

Swedish Bilateral Assistance in the Field of Migration and Asylum in Central and Eastern Europe, 1996–2002

**Kjell-Åke Nordquist
Martin Schmidt**

**Department for Central and
Eastern Europe**

Swedish Bilateral Assistance in the Field of Migration and Asylum in Central and Eastern Europe, 1996–2002

**Kjell-Åke Nordquist
Martin Schmidt**

Sida Evaluation 03/02

**Department for Central and
Eastern Europe**

This report is part of *Sida Evaluations*, a series comprising evaluations of Swedish development assistance. Sida's other series concerned with evaluations, *Sida Studies in Evaluation*, concerns methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, an independent department reporting directly to Sida's Board of Directors.

Reports may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
S-105 25 Stockholm
Telephone: (+46) (0)8 506 423 80
Telefax: (+46) (0)8 506 423 52
E-mail: info@sida.se

Reports are also available to download at:

<http://www.sida.se>

Author(s): Kjell-Åke Nordquist, Martin Schmidt.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Evaluation 03/02
Commissioned by Sida, Department for Central and Eastern Europe

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Registration No.: 2002-002118
Date of Final Report: December 2002
Printed by Elanders Novum
Art. no. SIDA2172en
ISBN 91-586-8739-4
ISSN 1401-0402

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Sveavägen 20, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1 Background	3
2 Description of the Co-operation	4
2.1 Background and goals of the co-operation	4
2.2 Target Groups/Co-operation Partners	4
2.2.1 UNHCR as partner	5
2.3 Administrative structure and management	5
2.4 Projects, activities and allocations	6
2.4.1 Estonia	6
2.4.2 Latvia	6
2.4.3 Lithuania	7
2.4.4 Belarus	7
2.4.5 Russia	7
2.4.6 Ukraine	7
2.5 Output	7
3 Findings	8
3.1 The Baltic states	8
3.1.1 Estonia	8
3.1.2 Latvia	11
3.1.3 Lithuania	12
3.2 Belarus, Russia and Ukraine	14
3.2.1 Belarus	15
3.2.2 Russia	15
3.2.3 Ukraine	17
3.3 Regional projects – Söderköping	18
4 Main Conclusions	20
5 Recommendations	23
 Annex 1 Terms of Reference	 24
Annex 2 Particular Note on Co-operation Management at SMB	29
Annex 3 Operations Overview;	31
a) Project portfolio	31
b) Estonia	32
c) Latvia	34
d) Lithuania	36
e) Belarus	38
f) Russia	39
g) Ukraine	40
Annex 4: List of Persons met	41

Executive Summary

Swedish co-operation in the field of migration and asylum matters with Baltic and East European countries dates back to the middle of the 1990s. This study, commissioned by Sida, analyses the cooperation in the period 1996–2002 between Sweden and Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine with respect to the relevance, performance and possible future directions of this cooperation. A slight difference between regions was made in the mandate for the study, since the cooperation with the Baltic states has been wider and deeper than has been the case with the other three states. The study was made by Mr Martin Schmidt, SPM Consultants, Stockholm, and dr. Kjell-Åke Nordquist, Uppsala University, Uppsala.

For Sweden as well as for other Nordic countries, the cooperation with the above mentioned countries in the field of migration and asylum has its background in the need for on the one hand securing stability and strengthened independence, and on the other the need for respect for international norms and standards in the execution of migration policies.

Partners in this cooperation have been ministries, governmental agencies and organisations close to the authorities' migration policies, their formulation and execution. The total value of the cooperation with all countries during the studied period amounts to 30,1 million SEK. The cooperation was initiated through decisions by the Swedish Government and/or Swedish MFA, while since 1999 Sida is the responsible administrator of the cooperation. During all years, the Swedish Migration Board (SMB) has been the Swedish executor of the activities.

The main types of activities are seminars and study visits, combined with training seminars, and in some case material support. Expertise from special fields of competence – such as legal experts, or country specific knowledge – has been introduced when appropriate. The Swedish Migration Board has thus functioned as a coordinator of its internal competences for various seminars.

Besides bi-lateral cooperation, there is also a multi-lateral activity supported by the SMB, usually called the Söderköping Process, named from its city of inception. Starting in 2001, it includes today – after four meetings – 10 states in the region, from Estonia to Moldova, which have agreed to share information and develop initiatives in the migration field. This emerging network shall be seen against the backdrop of a complex reality in the field of migration and asylum seeking, the nature of which is international, and sometimes also criminal or in other ways threatening the stability of the concerned states.

Finally it was noted, that the UNHCR, through its national offices in all the studied countries, play an important coordinating role for the countries as well as for agencies such as the SMB, when activities are planned and executed. SMB would have needed a considerably larger input administratively, had not the UNHCRs local offices been available in this role.

A key conclusion is that individual interventions have been highly successful and resulted in immediate results, yet that a relative lack of direction, strategic planning and follow-up of training activities has hampered long term sustainability, impact and the ability to learn from experiences made. Swedish input has added positively to the development of legal frameworks, competence enhancement and to a limited extent to the output capacity of the migration authorities. SMB shows technical merit, ability to act and to stimulate its partners. However, it shows systematic underestimation of what is necessary in order for local authorities to sustain immediate results in the medium or longer term.

Even if there is a strong link between SMB activities and the overall objective for Swedish cooperation, the documentation of many activities as a whole – from their inception to evaluation – is weak if not lacking in many cases. This makes an assessment difficult for certain activities.

The study recommends that, for the future a medium term strategy is developed for the cooperation between Sweden and all the concerned countries. This is particularly important since the changes related to the EU expansion have a direct impact on migration policy issues in all of them. For the Baltic states, a higher degree of specialised cooperation themes on a regular neighbour country co-operation basis (i.e. not development assistance) can still be motivated, given their general level of competence as of today. For Belarus, Ukraine and Russia, a Swedish role in the future should be based on the identification of strategic needs of the partner country, needs which Sweden can meet.

The Södeköping Process, finally, has drawn wide attraction and expectation among its members. It should be supported and developed into a cost-sharing activity, so as to become a network that is deemed relevant and prioritised by its members.

1 Background

This study was commissioned by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) as an evaluation of Swedish bilateral assistance in the field of migration and asylum in Eastern Europe. The analysed assistance has been developed with the Baltic states, Russia, Ukraine and Belarus.

Sweden began active co-operation in 1996, mainly through support of UNHCR and IOM activities in the region. Since 1997, support is channelled through the Swedish Migration Board (SMB), and executed predominantly in co-operation with local UNHCR Offices.

The purpose of the evaluation is laid out in the Terms of References, attached as annex 1.

In brief, the evaluation should assess the co-operation – on parameters such as relevance, results, sustainability, local ownership, cost-effectiveness, impact – and provide recommendations for the direction of possible future co-operation in the countries concerned.

A number of circumstances have motivated a slight difference in evaluation approach regarding on the one hand the Baltic states, and on the other Russia, Ukraine and Belarus¹. The assessment of co-operation with the former will be more thorough, whereas that of the latter will take the form of a review. The reader will note that these geographical areas will be treated slightly differently throughout the report.

The evaluation was assigned to SPM Consultants in Stockholm and carried out by Dr. Kjell-Åke Nordquist, Uppsala University, Uppsala, and Mr. Martin Schmidt, SPM Consultants, Stockholm, during late spring and autumn 2002. The team visited all countries concerned during late September – early October 2002 and met with some 60 co-operation stakeholders in various capacities. Confer annex 4 for a list of persons met.

¹ Among other things the (i) relative emphasis on support of the Baltic states, (ii) the different political developments of the two groups relative the EU, and (iii) the geopolitical position of the two groups in terms of migration flows.

2 Description of the Co-operation

2.1 Background and goals of the co-operation

Following the break-down of the Soviet Union there was wide-spread anticipation of large migration flows, both within the Union as well as beyond its borders. The actual development, however, turn out to be different – the unfolding migration pattern in Eastern Europe in ensuing years proved to be more complex and diversified than expected.

In the mid-1990s, the Baltic states suddenly experienced an increased pressure from migrants wanting to enter their countries in transit for Western Europe. Preparedness for this situation was weak and the need for supportive measures was considered by all the Nordic countries. A division of responsibilities was worked out among the Nordic states where Sweden co-ordinated the co-operation with Latvia in the first instance.

From 1996 onwards Sweden developed migration and asylum related co-operation with all three Baltic states and Belarus, Russia and Ukraine almost simultaneously. From the start and to date, co-operation in this field formed part of the Swedish “security promoting” co-operation with Central and Eastern Europe as one of seven components² dealing with issues including non proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, emergency preparedness, security policy advice, and migration and asylum.

From 1996 to 1998, all migration and asylum support was directed by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA), but subsequently that responsibility was delegated to Sida in 1999.

The *overall objective* for Swedish migration policy support in the six countries involved in this study (Russia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus, and Ukraine), formulated by the Swedish MFA in 1996, is to bring the migration and refugee policies of these countries closer to fundamental international norms in the field.³ This includes the creation of a basic structure for carrying out a migration policy, accession to the Geneva Convention, and an effective border control. The overarching purpose is then, that these countries should be regarded as safe first asylum countries (“första asyl-länder”). This goal formulation has not changed in substance over the studied period.⁴

2.2 Target Groups/Co-operation Partners

In the Baltic states, the target groups – generally described – have been state employees with responsibilities within the process from reception of/formal application from migrants/asylum seekers to the point of their integration or deportation. The formal organisation of these professional groups vary somehow between the states, but the concrete issues are to a high degree similar in the various stages throughout the process, irrespective of professional formal structures and country.

More specifically, three levels of professionals can be identified: 1) the highest levels of decision-making individuals on the level of Head of Office/Department and equivalent, including legal specialists (i.e.

² Confer the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs; “Intern översyn av det säkerhetsfrämjande stödet till Central- och Öst-europa”, EC 2002-07-04, p. 14–15.

³ Christer Norling in MFA/PM 961027 in preparation for a CIS Conference, May 1996.

⁴ Note that the overall goal formulation disregards the fact that support forms part of the “security promotion” co-operation and that its overall goal – *to promote stability and security in the region* – reasonably should extend to the field of migration and asylum. One should hence regard the formulation of the overall goal that these countries shall be recognised as “first asylum countries” as intermediate to the overall objective.

appeal mechanism judges), 2) staff responsible on Office/Department level for critical decisions in the process, and 3) staff with the most direct and personal relationship to the individuals in the migration- and asylum seeking process, such as border guards, reception centre staff, and (post-asylum seeking) integration staff.

It should be noted, that in individual activities these groups can be mixed, for instance through high level participation in introductory or networking meetings. Specialized activities have been arranged for categories 2 and 3, where these groups have been the specific target groups. The more specialised professional tasks, the more often specialised activities.

Co-operation partners then, on state level, have been either Offices or Departments for Asylum and Migration Affairs within Ministries (in most cases Ministry of Interior), Appeal councils/equivalent, Border Guards and Reception Centres/Temporary Detention facilities or equivalent.

In Russia, Ukraine and Belarus, the target groups should be characterised as similar or identical to those in the Baltic states. What differences there are has to do with scale and level of political and judicial development. The three former states are much larger, are exposed to larger migration flows and deal with migrants on both national and regional level to an unparalleled extent compared to the Baltic states. Management of migration issues thus falls on a larger group of government officials, and project participants extend more often to regional officials in these countries.

