and its EU accession. The inclusion of the similar topic in the IPA 2013 sector fiche in the "justice and home affairs" sector of the national program confirms this, as does the recent allocation of 240 mill EUR from EC for the regional housing program targeting refugees, and 15 mill EUR for the closure of collective centers in IPA 2012 program. The recent Serbia's progress report also confirms the project's relevance.</p>	
<p><b>RELEVANCE</b></p>		
<p><b>Overall Conclusion</b></p>	<p><b>Highly relevant project, whose operational context required undertaking of a series of mitigation measures</b></p>	
<p>Which outputs has the project achieved so far against the work plan?</p>	<p>Each component has resulted with a number of outputs. Major project results include the following: 1) the Commissariat for Refugees is transformed into the Commissariat for Refugees and Migration, the Migration Profile is published annually, 3) migration data sharing is regulated by law and 4) local migration councils are institutionalized by law.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">For details see Table 2 – Summary of Outputs</p>	<p>For commissariat – continue using produced outputs for future reference and and make full use of the DSM following the approval of the drafted bylaw. Promote and discuss widely the findings of the study on the impact of the demographic and migration flows on Serbia.</p>
<p>Are the project activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and annual action plans?</p>	<p>Finalization of the project required two non-cost extensions. Both were approved by the Contracting Authority and agreed with the main beneficiary. Original timetable has been amended twice – in July 2011, following the monitoring report and (partially) – in August 2012, when first non-cost extension was requested. The project required 20% additional time than originally planned. Out of 49 identified outputs, 4 were not done (- 8%), in consultation and upon approval of the donor. 3 unplanned outputs had been produced (+6%), 2 of which are major preconditions for the project. 2 outputs decreased their targets and 3 increased them.</p>	
<p>Are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with expected activity plan?</p>	<p>No major reallocations of the approved budget took place.</p>	
<p><b>EFFICIENCY</b></p>		
<p><b>Overall Conclusion</b></p>	<p><b>In the very complex institutional context, and because of ambitious design – the project had to practice mitigation, be extended and refocus of development of preconditions that were originally not in place. This required 20% more time than originally anticipated. As little as 8% of originally planned outcomes have not been met, but instead significant preconditions were produced, higher in order of significance to many of the original outputs planned.</b></p>	
<p>Is the project document sufficiently well designed to identify which impact was expected from the project and attributable to it?</p>	<p>The project's general logic of intervention and internal coherence is superb. However, as the indicators are in fact outputs the impact attributable to the project remains hermetic, without any reference to external change and/or data. So, instead of focusing on the fact that the project has contributed to seminal, sustainable change of legislation and institutional practice, that it reached out to over 90% of entire Serbia, and initiated planning in municipalities where 86% of returnees are accommodated, developed pioneer</p>	<p>For IOM – Avoid hermetic logical frameworks in future project planning.</p>
<p><b>EFFECTIVENESS</b></p>		

Evaluation Aspects	Summary of Findings	Recommendations
<p>Has the program generated any results that could indicate that the assistance has so far had an impact on the target beneficiary (CRS officials, line ministries and selected local servants)?</p> <p>Were there any impacts that were not foreseen by the project?</p>	<p>studies highly relevant for the country's socio-economic development and EU accession, its design forced the project team to focus on unrealistic output targets in reporting on the project progress.</p> <p>The project supported development of 1 law, 2 national action plans, revised 2 national strategies, and helped develop 78 local action plans. It has contributed to legal recognition of new functions that are relevant for migration management, both at inter-institutional and institutional, central and local level. It has produced 16 high quality papers, some of which are pioneer work in understanding, measuring and assessing migration in Serbia. It has raised knowledge of over 1000 practitioners dealing with migration management, covering in its capacity building over 90% of the country, and 100% of relevant national stakeholders, and has indirectly affected the lives of 86% of registered returnees by working with municipalities accommodating them. It produced 4 handbooks, 1 toolkit and two set of tools. Finally it has reached out to targeted public, including academia, general citizens and other stakeholders, through its campaign.</p> <p>Outputs, which not originally foreseen by the initial project design, and have a significant legislative, institutional and governance impact, were produced. They include new law on migration management, and new Action plan for migration management. The generated impact unforeseen impact hence, was the legislation change.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">For details see Table 3 – Summary of objectives met</p>	
<p><b>Overall Conclusion</b></p>	<p><b>In overall, all objectives that were achievable have been achieved. The project led to changes in legislation, inter-institutional cooperation practice, organizational practice of the main beneficiary, produced a compendium of valuable knowledge and raised capacities of both central and local stakeholders.</b></p>	
<p>Do the overall objective and project purposes contain an element of sustainability?</p> <p>Did local partners and stakeholders participate in the planning and implementation of the project to guarantee sense of ownership and interest in the sustainability?</p> <p><b>SUSTAINABILITY</b> Are the results obtained sufficient to draw any conclusion on the sustainability before the actual end of the project?</p> <p>What should be done in order to guarantee the sustainability, if necessary?</p>	<p>As noted in the mid-term evaluation, the project proposal considers sustainability aspects; however the initial project design has not fully analyzed institutional processes and legal requirements needed for the sustainable change to take place.</p> <p>Local partners, stakeholders and the main beneficiary participated in the project design. This is ensured through initial IPA programming process, in which the Beneficiary in cooperation with the national IPA programming bodies, has drafted the Project fiche and through the formation of the Project's Steering Committee, which eventually started discussing strategic issues of projects' concern. Main beneficiary has continued to use the project outputs outside of the project. It has also kept 2 of project staff through regular employment. Local action plans were endorsed by the local municipal parliaments.</p> <p>This project has already proved its sustainability. Partially this is due to fortunate and final enactment of the Law on migration management before the actual end of the project but also due to the design of the production of several outputs that took into account existing resources and practices and worked on the basis of them. The examples include Migration profile, Data sharing mechanism, Local action planning, EMM trainings and training in monitoring and evaluation of CRS.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">For details see Table 4 and 5</p> <p>The implementation of the Law on Migration management must be supported and fully monitored at the local level, Staff capacity of the Commissariat must be strengthened with practical analytical and legal analysis skills in the field of migration and EU law harmonization, Infrastructural improvement and IT training is required to complete the establishment of the data sharing mechanism once the relevant bylaw regulating it is adopted. Moreover, dissemination on knowledge gained on EU aquis to legal practitioners across central institutions should take place and additional efforts are needed to observe the needs of returnees locally. Serious consideration of long term policy planning on the basis of predictions on future demographic and labor force developments in Serbia, at highest level, would also guarantee sustainability.</p>	<p>For CRS – Ensure and/or advocate for actions listed under guarantees of sustainability</p>
<p><b>Overall Conclusion</b></p>	<p><b>All components developed sustainable outputs. Out of 6 sustainability indicators listed in the project proposal, 1 has not been fully met. There are several outputs that are examples of excellence in sustainability achievement. Project has produced and/or helped produce sustainable legislative change, strategic framework and institutional and organization change. It has also led to sustainable building of capacities and reached out to targeted audience and general public</b></p>	

# MAIN REPORT

## BACKGROUND

---

### **Relevance to the Country Context – Socio-economic needs**

Serbia is facing a series of migration challenges. Internal migration, caused by post WW2 rapid modernization, urban-rural migrations and decrease of population working in agriculture, led to the new population distribution. In the last decades, large-scale joblessness of youth, rising incidences of poverty and unbalanced regional development is particularly troubling as it causes the “brain drain” and new divides. In the period from 1991 to 2001, an average number of 78,800 persons changed their place of residence, on yearly basis. This number is significantly higher compared to prominent migratory periods in the past<sup>1</sup>, and it is only likely that it has increased in the next decade.

The 2002 census recorded over 762,000 immigrants from former republics of SFRY (B&H, Croatia, Slovenia and Macedonia). According to the recent data, the number of irregular migrants passing through Serbia and whose final destination is the EU has increased, approximately 9,500 irregular migrants were registered in 2011, as compared to 2,500 in 2010. The returnees coming back from the Western countries through the readmission agreements also form a part of the recently formed, specific migrant group. According to recent data 5,150 persons were returned to Serbia from an EU Member States in 2011 as opposed to 3,979 in 2010<sup>2</sup>.

