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Can housing property rights reconstruction/ issues help us understand/improve the chances for economic recovery in post conflict zones? This article aims to study the impact of the presence of the UNPKO on the performance of the Housing Land and Property Rights (HLP) policies (property claims/property restitution) across the 146 Municipalities in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). The existing literature focuses on the study of UNPKO performance and its effectiveness in establishing stability and therefore peace. Sambanis and Collier,¹ suggested there is still much to understand when it comes to property rights and their relation to economic concerns in a post-conflict stage, as they can be a missing key to achieve major economic stability.

This article uses quantitative methods using the 146 municipalities as the unit of analysis. The timing of this analysis is set in the post conflict stage, when the UNPKO must establish mechanisms to encourage return of refugees, thus laying the path to recovery and stabilization. I summarize the existing literature on the performance of the UNPKO regarding HLP issues, and on economic recovery in the aftermath of conflict. I present the case for HLP intervention, the data and my research design.

**Housing, Land and Property Rights Matters**

In all conflicts, violence creates waves of Internal Displaced People (IDPs) and/or refugees. Homes are destroyed and housing is scarce; in times of despair, illegal occupation of available/abandon houses is frequent (Bosnia), either by imposition or option (Kosovo); past disputes over land ownership emerge creating (more) confrontation (Cambodia)²; and access to arable land becomes scarce (Rwanda/Burundi or DR Congo)³. At the same time, HLP issues can play different roles in multiple processes including economic reparation (Colombia); stabilization of security conditions⁴; opportunities for international actors to invest and underpin development; demographic stabilization; disarmed,

---

¹ Collier & Sambanis, 2006  
² See Williams, 2009  
³ Unruh (2004 6), Leckie and Huggins (2011); Zevenbergen and Burns (2010)  
⁴ Security conditions can be also explore in the opposite direction where security can provide the framework to address PRs in the post conflict or by addressing these the security condition can improve.
demobilization and reintegration process (DDR) (Sierra Leone and Liberia). Table 1 shows a brief sampling of some of the more prominent HLP challenges evident in countries enduring or emerging from conflict, revealing the extent to which these are linked to conflict and post-conflict recovery.

Table 1: HLP challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Destruction of property</td>
<td>➢ Inequalities in Land Distribution from Colonial legacies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Secondary occupation.</td>
<td>➢ Changes in land tenure relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Abandoned houses.</td>
<td>➢ Weak state institution of land and property administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Inequalities in gender ownerships.</td>
<td>➢ Territorial disputes/claims based on ethnic religious or geographic identities by armed groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Special cases for orphans, widows, female households.</td>
<td>➢ State involvement in local (natural) resource struggles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Homelessness and landlessness.</td>
<td>➢ the political scope and scale of land-related distributive conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Insecure housing.</td>
<td>➢ Abandoned land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Un-administered public/social housing units.</td>
<td>➢ Insecure land tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Breakdown of traditional village structures.</td>
<td>➢ Breakdown of traditional village structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Increase in the frequency and extent of land disputes not solved because of lack of governmental capacity.</td>
<td>➢ Landmines and constraints in freedom of movement and access to land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Use of land for DDR programs and IDP.</td>
<td>➢ Landmines and constraints in freedom of movement and access to land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Rights**

➢ Pre-conflict ownership and tenancy disputes.                        
➢ Discriminatory HLP laws.                                             
➢ Abandonment Laws.                                                   
➢ Destruction or loss of property and ownership records.              
➢ The lack of appropriate land administration.                         
➢ Inequalities in gender ownerships: special cases for orphans, widows, female households.

Research into the re-establishment of HLP aspects in a post-conflict/peace building context is still in its early stages. Civil wars represent an enormous cost to societies in every single aspect. Civil wars curtail economic growth, destroy human and physical capital and limit GDP growth\(^5\). In the peacebuilding post-conflict process, property rights, land and housing issues reflect the extent of

---

\(^5\) Rodrik, 1999; Collier, 1999; Cerra and Saxena, 2008, etc
damage [refs]. Although these are associated with the humanitarian response, they are actually the basis for further long-term recovery. Hence, HLP issues must be addressed earlier in the peacebuilding process. The differences across countries that experience conflicts regarding these issues are difficult to address: clearly, it is not possible to assume that the way in which some African countries organize land tenure and property rights are similar to the South Asian or Balkans context.

Regardless of the context, institutional reconstruction of property rights is a greater task requiring significant amount of resources: well-trained personnel on all HLP aspects - at the local and national level - ; the establishment of a minimum level of security to guarantee the safety of the returnees and a further serious degree of commitment and cooperation with the recovery processes from the local authorities. The size of the displaced population and the political sensitivity of land conflicts will determine if addressing land issues can be one of the most important aspects of post-conflict stabilization.

HLPs are important to several aspects of livelihood, macroeconomic recovery, governance or reintegration of former combatants. Studies focus on civil wars, predominantly in Africa and South Asia, but also in the Balkans and Latin American countries. The strategies implemented and objectives affecting property rights, land and housing issues vary from case to case, showing uneven records of success. Most studies include HLP and refugee issues, either from a humanitarian perspective or as part of a Human Rights or legal approach, with certain exceptions such as Barakat and Zyck. On the other hand, studies of property rights as part of the economic recovery are scarce. Research on the effects of UNPKO performance on land and property issues is even more limited.

Wars and conflict force people to abandon their land and farms, often their only source of livelihood in an agriculturally based economic system, and their

---

6 Leckie (2009: 3)
7 Pantuliano (****)
8 The legal dimension is linked to the understanding of property rights, land and housing as part of the economic and social rights.
9 See Leckie (****) Fox (xxxx)
10 Put all the references from Barakat
houses, which can be their only asset. These conditions are common characteristics of post-conflict settings, but have been most relevant in cases such as Rwanda, Liberia or Cambodia, where the number of displaced persons and refugees represented a daunting challenge. HLPs can play a dual role as part of conflict studies. In the case of Palestine-Israel, HLPs can be seen as the source of conflict; in other cases, such as CDR Congo, HLPs can be a factor in prolonging the conflict. In all cases, disputes over land, destruction of housing and other immovable property become central to the attention of the affected population in the aftermath of armed conflict. As poverty is identified as one of the strongest factors leading to conflict and civil war\textsuperscript{11}, it is also clear that rural areas highly dependent on agriculture are the poorest and at greatest risk of conflict.

