

HUMANITARIAN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (HIP)

Eastern Neighbourhood and Western Balkans

The activities proposed hereafter are still subject to the adoption of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/ BUD/2017/01000

AMOUNT: EUR 1 800 000

The present Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) was prepared on the basis of financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2017/01000 (Worldwide Decision) and the related General Guidelines for Operational Priorities on Humanitarian Aid (Operational Priorities). The purpose of the HIP and its annex is to serve as a communication tool for ECHO's partners and to assist in the preparation of their proposals. The provisions of the Worldwide Decision and the General Conditions of the Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

1. CONTEXT

The HIP for Eastern Neighbourhood and Western Balkans covers the following 11 countries:

- In the Eastern Neighbourhood: Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia (South Caucasus), Belarus, Moldova.
- In the Western Balkans: Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Kosovo¹, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro.

This represents an area of approx. 400 million square kilometres with a total population of over 35 million (17 million in South Caucasus and – 18 million in Western Balkans).

This Humanitarian Implementation Plan covers both Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) programmes (former DIPECHO programmes) and natural/man-made humanitarian emergencies.

Political context and man-made disaster threats

The post-independence period in the **South Caucasus region** witnessed a proliferation of political tensions and ethnic conflicts, confronting the region with massive temporary and in several areas prolonged displacements. Some of these conflicts, such as Nagorno-Karabakh, Abkhazia, South Ossetia in the Caucasus, or Transnistria in Moldova are still unresolved or "frozen", which exacerbates the vulnerability and prevents development of their communities and societies.

In April 2016 the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh saw the worst outbreak of violence since 1994. Open combat ceased by the end of April thanks mainly to the mediation of the OSCE and the Russian Federation, but tensions remain very high, often accompanied by explosive rhetoric. Political negotiations for a peaceful resolution of the conflict have been reinitiated but with little if any progress so far. If negotiations do not succeed, a

¹ This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

resumption of armed conflict cannot be excluded. With this in view, partners such as ICRC and UNHCR are working on a contingency plan based on the scenario of the whole population of Nagorno-Karabakh, around 150 000 people, being displaced into Armenia. In this scenario, there will also be a humanitarian impact in Azerbaijan, at least in the villages along the Line of Contact where around 90 000 people live at close range of shelling from Nagorno-Karabakh, perhaps also within Armenia.

In Armenia, UNHCR estimates that there are approximately 16 000 Syrians of Armenian origin staying in the country, while the total number of passports issued by the government to Syrian-Armenians is 26 000 since the beginning of the conflict in Syria. Only 800 have applied for asylum in Armenia. The overall number of refugees is decreasing because those departing to third countries outnumber the new arrivals, which nevertheless keep arriving. The vast majority come from the Armenian community in Aleppo and tend to settle in the same neighbourhoods in Yerevan when they arrive in Armenia. UNHCR estimates that 6 000 are in need of assistance, mainly subsidies for rent. Yet, basic needs are fairly well covered by the various actors involved in the response and by the protective measures of the government (naturalization, access to Education and Health care among others). New arrivals tend to be more destitute rather than relatively well-off as in the past.

In Georgia, recent developments may potentially result in an escalation of tension with the Russian Federation and the break-away regions of **South Ossetia and Abkhazia**. In South Ossetia, borderization (encroachment on Georgian land across the Administrative Border Line - ABL) has continued, as well as the illegal detention of Georgians accused of crossing the ABL. The South-Ossetia de facto authorities have announced a referendum to join the Russian Federation. In Abkhazia, massive riots by the opposition took place in July 2016 for the first time since the end of the war in 1993. The repercussions of the Ukraine conflict may affect political developments in Georgia–Abkhazia and South Ossetia, the two breakaway republics supported by Russia.

Apart from the threat from the so-called frozen conflicts, another potential threat of man-made nature in South Caucasus is related to Environmental, Industrial and Nuclear risks (e.g. the Armenian Nuclear plant Metsamor).

In the **Western Balkans**, after the wars in the 1990s, and the Kosovo conflict in 1999, political tensions are currently relatively low. However, the region has been severely affected by the refugee/migrant crisis.