Population forecast is not promising. The population in 2041 is likely to drop to 5.5 million, 23% less than that observed for 2011. *“The natural change losses over the period would equal to 1.4 million, while net migration loss for the same period would be 261 thousand, the labor force would decline by 21% and the old-age dependency ratio would increase by 62%, to 40 people aged 65+ per 100 aged 15–64.”* is a likely low-spirited picture of Serbia’s future, if innovative overarching migration management policies are not developed.<sup>3</sup>

### **Relevance to EU Accession Requirements**

Serbia is on the way toward the integration into the European Union, and has signed the Stabilization and Association Agreement (SAA), with the European Communities and their Member states. Articles 6, 82, 83, 123 are specifically relevant for migration policy area and the SAA itself *“reaffirms the right of return for all refugees and internally displaced persons and the right the protection of their property and other related human rights”* in its preamble.

Pursuant the Article 72 of the SAA, the EU aquis should be approximated into the Serbian legislation, and this relates to a number of directives and regulations that that constitute the main body of the “EU

---

<sup>1</sup> Migration Profile of the Republic of Serbia, produced within the CBMM project

<sup>2</sup> Data retrieved from the last EC Progress report on Serbia

<sup>3</sup> The Impact of Demographic and Migration flows on Serbia, produced within the CBMM project

Migration Law”. *“Migration is now firmly at the top of the European Union’s political agenda”* highlights the recent Communication of the Commission on Global Approach to Migration and Mobility.<sup>4</sup>

### **Funding context**

The CBMM project has been financed by the EU (to the amount of 1, 8 million EUR), and co-funded by the IOM 1035 Facility (to the amount of 150,000 EUR) and the Czech MFA (to the amount of 15,000 EUR). It is predominantly funded from the 1<sup>st</sup> pillar of the EU’s Instrument of Pre-accession (IPA) that provides funds for transitional assistance and institution building, and under the 2010 national program for Serbia. National Programme on Serbia under the IPA Transition Assistance and Institution Building Component for the year 2010 (NP 2010) has its focus on several priority axes<sup>5</sup>, including political criteria, socio-economic criteria and ability to assume obligations of membership. Under the “ability to assume membership” priority axis - migration is specifically mentioned – with a particular focus on capacity-building of relevant institution and prevention of illegal migration. The NP 2010 mentions that the purpose of the CBMM project is to *“To strengthen existing institutions’ capacity in order to achieve EU standards in Migration Management and reintegration of returnees upon readmission.”* The NP 2010 also foresees another project relevant for the issue of the migrations – “Establishment of efficient system for prevention and suppression of illegal migrations on the territory of the Republic of Serbia” - that is to be focused on the Ministry of Interior.

The CBMM project is conducted in joint management with the IOM. The 2010 program recognizes 3 such projects (following Article 53d of the Financial Regulation and the corresponding provisions of the Implementing Rules).

According to the original project fiche<sup>6</sup> the project has been programmed to *“Contribute to the establishing of Migration Management Mechanism in the Republic of Serbia in line with EU acquis.”* The project document itself lists that its *“overarching aim .... is to contribute to the establishment of a Migration Management Framework in the Republic of Serbia in line with the EU acquis and to strengthen the capacity of central and local authorities to achieve EU standards in Migration Management, Readmission and the Reintegration of Returnees.”*<sup>7</sup>

Migration management centered project and/or projects supporting vulnerable migrants (refugees, IDPs, returnees) are a constant in the yearly IPA plans. The NP 2011<sup>8</sup> mentions that *“Livelihood and living conditions of vulnerable groups, including internally displaced persons (IDPs), refugees and returnees is a pressing problem in Serbia and in the region as a whole”* and allocates 7.0 mill EUR for the “Support for the implementation of strategies for IDPs, refugees and returnees” project. The NP 2012<sup>9</sup> priority sectors include: justice and home affairs, social development, and environment and climate change. In the “justice and home affairs” sector, the NP 2012 focuses on (amongst other issues): *“strengthening*

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/pdf/1\\_en\\_act\\_part1\\_v9\\_com2011-743\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/pdf/1_en_act_part1_v9_com2011-743_en.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2010/adopted\\_documents\\_np\\_serbia\\_2010.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2010/adopted_documents_np_serbia_2010.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2010/17\\_migrations\\_mgmt\\_ipa10.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2010/17_migrations_mgmt_ipa10.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> CBMM Info sheet

<sup>8</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2011/comm\\_native\\_c\\_2011\\_4972\\_1\\_en\\_decision\\_execution\\_commission.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2011/comm_native_c_2011_4972_1_en_decision_execution_commission.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2012/071212\\_annex\\_financing\\_proposal\\_annexe\\_acte\\_autonome.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2012/071212_annex_financing_proposal_annexe_acte_autonome.pdf)

border controls, supporting migration management and fight against irregular migration, including measures to address trafficking in human beings, as well as the asylum system". The NP 2012 program foresees two specific projects relevant for the migration management area, "Police reform and migration management project", (amounting to 3.91 mill EUR) and "Support for improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of Collective Centers", (amounting to 15.2 mill EUR).

Previous national programs had also dealt with the migration management. NP 2007 program<sup>10</sup> allocated 10 mill EUR "to build durable solutions to address the IDP/Refugee Challenge"; NP 2008<sup>11</sup> program foresaw 6 mill EUR "to contribute to resolving the problems of refugees and IDPs in Serbia while ensuring their full access to their rights", and NP 2009 program allocated 12.5 mill EUR for the "Supporting access to rights, employment and livelihood enhancement of refugees and IDPs in Serbia" project.

**Table 1 IPA funding for migration management**

National program	Title of the project	Funds	Main beneficiary	Priority axis
<b>IPA 2007</b>	Support to Refugees and IDPs	10 mill EUR	Commissariat for Refugees	Political Requirements
<b>IPA 2008</b>	Support to Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons	6 mill EUR	Commissariat for Refugees Ministry for KiM	Political Requirements
<b>IPA 2009</b>	Supporting access to rights, employment and livelihood enhancement of refugees and IDPs in Serbia	12.5 mill EUR	Commissariat for Refugees of the Republic of Serbia Ministry of Labour and Social Policy Ministry for KiM	Political Requirements
<b>IPA 2010</b>	Establishment of efficient system for prevention of illegal migrations on the territory of the Republic of Serbia	5 mill EUR	Ministry of Interior	Ability to assume obligations of membership
	Capacity building of institutions involved in migration management and reintegration of returnees in the Republic of Serbia	1.8 mill EUR	Commissariat for Refugees	Ability to assume obligations of membership
<b>IPA 2011</b>	Support for the implementation of strategies for IDPs, refugees and returnees	7 mill EUR	Commissariat for Refugees Ministry of Labour and Social Policy Ministry for KiM	Social Development
<b>IPA 2012</b>	Police reform and migration Management	3.91 mill EUR	Ministry of Interior	Justice and Home Affairs
	Support for improvement of the living conditions of forced migrants and closure of Collective Centres	15.2 mill EUR	Commissariat for Refugees  Office for Kosovo and Metohija	Justice and Home Affairs

The programmers of IPA national programs have not been very coherent in terms of placing the migration under the specific sectorial policy. In 2007, 2008 and 2009 support to vulnerable migrants has been considered as part of the political accession requirements. In 2010 – migration management has been considered as important for the "ability to assume membership" requirements. In 2011 the sector grasping the support to migrants was "social development", whilst in 2012 it was under the "justice and

<sup>10</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/support\\_to\\_refugees\\_and\\_idps\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/support_to_refugees_and_idps_en.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2008/3-refugees\\_and\\_idps\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2008/3-refugees_and_idps_en.pdf)



home affairs”. Current 2012 “Social development” sector project fiche<sup>12</sup> does not recognize housing as the area of action, hence the placement of a project that tackles closure of the collective centers under the “Justice and home affairs” priority axe.

Amongst all the mentioned projects across the years, the CBMM project has been **the only institution building project targeting full migration framework** – and having a Commissariat for Refugees as the main beneficiary. Others have shifted from social inclusion (predominantly) towards issue-specific support to the law enforcement sector. According to the Commissioner for Refugees the 2013 IPA program includes a sector fiche in the area of justice and home affairs, where migration management framework development is prioritized.

**Conclusion 1** – The migration and migrant-related projects had been a constant in the IPA funding for Serbia. Average allocated amounts accounted for 5% - 10% of the available funds for transitional assistance and institution building yearly.

**Conclusion 2** – The migration sphere has not been grasped coherently throughout the IPA programming cycles. The programmers should take into account that migrations a) cause significant **social challenges** for Serbia, and consider allocating funds to help alleviate them; and this includes also the housing policy for migrants; but should also note that b) migration management is of particular importance for the **EU aquis approximation** and that institutional development is needed to meet that end. Both of these goals need to be mainstreamed in the planning, and Commissariat for Refugees should be the primary target of both, as a designated migration management agency in the country.