**UN Peacekeeping Operations and Housing, Land and Property Rights**

In general, terms, the multidimensional UNPKO do not have a specialized body to face HLP issues. The tendency has been that United Nation High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) would deal with some HLP aspects to solve refugee and IDP issues. HLPs in the post-conflict context are diverse and highly multifaceted, including housing destruction, illegal occupation, and destruction of property and tenancy records, disputes over access to agricultural land or unequal distribution of land. It might be expected that the United Nations Peacekeeping Operations (UNPKOs) consider – or treat – as a priority the reconstruction of housing units, clarification and restoration of property rights and the redistribution of land\textsuperscript{12}. It is also expected that these issues might be a relevant part of the mandates of the different UNPKOs. In practice, different missions have failed to address comprehensively the challenges presented by HLPs in the aftermath of conflict.

\textsuperscript{11} (Collier et al., 2008)

\textsuperscript{12} Distribution of land can be look at from two perspective: one as a reparation / reward elements or as mechanism to encourage economic reactivation in rural areas.
Since 1990, the UN and other major peace-building operations have been active. A common characteristic, regarding HLP issues, is that the record of missions is somewhat inconsistent: the approach and policies implemented vary from mission to mission or in the worst cases are completely ignored depending on the mission’s mandate and what is established by the peace agreement. Until now, the mission in Bosnia is unique by including housing land and Property rights aspects as part of the mission core activities\textsuperscript{13}. The tendency is to use “practical initiatives” with the shape of quasi-judicial mechanisms to address HLP rights in some national context. However, at the UN institutional level there is no well-developed framework with clear policies concerning HLP rights in post-conflict environments, in comparison to those adopted to address other Human Rights and Rule of Law issues\textsuperscript{14}.

Scott Leckie\textsuperscript{15} has highlighted the mission’s lack of understanding regarding HLPs and its inability to understand and integrate these into short and long term strategies. The author evaluates the missions’ performances on HLP aspects based on the compilation of 11 mission cases studies. A common characteristic across missions is that HLPs are treated as part of the strategy for the reconstruction and reestablishment of rule of law, leaving the affected population awaiting reform of constitutional and legal systems in order to achieve resolution of their HLP disputes. In some cases, IDPs and refugees might never secure assistance with these problems.

In the peace building process, land issues do not receive necessary attention, despite their relevance for economic recovery, in contrast to strategies geared toward democratization or security. The reason is the lack of understanding of the local dynamics, characteristics and context of the organization of property rights. On the other side, lack of focal strategies to deal with difficult and challenging HLP aspects makes economic recovery a weak point within the peace building process. In some cases, putting aside those challenges might be the

\textsuperscript{13} There is currently a Land tenure Project in Afghanistan directed by USAID running from 2010.
\textsuperscript{14} Cordial and Resandhaug (2009), Leckie (2009)
\textsuperscript{15} See (Leckie, 2009). Since 2005
difference between peace and the recurrence of violence. What happened in BiH presents the opportunity to question the importance of HLP for post-conflict reconstruction and the peace building process. Land and property issues play a significant role in post-conflict reconciliation and economic rehabilitation, as the agrarian reform has played an important role in many insurgent and revolutionary agendas.

In the literature there are studies evaluating and explaining the way in which property rights and housing issues were tackled in different post conflict situations (e.g. East Timor, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Angola and Mozambique). The studies illustrated how difficult and challenging HLP issues are, not only in a post-war context, but also when there are old and complex property rights and land distribution problems, such as communal costumes or colonial legacy. For example, Unruh and Williams (2013b) conclude that, while HLP programs are indeed context-specific and require technical expertise, the issues themselves are deeply political. Experience shows that failure to address them, or well-intentioned but inadequate international programs, can exacerbate tensions and jeopardize the long-term viability of many efforts to foster security and development. The studies agreed that it is necessary to understand the local dynamic in HLP issues, and it is necessary that International Organizations, donor and UN organizations increase awareness and attentions towards HLP aspects, before-during and after the conflict to fill this gap. None of these studies focuses on or uses quantitative analysis of the importance of HLP to economic recovery in a comprehensive way.

---

17 Fitzpatrick (2012)
20 Cain (2007)
21 Unruh (1997), Unruh (2001)
22 NGOs’ reports and guidelines are valuable source of data regarding HLP issues and an “objective” critic to UNPKO and International Organization performance in the field and. For some of the most comprehensive reports see Hurwitz et al. (2005), Pantuliano (2009b), (2009a) Pons-Vignon and Lecomte (2004); Wily (2009) and USAID (2004)
United Nation’s Peacekeeping Operation in Bosnia

In 1995, after three and a half years of war and ethnic cleansing, with 2.3 million people displaced from their homes and the population divided among ethnic groups. During the cease-fire, differences became more explicit and the mass dispossession of property generated conflict. Despite this, contradicting expectations, the armed confrontation stopped, and ground for ethnic co-existence emerged. By 2002, large scale infrastructure and housing was repaired, which become an incentive for the refugees to return to destroyed villages; more than 600,000 refugees and Internal Displaced People (IDPs) have been able to recover possession of the homes they had before the war. Regarding HLP issues, the performance of the UNPKO in BiH UNMIBH is the only case (mission) that has had a commission, entirely and uniquely, dedicated to land and property issues. As the UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina focused on the return of refugees and IDPs, The Commission for Real Property Claims of Displaced Persons and Refugees (CRPC) was created to process and deliver options to solve most of the issues related to land claims, secondary occupation, housing and reconstruction, among others. In BiH, HLP was use as a mechanism to address segregation and ethnic division, and crucial to achievement of major concerns such as security, rule of law and institutional reconstruction. In this way Bosnia is special in the way that it allows us to look at the long term impact of the policies implemented on HLP issues, including the fact that despite the war, there were institutional aspects that provided a base or framework to build from.

The Commission for Real Property Claims of Displaced Persons and Refugees (CRPC) model could offer some valuable lessons for future cases. It is considering the scope for creating and establishing mechanism dealing with post-conflict property issues, such as security and return. In contrast to other missions, the incentive for the return to abandoned houses was to provide security and safety for those integrating into differentiated ethnic areas. Another example is that

---

23 Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies (2014)
24 See for example Unruh (2004 ) and (Cox and Garlick, 2003)
25 The Yugoslav institutional framework itself represents a challenge as how to adapt this communist-socialist oriented to a more capitalist property rights system.
the land was part of political motivation to address segregation and address past grievances. Thus, it evidence of how land and property interact with local dynamics.

Nevertheless, as was mentioned above, this has not provided a comprehensive, holistic approach to tackle HLP challenges during and after the conflict. In BiH, the mission implemented a comprehensive approach by putting in place three strategies: (1) the creation of a mixed domestic/international property claims tribunal; (2) establishment of an extensive campaign for legislative reform repelling discriminatory laws, and to establish an administrative property claims process at municipal level, under close international supervision. Lastly, (3) to put in place a robust plan for the reconstruction of destroyed villages and de-mining land26.

Why Bosnia?