A large group is also made up of representatives of the legal and political systems involved in reformation of the judiciary system and policy making in the field of migration and asylum.

A critical role as a local organising partner has in all six states been played by the UNHCR, whose national offices have provided logistical, substantial and economic contributions in various ways, over the whole period. In a few cases, also IOM, Norway, and Denmark have been co-operating partners for specific activities.

2.2.1 UNHCR as partner

UNHCR is represented at Office level in all targeted states and they have served as key connection points throughout the whole period, from the very first contacts to the execution of specialised seminars in an on-going co-operation. The UNHCR offices have served both as an identifier and communicator of needs in a given country. In practice this has also had a co-ordinating effect between different international co-operation partners. Without the local knowledge, competence and economic support from the UNHCR, Sweden's co-operation in this field would have looked very different, and without doubt would have required a significantly higher level of economic and administrative input from the Swedish side, if an equal level of co-operation should have been reached.

2.3 Administrative structure and management

To a large extent, SMB has acted reactively to a process of development on-going in the target countries. The agenda of that process has, in turn, been monitored and acted upon by the UNHCR and national authorities.

Upon request and in negotiation with these groups, SMB has provided input on a needs basis. Priorities and methods of implementation have then been determined in this mutual process.

At SMB, project activities have been formulated by a small group of 1–3 persons in their individual capacities, rather than as a unified team. These people have formed part of the regular divisions of the SMB and their involvement in project activities have been relying on that experience and background. Throughout the co-operation period, competences within SMB have been drawn upon for specific tasks

within projects, but the overall responsibility for their execution has remained with the smaller group. In all, a group of 12–15 people have been involved in project activities within the SMB.

Since January 1, 2001, SMB has organised an international co-operation division with responsibility for external project management. The division currently manages (i) the Sida migration support, (ii) twinning projects with EU funding, and (iii) activities within the framework of the European Refugee Fund. Annual turn-over for the unit is roughly SEK 40 million (2002).

Since its creation the SMB “international co-operation division” has been funded solely by external project funds.

SMB has not formulated any long term relationship strategies, but rather focused on being able to supply technical assistance on a needs basis. These conditions have resulted in short term (or even ex-post) planning. Existing project descriptions are rudimentary and lack information about anticipated results and their links to the overall objective.

Similarly, SMB has not engaged in systematic follow-up and documentation of its operations. Directives to this effect has by and large been lacking, in particular before 1999. This state of affairs has remained unchanged throughout the operation period.

2.4 Projects, activities and allocations

The project portfolio has developed in a seemingly erratic manner. During the co-operation period, 24 separate decisions have been taken by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Sida, with a peak during 2001 when 8 separate decisions were taken (confer annex 3). Decisions range in volume from SEK 60 000 to SEK 4 000 000. While some decisions comprise as many as 8–12 activities, others include only one. Note that three major decisions regarding the Baltic states have been taken that involve a large range of activities each.

In all, the MFA and Sida has allocated 30,1 million SEK for co-operation in this field since 1996.

2.4.1 Estonia

The Estonian Citizenship and Migration Board, identifies 12 activities (held in Estonia and/or Sweden) with Swedish support and organised in the period between November 1997 and June 2002. The total activity, from Sida’s project documentation ends with 22 activities. They are all founded, and funded, in three major project decisions taken in 1997, 2000 and 2002, respectively (see Annex 3b). Totally 9 are seminars/training workshops, 5 are study-visits, 4 expert visits/consultations, and finally, 4 are other activities (such as equipment delivery, needs assessment, and network planning).

The co-operation with Estonia has taken shape within the framework of three major decisions by the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Sida, respectively (98/1502, 90/00, 54/02). In addition, asylum support has been given to IOM for training in Estonia on asylum management (564/01). The total economic value of the Estonian co-operation is SEK 3 818 859, for the analysed period.

2.4.2 Latvia

Co-operation with Latvia has been a main activity for Sweden during the studied period. Among the Nordic countries, Sweden was given a co-ordinating role for Latvia. Economically, the Swedish-Latvian co-operation amounts to SEK 5 328 546 for the period. Structurally, however, the co-operation with Latvia is of the same character as with other Baltic states, and Latvia is part of the major funding decisions in this area taken by the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Sida, respectively (98/1502, 90/00, 54/02).

In addition, asylum support has been given to IOM for training in Latvia on asylum management (564/01), asylum training for border guards (642/01) and a study visit for migration officers to Sweden (621/99).

2.4.3 Lithuania

The Lithuanian co-operation is comparable to that of Latvia in terms of scope and content, besides the traditional components, for instance of the asylum management process, also material support has been part of the co-operation. In economic terms, the Lithuanian co-operation amounts for the period to SEK 7 232 270, which is the highest figure among the Baltic states.⁵

2.4.4 Belarus

In Belarus, Swedish interventions have been few. In 1996–1997 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs supported UNHCR and IOM directly in Minsk. From late 1997 onwards support has been channelled through SMB in eight separate projects.

In project identification SMB has co-operated closely with the UNHCR. There have been five national interventions (1997, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002) and Belarus officials have also participated in the three meetings of the Söderköping-process.

Including participation in the Söderköping process, the total allocation for Belarus is SEK 2 895 967.

2.4.5 Russia

SMB has been involved in five projects in Russia. Together they comprise about 12 separate activities involving at least 200 Russian participants from the migration services of Moscow and St. Petersburg, including migration officers, judges and policy makers. Co-operation started in 1997, was disrupted during 2000 due to major institutional changes on the Russian part, and resumed again in 2001–2002 with two projects on Russian regional level (St. Petersburg and other regions).

Throughout the period 1997–2002 UNHCR has been a dialogue partner and to various degrees co-financier of implemented activities. All activities involve training and exchange of experiences, mainly in the form of seminars and workshops, and in one case exchange service for a longer period involving both Swedish and Russian officers in service in Moscow and Malmö. In total, the Swedish allocation for co-operation with Russia has been SEK 5 112 255.

2.4.6 Ukraine

The co-operation with Sweden started in 1997 and amounts to day to SEK 4 431 800. It has till now been limited to a few projects; a series of seminars and workshops in 1999, one planning trip in 2001, and meetings within the Söderköping process (cf. section 3.3).

2.5 Output

Output should be described in terms of knowledge and equipment transfer and indirect support of legal and organisational development. It is our estimation that more than 1 000 people have been exposed to Swedish input, although a more limited group of approximately 400 people have been actively engaged in project activities.

Tools for migration management systems have also been provided, such as country assessment archives and interview manuals, on a large scale.

⁵ The number of cases in the administrative system has also been the highest among the Baltic states during the same period.

3 Findings

3.1 The Baltic states

The Swedish Migration Board (SMB) states in 2001 that the general goal for its support and co-operation with the Baltic states is a continued support to the establishment and development of the migration services of these countries, in order to contribute to their sovereignty, stability, and internal security, and that the reception of refugees in these countries should be in line with the rules of the European Union and the Geneva Convention. Finally, the goal is also to safeguard common security in the Baltic region.⁶

Beyond this level of explicit goal formulation, formulations on a more concrete level are only appearing indirectly in the description of projects, as a conclusion but not as a point of departure, a steering instrument for the initiation, target group identification, and result/outcome assessment of the activity, which would have been the desired use.

Given the wide need for support for a young state administration – within the whole chain of events from reception to integration/deportation – the SMB and UNHCR have identified projects that support steps in this chain, and have made them available to the countries as these have been prepared to accept them when offered. The orientation of the projects has according to some partners been rather asylum-dominated, their impression is that this is an area of specific Swedish competence, while other migration policy matters have not been given proper response sometimes. However, the relevance of the issues covered is beyond doubt. Documentation has not allowed us to have a view on specific parts of the content in specific activities, but on the general level this impression still holds.

Concerning the administrative structure of the activities, the dominating pattern is that of singular activities (“one-off” events). This means that a cumulative learning effect is not visible, the integration of knowledge and experiences is left to the individual participant, beyond influence of the organiser. As is shown in the Annex, the co-operation with the Baltic states is based upon a few major applications with subsequent decisions by Sida, something which from a planning perspective would have given the possibility of a strategic approach covering, say, two-year-periods where the potential of interrelationship, integration and follow-up could have been utilised to enhance the overall goals. This possibility has not been utilised as the co-operation now has been arranged.

3.1.1 Estonia

Context. Even if Estonia in its Constitution (art 123) states that if laws/legislations are in conflict with international treaties, the treaty should apply, the lack of laws as such was for long a problem from a migration point of view, in particular since Estonia’s Constitution does not provide for the right of asylum. Estonia’s Refugee’s Act is from 1997, and Estonia has since, in dialogue with its neighbouring countries and in particular as a candidate country to the European Union, developed its legislation gradually. No major legal gaps exist today in the migration and asylum process, even if individual actors in the field may have opinions about the legal content on specific matters.

In Estonia, the Ministry for Internal Affairs is responsible for both Border Guards and the Citizenship and Migration Board, while the Reception Centre – Illuka – is under the Ministry for Social Affairs.

⁶ Revised Application for migration support, MV 211-2001-3133, p. 6.

This means that an individual following a complete asylum seeking process, for instance, will be a responsibility for two Ministries.

Estonia has historically close relations to Finland, and Finland has been a major actor in the field of asylum and migration co-operation.⁷ Swedish competence, for instance in the asylum area, is however very different from the Finnish, which makes for a relatively natural distribution of activities among these two countries. An important actor in this field is also the European Union, towards which Estonia has directed its interest both for possibilities for support and co-operation in general, and for the support particularly related to Estonia in its capacity as a candidate country.

Assessment of outcome. Although the co-operation with Sweden has been founded in three major “project-like” decisions, the activities in these have not been coordinated so as to add cumulatively to an increasing body of knowledge and experience. Instead, the generally formulated Swedish goals have resulted in a variety of punctual activities to be carried out, partly due to the thematically broad need of co-operation, partly due to inexperience in co-operation formulation from the Swedish side in the early phases of co-operation.

Within this generally formulated framework, co-operation with Estonia has had a low intensity over the years, and in 2001 SMB itself finds that the execution of planned activities in Estonia has been difficult.⁸

A weak goal description is a first hinder in the execution of activities, and combined with some Estonian staff rotation and re-organisation in Sweden (change from MFA to Sida and within the SMB structure) enough factors are identified to explain the comparatively low level of co-operation with Estonia.

This structural deficiency should however not reduce the relevance and utility of specific activities in their own respect, which is discussed further below. However, the fragmentary approach taken by the SMB to the co-operation in Estonia has not served the purpose of maximising the potential of the many qualitatively strong activities that have been carried out.

The activities in the analysed period have trained border guards and centrally placed officials, together with regional border officials, in competence areas such as interview techniques and asylum application management. Reception and social work, related to an asylum seeker’s needs, have been studied by relevant Estonian staff in Sweden, as well as through seminars and expert visits in Estonia. On the whole, the process of asylum management – from its inception to final decision – has been covered in seminars, expert visits, and consultations on relevant levels of administration. Thus the critical moments in the asylum process have been covered over the years.

Cost-effectiveness /efficiency. The co-ordination/co-planning of some seminars and other activities between the Baltic states has from an SMB perspective increased their cost-efficiency on a general level. The activities are relatively short, of different methodological character and carried out, it seems, with normal methodological ambitions. Since the co-operation takes place between individuals and their respective organisations, who play a unique professional role in their societies, the conditions for issue-concentration are comparably good, which should play a positive role in the assessment of cost-efficiency.