The projects mentioned above, are all identified in the national IPA program for Serbia. Of course, bilateral donors have also contributed to the provision of funds, and recent implementation of the Regional Housing Program, which resulted from the Sarajevo declaration process, is another example of the aid for this field. The EC provided 230 mill EUR for this program alone.

### **Migration Policy reforms in Serbia**

In its recent Progress report<sup>13</sup> on Serbia, the European Commission notes that *“There has been no progress regarding migration management. The number of irregular migrants passing through Serbia and whose final destination is the EU has increased....Coordination amongst bodies responsible for implementing the migration strategy still needs to be improved and sufficient financial means allocated.....the capacities and resources for integrating returnees from the readmission process are very limited.”* The report also notes that *“Serbia continues to be in the early stages of implementing the asylum policy”,* that *“Roma, refugees and internally displaced persons continue to face a difficult situation.”* The report also notes that *“The program for supporting municipalities which prepare local action plans for the improvement of the status of refugees and IDPs has continued and some improvement has been recorded concerning the displaced persons housing situation.”* However, the report again stresses that *“the living conditions of many refugees and internally displaced persons are still difficult. Many are unemployed and live in poverty.”*

<sup>12</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2012/pf\\_6\\_social\\_development.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2012/pf_6_social_development.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key\\_documents/2012/package/sr\\_rapport\\_2012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/sr_rapport_2012_en.pdf)

To respond to the EU accession requirements, Serbia has signed the Readmission agreement with the EC in 2008, and also formed the Coordination body for the monitoring and the management of migrations in 2009. National strategy for refugees and IDPs was approved in 2002. Strategy for the Integrated Border Management has been approved in 2006, stressing the need for a harmonized database on all the data regarding legal and irregular migrants and for the effective monitoring. National strategy to combat trafficking has been approved in 2006. Migration Management strategy, Strategy for the Reintegration of Returnees and the Strategy for the Suppression of Illegal Migration have all been approved in 2009. Several laws were enacted within the reform processes, including the Law on Foreigners (2008), Law on Asylum (2007), Law on protection of state borders (2008), Law on identification documents (2008), Law on travel documents (2007) and Law on Citizenship (2004). Law on employment of foreigners is expected to be in place during 2013.

The Migration management strategy and the National Plan of Integration (both from 2009) foresaw the enactment of the Law on migration management, as the short term priority. The Law has been approved by the Government in late 2011, and enacted in late 2012, upon the formation of the new Serbian government. The enactment of the law has been in the delay, compared to original plans.

The Migration management strategy of 2009 noted that: *“In the Republic of Serbia exists no systematic monitoring of migration flows, and thus there is neither a serious analysis of the migration potential, the migration profile, the realization of migrant’s rights nor on the impact of migration on the development of the country. The issue of migration does not attract the greater interest of neither the general nor the academic public.”* It also noted that: *“Within the framework of the current institutional structure and the division of competencies there is a lack of horizontal and vertical coordination, and occasionally also the overlapping jurisdiction of the institutions”* and that *“The competent authorities are keeping registers on the issued residential permits, work permits, declined entrances, deportations, asylum seekers and those who have been granted the refugee status. In spite of the fact that they signify the basic source of information necessary for the functioning of the official statistical system, the providers of the data are a weak link in the statistical system out of various reasons, such as the refusal to hand out data, the delayed delivery and the supplying of low quality figures, namely inaccurate data.”* The activities of the CBMM project were designed to respond to these claims.

#### ADEQUACY OF PROJECT’S INITIAL DESIGN

---

The mid-term evaluation has revealed faults in the initial design of the project, and they are discussed in detail in there. Predominantly, the design relied too much on the wording of the Strategy and has not taken into account the analysis of the institutional features such as obligation, justiciability, existence of legal norms, sanctions, and/or enforcement staff. These factors had not been under the control of the project team, which undertook proper mitigation planning and supported development of missing preconditions, encouraged in these steps by the main beneficiary of the project. With the consequent enactment of the Law on migration management, these faults had been largely mitigated.

**Conclusion 3.** - As concluded in the midterm evaluation, the initial design has relied too much on the texts of the line strategies – overseeing the fact that these documents remain only “soft law”<sup>14</sup> in its character and are not a sufficient guarantee for changes, as they are not binding. However, the project undertook proper mitigation measures to address the faults in the initial design and supported the developing of a binding, overarching law. This mitigation has been done with success and it rectifies initial faults in the design. Subsequently the Government of Serbia approved the Law on Migration management.

As noted by the ROM monitors that monitored the project in its early phase, the indicators provided are actually the outputs of the project, and this also influenced the project implementation, making it more hermetic than needed. Usage of outputs instead of indicators may disable appropriate internal monitoring as progress towards meeting those is no longer relevant (the output has either been produced or not), and this in turn may have an effect on risk management. The initial delay in staff recruitment also caused subsequent prolongation of implementation.

#### ANALYSIS OF PROJECT'S EFFICIENCY

---

##### **Organization of Tasks/Timing**

The project is divided into five components, to address five specific objectives, including:

**Component 1:** To review the Strategy for Migration Management and provide support for the review and implementation of the Action Plan for Migration Management 2012-13.

**Component 2:** To establish and improve inter-institutional data collection mechanisms and systems for sharing and analysing data relevant to migration management.

**Component 3:** To strengthen the capacity of central and municipal authorities in migration management.

**Component 4:** To support the capacity of central and municipal authorities, including local services such as the Centres for Social Work, to plan, monitor and carry out the reintegration of returnees.

**Component 5:** To raise awareness among institutions, civil society and the public on migrants' rights and integration needs.

In June 2011, the monitoring recorded that *“There are already serious deficiencies emerging in the implementation of the activities.”* The IOM has developed the new timetable to rectify this situation and has presented it to the Steering Committee. Towards the original end of the project, non-cost extension was requested in August 2012, and approved by the Contracting Authority (with new end date being 15 December 2012). This non-cost extension enabled full implementation of several activities. In November 2012 a second non-cost extension was requested and approved, setting the new end date to 28 February 2013. This non cost extension enabled full implementation of the campaign planned within the

---

<sup>14</sup> In his definition, Francis Snyder describes soft law as “rules of conduct which in principle have no legally binding force but which nevertheless may have practical effects.”, F Snyder “The Effectiveness of EC Law,” in T Daintith (Ed.) Implementing EC Law in the UK (1995)

project. Whilst project extensions are generally not speaking in favour of their efficiency, these were needed mainly because of the very ambitious initial design, and also due to elections that took place in Serbia in 2012. The midterm evaluation has also recognised that the project extension will be needed.

The recruitment of long term and short term consultants has been done as planned, but with constraints and delays, mainly due to the fact that there are not many migration policy experts in Serbia available on the market, so additional time was needed to identify appropriate personal. Two out of four long term experts who served within the Commissariat had actually stayed in there after the finalisation of their contracts with IOM and started working as regular staff.<sup>15</sup> This signals the value of the project staff selected, and the recognition of their skills and potential by the main beneficiary. Products developed within the project by short term experts (Migration profile, Monitoring and Evaluation tables for example) are recognised as valuable by the main beneficiary and will be further used in the regular work of the institution. Their maintenance does not require any external expertise.

Steering Committee has been established, however also with delays due to the slow process of selection of a member from the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. Initially, most operational decisions were made through operational agreements between the IOM and Commissariat. However, at the time of the evaluation the last Steering Committee was held and used to discuss the added value of the project, amongst other topics. The general remark of the main beneficiary is that the project significantly strengthened the relations between the Commissariat and the national stakeholders involved in migration management, and in particular with the Ministry of Interior. They regard the project as one of the most successful in their project portfolio, and speak highly of its relevance, sustainability and effectiveness.<sup>16</sup>

### **Analysis of Outputs**

Major project results include the following: 1) the Commissariat for Refugees is transformed into the Commissariat for Refugees and Migration (through new Law), 2) the Migration Profile is published annually (guide has been produced, data tables and processes defined, and Commissariat continued producing it outside of the project), 3) the Migration data sharing is now regulated by law and 4) the Local migration councils are institutionalized by the law. Other than that institutional, legal, organization and socio-economic specifics of the migrations in Serbia are now better identified and known. Country's future population trends had been studied and forecasted. Public, academia and media are familiarized with the topic, and central level ministries better informed on EU migration aquis. The project trained people from 161 municipality from Serbia, which is over 90% of Serbia. The project initiated migration related action planning in municipalities that accommodate over 86% of returnees.