The context in Bosnia at the beginning of 1996 could be a common context to other post-conflict context where necessary measures had to be put in place targeting specific HLP issues. Bosnia was challenging regarding the deep divisions and polarization that the war created, making the issues of property, internal displacement, and return a critical bridge to pass through. Additionally, Bosnia shows the challenges face by the UN agencies and other organizations trying to build or reconstruct institutional frameworks as a foundation of rule of law, economic recovery and peace. In the institutional framework BiH can bring light into the importance and relevance of pre-existing institutional framework or infrastructure relating to HLP issues and how it can affect the implantation of these policies.

Bosnia encompasses all the challenges that might be present in any other civil war. It is possible to identify that the land and property issues brought to the social level include the possibility of return, reconciliation and integration; at the politic level they gave the opportunity to compromise on previous accords and to enforce agreements regarding the land. Hence, we expect that, as struggles in

---

26 In addition to seven years of military engagement, civilian police monitors and a US $ 5.1 Billion reconstruction programme. (Cox and Garlick, 2003: 65-66).
BiH were based not only on ethnic struggles, but at the end of a territorial dispute, BiH sets the conditions to study the performance of the mission regarding HLP aspects.

The Argument

Figure 1 represents the structure of the argument on how the presence of the UNPKO and the implementation of policies regarding HLP issues impact the economic recovery. There are two phases: the first is how the presence of the mission across the country affects the implantation of the policies. The second it’s how the combination of the presence of the mission and the implementation of the policies affect the economic recovery of the country. When there are policies targeting HLPs, the mission is providing refugees and IDPs with the opportunity to return to where they were expelled from, resulting in the beginnings of reintegration and recovery.

What happen when the UNPKO is present?

After a conflict or civil war is over, the task of reconstruction is complex, challenging and demanding for both the international community and the affected society. Studies of economic recovery in post-conflict contexts focus on the necessary conditions to achieve better results, such as security issues,
disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes, reconstruction of
the rule of law, and democratization through electoral processes. If organizations
responsible for the process of post-conflict recovery have not fully addressed
issues related to the reconstruction of housing units, land and property rights
(HLP) they may be missing an opportunity. In the case of Bosnia and in particular the policies applied by the Commission
required the voluntary application for the restitution of the property to the
claimant. Although there is not ways identified what were the personal or
individual motives for the application. It might be possible to set possible
explanations. The presence of the mission can make a difference when it comes
to decide whether people wish to return or stay in the place of displacement. The
provision of means of security is an element to consider. The presence of the
UNPKO provides security creating a vote of confidence for return. But it can
also mean that where the mission is present there are other UN offices which
can provide incentives for return and resettlement, which translates into more
investment and attention to the population and particular problems that this
area is encountering. In terms of commitment, the presence of the mission can
prove credible commitment from the mission regarding the long term recovery of
this particular location, along with more report and monitoring on particular
aspects of post-conflict. In this way the presence of the mission reinforce the
implementation of the HLP policies.

Strategies addressing HLP help mitigating the negative experiences for the
returnees. Not only is difficult to go back “home”, but return to a post-war
conflict can contribute to a spiral of decline, whether through perpetuating
inequalities, through re-igniting the conflict or through economic hardship,
which both can create more displacement and keep the economic conflict trap. Taking the decision of return comprehend multiple considerations. The state of
the house or property, it is the property habitable, or what is the extend of the
damage. There are possible sources of income, job opportunities for the

27 (Pantuliano, 2009b, Pantuliano, 2009a)
28 (Black and Gent, 2006)
households to provide the minimum goods. There is in place provision of services such as hospitals or schools for children. On the other side, there are war circumstances that might affect the decision of putting on place the claim and further/possible return like a traumatic experience; war grievances and reluctance to return to the place where lost was experienced.

\[TP_{PRI}: \text{the presence of UNPKO should increase the number of reclaims of property.}\]

Part of the sustainable economic recovery, it is the idea of return and reintegration to the previous communities, or the current places of displacement. Allowing people to return to their homes must be a priority. In order to complete the return as a successful task, it is important that those processes are accompanied by attempts to address unlawful occupation of land and land disposition. Once the strategies and policies are in place the presence of the mission must help to reinforce the implementation of the HLP policies. In Bosnia the presenting a claim for a particular property did not necessarily mean return. One way to measure return and how the mission reinforces these policies is the information on repossession of houses and properties. The task of monitoring the implementation of decision by the Commission was performed by the Property Law Implementation Plan (PLIP). This commission was created in a coalition of UN organization including the UN International Police Task Force (UNIPTF) and UNHCR and the mission force itself. The function of this commission was to accompany the owner of the property to make effective the decision of repossession of the property.

It is important to mention that property and land disputes might be a pre-war characteristic. Refugee and IDP return strategies therefore need to address both land access and the security of property rights more broadly, especially given the institutional vacuum that usually accompanies post-conflict transitions. Managing these issues effectively in a peace process is crucial to prevent continued instability and to sustain reintegration, including people’s re
engagement in traditional land uses that sustain the agricultural production, food security and trade on which recovery can be built\(^{29}\).

\(TP_{PR2}\): the presence of UNPKO should increase the number of repossessed houses.

In this sense, it is not only a question of how to make return per-se, but how to make it sustainable in a way that addresses the socio-economic concerns on a community-wide basis looking toward an economic stabilisation. Presumably, in case that there are not policies addressing these major concerns, such as housing, IDPs and refugees might opt to stay in their current place \(^{30}\). In this way it might expected to see a large level of return in those places where HLP policies where implemented than where there was not a major emphasis.

**Title[...]**

In the literature on post-conflict and economic recovery, HLP issues are barely mentioned, with few exceptions which look solely at how secure PRs by strong institutions contribute to economic development\(^ {31}\). PRs and economic recovery studies look at market and value assets; public and private aspects; the relation of PRs as reflection of a functional rule of law structure; incentives for investment, trade and productivity. Collier and Sambanis mention that making PRs secure is an element in escaping “the conflict trap”, hence reducing the probability of conflict recurring\(^ {32}\). As was mentioned above, the destruction of HLPs are common challenges in any post conflict context as well as the need to deal with major flows of IDP and refugees. These two issues are deeply connected.

\(^{29}\) Leckie, 2009  
\(^{30}\) Ibid, pag 7. Sussex research found that respondents had a “staged” approach to decision making with one or more issues (usually security) being of prime importance followed by other issues such as the economic situation or incentives to return only where the initial concern was resolved. Among key conditions for sustainability, returning migrants arguably need employment, housing, access to public and social services, education, public utilities and security.  
\(^{32}\) Collier et al., 2003, Collier and Sambanis, 2005b
Foley, et al. explain that “the Land Reform programs of the 1980s and the Land Transfer Program (PTT) implemented after the signing of the Peace Accords reduced the concentration of landholding by redistributing about 30 percent of the country’s cropland, and increased substantially the number of individuals who own small plots or share in the ownership of cooperative lands.” While such changes tackled the issue of inequality and reduced the political tension in the countryside, they have not fundamentally changed the economic insecurity of rural life in El Salvador. Those who had received land from the programs could not become viable farmers and create a source of income for themselves as many of them had the burden of land. In post-conflict context, Property rights (PRS), particularly, are crucial in accelerating recovery through the re-activation of local economies which might attract international investors. This security must rely on the legality and authority of institutional frameworks that reinforce the legality of PRs. For the small and the largest holder communities, this legality makes possible to negotiate about communal uses of land; e.g. schools, roads, or wells.

