



External evaluation of the EUAA's Roadmap for cooperation with Montenegro 2022-2023

Ex post evaluation report

Prepared by Ramboll Management Consulting

The sole responsibility for this report lies with the author. The EUAA is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

EUAA/EVAL/2023/06/FR; Final

February 2024





Contents

Contents	2
Acronyms and definitions	3
Executive summary	4
1. Introduction: purpose and scope.....	7
2. Intended results of the action.....	7
2.1 Description of the action and its intended results.....	7
2.2 Points of comparison	9
3. Implementation of the action: current state of play	10
4. Evaluation findings.....	13
4.1 To what extent was the action successful and why?.....	13
4.2 How did the Agency make a difference through the action?	18
4.3 Is the action relevant?.....	18
5. Conclusions and recommendations.....	19
5.1 Conclusions	19
5.2 Good practices and lessons learnt	22
5.3 Recommendations	23
Annex 1: Methodology and analytical models used	25
Annex 2: Evaluation matrix	26
Annex 3: Intervention logic	34



Acronyms and definitions

Term	Definition
ARC	Assessment of reception conditions
ATP	Access to procedure
BIC	Best interest of the child
CEAS	Common European Asylum System
COI	Country of origin information
DfA	Directorate for Asylum
DfR	Directorate for Reception of Foreigners Seeking International Protection
EU	European Union
EU+	EU Member States and associate countries
EUAA	European Union Agency for Asylum
EUD	European Union Delegation
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IPA	Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance
MoI	Ministry of Interior
PSMM3	Regional Programme supporting Protection-Sensitive Migration Management Systems in the Western Balkans, funded by the European Commission through IPA III
SOP	Standard operating procedure
TtT	Train the Trainer
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
WB	Western Balkan(s)



Executive summary

This report provides an evaluation of the effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, European Union (EU) added value and relevance of the Roadmap for cooperation agreed between the European Union Agency for Asylum (EUAA) and Montenegro for the period January 2022 – December 2023. The overall objective of the Roadmap was to strengthen the asylum and reception system in line with the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) and EU Member States' practices. More specifically, the Roadmap aimed to: strengthen access to the asylum procedure in line with the CEAS; enhance the quality of asylum application decision making at first instance; strengthen the capacity of authorities to identify, assess and respond to the needs of minors; and strengthen the reception system and align reception conditions with EU and EUAA standards.

The Roadmap was highly relevant to the needs of national authorities in Montenegro. The Roadmap was designed to respond to priorities identified at EU level in the Communication on EU Enlargement Policy (2022)¹ and by national authorities in the National Strategy on Migration and Reintegration of Refugees of Montenegro. The participatory nature and multidisciplinary expertise of the team involved in the needs assessment contributed to the relevance of the Roadmap. Moreover, it proved to be highly flexible in adapting to and providing a framework for responding to the unexpected influx of Ukrainian nationals further to the invasion of Ukraine launched by the Russian armed forces. In this context, certain activities in the Roadmap were deprioritised to allow for the development of a response and contingency plan aligned with EU Member States' priorities.

Given the changing context in which the Roadmap was implemented, cooperation between the EUAA and Montenegro was rather effective. The EUAA contributed to the achievement of the majority of the foreseen outputs (mainly in the asylum field) by delivering nearly half of the indicative activities outlined in the Roadmap. The EUAA, through the Roadmap, showed significant flexibility in accommodating substantial new requests from the authorities, even amidst the high workload of the Agency following the invasion of Ukraine. The development of a response and contingency plan was reportedly effective and led to significant procedural learnings for both the Agency and authorities. The provision of support by the EUAA through the development of standard operating procedures (SOPs), study visits and practical guidance contributed to the strengthening of institutional and individual capacities in the asylum administration.

All key parties involved in the implementation of **the Roadmap judged its benefits to have outweighed the costs.** The EUAA's limited human resource capacity – below what was foreseen by the IPA-funded project – impacted the efficiency of the Roadmap, which led to certain activities being delayed or put on hold. Other challenges included the high costs of travel to Montenegro and the limited time availability of EUAA in-house experts.

The Roadmap was coherent with EU policy priorities for Montenegro and national priorities. Efforts were made to ensure consistency and complementarity with the support provided by EU Member States and international organisations. The distinct but complementary mandates of the EUAA and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees also ensured that there were no overlaps or duplications in the support offered by the two organisations. However, there is room to ensure

¹ European Commission (2022) Montenegro 2022 report, Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, SWD (2022).



increased clarity and mutual understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the EUAA and international organisations in-country.

The added value of the Roadmap is derived from the Agency's role as a centre of expertise on the CEAS, particularly in light of the accession journey of the country to the EU. The access to experts, tools and knowledge of Member States' practices was perceived to be the key added value of the Agency.

Based on the findings, the evaluation brings forward five recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Ensure better alignment between the level of ambition, scope and timeline of the Roadmap and available EUAA human resources

Accounting for available resources is important to set adequate objectives, ensuring that expected results are achieved. Hence, the Agency could consider including fewer, higher-priority activities in the Roadmap, while identifying whether outputs are expected to be achieved in the short, medium, or long term. Resources allowing, the Agency could consider extending the timeframe for implementation of the Roadmap to account for changes in priorities and any unforeseen factors that may delay implementation.

Recommendation 2: Ensure the availability of adequate EUAA human resources to implement the Roadmap

Given the challenges caused by the limited EUAA human resources, it would be important to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the recruitment process for EUAA staff in the Western Balkans, to ensure that all staff members foreseen by the regional programme are hired in a timely manner. If, once all foreseen positions are filled, human resources continue to be strained, the Agency could consider conducting a comprehensive assessment of workload and resource allocation prior to approving any change, extension or renewal of the Roadmap. This would help ensure appropriate resource allocation and parity with similar-sized Roadmap operations in other partner third countries, following the priorities set out by the External Cooperation Strategy.

Recommendation 3: Amend the Roadmap in the event of a substantial change in needs

The Roadmap has proven effective in addressing requests from the authorities in the event of emerging needs. However, this led to the reprioritisation of the support originally outlined in the Roadmap without a formal revision having been made to the Roadmap. To account for the dynamic nature of the operational environment and facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of the Roadmap, the Agency could consider (resources allowing) conducting a mid-term review of the Roadmap to assess the state of implementation and readjust objectives and pre-conditions, if needed. If major changes to the text of the Roadmap are foreseen, the Agency could consider amending the Roadmap to incorporate the provision of new support and to justify any reprioritisation of the original support foreseen. Should the Roadmap be amended, its monitoring framework would need to be adjusted accordingly.

Recommendation 4: Prioritise support areas where progress has been partially achieved or not achieved

Given the partial achievement of some of the results during the Roadmap's implementation period, the resumption/completion of certain activities would be beneficial. Without prejudice to the results of a needs assessment preceding a future Roadmap, the Agency could consider prioritising the delivery



of support in key areas of relevance (e.g., the development of SOPs on age assessment procedures and SOPs on reception, respectively; encouraging/facilitating the participation of national authorities in training (e.g. reception and registration); and extending the involvement of the Montenegrin authorities in Agency networks, in particular in the country of origin information network.

Recommendation 5: Clarify roles and strengthen cooperation with organisations operating on the ground

While national authorities are responsible for coordinating the activities of international organisations on the ground, the Agency could consider establishing a formal communication framework with the European Union Delegation to raise awareness about the EUAA's role and work and supporting the planning of meetings among international actors, including the Agency. In this respect, the EUAA could suggest relevant actors to invite to such meetings, or topics for discussion. Additionally, the Agency could consider putting in place more structured collaboration between the EUAA and EU Member States working in the field of asylum in the Western Balkans (e.g., putting in place platforms for knowledge sharing).



1. Introduction: purpose and scope

This report presents the results of the evaluation of the 2022-2023 Roadmap for cooperation between the European Union Agency for Asylum (EUAA) and Montenegro ('the Roadmap'). The evaluation was conducted by evaluators from Ramboll Management Consulting and a subcontracted expert and is part of a broader evaluation exercise including the 2022-2024 EUAA-Kosovo² Roadmap.

The overall objective of the EUAA-Montenegro 2022-2023 Roadmap is to enhance the protection space for asylum seekers and refugees in Montenegro in line with the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) and Member States' practices. By providing capacity-building support, the Agency supports the strengthening of asylum and reception systems, while ensuring alignment with the EU acquis. The main asylum and reception authorities in Montenegro, and main counterparts of the Roadmap, are the Directorate for Asylum (DfA), Directorate for Police and Directorate for Reception of Foreigners Seeking International Protection (DfR). All these Directorates belong to the Ministry of Interior (Moi).

In line with the [European Commission's Better Regulation Guidelines](#), the evaluation assessed the **effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, European Union (EU) added value, and relevance** of the Roadmap as a framework for cooperation between the EUAA and the Montenegrin authorities. While it considered contextual factors, it did not assess the performance of the Montenegrin authorities or other stakeholders. The evaluation sought to answer five main evaluation questions (see evaluation matrix in Annex 2), with a specific focus on a priority question³. To answer these questions, it combined evidence from secondary data, with primary data collected through interviews with key stakeholders (see **Error! Reference source not found.** for details on the methodology). Based on the evidence collected, the evaluation draws conclusions and presents lessons learnt, in view of a potential extension, amendment, or renewal of the Roadmap.