In general, outputs<sup>17</sup> produced within the Component 1 are of excellent quality. Legal and institutional assessments had been done; new systematization of Commissariat has been drafted and adopted in

---

<sup>15</sup> Info received at the interview with Ms Svetlana Velimirovic, Deputy Commissioner at CRS, held Friday, 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2013, at the premises of CRS

<sup>16</sup> ibidem

<sup>17</sup> Data for all outputs retrieved from the CBMM Interim report, Final report, documents review and interview with the main beneficiary and local stakeholders.

April 2012. Migration Management Strategy was reviewed; Action plan for the period 2011 – 2012 has been endorsed. Gap analysis produced in relation to national vis-à-vis EU legislation in the area of migration, is an example of professional excellence and should be used as an input for the new migration management projects that focus on legal approximation towards EU aquis. The Migration Profile for 2010 has been done, published, but also Guide for its development, so that the beneficiary may easily use it in the future. Commissariat benefited from several trainings. The formation of the Technical group that was used for the production of a Migration profile is a rare example of achieved inter-institutional coordination.

The implementations of the Component 2 lead to a detailed understanding on data collection, storage, sharing and use. The EUROSTAT compliance assessment has also been done. The Law on Migration management now regulates the data sharing. The project also helped produce the bylaw on data sharing mechanism which is to be adopted in 2013. Main beneficiary is now able to gather, process and use the needed data, but is also aware on the financial costs of the data sharing. This activity has been linked to the implementation of Component 1 and led to establishment of smooth cooperation between the Commissariat and the Ministry of Interior, much needed in migration management as a whole.

Both Components 1 and 2 required mitigation, change of original plans and timing, but have led to production of meaningful, sustainable and high-quality outputs. The 2012 elections had also influenced their implementation. Two activities within the Component 2 were canceled. 5 activities required more time than originally planned. 1 output has been changed in targets. Instead of focusing on the activities planned, the team had to develop preconditions, the Law, the Action plan, as they were not in place.

The Component 3 included a series of trainings, done at local and national level. A study trip to Sweden also took place, including 10 participants from the Commissariat, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Labor and Social Policy, Ministry of Economy and Regional Development. The document produced within this Component – the Fundamental of Migration Management in Serbia is a very detailed, comprehensive paper that may be used for future reference, as it helps in grasping the complexity of this framework and its many actors.

This Component required no mitigation, but required additional time to the one originally planned. The number of trained participants at local level is at end higher for 30%.

The Component 4 led to identification of over 100 municipalities with specific migration management needs, related to return through readmission. An empirical research titled “Survey on trends and needs of returnees” reveals interesting data on the beneficiary group, observing, for example, that returnees lack of familiarity and rarely use local social protection systems. Support for revision of local plans has been delivered to 78 municipalities.

This Component 4 has also faced mitigation efforts, due to initial unrealistic ambitions and lack of legal background for the functioning of the local migration councils. The 2012 local elections have also influenced the implementation. In result, one activity was amended, two included change of targets (increase of round tables in one case and decrease in another). One activity failed to achieve original, unrealistic targets (local plans). 3 activities required additional time.

Finally, Component 5 included drafting and endorsement of the Commissariat's Communication Strategy and action plan. National multi-media migration information campaign has been implemented. The products of this component include handbooks, toolkits and similar info-material, but it also included broadcast of produced media material and round tables. The future population trends were also studied and forecasted. The population forecast raises high concerns and should be an input for overarching policy making on the long term.

This Component (5) has not met much mitigation needs but it required additional time. It is the main subject of the second non-cost extension request. The subcontractor failed to meet the deadline in the execution of one activity, and also one bidding procedure was canceled. One activity (output) has been canceled.

In general, all components had led to production of needed, solid quality outputs and had met their purposes.

The evaluation identified 49 expected outputs, 4 of which had not been done - which is 8% (of course without any weighting of the individual outputs which are not all of the same significance). The outputs were omitted in consultation and with approval of the Contracting authority (include training curricula on DSM, piloting of DSM, 1 study visit to Vienna, 1 impact assessment of the Returnee Integration strategy). There are two outputs that are in fact preconditions that were developed and were not originally planned – the Law on migration management and the Action plan. There is one additional output - the revision of the Returnee Integration Strategy done to replace the originally expected one (impact assessment). Project did make an effort to proceed in the line with the original plan, but there has been no support from the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, which is the major stakeholder in the implementation of the said strategy, and there were limited implementation mechanisms at local level, so instead of an impact assessment, review was done. Out of the 45 implemented outputs, 3 had an increase in targets, and 2 a decrease (more step down trainings was done with higher participation, more round tables with municipalities on local planning, more participants traveled to Slovakia; less action plans than originally planned were produced, less good practice round tables took place,).

**Conclusion 4** - In the very complex institutional context, and because of ambitious design – the project had to practice mitigation and refocus of development of preconditions that were originally not in place. As it was a project dealing with government institutions, at local and central level, the 2012 elections also affected its implementation. All this led to a 5 month extension, which is 20% additional time to the one originally foreseen. In total, out of the 49 identified, 45 outputs were produced, 4 had not been done, Activity/Output results differ from targets in 5 cases, 3 overachieving them and 2 not meeting them fully. Project failed to implement only 8% of the expected outputs, but has also produced 3 additional outputs (2 needed preconditions and 1 additional output).

The table below presents the detailed list of the outputs, per individual components.

Table 2 Summary of Outputs per Components

	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4	Component 4
Outputs produced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of the national migration legislative framework is completed</li> <li>Gap analysis of the Legislation of the Republic of Serbia in Comparison with the EU Acquis is completed, training and coordination delivered</li> <li>Desk and field assessment of the existing institutional framework was conducted</li> <li>Drafting of new systematization was supported, systematization endorsed in April 2012</li> <li>EU oriented institutional framework of the Commissariat is completed</li> <li>The ToR for Department for Migration and Euro integration and job descriptions have been drafted</li> <li>The Strategy on Migration Management has been reviewed and six strategic areas of action identified</li> <li>The future support needs to further strengthen Commissariat and Trustees have been identified</li> <li>Action plans covering period 2011-2012, 2012-2013 were produced</li> <li>The Technical working groups where MoI, MoFA, MoERD, MoRD, MoKiM, MoHMRSALSG, MoLSP, Republican Office of Statistics, Commissariat for Refugees are represented was formed</li> <li>Standardized set of 137 indicators for the Migration profile is endorsed by the Technical group, the methodology for Migration profile development is set, the Migration profile is developed, training delivered</li> <li>Monitoring and Evaluation, Policy and Analysis and a National Contact Point for Migration functions within Commissariat have been established</li> <li>Monitoring and Evaluation system is in place</li> <li>Training at NCP Slovakia took place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey of the data collection demand and information systems currently in use is done, and includes a legal and IT section</li> <li>Standardized set of migration data is defined</li> <li>EUROSTAT compliance report delivered, with summary on key definitions of the EUROSTAT migration data</li> <li>Data sharing mechanism draft by-law is produced</li> <li>Charts on migration data and migration statistics are produced</li> <li>The practice of sharing migration data among the line ministries that are members of the Coordination Body is introduced</li> <li>The normative framework for the system of DSM model is endorsed by the Government with the Law on Migration Management</li> <li>Assessment on the equipment, software, staff and training needs and a cost estimate for the full implementation of the uniform data collection system and Data Sharing Mechanism has been done</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>28 CRS staff are trained in Essentials of Migration Management</li> <li>44 civil servants attended the training on EU migration acquis</li> <li>The training for trainers on Essentials of Migration Management was attended by 15 practitioners from central level ministries and bodies</li> <li>The handbook on essentials of migration management has been developed and printed in 1200 copies</li> <li>651 staff, from 161 municipality had been trained in migration management</li> <li>10 officers from central ministries attended a study trip to Sweden</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>107 municipalities affected by returns are identified based on data analysis over 17 months, as well as 4,259 returnees</li> <li>Study on Returnee Trends and Needs is produced on a sample of 500 returnee households and practitioners in 100 municipalities</li> <li>Proposal for the revision of the National strategy of returnees in Serbia is produced</li> <li>Desk study on the composition and functioning of the Refugee Councils has been conducted</li> <li>10 regional workshops were organized for 170 representatives of 60 municipalities on creating/revising Local Migration Action Plans</li> <li>Mentoring and coaching to 78 local migration councils in revision/drafting of local action plans</li> <li>3 round tables for 38 municipalities with 114 participants have been organized on best practices in migration councils work</li> <li>24 municipalities adopted revised migration action plans, 44 plans have been developed and are in revision/adoption process and 22 new plans were developed and approved.</li> <li>Handbook on implementation of local migration plans is produced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication strategy and Action plan of CRS are developed</li> <li>Campaign is implemented (including opinion polls, radio and TV spots, reportage and radio shows, social media use). Campaign included training to 60 trustees and CRS staff in media.</li> <li>5 round tables for 86 reps of civil society and media were held on migration related topics</li> <li>4 round tables for 53 media representatives were held</li> <li>Study on migration and demographic trends in Serbia that forecasts and analyzes the impact of these dynamics on Serbia in 2041 as a guide for policymaking and planning is produced</li> <li>Handbook on Migrant Rights in Serbia is produced</li> <li>Migrant Integration Toolkit is produced</li> <li>1 high level conference was held</li> </ul>