An important step in determining the relation between HLPs and economic recovery (ER) is identifying the type of actions and policies addressing the HLP conflict related aspects, the context under which these were implemented, and where these were implemented. One initial indicator of measurement is the number of reported issues to address and the number of solved cases in each region. During conflict, the level of damage and destruction varies from place to place, making it “easy” to identify the region where the strategies where implemented or not. The expectation will be that the more destroyed places will received major attention. Hence these focus areas will perform better in the economic recovery.

\[ TP_{PR} \]: places where actions by the UNPKO focus on PRs reconstruction will have a positive effect on economic recovery.

33 (Foley et al., 1997:3)
34 (Foley et al., 1997)
36 (Deininger, 2003b)
Title [......]
The Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIB), based on the recommendation of the UNHCR, late in 1996 set a plan focus on “Target Areas” for priority reconstruction assistance. This program is part of the major strategy addressing HLP issues focussing on 22 out of 146 municipalities. These 22 municipalities were selected by the end of 1996 based on the assessment of priorities for reconstruction and return of refugees. Figure 2 presents the comparison between the general and focal policies. Moreover, in order to investigate whether if there is a difference within the municipalities’ performance, I separated the policies applied on the different municipalities assuming that although there is general destruction, this would be higher in those 22 ones. If the strategies were successfully implemented there should be a larger effect on economic recovery.

In the case of BiH, the designs of the strategies addressing HLP were comprehensive, including the reconstruction of health services and schools, and assistance programs for food security and economic reactivation. For instance, including HLP strategies must create appropriate socio economic conditions for the returnees to start over. The outcome of these must be reflected on the improvement of socio-economic conditions, including increase of household income; increase educational and health outcomes and increase household food security. Figure 3 shows the logic of this argument. Then, in the case that The UNPKOs acts for the reconstruction and resolution of PRs is to providing a stable context where societies can settle and engage with the reconstruction process. Stability is founded on confidence that there is somewhere to return to, to recover the human capital lost during the war; this confidence underpins the incentive to settle and to promote investment in the future in different ways\(^{37}\).

The current argument considers how solving HLPs relates to the return of refugees and IDPs and how it can have an impact on the economic recovery at the local level. Refugees and IDP's usually belong to a specific and identifiable

\(^{37}\) (de Soto, 2000) and ((DFID) UK Department for International Development, 2014)
group (e.g. ethnic, gendered or regional), hence they have different concerns. Let’s assume that all necessary conditions are present in the place they fled from: the war is over, there are no security fears and the possibility of returning to their reconstructed home is guaranteed, such as housing, access to public and social services and employment. Seemingly, refugees would have the option to return and reintegrate. If they decided to return, they would start to reactivate the local economy of their particular region. As they returned to their previous activities, re-establishing ordinary commerce and daily life, restoring a mix of generations, the returnees would start to create some sort of normality. If that were the case, their return would put in motion the recovery of human capital. Furthermore, the failure to note that increases in insurgent attacks can also lead to greater repression will produce mistaken inferences. We must recognize that the 22 municipalities where the policy was implemented the economic recovery will be lower in contrast to the rest of the municipalities.

**Figure 2**

In the case, that there are not in place any strategies promoting and/supporting return of refugees, the consequences can be devastating. The returnees in Liberia encountered difficult situation after return, their houses were illegally
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38 (Black and Gent, 2006)
39 (Justino, 2009, Justino, 2011b, Justino, 2011a) present an overview on the impact of violent conflict on human capital. She sustain her ideas on the extended damage on human capital specially among children, due to the destruction of school infrastructure, displacement, deterioration of economic conditions, destruction of family structures among others.
occupied by governmental forces looking for political and economic control of the area, or in other cases they found their houses destroyed. For many of those, the return was unaccompanied by any of the UN bodies, who did not have the resources, nor the capability to support the return of refugees. The return occurred in many cases without access to economic support or provision of social services in a context of high gender-based violence and increased communal conflicts over land and property rights\textsuperscript{40}. Liberia is an example of how the gap in human capital widens by not addressing PRs issues, leaving women and children\textsuperscript{41} without opportunities to find sources or income and few or none access to education and less expected job opportunities\textsuperscript{42}.

\textit{TP\textsubscript{PR}}: The 22 municipalities where actions by the UNPKO focus on HLPs reconstruction will have a positive effect on economic performance in contrast where the policies were not implemented

\section*{Data and Research Design}

\textit{Dependent and Independent Variables}

The first part of the empirical section investigates whether the presence of the mission across the different municipalities had an impact on the economic recovery. The second assesses the impact of the mission’s HLP policies on the economic recovery in the municipalities. In both sections, the 146 municipalities of Bosnia and Herzegovina represent the unit of analysis, while the independent variable changes. As a result of the Dayton Peace Agreement, BiH is divided between two entities: The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) and Republika Srpska. This unit of analysis represent a challenge itself. Previous the war there were a total of 109 Municipalities. After the war the number of municipalities increased to 143: 79 in the FBiH and 64 in the RS; the Brcko

\textsuperscript{40} Cited on IDMC (2007). Liberia: Focus for IDP returnees moves from conflict to development, country report UN SC, 15 March 2007) (IRIN, 8 February 2007; GoL/Ad Hoc Presidential Commission, October 2006)

\textsuperscript{41} The author is aware of how war impact negatively on education and schooling performance. At the same time the research does not focus on the differences between the impacts of education on gender or child soldiers, nor is it the concern of this research to look at the maximum levels of education achieved differentiated by gender or circumstances. The magnitude and direction of the effects might vary from context to context and from country to country based on the pre-existing economic conditions, the type of conflict and its duration and the context of country.

\textsuperscript{42} (Colletta and Cullen, 2000) and (Justino, 2010, Justino, 2011b, Justino, 2011a)
District does not belong to either entity. Table 2 list the municipalities that were divided or created out of the division between the two major entities. In 2000 the territory of Brcko was granted as independent entity within the country of Bosnia, creating an additional entity. At the time of the creation of the Dayton Accord, Brčko was also divided between FBiH and RS; but lately, the city was re-consolidated in the entity-neutral Brčko District.

