



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft  
Confédération suisse  
Confederazione Svizzera  
Confederaziun svizra



UNIJA ZA ODRŽIVI POVRATAK I  
INTEGRACIJE U BOSNI I HERCEGOVINI  
The Union for Sustainable Return and  
Integrations in Bosnia-Herzegovina

Monitoring of sustainable return in B&H / "Monitoring održivog povratka u BiH"

## Monitoring and verification of prioritized beneficiaries for return and reconstruction projects in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Reporting period:

**January 1<sup>st</sup> 2009 – June 30<sup>th</sup> 2009**

### Content:

- I. Review of the Project
- II. Applied Methodology
- III. Realised Activities
- IV. Partners and business cooperation
- V. Coming activities
- VI. Summary
- VII. Annex

---

The Project implements:  
**The Union for sustainable  
return and integrations in B&H**

# CONTENT

CONTENT .....	2
SECTION I - REVIEW OF THE PROJECT.....	3
SECTION II - APPLIED METHODOLOGY.....	4 – 5
<i>Process of beneficiary selection for house reconstruction .....</i>	4
<i>Strategy of the Union for monitoring of the beneficiary selection process for house reconstruction .....</i>	5
SECTION III - REALISED ACTIVITIES.....	6 - 17
<i>General pre- activities.....</i>	6
<i>Forming the monitoring teams.....</i>	6
<i>Education of the monitoring teams.....</i>	6
<i>Design/Creation of the Questionnaire and Data Base.....</i>	6
<i>Monitoring of return – Verification of the prioritized beneficiaries and estimation of the needs.....</i>	7
<i>Creation and distribution of reports about situation on the field.....</i>	10
<i>Brochure drafting –story recording.....</i>	17
SECTION IV - PARTNERS AND COOPERATIONS.....	17- 22
<i>Cooperation with representatives of local authorities.....</i>	17
<i>Cooperation with the Commission for refugees and displaced Persons in B&amp;H .....</i>	19
<i>Cooperation with the Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees B&amp;H.....</i>	20
<i>Cooperation with local NGOs.....</i>	22
<i>Cooperation with international NGOs.....</i>	23
<i>Media.....</i>	23
SECTION V - COMING ACTIVITIES.....	24
SECTION VI - CONCLUSION.....	24- 26

## I. REVIEW OF THE PROJECT

Signing the General Framework Agreement for Peace (GFAP) in Bosnia and Herzegovina marked the end of a four year war in BiH. The consequence of the war was the displacement of half of the country's population or 2.2 million people from their pre-war homes.

Today, after 13<sup>th</sup> years of Dayton Agreement, there are a large number of refugees and displaced persons who are still waiting the main preconditions for permanent return to be provided. The actual registration data of potential returnees show that approximately 43'000 families (including around 2'000 families who are still in collective centers) or 140'000 persons, still need reconstruction assistance in order to be able to return<sup>1</sup>.

However, in recent years the interest for financing the reconstruction programs has been decreasing because of the fact that real process of return is really low and the huge number of reconstructed housing units has in the meantime changed their owner. This especially affects the most vulnerable people: Internally displaced persons (IDPs) - potential minority returnees, who are living in poverty and are genuinely interested in return to their pre-war areas of residence.

Therefore the key priority set ahead by those responsible for the process of sustainable return is to ensure that IDPs, which fall within the most socially vulnerable categories of the population, and have expressed their genuine interest for return to their pre-war homes, are really the ones given priority in selection for return and housing reconstruction assistance programmes in period 2008-2010. With development and consistent use of transparent general and special criteria for selection of beneficiaries, the priority will be given to those in the most need and the return process speeded up.

The project that implements the Union for sustainable return and integrations in B&H implies monitoring and verification of prioritized beneficiaries for return and reconstruction projects in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**Overall goal of the project:** Contribution to the insurance of the basic preconditions for voluntary and sustainable return of minority returnees, respecting the principles of transparency and equality in prioritization of beneficiaries of return related assistance programmes.

**Purpose and output 1:** *Decreasing of Poverty of the most vulnerable ones among returnees, displaced persons and refugees by ensuring that support (reconstruction, economic support – employment opportunities, etc.) is being adequately distributed in accordance with the established criteria and priorities.*

**Purpose and output 2:** *Improving transparency of operations and accountability of the National Commission for Refugees and IDPs, National Fund for Return, Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees of BiH, as well as entities' Ministries for Refugees and IDPs.*

**Purpose and output 3:** *Establishing of basic pre-conditions for sustainability of return and effective utilization of financial means - joined funds of entities, Brcko District, Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees of B&H, and national and international donors - earmarked for the return assistance.*

The main **project activities** include combination of NGOs' capacity building, monitoring of return process, estimations of return, promotions, public advocacy, critics toward authorities: forming of monitoring teams, education of monitoring teams, creation of questionnaire and database, list verification of prioritized beneficiaries, monitoring of beneficiaries selection process, estimation of needs, reports drafting about mistakes on the field, distribution of the report to the competent institutions, media' monitoring, brochure drafting.

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: Ministry for human rights and refugees of B&H

**The project direct beneficiaries** are Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees of B&H, local authorities, entity governments, national and entity Institutions of Ombudsman, municipal associations of refugees, IDPs and returnees (members of the UARDP), NGOs dealing with human rights protection, and international donors.

**The end beneficiaries** of the project are IDPs and refugees – potential minority returnees, registered for return and housing reconstruction assistance, who are genuinely interested in return to their pre-war areas of residence, and who fulfill all criteria defined by the Law.

The project will cover the whole territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, wherever the return is happening.

**Project duration:** February 1<sup>st</sup> 2008 – December 31<sup>st</sup> 2010

**Budget of the project:** CHF 393'276.--

## II. APPLIED METHODOLOGY

### **Process of beneficiaries' selection for house reconstruction**

Institution competent for the process of sustainable return is state Commission for refugees and displaced persons of B&H (hereafter: The Commission). Commission's competence is coordination and stimulation of consultations between entities related to the implementation of projects for return, but also related to the questions of achieving of basic precondition for return and sustainability of returnees.

The Commission is especially competent for: <sup>2</sup>

- Approval of projects for reconstruction and return
- Approval of common projects
- Issuing of authorization for financial realisation of approved projects
- Monitoring of financial realisation of approved projects

Nomination of Commission's members performs the Presidency of B&H.<sup>3</sup> The Commission has nine (9) members (representatives of state and entities ministries for refugees and displaced persons), two (2) permanent participants in Commission's work from international organizations / institutions, three (3) observers from international organizations / institutions in B&H, as well as observers from NGOs - related with issues of refugees and displaced persons in B&H (representatives of the Union have status of observers).

The realization of the reconstruction project goes in following order: after the Commission approve the projects for reconstruction and allow resources for their implementation, selected municipalities accept main role in further project realisation on local level by signing "Memorandum of Understanding" (shortly MoU). In other words, municipal commissions perform the end beneficiaries' selection for reconstruction of houses.

In order to provide transparency of beneficiaries' selection process, the Commission drafted the Guideline for work of municipal commissions that obligates them to commit with the rules: "THE GUIDELINE ABOUT THE WAYS AND PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF BENEFICIARIES FOR RETURN AND RECONSTRUCTION PROJECTS".<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Commission competency is defined by Article 23. in "Law about refugees from B&H and displaced persons in B&H" ("Official Gazette of B&H", no. 23/99, 21/03 and 33/03)

<sup>3</sup> Based on Article 23. of „Law about refugees from B&H and displaced persons in B&H" ("Official Gazette of B&H", no. 23/99, 21/03 and 33/03) and proposed by Council of Ministries of B&H, Governments of entities and Government of District Brčko

<sup>4</sup> Based on Article 22. and 23. Of above mentioned Law

This Guideline determines the criteria and procedures for selection prioritized beneficiaries for return and reconstruction projects for the purpose of return, gives directions in implementation process of selection prioritized beneficiaries for reconstruction projects, and determines constitution and the way for work of municipal commissions for beneficiaries' selection.

Municipal Commission contains representatives of municipality, authorized representative of donor, representative of association that works on issues related to refugees and displaced persons and representative of associations of returnees.