Following the EU-Turkey statement of 18/03/2016, the number of refugees reaching the Western Balkans, mainly the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia, has diminished. However, a steady flow of new irregular arrivals continues to be reported in countries along the Western Balkans route and, since August 2016, with a steady increase in number, even if these numbers remain low compared to the period of pre-EU Turkey statement. The situation is fragmented with multiple entry points and fluctuating numbers. If before the EU-Turkey statement the vast majority of refugees were coming from Greece, now refugees enter Serbia transiting through the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Bulgaria to reach the Hungarian border. While Hungary has recently allowed 30 entries per day through the transit zones, the number of illegal migrants reaching Serbia is estimated at around 300 per day, with a consequent growing number of stranded migrants especially at the Serbian /Hungarian border and a growing

population in the reception centres. UNHCR estimates of stranded migrants rose to 6 300 in Serbia in October 2016. Of these, close to 80% are being accommodated in government facilities.² Decongestion of the two transit zones on the HU border continued while the number of those camping outdoors in Belgrade rose. The numbers are based on estimates as there is a sizeable number of non-registered arrivals (as well as illegal transit to Hungary) supported by smugglers.

The existing reception capacities in Serbia are overstretched and many reception facilities are not up to standard and need urgent rehabilitation. As of October 2016 Serbian authorities have started exercising a stricter control of the border but also a more thorough implementation of the domestic law on migration.

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia remains a transit country whose situation vis-a-vis refugees is so far determined by the situation at Hungary/Serbia border.

Most recent information from various sources shows a low but growing number of refugees transiting through Albania and Kosovo to reach Serbia. No massive influx is expected in 2017, but any unravelling of the EU-Turkey Statement could lead to a new scenario here and in the Western Balkans in general.

Natural Disaster Risks

Both South Caucasus and Western Balkans are increasingly exposed to natural hazards, including earthquakes, landslides, floods, mudflows, droughts, avalanches and extreme temperatures. However, while the frequency of hazards and numbers of affected people is increasing, casualties are decreasing as result of the better preparedness of the population. The geological characteristic of the region, placed along several fault lines, makes it one of the most seismically active regions in the world.

Moreover, climate variability is increasing the frequency and intensity of disasters. In the past few years, climate-related disasters have been frequent in South Caucasus, such as the devastating floods in Tbilisi in June 2015, or the floods and mudflows in Shirak and Geharqunik provinces of Armenia in June 2016. Floods, landslides, and avalanches are recurrent, as demonstrated by the massive floods in the Western Balkans in May 2014 or the most recent flash floods that hit the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in August 2016.

Natural hazards, combined with the high vulnerability of the population and insufficient local capacities to address (prepare, mitigate or prevent) the risks, exacerbate the impact of disasters. As in other disaster risk regions of the world, the scale of vulnerability and exposure to hazards are projected to substantially increase in the coming years and decades.

² UNHCR statistics (August 2016) observe an alarming average 41% of children, 18% of women and 41% of men in the composition of the arrivals in the Presevo Reception Centre and the two border sites in the North.

The main pillars of this regional 2017 HIP will be:

- 1. DRR in South Caucasus (SC).**
- 2. Humanitarian response to the refugee crisis in the Western Balkans.**
- 3. Responding to any other major natural/man-made crises.** If such new crises would materialize in the course of the year, these will be addressed through a modification and a financial top up of the current HIP.

2. HUMANITARIAN NEEDS

1) Affected people/ potential beneficiaries

For South Caucasus (SC)

In the SC region, resilience building of local **communities** has been the object of a DIPECHO intervention for over six years, in all three countries. The capacities of national governments in the SC region to respond to natural hazards vary significantly from country to country. Azerbaijan, with its higher level of economic development, possesses more material resources. Armenia and Georgia, despite having gained significant experience due to frequency of small-scale disasters, would not be able to cope on their own in case of major disaster, and are likely to request external aid.