⁷ The establishment of a reception centre in Estonia, Illukka, is a case in point where Finnish and Swedish resources have been coordinated.

⁸ Ansökan om medel... 2001-03-29/MV211 2001 3133

Local ownership. The field of migration and asylum policy matters relate in Estonia to the country's modern history and in particular to recent experiences during the Soviet period. While this can be understood from a political point of view, it can also have the effect on co-operation with an external partner, such as Sweden, which leads to a relatively passive and receiving role, rather than active partner. Estonia's approach to co-operation with Sweden has not been to actively address Sweden (MFA or SMB) with specific interests or needs, rather Sweden has presented proposals in co-operation with UNCHR-Tallinn. Estonia has reacted to these ideas and modified whenever appropriate. Sweden has on this point taken a somewhat different approach compared to other countries, who more actively have engaged in a direct dialogue with Estonia on their interests and needs.

Sustainability. Sustainability has both a material and a staff competence dimension. Materially, which here mainly means equipment to Illukka reception centre, the co-operation has been relevant, and is most likely to be sustainable as long as the present organisational structure and its trained staff remains. Sustainability of competence seems today more dependent on the possibility of maintaining the present staff level and organisational structure also after Estonian membership in the EU, than on an immediate risk for staff rotation due to career reasons.⁹

Impact. The impact of Estonia's co-operation with Sweden can be identified in terms of material contributions (Illukka equipment), training and increased competence, and normative exposure. The equipment transferred to Illukka Reception Centre is a *sine qua non* for an effective work at the Centre.

Given the general goal of the co-operation (described above), one measure of impact is the formal adherence to international documents in the field. From this perspective, Estonia has developed strongly and recently received EU recognition for this. An important element in this process is the exposure to norms and values of international documents. This is something that only seminar activities, based on presentations and texts never fully can provide. The seminar discussions, the concrete examples of practice and praxis, and dialogues between experts on cases of principal nature are all important components in the development of nationally anchored norms and practices in this field. Sweden's co-operation with Estonia has within the limits of its scope without doubt contributed to this dimension in Estonia's migration policy development, in particular within the field of asylum management.

Future. For Estonia, the possible EU membership in 2004 is a clear point of reference for its planning and practice also in the field of asylum- and migration policy. Thus, any planning from the Swedish side in this field needs to consider this fact, and it is reasonable to think of the period from now and up to EU membership – whenever it comes – as an interim period in Swedish-Estonian relations.

Sweden can use this period for two purposes: one is to continue and fulfill its present role as information and skills provider within narrow and well-defined areas of interest. These are areas that may not always coincide with the competence of SMB. Secondly, Sweden should reconsider the nature of its co-operation with Estonia, maybe even to the level where a lack of initiatives from Estonia also means a lack of activities as a whole. This may sound over-the-limit, but Estonia is keen on being treated as one among equals in the EU family, and should be encouraged to develop its ability to professional intergovernmental co-operation rather than assistance-based co-operation.

⁹ The low number of cases in the asylum process, for instance, is a tricky factor: it gives few cases to get experience from professionally, and it doesn't motivate government spending within an area that is politically sensitive nationally as well as internationally. On the other hand, it gives time for continued staff training which up to a certain level increases sustainability.

3.1.2 Latvia

Context. Latvia is an important partner for Sweden in this co-operation economically but also politically, since Sweden has a coordinating role for support to Latvia among the Nordic countries. This coordinating role has, however, had a low profile and the UNHCR Office in Riga seems in practice to be the main coordinating mechanism with respect to Nordic countries as well as globally. The Nordic countries remain dominating on the Latvian scene and the structure of the Latvian partners allow for good information about on-going activities in the country. Latvia has at some occasions sought support and co-operation from European Union member states but has not received positive reactions, Latvia does not belong to their “sphere of interest”. Finally, as long as Latvia is a candidate country to the European Union, this position gives the EU a special role and influence in Latvia also in the field of migration policy.

Assessment of outcome. Latvia has received a broad scope of Swedish competence in the field over the years, including material support. Since Latvian co-operation was co-ordinated by Sweden, one would in this case even more than for Latvia’s neighbours expect a conscious formulation of goals and strategies so as to both co-ordinate and maximise outcome of the total Nordic co-operation with Latvia. The lack of such an approach in general in Swedish-Baltic co-operation is particularly felt in the case of Latvia.

In objective terms it can be concluded, though, that the co-operation has covered the major steps from entry to integration/deportation within the asylum process of Latvia. It has involved key persons in the various steps and it has had a degree of regional/Baltic co-operation in some activities. Sweden has been a visible partner in the co-operation, more than in Estonia. On the whole, it can be concluded that the present competence level in Latvia is significantly due to Swedish co-operation.

Cost-effectiveness/efficiency. For Latvia, as for its Baltic neighbours, the co-ordination/co-planning of activities among them has from an SMB perspective increased their cost-efficiency on a general level. They have in all important respects the same character: they are relatively short, of different methodological character and relatively conventional, which should not necessarily be understood negatively. Latvia has however also had a “flying seminar”, a process of thorough penetration of an administrative structure and how it can be developed given certain goals, something which is likely to enhance integrity and effectiveness of an organisation. The co-operation has been between professionals from both sides, with different experiences and perspectives, but still between colleagues rather than anything else. This should increase the likelihood for cost-efficiency. The lack of reporting in general on performance dimensions, however, makes it not possible to have a well-founded view on this aspect.

Local ownership. On the political level, Latvia’s ambition towards EU membership is a driving force for change also in legislation as well as more practical migration policy matters, including asylum, and it is an open question to what extent this change had had the same priority level if this was not the case. Latvian migration administration is today concentrated so that one office, Office for Citizenship and Migration Affairs in the Ministry of Interior, is in charge of all steps in an asylum process, from entry/border control to integration/deportation. This provides a formal basis for effective ownership. Of course, the recent accomplishment of this, the scarce economic resources generally for administrative structures in Latvia and – given Latvia’s ambitions visavi the EU – the continued need for training and “europeanisation” of standards and practices, indicates that ownership is under development during the studied period. To this picture we should also add the presence and assistance of UNHCR in Latvia during the studied period which on the one hand contributes to limited ownership while on the other hand might be a necessary condition for such ownership to be developed at all.

Sustainability. Latvia has had some reorganisation of its administrative migration structures (for instance, the Border Guards were previously part of the Immigration Police, but is now a new unit under a different structure), something which impacts negatively on sustainability. Equally important as the fact that training in some cases has been carried out only for certain (higher) levels within the agencies, which in the case of Border Guards again, means that certain skills are still lacking on regional levels. If a practice is not established on all levels of an organisation, it is likely to lose effect over time.

Given that Latvia has finalised its major structural reorganisation in the field, sustainability is more a matter of how the country develops its administration after EU membership – whenever that comes – than particular problems within the migration structures as such. The very low number of cases in the asylum process is always a double-edged factor, allowing for both development and lack of motivation among the staff.

Impact. The impact of Swedish co-operation in the migration and asylum field is probably the highest in the region. The reception centre/registration centre mentioned above is a conspicuous example of this. More subtle is the degree of impact within the organisations as such.

Given the general goal of the co-operation (described above), one measure of impact is the formal adherence to international documents in the field. From this perspective, Latvia has developed strongly and recently received EU recognition for this. An important element in this process is the exposure to norms and values of international documents. This is something that written texts never fully can provide. The seminar discussions, the concrete examples of practice and praxis, and dialogues between experts on cases of principal nature are all important components in the development of nationally anchored norms and practices in this field.

Future. For Latvia as for its neighbours Estonia and Lithuania, the possible EU membership in 2004 is a clear point of reference for its planning and practice also in the field of asylum- and migration policy. Thus, any planning from the Swedish side in this field needs to consider this fact, and it is reasonable to think of the period from now and up to EU membership – whenever it comes – as an interim period in Swedish-Latvian relations.

Latvia has indicated specific areas for continued co-operation, an indication of ownership and interest in professionalisation. Given Sweden's role in Latvia in this field, there are good reasons for fulfilling a line of co-operation into some areas of specialisation, where this is possible. The approaching EU membership of Latvia does not change the conditions for such relatively short-term activities. Rather to the opposite. A recently established EU-Twinning project between Sweden, Greece and Latvia, and involving the National Police Board and the Swedish Migration Board, is a case in point. For the longer perspective though, a dialogue with Latvia on the nature of Sweden's future relationship needs to be developed, taking the EU as a major point of reference in that structure. For Latvia, EU membership is a reason for continued co-operation, rather than the opposite, and Sweden needs to develop its own position with respect to this.

3.1.3 Lithuania

Context. The geographical position of Lithuania makes it more exposed to the more complex Central European migration patterns than its northern Baltic neighbour countries. This is reflected in Lithuania's need for material support in the practical work with asylum seekers. This is also a reason for Lithuania to be part of the Söderköping process (see section 3.3), which now only after expansion will include other Baltic states as well.

Previously Denmark and Poland were co-operating partners with Lithuania, but this is not the case any longer. Also, there is no co-operation with Finland at this point. Sweden remains one of the few

partners since the early years of co-operation in this field. Moldova has expressed interest to share Lithuanian experiences, which means that another role for Lithuania is asked for in a Central/Eastern European context.

Given this situation, and UNHCRs continued activity in the field, Sweden has been, and still is, in a position to identify its role clearly, in relation to other donor countries. The most complex picture in this regard is the EU-supported activities in Lithuania, where its position as candidate country gives a particular role for the Union during the period up to membership.

Assessment of outcome. Lithuania has received the broadest scope of all countries involved in co-operation with Sweden on asylum- and migration policy matters. From the documentation of this work, it seems likely to assume, that this is due more to practical and ideographic conditions than an overall assessment of the needs in Lithuania compared to the two other Baltic states. This does not amount to saying that there is no needs assessment behind the co-operation, but the resulting focus on Lithuania would have required a comparative analysis, which has so far not been documented.

Cost-effectiveness/efficiency. Lithuania has experienced the same type of seminars, training activities, and study visits as other Baltic states. As with Latvia there has also been a flying seminar, which is a process of thorough penetration of steps in an administrative process. The flying seminar was organised at a point when Lithuania's administrative structure and competence allowed such a comprehensive activity, even if the implementation of its result may take time. Lithuania, as other co-operating partners, have indicated the effectiveness of study visits for the understanding of principles and rules, there is hardly no other way to get the feeling "on ground" of what certain things mean, if not in real life conditions. This view indicates that a seemingly high cost-effectiveness in meeting groups of staff persons in Lithuania, for example, may in the long-run prove less effective as knowledge transfer is not followed up at all, or by other methods.

Local ownership. Given the goals for Lithuania's asylum- and migration policy – which are to live up to international and European/EU standards – the agenda for the co-operation has in one sense been given. UNHCR has played, and still plays, an important supportive role in Lithuania's migration policy development. Co-operation does not as such reduce ownership, and given the problems of any new administrative structure, Lithuania has often found itself in the position of choosing from offers from Sweden and/or the UNHCR. Over the years, ownership is likely to have increased, the problem for such a development to take place lies more in the Swedish capacity to secure ownership, since this can also be seen as part of the overarching goals of Swedish co-operation.¹⁰ Lithuania expressed a particular need in finding support for the execution of whatever will be the outcome of the political discussion on the status of Kaliningrad citizens. This is a special matter for Lithuania, and will require special attention from co-operating partners.