The process of beneficiaries' selection on municipal level (after signing MoU with state Commission) goes in following order: forming of municipal commissions, publishing of notification for potential beneficiaries of assistance, identifying of general and special criteria's, scoring and end beneficiaries' selection.

### **Strategy of the Union for monitoring of beneficiaries selection process for reconstruction assistance**

Since the above mentioned procedure is very complex, it was necessary to draft Strategy for monitoring of entire process in order to obtain the projects aims. With regard to the involvement of all governmental levels in process of beneficiaries' selection for reconstruction assistance, the project implementer (the Union for sustainable return and integrations in B&H) has made such Strategy that enables the monitoring of that process on all authority levels.

The Strategy is based on so called "bottom-up" approach (from above to down). This approach means monitoring of process on level of citizens, on level of local community (local communities – the places of returnees), on level of municipality and on the state level. The monitoring of process means also data exchange in two directions between the Union and stakeholders on certain level, as follows:

- Monitoring on level of citizens / local communities includes exchange and gathering of information about potential returnees, as well as determination of needs for those who have returnees. The Union's Strategy in this level is work with 90 local associations – members (data exchange in both directions). The union gives the inputs – educates its members about beneficiaries selection process, about the ways and techniques of valuation about returnees' needs on the field, about the way of municipal commissions' work, where the Union members perform field visits and deliver reports to the Union.
- Monitoring on level of municipality means monitoring of municipal commissions' work. It is planned on way that representatives of associations (the Union' members) become a part of municipal commissions in order to monitor the commission's work directly. To realized this activity it is necessary to establish cooperation between the Union and municipality (to get approval of municipality), to lobby that representatives of associations become a part of municipal commissions. On this level it is planned data exchange between the Union and member associations (the Union educates its members about general and special criteria's for assistance distribution, and members deliver reports about the work of municipal' commissions to the Union)
- Monitoring on state level means receiving information from the field (from associations) and reactions towards higher authority levels: the Union as observer in state Commission (gives suggestions during selection of municipalities, delivers reports about observed malfunctions in work of municipal commissions, reports about wrong beneficiaries selection, and analysis of needs on the field as well), the Union as partner to the Ministry for human rights and refugees of B&H in drafting of Revised Strategy of return, reactions toward Parliament of B&H, etc.

Beside of these three-level monitoring, the Union informs the publicity in the same time about the results of monitoring – media´ covering of achieved results (cooperation with local and state media, press releases, etc)

This means continual inter-active communication of the Union with:

- 90 association – members: meetings with representatives of associations, sending of letters, educations, delivery of reports (monitoring of return, estimation of needs, prioritized beneficiaries list verification, the work of municipal commissions, current situation in return process, etc)
- Municipalities in B&H: meetings with municipal representatives, sending of letters, signing of MoU, reaction on the work of municipal commissions, participation in work of municipal commissions, receiving of reports about the wok of municipal commissions.
- Higher authority levels: meetings with representatives of institutions, participation in work of state Commission, monitoring of Commission´s Sessions, sending of letters, delivery of reports with suggestions, reactions about observed malfunctions, etc.
- Media on local and state level: media´s covering of all mentioned above, press releases, etc.

On the end archiving of all received documents: starting from monitors´ field reports, reports about the work of municipal commissions, reports of state Commission, to the work on revision of Strategy for return, etc.

### **III. REALIZED ACTIVITIES**

#### **General pre-activities**

Those activities include meetings between:

- The Union ↔ Associations: introducing the aims of the project, explanation of the beneficiary selection process and their role in it, agreement about candidate nominees in monitoring teams, defining the procedures of the Commission (circular letter, reporting system)
- The Union ↔ State institutions (Ministry for human rights and refugees of B&H, State commission for refugees and displaced persons, entity ministries for refugees): membership in Commission as observer, signing of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)
- The Union ↔ Municipality (municipal Commissions): contacting all selected municipalities, signing of the MoU, nominating („injecting „) representatives of member associations of the Union in work of municipal commissions.

#### **Forming the monitoring teams**

Described in previous Reports

#### **Education of the monitoring teams**

Described in previous Reports

#### **Design/Creation of the Questionnaire and Data Base**

Described in previous Reports

## **Monitoring of return – Verification of the prioritized beneficiaries and estimation of the needs**

It includes:

- Verification of the lists with prioritized beneficiaries on the field – verification if the real situation on the field accord to the data list (beneficiaries of the double assistance for reconstruction...)
- Nominees of potential beneficiaries identified on the field that are in real need and fulfilled general and special conditions for reconstruction assistance. Nomination toward municipal commissions.
- In the same time with list verification of selected beneficiaries, the monitoring of real return (those whose houses have been reconstructed) and estimation of socio-economic needs are under investigation.
- Preparation and sending the reports from the field (about lists correctness, about the work of municipal commissions, about eventually observed malfunctions, ...) to the Union

The main aim of this activity is to research, select and analyze information about actual/realistic situation of the refugee return process, as well as to give distinctive recommendations about the ways how to resolve identified problems and obstructions in implementing of human rights of refugees, displaced persons and returnees.

Information and recommendations in Report could also be used as base for defining next activities of domestic and international institutions and organizations involved in refugee return process.

According to our opinion, such method and the way of validation of the actual information present the best and the most effective method, not just for verification of prioritized beneficiary list related with reconstruction of destroyed houses, but also to submit the numbers of displaced persons, numbers of reconstructed and unreconstructed houses and infrastructures, as well as to submit the needs of the families for sustainable return.

In first semester of 2009, the Union for sustainable return and integrations in B&H, in coalition with its member associations, has continued with the monitoring of the selection process of beneficiaries related with house reconstruction projects. Validating the data on the field, certain irregularities have been observed in a work of municipal commissions.

The Union selected all reports from the field with observed irregularities and made the report that has been delivered to higher authority levels in B&H (see activity: „*Creation and distribution of the report on the situation on the field*“).

Related to the valuation of the needs, the Union for sustainable return and integrations in B&H investigates not just the segment of reconstruction of the houses, but the Union also concentrated its activities toward the 10 areas, such as employment, education, health care, infrastructure, social policy, return sustainability, care of older and invalid persons, and closing the collective centers for living.

**Working method** – communication with direct beneficiaries that need assistance; communication with municipal departments for general directory, presidents and secretaries of local community in municipalities, communication with the member associations of the Union from selected municipalities and through the field visits of our monitors.

After creating the method for work, 140 letters have been distributed to the addresses of municipal departments requesting the delivery of lists and contact details of the persons in local communities. It is a great pleasure that we have received replies/answers from 138 municipalities (only Usora and Uskoplje Municipalities did not send any reply). Based on selected contact details of local community representatives, the address book of local communities in B&H has been made (**the address book contains 2.244 local communities, regarding 138 municipalities**) (see **Annex 1.**)

We have to highlight that the Union, until present day, has signed 62 memorandums of understanding (MoU) with municipalities, while the memorandum signing with other municipalities that have expressed their wish for cooperation is in progress.

From the start till now, we have communicated with 2.244 local communities and received their support for this work. Summary, we have summarized and elaborated data for 50 municipalities, 437 local communities with returned population (from totally 823 local communities) and 123 places in municipalities where people live with no local community formed. All data are analytically shown. During the field visits of the monitoring teams between 01.02.2008 – 01.06.2009, over 18.000 families have been contacted, where 11.635 families are identifies as returnees; 6.172 families with status of „displaced persons“ have not been recorded in data base of Ministry for refugees, and 351 internally displaced persons.

For relative short time, the great success of monitoring teams have been accomplished, not just in summarizing and elaborating of data, but also in analyze of collected information's.

Summarized data have been used for creation of analysis/ recommendations/ reports. By analyze, the real effects of return have been submitted, and our monitors have specially collected information about actual returnees - families that have been seen in their houses.

For each municipality, each monitor had descriptively to show all visited areas and to deliver summarized facts and data.