Refugee crisis and any other major unforeseen natural and man-made crises in Eastern Neighbourhood and Western Balkans

The number of refugees stranded in Serbia will likely continue to increase and most of the reported refugees are expected to spend the winter in Serbia. The capacities of the government and the civil society organizations in the Republic of Serbia have proven to be relatively good and responsive to challenging situations and a contingency plan had been developed to accommodate between 5 000 and 6 000 refugees during the winter. These figures also matched the reception capacity the Government of Serbia wanted to develop in 2015. The efforts to ensure such capacity are still ongoing. As the number in October 2016 has already exceeded 6 000, rapid emergency measures (increased reception capacity, including by rehabilitation of existing shelter capacities) would need to be supported, along with a most comprehensive strategy for winterisation. The unpredictability of the situation requires flexibility in the response. In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the situation is different since it is mostly a country of transit with around 230 refugees reported regularly.

In case of any other unforeseen natural and man-made disasters, vulnerable population requiring humanitarian assistance, being host population, internally displaced people, refugees, asylum seekers, etc., should be considered as potential beneficiaries, based on sound needs assessment.

2) Description of the most acute humanitarian needs

In South Caucasus (SC)

In the SC region, capacities of national institutions to respond to smaller-scale disasters exist, although still inadequate and insufficient to cope with any major humanitarian disaster. What is common to all SC countries is weakness in essential preparedness at institutional level: absence of effective early warning systems at community levels, poor

capacity for monitoring and prevention of natural hazards, lack of vulnerability and risk mapping, insufficient Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management planning and funding, and lack of cross-border agreements during emergencies among countries.

Strengthening of the capacities and knowledge of existing emergency management agencies for disaster prevention/mitigation remains important. Furthermore, national policies and legislation, despite many positive changes in the legislation, are still largely focused on rescue and relief activities. Linkages between the national/regional and community levels are insufficient and often sought for on an ad hoc basis during the response phase. The reinforcement of the existing DRR platforms should be promoted at national, regional and local levels.

Direct support to communities remains critical in order to increase risk awareness, design community disaster preparedness plans and strengthen local disaster response capacity. The process of preparing local communities for disaster can be significantly accelerated by further investing in DRR at national level.

In the three countries of the South Caucasus, the formal incorporation of DRR in Education was achieved largely as a result of the DIPECHO program. DRR is taught through various subjects in primary and secondary education, and standards and learning materials are officially endorsed by the Ministry of Education in Georgia and Armenia. In Azerbaijan, DRR is mainstreamed within subjects of the school curriculum such as Skills for Life and Geography. However, replication and wide application remains challenging so far, mostly due to limited capacities and means.

In the Western Balkans

While short-term humanitarian assistance remains the priority, support to mid-term projects should be considered in parallel. Humanitarian needs originally identified were linked to the protection concerns faced by most of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants while transiting in Serbia. Needs must now be readapted to a situation of longer term stay. They mainly consist of primary health care services, NFI assistance to improve the hygiene and sanitary conditions, with particular attention to the needs of women and children, water, food, psycho-social support and assistance to restore family links. All this is complementary to a massive effort of rehabilitation of facilities to increase the capacity of reception. More specifically the response should be structured as follow:

Shelter and NFIs (winterization): support to complement the action taken by authorities will be necessary. It could include the provision of winterized NFIs, the emergency deployment of additional reception capacity (including the rehabilitation of permanent shelter, and winterisation of temporary shelters) or the setup of an emergency cash system.

Health: access to primary health care service should be ensured in reception centres where refugees are hosted or in areas where refugees gather and where the presence of the Ministry of Health is not ensured. ECHO's funding should focus on supporting and complementing the assistance provided by the public medical centres of the Ministry of Health (MoH) of Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. As the characteristics of the migrant population have changed (longer-term stay, more

stationary population, less financial means among the migrants, more non-Syrians, etc.) the need for secondary health care has become more pressing.

Food: provision of food should continue in the reception facilities as well as in refugees' gathering areas. However a new situation of a numerous and more stationary population during the winter implicitly demands minimum standards for food quantity / energy requirement to be addressed, and a better effort towards the quality and diversification of food (nutritional status, baby friendly food and more warm food ratios).