2. Intended results of the action

2.1 Description of the action and its intended results

Bilateral cooperation between the EUAA and Montenegro in the form of a Roadmap was established at the end of 2021, for the period January 2022 to December 2023. Its implementation was funded by the third phase of the EU Regional Programme supporting Protection-Sensitive Migration Management Systems in the Western Balkans (WB) (hereinafter 'PSMM3'), funded by the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA). The Roadmap is structured around two high-level outcomes (expected objectives), each consisting of several outcomes and intended outputs. Following the invasion of Ukraine launched by the Russian armed forces in February 2022 and the subsequent

² 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.

³ Priority question: What characterises the cooperation between the Agency and national authorities and international organisations in Montenegro in the context of the EUAA-Montenegro 2022-2023 Roadmap? How has this cooperation evolved over time? What key factors and drivers influenced the cooperation? How has the cooperation between the EUAA and the Montenegrin authorities impacted the relationship between the Agency and other stakeholders in the field?



activation of temporary protection measures in Montenegro, the EUAA mobilised emergency response support at the request of the Montenegrin authorities and the European Union Delegation (EUD) in Podgorica. Despite not being formally set out in a revised version of the Roadmap, support in this area was considered part of the Roadmap (outcome 4, output 4.3).

Outcome 1: Strengthened access to procedure in line with the CEAS

- Output 1.1.: Enhanced identification of persons who may wish to apply for international protection in line with the CEAS;
- Output 1.2.: Strengthened provision of guidance on follow-up assistance and procedural guarantees that should be provided to persons who may wish to apply for international protection in line with the CEAS.

The Roadmap aimed to provide assistance to national authorities in the development of standard operating procedures (SOPs) on first contact and registration of intent to apply for asylum and the lodging of applications. Additionally, participation in train the trainer (TtT) sessions on registration of applicants for international protection and support in the delivery of national training sessions was foreseen. The Roadmap also envisaged the adjustment of the access to procedure (ATP) toolkit to Montenegro's context and the organisation of a workshop on its use. Lastly, the organisation and delivery of training sessions on information provision to asylum seekers was foreseen.

Outcome 2: Enhanced quality of decision making at the first instance in line with the CEAS

- Output 2.1.: Enhanced implementation of the key provisions of the law on international and temporary protection of foreigners of Montenegro at an operational level in line with the CEAS;
- Output 2.2.: Enhanced technical skills of the case officers in particular on interview techniques, evidence assessment, decision writing, decision assessment and use of country of origin information (COI) in line with the CEAS.

The Roadmap sought to provide support with the development of a SOP on examination. It envisaged the development of tools to support case officers in their day-to-day work (e.g., legal guidance, interview guides, etc.), and aimed to develop their technical skills in interview techniques, evidence assessment, decision writing, decision assessment and the use of COI. Montenegrin case officers were also to shadow their counterparts in an EU Member State. In addition, the organisation of a workshop aimed to identify concrete training needs and the consequent definition of a training plan were envisioned. Following on from this, the participation of the DfA in TtT sessions and the provision of support in the delivery of national training sessions were foreseen.

Outcome 3: Strengthened capacity of national authorities to identify, assess and respond to the needs of minors

- Output 3.1.: Enhanced right compliance age assessment process;
- Output 3.2.: Strengthened capacity of national authorities to implement the best interest of the child (BIC) in their daily work.



Through expert support, the Roadmap sought to assist national authorities with the development of an age assessment process procedure, instruments and tools. Expert missions and mentoring were also planned to support the implementation of EU Member States' and associate countries' (EU+ countries') best practices on age assessment procedures and methods. Expert support in the preparation of a national training programme on the BIC to support the daily work of the MoI, in line with the Migration Management Strategy of Montenegro, was also foreseen.

Outcome 4: Strengthened reception system aligned with EU and EUAA standards for reception conditions

- Output 4.1: Enhanced alignment with the EU and EUAA reception standards of the planned extension of the asylum reception centres in Božaj and Spuž;
- Output 4.2: Increased efficiency of the reception system management;
- Output 4.3: Enhanced knowledge, technical skills and competences on reception aligned with the CEAS and EU+ countries' practices.

The Roadmap foresaw the provision of technical and expert advice for site design, and organisational and workflow-related aspects, of the planned extensions of the reception centres in Božaj and Spuž. Support to the development of general reception protocols and SOPs for specific thematic areas, and the provision of related training/mentoring, where judged necessary, were also envisaged. In addition, the development of information provision workflows and information material for the arrival phase was planned. The Roadmap further foresaw the participation of reception officials in TtT sessions on relevant reception modules, as well as the provision of support in the organisation and delivery of national training sessions. Mentoring on prioritised thematic areas, such as general reception work; the reception of vulnerable persons, safety and security; communication and conflict management were envisaged. Finally, thematic study visits and exchange programmes (e.g., planning of staffing needs) were foreseen.

2.2 Points of comparison

To be able to understand what the Roadmap was seeking to achieve, it is important to set out the migration context and needs in-country prior to its implementation.

In September 2021, the [Strategy on Migration and Reintegration of Returnees in Montenegro](#) for the period 2021-2025 was adopted, aligning the policy framework with the EU acquis and best practices on legal migration, asylum, and prevention of irregular migration, readmission, return, integration, internally displaced persons and statelessness. Thus, as per Chapter 24 of the [Communication on EU Enlargement Policy \(2022\)](#) (hereinafter 'progress reports' or the 'Communication on EU Enlargement'), **Montenegro's legal framework on asylum was considered largely aligned with the EU acquis and all the necessary institutions to handle asylum applications were in place.**

Some areas for improvement in the area of **asylum** were identified by the European Commission in this same Communication, including delays in the status determination process as the deadlines to deliver a decision in some cases exceeded the 21-month deadlines set at EU level. It thus recommended that Montenegro further strengthen its refugee status determination capacity and issue decisions within the regular deadline and, in any case, never beyond the exceptional deadline of



21 months. The European Commission also advised to better understand and make a better use of key legal concepts such as the safe third country.⁴ It is worthy of note that the number of people expressing their intention to request asylum in Montenegro outweighs the number of people who end up lodging an application. In 2021, 3 342 migrants expressed their intention to request asylum (an 18 % increase from 2020), but only 270 (50 % less than in 2020) lodged an application⁵. Nationals from Morocco, followed by Algerians, Iranians, and Afghans lodged the most applications in 2020.⁶ Although the registration of intentions to request international protection is possible on the whole territory of Montenegro, it takes place mainly at the Božaj migrant centre near the border with Albania. The European Commission further stressed the importance of consolidating the asylum system in Montenegro by increasing its **reception capacity** for asylum seekers, improving the status determination procedure, establishing an integrated service system for asylum seekers and enhancing the integration measures for people under international protection.⁷ The country's reception centres accommodated a total of 2 688 migrants in 2021⁸, a figure comparable to the 2 702 recorded in 2020⁹. The overall capacity for hosting asylum seekers in 2021 was 189 beds, inclusive of 25 beds in a centre designed for unaccompanied children but not exclusively dedicated to children¹⁰. Despite ongoing projects to expand existing facilities and increase reception capacity, these endeavours had not been finalised as of 2021. Indeed, the planned extension to enhance the capacity of the Božaj reception centre, supported financially by the EU, had not started.

Against this backdrop, a **needs assessment** mission, coordinated by EUAA experts, was conducted in September 2021 to identify Montenegro's needs in the field of asylum and reception. After consultations with relevant stakeholders (i.e., authorities, EUD, European Commission services, International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)), a Roadmap was signed by the EUAA's Executive Director and the Mol. The Roadmap established preconditions for the provision of support in the key areas identified during the needs assessment.

3. Implementation of the action: current state of play

The Roadmap is a bilateral cooperation instrument between the EUAA and national authorities in Montenegro. Its development and implementation was financed primarily from the EU-funded PSMM3 project, combined with the core budget of the Agency. The PSMM3 project allocated €6 million to help advance the EUAA's cooperation in the WB region overall. The contribution from the Agency's core budget mainly related to the provision of support through EUAA in-house staff. In terms of human resources, the IPA-funded project was supposed to finance ten staff members in the WB team to support implementation of six bilateral Roadmaps and joint regional activities, as well as financial and reporting responsibilities stemming from the externally funded project. At the time of writing, the team was composed of only five officers, with two interim staff members supporting administrative functions. One operations officer coordinated the needs assessment and the

⁴ European Commission (2022) Montenegro 2022 report, Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, SWD (2022) 58.

⁵ European Commission (2022) Montenegro 2022 report, Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, SWD (2022) 58.

⁶ European Commission (2021) Montenegro 2021 report, Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, SWD (2021) 48.

⁷ European Commission (2022) Montenegro 2022 report, Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, SWD (2022) 58.

⁸ European Commission (2022) Montenegro 2021 report, Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, SWD (2022) 59.

⁹ European Commission (2021) Montenegro 2021 report, Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, SWD (2021) 49.

¹⁰ European Commission (2022) Montenegro 2022 report, Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, SWD (2022) 59.



implementation of the Roadmap, while simultaneously being responsible for the implementation of two other Roadmaps.

As part of the assessment of its state of implementation, it is important to take into account the changing context within which the Roadmap was implemented. Following the invasion of Ukraine by the Russian armed forces in February 2022, Montenegro experienced a high influx of Ukrainians who were granted temporary protection. In fact, Montenegro was the WB partner that hosted the highest number of Ukrainian nationals, both in absolute figures¹¹ and proportionally to its population (1 %). In addition, Montenegro experienced a relatively large influx of Russian nationals¹² seeking asylum to avoid national conscription.¹³ The need to activate emergency support due to this mass inflow of persons fleeing Ukraine led to a reprioritisation of support in favour of the development of a response and contingency plan. This meant that not all the activities originally foreseen in the Roadmap could be implemented. A total of ten activities¹⁴ out of the 23 foreseen were implemented (44 %) and 13 were pending and/or were not implemented by December 2023 (56 %). In terms of deliverables, six out of the 14 foreseen had been delivered at the time of writing. Nine deliverables not originally reflected in the Roadmap¹⁵ were developed and delivered to the authorities.