In a following spreadsheet is presented the table-illustration of main data for 50 municipalities. **Annex 2** of this Report presents **detailed analysis made in areas of municipalities shown in this spreadsheet.**

No.	Municipality	Number of returnees (persons)	Number of returnees (families)	Number of reconstructed houses	Number of destroyed houses
1.	BANJA LUKA	4.933	1740	2641	872
2.	BILEĆA	4	3	2	39
3.	BOS.GRAHOVO	2.000	671	886	1.559
4.	BOS. PETROVAC	3.605	1.242	1.318	639
5.	<b>BRČKO DISTRIKT</b>	37.336	10.933	8.631	2.466
6.	ČAPLJINA	5.748	1.928	861	227
7.	ČELINAC	64	30	42	31
8.	DERVENTA	4.261	1.373	1.377	4.319
9.	DOBRETIĆI	672	180	62	1.156
10.	DONJI VAKUF	197	121	1.433	970
11.	DONJI ŽABAR	220	72	70	2
12.	DRVAR	11.450	3.178	379	451
13.	FOČA-USTIKOLINA	2.839	947	1.080	550
14.	GACKO	48	18	80	200
15.	GLAMOČ	3000	1000	1.010	459
16.	G. VAKUF-USKOPLJE	2.780	776	851	300
17.	GRADIŠKA	9.312	2.451	1.168	336
18.	HADŽIĆI	3.900	1.650	1.930	114
19.	ISTOČNA ILIDŽA	629	170	170	10
20.	JEZERO	3.305	1.115	1.030	84
21.	KAKANJ	3.433	1.383	433	1000
22.	KALINOVIK	42	26	26	170
23.	KLADANJ	323	105	130	189
24.	KONJIC	3.402	1.098	1.098	3.522
25.	KRUPA NA UNI	1.763	593	394	56
26.	KUPRES - FBIH	214	116	170	277
27.	LIVNO	1659	580	650	543
28.	LOPARE	1.815	527	523	228



29.	LJUBINJE	29	8	7	110
30.	MAGLAJ	14.050	4.221	4.005	904
31.	MODRIČA	3.203	1.063	551	669
32.	NEVESINJE	102	42	96	79
33.	OLOVO	2.906	724	675	386
34.	PALE	185	85	84	76
35.	PRNJAVOR	7.818	2.191	213	357
36.	PROZOR-RAMA	3.370	1.125	1.125	300
37.	RIBNIK	7.907	2.962	1.052	387
38.	ROGATICA	1.705	660	781	1.003
39.	RUDO	321	127	270	668
40.	SANSKI MOST	4.584	1.481	960	2.462
41.	SAPNA	424	194	148	768
42.	SREBRENICA	4.082	1.774	2.431	2.516
43.	STOLAC	5.400	1.460	2.250	1.203
44.	TRAVNIK	17.845	5.875	4.384	3.519
45.	TRNOVO FBIH	1.819	700	688	243
46.	TRNOVO - RS	575	258	236	81
47.	USTIPRAČA	4.678	1.389	1.007	375
48.	VAREŠ	2.926	1.036	851	1.679
49.	VIŠEGRAD	1.400	426	448	604
50.	ZAVIDOVIĆI	5.537	1.925	1.054	778
51.	ZENICA	6.259	2.961	365	768
	<b>TOTALLY</b>	<b>206.079</b>	<b>66.713</b>	<b>52.126</b>	<b>40.704</b>

In order to show the real situation in the refugee return process, we have to mention and to remind on the official/ state statements as follows:

There were 2, 2 million displaced persons; it is estimated that after Dayton Agreement around one million persons returned to their pre-war houses. 125.072 persons (41.013 families) are still waiting for help/ assistance in reconstruction of houses, in order to return in their pre-war homes.

From above presented table, it can be observed that till now in 50 municipalities 66.173 of families or 206.079 persons are returned in their pre-war houses, which summarized in percent presents:

- From totally number of 143 municipalities in B&H, 35% of them have been elaborated, and according to that facts it makes more than 1/3 researched municipalities in B&H.
- In researched municipalities, 206.079 persons have been returned or in percents it makes 19, 5 % returnees from data officially presented in public, which is less than 1/5.

**We have to emphasize that the information very often presented in public by the Union, where in their pre-war houses live just 1/3 of returnees from totally numbers presented by official institutions, will be sooner or later true.**

Example:

It has to be specially emphasized that the real information about situation related with the refugee return process is not as it is presented and manipulated in public. As an example, we will take a Canton Sarajevo: official statements present information that in this Canton 25.315 families or 81.000 persons of Serbs have been returned. Those figures handles Cantonal ministry for social welfare, displaced persons and refugees in Sarajevo, and they are presented in

public. We ask ourselves, where do these people live, when they are not found in their houses / apartments, in which today some other owners live. What was the way for summarizing of those figures and data? Was it on way, as many municipalities use to work, based on temporary registration and sign-out or based on some other elements? From that reasons, our figures and data are on many ways different from official statements handled by investigated municipalities, since our data analysis was made by actually situation on the field.

What specially concerns us is the fact that return of property does not mean at the same time as actual return. Property has been returned in 99, 7%, but actual return has been made in much less figures.

### **Creation and distribution of reports about situation on the field**

After field visits, the members of monitoring teams and representatives of the associations have sent their reports to the main office of the Union. All received reports from the field have been stored in headquarter of the Union in Sarajevo.

The project team of the Union started with analysis of all received reports and, based on that, the Union made valuation of the situation on the field related with the refugee returns process and archived the following **analysis/ reports/ recommendations**:

#### **A) REPORT ABOUT OBSERVED MALFUNCTIONS IN A WORK OF MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONS**

After overall data acquisition, certain weaknesses have been observed related to the:

- On 20.05.2009, state Commission has made decision about resource distribution for house reconstruction for year 2008 that includes 57 municipalities and District Brčko. The value of the project is estimated on 21, 8 million KM, which according to estimations would be enough to reconstruct 900 houses (24.000 KM per each unit / house). After that decision, the MoR has been signed with selected municipalities, but till present day none house has been reconstructed.
- In compare with previous praxis of local and international implement organizations for houses reconstruction assistance, discriminatory behavior based on national key related with selection process of beneficiaries is observed at first place.
- A strong political influence from a side of those who decide the prioritized areas makes it clear that resources have been directed in municipalities where majors belong to the same political party, which is in other words „vote buying“ – the influence of certain state officers and persons from some political parties on municipal commissions for reconstruction and beneficiary selection. Irregularities have been observed in reconstruction of houses, from resources estimated for return, for persons that are not returnees and whose houses were not existed in present address before the war.
- Funds for return (collected in Fund for return) are losing the name purpose, since there are not distributed for purposes they should (example of Zvornik);
- Selection of the prioritized municipalities is transparent only after the list has been published – it has to be asked: when and who decides, under which conditions and way selection is made? We find that this praxis has to be changed and that data/ information from civil society, specially our organization, which has an aim

to deliver them relevant information's (related to reconstruction, collective centers of living, infrastructure, employment, economic support to process of refugee return, social protection, etc), need to be evaluated.

- Reconstruction of buildings with collective living is also irrational. Is it done with purpose or without it, but reconstruction of buildings is planned for objects with insufficient number of returnees, where the resources are approved for entire building.
- Resources directed for facade renewal, but not for objects.
- Resources for sustainable return are used for reconstruction of religion objects. With monitoring, we determined that there are no returnees in such communities.
- Infrastructure-electrification, roads, water distribution network (...) is under construction, but data about reconstruction are surprising for returnees since their suggestions are missed out and no one consult them about priorities during assistance delivery.
- Ministry for human rights and refugees B&H, Commission for refugees and displaced persons B&H should have coordinating role, which is on the field unfortunately not observed and inappreciable.
- Commission stand not for procedures defined by Guide, specially related to the resources obtained from other sources (international donations...)
- Over high-level preconditions for beneficiary selection und recognized problems during the rating process (reactions to the commissions in Vogosca Municipality, reaction of „Democratic initiative of Sarajevo Serbs“-Ilidza, humanitarian organization „Centar zivota“ Konjic).
- Political parties influence is recognized in a work of municipal commissions. As members of those commissions, beside the representatives of refugees associations, there are representatives from political parties that have more influential role than other members of the commission (corruption and political favoritism):
  - During the work of the municipal commission in Bosanska Kostajnica, political divergence occurred and the president and one member left commission.
  - All members of municipal commission in Travnik shared the same opinion that beneficiary selection should be done without national key principle.
  - Reactions of associations for refugees and displaced persons from municipalities: Novo Sarajevo, Kotor Varoš, Zvornik, Bosanski Brod,...
- Although some candidates/ beneficiary are selected, they are being removed from the lists.
- Some doubts related with correctness of certain data are expressed by potential beneficiaries (reactions from Municipalities Rudo, Višegrad, Bijeljina, Sokolac, Osmaci,...)
- Certain number of municipal Commissions works with a same team/structure in a last few years, so there is a need to examine memberships and nominations of new commissions.