Protection: presence of protection mandated agencies should be continued at borders, receptions centres, gathering areas as well as in detention centres. Refugees should be informed on their status and rights and the legal frameworks that protect them. The stricter application of migration law, recently introduced by the Serbian Government makes the aspect of protection and rights-awareness even more pressing. Specific attention should be brought to vulnerable groups such as Unaccompanied Minors (UAM), Women and children or people with disability.

WASH: monitoring of the water and sanitation conditions remains important and assistance should be provided to complement the services offered by Authorities. Health and hygiene education should be strengthened together with the provision of hygiene items distribution to ensure minimum hygiene standards. Securing regular garbage collection is also a priority.

Psychosocial: Psychological stress is often protracted among refugees after the traumatic experiences they have endured before arriving to the Western Balkans. Psychosocial Support and counselling (which should be provided in the language of the refugees) is needed, including Child Friendly Spaces.

3. HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE

1) National / local response and involvement

In South Caucasus (SC)

National DRR platforms exist and progress has been made. However, lack of adequate legislative framework, technical expertise, capacity, and/or resources to systematically and sustainably introduce and integrate DRR at all levels, requires the strengthening of DRR legislative framework in all three countries.

In the Western Balkans

In the region, governments have been involved since the beginning in the response to the refugee crisis. Given the magnitude of the crisis, support was requested to the international community for emergency response as well as to reinforce structural capacity.

In Serbia, the government has established an Inter-Ministerial Working Group on Mixed Migration. The Commissariat for Refugees and Migration of the Republic of Serbia has been mandated to respond to the crisis.

In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the government established an Inter-Ministerial Coordination Body. Authorities are managing the reception sites while assistance is mainly provided by aid organisations.

2) International Humanitarian Response

For South Caucasus (SC)

Through this Humanitarian Implementation Plan, cooperation and coordination with a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including national authorities, academic institutions and civil society will be encouraged. UN agencies, international organizations, Red Cross and Crescent Societies, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are all valuable and indispensable partners when it comes to DRR.

In the region, many National Cooperation Agencies have all committed funding support to DRR projects and thereby implementation of DRR global frameworks of Action. Nevertheless, there has been a continuous downward trend in DRR funding in the SC region in recent years and programmes have been mainly designed to combine DRR with development. In recent years, the European Commission through ECHO has been the single largest, and in some cases the only donor supporting DRR activities.

For the Western Balkans

In 2014, flood emergency response was provided in Serbia and Bosnia Herzegovina by the EU with bilateral support from other countries (including the US and the Russian Federation). Following the recent flash floods that hit the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in August 2016 emergency response has been provided by both the Commission and several Member States.

International donors and organizations have mobilized since mid-2015 to support the national authorities to respond to the needs required by the humanitarian crisis along the Western Balkans route. In that context the EU proved to be a leading donor to support the humanitarian response and the rehabilitation of infrastructure in an effort to meet emergency needs as well as in the preparation of a mid-term response capacity. International organizations including UNHCR, IOM, IFRC, UNICEF as well as NGOs have also mobilized and remain present to support the very active civil society who is leading the response.

3) Constraints and DG ECHO response capacity

While there are generally no security concerns and access hindrances, the successful implementation of DIPECHO operations in SC is contingent on the willingness, motivation, and capacity of the selected communities, as well as on the support and commitment by the relevant local authorities and government structures.

As for humanitarian action, ECHO has access to all regions of South Caucasus, with the exception of South Ossetia and Nagorno-Karabakh. In the Western Balkans, ECHO and partners have good collaboration with the authorities and both have full and complete access to refugees. There is no reason to believe that this situation will change in the coming months.

4) Envisaged DG ECHO response and expected results of DRR and humanitarian aid interventions

On Disaster Risk Reduction, DRR

The Humanitarian Implementation Plan 2017 will focus on the exit strategy that corresponds to the end of the fourth DIPECHO cycle. ECHO's intervention aims at consolidating and institutionalising, where possible, the results achieved through the previous DIPECHO program in the South Caucasus from 2010 to 2016. The exit strategy will pursue the maximisation of resilience building actions of the four DIPECHO cycles and a culture of safety in line with the Sendai Framework for DRR 2015-2030 (SFDRR), to which all governments in SC have made commitments. The consolidation of earlier investments through DIPECHO should lead toward maximum replication, adaptation of common approaches, and integration of DRR into key government policies, while bringing in and sharing best global and regional DRR practices.