	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4	Component 4
	<b>14 outputs achieved</b>	<b>8 outputs achieved</b>	<b>6 outputs achieved</b>	9 outputs achieved	8 outputs achieved
<b>Total of 45 outputs achieved</b>					
<b>Outputs produced as a result of Mitigation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action Plan 2011-2012 is done and endorsed by Government – as there was no Action Plan for 2011 when the project started</li> <li>Drafting of Law on Migration management was supported</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drafting of Law on Migration management in which DSM is regulated was supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revision of Strategy on Integration of returnees has been produced instead of its impact assessment</li> <li>Drafting of Law on Migration management in which local migration councils are regulated was supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>
<b>Total of 3 additional outputs (Law, Action plan. Revision), Law and Action plan preconditions</b>					
<b>Outputs not met /not met fully/overachieved</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study trip to Slovakia increased in participant numbers (in consultation with Contracting Authority and upon its approval, the number of participants has been increased from 1 to 3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training curricula and execution of training on data sharing is <b>omitted</b> (normative framework in place only towards the end of the project)</li> <li>Pilot testing of data sharing model is <b>omitted</b> (same as above)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of step down training <b>increased</b> from 20 to 28, number of participants increased from 500 to 651</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact assessment of the Strategy for Returnees is <b>omitted</b>(revision done instead)</li> <li>10 regional workshops instead of five on local action planning were done (overachieving)</li> <li>3 round tables instead of 8 on best practices in the work of migration councils were done (decreased)</li> <li>78 instead of 100 local action plans (due to lack of interest, planning ability and local elections) were developed (decreased)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3-day study visit to EU Fundamental rights Agency in Vienna is canceled</li> </ul>
<b>4 outputs not done (Training curricula for DSM, Pilot testing of DSM, Impact assessment, Study visit to Vienna)</b> <b>3 outputs increased (Slovakia study trip, Step down training, Regional LAP workshops)</b> <b>2 outputs decreased (Adoption of plans, Best practice workshops)</b>					



	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4	Component 4
<b>Result achieved</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CRS now operates as Commissariat for Refugees and Migration</li> <li>The Migration profile 2011 has been published by Commissariat using the methodology developed, without any external support</li> <li>The Commissariat has functional monitoring and evaluation system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Law on Migration Management now regulates the data sharing mechanism</li> <li>Standardized set of indicators on migration is defined and the methodology for collecting data is legally regulated</li> <li>Test model of DSM platform and database exist</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over 90% of Serbian municipalities trained in migration management</li> <li>Officials from central level ministries more familiar with EU migration law</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning initiated in municipalities that currently accommodate 86% of registered returnees</li> <li>Needs of returnees identified and also the views of practitioners</li> <li>The Law on Migration Management now regulates the establishment, mandate and composition of local migration councils and Commissariat is mandated to coordinate their work.</li> <li>128 local migration councils are established, 78 plans developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PR function in CSR systematization grasped, CRS Comm Strategy developed</li> <li>Population trends related to migration are analyzed</li> <li>Public, civil society, academia, general public more informed on migration management</li> </ul>
<b>Good practice noticed:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Migration profile development practices and internal Monitoring and Evaluation functions practices have been development on sustainable basis and beneficiary is now equipped to carry with those without any external support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The system for Migration profile development has been developed in consultation with a number of national stakeholders, all of which gather, store and process individual migration relevant data, and its functioning requires no additional costs (other than equipment upgrade and IT training for CRS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ToT training methodology produced 15 new trainers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of regional workshops was increased, to better serve the needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Campaign included diverse target audience, and used diverse communication methods</li> </ul>
<b>Difficulties observed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of Law on Migration Management, lack of Action Plan, lack of Systematization</li> <li>Due to election Law postponed until end 2012</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Normative framework present only in the end of 2012, and bylaw only drafted but not in place</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slow process in local authorities to approve plans</li> <li>Low interest amongst Centers for Social work to take part in the planning</li> <li>Lack of legal jurisdiction of local migration councils during most of the project</li> <li>Elections affecting timeline</li> <li>Lack of coordinated implementation mechanism and lack of support at central level for the impact assessment of the Strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial design not taking into account the required duration of procurement procedures</li> </ul>

The analysis of the budget spending per budget headings reveals that no major reallocations of the approved budget in terms of budget heading amounts were required. There were sufficient funds available for both non- cost extension.

## ANALYSIS OF PROJECT'S EFFECTIVENESS

### Analysis of the Objectives' Indicators and Unforeseen Impact

As noted in the mid-term evaluation, the analysis of projects' objectives impact is made difficult due to the fact that project objectives in the log frame are described on the level of the activities. The indicators are in fact outputs. The analysis has therefore included an exploration of whether the expected has in fact been achieved. The unforeseen impact is also explored.

In general, the projects lead to seminal legislative change, as the transformation of the Commissariat into the designated national migration management agency is now recognized by the law, and as data sharing is now also regulated by the law. Its capacity building efforts covered almost 90% of the country, and it has an indirect impact on 86% of registered returnees, as municipalities accommodating them are now aware of the returnees needs and have initiated local strategic planning actions to assist in their inclusion and integration.

**Table 3 Summary of met Objectives and Unforeseen Impact observed**

Objectives	Indicators as per the Logframe	Status	Unforeseen Impact
To review the Strategy for Migration Management and provide support for the drafting and implementation of the Action Plan for Migration Management 2012-13	An EU-oriented organigram and the Terms of Reference for each of the units that would compose the National Agency for Migration is produced	Done through the Government endorsement of CRS Systematization in April 2012	Legislative Change – Draft of the new Law on migration management foresees establishment of designated national agency for migration (Commissariat for Refugees and Migration), Action Plan 2011-2012 endorsed by Government, Commissariat systematization endorsed in April 2012.  Organizational memory kept – Two project staff kept and hired regularly by the main beneficiary
	A review of the Strategy for Migration Management is conducted	Done, and also extended as within Component 4 revision of the Returnee Integration Strategy is done. The review of the Migration management strategy has been done on the basis of the gap analysis produced within the project.	
	The current Action Plan for Migration Management is reviewed and updated	Done, but not as planned, as there was no Action plan to be reviewed, one developed instead	
	The Action Plan for Migration Management 2012-2013 is drafted, reviewed and approved by the Coordination Body	Done, but not approved by the CB as this body has not met. Plan changed its time coverage, covering 2011-2012 instead, as this was priority. The Action Plan was endorsed by Government.	
	The Migration Profile is published at least annually	Done, and with great success as 2011 Migration profile has been published and produced by Commissariat without any external assistance	
	A Monitoring and Evaluation unit, Policy and Analysis unit, and a National Contact Point for Migration function are created, staff are trained and systems are functional	Done partially through the Government endorsement of CRS Systematization in April 2012, and fully following the enactment of the Law on migration management in October 2012.	