Outcome 1: Strengthened access to procedure in line with the CEAS

Out of the six activities foreseen under outcome 1, two were fully implemented (30 %) and four (70 %) experienced delays/were not implemented. The development of the SOPs on first contact and registration of intent to apply for asylum (1.1.1) and lodging of the application (1.1.2) were successfully developed and delivered. However, there was no participation in the TtT sessions on the module on registration of application for international protection (1.1.3). The adjustment of the access to procedure (ATP) toolkit to Montenegro's context (1.2.1) and related workshop on its use (1.2.2) were delayed. Similarly, the organisation and delivery of training sessions on information provision to asylum seekers (1.2.3) were not delivered.

Outcome 2: Enhanced quality of decision making at the first instance in line with the CEAS

Four out of the seven activities (57 %) foreseen under this outcome were delivered, one was partially delivered (14 %) and two were not delivered (29 %). The Agency provided support with the development of a SOP on examination (2.1.1) and mentored eight case officers on interview techniques, evidence assessment, decision writing, decision assessment and the use of COI (2.2.1). In October 2022, the Agency provided expert support for the preparation of a professional development plan for the DfA and the development of the training plan of the Mol of Montenegro (2.2.3). Two

¹¹ By the end of March 2023, 7 857 Ukrainian nationals had been granted temporary protection (Montenegro 2023 report, Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, SWD (2023) 65.

¹² In 2022, Russian nationals represented the largest group of asylum seekers in Montenegro, with 72 applicants (EU Progress report, 2023).

¹³ European Commission (2023) Montenegro 2023 report, Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, SWD (2023) 64.

¹⁴ Including support in the context of high influx of persons fleeing Ukraine.

¹⁵ Structure of and guidance on response and contingency plan, response and contingency plan, SOP on registration of requests for temporary protection, SOP on vulnerable persons, SOP on unaccompanied minors, information provision protocol, SOP on access to education, SOP on access to health and SOP on identification and referral of potential victims of trafficking.



participants were registered in the TtT session¹⁶ (2.2.4) and seven participations were registered in regional training sessions¹⁷. In addition, the foreseen EUAA practical guides¹⁸ were translated into Montenegrin and disseminated to the authorities. The provision of support in the delivery of national training sessions on given modules (2.2.5) could not be delivered. The development of tools to support case officers, such as legal guidance and interview guides was ongoing (2.1.2). Similarly, the shadowing in a Member State (2.2.2) with the aim of increasing technical skills could not be organised.

Outcome 3: Strengthened capacity of national authorities to identify, assess and respond to the needs of minors

One out of the three (33 %) foreseen activities was successfully implemented, one (33 %) was partially implemented and one activity (33 %) was not carried out. The development of an age assessment process procedure (3.1.1) was ongoing at the time of writing, the EUAA having started providing support in March 2023. This effort began with an introductory workshop that led to the formation of a dedicated interinstitutional working group. In June 2023, the EUAA facilitated the first meeting of this working group, offering expert guidance on the principles and practices of age assessment procedures in the EU context (3.2.1). In addition, the EUAA's practical guide on age assessment was disseminated. However, the provision of expert support to prepare a national training programme for the MoI on the BIC (3.2.1), in line with the Migration Management Strategy of Montenegro, was not held.

Outcome 4: Strengthened reception system aligned with EU and EUAA standards for reception conditions

Three out of the seven activities foreseen took place successfully (43 %), one was partially implemented (14 %) and three out of seven (43 %) could not be implemented. The Agency supported the development of a response and contingency plan in the context of the mass inflow of persons fleeing Ukraine (4.2.2). At the request of the EUD and the MoI, the EUAA carried out a rapid needs assessment in April and May 2022. The assessment identified the needs on the ground and provided recommendations for immediate and medium-term response. The plan was developed through a series of three workshops and a number of expert missions (between September 2022 and January 2023) and a study visit to Slovenia, with the contribution of Member State experts from the Czech Republic, Slovenia, and Sweden. The draft plan was finalised in December 2023 and was pending adoption at the time of writing. Additionally, asylum staff were mentored on prioritised reception areas (4.3.2) and 30 participants (six originally foreseen) participated in a study visit to Slovenia in the context of accommodating arrivals during the mass influx from Ukraine (4.3.3). While the development of SOPs on reception could not take place, the EUAA presented the reception standards and assessment of reception conditions (ARC) tool¹⁹ to the competent authorities of Montenegro (4.2.1). The provision of technical advice on the site design of the planned extension of the reception centres in Božaj and Spuž (activity 4.1.1) could not take place. Similarly, the provision of technical support on

¹⁶ One on interviewing vulnerable persons and one on evidence assessment.

¹⁷ Six participants took part in the regional session on interview techniques and one participant attended the regional session on evidence assessment.

¹⁸ In particular, the guide on assessing mobilisation cases and the practical guide on political opinion, membership of social groups and religion were translated into Montenegrin. The COI on Russia was also disseminated.

¹⁹ <https://arc.euaa.europa.eu/>



the organisation of sites and workflows in these same centres (Activity 4.2.1) was not carried out. Concerning the enhancement of knowledge, technical skills and competences on reception, the foreseen participation of reception officials in reception TtT sessions (4.3.1) could not take place.

4. Evaluation findings

4.1 To what extent was the action successful and why?

Given the changing context in which the Roadmap was implemented, the cooperation between the EUAA and Montenegro was rather effective. The EUAA contributed to the achievement of the majority of the foreseen outputs (mainly in the asylum field) by delivering nearly half of the indicative activities/deliverables outlined in the Roadmap. Additionally, through the Roadmap the EUAA demonstrated flexibility in accommodating new requests from the authorities (i.e., the development of a response and contingency plan in response to the influx of Ukrainian nationals). The provision of support by the EUAA through the development of SOPs, study visits and practical guidance contributed to the strengthening of institutional and individual capacities in the asylum administration. Furthermore, the exchanges with experts from Member States were particularly valued by the authorities who saw them as an opportunity to understand the functioning of EU asylum and reception administrations.

Collaboration between the EUAA and Montenegro was positive, as the request that the EUAA lead coordination efforts in developing a response and contingency plan exemplifies. Moreover, the MoI formally requested that the EUAA explore opportunities for Montenegro's participation in EUAA's networks, and national authorities expressed interest in signing a working arrangement with the EUAA, which could lead to increased cooperation going forward. This good collaboration was underpinned by several key enabling factors:

- Montenegro's advanced position in the EU accession process allowed it to have a good understanding of the EU's asylum-related priorities. This facilitated constructive discussions, for example, on the temporary protection provisions it had included in its national legislation;
- The authorities' clear understanding of the EUAA's mandate;
- The fact that the asylum system in Montenegro operates without substantial pressure (see Chapter 2.2). Despite the relatively high influx of Ukrainian nationals over the implementation period, Montenegro does not tend to receive a high number of applicants which creates a conducive environment for the strategic implementation of the Roadmap;
- The language proficiency of the EUAA focal point, coupled with the frequent visits of the EUAA team to the country. While a couple of stakeholders recognised the additional benefits that a permanent, in-country presence of the EUAA could bring, stakeholders generally agreed that the EUAA had adequately cultivated strong and reliable connections with local authorities.

Although the support provided by the EUAA was appreciated by all stakeholders, **certain factors impeded the complete implementation of the Roadmap's activities:**



- Lack of human resources on the part of the Agency was one of the main hindering factors. An illustrative example of this was the need to reallocate the EUAA reception expert to support the authorities in Romania, thereby delaying the support to Montenegro. In response to such challenges, new staff members were recruited in October 2022 and 2023, and steps were taken to recruit an asylum and reception expert within the WB team. Nonetheless, staff resources continued to be stretched and recruitment delays for project-based staff persisted, as outlined in Chapter 3. Ensuring the availability of EUAA in-house experts to provide operational support also often proved difficult, due to their varying portfolios and limited available time. Overall, such limited resources required the team to be selective on the activities that could be implemented at a given time;
- On the authorities' side, the small size of Montenegro's administration and its self-perceived limitations in the English language sometimes led to delays, according to EUAA staff and European Commission representatives. The political situation of the country (e.g., changes in government) and logistical limitations on the authorities' side (e.g., analogue system, hacking event) were also reported to be a challenge encountered over the implementation period. Furthermore, the absence of a Roadmap coordinator on the authorities' side resulted in limited implementation of specific activities, especially those intended to support more than one Directorate;
- The need for the EUAA to support the authorities with the establishment of a response and contingency plan led to a reprioritisation and the postponement of the majority of activities foreseen in the Roadmap, most notably in the field of reception, reflecting the dynamic nature of the operational environment.

Overall, **the benefits achieved through the Roadmap were found to have outweighed its costs by all stakeholders consulted.** However, the lack of human resources on the Agency's side impacted the **efficiency** of the support provided. Limited staff allocated to the implementation of the Roadmap led to delays and the reprioritisation of activities, particularly after the need to activate emergency support in the context of the high influx of Ukrainians. Additionally, the costs of travelling to Montenegro (i.e., financial and time spent) represented a challenge for both in-house experts and for staff more directly involved in the implementation of the Roadmap. This was mitigated by carrying out multiple activities during a mission. The delivery of training at regional (instead of national) level also allowed for efficiency gains as more people than the few available in Montenegro's small administration could be trained at once.