Table 2: List of divided and new municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality in the FBiH</th>
<th>Municipality in Republika Srpska</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosanska Krupa</td>
<td>Krupa na Uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanski Most</td>
<td>Oštira Luka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ključ</td>
<td>Ribnik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosanski Petrovac</td>
<td>Petrovac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drvar</td>
<td>Istočni Drvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupres (FBiH)</td>
<td>Kupres (RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jajce</td>
<td>Jezero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobretići</td>
<td>Kneževo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doboj South and Doboj East</td>
<td>Doboj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gračanica</td>
<td>Petrovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradačac</td>
<td>Pelagićevo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orašje</td>
<td>Donji Žabar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domaljevac-Šamac</td>
<td>Šamac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odžak</td>
<td>Vukosavlje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čelić</td>
<td>Lopare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teočak</td>
<td>Ugljevik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapna</td>
<td>Žvornik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalesija</td>
<td>Osmaci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stari Grad</td>
<td>Istočni Stari Grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novo Sarajevo</td>
<td>Lukavica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilidža</td>
<td>Istočna Ilidža</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trnovo (FBiH)</td>
<td>Trnovo (RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pale-Prača</td>
<td>Pale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goražde</td>
<td>Novo Goražde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foča-Ustikolina</td>
<td>Foća</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostar</td>
<td>Istočni Mostar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolac</td>
<td>Berkovići</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravno</td>
<td>Trebinje</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of economic recovery is measure with data on night light that was captured in each municipality. The data concerning the peacekeeping presence
in the municipalities derives from my coding of 36 UNMIBH mission reports from 1996 to 2003; plus the Secretary General’s reports on the situation of the country (See Annex 1 for a draft of the coding book for this dataset). The reports give a regular, fairly extensive and systematic account of the mission’s activities. The coding exercise has recorded all the incidents, actions and strategies implemented by the mission in the mentioned time. The database includes a wide variety of events and reports about the activities of other UN organizations in Bosnia. I used the information from the dataset to construct a dummy variable that equals 1 when peacekeeping troops are present in a given municipality. It is important to notice that the presence of the mission is not random. For testing the second hypothesis, I identified the location where a particular policy (Open City Policy) was implemented. I used the information of the database to create a dummy variable that equals 1 when a particular municipality benefit of the particular policy.

Control Variables

In order to assess the hypothesis in a comprehensive way, I included information on the ethnic diversity of the municipalities using data from the census in Yugoslavia in 1991 prior to the outbreak of the war, which recorded (self-assigned) ethnic identities of respondents (Bosniak, Croat, Serb and others). On the population of the municipalities after the war, I used the report compiled by UNHCR in 1997 which is in the BiH National archive (this is estimation) and the 1st report on the recent Census in Bosnia carried out in 2012 and from which the final report has not been released. To assess the level of damage I include information on the number of houses destroyed by 1995 categorized by municipality and ethnic distribution and the assessment on the remaining number of houses destroyed by 2005. Regarding return, I include information on the return of “minorities” to each municipality by 2005. Finally, for the measurement of repossession of houses, I include information from the final

---

43 My coding mirrored the database of the Peacekeeping Operation Location and Event Dataset (PKOLED), Developed at the department of Government of the University of Essex. This dataset has coded all events reported by the troops involved in the UN peacekeeping missions to intra-state conflicts in the post-Cold War period (1989-2005). However, this particular mission of UNMIBH is not part of PKOLED dataset.
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report of the Property Law Implementation Plan (PLIP) activities for each of the 146 municipalities. On the information on the number of claims, I use the files rested on the Bosnia and Herzegovina Archives containing all the information of the CRPC from 1995 to 2003. All this information is not available in a digital form. Hence it was necessary to compile and transfer all that information (13,000 circa) in a digital format (see annex 2 and 3 for a summary of the data collected from the archives). The information on the number of claims and decision reports by the commission is monthly between the years of 1996 to 2003.

The table 2 presents information on additional data available in my general dataset, which might be include as part of the model.

Table 3: Data Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data survey</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ethnic information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book of Death People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War UNPKO presence PKOLED</td>
<td>1991-1995</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devastation assessment</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of housing units and arrangements</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement information</td>
<td>1996 and 2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration of Displacement</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential returnees by current residence</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential returnees by municipality to return</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPC claims and type</td>
<td>Monthly 1996-2003</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPC claims and type</td>
<td>Consolidate 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPC decisions</td>
<td>Consolidate 2003</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLIP claims</td>
<td>Consolidate 2005</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education info (CANTON)</td>
<td>Consolidate 2002-2005</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSMS (survey) World Bank</td>
<td>2001-2004</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 1

**Code for each municipality**: 1 to 146

**Municipality**: based on the political division presented in official documents. Initial template: Census. *(Admin level 1 ?)*

**Entity**: After the war, Bosnia is divided into two political different political entities:
- FBiH
- RS

**Year**: The database covers the active years of the second UNPKO mission in Bosnia from 1996 to 2002.

**Citystatus_Du**: *City Status*, This is to determining the status of the municipality as a major city or small one. Is a dummy variable. This information is based on official classification.
1= city
2= capital
0= no city status

**Canton**: For the purpose of the analysis. In some cases, the reports do not mention the cities as such, but the canton name where the actions occurred. This variable might help with the later analysis a geographical level. In the same way depending on the entity the municipalities are classified in a different way. See table below.

**TRA_Du**: “Target Return Area” (TRA) programme is a variable referring to a UNHCR program that aims to encourage return of IDPs and refugees to a majority ethic area. These municipalities received special attention in terms a major implementation of programmes for reconstruction and return. This is a dummy variable.
1= city identified as TRA
0= city is not identified as TRA

**OpenCity_Du; RMA_Du**: “Return of minority Areas” programme is a variable referring to a UNHCR program that aims to encourage return of IDPs and refugees to a minority ethic area. These municipalities received special attention
in terms a major implementation of programmes for reconstruction and return. This is a dummy variable.
1= city identified as RMA
0= city is not identified as RMA

**PKOP_Du:** (dummy variable) that represent the presence of UNPKO in the municipalities. The information of this variable is determined by the information gather from the different UN peacekeeping operation reports. The information is a representation of the different components of the mission present in each particular municipality.
1= UNPKO is present in the municipality
0= UNPKO is not present in the municipality

**CivilAff-Du:** (Dummy Variable) Office of Humanitarian Affairs, which was one of the initial UN bodies to be establish after the creation of the second mission UNMIBH. The information is collected from the different reports and maps published on the different UNPKO mission reports. This variable shows where this particular office was set in the different municipalities.
1= UNPKO is present in the municipality
0= UNPKO is not present in the municipality

**CAType_pre:** (Categorical variable). This variable presents the type and general function of the office establish in the particular municipality. This variable helps to differentiate from United Nations International Police Task Force (UNIPTF) presence and type of offices.