Objectives	Indicators as per the Logframe	Status	Unforeseen Impact
		Department for Euro integration and migration performs the roles	
To establish and improve inter-institutional data collection mechanisms and systems for sharing and analyzing data relevant to migration management	A standardized set of migration indicators is defined and the model for a Data Sharing Mechanism in Serbia is produced, approved and pilot-tested	Done ,, except of pilot testing of DSM. Full set of 137 indicators migration indicators for Serbia is produced and tested during production of the Migration Profile; DSM is model now legally regulated in Law for Migration management , Draft bylaw on DSM is produced, platform model developed, however DSM could not be pilot tested because the bylaw is not yet approved	Governance change – Inter-institutional cooperation between the CRS and Statistical Office established, very good cooperation between CRS and Ministry of Interior established
	A needs assessment and cost estimate for the phased and full implementation of the DSM is produced	Done, survey produced, and cost estimates done, cost effective data sharing developed	Legislative Change –New Law on migration management foresees preconditions for DSM
To strengthen the capacity of central and municipal authorities in migration management	More than 550 officials on a central and municipal level are trained in key migration topics	Overachieved. Over 650 people were trained in subjects relevant for migration management, and thus 15 trainers were produced through training of trainers’ methodology. 28 CRS officials received training in key EMM modules and 44 officials from relevant ministries gained knowledge on EU migration aquis	Knowledge transfer – 15 trainers produced through ToT
	A five-day study visit to an EU member state is organized	Done, 10 officials traveled to Sweden on a 5 day study visit	
To support the capacity of central (CRS and MLSP) and municipal authorities, including local services such as the Centers for Social Work, to plan, monitor and carry out the reintegration of returnees	Migration Councils are established and Local Migration action plans are drafted and adopted in 100 targeted municipalities in Serbia	Done, but not as planned: Councils established before the project start (currently 128), 78 municipalities developed/revised plans, of which 24 adopted revised plans and 22 adopted new plans, and the rest are in the process of adoption	Legislative Change - new Law on migration management gives jurisdiction to local Migration councils and to CRS
	More than 250 key members of civil society, academia, legislators and media participate in public events centered on migration themes.	Overachieved, 170 officers were trained on local migration planning, 114 participated at best practice workshops on local migration planning, 284 in total	
	A Handbook for the Implementation of Local Migration Action Plans is published and 2,000 copies are distributed	Done, copies handed over to CRS	
To raise awareness among institutions, civil society and the public on migrants’ rights and integration needs	The Communication unit is reconstituted in accordance with the Agency for Migration model and is fully staffed and functional	Done through the Government endorsement of CRS Systematization in April 2012, as Group for Return, Cooperation with International organizations and Public Relations was formed	
	The Communication strategy of CRS is revised and adopted	Done, but not as planned, as there was no Communication strategy, so one drafted from scratch	
	An action plan (media campaign) is designed and implemented	Done, campaign included diverse activities and targets	

Objectives	Indicators as per the Logframe	Status	Unforeseen Impact
	A study on migration and demographic trends in Serbia is produced and 500 copies printed and distributed	Done, study titled "The impact of demographic trends and migration flows in Serbia" produced	
	2,000 copies of the Handbook on Migrant Rights in Serbia are produced, printed and distributed to civil servants throughout Serbia who deal with migrants in their daily work	Done, paper titled "Protecting the rights of migrants in the Republic of Serbia – manual for Civil servants and local self-government officials" produced	
	A Migrant integration toolkit is produced	Done, published in 200 copies	
	A high-level conference on International Migrant's day gathers over 250 participants	Done, on the occasion of presentation of Migration profile 2010, attended by Prime Minister, Head of DEU and Head of IOM, but for less participants, however in addition to 100 participants at the conference, 60 trustees were trained in media work, 90 people attended round tables on migration themes, and 53 media reps were briefed on migration.	

The project final report included 130 annexes evidencing achievement of expected results and they include studies, training curricula, video material, guides, toolkits, handbooks, reports etc. This is a valuable compendium of knowledge that should be preserved and built upon in the future.

**Conclusion 5.** - In overall, all objectives that were achievable have been achieved. **Component 1's** objectives had been fully met. All **Component 2's** objectives that were attainable within the project lifespan have been met (the piloting of the DSM did not take place, as bylaw is not yet endorsed). **Component 3** has shown evidences of *overachievement*, as it covered 30% participant more than originally planned. **Component 4** has shown both evidences of *overachievement* – as number of participants reached at the end was 13% higher than originally expected, and as 161 municipality was involved in planning with more than 90% of the country actually covered; as number of established councils at local level is for 28% higher than planned (most of those has already been established prior to the project, but project can attribute to maintaining their existence); and *underachievement* – as number of adopted plans is for 54% less than expected, or 22% with liberal approach (having in mind that 22+24 plans were adopted; and 78 had in fact been worked on and remain in process of the adoption). Planning was done in municipalities where 86% of registered returnees are accommodated. Finally, objectives of **Component 5** had been fully met; the log frame foresees high level conference for 250 people, that took place, but with fewer participants, which was compensated with a number of meaningful activities.

## ANALYSIS OF PROJECT'S SUSTAINABILITY

### Analysis of the Sustainability per the Initial design

Project proposal reflects onto sustainability. It mentioned that: *“The staff the Commissariat of for Refugees will be trained and enabled to carry out fundamental tasks such as monitoring and evaluation, and policy making and analysis, which will ensure the functioning of the migration management system in the future.”*, that *“the ability of the Government, the specialized agencies and other stakeholders to devise and implement policies and assistance measures specifically targeting various groups of migrants will be enhanced through the production of assessment studies and by the availability of comprehensive and continuously updated data.”* and that *“The situation of migrants will also improve indirectly as a result of this Action through better services at the local level, better access to information about policies and programs that affect them and will be generally empowered to become involved in homeland development processes.”*

Indicators foreseen in the log frame, for the overall objective, and their fulfillment are presented in the table below (the level of the projects’ actual attribution to it, which is problematic, is discussed in detail in the mid-term evaluation):

**Table 4 Review of Overall Objective’s Indicators**

Overall Objective	Indicators as per the Log-frame	Status	Conclusion
To contribute to the establishment of a Migration Management Framework in the Republic of Serbia in line with the EU acquis and to strengthen the capacity of central and local institutions to achieve EU standards in Migration Management, Readmission and the Reintegration of Returnees	Increased number of returnees	5,150 persons were returned to Serbia from an EU Member States in 2011 as opposed to 3,979 in 2010.	Fulfilled
	Increased number of migrants	Number of people changing residence annually on rise, irregular migration increased as well, 9,500 irregular migrants were registered in 2011, as compared to 2,500 in 2010	Fulfilled
	The institutional, legislative and technical changes needed to establish the Migration Management Framework are identified and cost estimate made	Law on Migration Management is enacted, Migration profile published annually, designated national agency for migration legally recognized, data sharing legally regulated, local migration councils legally regulated, Costs estimates produced	Fulfilled
	A Migration Data Sharing Mechanism is established and progress towards its full-scale implementation made	Data sharing regulated by law, the bylaw on data sharing developed and yet to be approved	Fulfilled
	CRS successfully transitions to the National Agency for Migration	New systematization enforced (April 2012); New law enacted (October 2013), internal organization and practice changed	Fulfilled
	Municipal Migration Councils established and Local Migration Action Plans drafted and adopted in 100 municipalities	128 Municipal Migration Councils established before the project started, new Law gives then jurisdiction in migration management to local councils, 78 plans developed	Fulfilled with alteration from initial target

Regardless of the formal analysis of the official log-frame indicators, there are clear evidences that the project has achieved significant sustainable changes in the sphere of legislation change, strategic framework development, institutional and organization development of the main beneficiary, and inter-institutional cooperation. It has also helped develop knowledge on the subject matter, through a series of studies, reports, assessments and researches, has developed capacities of relevant officials and practitioners and reached out to public through the production of media material, direct outreach to targeted audience and general public.

There are several examples of excellence in terms of sustainable development of outputs, and these include:

- Development of methodology for the Migration profile creation. The profile has been published for 2011 by the CRS itself without any external support, so proof of sustainability is already available. The data gathering has been organized without the need for additional costs and resources.
- Development of DSM. It took into account existing institutional practice and worked around the current available resources.
- EMM training. It focused on training of trainers, creating the resources for future dissemination.
- Development on internal monitoring and evaluation system within CRS. It had a comprehensive focus, and included detailed tailored training, producing handy tools that are used by the main beneficiary on regular basis, without any need for external support.

Factors contributing to achievement of sustainable change are not to be attributed to initial project design, but much more to:

- Specific competence and specialized knowledge of IOM as the organization, and its ability to recruit international expertise, that is not available in Serbia.
- Understanding of the institutional development sequencing and complexity amongst the project management and staff.
- High commitment and readiness to support the implementation by the main beneficiary.
- Contracting authority's ability and willingness to approve non cost extension.
- Diligence in expenditure, which enabled an extension at no-cost.