## **B) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SELECTION OF PRIORITIES RELATED WITH PROJECTS OF REFUGEES RETURN (SPECIALLY STRAIGHTENING RETURN PROCESS OF REFUGEE YOUTH) IN A FOLLOWING MUNICIPALITIES**

**Donji Vakuf** – conditions for refugee return are not adequate – there were no donations for sustainable return – unsuccessfully applied – from 685 returnees (noted in 2004) just 194 stayed .

**Derventa** – 869 families have expressed a wish for return – it is necessary to provide them a possibility for house reconstruction and for programs of sustainable return.

**Bosanski Petrovac** – For a while, 10 families live by neighbors and relatives waiting for reconstruction of their houses.

**Banovići** – Seona local community – 35 houses need to be reconstructed for families that live by relatives and neighbors.

**Berkovići** – it is necessary to reconstruct three houses for families Raguž, Tuka and Kohnić, since for a while they live in this area and waiting to obtain donation.

**Bosansko Grahovo** – this place requires a higher level of resources for reconstruction, since there are 1.559 unreconstructed units including reconstruction of 10 buildings with apartments.

**Drvar** – Vrtoče local community – 12 families live in inadequate houses for living (nylon instead of roof and windows)

**Lopare** – to build ambulance in local community Završje, since returnees have to travel 22 km to the nearest health building (in Lopare).

**Oštra Luka** – it is necessary to build ambulance (since doctor visits this place one a week), and for all other needs and interventions refugees need to go to the nearest ambulance, which is 40 km far away.

**Prnjavor** – Local community Lišnja – requires a higher distribution of resources for return, since on this place 120 families have expressed their wish to return. In Galjipovci local community, 2 families live during all four seasons of the year by neighbors waiting for reconstruction of their own houses. In the same local community, there was no any assistance for sustainable return (needlessly three tradesman returnees have requested for assistance in order to open stores; they live in this community for a while)

**Sanski Most** – Local Community Fajtovci- in a village Pijevci there are no returnees, since no single one of 300 houses is reconstructed.

**Sapna** – Local Community Skakovica – in this place, politic was involved in refugees return process – only 20 families have returned, and the same number of houses is reconstructed. A wish for return expressed over 200 families, but there is no donations and reconstruction of houses (320 houses require reconstruction). Returnees have to carry water from source in forest that is 300 meters far away. They also do not have school and ambulance.

**Stolac** - Discrimination during the employment process has to be solved (for example Municipality Stolac): In local government work 41 Croat and only 10 Bosniaks. In high school work 35 Bosniaks based on piece work agreement - no one in full (constant) employment.

**Vareš** – Local Community Brgulje – three Stanišić families in this community are waiting for reconstruction of their houses. In village Čamovina – 2 families (Kapetanovići and Todorović) live in log cabin waiting for house reconstruction. For family Topalić, the house has been reconstructed, but electricity is not connected.

A wish for return exists, but based on low assets of house owner, they are not in position to visit their estates. It is indicative that in last year no one of Serb houses is reconstructed. There is just one school boy that is occasionally visited by teacher - that is "normal education".

Local Community Dubostica – political influence (SDA-HDZ) is observed - that is the reason why returnees are not selected in certain assistance program. Out of 120 families in this place before the war, just 8 families have returned. Since 2001 refugee return process is stopped – no one has returned.

**Zavidovići** – in local community Vračevac, returnees received donors' assistance in strawberry plants, that are successfully raised and in market presented. They expressed need for assistance in order to enlarge curtain plantations and to involve more returnees in work.

### **C) WEAK RETURN – BAD BENEFICIARY'S ASSISTANCE SELECTION**

As special fact we emphasize that very bad beneficiary's assistance selection in certain municipalities is a reason not just for very weak return, but it also gives unrealistic picture about the number of real returnees in following municipalities:

**Zvornik Municipality** – over 1.000 reconstructed houses – no one lives in those houses and house owners still have status of returnees even if they live in some other places.

**Kupres Municipality** – in a city part, 4 families returned (2 older ladies, 1 older man and 2 persons, that work in police). 90% of property is sold. It is concerning, that the government of Republic Croatia reconstructed 420 houses for Serb returnees and that the owners sold their houses to immigrant Croat families from different parties in Bosnia & Herzegovina.

**Travnik** – more adequate beneficiaries selection for receiving of assistance; For example: on one side, houses are built for those who do not live in them or just visit them occasionally – In local community Vitovlje no one lives in 17 reconstructed houses.; In local community Korićani, 10 reconstructed houses are occasionally used; In local community Ilovača three houses are occasionally visited; in local community Mehurići, five houses are also occasionally visited; On the other side, in local community Zagrađe – 2 families permanently live in this area, but their houses are not reconstructed and they are waiting for donations several years. In this local community, there is just one reconstructed house.

**Višegrad** – house reconstructions is for families that do not live in them, for example: in village Kapetanovići 7 reconstructed houses; In local community Drinsko, from 35 reconstructed houses, in just 8 of them reside families. In village Đankići, there are 8 reconstructed houses – in one of them live returnees; In local community Klačnik, there are 30 reconstructed houses and they are used from springtime till autumn. In the same local community during the year live 2 families in improvised objects and wait for house reconstruction. Otherwise, in area of this municipality, in many villages there is no return of refugees – properties are uncared (rusty).

**Vareš** – Local community Dragovići, village Kopjari – Out of 60 Croat families, just one returned in this village. In little village Borovičke Ive, 20 houses are completely devastated, and no one has returned.

**Zavidovići** – in local community Dolac, 54 Serb families have returned, but based on bad living conditions and unemployment, youth are leaving this place (just three returnees actually work) and the rest of population never received any kind of assistance for sustainable return. Older population is requesting building of ambulance and chapel in grave-yard. In local community Dolina Alići – villages' Šimići and Kneževići there are 12 employed returnees who need to travel 24 km far away in order to work in Žepče.

**Zenica** – unsatisfactory return and high % of soled property are evident. Just in the time between January and October 2003, 2.142 apartments and 384 houses have been sold, according to the office of taxation authority. It is estimated that the owners were Serbs. This process is still going on.

## D) EDUCATION

**Seeing that the category of youngest returnees is most jeopardized, it is necessary to improve education conditions, and especially in the following municipalities:**

- Bosansko Grahovo – out of 15 pre-war schools, just 2 of them have been reconstructed
- Kakanj – the reconstruction of elementary school in Slapnica
- Zavidovići – local community Dolac – 10 scholars walk 6 km to the nearest school in Bočinja
- Lopare – local community Priboj – children have to walk 6 – 8 km to the nearest school. The same case is in local community Konakovići, where 9 scholars daily walk 24 km to the nearest school.
- Olovo – the school is physically in bad conditions with 137 scholars up to 5<sup>th</sup> grade.
- Rudo – local community Strgačina – the school with 1.470 scholars before the war, is not reconstructed. That is the reason of weak return of youth in this area. Unemployment is a big problem. Currently, just one returnee works (as Registrar).
- Stolac – two schools under the same roof.
- Čapljina – two schools under the same roof.
- Kiseljak – two schools under the same roof.

## E) INFRASTRUCTURE

### **Returnee households without electrification**

Bosanski Petrovac – Local community Bjelaj – in villages Cimeše and Vekići, there are 8 households that live without electrification; In local community Kapnjuh – 12 households live without electrification; Village Skakavac – 3 households live almost 8 years in dark; Village Marjanovići -11 households live without electrification; Local community Vrtoče – Families that have returned in 2001 in villages Prkosi and Oraško Brdo still live without electrification. Village Risovac – 3 households do not have electrification.