Sustainability. The main problem for sustainability seems to lie in re-organisation more than in lack of cases, resources or other aspects. Due to re-organisation in 1998, most if not all of those involved in training that year or before are not in their positions any longer, while this is the case from the period thereafter.

Rukla Reception Centre for Asylum Seekers & Refugees, and the Foreigner's Registration Centre in Pabradė have both been equipped substantially through the Swedish Migration Board. The sustainability of this is without doubt, and even if some "minor" problems in the equipment may cause comparatively high costs for Lithuania, this does not change the overall picture.

¹⁰ For instance, the so called Handbook project, which is part of a recent decision from Sida – 54/02 – where SMB indicates this is a project with Lithuania (14035), is a case in point. Lithuanian partners indicate during this study, that this project is now fulfilled with an Austrian counter-part, who won the project in competition with, among others, SMB.

Impact. Due to initiatives from the Swedish police authorities in the early phases of Lithuania's regained independence, the co-operation with Sweden has had both an SMB component and a police component. For Lithuania, this has had a complimentary function and – it seems – this has strengthened the impact from both components. From a practical point this seems most obvious.¹¹ Also, the width in matters covered by the Swedish-Lithuanian co-operation increases the likelihood of an impact beyond that of the singular activity. On the whole, and given these aspects, the impact on Lithuania's asylum- and migration policy administration must be considered significant as a result of the co-operation with Sweden/SMB.

Future. Lithuania sees the coming EU membership as a new arena for co-operation with Sweden, not as a breaking-point. Sweden is one of the few countries that over the years have maintained co-operation with Lithuania and is for that respected and expected to continue in this role. In addition to the future challenges likely to come, some specific needs both for material support and training related to previous co-operation, and partly created by internal restructure, points to the need also for some follow-up activity on the part of Sweden.

Lithuania has indicated a number of areas including concrete issues where a continued co-operation is of interest. The present structure of co-operation is suitable also for covering those issues. In addition to that, the EU membership process raises issues which are of great importance to Lithuania, but which may not always be within the competence of the SMB to deal with. The new situation emerging requires Sida and the Swedish MFA to develop a dialogue with the Baltic states on the nature of co-operation related to EU-initiated challenges to these countries. Lithuania is maybe the most clear example of how the existing co-operation should be specified and brought into specialised areas of support, while a new window of co-operation and professional, inter-agency partnership needs to be developed in the wake of the EU-process in Lithuania, as well as in Latvia and to some extent also Estonia.

3.2 Belarus, Russia and Ukraine

Given the overall goals of the co-operation with Belarus, Russia and Ukraine (confer section 2.1) activity focus and orientation has been to the point. SMB has operated on the technical level and given substantial input to the initial development of routines, practices and legal processes. It is clear that on a general level, SMB input (or equivalent) has and remain important to the enhancement of migration policy and management capacity in the three countries.

A strong link to UNHCR and its local offices has also contributed to timely interventions at par with and adaptive to national agendas. This feature adds to the relevance of the co-operation.

As co-operation has progressed, mainly in Belarus and Russia, a systematic lack of activity based follow-up does, however, put *orientation relevance* in a less clear perspective. It is often uncertain how technical input in various areas correspond to local development needs and abilities, or if at all they are reasonable considering local capacity to carry the work (practices, information systems, adherence to laws) forward and beyond the level of "information exchange" with SMB. This general trait of uncertainty is disquieting.

¹¹ The division of responsibilities in the Swedish system cannot be taken as a practically motivated division, it has roots in an historical development. The recent change in the responsibility for deportation in Sweden is a case in point.

3.2.1 Belarus

Context. Belarus finds itself in an exposed position with regard to its capacity to manage migration and asylum policy and its execution. Its territory lies “in-between” in many respects and although migration flows are quite limited, management capacity – in border services and migration authorities – is low. Its relatively “open” border with Russia and geographical position bordering four other Central and Eastern European states makes it a crossing point for migration flows westward.

Management procedures and legal frameworks have developed slowly during the 1990s and remain in progress. Competence and knowledge of modern management procedures and international migrants treatment standards have developed at a slow but steady pace. Current (2002) legal and institutional frameworks provide a sound yet fragile platform for further developments in management practice and output capacity.

UNHCR has been operative in the country since independence and has followed and supported migration policy developments closely. Due to the political situation¹² bilateral partners have been few and Sweden has been and remain the only prominent partner of UNHCR and local authorities in this field since 1997.

From a Belarus perspective, Sweden has emerged as a bilateral partner in times when such partners have been few. This feature has rendered a high visibility and goodwill on the Swedish part.

Co-operation assessment. Specifically, SMB has provided efficient support with limited means concerning legal advice. The process of developing a law of migration and refugee issues has received timely and relevant support. With limited means, SMB has reached a large and relevant target group. SMB has also gained access to and influenced legal development in a way UNHCR officials conclude would have been unattainable should UNHCR have operated alone. SMB is regarded as a practically oriented partner, rather than a normative organisation with a global mandate such as the UNHCR. On this level of involvement, sustainability should be regarded as high.

The effort to support reception facilities (October 2000) was less successful. Management capability was enhanced and a visit to reception facilities in Lithuania (Rukla and Pabrade) gave important input, but turning the intended Belarus facility into an operational unit has not occurred. It seems clear, nevertheless, that input provided has been useful elsewhere (Vitbesk).

Training in migration management issues has been limited and the last activity was conducted in late 1999.

A general drawback in assessing impact lies in a fragmentary project formulation and a lack of follow-up on all levels of involvement. The assessment that can be made is that impact seems to be high on a practical level, and in the legal sphere, although institutional re-organisation on the Belarus part has mitigated the effect.

Local ownership is relatively low due to the heavy reliance on UNHCR and SMB initiative. A way to increase local ownership would be to institutionalise co-operation and more thoroughly establish Belarus commitment in various migration policy fields.

3.2.2 Russia

Context. In the field of migration Russia present a thoroughly complex situation. Russia is the heartland of the former union and the influx of migrants from the former Soviet republics – both ethnic Russians

¹² Relative international political isolation of Belarus.

and others – and other parts of the far east is considerable, and of gigantic proportions as compared with all other states covered by the co-operation with Sweden.

According to Russian migration authorities, for a long time they held the view of Russia as a transit country for migrants bound for Western Europe. This hypothesis proved to be wrong as the new border control and migration authorities formed and established a certain overview of the situation. Literally millions of people (8,0 currently in the country according to UNHCR sources) have migrated to Russia over the past ten years, with large concentrations in the Moscow area and around St. Petersburg, and although the vast majority stays in Russia their status remain unclear to the authorities. A minority, according to UNHCR 15 533 people, is currently recognised as refugees, and an even smaller number (984) have been granted asylum status¹³.

According to the Federal Migration Service Moscow (FMS), millions of migrants are organised, by Russian interests, on the black labour market with a high concentration in the larger Moscow area. These circumstances makes it difficult to establish personal identities and determining status, but also creates incentives for migrants to stay and not involve themselves with migration authorities.

Currently the Ministry of Interior, under which FMS sorts since 2000, is undertaking a legislative reform – under review by a presidential committee – which should provide the legal framework necessary to deal with the situation. It is estimated to come into force in late 2003.

The complexity of the migration field is added to by the large number of co-operation partners. Russian authorities currently works together with partners in the CIS, but also together with and with funding from the EU, Germany, Switzerland, Australia and Canada. Operations are oriented towards border control, legal development and transit facilities. Swedish co-operation fits reasonably well in this context although some overlapping has occurred (legal field). Russian authorities express the hope that with the new legislation in place – and a coherence of practice – co-ordination will be improved.

Co-operation assessment. SMB interventions have been planned together with Russian authorities and the UNHCR offices in Moscow and St. Petersburg. SMB's role has been of two kinds. On the one hand SMB has been responsive to requests by UNHCR and FMS. On the other hand SMB has engaged in extensive dialogue with FMS on the content and direction of activities. In these instances FMS has shown initiative and high commitment.

Activities have focused on a number of technical aspects of the migration management process: land documentation systems, voluntary repatriation, immigration control and border work, ID control and fingerprint procedures, asylum process and status determination, refugee laws, appeal board practices, and exchange on legal issues.

The choice of topics has been determined in an integrated process where the Russian part has been pro-active. Russian ownership and direction should be considered high in this respect.

Reception of Swedish experience and knowledge has been unproblematic and working relations have been excellent on the technical level. The applicability of SMB input have been high in areas where Russian procedures have been undeveloped (which include all topics mentioned above). In areas where the technical process requires large investments beside the labour force, such as networks for information exchange or equipment for fingerprint databases, the knowledge transfer has not reached far beyond the theoretical level.

¹³ UNHCR Moscow; Refugees, asylum seekers, IDP's and forced migrants in the Russian Federation, June 30, 2002.

Projects are considered particularly useful (by FMS and UNHCR) as an input to the ongoing legal process: both the targeted legal workshops and co-operation in technical areas have fed into the law making process. It should be noted, however, that it is yet uncertain what the law making process will result in. UNHCR expresses its concern about the Russian emphasis on punitive (detention, imprisonment, expulsion) measures and the relatively low level of adherence to international humanitarian standards.

Technical co-operation seems to render mixed results on the practical level. Actual application of skills acquired remains to be seen in many areas. The centralised Russian system inhibits local (regional) application unless directives from Moscow are clear. The relative turmoil of the last years (1999–2002) with institutional and legal reform, has hampered applicability. FMS Moscow confirms this picture and emphasise the contributions to the legal process while hoping to reform migration procedures, both centrally and in the regions, more thoroughly once the new system has settled.

As is the case in Belarus, a general lack of follow-up on all levels of involvement and fragmentary project formulation makes it difficult to establish cost-efficiency, impact and sustainability. On the level of impact and sustainability, levels are apparently low although a sound basis for continuation and follow-through of input already provided has been laid.

3.2.3 Ukraine

Context. If Russia, due to its size and dominating historic role in Eastern Europe has a complicated boundary situation, Ukraine is not very far from the same magnitude of complexity. Like Russia, also Ukraine borders 7 countries, plus the Black Sea, and it will be one of the most critical EU-border countries after the planned expansion of the Union. Ukraine has developed its legal basis for its migration- and asylum policy during the 1990s, however, the signature under the 1951 Convention was not made until early this year, 2002. Even with great ambitions, Ukraine's border countries remain weak in migration policy practice, among them Belarus and Moldavia, something that challenges Ukraine due to its size and economic potential. Ukraine is – at the time of writing – in the process of reorganising its migration/asylum management in a draft legislation that proposes a major change of the structure.

In Ukraine, the Swedish co-operation has had a low level (see Annex 3g). The activities so far have not been overlapping with other countries' co-operation. They can be regarded as feelers in the absence of a strategy guided medium- or long-term involvement. The SMB has maintained relations with Ukraine over the years, including arranging/participating in seminars on migration matters, with or without Sida support. A case in point is a 2001 seminar on a variety of issues, including the new legislation on a new legal framework for migration administration in Ukraine. With respect to coordination, there is in practice an internal coordination in the country through the information and support provided by the UNHCR between different kinds of support and donors. Ukraine is co-operating with the European Union agencies but not in the same role as the EU candidate countries of the Baltic region, for instance.

Co-operation assessment. The documentation from the projects does not allow an assessment of outcome on project level. The projects have not overlapped in content with other countries' co-operation. So far the co-operation has mainly covered issues of immigration control, reception procedures, country documentation and rules and procedures in the asylum-seeking process, through seminars as well as study visits.