The project identified that the following support is required to continue successfully the stream of actions and outputs achieved: a) the implementation of the Law on Migration management must be supported and fully monitored at the local level, b) Staff capacity of the Commissariat must be strengthened with practical analytical and legal analysis skills in the field of migration and EU law harmonization, c) infrastructural improvement and IT training is required to complete the establishment of the data sharing mechanism once the relevant bylaw regulating it is adopted. Moreover, dissemination on knowledge gained on EU aquis to legal practitioners across central institutions is needed, additional efforts at central level related to the integration of returnees and observance of their needs at local level in future implementation of strategies that tackle them is needed, and serious consideration of long term policy planning on the basis of predictions on future demographic and labor force developments in Serbia, at highest level, is needed.

The following table summarizes projects' contribution to specific areas of change:

Table 5 Summary of results achieved per the area of sustainable change

Legislative change/Normative framework	Strategic framework	Institutional change/Organizational framework	Coordination change/ Inter-institutional cooperation and practice	Knowledge change/Assessment, Analysis, Research, Studies and forecasts produced	Capacity building/Training, training of trainers/Handbooks	Public awareness
<p>Law on Migration Management recognised CRS as country's designated migration management agency</p> <p>Data Sharing Mechanism is regulated by the Law on Migration Management</p> <p>Draft bylaw on Regulation on the type of data, methods, dynamics, and technical requirements of the unified system for the collection, organization, and exchange of data is developed</p> <p>The Law on Migration Management regulates the establishment, mandate and composition of local migration councils, and the Commissariat acquired authority to coordinate them</p>	<p>National Action Plan for Migration management 2011 – 2012</p> <p>Draft migration action plan for the period 2013 -2014.</p> <p>Proposal for the revision of the National Strategy for the Reintegration of Returnees in Serbia</p> <p>78 municipalities were supported in either development of new or revision of existing local action plans on migration</p>	<p>Systematisation of CRS</p> <p>The terms of reference of the Department for Migration and Euro Integration</p> <p>Guide for the use of the Monitoring and Evaluation System of the Commissariat for Refugees of Republic of Serbia</p> <p>Tools for monitoring of relevant national strategies from the standpoint of migration management developed</p> <p>Elements of the System for Regular Policy Analysis at the Commissariat for Refugees developed</p> <p>Public relations function recognised in new CRS systematization</p> <p>CRS Communication strategy and action plan developed</p> <p>Map of competences of the Commissariat for Refugees and identification of gaps done</p>	<p>Technical Working Group established</p> <p>Approved template and standardized indicators of the Migration Profile</p> <p>Guide for Establishing a System for Migration Monitoring and Reporting on Migration in use</p> <p>Needs assessment and the proposal for the implementation of the data sharing mechanism, including cost estimation is developed</p>	<p>Review of the Legal and Institutional Framework of the Republic of Serbia in the field of Migration Management developed</p> <p>Gap Analysis of the Legislation in the Republic of Serbia in Comparison with the EU Acquis done</p> <p>Rapid Migration related Institutional Assessment within EU Integration Context done</p> <p>Report on the Review of the Migration Management Strategy 2009 of the Republic of Serbia produced</p> <p>Migration Profile Serbia 2010 produced</p> <p>Overview of the data and statistical indicators of relevance to migration produced by the Public Administration in Serbia done</p> <p>Narrative report on data collection, storage, aggregation and exchange with competent authorities done</p> <p>Mapping of existing data collection, storage aggregation, and dissemination systems done</p> <p>Assessment of needs for establishing of the monitoring and evaluation system in the Commissariat for Refugees of the Republic of Serbia done</p> <p>Report on Compliance of the newly established Migration indicators with EUROSTAT Standards done</p> <p>Summary Analysis related to data collecting and demand in the field of migration management done</p> <p>Analytical report on existing return statistics and return trends to municipalities produced</p> <p>Survey on the Needs of Returnees in the Republic of Serbia produced</p> <p>Overview of the Structure and Functions of Municipal Migration Bodies in Serbia produced</p> <p>The impact of demographic and migration flows on Serbia produced</p>	<p>2 legal officers from Mol and CRS received training on EU aquis compliance</p> <p>TWG members received training on migration profile methodology</p> <p>12 CRS officers received training on Monitoring and Evaluation</p> <p>10 CSR officers were coached in the production of several policy documents</p> <p>Study trip to the National Contact Point Slovakia attended by 3 CRS staff</p> <p>28 CRS staff received training on "Essentials for Migration Management"</p> <p>44 civil servants received training on EU migration aquis legislation</p> <p>Project trained 15 EMM trainers</p> <p>651 staff at municipal level are trained</p> <p>10 officers from relevant ministries attended a study trip to Sweden</p> <p>170 members of local migration councils trained in council management</p> <p>114 participants are trained in best practiced in the implementation of migration local action plans</p> <p>60 trustees trained in media work</p> <p>Handbook on best practices in the implementation of local migration action plans is produced</p> <p>EMM handbook is developed</p> <p>Handbook titled Protecting the rights of Migrants in the Republic of Serbia – Manual for Civil Servants and Local Self-Government Officials produced</p> <p>Toolkit on migrant integration produced</p>	<p>1 campaign held</p> <p>86 reps of civil society, academia, government attended round tabled</p> <p>53 media representatives briefed with 43 media material produced as result</p> <p>1 high level conference took place, 100 participants</p>
<p>1 law enacted, 1 bylaw drafted</p>	<p>1 plan approved, 1 drafted, 1 strategy review done, 78 local plans developed, 24 approved</p>	<p>1 systematisation done, two functions installed, 1 guide and 1 set of tools developed, 1 comm strategy in place, 1 internal knowledge product</p>	<p>1 technical inter-ministerial cooperation body established, 1 data gathering and processing template approved, 1 guide developed and used in practice</p>	<p>15 knowledge products</p>	<p>1129 people trained, 4 handbooks produced</p>	<p>1 campaign held, 239 people reached, 1 high level conference organised</p>

**Conclusion 6** – All components developed sustainable outputs. Out of 6 sustainability indicators listed in the project proposal, 1 has not been fully met. There are several outputs that are examples of excellence in sustainability achievement. Project has contributed to producing legislative change, improving strategic framework at central and local level and inter-institutional coordination, has helped achieve institutional and organization change of main beneficiary. It has also led to sustainable building of capacities and reached out to targeted audience and general public.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE

---

The above analysis identifies several recommendations for the main donor, IOM and the main beneficiary.

1. **Delegation of European Union to Serbia (and national IPA programmers)** – should consider that migration management, as a policy area, should be topic of both the social development sector based planning as well as justice and home affairs sector based planning, with Commissioner for Refugees being the primary target of both. The analysis of the previous support identifies that this has not always been the case, and that migrations have been a part of various priority axes in the past. The future sector-based approach will potentially bring positive changes. Programmers should also ensure that the analysis of the institutional features such as obligation, justiciability, existence of legal norms, sanctions, and/or enforcement staff is done when programme planning is taking place.
2. **Commissariat for Refugees and Migration** – should ensure and/or advocate for the full implementation of the Law on Migration management, endorsement of needed bylaws and should also ensure full monitoring of the law implementation at local level. It should advocate for the strengthening of its staff with practical analytical and legal analysis skills in the field of migration and EU law harmonization, and look for infrastructural improvement and IT training to complete the establishment of the data sharing mechanism once the relevant bylaw regulating it is adopted. CRS should continue using produced outputs for future reference and planning (Gap analysis, Migration profile, Fundamentals on Migration management, Monitoring and evaluation tables) and promote and discuss widely the findings of the study on the impact of the demographic and migration flows on Serbia
3. **Relevant ministries** – Should ensure dissemination of knowledge gained on EU aquis to legal practitioners across central institutions and seriously consider long term policy planning on the basis of predictions on future demographic and labor force developments in Serbia. The implementation of this project, empirically and practically reveals that the Ministry of Labour, Social Policy and Employment and also local Centers for Social Work are a weak link in migration management (they were hesitant to take part and/or were underrepresented throughout the relevant project activities, migrants themselves are rarely approaching them, and practitioners themselves do not recognize their role in the framework). This should be acknowledged and tackled at the central government level.



4. **IOM** –should ensure that SMART indicators are used in projects log-frames and that hermetic logical frameworks are avoided, as they disable internal monitoring, which in turn disabled proper risk management. IOM should also build upon the lessons learnt and products made within this project.