In terms of the Roadmap's coherence, **efforts were made to ensure consistency and complementarity of the support provided** in the context of the Roadmap and the support provided by other EU Member States and international organisations. For instance, the decision to engage EU Member States in the needs assessment and the subsequent implementation of the Roadmap was taken to avoid overlapping activities, according to consulted EUAA staff. Thus, Croatian and Greek representatives were included in the needs assessment process after consultations in the EUAA's networks. Moreover, the PSMM3 and related meeting served as a framework to ensure alignment of the planned activities and prevent any potential overlaps among collaborating partners (i.e., UNHCR, IOM, Frontex²⁰). The fact that the UNHCR enjoys observer status on the EUAA's Management Board and has a working arrangement with the Agency contributes to frequent exchanges between the two, according to EU stakeholders. The distinct but complementary mandates of the EUAA and the UNHCR also ensured

²⁰ The European Border and Coast Guard Agency.



that there were no overlaps or duplications in the support offered by the two organisations. While the UNHCR has a more operational and advocacy role in the country, the EUAA's unique mandate in facilitating peer-to-peer exchanges with EU Member State practitioners and in providing capacity development support driven to ensure alignment with the CEAS contributed to avoiding overlaps.

However, **there is room to ensure increased clarity and mutual understanding of the mandate of the EUAA and role in-country of international organisations** such as the UNHCR and the IOM, i.e., how these differ and what can and cannot be done by the EUAA in its role in relation to the CEAS. While the Roadmap outlines possible complementarities and synergies between organisations, some misunderstandings arose between the EUAA and the UNHCR during the implementation of the Roadmap. In particular, there was lack of clarity regarding the involvement of the UNHCR in the development of SOPs. Although the organisations' mandates/roles differ, EU stakeholders and international organisations consulted found that there is a need to work together to respond to the migration challenges in Montenegro (and in the region) and to further foster a harmonised approach to addressing shared objectives. Similarly, EU stakeholders, including consulted EU Member States, highlighted the need for the EUAA to further leverage the experience and presence in the field of organisations with a long-lasting presence in the country. Thus, encouraging the mutual sharing of capacity-development plans, better defining roles and responsibilities, establishing a clearer allocation of tasks, and setting out clear channels for communication and key areas for cooperation between the EUAA and international organisations, most notably the UNHCR, would be helpful in this regard. Within the Agency, EUAA experts who participated in the needs assessment and in the implementation of the Roadmap, as well as experts from EU+ countries, positively assessed the coordination efforts made by the WB team and highlighted the good cooperation among colleagues within the Agency. However, according to EU stakeholders, including EUAA staff, there is **a need for more structured collaboration between the EUAA and EU Member States working in the field of asylum in the WB** (e.g., putting in place platforms for knowledge-sharing).

Outcome 1: Strengthened access to procedure in line with the CEAS

The provision of support concerning the strengthening of the ATP in line with the CEAS was **partially effective**. The development of SOPs²¹ was perceived to be an **effective tool to contribute to the strengthening of access to asylum in line with the CEAS in Montenegro**. Indeed, the lack of written SOPs prior to the inception of the Roadmap, coupled with the complexity of the registration procedure²², called for a systematised approach. The SOPs helped put in writing a system that can be followed by all the authorities involved in the asylum procedure. According to the EUAA experts consulted, this did not only provide certainty, but also helped to map gaps in the procedure that could be mitigated in future generations of the Roadmap. However, a few consulted stakeholders (including an EUAA expert and representative of an international organisation) mentioned that there was **a need to move from the mere design of SOPs to their actual implementation**. Additionally, stakeholders emphasised the need for further involvement and ownership of the authorities in the drafting and implementation of the SOPs to ensure their effectiveness going forward. In this regard, the TtT sessions were seen as a very effective means to move from theory to practice, according to the international

²¹ SOPs on first contact and registration of intent to apply and the SOP on lodging of the application were developed.

²² The asylum application in Montenegro is a two-step procedure, under which applicants first register an intention to request asylum with the border police and then have 15 days to lodge an asylum request with the DfA (2023 Communication on EU Enlargement).



organisations consulted. However, the authorities did not participate in the TtT on registration due to language constraints and the reprioritisation of activities following the invasion of Ukraine. Similarly, the delivery of an ATP tool kit and respective workshop was delayed. Thus, the actual effectiveness of these activities is difficult to assess.

Outcome 2: Enhanced quality of decision making at first instance in line with the CEAS

The support provided by the Agency through the Roadmap **effectively contributed to an increase in decisions at first instance, as well as the quality of decisions**²³. While stakeholders, including an international organisation, recognised that it is difficult to attribute causality (as many factors played a role), they acknowledged the role of the Agency in this area. Stakeholders emphasised the effectiveness of the support provided by the Agency concerning the handling of cases, including complex cases where the EUAA provided support on an *ad hoc* basis. While the number of asylum applications in Montenegro is relatively low, the processing of cases can prove challenging due to the limited capacity of the national administration. The EUAA showed flexibility by adapting its support following changes in the national workload. In this regard, the authorities particularly valued the provision of the **EUAA's practical guides and support in the preparation of interviews**. Likewise, the **support provided in the field of COI** was highly valued and expected to further strengthen the capacities of staff working in the newly established COI department, according to the authorities and an international organisation. Similarly, the authorities emphasised the positive support provided by the EUAA, together with the UNHCR, in relation to the safe third country interpretation. The effectiveness of this support was expected to be strengthened with the delivery of legal guidance and an interview guide which was being developed at the time of writing. Moreover, the participation in **on-the-job coaching sessions and training, including TtT modules organised by the EUAA**, enhanced the technical skills of case officers. While the DfA recognised the effectiveness of the training sessions offered by the EUAA, some suggestions to further encourage the participation of officials were reported. This included allowing more than one official to access TtT, as well as the possibility to receive training in their mother tongue which would allow for a more complete understanding, and better transfer of knowledge and implementation. Linked to this, EUAA staff highlighted the importance of supporting the roll-out of national training sessions to further increase and consolidate the technical skills of case officers. The regional training on quality of procedure on the application for international protection was reported to be quite effective. Additionally, the DfA explained that this event was a platform to enhance cooperation in the field of asylum with other countries in the region.

Outcome 3: Strengthened capacity of national authorities to identify, assess and respond to the needs of minors

The provision of support to strengthen the capacity of national authorities to identify, assess and respond to the needs of minors was partially effective. The work done on the establishment of an age assessment process was considered a key benefit by the authorities. However, the finalisation of the draft was still pending at the time of writing. Similarly, the development of a training plan on BIC could not be delivered as the provision of support in this area was contingent on the appointment of a coordinator which did not take place. Delays were primarily due to the need to reprioritise tasks and

²³ As per the Montenegro 2023 progress report, since 2021 more cases have been processed within the six month regular deadline and fewer decisions were overturned, signalling a better quality of the determination process.



reallocate resources to address the substantial influx of Ukrainians into Montenegro. Cooperation in this area only started in the first quarter of 2023, though it was initially anticipated to be completed by the end of 2022. Despite these delays, the authorities were satisfied with the support provided, most notably with the establishment of an interdepartmental working group. In addition, the authorities highlighted the usefulness of a workshop session on age assessment where an EUAA in-house expert presented best practices in relation to age assessment and provided recommendations concerning the operationalisation of Montenegrin legislation. Efforts were made by the EUAA and the MoI to cooperate with all relevant stakeholders, including the UNHCR, in the definition of a right compliant age assessment procedure in Montenegro. Similarly, the development of a training plan on BIC foresees the inclusion of relevant stakeholders in the field.

Outcome 4: Strengthened reception system aligned with EU and the Agency's standards for reception conditions

The ability of the Agency to effectively contribute to strengthening Montenegro's reception system in line with EU standards was highly impacted by several factors. In particular, the invasion of Ukraine prompted both the Agency and national authorities to reassess and realign priorities to adapt to the fluctuating circumstances. Therefore, even though a certain number of activities under this outcome were not implemented, the Agency effectively addressed and adjusted its support to respond to Montenegro's needs at a specific point in time. **The Agency's support concerning the development of a response and contingency plan was considered effective** by the stakeholders consulted. The majority of stakeholders who took part in the development of the plan acknowledged that the EUAA's response to the invasion of Ukraine was very positive and fell within the mandate of the Agency. They expressed satisfaction with the overall outcome, though there were concerns about its timeliness. EUAA experts emphasised the crucial role of the response and contingency plan in helping the authorities establish a baseline and gain a more comprehensive understanding of individual roles. They highlighted that, beyond the plan's content, the development of the plan led to significant procedural learning for both the Agency and the authorities. Addressing Montenegro's contingency needs also provided the Agency with an opportunity to enhance internal capacity and develop tools applicable to various contexts. The DfA commended the EUAA for facilitating its involvement in coordination body meetings overseeing decisions on providing temporary protection, and also noted the positive impact of a study visit to Slovenia. Moreover, both national authorities and EU stakeholders valued the involvement of EU Member State experts in the development of the plan. However, there was a lack of clarity as to the level of involvement of international organisations in the development of the contingency plan which led to certain misunderstandings. The need for a clear and explicit definition of responsibilities between the EUAA and long-standing organisations in the field was recognised not only by these organisations, but also by consulted EU representatives. Additionally, some stakeholders, particularly Member States contributing to the development of the plan, highlighted challenges associated with the high number of individuals involved. Finally, EU stakeholders emphasised the need to be mindful when organising study visits to Member States as there are divergencies in the level of alignment with the CEAS within the EU. An additional area of support under this outcome concerns the **introduction of the ARC tool** to the authorities who committed to using the tool. The tool can be used by the Agency to refine the support provided and concentrate on specific aspects that necessitate further assistance (e.g., arrival) in future iterations of the Roadmap. This, in turn, can lead to the development of SOPs relating to specific aspects of reception. In fact, representatives from the DfR



expressed a keen interest in intensifying the cooperation in the area of reception going forward, in particular through the development of SOPs for different thematic areas of reception.