According to one source, the co-operation with Sweden is the “most powerful” that Ukraine has had in this field.

UNHCR has played a critical role in the identification of areas of co-operation. Compared to other countries in this study, Ukraine has since a few years back formulated areas of co-operation, and has questions about weak response from the Swedish side in certain areas. This points to a degree of ownership that should be recognised. Still, the conditions for local ownership have been such that it is very difficult to execute, mainly through the wide division between different responsible actors within the migration- and asylum process.

The size of Ukraine in combination of the small size of the co-operation so far makes it somewhat difficult, or preposterous, to speak about impact on a wider or general level. The seminars and study visits that have taken place, though, have made an impact in the organisation, for instance on the regional level in Kiev.

On central level, Ukraine has reorganised its administration of migration matters seven times during the studied period, thus the sustainability is likely to be low on that level, of the outcome of the co-operation. However, regionally, the structure is much more stable and the sustainability is from acceptable to good, on that level.

Ukraine has a potential for being an effective partner for co-operation in the future which follows from the developed and internationalised legislation and the planned comprehensive structure for the administration. Its strategic location and role for Central European migration patterns keeps Ukraine among the important states also for Swedish co-operation in the future in these matters.

3.3 Regional projects – Söderköping

The Söderköping process has become the name for what initially was a four-country meeting (Lithuania, Belarus, Ukraine and Poland) but which since 2001 has expanded so that today 10 countries are either observers or members¹⁴. The process rests so far on three Sida decisions, 244/01, 603/01 and 264/02. There have been until now four meetings, the first in the Swedish small-town Söderköping. The expansion of the process is partly due to decisions among some countries to cease an on-going co-operation in the same area, and join this process instead. The purpose of the process has emphasised information sharing and there is no training component in this co-operation so far.

The process can be described as strategic in the sense that it brings together countries, which constitute the core countries in Eastern Europe with respect to east-west migration. Some of them will be EU border countries – either as new members or in their present role. There is no alternative forum for regular meetings between these countries about migration matters in a wide sense. One source in this study has indicated that some initiatives have been taken as a result of the process so far, and it is a common view among all interviewed that this process is unique and very useful for the regional dimension of their work.

This is however not enough a motive for meetings per se. It is imperative for the development of the process that its goals, structure and follow-up mechanisms are clarified and made explicit. This is particularly important since new members have been invited over the period.

Presently the Swedish SMB is seeking EU funding for the process, and at the most recent meeting, a division into three geographical sectors was discussed so as to make the process more effective among neighbours, but still maintain the regional component through yearly meetings for all participants.

¹⁴ The additional countries are: Latvia, Romania, Hungary, Slovakia, Estonia, and Moldova.

It is our assessment, that the process has components that are unique and deserve to be maintained or developed. The process is for some of its participants the most important regional contact area in this process. However, this process has originally been designed as has other activities, and a continuation needs to be based upon an assessment and documentation that is comprehensive in terms of goals, matters and participants.

4 Main Conclusions

The evaluation of Swedish support in the migration and asylum field has led to the overriding conclusion that individual interventions have been highly successful and resulted in immediate results, yet that a relative lack of direction, strategic planning and follow-up of training activities has hampered long term sustainability, impact and the ability to learn from experiences made.

In the concerned countries, the co-operation has contributed to the overall objectives (cf. section 2.1). Swedish input has added positively to the development of legal frameworks, competence enhancement, and to a limited (uncertain) extent to the output capacity of migration authorities. Swedish operations, as far as have been possible to establish, have contributed to changed perceptions and professional attitudes towards migrants.

SMB as an implementer should receive praise for technical merit and ability to interact with and stimulate its partners. On the other hand, SMB has displayed a structural inability to manage – i.e. plan, report and document – operations comprehensively. Perhaps in consequence, SMB operations show a systematic underestimation of what is necessary in order for local authorities to sustain immediate results in the medium to longer term.

On a more specific level, and only with relative certainty, the following observations can be made:

Results:

1. Input provided by SMB has contributed to a recognition and incorporation of international migration policy standards in national legislation (in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania in particular, including EU standards, in Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine to a significant extent yet at a lower level of legal development).
2. In the Baltic states, input provided has stimulated competence and output capacity in the fields of reception capacity, refugee status determination and general migration policy execution, particularly at the onset of activities. A certain loss of competence has been made in reorganisations and intra-administration processes, yet without entirely jeopardising the major results achieved.
3. In Belarus, Ukraine and Russia, input provided has stimulated competence and output capacity although from a different point of departure than in the Baltic states. Adoption of new (international) migration standards has been slower. Also, the development has been subject to major institutional disruptions in all three countries – mainly in the form of high-level institutional changes, while lower levels often have remained more stable.

Relevance:

1. Activities have been relevant in relation to the overall objective of the co-operation by targeting critical technical areas and target groups of migration policy and management.
2. There is a strong link between SMB *activities* and the overall objective. However, actual results and their link to the overall objectives – in the form they are formulated – are less obvious. Project documentation and follow-up is insufficient to make such an analysis. It is hence difficult (impossible) to assess the relevance of the mode of implementation.
3. The co-operation is relevant from a needs perspective and on management level. Existing recipient structures has been strengthened in its critical functions through competence enhancement, legal advice, and equipment assistance.
4. The co-operation is less relevant to the recipients on the strategic and/or political level. Refugees and asylum seekers are few except in Russia. All countries in the target area are mainly transit

countries (Russia is a special case, cf. section 3.2.2). Co-operation has helped to create an ability to manage larger migration flows, but this often goes contrary to national sentiment that emphasises border protection and repatriation as main operational tools.

Local ownership:

1. Local ownership is generally low. The migration and asylum field is a low political priority in the respective partner countries. The tendency to emphasise other means of managing migration flows, such as border control mechanisms, than migration and asylum policies in line with international standards, has weakened targeted institutions in their capacity to formulate policy and needs. The political level above targeted institutions are, in a way, not in tune with the change in perceptions occurring at the lower level, yet still dictating the agenda (targeted border protection organisations are an exception in this regard).
2. Activity ownership is stronger on management level (targeted migration management structures) than at political level. The management levels' ability to act is, however, still constrained through this imbalance in the national structure.
3. In the Baltic states, the international co-operation and EU orientation has reduced the mentioned imbalance to a certain extent. A similar development is yet to be seen in Belarus, Russia and Ukraine.

Cost-effectiveness:

1. Cost-effectiveness is almost impossible to measure due to inadequate reporting. SMB has attempted to optimise turn-over and activity frequency, rather than achieving fewer qualitative activities with larger input in each. SMB has repeatedly overestimated reimbursable activity costs and made the reverse underestimation regarding work input. Portfolio development suggest or is characterised by urgency above all. This has resulted in quite an unusual situation. Cost-effectiveness in (particularly early) projects seems "negative" in the sense that too small fee allocations have been requested for each activity. To the extent results have been achieved, "cost-efficiency" is high, but too little time has been set aside to carefully plan activities and follow-up on their results, and more importantly to carry them to their conclusion¹⁵.

Sustainability and impact:

1. Small migration flows and unclear/weak political will is a threat to the sustainability of results achieved, particularly in the field of asylum treatment. The threat looks different in Russia where migration flows are substantial, the needs are recognised, but where the methods are yet to be determined.
2. It seems clear that knowledge transfer has enhanced the competence of partner institutions, but how and the extent to which this competence has been used is largely unknown.
3. It is reasonable to assume that long term impact has been hampered by the "one-off" nature of each activity. Specific practice oriented follow up has by and large been lacking.
4. Impact is also difficult to measure since it largely has to do with changed perceptions. Perceptions seem to have been affected, particularly so as the development of the legal frameworks have progressed¹⁶. This development has put the "human rights" aspect in focus and created a new normative link between the political and management levels of the migration field. SMB (and UNHCR) interventions have stimulated this process in its choice of target groups and topics.

¹⁵ This means that, for instance, a theoretical seminar on third country documentation could be followed up by practically oriented activities to enhance impact at a low input level.

¹⁶ The stronger the judicial development, the stronger we believe perceptions have been affected, also on a practical level. Note, however, that there is no formal backing to support this judgement.

Regional approaches:

1. The Söderköping process has achieved to create an interest in its potential rather than in its outcome. This is a type of result, although of a short-lived and relatively peripheral nature. Its impact so far has been in the field of information sharing. The process most likely needs to develop an internal life of activities and information sharing, based on processes within the network itself, to achieve real activity based results.

5 Recommendations

This report covers a large co-operation area and six target countries and its recommendations will be divided in clusters to accommodate this feature. Recommendations given are directed to Sida, although in most cases Sida should require the co-operation partners to execute them, and regard the co-operation and its future on the (i) general level, in the (ii) Baltic states, in (iii) Belarus, Russia and Ukraine, and (iv) regarding regional approaches.

It should be noted that these recommendations are based on a general assumption that co-operation should be continued. The report finds no reasons to discontinue co-operation in this area provided it is based on clear directives and a comprehensive project implementation mechanism (planning, needs assessment and institutional analysis, and follow-up).

General

- Formulate a medium term strategy for co-operation with individual countries based on national political support and institutional analysis (needs, priorities and capacity).
- Allocate sufficient funds to establish medium term strategies including proper follow-up activities and assessment.
- Develop a policy/view regarding the role of the UNHCR in coming co-operation strategies with a view to strengthen local ownership and commitment level among target countries.

The Baltic states

- Consider support for specialised competence within existing competence areas, and consider widening the co-operative scope to new migration policy challenges such as trafficking and illegal trade.
- Determine the level of commitment in various policy areas by using cost-sharing unless sustainability will be lost or unattainable.
- Treat the period from now on, to EU membership, as interim; focusing on building equal relations adapted to the membership situation.

Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine

- Identify fields of particular strategic importance for the partner (priority and commitment) in the migration and asylum field and consider a widening of scope to migration related policy areas (trafficking, illegal trade).
- Develop more comprehensive country specific and long-term relationships between co-operating institutions.

Regional approaches

- Develop a special strategy for the Söderköping process, and similarly for any other regional initiatives, based on institutional analysis of the co-operating countries, including specific verifiable targets for activities, cost-sharing, and implementation.

Annex 1

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of the Swedish bilateral assistance in the field of migration and asylum

1. Background

In the mid-90s the Baltic countries experienced a sudden influx of relatively large numbers of migrants. Most of the migrants ended up in the Baltic states on their way to Western Europe. The newly independent countries around the Baltic sea were more or less unprepared for the situation and the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs assigned the Swedish Migration Board to provide assistance to our Baltic neighbours in the field of asylum and refugee reception affairs.

Since 1997, the Swedish Migration Board has been involved in cooperation with the migration authorities in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Cooperation initiatives has also been extended to Russia, Ukraine and, to some degree, Belarussia. Initially, the support focused on immediate responses, often in terms of equipment supplies, to the influx of migrants in the Baltic countries. Gradually, the assistance has developed into institutional cooperation and support to the establishment of national structures for asylum and refugee affairs. Subject areas have been legislation, asylum process, practical case handling and support to establishing a sustainable organisation for refugee reception.

In 1999, Sida was assigned to administer the civil parts of the Swedish bilateral security promotion support. This had previously been handled at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Stockholm. From 1999, Sida has allocated appr. 13,2 msek for migration support to Central and Eastern Europe, whereof approximately 9 msek for the Baltic states, 3,2 msek for Russia, Ukraine and Belarussia and about 1 msek for a cross-border initiative.