Kneževo – Local community Gornji Korićani, 3 hosholders live without electrification, and in the whole area, there is a problem with inadequate electrification.

Berkovići – settlements Zabrđe, Žegulja and Gornja Bitunja do not have electrification.

Kupres RS – settlement Bajrovići – 10 households live in dark.

Višegrad – without electricity are the following villages: Rohti, Dubočica and Đankići with total 32 hosholds. Project for electrification is made last year and it was sent to the Federal ministry for refugees and displaced persons. Up to date, there is no answer; Local community Drinsko, 10 households live without electrification; Local community Crni Vrh – 18 households live without electricity, Orahovica – 18 hosholders live without electrification, Gornja and Donja Brštanica 20 households live without electrification.

Pelašicevo – Local community Blaževac – as result of mined road, the construction of electricity transformer is stopped, and 38 families are still waiting for better electricity delivery; Petrovo – local community Kaluđerica – village Rovine and Vrela 10 householders without electrification.

Prnjavor- Local community Kulaši – returnees are not in position to give 50 KM in order to buy electricity meter, and for those supplies no one wants to help them.

Ribnik –settlement Mrazovo with its 12 returnee households (52 persons –thereof 3 young scholars) does not have electrification. The electrification project is applied to Ministry for human rights and refugees B&H, and it is not selected for its realization till now. The project value is 200.000 KM and participation of Municipality is estimated about 30.000 KM.

Rogatica – without electrification are the following villages: village Trnovo – 5 families; village Orahovo – 5 families; village Kopjerci – 5 families; village Šljedovići – 20 families; village Nahota – 3 households; village Radići – 7 households; village Kamen – 2 households; village Prosječno – 5 families; One returnee live during the year in a hut house without electricity. In village Starčice, the households of Bosnaks do not have electrification, but Serb households have. In local community Kukavice 12 households are without electrification.

Sanski Most – without electrification are the following places: Local Community Vrhpolje – settlements Podovi with 10 households and part of the village Kozići. Settlement Tomina belongs to Federation B&H and 30 households do not have electrification; Village Sehovci – 30 households without electrification; Local community Zdena – village Vukinici (4 households) and Brankovići;

Sapna – Local community Nezuk – 6 families (returnees) live in this area just during the summer-time, since they do not have electrification.

Stolac – Necessary to network electrification in villages: Komanje Brdo (2 families), Burmaci (2 families), Dragovilje (1 family) and Carevo (2 families).

Ustiprača – Almost 7 years in villages Borik Brdo, Kalnici and Osoje, 30 families live without electrification; In local community Jabuka – villages Surovi, Zamegresi, Džuve, Borove hamlet and Zakalje (7 families – 5 Serb and 2 Bosniak don't have electrification). In village Mahovići, 5 households are without electrification.

### **Water and sewage network**

Bosansko Grahovo – from totally 55 km of water network, until now are just 3, 5 kilometers reconstructed; sewage network with its 7, 5 km length is not reconstructed at all.

Čelić – In local community Brezje, destroyed water network was reconstructed by Mercy Corps Tuzla, which was in function just 15 days. Inhabitants are still trying to supply themselves with water on different ways, since reconstructed waterworks is not in use.

Kakanj – need for reconstruction of water network in local community Ričica and Slapnica; need for reconstruction of sewage network in local community Zgošće – villages Crnač and Slapnica.

Zavidovići – as result of unresolved problem related to the sewage network in local community Alići, inhabitants are faced with infections and often epidemics. In this area, there is a need for reconstruction of water work "Vrelo" (water network length is 8 kilometers). There is a need for building of water network pool in Crnjevo (the project proposal is done, but there are no resources for its realisation) and reconstruction of old water work "Krš". Essentially, returnees in those areas are forgotten by all political levels.

Lopare – In local community Priboj – settlements Džemat and Brijest – 80 households have returned and there are no resources for building of water network. People live under very difficult conditions (because of poverty and unpaid bills, the electricity is for a while turned off for 19 families – returnees)

Olovo – In local community Luke – out of three water works, no one is reconstructed. In local community Kruševo – water work 30 years old is not in function.

Prnjavor – Local community Kulaši – in some areas, 25 years old water network is destroyed as result of woods transport and returnees are faced with difficulties in water delivery. They do not have own resources to reconstruct damages, and local authority is not interested in this problem.

### **The unreconstructed roads**

Bosansko Grahovo – out of 49, 6 km of asphalt road, just 6,5 kilometers are reconstructed; 113 kilometers of macadam road is in very bad condition.

Ribnik – it is necessary to reconstruct macadam road from settlement Pavići to Mrazovo (6 kilometers), as well as macadam road between Mrazovo and Bunarevo (6 km).

G.Vakuf- Uskoplje – Part of the road (in length of 5 km) between Kladuša and Lužani is in very bad condition.

Bosanska Gradiška – In local community Novo Selo – Dolina, it is necessary to demine some parts of the road and to repair the rest of the road.

Kakanj – it is necessary to reconstruct the roads in local communities Poljani, Seoce, Haljinići, Lučići, Ričica and Čatići.

Vareš – Local community Javorak – there is a dump trash in excursion site Ponikve. In a present tunnel, the water venthole is plugged and it makes overflows that inrush the road making big holes which is the reason for continually road closing. In this municipality, the areas in villages Zubete and Mačak are still mined.

Prnjavor – Local community Kulaši – local road is in very bad condition even for the walking, especially during rainy periods.

Sanski Most – On the road between Sanski Most and Bosanski Novi, it is necessary to asphalt 12 kilometers of the road. Road section Stanića Brdo – Lušci Palanka is in very bad condition, there for dairy farm denounced milk buying and returnees do not have other buyers to sell milk, which is the only income in family. In this municipality, some parts in following areas are still mined: Tomina, Tramošnja, Škrleševita, Poljak, Podvidača and Slatina.

\* \* \*

All above mentioned analysis, suggestions/reports, the Union has delivered to higher authority levels (in the first place to the Ministry for human rights and refugees B&H, state Commission, entity ministries) in a form of letter and bilateral meetings with representatives from mentioned institutions. On these meetings, as well as with participating on regular sessions of working bodies mentioned institutions, the Union informed all participants of working bodies about current situation related to the process of return, presented Reports, named the problems and their possible solving (drafting of Revised Strategy for return, the work of state Commission – selection of municipalities and revision of the work of state Commission, the work on revision of Guideline for beneficiary selection in reconstruction assistance,...).

Our advocacy towards higher levels of government is conceived on way that the monitors' observations are becoming the subject of discussions of those who are responsible for transparency in spending money, emphasizing that results of our analysis show very low number of real returns on the field. Return and its sustainability are impacted by complex political situation and with teamwork it is necessary to ensure that funds receive prioritized beneficiaries.



### Results:

The Union has submitted Report about observed malfunctions of municipal commissions (Report A) to the Ministry for human rights and refugees B&H, as well as to state Commission (letter "Remarks on work of municipal Commissions for beneficiary selection in projects of house reconstruction" was sent).

The state Commission, prompted by reaction of the Union and "remarkable reactions of other organizations and individuals on the work of municipal commissions, as well as by own cognition, expressed disappointment about observed malfunctions" and "concluded that during beneficiary selections certain municipalities seriously derogated from procedures about beneficiary selection".<sup>5</sup>

Caused with mentioned above, the Commission requested from municipalities to revise all made decisions, starting from decision about forming the Commission for beneficiary selection to the decision about beneficiary list creation, and additionally to check, for all received requests, the criteria satisfaction.

As result of this, out of 57 municipalities, 9 municipalities are returned in newly procedure because of marked malfunctions.<sup>6</sup>

### **Brochure drafting – story recording**

Instead of brochure, and with a previous donor approval, it is recorded the documentary story under the name "House on the end of road" with duration of 28 minutes. The story is recorded in coproduction with "BLICKO" firm from Tuzla and "PRIMP" firm from Brcko. The story is submitted with previous Report, and it was showed on BHT, FTV, RTRS, NTV HAYAT, TVSA, as well within the network „BH VEZE“ and other cantonal TV stations. Thanks to story, the public is informed about real situation of return process (through three returnees stories), but also with efforts of the Union for sustainable return and integrations in B&H, as well of Ministry for human rights and returnees in B&H, in area of returnees issues.