\*\*\*

Although critically referenced in the initial stage when external monitoring took place, and with risks of underachievement identified in the mid-term evaluation, the CBMM project has been finalized with success. This is mainly due to understanding of the institutional development sequencing and complexity, amongst the project management and staff and also due to diligence in expenditure, which enabled an extension at no-cost. The commitment of the project staff should therefore be acknowledged here. High commitment and readiness to support the implementation by Commissariat has also been the factor that influenced eventual success. Contracting authority's willingness to approve non cost extension and fortunate enactment of the Law in the very final stage of the project has also helped. But if there were no fortune, committed staff, good will in beneficiary and the understanding of the donor, the project may have not achieved the targets.

#### NOTE ON FUTURE FUNDRAISING OPTIONS

---

This project has shown excellent results in effectiveness and sustainability quality area, which is rare. The reason for this is high expertise and technical familiarity of the subject matter in question amongst project staff, long term and short terms experts. However, relevance issues, in particular those that relate to project design as well as efficiency (and these two quality areas are always linked) were the source of challenge. Both non cost extensions could have been avoided if the initial design was done in a different manner and with less ambition, and included sequencing, took into account risk management options and proposed different progress measurement. The likely reason for this is initial lack of the knowledge of the technocratic areas of project management in project planning.

Many projects are managed and written with excellence, but their effectiveness and sustainability is low. This is an altogether different project, achieving high in effectiveness and sustainability area.

This situation is not surprising. While IOM has a specific know-how in the subject matter and ability to recruit relevant international expertise, it is not a consulting company with excellence in "omnivour" project management. To that end, IOM should consider utilizing its advantages in future fundraising, with innovative partnerships. One of the possibilities is looking into the partnerships with international consulting companies with strong background in project management and combining their strengths with its own competence and expertise. IPA 2012 and IPA 2013 national programs both include projects that will be tendered on the market and IOM may consider applying to them.

In programmatic terms, IOM's knowledge on data sharing mechanisms, population forecasts and EU migration aquis is still unique in Serbia and highly relevant. On the basis of those IOM should also consider specific project planning that targets harmonization of data sharing mechanisms related to migration and consequent harmonized implementation of bylaws regulating them. Support to government in making migration policy choices on the basis of the demographic trends and migration

flows and further support to legal approximation with the EU aquis are also specific areas where individual projects could be initiated.

## Annex 1 List of Documents reviewed

Analysis related to data collecting in the field of migration management, CBMM project, IOM, 2012
Analytical report accompanying Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council "Commission Opinion on Serbia's application for Membership of the European Union", COM(2011) 668 ( <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2011/package/sr_analytical_rapport_2011_en.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2011/package/sr_analytical_rapport_2011_en.pdf</a> )
CONCLUSION ON THE ADOPTION OF THE MIGRATION MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION ACTION PLAN 2011–2012 (Official Gazette of the RS, No 37/2011)
COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 1085/2006 of 17 July 2006 establishing an Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) ( <a href="http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/documents/tempus_ipa.pdf">http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/documents/tempus_ipa.pdf</a> )
Country review of Human Resource Development in Serbia, V Klehna et al, ETF, 2010 ( <a href="http://www.eaea.org/doc/pub/Serbia-Country-review-of-human-resource-development.pdf">http://www.eaea.org/doc/pub/Serbia-Country-review-of-human-resource-development.pdf</a> )
DRAFT LAW ON THE MIGRATION MANAGEMENT, Government of the Republic of Serbia, 2011
Draft Operational Program for Human Resources Development, Second draft, Government of the Republic of Serbia, 2011 ( <a href="http://www.cdsprelaze.org.rs/Content/downloads/OP-HRD_2nd_Draft_(main).pdf">http://www.cdsprelaze.org.rs/Content/downloads/OP-HRD_2nd_Draft_(main).pdf</a> )
Draft revised Migration Management Strategy of the Republic of Serbia for 2013-2017, CBMM project, IOM, 2011
DRAFT ROADMAP, prepared within the ASSISTANCE TO THE COMMISSARIAT FOR REFUGEES OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA IN CAPACITY BUILDING AND MIGRATION MANAGEMENT framework contract, V Korac et al for ETHOS Challenge, 2009
Evaluation of the Migration management strategy in Serbia and initial finding for its implementation, prepared within Assistance to the Serbian Commissariat in preparing a draft strategy for Migration management ARS Progetti Dialogue Consortium, 2009
Final Mission Report on the Review of the Migration Management Strategy 2009 of the Republic of Serbia, Juris Gromovs for CBMM project, IOM, 2012
GAP ANALYSIS OF THE LEGISLATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA IN COMPARISON WITH THE EU ACQUIS IN THE AREA OF MIGRATION, Juris Gromovs for the CBMM project, IOM, 2011
Guide for Establishing a System for Migration Monitoring and Reporting on Migration, CBMM project, IOM, 2012
Guidelines for Grant Applicants, EuropeAid/133297/L/ACT/RS ( <a href="http://www.europa.rs/sw4i/download/files/article/Guidelines.pdf?id=698">http://www.europa.rs/sw4i/download/files/article/Guidelines.pdf?id=698</a> )
Info Sheet "Capacity Building of Institutions Involved in Migration Management and Reintegration of Returnees in the Republic of Serbia", CBMM, 2011
INTERIM NARRATIVE REPORT, for the period 13 September 2010 – 30 December 2011, CBMM project, IOM, 2011
MIGRATION PROFILE 2010, Government of the Republic of Serbia, prepared within CBMM project, IOM, 2012
MONITORING REPORT, C-247542, 17/06/2011, by Igor PELLICCIARI and Sarah LINDE
Narrative report on data collection, storage, aggregation and exchange with competent authorities, CBMM project, IOM, 2012
National Programme for Integration (NPI), Government of the Republic of Serbia, 2009 ( <a href="http://www.seio.gov.rs/upload/documents/NPI/Revidirani_NPI_2009.pdf">http://www.seio.gov.rs/upload/documents/NPI/Revidirani_NPI_2009.pdf</a> )
Overview of the data and statistical indicators of relevance to migration produced by the Public Administration in Serbia, CBMM project, IOM, 2012
Project proposal "Capacity Building of Institutions Involved in Migration Management and Reintegration of Returnees in the Republic of Serbia", including the Log frame, IOM, 2010
Rapid Institutional Assessment within EU Integration Context, Marina Manke for the CBMM project, IOM, 2011
Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 311/76 on the compilation of statistics on foreign workers ( <a href="http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32007R0862:EN:HTML">http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32007R0862:EN:HTML</a> )
Report on Compliance of the newly established Migration indicators with EUROSTAT Standards, CBMM project, IOM, 2012
REPORT ON THE MIGRATION MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION, draft prepared for endorsement to Coordination body for Migration Monitoring and Management, CBMM project, IOM, 2011
Report on the Review of the Action Plan Implementing the Migration Management Strategy of the Republic of Serbia for the years 2011 – 2012, Juris Gromovs for CBMM project, IOM, 2012
Report on the Review of the Migration Management Strategy 2009 of the Republic of Serbia, Juris Gromovs for CBMM project, IOM, 2012
REVIEW OF LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA IN THE FIELD OF MIGRATION MANAGEMENT, CBMM project, 2011
Stabilization and Association Agreement between the European Communities and their Member States, and the Republic of Serbia ( <a href="http://www.europa.rs/upload/documents/key_documents/2008/SAA.pdf">http://www.europa.rs/upload/documents/key_documents/2008/SAA.pdf</a> )
Standard Summary Project Fiche; Capacity building of institutions involved in migration management and reintegration of returnees in the Republic of Serbia (CRIS Number: 2009/021-765) ( <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2010/17_migrations_mgmt_ipa10.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2010/17_migrations_mgmt_ipa10.pdf</a> )
Standard Summary Project Fiche; Further Support to Refugees and IDPs in Serbia (CRIS Number: 2007/19322) ( <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/support_to_refugees_and_idps_en.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/support_to_refugees_and_idps_en.pdf</a> )
Standard Summary Project Fiche; Support to Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (CRIS Number: 2008/020-406) ( <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2008/3-refugees_and_idps_en.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2008/3-refugees_and_idps_en.pdf</a> )
Standard Summary Project Fiche; Support to the implementation of strategies for IDPs, refugees and returnees (CRIS Number: 2011/022-585) ( <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2011/09_support_to_strategies_for_idps_refugees_and_returnees.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/serbia/ipa/2011/09_support_to_strategies_for_idps_refugees_and_returnees.pdf</a> )