The aim of the cooperation with the Baltic states is to support the development of the migration services, in coherence with the Geneva convention and relevant EU-legislation. The goal is for the Baltic states to become full EU-members and be classified as safe third countries, being able to receive refugees on the same terms as other EU member states.

The goal of the cooperation with Russia, Ukraine and Belarus is to assist in developing a well functioning migration organisation and refugee reception capacity, in line with international legislation and standards. From a Swedish perspective, it is also of vital importance to develop good operative relations with the countries neighbouring the future external borders of EU/Schengen. Areas covered in the cooperation are legislation, asylum process and refugee reception. Lately, the cooperation has halted due to reorganisations on the Russian, as well as the Ukrainian side.

Another initiative regarding border management and migration was taken by Sweden in 2001, involving countries near the future external EU border, in this case Lithuania, Poland, Ukraine and Belarussia. The purpose is to establish an informal network between relevant authorities in these countries in order to improve the management of migration flows near the future EU border.

During the bilateral cooperation projects conducted by the Swedish Migration Board, UNHCR has acted as co-ordinator and actively participated in planning the different projects. Beneficiaries are the migration services, the Interior ministries and the units for refugee reception, normally under the Ministry of Social Affairs.

Today it is about five years ago since the Swedish Migration Board initiated development cooperation projects in the Baltic Sea area. The character of the bilateral support has changed during this time. Against the backdrop of a phasing out of the Swedish bilateral assistance to the Baltic countries and a gradual change towards regular neighbour countries' relations, it is deemed timely to conduct an overall evaluation of the support provided in the area of migration and asylum.

The cooperation in the field of migration and asylum with Russia, Ukraine and Belarussia is also of interest for the evaluation and will be included, focussing primarily on lessons learned as regards project design, methods used and results of the cooperation this far. It is furthermore important to investigate preconditions and opportunities for future bilateral cooperation with regard to these countries.

2. Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is:

- to assess relevance, results, sustainability, local ownership, cost-efficiency and methods of the Swedish migration and asylum support to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and to discuss opportunities for a future regular operative cooperation.
- to give an account of the relevance, results, project design and methods used this far as regards development cooperation activities in Russia, Ukraine and Belarussia in the field of migration and asylum, and to discuss prospects for a viable future bilateral development cooperation.
- In line with the outcome of the above, provide recommendations for the future cooperation with the concerned countries in the field of migration and asylum.

Main beneficiaries of the evaluation are the financiers, Sida and MFA, the cooperation partners in the concerned countries and the Swedish Migration Board.

3. Scope of work

The evaluation shall cover the assignments carried out by the Migration Board as listed in annex 1 (identification of additional relevant MFA funded projects and its documentation might be necessary). As shown, the evaluation shall not be restricted to cover only Sida-financed projects, as previous MFA-funded initiatives also have a bearing on the overall results achieved.

The evaluation shall focus on the following main issues:

I. For Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania:

- a) Assess the *relevance* of the projects in terms of goals and needs of recipient organisations, EU-alignment and Swedish development cooperation goals.
- b) Assess/discuss whether and to what extent the *objectives and goals* of the projects have been achieved, as outlined in project plans and as stated in the goals for the development cooperation with Central and Eastern Europe. Discuss the reasons for high or low achievements, with regard to administrative, organisational, financial and other factors within the Swedish as well as the recipient countries' organisations.
- c) Assess lasting effects of the cooperation initiatives and the *sustainability* of the projects. Discuss other factors relevant for goal attainment, external to the Swedish bilateral cooperation (and other effects of the cooperation, not accounted for in the project goals). Discuss the potential for sustainability against the fact that migration flows have diminished markedly in some of the Baltic countries.
- c) Assess *local ownership* of the cooperation, in the initiation, planning, implementation and follow-up of the projects. Discuss the consequences for low/high degree of local ownership on projects and their effects.

- d) Discuss the *role of the UNHCR* and how it might have influenced the bilateral cooperation with the Baltic countries, the project aims, results as well as local ownership.
- e) Assess/discuss the *cost efficiency* of the projects. Discuss whether the same results could have been achieved with fewer resources, by other means or with an alternative approach.
- f) Discuss how the *gender perspective* has been taken in account within the cooperation.
- g) Comment on the *coordination with other major donors* in this area.
- h) Discuss the *prospects for future cooperation* with Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania based on regular cooperation between neighbour countries. Summarise possible future priorities and recommended changes as regards the cooperation in the area, its content and form.

II. For Russia, Ukraine and Belarussia:

- a) Assess the *relevance* of the project activities in terms of goals and needs of recipient organisations, regional integration and Swedish development cooperation goals. Discuss the role of the UNHCR in this context.
- b) Assess/discuss whether, and to what extent, *objectives and goals* of the projects have been achieved, as outlined in project plans and as stated in the goals for the development cooperation with Central and Eastern Europe. Discuss the reasons for high or low achievements, with regard to administrative, organisational, financial and other factors within the Swedish as well as the recipient countries' organisations.
- c) Discuss *local ownership* of the cooperation projects. Comment on the role of the UNHCR and the implications for the bilateral cooperation.
- d) Comment on the *coordination with other major donors* in this area.
- e) Discuss the *opportunities and risks with regard to future development cooperation* with Russia, Ukraine and Belarussia. Summarise possible future priorities and recommended changes as regards the cooperation in the area, its orientation, form and methods.

4. Method, time schedule, undertakings

- Identification and study of relevant documentation in Sweden,
- Interviews with relevant actors in Sweden,
- Field visits in all three Baltic countries, Russia, Ukraine and possibly Belarussia,
- Completion of the written report and presentation of the findings to relevant parties.

The estimated time period for the fulfilment of the assignment is 9 man-weeks. The evaluation team will consist of two persons, one experienced evaluator with good knowledge of Sida, and one expert on migration and asylum issues.

A draft report shall be presented to Sida no later than October 15, 2002. A final report shall be presented to Sida before October 31, 2002.

The Consultant will be responsible for the practical arrangements related to the international missions and other visits and meetings. Sida will make available written material considered to be of relevance to the evaluation by the Consultant and Sida. Responsible officer at Sida will inform the Swedish counterparts of the forthcoming evaluation.

5. Reporting

The evaluation report shall be written in English and should not exceed 30 pages, excluding annexes. Format and outline should follow the guidelines in “Sida Evaluation Report – a standardized format” (annex 2).

A draft report shall be sent to Sida electronically and in five hard copies no later than October 15, 2002. Within 2 weeks after receiving Sida’s comments on the draft report, a final version shall be submitted to Sida, again electronically and in five hard copies. The evaluation report must be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing. Subject to decision by Sida, the report will be published in the series *Sida Evaluations*.

The following enclosures shall be attached to the final report:

- Terms of reference
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documentation

The evaluation assignment includes the completion of Sida Evaluations Data Work Sheet (annex 3), including an Evaluation Abstract (final section, G) as defined and required by DAC. The completed Data Worksheet shall be submitted to Sida along with the final version of the report. Failing a completed Data Worksheet, the report can not be processed.

Annex:

1. list of project decisions in the field of migration and asylum
2. Sida Evaluation Report – a standardized format
3. Sida Evaluations Data Work Sheet

Project decisions (MFA and Sida) – migration and asylum cooperation

Decision no.	Title of project	Countries	Agreed amount (SEK)
UD93/(1993-06-17)	Migration support to Estonia (Bidrag för migrationspolitiskt samarbete med Estland) [UD och Kulturdep]	Estonia	405 000
UD1995/xx?(Oct)	Migration policy support (Stöd till migrationspolitiska insatser i Baltikum)	Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania	? 1 900 000
UD96/xx?(June)	Migration policy support	UNHCR, Lithuania	? 1 000 000
UD97/1456/EC (1997-10-02)	cont. Migration policy support (Svenskt stöd till de baltiska staterna på det migrationspolitiska området)	Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania	4 000 000
UD98/1502/EC (1998-12-10)	Migration policy support	Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania	3 571 000
UD99/xx? (= above?)	Migration policy support	Baltic countries	? 1 700 000
UD2000/1137/EC (2000-10-19)	(Stöd till projekt för frivilliga återvändare från Lettland till Ryssland)	IOM/Latvia	500 000
Sida 621/99	Migration policy and equipment support	Latvia, Lithuania	1 726 730
Sida 90/00	Support to the Migration services	Baltic countries	2 609 000
Sida 241/01	'Flying seminar' (IT-systems support for migration service)	Lithuania	640 489
Sida 564/01	Participation in IOM project: 'Managing Asylum Seeking, Refugee and HR Protection in the Baltic States'	Baltic states	415 000
Sida 642/01	Asylum training for Border guards	Latvia	157 000
Sida 54/02	Migration support	Regional Baltic	3 508 300
UD/96/1727/EC (1996-11-21)	('Stöd till UNHCR för migrationspolitiska åtgärder')	UNHCR, IOM, Russia, Ukraine, Belarussia	1 000 000
UD97/1055/EC (1997-07-03)	('Stöd till UNHCR och IOM för migrationspolitiska åtgärder i Ryska federationen, Ukraina och Vitryssland inom ramen för CIS-konferensen')	Russia, Ukraine, Belarussia	4 000 000
UD97/1363/EC (1997-09-04)	('Uppdrag till SIV om visst utv.samarbete med Ryska federationen, Ukraina och Vitryssland som rör migrationspolitik')	Ryssland, Ukraina, Vitryssland	2 000 000
Sida 155/99	Institution building	Russia, Ukraine	1 327 792
Sida 536/99	Institution building	Belarus	330 250
Sida 475/00	Planning trip f. co-op with UNHCR/Belarus	Belarus (Lithuania)	113 400
Sida 46/01	Migration co-operation	Russia, Belarus, Ukr.	536 600
Sida 569/01	Planning trip	Russia	188 200
Sida 671/01	Planning trip	Ukraine	97 000
Sida 183/02	Planning trip	Belarus	56 300
Sida 189/02	Migration cooperation Russia, II	Russian federation	545 300
Sida 244/01	Regional border and migration coop. (Söderköpingsprocess 1')	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	276 100
Sida 603/01	Regional border and migration coop. (Söderköpingsprocess 2')	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	355 500
Sida 264/02	Regional border and migration coop. (Söderköpingsprocess 3')	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Li	290 500

Annex 2

Particular Note on Co-operation Management at SMB

A particular note on the structure of SMB's organisation and its relation to the Swedish government and Sida is motivated by the findings of this report. SMB has proved to be an effective implementer of individual interventions, yet it is clear that its long term planning ability and project management capability in general, to date, has been weak. On this account, although not an explicit part of the Terms of Reference for this study, and only insofar as SMB organisation impacts of project outcome, the following remarks are reasonable.

Organisation

The contractual basis for the relationship between Sida and SMB needs to be based on a strategy and articulated commitment on the part of SMB regarding its engagement for international co-operation.

In turn, the development of such a strategy needs, as its point of departure, clear directives from the Swedish government (MFA or Sida) spelling out objectives and expectations.

Desirably, such a strategy should lead to a development away from singular to longer term relationships and projects where a cumulative learning effect is sought for. For the intermediate future, relationships should be developed on a country basis for Belarus, Russia and the Ukraine, and on an interim basis for the Baltic states due to their anticipated EU membership.