## **IV. PARTNERS AND BUSINESS COORPORATION**

### **Cooperation with local authorities**

We emphasize the fact that from 86 representatives of the Union proposed as members in municipal Commissions for beneficiary selection, 42 of them are accepted.

### **MEETINGS:**

**Bosansko Grahovo** – problem of return process, Mayor Uroš Makić

**Doboj-Jug** – Office for civil defense

**Jezero** – Deputy Mayor Mr. Dragan Strugalović. Dialog was about current priority, which is regulation of Jošavka river catchment, since this river floods regional road Bihać-Sarajevo and local returnees' houses.

**Kladanj** – The conversation with Mayor of this municipality Mr. Fuad Imamović about reasons for low return in this area, especially return of displaced persons Serb nationality. Out of 3.645 pre-war inhabitants, just 323 persons have

<sup>5</sup> Citations from documents „Letter of Commission for refugees and displaced persons B&H to all municipalities that implement project „ZP08“ since 8th December 2008“ and „Protocol from the 13th Session of Commission for refugees and displaced persons B&H“ (recorded on 26th January 2009).

<sup>6</sup> „Work statement for 2008“ of Commission for refugees and displaced persons B&H, media articles (ONASA; BHT...)

returned till now. To this conversation attended our representative, member of Serb Civil Council (SGV), Mr. Dušan Lekić. It was discussed the question why property selling is so much presented in this municipality.

**Krupa na Uni** – meeting was held with Mayor Mladen Kotur about issues related to the unemployment of returnees with remark that 25 woman returnees, worked in factory “Zlatna igla”, are dismissed and registered at Employment Institute. It is suggested to make efforts in order to start production of textile in current building, in local community Osredak (failed just machines). It was also discussed about changing the current wooden pillars for electricity that were made in 1972, and about donations for local community Hašani that were used for other purposes. It was discussed about possibilities to reconstruct water network in local community Vranovina (within the reconstruction of Una-Sana river basin financed by Switzerland), where live 26 returnees’ households.

**Domaljevac-Šamac** – meeting with Mayor Željko Josić about development of municipality, about deficiency of cultural and educational institutions for young returnees, which would be a precondition to attract young people and to animate them for return.

**Fojnica** – possibilities for return of young people through more employment and house reconstruction – conversation with municipal representatives’ initialized by Mr. Mato Knežević – Service for reconstruction

**Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje** – Office for civil defense, housing and communal work, reconstruction and environment – Mr. Abid Tihak – it is urgent to reconstruct partly reconstructed 10 houses and road Kladaša-Lužani in length of 5 kilometers.

**Kupres RS** – meeting with Mayor Goran Zubić about water network project that is composed, but 2 million KM are needed. It is also discussed about project of booster building in settlement Bajrovići, for whose implementation are resources also needed. In that settlement, 10 houses of returnees’ households are not connected on electrical network.

**Bosanska Gradiška** – conversation with Mayor Nikola Kragulj about reconstructed ambulance that needs to be put in function, since inhabitants have to walk 8 kilometers to the nearest health institution. Analysis within returnees has to be done in order to determine if such profession is presented among returnees in order to employ them.

**Banovići** – letter is addressed to the Mayor of this municipality requesting assistance in local community Aljkovići, since three households in village Laze do not have electricity. For coupling, returnees have to pay 5.000 KM – money that they do not have.

**Višegrad** – Resulted with low return and beneficiary selection for assistance in municipality Višegrad, we have discussed with Mr. Mahić Nedžad – coordinator for return

**Vareš** – With coordinator for local communities Mr. Salih Ganić and with officer from Department for social activities Mr. Rusmir Bereberović, it was discussed about trash depot in excursion site “Ponikve” and reconstruction of tunnel “Ponikve” that requires lower material investment.

**Prnjavor** – Related to the entire process of return in areas of municipality Prnjavor and problems with returnees are faced, it was discussed with mayor adviser Mr. Muhamed Kopic.

**Rogatica** – At the meeting about electrification and entire process of return attended Mr. Kemo Čamdžija (president of Municipality Assembly) and Mr. Mehmed Mešić – returnee.

**Travnik** – realized contact with deputy mayor Mr. Mato Jozak and Department for general administration Mrs. Koviljka Anić – the subject of conversation was distribution of donor resources and more proper priorities determination for house reconstruction.

**Sanski Most** – In this town, for who we consider that lower number of returnees Serb nationality is recorded, was organized the meeting (in assistance with Mr. Slobodan Radosevic- returnees representative) with Mr. Dragan Praštalo (president of Municipality Assembly), deputy mayor Mrs. Mevlida Deumić and with municipal officer for refugees and displaced persons Mr. Semir Praštalo.

**Zavidovići** – Insufficient assistance for returnees, that consider themselves forgotten by all authority levels, was the subject of discussion with Mayor Mr. Osmić Hakija.

**Jajce, Ribnik, Ključ** – In these three municipalities, specific results are evident, so we consider that the level of citizens’ participation in decision making process will be higher in the future, based on their capacities and opportunities to perform public advocacy in order to protect basic human rights of most jeopardized population called returnees.

**Doboj, Odžak, Modriča** – A great satisfaction for us is improved cooperation between local authorities and NGOs in areas of these three municipalities. For July 2009, it is planned to be held six (6) public discussions in six (6) multiethnic local communities in areas of those three municipalities, where citizens will participate in creation/drafting of Action Plans for community development of those local communities.

**Brčko District** – Continuous cooperation with Department for displaced persons and refugees of District Brcko was through the meetings where attended chief of Department (Mrs. Branka Žilić-Đurić) and chief assistant (Mr. Enes Šerifović). With above mentioned representatives of District Brcko, we have visited local communities Kruhakovac, Mujkići, Meraja, Ivici. When mandate for Department chief ended and re-election started, we reacted and lobbied for newly selection of Mrs. Đurić-Žilić. Our explanation was based on all positive results in process of return, wherein Mrs. Đurić-Žilić has made remarkable efforts.

In coming period, we will continue to connect and to improve cooperation on other areas as well.

### **Cooperation with the Commission for refugees and displaced persons in B&H**

Three sessions are held from the beginning of 2009 (13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Session)

#### **A) ON 26<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2009 IT WAS HELD THE 13<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF COMMISSION FOR REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS IN B&H**

2<sup>nd</sup> point of Agenda Session was planned for list verification and confirmation of priorities of municipality for Project “ZP08” in order to obtain correct regulations and entities, national and other balances.

Out of 58 Municipalities (including District Brcko), 42 Municipalities have made final lists (including 3 later submitted lists). The rest of municipalities submitted preliminary lists or just evident lists, while municipalities Bratunac and Stolac did not have any contact with Ministry for human rights and refugees B&H related with realization of procedures in assistance beneficiaries selection within the scope of “ZP08”.

#### **After discussion, the following conclusions are accepted:**

Commission verified 33 beneficiaries lists (for municipalities Bijeljina, Brčko Distrikt, Bugojno, Čajniče, Čapljina, Dobretići, Donji Vakuf, Foča, Foča-Ustikolina, Goražde, Gradiška, Ilijaš, east Novo Sarajevo, Jajce, Kakanj, Ključ, Konjic, Kotor Varoš, Lukavac, Maglaj, Modriča, Prozor-Rama, Ravno, Rogatica, Rudo, Sarajevo-Ilidža, Sokolac, Šamac, Travnik, Trnovo, Vareš, Višegrad and Zvornik).

Commission did not verify 9 lists (of municipalities Bos. Brod, Sarajevo-Centar, Derventa, Fojnica, Novo Sarajevo, Srebrenica, Teslić, Tuzla and Vogošća); Compositied Commission was formed for those municipalities (representatives from Ministry for human rights and refugees B&H, Commission for refugees and displaced persons of B&H, Fund for return and municipal representative) in order to check all documents based on law procedures and to inform Commission about their suggestions related to successful lists verification.

In municipalities that did not deliver their final lists, Ministry for human rights and refugees will send urgency and request final list delivery, but in counterpart Ministry will consider repeal of funds planned for those municipalities.