**OCHAOff_Action:** This is a descriptive variable that present information on specific actions carried out in the particular municipality in a particular year.

**IPTF_Du (Ca):** that represent the presence of UNIPTF in the municipalities. The information of this variable is determined by the information gather from the different UN peacekeeping operation reports and maps.
There are three categories
0= UNIPTF is not present in the municipality
1= UNIPTF is present in the municipality
3= UNIPTF visited the municipality but is not permanently establish there.

**IPTFType_pre:** (Categorical variable). This variable presents the type and general function of the UNIPTF establish in the particular municipality. This variable helps to differentiate from United Nations International Police Task
Force (UNIPTF) presence and type of offices.
Categorical
NP (not present) (0)
District HQ (1)
Regional HQ (2)
Station (3)
UNIPTF HQ (4)
Occasional (5)

**Num_Station:** When is identified the number of stations present in the given municipality (Numerical)

**Num_force:** When is possible to identified the number of police officers deployed in this particular municipality.

**IPTFT_Action:** This is a descriptive variable that present information on specific actions carried out in the particular municipality in a particular year.

**UNHCR_Du:** (dummy variable) that represent the presence of UNHCR in the municipalities. The information of this variable is determined by the information gather from the different UN peacekeeping operation reports and UNHCR reports on the country. *In this variable there is relation between the Open City program and target Area for Return*, where the UNHCR had to pay special attention in these particular municipalities in a given year.
1= UNHCR is present in the municipality
0= UNHCR is not present in the municipality

**UNHCR_Action:** This is a descriptive variable that present information on specific actions carried out in the particular municipality in a particular year:

- Monitoring TRA actions
- Information centres for refugees
- Legal Aid Centres
- Monitor OC

**Incidents:** This variable represents any particular incidents that are related to issues of return, either by prevention of it or incidents related to it.

**ACTIONS**

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION ACTION:** It present a description of the action or incident reported in the UNMIBH report.

**ACTIVITY**
Police training
New programme/policy
Return of Refugees*
Reintegration ***
Economic and agricultural rehabilitation programme
Weapons inspections
Weapons confiscation
Freedom of Movement
Setting up an investigation committee
 Provision of assistance to government structures
Transfer of responsibilities
Provision of technical assistance to confidence building
School rehabilitation (or school opening)*
Housing reconstruction*
Police reform
Incidents
Send Liaison team
Returnee related violence
Mine clearance
Open office/school/camp
Return of Minorities
Preparation for election/Elections

**CATEGORY** This section covers the type of categories that comprehend the types of actions carried out by the UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina UNMIBH

Assistance
Return of Refugees *
Governance
Extraction/Interposition
Enforcement
Extraction
Monitoring/Reporting
Other
Integration****
Rule of law
Security
AREA
**ORGANIZATION-ACTOR 1:** It present the UN organization that was involve in the action.

There might be several actors participating in this action. So in that case there is a

**ORGANIZATION ACTOR 2:**

**ORG-ACT_COD:** Code assigned to each actor to identification purposes.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IFOR</td>
<td>Implementation force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OHR</td>
<td>Office of High representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNIPTF</td>
<td>International Police Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civilian Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nation Agency for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CRPC</td>
<td>Commission of Property rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UNIPTF</td>
<td>United Nations Police Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Office of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Mine Action Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>UNTF</td>
<td>United Nation Trust fund-Quick impact fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>The United Nations Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>UNMIBH (HRO)</td>
<td>The UNMIBH Human Rights Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ITFY</td>
<td>International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMACP</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina Mine Action Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>USIP</td>
<td>United States Institute for Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>The coordination office for emergency interventions of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>RS PM</td>
<td>Republika Srpska Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>RRTF</td>
<td>Reconstruction Return Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCATION: it presents the place/country/canton/ region/municipality where the action took place. When the place is identified as one of the 143 municipalities it will assign with the Municipality central code.

ENTITY: When it is possible I will assign the entity where the city is located it, when the specific city is mention in the report or map.

1= Republika Srpska
2= Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina

LEVEL OF THE ACTION: it indicates the level at which the action takes place. Varying from:

1= Municipality level
2= Cantonal Level (in Federation)
3= Regional Level ( Federation of BiH & Republika Srpska)
4= Brcko District
5= National level
6= Abroad
7= Not mention/not clear

*There are some actions that are clearly develop at national level.

YEAR: The database covers the active years of the second UNPKO mission in Bosnia from 1996 to 2002.

Specific_ Date: It contains the specific dates when the action took place.

Month of Report : it represent when it is possible the moth in when the event occurred, or it will be the moth in which the report was submitted to the council.

UN report File : it contains the report reference with its UN universal identification reference and the number of the paragraph where the information was extract from; in addition to the date

Example: S/1998/862-

DATE OF THE REPORT: It contain the date of the publication for the report.

1998-09-16/31

Comments: It contains links to other/previous action or necessary extra information.

Annex 2

1. Data Set Name: CRPC Monthly 1998 by Municipalities
Presents information on the number of cases in each of the municipalities

The information is organized at unit of analysis for Municipality

**Year**: 1998

**Months**: July, August, October, November

The information is divided by the different types of claim that the person presented, depending on what s/he wanted to do with the property.

The options are as follows:

- **Claimant’s option A**: Returning to possession of the property
- **Claimant’s option B**: Retaining the rights to the property in order to dispose of it in a manner that the person will decide later on.
- **Claimant’s option C**: The claimant wishes to dispose of their rights by authorizing the Commission to take all necessary actions on her/his behalf to propose terms for a possible transfer of the ownership rights over the claimed property to the Commission or a third party, in order to receive fair compensation to be accepted by the claimant in lieu of return of property.
- **Claimant’s No particular option**: No option chosen by the claimant.

---

**2. Data Set : Mobile teams Commission for Real Property Claims of Displaced Persons and Refugees**

This data reflects on the information collected directly by the Mobile Teams regulated by CRPC (Commission for Real Property Claims of Displaced Persons and Refugees). This team started operations during 2000.

The information is organized at unit of analysis for Municipality

**Year**: 2000

**Estimated # of DP**: This figures estimated the number of internal displacements in the given municipality. The information is taken for estimates provided by UNHCR

**# Claims collected**: Information on the number of claims collected in each of the municipalities visited by the mobile teams.

---

**3. Data set Name**: Property Law Implementation Plan
These statistics reflect the implementation of the property laws in Bosnia and Herzegovina since the passing of the property laws in April 1998 in the Federation and in December 1998 in the Republika Srpska. However, this plan was not implemented fully until late 1999.

These statistics are collected every month by the staff of OSCE, UNHCR and OHR in the field on the basis of information provided to them by the municipal housing authorities/OMIs.