As SMB extends its capacity, a mechanism/function for internal review of its own project implementation would serve SMB well in its development. Such a function could also take on a responsibility for staff development in the particular roles that emerge from the specific nature of international co-operation, for instance regarding leadership and organisation. Outside guidance in the creation of such a mechanism is recommended.

The organisational development implicated above is believed to be a basic requirement for continued co-operation through SMB as an implementer, if the shortcomings indicated in this study should be alleviated. If a relationship between Sida and SMB can be established on these grounds, an organisational review should be feasible following a necessary trial period.

When SMB feels comfortable with a more developed contractual relationship one may consider the model of contract-based technical assistance for co-operation with institutions in the Baltic states. For the remaining countries, project-based, medium- to long-term projects should be developed, in order to allow for a cumulative, planned, and participatory process to be developed in the co-operation relationship.

Implementation

The Baltic states are at a breaking-point which, according to themselves, requires equal treatment on a good-neighbour basis from their neighbouring countries, rather than any other form of more asymmetric relationships. This point in time is therefore natural for the development of mutual allocation commitments within this cooperation, regardless of its content and form. This will not only allow for local ownership, but it will also produce incentives for a continued high cost-efficiency level.

For SMB, this will require a shift in the conditions under which the cooperation is carried out. If a symmetric cooperation now is sought for, there will be even more demands of dialogue and mutual

responsibility than is the case when one partner is totally responsible for critical aspects, such as financing, methods or priorities. To introduce a new approach and attitude is likely to demand even more resources than before. Notwithstanding, finding ways and means to do this is deemed necessary if established relations shall change.

Annex 3

3a – Project Portfolio

Decision	Title	Countries	Allocation	Tot. disb.	
UD19930617	Migration support to Estonia	Estonia	450 000		
UD96/1727	Support of UNHCR (IOM) for migration policy operations	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	1 000 000		
UD97/1055	Support of UNHCR and IOM regarding CIS conference	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	4 000 000		
UD97/1363	Migration support	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	2 000 000		
UD97/1456	Migration policy support	Regional Baltic	4 000 000		
UD98/1502	Migration policy support	Regional Baltic	3 571 000		
UD2000/1137	Support of voluntary repatriation	Latvia/IOM	500 000		
155/99	Institution building (+MFA contrib. 1,4 msek, -97)	Russia, Ukraine	2 727 800	1 016 300	37%
536/99	Institution building	Belarus	330 250	217 400	66%
621/99	Institution building	Latvia, Lithuania	1 726 730	1 250 000	72%
90/00	Migration cooperation	Regional Baltic	2 609 000	1 288 300	49%
475/00	Planning for coop UNHCR and Belarus	Belarus (in Lithuania)	113 400	12 250	11%
46/01	Migration Cooperation	Russia, Belarus, Ukraine	536 600	277 500	52%
241/01	Flying seminar (IT-support for migration service)	Lithuania	640 489	516 629	81%
244/01	Regional border coop. ('Söderköpingsprocess 1')	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	276 100	143 500	52%
564/01	IOM project 'Managing Asylum Seeking, Refugee and HR	Regional Baltic	415 000	–	–
569/01	Planning trip	Russia	188 200	181 500	96%
603/01	Regional border coop. ('Söderköpingsprocess 2')	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	355 500	141 433	40%
642/01	Asylum training, Border guards	Latvia	157 000	116 500	74%
671/01	Planning trip	Ukraine	97 000	80 975	83%
54/02	Migration support	Regional Baltic	3 508 300	–	–
183/02	Planning trip	Belarusia	56 300	47 486	84%
189/02	Migration cooperation, II	Russian Federation	545 300	289 338	53%
264/02	Regional border and migration coop. (Söderköping 3)	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	290 500	90 049	31%
			30 094 469		
			14 573 469		
			15 521 000		

Annex 3

3b – Estonia

Decision	Title	Countries	Allocation	Of which Estonia
UD19930617	Migration support to Estonia	Estonia	450 000	450 000
UD96/1727	na		1 000 000	
UD97/1055	na		4 000 000	
UD97/1363	na		2 000 000	
UD97/1456	Migration Policy Support	Regional Baltic	4 000 000	
	*Needs assessment, Sweden + Norwegian UDI			17 578
UD98/1502	Migration Policy Support	Regional Baltic	3 571 000	62 210
	*training: interview, safe country, country info			
UD2000/1137	na			
155/99	na			
536/99	na			
621/99	na			
90/00	Support to migration mgmt. structures	Regional Baltic	2 609 000	
	*Semin I: Border Guards (11976)			153 200
	*Semin II: Border Guards (11980)			153 200
	*Study visit/Internship in Sweden (11977)			95 450
	*Expert support (11978)			60 550
	*Consultations (11979)			60 550
	*Illuka, equipment			610 400
	*Illuka, study visit no. I, to Sweden (11981)			65 600
	*Illuka, study visit no. II, to Sweden (11982)			86 800
	*Practical support service (11983)			145 800
	*Seminar in Estonia for Illuka (11984)			154 725
	*Administration, local costs in Sweden, SMB			75 737
475/00	na			
46/01	na			
241/01	na			
244/01	na			
564/01	IOM proj. support/particip., Baltic states	Regional Baltic	415 000	138 333
569/01	na			
603/01	na			
642/01	na			
671/01	na			
54/02	Migration Support	Regional Baltic	3 508 300	
	Family reunion project consisting of:			
	*Riga seminar+consultation in Estonia (14031)			127 624
	*Subsidiary protection (14032)			125 643
	*Two-day interpreter training (14033)			366 542
	*Baltic Migration Network (14039)			206 084

Decision	Title	Countries	Allocation	Of which Estonia
183/02	*Follow-up seminar, unclear where			168 084
189/02	*Asylum case management, study visit (14043)			136 000
264/02	*Asylum case management, study visit (14036)			195 460
	*Follow-up trip, assessment (14038)			163 289
	na			
	na			
	na			
			21 553 300	3 818 859

"na": Not applicable
 "n.a.": Country specific activities

3c - Latvia

Decision	Title	Countries	Allocation	Of which Latvia
UD19930617 UD96/1727 UD97/1055 UD97/1363 UD97/1456	na na na na Migration Policy Support – total project *Planning trip *Refugee Affairs Board: asylum mgmt training *Equipment	Regional Baltic	4 000 000	45 960 25 095 958 091
UD98/1502	Migration Policy Support – total project *Seminar on norms and approaches *Refugee Affairs Board: asylum mgmt trainingx2 *Appeal process support *Specific areas in asylum mgmt *Country documentation *Register of aliens/seminar + visit in Sweden/ *Asylum Rights/Border Guards seminar *Equipment, Mucenieki *Training, Mucenieki *Training step 2, Mucenieki *Expert support, Mucenieki *Expert support, Mucenieki *Mucenieki staff training in Lithuania *Mucenieki staff training in Sweden Support of voluntary repatriation			108 425 77 210 54 800 84 569 84 704 90 488 61 260 597 000 29 280 118 008 49 125 79 404 40 000 118 008 500 000
UD2000/1137 155/99 536/99 621/99	na na Migration policy and equipment support *Latvian detention mgmt officers/Sweden visit Support to migration mgmt structures *Seminar on Iraq (11956) *Expert support in Latvia *Task Force Support for NAP *Detention seminar *Flying seminar	Latvia/IOM	1 726 730 2 609 000	133 700 25 018 34 436 31 630 23 918 505 424
90/00				
475/00 46/01 241/01 244/01 564/01	na na na na IOM proj. support/particip., Baltic states			138 333

Decision	Title	Countries	Allocation	Of which Latvia
569/01	na			
603/01	na			
642/01	Asylum training, Border Guards (14041)		156 900	156 900
671/01	na			
54/02	Migration Support		3 508 300	
	<i>Family reunion project consisting of:</i>			
	*Riga seminar+consultation in Estonia (14031)			127 624
	*Subsidiary protection (14032)			125 643
	*Two-day interpreter training (14033)			366 542
	*Baltic Migration Network (14039)			206 084
	*Follow-up seminar, unclear where			168 578
	*Follow-up trip, assessment (14038)			163 289
183/02	na			
189/02	na			
264/02	na			
			16 486 930	5 328 546

"na"; Not applicable
 "na"; Country specific activities

3d – Lithuania

Decision	Title	Countries	Allocation	Of which Lithuania
UD19930617 UD96/1727 UD97/1055 UD97/1363 UD97/1456	na na na na Migration Policy Support	Regional Baltic		4 000 000
UD98/1502	*Implementation of integration process *Assessment of asylum applications *Interview technique *Equipment, different places Migration Policy Support *Equipment and interpreter training *Country documentation *Aliens register – pre-study and study visit *Implementation of reception and integration *As above – internship visit	Regional Baltic	3 571 000	156 692 99 128 98 275 1 302 690
UD2000/1137 155/99 536/99 621/99	na na na Migration policy and equipment support *Study visit in Sweden *Seminar in Sweden on detention, 6 Lith. officials	Latvia, Lithuania	1 726 730	130 750 146 900 1 315 380
90/00	*Equipment, Pabradė Support to migration mgmt. structures *Expert support in Lithuania *Interview technique seminar	Regional Baltic	2 609 000	79 240 211 400
475/00 46/01 241/01 244/01 564/01 569/01 603/01 642/01 671/01	na na Flying seminar Söderköping Process IOM proj. support/particip., Baltic states na Söderköping Process na na	Lithuania Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith Regional Baltic Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	640 489 276 100 415 000 355 500	640 489 69 025 138 333 88 875

Decision	Title	Countries	Allocation	Of which Lithuania
54/02	Migration Support <i>Family reunion project consisting of:</i> *Riga seminar+consultation in Estonia *Subsidiary protection *Two-day interpreter training *Handbook over asylum process *Baltic Migration Network *Follow-up seminar, unclear where *Asylum case management, study visit *Follow-up trip, assessment	Regional Baltic	3 508 300	127 624 125 643 366 542 48 000 206 084 168 084 136 000 163 289
183/02 189/02 264/02	na na Söderköping Process	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	290 500	72 625
			17 392 619	7 232 270

"na": Not applicable
 "**": Country specific activities

3e – Belarus

Decision	Title	Countries	Allocation	Of which Belarus
UD19930617 UD96/1727	na Support of UNHCR (IOM) for migration policy operations *UNHCR and IOM action programmes 50/50	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	1 000 000	333 333
UD97/1055	Support of UNHCR and IOM regarding CIS conference *UNHCR and IOM action programmes 50/50	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	4 000 000	1 000 000
UD97/1363	Migration support *SIV activities	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	2 000 000	666 667
UD97/1456 UD98/1502 UD2000/1137 621/99 155/99 536/99	na na na na na Institution building *Seminar in Minsk (UNHCR) various topics *Study-visit SWE various topics			
90/00 475/00	na Planning for coop UNHCR and Belarus *Visit to Vilnius, reception facilities *Visit to Belarus, reception facilities	Belarus	330 250	330 250
46/01	Migration Cooperation * One seminar with judges from the Appeal board in Minsk (40-50 pers.)	Belarus (in Lithuania)	113 400	113 400
241/01 244/01 564/01 569/01 603/01 642/01 671/01 54/02 183/02	na Regional border coop. ('Söderköpingsprocess 1') na na Regional border coop. ('Söderköpingsprocess 2')	Russia, Belarus, Ukraine	536 600 189 700	
	na Regional border coop. ('Söderköpingsprocess 1')	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	276 100	69 025
	na Regional border coop. ('Söderköpingsprocess 2')	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	355 500	88 875
189/02 264/02	na Planning trip *Visit to Minsk (P Sjögren) planning Regional border and migration coop. ('Söderköping 3')	Belarus	56 300	56 300
		Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	290 500	48 417
			8 958 650	2 895 967