Members are informed with:

- Decisions about resources transaction of Ministry, aimed for emergency needs, and
- Decisions about resources schedule for emergency needs aimed for return of displaced persons, returnees and refugees.

#### Emergency needs in amount of 1.540.000 KM are approved for ca. 160 prioritized beneficiaries in 58 municipalities.

Resources are aimed for implementation of sustainable return projects, reconstruction/building of water networks, road and bridge reconstructions, reconstruction of farm objects, buying multi-cultivators (for 89 beneficiaries), assistance in building-reconstruction of houses (for 54 beneficiaries), building/reconstruction of barns (for 8 beneficiaries), cows for 9 beneficiaries, etc.

## **B) 27<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2009 WAS HELD THE 14<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF COMMISSION FOR RETURN AND DISPLACED PERSONS B&H**

On this Session, Commission verified 10 beneficiary lists of municipalities: Bosanska Krupa, Bosanski Petrovac, Dobojo, Gacko, Kozarska Dubica, Osmaci, Prijedor, Sanski Most, Tuzla and Kalesija.

Beneficiaries' lists have not been verified for municipalities Bosanski Brod, Sarajevo-Centar, Derventa, Fojnica, Novo Sarajevo, Srebrenica, Teslić, Vogošća and Glamoč.

### **The Report about Commissions work for year 2008 was accepted.**

Discussed/ investigated were:

- Agenda proposal of Commission for refugees and displaced persons for year 2009
- Report about work of Fund for return for year 2008
- Agreement about alliance and way of realization for resources aimed for support in process of return in year 2009

The Decision about resources distribution aimed for support in process of return in B&H in year 2009 was agreed, as follows:

- Reconstruction of individual housing units – 20 million KM
- Emergency needs of returnees – 5 million KM
- Collective centers and alternative settlements – 5 million KM
- Sustainable return – 7 million KM
- Reconstruction of apartment houses – 4 million KM
- Electrification of returnees settlements – 5.233.300,00 KM
- Return of refugees-mental patients from Hungary to B&H – 200.000 KM
- Support to the NGOs projects related with return of refugees – 450.000 KM.

## **C) THE 15<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF COMMISSION FOR REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS B&H WAS HELD ON 25<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2009**

Besides holding of the 15<sup>th</sup> Session of mentioned Commission, the Union, faced with the problem of resources distribution for year 2008 based on “national key”, has sent the inquiry to the Commission requesting correction of old praxis and identifying priorities of real situation.

To the all members of the Commission (21 of them), the Union has delivered the information and suggestions of Analyze about situation in process of return, hoping that Commission will consider and accept our suggestions seriously.

On this Session, lists for the rest of municipalities for the project ZP-08 have been verified and resources distribution towards municipalities (Project ZP 09) is done. The previous praxis – resources distribution based on national key – is repeated, although the Union warned the Commission during its work about incorrect way of that distribution. The special concern of NGO sector is the fact that resources aimed for sustainable return are forwarded to the building of religious objects (out of total 8 million KM aimed for sustainable return, over 2 million KM is given for building of religious objects). Reactions of the Union and its members are shown on press conference held on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2009, where 11 media houses were presented and informed public about incorrectness.

### **Cooperation with the Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees B&H**

The cooperation with the Ministry for human rights and refugees B&H is continual and by this Ministry, the Union is accepted as a partner.

The most important part of this cooperation, besides consultative agreements, experience and data exchange, is in common efforts in order to determine the real number of returnees, the number of potential returnees, the number (un)reconstructed units and infrastructure.

\*\*\*

Related to our reactions on the work of municipal commissions, after collected reports and observed malfunctions in a work of mentioned commissions, the Union requested the meeting with the minister for human rights and refugees and his assistants, on initiative of members in municipal commissions for beneficiary selection.

On 4<sup>th</sup> February 2009, the Ministry for human rights and refugees B&H has sent circular letter to all municipalities and District Brcko, informing them, that Ministry received a significant number of observations on work of certain members and presidents of these bodies in some municipalities. It is discovered that certain number of commissions work with a same team for a longer period, pointing the need for membership revision and new commission nomination, in accordance with existing procedures.

As it is mentioned in this letter, the suggestions are made by NGOs related with process of return, and also by many individuals that inform this Ministry about many malfunctions and malversations.

On 9<sup>th</sup> February 2009 was held common meeting between minister for human rights and refugees, his assistants and representatives of the Union where we tried to draw attention about malfunctions (suggestions are given in written form) caused with non adequate using of the Guideline about the way and procedures of beneficiary selection for reconstruction assistance. On this meeting beside individual houses, special attention is also given to the reconstruction and building of apartment houses (block of buildings).

Related with mentioned above, **the Union organized the meeting in Mostar that was held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2009** on initiative of refugees and homeless people, caused with low reconstruction of apartment houses in this town.

The meeting was some kind of introduction to the campaign beginning related to the assistance for 45.000 families – homeless persons in B&H, which are almost 14 years patiently waiting for reconstruction of their destroyed homes. One of the conclusions of this meeting is “to obligate the Parliamentary Assembly Delegates so that they can order to Ministry for human rights and refugees to draft the Plan and Program for reconstruction of all destroyed houses and block of buildings for year 2009 and to work on creation of conditions for sustainable return”.

**The second meeting about the same issue was held on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2009 in Mostar.** The subject of meeting was „**The current issues of returnees and sustainable return**”, and it was discussed about following topics:

- Problems related to the building of individual living spaces
- Problems related to the reconstruction and building of apartment houses (block of buildings), with special overview on problem resolving of destroyed block of building in a street Braće Brkića number 1 and 7, known as „Razvitak”.

On this meeting, “**Association of Serb returnees in Mostar**” has sent the letter (about acceptance of Revised Strategy B&H for implementation of Annex VII of Dayton Agreement) with expressed requests that are with one assent accepted. This letter as a whole has been sent to Club of Alliance of Independent Social Democrats (SNSD). Conclusions from this meeting are sent to the Constitution Commission of The House of Peoples and to the Commission for human rights, rights of children, youth, immigrants, returnees, refugees, asylum and ethic. The meeting was covered by media.

\*\*\*

Related to the **advocacy activities for acceptance of Revised Strategy of B&H for implementation of Annex VII of Dayton Agreement**, we have sent the request to the Board of House of Representatives for participation in Sessions that are related with discussions about acceptance of mentioned Strategy, and our request is approved.

## **President of the Union for sustainable return and integrations in B&H participated in all three Sessions that contained the Agenda of Revised Strategy B&H for implementation of Annex VII of Dayton Agreement**

In addition to holding of Session of Parliamentary assembly B&H (on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009) with its Agenda – discussion about adoption of Revised Strategy B&H - , the Union has **sent letters to the all “Board of House of Representatives” members, requesting adoption of Revised Strategy**, based on initiative and support of the Union’ members.

After Session that ended with the adoption adjournment of the Revised Strategy, office of the Union received numerous objections and displeasure, caused not just with non-adoption of the mentioned document, but also with additional hopeless of more jeopardized citizens of our country.

The Union announced with the **press release as expression of displeasure because of Strategy’s adoption adjournment.**

Neither on next Session (held on 22<sup>th</sup> April 2009), the mentioned document has not been adopted.

**The Revised Strategy B&H for implementation of Annex VII of Dayton Agreement has been adopted on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2009 by Parliament of B&H.**

**According to the law procedures, the Strategy adopted by Parliament needs to be additionally approved by the House of Peoples, the mentioned body on its Session held on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2009 DID NOT ADOPTED this document.**

Motivated with that reason, the Union announced again with the letter addressed to the all members of the House of Peoples and to the Office of High Representative in B&H (Mr. Valentin Incko)

## **PURCHASE OF MOTOR VEHICLE**

As it can be concluded in previous reports, the monitoring of refugees return process, in other words the achieving the aims of this project, means intensive cooperation and contacts with organizations / institutions on all authority levels and on whole area of B&H. This is in detail described in Section II of this Report (Applied Methodology).

Based on mentioned, specific working methodology that implies intensive field work of the project staff, we determined necessity for purchase of motor vehicle for the project needs.