On the humanitarian response to the refugee crisis in the Western Balkans

ECHO's support will focus on the humanitarian needs of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants crossing or stranded in the Western Balkans. It will aim at reinforcing the capacity of organizations providing first line response to the beneficiaries and ensure their protection along the migration route. ECHO's action will mainly focus on short-term emergency support to meet basic humanitarian needs, but the evolving scenario implies support to operations providing assistance to refugees stranded for an unknown period of time. The structural needs of hosting countries in terms of registration, reception capacity and asylum policies should be covered by development funds.

EU humanitarian assistance will support multi-sector emergency activities notably food assistance (including food for people with special needs), hygiene items, winterization, temporary shelter, Primary and Secondary Health and Psychosocial support, contingency planning and WASH. Protection of the most vulnerable people will also be supported, by promptly identifying and addressing acute protection needs, keeping in mind that the vast majority of people migrating through the Western Balkans originate from refugee-producing countries. The provision of information is essential to ensure that refugees are aware of their rights and how to access them. The provision of multi-purpose cash assistance as an efficient and dignified modality to meet those needs will be considered.

On any other major unforeseen natural and man-made crises in the Eastern Neighbourhood and WB regions

In response to any unforeseen natural disasters, as well as to potential conflict-related emergencies such as resumption of armed hostilities in Nagorno-Karabakh, life-saving activities will be supported for the provision of multi-sectoral emergency support to the most vulnerable population. Sectoral activities in the field of protection, shelter, NFIs,

food, WASH, health, PSS, nutrition or Education in Emergencies could be considered on the basis of sound needs assessments.

So far, no funding is foreseen under this current HIP to respond to such potential new humanitarian crises. Should a new crisis emerge a financial top-up of the current HIP that is proportionate to the magnitude of the crisis could be considered.

On Visibility

Partners will be expected to ensure full compliance with visibility requirements and to acknowledge the funding role of the EU/ECHO, as set out in the applicable contractual arrangements.

Thematic priorities

On IHL: While there are no interventions planned related to IHL, an urgent need may arise if the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh escalates to an open conflict³.

On education in emergencies:

ECHO will provide further support to meet the mounting needs of children in conflict affected contexts that are out of school or risk education disruption. Within this HIP projects addressing education and child protection will be funded. ECHO will favour education in emergency projects that prevent the disruption of education, provide access to quality education and safe and protective learning environments. Linkages with protection-related activities are strongly encouraged. The capacity building of teachers and educational personnel will also be supported in order to enhance response to children's psychosocial needs and support their resilience, including through life skills training. Complementarity and synergies with funding provided by the Global Partnership for Education is encouraged.

4. LRRD, COORDINATION AND TRANSITION

1) Other DG ECHO interventions

For over two decades, the EU has supported humanitarian interventions in South Caucasus and Western Balkans. The most recent large emergency humanitarian aid actions were implemented in the Caucasus in support of the populations displaced as consequence of the Georgian – Russian conflict in August 2008; In Serbia and Bosnia, ECHO and other EU bodies supported flood response and recovery in 2014, with a major complementarity with the assistance provided through EU Civil Protection Mechanism.

In addition to the DRR interventions, ECHO also provides assistance to respond to small-scale natural disasters through the DREF (Disaster Response Emergency Fund) implemented by the International Federation of the Red Cross/Crescent (IFRC) and

³ If so, enhanced reporting relevant to the EU IHL Guidelines is encouraged in order to propose practical measures to improve IHL and human rights compliance by parties to the conflicts.

national societies and through the financing decision of small-scale humanitarian response. Recently, in July 2016 ECHO approved the support to a DREF operation in response to mudflows in the Shirak region of Armenia.