4.2 How did the Agency make a difference through the action?

The added value of the Roadmap is derived from the Agency's role **as a centre of expertise on the CEAS**, particularly in light of the accession journey of the country to the EU. The Agency is recognised as a priority partner in delivering practical support for the implementation of asylum legislation in accordance with the CEAS. Additionally, the Roadmap is perceived to be the primary tool by EU stakeholders for delivering structural and practical support to the authorities in Montenegro. For instance, an EU-level stakeholder noted that the Roadmap had supplanted conventional instruments, such as the European Commission's Technical Assistance and Information Exchange (TAIEX) instrument, in providing support to the WB partners. A clear example of the EUAA's added value concerned the **provision of support in the establishment of a response and contingency plan**. The request for the EUAA's involvement in leading the contingency planning in response to the high influx of Ukrainians into Montenegro came directly from the EUD and the MoI. The provision of support concerning the handling of unfamiliar cases in line with the CEAS was also perceived to be an area where the Agency made a difference, according to EU stakeholders and the DfA. The Agency also **provided added value through its support on COI**, where it is seen as a well-recognised actor, according to international organisations, the DfA and EU stakeholders. The **added value of the EUAA's TtT** approach was highlighted by international organisations and EU stakeholders. In their view, the TtT modules not only contributed to strengthening the capacity of the authorities but also ensured the sustainability of the support going forward. While progress in the field of reception was modest, available tools shared with the authorities such as the ARC tool were an example of the added value that the Agency can bring, particularly considering Montenegro's need and interest to align its reception conditions with EU standards.

4.3 Is the action relevant?

The Roadmap was highly relevant to give response to the needs of the authorities in Montenegro. While the asylum legislation is well-aligned with the CEAS, the needs assessment as well as the national Strategy on Migration and Reintegration of Returnees identified the need to further operationalise the legal framework. Additionally, the Roadmap was designed to respond to needs in all areas identified in the European Commission's Communication on EU Enlargement Policy (2022)²⁴. In this context, the provision of tailor-made, flexible and demand-driven support was very relevant according to all the stakeholders consulted. **The approach to the needs assessment, most notably its participatory nature and the multidisciplinary expertise of the EUAA team that participated in the exercise, was perceived to be very relevant** to identify Montenegro's needs. The involvement of the authorities and the possibility to consult personnel at different levels (i.e., from managers to case officers on the ground) was highlighted as a good practice. Additionally, the inclusion of EU Member State experts in the needs assessment process was perceived to be a very good practice according to EUAA staff. The EUAA, through the Roadmap, was sufficiently **flexible to adapt to emerging needs, most notably the need to give response to the unexpected high influx of Ukrainians** following the Russian invasion of

²⁴ European Commission (2022) Montenegro 2022 report, Communication on EU Enlargement Policy, SWD (2022).



Ukraine. Thus, the provision of support by the EUAA, through a rapid needs assessment and the development of a contingency plan was highly relevant. Despite the time-consuming nature of this task and the need to improve the timeliness of the response, developing a contingency plan in line with the CEAS was an essential priority, according to EUAA staff and the international organisations consulted.

The Roadmap was highly relevant in the field of asylum. Support in this area was designed to support priorities previously identified by national authorities and reiterated by the stakeholders consulted. This included the need to improve the efficiency of the procedure of application for international protection; the development of age assessment procedures; and the enhancement of quality of decision making at first instance. In the field of **reception**, there was a clear and continued need to put in place a SOP, mirroring the approach taken in the field of asylum, as emphasised by the consulted EUAA personnel and reception authorities. According to the EUAA reception experts and the DfR, at the time of writing there was no defined procedure (e.g., criteria for allocation, timing, transfer protocols, etc.) in place for the accommodation of asylum applicants. Practices were primarily based on experiential knowledge and the reliance on verbally transmitted knowledge by officers and administrators. According to the authorities, a SOP on reception would mitigate the risk of knowledge loss in the event of turnover, particularly when experienced staff members leave. Both the EUAA and the authorities agreed that a SOP on reception should be developed in the next generation of the Roadmap. Considering the UNHCR's reported work on developing SOPs on reception together with the authorities (i.e., SOPs for the treatment of asylum seekers in the reception centre for asylum seekers in Božaj, with special emphasis on vulnerable persons), it is important for the EUAA to engage with them during this process to ensure coherence and prevent any duplications or redundancies in their support going forward.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

The Roadmap proved to be highly relevant in addressing the needs of Montenegro's authorities. The relevance of the Roadmap stems from the participatory nature of the needs assessment and the fact that the Roadmap responded to the priorities identified by the European Commission and the Montenegrin authorities. While the country's asylum legislation was aligned with the CEAS, stakeholders recognised a need for further operationalisation of the legislative framework. Additionally, the Roadmap proved to be a flexible tool to allow the EUAA to adapt to unexpected needs, i.e., the need to develop a response and contingency plan further to the influx of foreign nationals as a consequence of the invasion of Ukraine. In the field of asylum, additional support concerning the development of an age assessment procedure and the improvement of the efficiency of the asylum procedure remains a key priority for asylum authorities. In the field of reception, support remained relevant despite the fact that the foreseen activities could not be implemented. Developing SOPs on reception and supporting the management and organisation of reception centres was seen as a priority that needs to be carried over to the next generation of the Roadmap.

The Roadmap proved to be an effective tool to respond to the (changing) needs of the authorities. In the field of **asylum**, the EUAA contributed to strengthening the ATP in line with the CEAS (outcome 1) through the development of SOPs and exchanges with experts from Member States which were



highly valuable. However, the provision of support concerning the strengthening of provision of information on follow-up assistance and procedural guarantees was delayed. The EUAA effectively contributed to an increase in decisions at first instance, as well as the quality of decisions at first instance (outcome 2). The support provided in this area included assistance for handling of complex cases and providing practical guidance. Additionally, support in COI and safe third country interpretation was highly valued and expected to further enhance staff capacity. Similarly, participation in training sessions, including TtT modules, enhanced case officers' technical skills, though suggestions were made to increase participation and facilitate a better understanding of the content. Regional training events were effective in fostering cooperation in asylum matters among countries in the region. Support to strengthen the capacity of national authorities to identify, assess and respond to the needs of minors (outcome 3) was partially effective. This is due to the fact that the right compliance age assessment procedure as well as the training plan on BIC could not be developed during the implementation period of the Roadmap. However, some progress in this area was observed through the establishment of an interdepartmental working group and the conduct of workshops. The effectiveness of support in **reception** (outcome 4) was quite limited, as most of the initially planned activities could not be implemented. However, under this outcome, the EUAA provided effective support in putting in place the response and contingency plan, though it had not been approved at the time of writing. The authorities expressed interest and willingness to sustain collaboration with the EUAA in the reception field. This suggests that the authorities perceive that such activities have the potential to be effective in strengthening the reception system, aligning it with EU standards.

The collaboration between Montenegro and the EUAA has positively evolved over time²⁵. Two months into the implementation of the Roadmap, the invasion of Ukraine launched by the Russian armed forces prompted adjustments in the priorities of both the Agency and national authorities. In this context, the EUAA was perceived as a priority partner to lead the efforts in the development of a contingency and response plan. The positive relationship between the EUAA and Montenegro was also exemplified by the authorities' desire to expand the cooperation with the EUAA through their participation in the EUAA's networks and the possibility to sign a working arrangement. The good cooperation between the EUAA and Montenegro can be explained by several factors. Firstly, Montenegro's advanced status in the EU accession process, reflected in the alignment of their legislation with EU asylum standards, indicated a clear understanding of EU priorities and facilitated constructive discussions with the Agency. The Montenegrin authorities understand the role and mandate of the Agency, which is perceived as a priority partner, particularly in light of their accession journey to the EU. The low-pressure environment of Montenegro's asylum system, coupled with the language proficiency of the focal point and regular EUAA team visits, contributed to a conducive atmosphere for collaboration. The new and close cooperation between the EUAA and Montenegrin authorities reportedly led to a lack of clarity concerning the role of other organisations on the ground, most notably the UNHCR, and the degree to which/how they are to be involved in given activities taken forward as part of the Roadmap.

Drawing conclusions on the overall efficiency of the Roadmap proved challenging due to the lack of detailed data, making it difficult to assess the efficiency of specific activities and outcomes. While the

²⁵Priority question: What characterises the cooperation between the Agency and national authorities and international organisations in Montenegro in the context of the EUAA-Montenegro 2022-2023 Roadmap? How has this cooperation evolved over time? What key factors and drivers influenced the cooperation? How has the cooperation between the EUAA and the Montenegrin authorities impacted the relationship between the Agency and other stakeholders in the field?



financial resources allocated for the Roadmap's implementation were deemed sufficient, challenges were experienced primarily in relation to the human resource capacity of the Agency, which was below what was foreseen by the PSMM3. Other affecting factors related to the limited time availability of EUAA in-house experts and the overall high cost of travelling to Montenegro (though this did not hinder implementation per se).