These statistics do not include information on decisions and repossessions on destroyed property, business premises or land. These statistics do not include information on claims, decisions and cases closed on uncontested/unoccupied property.

**Municipality:** based on the political division as represented in official documents

**Entity:**

Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina
Republika Srpska
Brcko District

**Canton:** This variable might help with later analysis on a geographical level. Depending on which entity is documented, the municipalities are classified in different ways.

**Year:** 2000-2004

**Month:** May 2000 until September 2004 (There are some months missing in some of the years)

**SOP #claims** (Socially Owned Property Claims): The number of claims is equal to the total number of properties on which a claim was filed with the Municipal authorities. The figure stated is equal to the total number of properties on which a claim and/or request for enforcement of a CRPC decision was filed with the municipal housing authorities.

**SOP #Decisions** (Socially Owned Property Number of Decisions): The number of decisions is the total number of decisions issued by the Municipal authorities.

**SOP Reposessions** (Socially Owned Property Number of Repossessions): The number of repossessions is the total number of occupancy right holders or owners that have collected their keys from the municipal authorities.

**PP #claims** (Private Property Number of claims): The number of claims stated is equal to the total number of properties on which a claim and/or request for enforcement of a CRPC decision was filed with the municipal housing authorities.

**PP #Decisions** (Private Property Number of Decisions): The number of decisions is the total number of decisions issued by the Municipal authorities.
PP_Repossessions (Private Property Number of Repossessions): The number of repossessions is the total number of occupancy right holders or owners that have collected their keys from the municipal authorities.

Efficiency Ratio: The implementation ratio is the total number of repossessions divided by the total number of claims, expressed in percentage form.


This data set contains information collected in collaboration between the Ministry for Refugees in Bosnia and Herzegovina, United Nations Agency for Refugees (UNHCR), Commission for Real Property Claims of Displaced Persons and Refugees (CRPC) and the Office of High Representative (OHR).

The information assesses the situation of BiH into five years after the Dayton Peace Agreement. The report presents information at the municipality level, differentiating between the different entities (FBiH, Republika Srpska and Brcko District).

Projection of Population Distribution Based on 1991 Census – per Present BiH Municipalities

Number and Disposition of Housing Units – per 1991 Census: the information presents the total number of Housing units (privately and socially owned). Information is collated by ethnic identity in each municipality.

Projection of Housing Stock Situation by End of 1995 – per Present Municipalities in BiH: the information is at Municipality level, and contains the level of destruction and damaged housing Units between 1992 and 1995.

Number of Persons (Re)-registered in FBiH – per Places of Displacement and 1991 Residence: the information is at Municipality level and Canton level, with information on the origin of displacement.

Number of Persons (Re)-registered in RS – per Places of Displacement and 1991 Residence: the information is at Municipality level, and Cantonal level, with information on the origin of displacement.

Displaced Persons Re-registered in BiH – per Municipalities of Displacement and 1991 Residence: Detailed Review of Displaced Persons Re-registered in BiH – per Municipalities by ethnic origin. The information is at Municipality level, and Cantonal level, with information on the origin of displacement.

Detailed Review of Housing Stock Situation 2005 per Municipalities: the information is at Municipality level, contains the level of destruction and damaged housing units, as well as the number of repaired housing units.
Review of Potential Beneficiaries – per Municipalities of Current Residence in FBiH and RS and Review of Potential Beneficiaries per Municipalities of return in FBiH and RS: Information per Municipality, including ethnic identity.

Review of Number and Rate of “Minority” Returns at the Territory of BiH Federation and RS: Information on the number of minority returnees at the Municipality level classified by ethnicity at 2005

5. Data Set: Return Of Refugees And Displaced Persons To BiH for The Period 2009-2014 (Projection)

Ethnic composition of potential assistance beneficiaries broken down by return entity: A detailed review broken down by return entity and municipality has been presented in separate tables, divided into:

Categories and ethnicities of potential beneficiaries (Refugees/Internal displaced persons), Ethnicity : Bosniacs, Croats, Serbs, Others and Unknown) differentiation between person and families.