Enhanced complementarity between DRR and EU Civil Protection mechanism should be further explored especially in terms of preparedness support - whenever possible EU Civil protection should complement DRR action by ECHO. EU Civil protection has already been engaged in response activities in the SC and WB regions, and this practice is expected to continue. PPRD East can be used to complement DIPECHO where applicable.

2) Other services/donors availability

EU humanitarian aid is framed in an overall international approach that brings together a wide diversity of humanitarian actors, including the United Nations, the Red Cross/Crescent movement and humanitarian NGOs. In this context, the EU ensures that its overall contribution to the humanitarian response is effective and appropriate, underpins the international humanitarian effort to deliver aid to people in need and addresses adequately the challenges facing humanitarian actors.

3) Other concomitant EU interventions

On DRR

Humanitarian actions must be implemented consistently with EU development programmes as laid down in Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) and Multi-annual Indicative Programmes (MIPs) and funded by other EU instruments, notably the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI), the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP), the European Instrument for Democratisation and Human Rights – EIDHR and the Partnership Instrument (PI), in order to link relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD). The European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI) supports wide range of co-operation areas in South Caucasus.

South Caucasus

EU assistance is provided to the countries of the South Caucasus through a set of instruments: The European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI), Twinning, TAIEX (Technical Assistance and Information Exchange), SIGMA (Support for Improvement for Governance and Management) and Thematic Programmes.

In the South Caucasus, the IcSP continues to provide an effective, timely, flexible and integrated response to the peaceful settlement of conflicts and the prevention of further violence, in particular by promoting confidence building at grass-roots level. A sixth IcSP package of confidence building measures (EUR 7.5 million) is being implemented in Georgia (2016-2019) and a third phase of the further support to the peaceful settlement of the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh (through the consortium 'The European Partnership for the Peaceful Settlement of the Conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh', EPNK, EUR 6.5 million) is ongoing (2016-2019). Related activities also support and complement the work of the EUSR for the South Caucasus and the crisis in Georgia.

The SC region is beneficiary of the regional programme for the Prevention, Preparedness and Response to Natural and Man-Made Disasters (PPRD-EAST) which is one of the 6 Flagship Initiatives of the Eastern Partnership (PPRD I- EUR 6 million from 2010 to 2014, PPRD II- started in Jan 2015 with a budget of EUR 5.5 million /4 years). With the Union Civil Protection Mechanism (CPM) new opportunities are made available for strengthening the cooperation between Georgia and the Mechanism/ Participating States. In addition, Georgia became an eligible country for the Mechanism Exchange of Experts programme, ECHO peer reviews and for the annual calls for Prevention and Preparedness projects and Civil Protection Exercises.

Western Balkans

Since the beginning of the migration/refugees crisis, the EU has committed funds under two Special Measures totaling EUR 20 million for Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The Special Measure covers running costs and staff for the asylum and reception centers of the country. Works and refurbishment for additional locations are also foreseen, as well as equipment and vehicles for the Serbian authorities.

In addition of the Special Measure, additional efforts are foreseen. Under the Madad Trust Fund, aiming at continuing many activities started under the Special Measure. In May 2016, Madad's board approved €15 million to provide support to manage the influx of migrants and refugees in the Western Balkans, (EUR 11.5 million for Serbia and EUR 3.5 million for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia). The EU Delegation is working to make these funds operational towards the end of 2016. The funds will cover the Voluntary Return mechanism and continue supporting the running costs of the asylum and reception centers. Funds will also be allocated for maintenance and refurbishment of additional asylum/reception centers.

4) Exit scenarios

South Caucasus

As an exit strategy, ECHO should continue to promote for the institutionalization of successfully tested DRR models through the four DIPECHO phases and replication at local and national level. ECHO will also focus on advocacy for the integration of DRR into key government policies, and encourage cross-fertilisation with other regions, in line with global best practices and the Sendai commitments. The support to comprehensive Emergency Response Plans and effective Disaster Management Country Teams in the three countries will be also part of the Exit strategy.

Western Balkans

The situation is constantly evolving with a high level of uncertainty on future developments that depend on many factors. It is impossible at this stage to conceive an exit strategy.