In terms of coherence, the Roadmap aimed to ensure consistency and coordination in the support provided by the EUAA. Efforts were made to prevent overlapping activities through needs assessments involving EU Member States, and alignment was maintained through frameworks like the PSMM3. The EUAA's distinct mandate, particularly compared to other organisations such as the UNHCR avoided duplications in the support provided. However, some misunderstandings arose during implementation. To address challenges, there is a need for increased clarity on mandates and roles, defined responsibilities, and improved communication channels between the EUAA and international organisations, especially the UNHCR. Leveraging the experience of long-standing organisations in the region are also emphasised for a harmonised approach to migration challenges in Montenegro. Opportunities to further disseminate and promote the support provided by the EUAA in the context of the Roadmap were identified.

The added value of the EUAA is its role as a centre of expertise on the CEAS. This is mainly observed through the provision of practical support in ensuring the operationalisation of the asylum legislation with the CEAS, through the development of SOPs and delivery of capacity-building activities. The request made by the EUD and the MOI to the EUAA concerning the coordination of a contingency plan in the aftermath of the invasion of Ukraine was also an example of the perceived added value of the Agency. There is also potential for high added value of the intervention in the area of reception once the foreseen activities are implemented.

Table 1. Evaluation criteria by result²⁶

	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4
Relevance	Very good	Very good	Very good	Very good
Effectiveness	Good	Good	Fair	Fair
Efficiency ²⁷	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair
Coherence	Good	Good	Good	Good
EU added value	Very good	Very good	Very good	Very good

²⁶ The ratings are based on the degree to which progress was made towards the achievement of outputs and outcomes at the time of writing, coupled with judgements about the degree to which this was affected by factors outside the control of the Agency.

²⁷ Given the unavailability of granular data, no assessment of the efficiency per outcome could be made. It is considered 'fair' across the board because there were some resource constraints, but the costs incurred were proportionate to what was achieved.



5.2 Good practices and lessons learnt

The relevance of the Roadmap stems from the **needs assessment process** which included all relevant stakeholders in the country. By having the opportunity to visit the country, EUAA experts could interact with the authorities and gain insights at various levels (from managers to on-the-ground case officers). This allowed them to gain a relatively in-depth understanding of the needs of the asylum and reception system in the country. All stakeholders involved in the exercise positively assessed the coordination efforts of the European and International Cooperation Unit and their support in adequately briefing them.

The **involvement of Member States during the needs assessment as well as during the implementation of the Roadmap** was perceived to be a good practice by all stakeholders consulted. This not only provided the authorities with insights into asylum and reception administrations in Member States, but also established a framework for consistency and coordination in the support offered by various relevant actors within the country. Nevertheless, EU representatives emphasised that the involvement of Member States, particularly through field visits, should take into consideration the variations in compliance with the CEAS across the EU.

The **positive collaboration between Montenegro and the EUAA** was characterised by the willingness and motivation of the authorities to align and comply with the CEAS. The fact that the EUAA focal point spoke the language, together with the regular visits to the country, contributed to the strengthening of the relationship over time. While stakeholders positively assessed the support provided and level of cooperation, having a permanent EUAA presence in Montenegro/the WB region would have the potential to limit the travel of EUAA staff and could potentially increase the efficiency of the work in-country. In this sense, the EUAA could consider conducting a cost-benefit assessment to compare in a robust manner the costs and benefits of establishing a permanent presence in Montenegro/the WB region with those related to the current setup.

The **development of the contingency plan presented a valuable opportunity for both authorities and the EUAA** to enhance their capacities. By engaging in the planning process, the authorities had the chance to convene and establish a clear understanding of their respective roles. Additionally, for the Agency, this exercise served as an opportunity to consolidate expertise, create a framework, and develop a common tool that can be applied in other contexts.

In order to keep track of the activities implemented, assess results achieved and remaining needs at country level, having an accurate **monitoring framework** is essential. In this respect, room for improvement has been identified in terms of the comprehensiveness and level of detail of the Roadmap-specific monitoring framework. Adding target/achieved values for all the activities – e.g., number of participants, Agency staff involved, tools/guides used and, where possible, costs – as well as information on, e.g., challenges, delays, changes in the workplan, would allow for a better overview of the status of implementation, potential priority changes, challenges and facilitating factors.

The EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap is one of the cooperation instruments of the Agency in the WB region. Since the management and implementation of the Roadmaps for cooperation with the WB countries are facilitated with support from EU funding, specifically under the PSMM3, multiple aspects related to their implementation are interrelated (i.e., human and financial resources, monitoring and



reporting requirements). Moreover, shared needs exist across the WB, which in some cases, are met through regional-level activities, such as regional training sessions. For these reasons, conducting a **regional-level evaluation** covering all Roadmaps might allow the evaluation process to be streamlined, capitalising on and assessing all aspects that are monitored at regional level only. Simultaneously, it might allow changes to be addressed over time in the type and complexity of support, resource allocation, and workload, as well as provide input for programming support going towards the future.

5.3 Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Ensure better alignment between the level of ambition, scope and timeline of the Roadmap and available EUAA human resources

Accounting for available resources is important to set adequate objectives, ensuring that expected results are achieved. The Agency, with national authorities, could consider:

- Including fewer, higher-priority activities in the Roadmap going forward (while acknowledging that more could potentially be done should resources allow or priorities change);
- From the outset, identifying whether outputs are expected to be achieved in the short, medium, or long term (coupled with their priority level) to determine where to focus resources as needed;
- Extending the timeframe for implementation of the Roadmap to three years, to account for slower absorption rates, changes in priorities and any unforeseen factors that may delay implementation.

Recommendation 2: Ensure the availability of adequate EUAA human resources to implement the Roadmap

Given the challenges caused by the limited EUAA human resources, the Agency could consider:

- Enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the recruitment process for EUAA staff in the WB, to ensure that all staff members foreseen by the regional programme are hired in a timely manner;
- If, once all foreseen positions are filled, human resources continue to be strained, the EUAA could conduct a comprehensive assessment of workload and resource allocation prior to approving any change, extension or renewal of the Roadmap. This would help ensure appropriate resource allocation and parity with similar-sized Roadmap operations in other partner third countries, following the priorities set out by the External Cooperation Strategy.

Recommendation 3: Amend the Roadmap in the event of a substantial change in needs

The Roadmap has proven effective in addressing requests from the authorities in the event of emerging needs. However, this led to the reprioritisation of the support originally outlined in the Roadmap without a formal revision having been made to the Roadmap. To account for the dynamic nature of the operational environment and facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of the Roadmap, the Agency could consider:

- Contingent to recommendation 2 relating to resources, conducting a mid-term review of the Roadmap to assess the state of implementation and readjust objectives and pre-conditions if needed;
- Amending the Roadmap to incorporate the provision of new support in response to a substantial change in the needs and to justify any reprioritisation of the original support foreseen;



- Should the Roadmap be amended, its monitoring framework (see recommendation 5) needs to be adjusted accordingly.

Recommendation 4: Prioritise support areas where progress has been partially achieved or not achieved

Given the partial completion of some of the activities during the Roadmap's implementation period, the resumption/completion of their implementation would be beneficial. Without prejudice to the results of a needs assessment preceding a future Roadmap, the Agency could consider:

- Prioritising the delivery of support in key areas of relevance (e.g., development of SOPs on age assessment procedures and SOPs on reception), in coordination with international organisations also working on such SOPs (as relevant);
- Further encouraging/facilitating the participation of national authorities in training, particularly in TtT sessions in areas identified and requested by national authorities (e.g., reception and registration);
- Extending the involvement of the Montenegrin authorities in the Agency's networks, in particular in the COI network.

Recommendation 5: Clarify roles and strengthen cooperation with organisations operating on the ground

While the responsibility for coordinating organisations on the ground remains with national authorities, the Agency could consider:

- Clarifying the mandate of the EUAA and how this differs from that of international organisations such as the UNHCR and the IOM i.e., what can and cannot be done by the EUAA in its role in relation to the CEAS;
- The EUD could support in the planning of meetings among international actors, including the Agency. In this respect, the EUAA could suggest relevant actors to invite to such meetings, or topics for discussion;
- Encouraging more structured collaboration between the EUAA and EU Member States working in the field of asylum in the WB (e.g., putting in place platforms for knowledge sharing).



Annex 1: Methodology and analytical models used

The evaluation applied a mixed methods approach, combining the use of existing sources of evidence with primary data collection, notably through (group) interviews.

Desk research included the Agency's monitoring data as well as other overview documents, the Roadmap document itself, relevant reports by the European Commission (the European Commission reports for Montenegro, accompanying the 2021, 2022 and 2023 Communications on EU Enlargement Policy), and to a lesser degree, statistics on asylum and reception, which were used as contextual background information.

The evaluation made use of evidence collected through a total of 14 **interviews**. The majority were carried out as group interviews, so a total of 22 stakeholders were consulted across all interviews, including relevant staff members from the EUAA, national authorities, international organisations and experts from EU+ countries involved in the implementation of the Roadmap.

The primary and secondary evidence collected underwent a process of **triangulation and synthesis**, with a view to deriving robust, evidence-based answers to the evaluation questions, and formulating conclusions and lessons learnt for the future on that basis. In this respect, it is worth noting that while it was important to consider the context within which the Roadmap operated, this is an external and independent evaluation of the EUAA's support via the Roadmap, which does not make any judgements on the functioning of Montenegro.

Conclusions and lessons learnt (as well as recommendations following on from them) were validated after the submission of the draft report to ensure they were appropriate and workable given any contextual constraints faced by the Agency, national authorities and/or other stakeholders.

Robustness and limitations of the evaluation

The evaluation process faced challenges in connecting the monitoring data with the activities and outputs outlined in the Roadmap. Moreover, the lack of revisions to the Roadmap (and consequently its monitoring framework) following the adjustments made to the support that the EUAA was to provide as part of the Roadmap further to the invasion of Ukraine launched by the Russian armed forces (i.e., the development of the response and contingency plan) made it difficult to adequately assess the support provided in this context.