Because of the nature of work, all mentioned above requires longer and often field absence from the office. With purchasing of motor vehicle, we would not be forced to use private vehicles in official purposes, which is the practice in last time.

## **Cooperation with the local NGOs**

The cooperation between the Union and local NGOs presents the key of success of the Union’s work and entire project as well. This cooperation implies common appearance of all associations – members of the Union for sustainable return and integrations in B&H (90 associations), related to the monitoring of spending public resources aimed for sustainable return.

Representatives of the associations – members of the Union, observe the process of beneficiary selection in their municipalities, from the phase of forming municipal commission members (nepotism, confrontation of interests, party and other interests), monitoring of work of municipal commissions (beneficiary selection, verification of all received request for assistance, satisfaction of municipal/special criteria) to the selection of end beneficiaries (list verification of

end selected beneficiaries, verification if beneficiaries received previous assistance – double beneficiaries,...) and estimation of returnees' socio-economic needs.

Beside of all mentioned activities, **this cooperation presents coordinated and united appearance of organizations network of the Union, as mechanism for monitoring of beneficiaries selection process for assistance and reconstruction of house units. Additionally, this fact is contributing to the improvement of NGOs' respectability and acceptance of NGOs real function in B&H society as well.**

Satisfying the obligations toward the end beneficiaries (140.000 persons that live in poorness and that are interested to return in their pre-war houses), the Union for sustainable return and integrations in B&H together with its members provides maintaining of high reputation and trust of this population. Additionally, defined model enables rising of the Union's importance in the public and higher recognition by other institutions as well.

Dynamic and scope of communication between the Union and local associations are the best illustrated by following facts:

- With representatives of our associations, **the monitors have visited 23 municipalities and 1.122 local communities.**
- The union has received **170 reports** from the field, whereof **70 reports** in year 2009.

Since we have done revision of the Union's members based on their activities and financial reports, the Union retained 66 active associations. The requests for membership in the Union are approved for 28 new associations – with that number the Union contains **94 active associations**. The request for membership for 5 associations is under consideration.

## **Cooperation with international NGOs**

Related to the project called "Support to the socio-economic reintegration of survived mine victims through creation of working places in communities with higher level of minority return", we were actively involved as a partners in data collection for target population in following municipalities: Bileća, Brod, Derventa, Doboje, Foča, Kozarska Dubica, Nevesinje, Rogatica, Sokolac, Srebrenica, Trebinje, Zvornik, Bihać, Bos.Krupa, Busovača, Čapljina, D.Vakuf, Iliđa, Kalesija, Kladanj, Konjic, Livno, Maglaj, Mostar, Novi Travnik, Olovo, Travnik, Trnovo, V.Kladuša, Zavidovići and District Brčko.

The project is financially supported by **European Union** and co financed by Federal ministry for work and social policy, Federal Employment Service, Fund for professional rehabilitation and employment of disabled persons in Republika Srpska, micro-credit foundation "Partner" and Hypo Alpe Adria Bank BiH. For project implementation is responsible international organization **Mercy Corps Scotland**.

## **MEDIA**

Besides higher levels of authority, all reports about the current situation of return process are delivered to the public media in B&H in a form of press releases. This is opportunity to highlight very good public media attention related to all our reactions.

In **2009** we published seven (7) press releases and held five (5) press conferences.

**We have good cooperation with following TV media:** NTV HAYAT, RTRS, TVSA, FTV, BHT1, ATV, ALFA, Slobodna Evropa – TV Liberty, cantonal televisions in Mostar, Tuzla, Zenica, Travnik.

**With printed media:** Glas Srpske, Nezavisne novine, Dnevni Avaz, Oslobođenje, Fokus, As, Dnevni list and journal agencies SRNA, FENA, ONASA.

## V. COMING ACTIVITIES

- Continue with the monitoring process of the beneficiary selection for house reconstruction
- Continue with monitoring of real returnees whose houses are reconstructed and estimation of socio-economic sustainability of return
- Continue with the data collection for other municipalities, their analysis and to enter in database.
- Analyze of field informations and creation of reports about return failures.
- Continue to inform State Commission for refugees and displaced persons about the work of municipal commissions for return and about real situation on the field.
- Continue the cooperation on all authority levels
- Continue with organizing of public meetings in major towns of B&H, as reaction of non-acceptance of Revised Strategy for implementation of Annex VII of Dayton Agreement, under the topic: "Return in own homes is blocked".
- Continue to inform publicity about the impacts of return assistance projects and results of cooperation between government and civil society.

## VI. CONCLUSION

With this and previous Reports, we hope that we have achieved to illustrate all challenges that we are faced with during the realization of this Project, to demonstrate how hard effort we have made in realization of each single project activity and to prove how substantially complex this project is.

Coordinated coalited appearance of the Union's organizations network as mechanism for monitoring of beneficiary selection process for reconstruction assistance, open and correct dialog with municipal authorities, remarkably relationship with state authorities and good connections with media, are the main indicators of present success of project implementation.

The project strength lies in tight connection of all above mentioned subjects, and exactly that connection is precondition of the successful project finalization, and precondition for development of new projects within the Union as well.

In order to obtain broader picture about the scope and measure of developed mechanisms for monitoring of return on all authority levels, we quote the following **quantitative indicators for year 2009**:

- The monitors, together with representatives from associations, have **visited 1.122 local communities**
- **70 field reports** are received
- Accomplished **5 Analyses of return situation**
- Compiled address book of local communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Organized **25 meetings with representatives of municipalities in Bosnia-Herzegovina**
- The **102 letters have been sent to the municipalities** (feedbacks are received as well)
- Organized **5 meetings with representatives of higher authority levels**
- **Participation in 3 (three) Sessions** of the State Commission for refugees and displaced persons in B&H
- **Participation in 3 (three) Sessions** of the Parliament Assembly of Bosnia-Herzegovina
- **94 letters have been sent to higher authority levels** (Ministry for human rights and refugees of B&H, Federal ministry for refugees and displaced persons, the Parliament Assembly delegates of B&H,



Commission for human rights, Constitutional Commission, the Government of District Brcko, the members of Commission for human rights and refugees of B&H)

- Published **7 press releases**
- Organized **five (5) press conferences**
- **More than 30 articles** are published in media.

As it can be concluded, the project implementation goes as it was planned and we will succeed to achieve foreseen project results.

Some of the results are mainly accomplished:

1) Established mechanism for monitoring of beneficiary selection process for reconstruction of house units

- Monitoring Teams (contained from returnees and intern-displaced persons) are established, educated and furnished with instruments and mechanisms for independent monitoring and verification of return process and delivery of feedbacks for governmental bodies / institutions.
- State Commission for refugees and displaced persons was regularly and directly informed about the work of municipal Commissions for return and about real situation on the field. Commission receives suggestions for actions, based on independent data collecting from the field, to be able to effectively make decisions and to control the process.
- Needs related to the socio-economic sustainability of return are defined, suggestions for adequate actions developed and delivered to the relevant governmental bodies / institutions.

2) Improved transparency of governmental institutions' work – improved cooperation between governmental and non-governmental sector

- State Commission and Ministry for human rights and refugees consider seriously all reactions of the Union related to the questions of return process.
- More effective mechanisms of cooperation and partnership between government and civil society are constituted (work on monitoring of beneficiary selection, creating of revised Strategy, changing of Guidelines...)
- Both governmental bodies, legislative and executive, receive feedbacks from first hand from those who are directly involved for their decisions and work related to the assistance in refugees return.
- Report about return oversights (mismatches) is created.
- The public is informed about the impacts of programs for assistance in return and about results from cooperation between government and civil society as well.

3) Improved influence of non-governmental sector on governmental' strategies – more efficient spending of public funds

- The Union, as important factor of civil society that acts as coalition, impacts stakeholders
- Improved institutional capacities of the Union
- With its work, the Union impacts on more adequate and effective spending of public funds.
- Monitoring of real returnees whose houses have been reconstructed and evaluation of socio-economical sustainability of return are done.

Starting from financial management' aspect, it can be concluded that received amount are entirely spent on realization of project activities, as it was planned, and financial report is attached in Annex.

All mentioned above positively affect not just beneficiaries' opinion about the project, but also their additional stimulation for attendance in the project.