"na": Not applicable
 "n.a.", Country specific activities

3f – Russia

Decision	Title	Countries	Allocation	Of which Russia
UD19930617	na	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	1 000 000	333 333
UD96/1727	Support of UNHCR (IOM) for migration policy operations * UNHCR and IOM action programmes 50/50			
UD97/1055	Support of UNHCR and IOM regarding CIS conference * UNHCR and IOM action programmes 50/50	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	4 000 000	2 000 000
UD97/1363	Migration support * SIV activities	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	2 000 000	666 667
UD97/1456	na			
UD98/1502	na			
UD2000/1137	na			
621/99	na			
155/99	Institution building (+MFA contrib. 1,4 msek, -97) * Study-visit SWE foreigner reg/land documentation FMS * Study-visit SWE voluntary repatriation FMS * Exchange service, immigration control and border work RMS * Seminar in SPb appeal board (UNHCR)	Russia, Ukraine	2 727 800	909 267
536/99	na			
90/00	na			
475/00	na			
46/01	Migration Cooperation * Two day seminar, ID controll and fingerprints * Study-visit to Sweden refugee laws Petersburg office	Russia, Belarus, Ukraine	536 600	74 488 395 000
241/01	na			
244/01	na			
564/01	na			
569/01	Planning trip * Swe participation in reg UNHCR conference (also planning)	Russia	188 200	188 200
603/01	na			
642/01	na			
671/01	na			
54/02	na			
183/02	na			
189/02	Migration cooperation, II * Seminar (70 pers) SPb/UNHCR asylum proc and status deter	Russian Federation	545 300	545 300
264/02	na			
"na"; ***, ,	Not applicable Country specific activities		10 997 900	5 112 255

3g - Ukraine

Decision	Title	Countries	Allocation	Of which Ukraine
UD19930617	na			
UD96/1727	Support of UNHCR (IOM) for migration policy operations	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	1 000 000	333 333
UD97/1055	Support of UNHCR and IOM regarding CIS conference	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	4 000 000	1 333 333
UD97/1363	Migration support	Russia, Ukraine, Belarus	2 000 000	666 667
UD97/1456	na			
UD98/1502	na			
UD2000/1137	na			
155/99	Institution building	Russia, Ukraine	2 727 800	1 527 250
	*Obodivka Reception Centre staff study visit Sweden			
	*Study visit on immigration control			
	*Rules and handbooks for migration/refugee work			
	*Country documentation			
	*Migration Seminar, Odessa			
	*Implementation of reception and integration process			
	*Seminar on practical issues, Kiev			
	*Planning and assessment, in the Ukraine			
536/99	na			
621/99	na			
90/00	na			
475/00	na			
46/01	Migration Cooperation	Russia, Belarus, Ukraine	536 600	267 900
	*Study visit/local work study in Sweden			
241/01	na			
244/01	Söderköping I			
564/01	na	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	276 100	69 025
569/01	na			
603/01	Söderköping II	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	355 500	88 875
642/01	na			
671/01	Planning Trip	Ukraine	97 000	97 000
54/02	na			
183/02	na			
189/02	na			
264/02	Söderköping III	Ukr, Belarus, Pol, Lith	290 500	48 417
			11 283 500	4 431 800

"na": Not applicable
 "": Country specific activities

Annex 4

List of Persons Met

Stockholm:

Ulrika Lindberg	Sida, Department for Central and Eastern Europe, Programme Officer
Anneli Hildeman	Sida, Department for Central and Eastern Europe, Programme Officer
Lars Pålsson	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Department for Migration and Asylum Policy, deputy director
Birger Karlsson	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Central and Eastern Europe Department, desk officer
Gun Enlund	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Department for Migration and Asylum Policy, deputy director
Jan Erlandsson	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Department for Migration and Asylum Policy, deputy director

Norrköping, Swedish Migration Board:

Göran Larsson	Senior Adviser, Legal Practice Division
Peter Eriksson	Senior Adviser, Development Division
Bitte Konrad	Head of Division, International Development Cooperation Division
Madelene Selleby	Administrator, Secretariat Division
Annika Johansson	Planning officer/Co-ordinator, International Development Cooperation Division

Moscow:

M. Jean Paul Cavaliere	UNHCR, Head of legal unit
Mr. Peter Kozelets	UNHCR, Protection assistant
Mr. Vladimir A Volokh	Ministry of Interior, FMS, Head of department
Mr. Vladimir Rucheikov	Ministry of Interior, FMS, Head of Asylum section
Ms. Ekaterina Zueva	Ministry of Interior, FMS, Head International Co-operation section

Minsk:

Mr. Bohdan Nahajlo	UNHCR, Head of Liaison Office Belarus
Mr. Vitaly Maslovsky	UNHCR, Protection Officer
Col. Yury O Fedorov	State border troops committee of Belarus, Deputy Head
Mr. Anatoly P Chirak	State border troops committee of Belarus, Head of legal dept.
Mr. Leon Yakhnovets	Department of Migration, Director
Mr. Vladimir Galteev	Department of Migration, Deputy Director (refugees)
Mr. Leonid Melnik	Consultant
Mr. Sergei Chernysh	Department of Migration, Chief expert on refugees
Ms. L Serikova	former head of the Department of Migration
Mr. Neil Buhne	UNDP, Resident representative and resident UN coordinator

St Petersburg:

Mr. Andrey Lablin	Ministry of Interior, RMS, Deputy Head
Ms. Galina Matseikovitch	Ministry of Interior, RMS, Head information and analysis dept.

Mr. Victor Efimov	Ministry of Interior, RMS, Head of dept.
Mr. Dmitry Kruzhkov	Ministry of Interior, RMS, Specialist

Kiev:

M. Guy Ouellet	UNHCR, Resident representative
Mr Dmytro Plechko	UNHCR, Protection Assistant
Mr. Andrej Prokofief	Department on Refugees and Migration, Deputy Head
Mr Yuriy Sukhov	State Committee for Nationalities and Migration, Deputy head
Mr. Vlodomyr Novik	Kiev City State Administration, Head

Tallinn:

Ms. Katrin Savomägi	Citizenship and Migration Board, Head Foreign Relations
Mr. Klen Jäärats	Citizenship and Migration Board, Head of Refugees Department
Mr. Tõnu Strandson	Citizenship and Migration Board, Specialist refugees
Ms. Anneli Pöiklik	Citizenship and Migration Board, Specialist refugees
Ms. Heikki Assaru	Citizenship and Migration Board, Counsellor, Refugees Department
Ms. Anu Potisepp	UNHCR, Liaison Officer
Ms. Kristin Aas	Social Secretary Illukka Reception Centre (Narva region)
Ms. Triin Raag	Ministry of Social Affairs, Specialist, Social Welfare Dept.
Captain Kerli K Hirv	Estonian Border Guard, Chief Analysis Division
Mr. Tiit Rosik	Ministry of Internal Affairs, Adviser, European Integration Dept.
Mr. Tairi Haabu	Ministry of Internal Affairs, Specialist, European Integration Dept.

Riga:

Mr. Baiba Biezā	Refugee Affairs Department, Head
Ms. Aija Šibajeva	Refugee Affairs Department, Head Reception Centre “Mucenieki”
Ms. Dace Žvarte	Refugee Affairs Department, Senior Official
Ms. Ilze Juhansone	Refugee Affairs Department, Deputy Head of Legal Division
Ms. Ilze Briede	Refugee Affairs Department, Head of Residence Permit Division
Ms. Uldis Apsītis	Refugee Affairs Department, Deputy Head of IT Division
Dr. iur. Aivars Fogels	Appeal Council for Refugee Matters, Chairman
Mr. Oskar Galanders	Appeal Council for Refugee Matters, Member
Ms. Dace Ose	UNHCR Liaison Officer

Vilnius:

Mr. Janas Vidickas	Ministry of Internal Affairs (MoIA), Dep. Director Migration Dept.
Ms. Gitana Razaliunienė	MoIA, Migration Department, Specialist, Div. of Law
Ms. Kristina Basakauskienė	MoIA, Migration Department, Head of Law Division,
Mrs. Liucija Voisnis	MoIA, Migration Department, Head, Division for Asylum Affairs
Mrs. Violeta Targonskienė	MoIA, Migration Department, Deputy, Division for Asylum Affairs
Mr. Olegas Skinderskis	MoIA, Director, Dept for International Relations and EU Integration
Ms. Nijole Valintinienė	MoIA, Head of International Relations unit
Mr Ramune Kazakauskienė	MoIA, State Border Guard Service, Chief Specialist,
Ms. Jolanta Narienė	MoIA, Specialist, International Co-operation
Mr. Robertas Petraitis	State Border Guard Service, Pabrade Registration Centre, Head
Mr. Jonas Platukis	State Border Guard Service, Pabrade Registration Centre, Deputy

Recent Sida Evaluations

- 02/32** **Programa de Protección a las Poblaciones Afectadas por la Violencia en Perú**
Raúl Lizárraga Bobbio, Lilian Sala Morin
Departamento Regional para América Latina
- 02/33** **Supporting Ownership: A Study of Swedish Development Cooperation Programmes in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda**
David Andersson, Chris Cramer, Alemayehu Geda, Degol Hailu, Frank Muhereza, Matteo Rizzi, Eric Ronge, Howard Stein and John Weeks
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 02/33:01** **Supporting Ownership: A Study of Swedish Development Cooperation Programmes in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda – Vol I: Synthesis report**
David Andersson, Chris Cramer, Alemayehu Geda, Degol Hailu, Frank Muhereza, Matteo Rizzi, Eric Ronge, Howard Stein and John Weeks
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 02/34** **Syntes av Svenska Enskilda Organisationers Utvärderingar.**
Holger Nilén, Per-Ulf Nilsson, Jocke Nyberg
Avdelningen för Samverkan med Enskilda Organisationer och Konflikthantering
- 02/35** **Implementation of the 1999–2003 Country Strategy for Swedish Development Cooperation with Vietnam**
Bob Baulch, Mick Moore, Anuradha Joshi, Jan Rudengren
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 02/36** **Implementation of the 1999–2003 Country Strategy for Swedish Development Cooperation with Laos**
Dan Vadnjal, Tim Conway, Jan Rudengren, Marc Juville
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 02/37** **Country Plans: the Missing Middle of Sida's Country Strategy Process.**
Samuel Egerö, Göran Schill
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, Asia Department
- 02/38** **Samata's Centre for Advocacy and Support – Project Activities and Directions for Future in India**
R. Sridhar, R. Rajamani
Asia Department
- 02/39** **Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA) to Support Democratic Decentralisation in India**
James Manor, R Parasuram, Anand Ibanathan
Asia Department
- 02/40** **Evolving Strategies for Better Health and Development of Adolescent/Young People: a Twinning Institutional Collaboration Project in India by MAMTA and RFSU**
Gordon Tamm, Rukmini Rao, Viveca Urwitz
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 03/01** **Sida Support to the PRONI Institute of Social Education Projects in the Balkans**
Birgitta Berggren, Bodil Eriksson
Department for Central and Eastern Europe

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
S-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 506 423 80
Fax: +46 (0)8 506 423 52
info@sida.se

A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, S-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 698 51 63
Fax: +46 (0)8 698 56 10
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>