Annex 2: Evaluation matrix

Operationalised questions	Indicators/descriptors	Norms/judgement criteria	Indicative sources of evidence
Relevance: To what extent was the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap significant to the needs of national authorities?			
<p>To what extent was the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap relevant to meet the needs of national authorities? How well has the EUAA been able to respond to national authorities' needs?</p> <p>To what extent did the scope and intended results of the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap remain relevant over the implementation period? If the needs changed over time, was the cooperation adapted accordingly?</p> <p>To what extent do the needs/problems addressed by the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap continue to require action by the EUAA? Will the cooperation continue to be relevant in the foreseeable future?</p> <p>To what extent did the intended results of the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap correspond to wider EU goals and priorities in the field of asylum and reception?</p>	<p>Intervention logic, objectives of the Roadmap</p> <p>Needs/problems the Roadmap was intended to address</p> <p>Needs of national authorities, including any changes over time</p> <p>Contextual factors that influenced the needs of national authorities (e.g., unforeseen shifts in migration patterns, organisational changes)</p> <p>Adjustments made to original objectives in response to changing needs (if applicable)</p> <p>Evidence/examples of the extent to which the four foreseen outcomes of the Roadmap continue to be relevant</p> <p>Stakeholders' views on the degree to which the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap has continued to respond to their needs throughout the implementation period</p> <p>Evidence/examples of ways in which the cooperation in Montenegro was appropriate and sufficient</p>	<p>The EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap was relevant to meet the needs of national authorities throughout the implementation period (January 2022-December 2023)</p> <p>Cooperation in Montenegro was adapted in line with emerging needs (where applicable)</p>	<p>EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap 2022-2023</p> <p>Needs assessments underlying the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap 2022-2023</p> <p>Monitoring data/implementation plan</p> <p>Statistical data from Eurostat/local sources (where publicly available)/UNHCR</p> <p>EUAA work programmes and planning documents</p> <p>Legislative documents pertaining to relevant EU policy/international obligations</p> <p>EU 'Chapter 24' reports pertaining to Montenegro</p> <p>Academic/news articles/EU publications relating to the current situation in operating plan countries</p> <p>In-depth interviews with EUAA staff</p> <p>In-depth interviews with national authorities</p>



Operationalised questions	Indicators/descriptors	Norms/judgement criteria	Indicative sources of evidence
	<p>to meet the needs of stakeholders</p> <p>Evidence/examples of gaps not addressed by the cooperation and explanatory factors</p> <p>Evidence/examples of the cooperation aligning with wider EUAA/EU goals and priorities</p>		<p>Interviews with EU Commission and the UNHCR</p>
<p>Effectiveness: To what extent have the results of the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap been met? Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered their achievement?</p>			
<p>Priority question: What characterises the cooperation between the Agency and national authorities and international organisations in Montenegro in the context of the EUAA-Montenegro 2022-2023 Roadmap? How has this cooperation evolved over time?</p> <p>To what extent was the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap implemented as envisaged (so far)? Were there any problems related to the implementation and application of the cooperation? If so, which ones and why?</p> <p>To what extent were the expected <u>outputs</u> achieved? If there were shortcomings, what (internal and external) factors caused these?</p>	<p>Intervention logic and its causal links</p> <p>Expected activities, outputs and outcomes outlined in the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap</p> <p>Degree of achievement of targets (output and outcome level) set out in the Roadmap</p> <p>Evidence/examples of achieved outcomes, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthened access to asylum procedures; • Enhanced quality of decision making at first instance; • Strengthened capacity of national authorities to identify, assess and respond to the needs of minors; • Strengthened reception system aligned with EU and EUAA standards for reception conditions. 	<p>The expected outputs and outcomes of the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap were largely met as a result of the implemented activities</p> <p>Where there were shortcomings, these can be justified by factors that were outside the EUAA's control</p> <p>Achieved outcomes can be attributed to the Agency's support rather than other factors</p> <p>The 27 cooperation between the Agency and national authorities has intensified over time leading to an increase in the effectiveness of the cooperation</p> <p>The support provided by the EUAA to give response to national authorities in light of</p>	<p>EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap 2022-2023</p> <p>Monitoring data/Implementation plan</p> <p>Statistical data from Eurostat/local sources (where publicly available)/UNHCR (for non-EU countries)</p> <p>In-depth interviews with EUAA staff and national authorities</p> <p>Interviews with EU Commission and International Organisation for Migration/UNHCR</p> <p>Professional development/training statistics and tools</p> <p>Relevant documents pertaining to other interventions (e.g., at local/regional/local level, by Ios, by civil society organisations)</p>



Operationalised questions	Indicators/descriptors	Norms/judgement criteria	Indicative sources of evidence
<p>To what extent were the expected <u>outcomes</u> achieved? If there were shortcomings, what (internal and external) factors caused these?</p> <p>To what extent has progress towards the overall aim (intended impact) of the cooperation been made? To what extent can this progress be linked to the EUAA's cooperation?</p> <p>How has the EUAA responded to the crisis in Ukraine and was the response sufficient?</p> <p>Can any (unintended) social or environmental impacts be observed that are linked to the EUAA's cooperation?</p>	<p>Evidence/examples of achieved outputs, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancement identification of persons who wish to apply for international protection; • Provision of guidance on follow-up assistance and procedural guarantees; • Implementation of key provisions of the law on international and temporary protection; • Enhancement of technical skills of relevant asylum staff in national administration; • Enhancement of right compliance age assessment procedure; • Strengthening of national authorities to implement the BIC in the daily work; • Alignment with EU and EUAA reception standards in the reception centres in Božaj and Spuž; • Increased efficiency of the reception system management; • Enhanced knowledge and technical skills on reception. <p>Evidence/examples of factors that explain why</p>	<p>the crisis in Ukraine has been sufficient</p>	<p>Relevant deliverables associated with the activities conducted</p>



Operationalised questions	Indicators/descriptors	Norms/judgement criteria	Indicative sources of evidence
	<p>expected outputs and outcomes were or were not achieved</p> <p>Evidence that the implemented activities contributed to the achievement of the observed outcomes</p> <p>Evidence/examples of unintended effects of the cooperation in Montenegro, including any (positive or negative) social and environmental impacts</p> <p>Stakeholders' views on the degree to which the outcomes/outputs can be attributed to the Agency's support</p> <p>Evidence/examples of the impact of the Agency's support compared to other (external or internal) factors</p> <p>Evidence/examples of changes in the intensity of the cooperation between the Agency and national authorities in Montenegro over time</p> <p>Stakeholders' views on the cooperation between the Agency and national authorities and international organisations in Montenegro</p> <p>Evidence/examples of the ways in which the EUAA responded to the impact of the crisis in Ukraine</p>		



Operationalised questions	Indicators/descriptors	Norms/judgement criteria	Indicative sources of evidence
	Stakeholders' views on the ways in which the EUAA responded to the impact of the crisis in Ukraine		
Efficiency: Have the results of the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap been achieved at the best relationship between resource inputs (costs, human resources, time) and outputs?			
<p>What inputs (costs, full-time equivalents, time investments) were associated with the implementation of the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap? How did these inputs compare to what was planned?</p> <p>Were these inputs sufficient to achieve the intended outputs/outcomes? Why or why not?</p> <p>Were the inputs proportionate to the outputs and outcomes achieved? Why or why not?</p> <p>To what extent has the governance structure of the Agency supported its ability to perform its tasks, having regard to its size, composition, organisation and work processes?</p> <p>Have there been any challenges to the efficient implementation of the cooperation in Montenegro? If so, which (internal or external) factors</p>	<p>Implementation costs of the cooperation in Montenegro (financial costs, full-time equivalents, investments, time investments), compared to budget plan</p> <p>Evidence/examples of amendments made to budgets or implementation plans and justifications for those amendments</p> <p>Outputs and outcomes generated compared to their costs</p> <p>Evidence/examples of inefficiencies in implementation and measures applied by the EUAA to avoid/mitigate challenges to the efficiency of the cooperation in Montenegro</p> <p>Comparative assessment of cost efficiency of given activities/outputs within the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap</p> <p>Evidence/examples of (internal and external) factors which hindered the efficiency of the</p>	<p>The inputs invested were sufficient to achieve the intended results</p> <p>The inputs invested were proportionate to the achieved results</p> <p>Where there were challenges to the efficiency of the cooperation, the EUAA made sufficient efforts to mitigate them</p>	<p>Cost data from the EUAA and other stakeholders (where available)</p> <p>EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap 2022-2023</p> <p>EUAA's work programmes and planning documents</p> <p>Monitoring data/Implementation plan</p> <p>In-depth interviews with EUAA staff</p> <p>In-depth interviews with national authorities</p>