Types of intervention and tentative costs: Information at the municipality level on the type of reconstruction needed: house reconstruction/apartment reconstruction/addition of a wing)
**Annex 3: List of Data and variables within each data file.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variables Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Claim Options</td>
<td>Claimant wishes to dispose of right:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A: by returning into possession.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: by retaining the rights to the real property in order to dispose of it in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>order which she/he will decide later on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: by authorising the Commission to take all the necessary actions on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>her/his behalf to propose terms for a possible transfer of the ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>right over the claimed real property to the Commission or a third party,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in order to received fair compensation, to be accepted by the claimant in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lieu of return of real property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None: No option Chosen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Census_2013</td>
<td>Contains preliminary results on the census carried out in 2012</td>
<td>Total_Enumerated Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total_Enumerated Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total_Enumerated Dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census_CRPC_1997</td>
<td>Contain information on preliminary census carried out by CRPC and UNHCR on</td>
<td>WB_ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>population in different municipalities and Internal Displaces</td>
<td>Ent_na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ent_ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canton_na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canton_ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Census_1991: population by municipality based on census 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Currentpop_97: population by municipality based on partial census 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DP's % of DP's from Pop: Percentage of number of Internal Displacees based on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>current living municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Potential</td>
<td>Contains the number of beneficiaries of</td>
<td>Bos_fa (Number of Bosniac families per municipality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries per Municipalities of Current Residence</td>
<td>per municipality of current residence. The information contains ethnic classification: Serbs, Bosniacs, Croats and other. It is also classified by number of person and number of families. This refers to an ethnic identity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005_Num_repaired_destroyed (per_category_damage_level) houses</td>
<td>Contains information by 2005 on the number of repaired housing units, and Number of remaining damaged and destroyed housing units (per categories and damage level) per municipality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census_1991</td>
<td>Contains distribution of 1991 population per present administrative units (municipalities) in BiH.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Original file: Refugees 2005 Corregido</em></td>
<td><em>Original file: Refugees 2005 Corregido</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos_per (Number of Bosniac persons per municipality)</td>
<td>Bos_per (Number of Bosniac persons per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cro_fa (Number of Croats families per municipality)</td>
<td>Cro_fa (Number of Croats families per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cro_per (Number of Croats persons per municipality)</td>
<td>Cro_per (Number of Croats persons per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser_fa (Number of Serb families per municipality)</td>
<td>Ser_fa (Number of Serb families per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser_per (Number of Serb persons per municipality)</td>
<td>Ser_per (Number of Serb persons per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other_fa (Number of other eth families per municipality)</td>
<td>Other_fa (Number of other eth families per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other_per (Number of persons per municipality)</td>
<td>Other_per (Number of persons per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a_fa (Number of n/a families per municipality)</td>
<td>n/a_fa (Number of n/a families per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a_per (Number of n/a persons per municipality)</td>
<td>n/a_per (Number of n/a persons per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot_fa (Total number of families per municipality)</td>
<td>Tot_fa (Total number of families per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot_per (Total number of persons per municipality)</td>
<td>Tot_per (Total number of persons per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num_repar_hou (Number of repaired housing units)</td>
<td>num_repar_hou (Number of repaired housing units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damage_level1 (I – category damage level (5%–20%) p/municipality)</td>
<td>damage_level1 (I – category damage level (5%–20%) p/municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damage_level2 (II – category damage level (25%–40%) p/municipality)</td>
<td>damage_level2 (II – category damage level (25%–40%) p/municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damage_level3 (III – category damage level (45%–65%) per municipality)</td>
<td>damage_level3 (III – category damage level (45%–65%) per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damage_level4 (IV – category damage level (75%–100%) per municipality)</td>
<td>damage_level4 (IV – category damage level (75%–100%) per municipality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mun_ID</td>
<td>Mun_ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mun_na</td>
<td>Mun_na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity_na</td>
<td>Entity_na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosniaks_pop: Bosniaks population per municipality</td>
<td>Bosniaks_pop: Bosniaks population per municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosniaks_pop%: Percentage of Bosniak population per municipality</td>
<td>Bosniaks_pop%: Percentage of Bosniak population per municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croats_pop: Croat population per municipality</td>
<td>Croats_pop: Croat population per municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croats_pop%: Percentage of Croat population per municipality</td>
<td>Croats_pop%: Percentage of Croat population per municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb_pop: Serb population per municipality</td>
<td>Serb_pop: Serb population per municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb_pop%: Percentage of Serb population per municipality</td>
<td>Serb_pop%: Percentage of Serb population per municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others_pop: Other population per municipality</td>
<td>Others_pop: Other population per municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units_1991</td>
<td>Number and disposition of housing units by municipalities in 1991 and Ethnicity based on 1991 census. This includes privately and socially owned housing units. A housing unit area was 60.45 square meters per household or 6.68 m² per an inhabitant.</td>
<td>Others_pop%: Percentage of Others population per municipality Yougoeslavs_pop: Yougoeslave population per municipality Yougoeslavs_pop%: Percentage of Yugoslavs population per municipality Total_pop: total population per municipality Total_pop%: Percentage of population per municipality out of the overall pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Devastation_1995</td>
<td>Projection of Housing Stock Situation by the end of 1995 – per present municipalities in BiH.</td>
<td>Mun_ID Mun_na Entity_na Condit_91 (Number of houses in municipality by 1991) Damage_20% (Number of houses with 20% damage by end of 1995) Damage_20-70% (Number of houses with 20-70% damage by end of 1995)Dama_abov_70%(Number of houses with above 70% damage by end of 1995) Damage_Total (Total number of houses damage by end of 1995) Total_dam% (Total % of houses damage by end of 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced Persons Registered in BiH_2005</td>
<td>Number of persons (RE)-registered in FBiH and RS per places of displacement and 1991 Residence</td>
<td>Mun_ID Mun_na(placeofresiden_91) Entity_na Can_na FBIH_Families FBIH_Persons RS_Families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Displaced_persons_re_registeredpermunofd Displacement91_05 | RS_persons  
| BD_families  
| BD_persons  
| Total_families  
| Total_persons  
| This file compares the two exercise of registration carried on in 2000 and 2005. The information contain “nationality” information or ethnic information. |
| Mun_ID  
| Mun_na(residence_91)  
| 91_Bosniaks  
| 91_Croats  
| 91_Serbs  
| 91_Others  
| 91_persons  
| 91_families  
| re_reg05_Bosnian  
| re_reg05_Croats  
| re_reg05_Serbs  
| re_reg05_Others  
| 05_persons  
| 05_families  
| Number of remaining damaged and destroyed housing units 2005 (per categories and damage level) |
| Mun_ID  
| Mun_na  
| Entity_na  
| Numb_repairedhouse_unit( number of repaired house units)  
| rema_damage5·20% (I – category damage level (5%·20%))  
| rema_damage25·40% (II – category damage level (25%·40%))  
| rema_damage45·65% (III – category damage level (45%·65%))  
| rema_damage75·100% (IV· category damage level (75%·100%))  
| n/a (Not information available)  
| Total_damage (Number of remaining damaged and destroyed housing units) |
Review
number_rate_minority returns at FBiH_RS_1996 to 2005

Municipality Data.
Dta collected between 1996 to October 31 2005.
The data is not differentiate by years (unfortunately)
In the overview of the number and rate of “minority” returns by entities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the number of registered “minority” returns is entered from the Statistics of the UNHCR Representation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the rate of “minority” returns is calculated as the relation between the number of registered “minority” returns of certain nationality at the territory of a particular municipality and the number of population of the same nationality according to the population based on census from 1991 in that municipality.
In cases when the rate of “minority” returns was more than 100%, i.e. when the number of registered “minority” returns was higher than the number of population of the same nationality in that municipality based on the census from 1991 – n/a is entered. Municipalities, in which no “minority” return was recorded, are not included in the overview of number and rate of “minority” returns. Also, there is a mismatch between analytical indicators in the table below and synthetic indicators from the UNHCR’s Statistics in several cases:
• In the section related to the Municipalities of Sarajevo Canton there is the difference of 18.955 “minority” returns recorded at the Cantonal level, but it could not be determined at the territory of which municipality these were realized:
• 2.582 “minority“ returns were recorded in the section related to Brčko District, which the UNHCR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mun_ID</th>
<th>Mun_na</th>
<th>Entity_na</th>
<th>MinorityBosniaks_Ret (Number of Minority_Bosniaks returning)</th>
<th>MinorityBosniaks_Ret% (% of Minority_Bosniaks returning) base_ cen 1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MinorityCroats_Ret (Number of Minority_Croats returning)</td>
<td>MinorityCroats_Ret% (% Minority_Croats returning) base_ cen 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MinoritySebs_Ret (Number of Minority_Serbs returning)</td>
<td>MinoritySebs_Ret% (Number of Minority_Serbs returning) base_ cen 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MinorityRet_Total (Total number of MinoReturnees returning)</td>
<td>Minority_Ret% (total % Minority_Bosniaks returning) base_ cen 1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
keeps in the Tuzla Canton of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and 2,600 in the section which the UNHCR keeps in the Republika Srpska as a separation zone; 
• For the Brčko District of Bosnia and Herzegovina, there is only synthetic overview of “minority” returns.

(citation Here)
Bibliography


HENLEY, G. 2013. Property rights and development briefing.

JUSTINO, P. 2007. On the links between violent conflict and household poverty: How much do we really know?


MATTINGLY, M. 2013. Property rights and development briefing.