Operationalised questions	Indicators/descriptors	Norms/judgement criteria	Indicative sources of evidence
<p>affected its efficient implementation and how did the EUAA mitigate them?</p> <p>Have any inefficiencies been identified? If so, how could these be addressed to increase the efficiency of the cooperation/future cooperation?</p> <p>How timely and efficient was the cooperation's administrative process (e.g., for reporting and monitoring)? Were there any inefficiencies associated with these processes?</p>	<p>cooperation in Montenegro</p> <p>Evidence/examples of simplification and cost reduction potential of the cooperation in Montenegro</p> <p>Evidence of the timeliness or lack thereof of administrative processes, and explanatory factors</p> <p>Costs and benefits for different groups of stakeholders</p>		
<p>Coherence: To what extent was the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap coherent with other interventions which have similar objectives? To what extent has the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap proved complementary to others in the field?</p>			
<p>What other interventions, implemented by the EU, competent authorities, international organisations, or civil society organisations existed in/with Montenegro that had similar objectives to the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap?</p> <p>To what extent was the EUAA's cooperation in Montenegro coherent with other EU interventions that had similar intended results? Were synergies actively sought to</p>	<p>Evidence/examples of other interventions implemented by the EU/local/international/civil society organisations in the field of asylum and reception</p> <p>Evidence/examples of synergies or complementarity between other interventions and the Agency's intervention in Montenegro</p> <p>Stakeholders' views on the coherence and complementarity of the interventions in Montenegro (or lack thereof)</p>	<p>The EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap and interventions by other actors were mutually reinforcing and/or complementary</p> <p>There were no inconsistencies or unnecessary duplications between the interventions</p> <p>Where relevant and appropriate in light of mandates, synergies were sought and joint interventions pursued</p>	<p>EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap 2022-2023</p> <p>EU 'Chapter 24' reports pertaining to Montenegro</p> <p>Monitoring data/Implementation plan</p> <p>Relevant documentation pertaining to the work of local/international/civil society organisations</p> <p>In-depth interviews with national authorities</p> <p>In-depth interviews with the UNHCR</p>



Operationalised questions	Indicators/descriptors	Norms/judgement criteria	Indicative sources of evidence
<p>promote the ‘Team Europe’ approach and were possible overlaps avoided?</p> <p>To what extent was the EUAA’s cooperation in Montenegro coherent with other local interventions that had similar intended results? Were synergies actively sought and possible overlaps avoided? Why or why not?</p> <p>To what extent was the EUAA’s cooperation in Montenegro coherent with other interventions implemented by international organisations or civil society organisations that had similar intended results? Were synergies actively sought and possible overlaps avoided? Why or why not?</p>	<p>Evidence/examples of duplication between the EUAA’s cooperation and other actors’ interventions having been avoided</p>		<p>In-depth interviews with EUAA staff</p> <p>In-depth interviews with national authorities</p>
<p>EU added value: What is the additional EU added value resulting from the EUAA’s activities, compared to what could be achieved through individual EU Member States’ capacity development initiatives in Montenegro?</p>			
<p>What has been the EU added value of the EUAA’s cooperation in Montenegro compared to those of other actors (e.g., Member States supporting national third countries, interventions by</p>	<p>Evidence/examples of EU added value of the cooperation, pertaining to the relative effectiveness and efficiency of the cooperation in Montenegro compared to a hypothetical situation in</p>	<p>The EUAA’s cooperation in Montenegro added value compared to what could have been achieved by Member States or national third countries alone</p> <p>The EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap</p>	<p><i>Results from all other questions, notably pertaining to effectiveness, efficiency, coherence</i></p> <p>EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap 2022-2023</p> <p>Monitoring data/implementation plan</p>



Operationalised questions	Indicators/descriptors	Norms/judgement criteria	Indicative sources of evidence
<p>international/civil society organisations)?</p> <p>To what extent has the EUAA-Montenegro Roadmap 2022-2023 contributed to any progress made concerning the accession process of the country to the EU? What lessons can be learned for the future?</p> <p>Could the intended results of the cooperation have been achieved sufficiently by the Montenegrin authorities acting alone?</p> <p>Were the intended results met more efficiently by the EUAA than they would have been met by national authorities acting individually (larger benefits per unit cost stemming from economies of scale)?</p> <p>Is it still valid to assume that the intended results of the cooperation can best be met by action by the EUAA? What would be the most likely consequences of stopping or withdrawing the EUAA's cooperation?</p>	<p>which the EUAA's cooperation did not exist</p> <p>Evidence/examples of activities implemented or outputs/outcomes achieved by the cooperation that could not have been achieved (to the same extent or at the same speed) by national authorities acting alone</p> <p>Evidence of the EUAA's products (training modules, guidance documents, practical tools, ...) being of added value to national authorities</p> <p>Stakeholders' views on what would have happened without the Agency's support</p> <p>Evidence/examples of likely consequences of the EUAA's cooperation being stopped</p> <p>Evidence/examples of mechanisms or safeguards put in place by national authorities to ensure the sustainability of the cooperation should it be discontinued</p> <p>Examples of the contribution of the Roadmap to any progress made by Montenegro in the context of its accession journey to the EU</p>	<p>2022-2023 has contributed to the progress of Montenegro in its accession journey to the EU.</p>	<p>Interviews with EUAA personnel</p> <p>In-depth interviews with EUAA staff and national authorities</p> <p>In-depth interviews with EU and international stakeholders</p>



Annex 3: Intervention logic

Needs/problems	Expected objectives
<p>Need to strengthen the implementation of the law on international and temporary protection</p> <p>Need to strengthen the implementation of the law on international and temporary protection</p> <p>Need to strengthen the knowledge and technical capacity of case officers</p> <p>Develop personal interviews guides</p> <p>Need to increase reception system’s human resources and specific training</p> <p>Need to standardise operating procedures and workflows in reception</p>	<p>Contributing to effective asylum procedures</p> <p>Contributing to an effective reception system</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Result impact</p> <p>Enhance the protection space for asylum seekers and refugees in Montenegro in line with the CEAS and EU Member States’ practices</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Result outcomes</p> <p>Outcome 1: Strengthened ATP in line with the CEAS</p> <p>Outcome 2: Enhanced quality of decision making at the first instance in line with the CEAS</p> <p>Outcome 3: Strengthened capacity of national authorities to identify, assess and respond to the needs of minors</p> <p>Outcome 4: Strengthened reception system aligned with EU and EUAA standards for reception conditions.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Result outputs</p> <p>1.1 Enhanced identification of persons who may wish to apply for international protection in line with the CEAS</p> <p>1.2 Strengthened provision of guidance on follow-up assistance and procedural guarantees that should be provided to persons who may wish to apply for international protection in line with the CEAS</p> <p>2.1 Enhanced implementation of the key provisions of the law on international and temporary protection of foreigners of Montenegro at an operational level in line with the CEAS</p> <p>2.2 Enhanced technical skills of case officers in particular in interview techniques, evidence assessment, decision writing, decision assessment and use of COI in line with the CEAS</p> <p>3.1 Enhanced right compliance age assessment procedure</p> <p>3.2 Strengthened capacity of national authorities to implement the BIC in their daily work</p> <p>4.1 Enhanced alignment with the EU and EUAA reception standards of the planned extension of the asylum reception centres in Božaj and Spuž</p> <p>4.2 Increased efficiency of the reception system management</p>	



4.3 Enhanced knowledge, technical skills and competences in reception aligned with the CEAS and EU+ countries' practices

Activities

- 1.1.1. Development of the SOP on first contact and registration of intent to apply for asylum
- 1.1.2. Development of the SOP on lodging of the application
- 1.1.3. Participation in TtT sessions on the EUAA module on registration of applications for international protection and, where appropriate, support the organisation and delivery of national training sessions on the module
- 1.2.1. Adjustment of ATP toolkit to Montenegro's context
- 1.2.2. Workshop on use of the ATP toolkit
- 1.2.3. Organisation and delivery of training sessions on information provision to asylum seekers
- 2.1.1. Development of an SOP on examination
- 2.1.2. Development of tools intended to support case officers in their day-to-day work (legal guidance, interview guide, etc.)
- 2.2.1. Mentoring on technical skills (interview, evidence assessment, decision writing, decision assessment, COI research, COI preparation, use of COI)
- 2.2.2. Shadowing in EU Member States with the aim to increase technical skills (interview, evidence assessment, decision writing, decision assessment, COI research, COI preparation, use of COI)
- 2.2.3. Organisation of a workshop, aiming to identify the concrete training needs of national officials in areas which are key for the performance of their daily tasks and specific roles for the DfA, resulting in a training plan
- 2.2.4. Participation in EUAA TtT sessions in line with the training plan for the DfA
- 2.2.5. Support with the delivery of national training sessions of the identified modules
- 3.1.1. Development of age assessment process procedures, instruments and tools through expert support
- 3.1.2. Expert mission(s) and mentoring to support implementation EU + best practices on age assessment procedure and methods
- 3.2.1 Expert support to prepare a national training programme on the BIC in their daily work for the Mol in line with the Migration Management Strategy of Montenegro
- 4.1.1. Provide technical and expert advice for site design of planned extension of the reception centres in Božaj and Spuž in line with EU and EUAA standards and indicators on reception
- 4.1.2. Provide technical and expert support on organisation of sites and workflows in Božaj and Spuž in line with EU and EUAA standards and indicators on reception
- 4.2.1. Development of general reception protocols and SOPs for specific thematic areas, followed up by training/mentoring where necessary
- 4.2.2. Development of information provision workflow and information material for the phase of arrival in reception (adapted to different target audience)



4.3.1. Participation of reception officials in TtT sessions on the relevant EUAA reception modules and, where appropriate, support the organisation and delivery of national training sessions on these modules

4.3.2. Mentoring on prioritised thematic areas: general reception work; reception of vulnerable person; safety and security; communication; conflict management.

4.3.3. Thematic study visits and exchange programmes (e.g., planning of staffing needs, etc.)

Inputs

Financial resources – IPA funds, EUAA’s own resources

Human resources – time invested by Roadmap coordinator and supporting staff from the Agency

External factors

Effects of regional initiatives implemented by the EUAA; effects of initiatives implemented by other actors (e.g., UNHCR, IOM); COVID-19²⁸ pandemic; situation on the ground; humanitarian crises and migration trends

²⁸ Coronavirus disease 2019.