



## **RMAP - VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT VIA FOCUS GROUPS PILOTED AT THE LOCAL LEVEL**

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROCESS.....	2
<b>2. QUESTIONS AND GUIDANCE FOR SOCIAL EXCLUSION ASSESSMENT VIA FG WITH LOCAL COMMUNITIES' (MZ) REPRESENTATIVES (STAGE 1).....</b>	<b>6</b>
3. MINUTES OF FG WITH LOCAL COMMUNITIES' REPRESENTATIVES PILOTED IN GORAŽDE MUNICIPALITY .....	9
<b>4. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FG DISCUSSIONS WITH THE IDENTIFIED VULNERABLE GROUPS (STAGE 2) .....</b>	<b>13</b>
5. MINUTES OF FG DISCUSSIONS WITH THE IDENTIFIED VULNERABLE GROUPS PILOTED IN GORAŽDE .....	16

## **1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROCESS**

### **Underlying research assumptions (1,2 and 3) to be answered by local FGs**

National statistics suggest that there is considerable poverty in BiH (17% average). Statistics also show that poverty is associated with household characteristics (female headed, no employed household members, several children, and age and returnee status), ethnicity, disability and low education.

**(1) It is likely therefore, that these groups form a disproportionate proportion of the poor and are likely to constitute most vulnerable groups at the local level.**

**(2) It is also likely that these groups either live in close proximity and in similar types of accommodation - and therefore there will be geographical dimension to the distribution of needs.**

Many commentators argue that the Social Welfare Centres (SWC) lack appropriate information, do not undertake outreach, and do not operate with sound procedures.

**(3) It is maybe therefore that SWCs have an incomplete understanding of who are the people in need of assistance, and potentially are not addressing the needs of all groups adequately.**

It is recognized that this outcome may be the product of the legal framework as of any conscious or implicit decision making.

### **Objectives:**

- (i) To investigate the types of vulnerability present in individual municipalities;**
- (ii) To identify groups that may have been left outside of the official system of social assistance and support;**
- (iii) To gain some idea of the relative level of deprivation felt, and an indication of the geographical distribution of those groups (if any)**

**This will be undertaken both in order to deepen analysis of the situation of needs within RMAP assessments, and provide a basis for more specific targeting in the planning processes.**

It is underlined that the exercise has been conceived with the explicit intention of improving local service delivery, and aiding municipalities and SWC to improve their effectiveness.

Focus Group discussions will also provide additional information, complementary to the ongoing data collection activities of RMAP in municipalities in order to assess the effectiveness of those systems (share of people in need covered); appraise the relevance of policies adopted; assess the resources needed (both financial and human) for improving the access to social services and support.

The FG use will focus on recipient side/ rights holders only, as primary and secondary data collection by RMAP related to 'providers'/ duty holders side (SWC, municipal administration...) is ongoing on parallel track.

Thus, it seems not to be necessary to come up with additional FGs at provider level.

The FGs exercise will be piloted in two of four partner municipalities (Goražde and Lopare) where RMAP assessments are presently ongoing.

## Methodology used – A two stage approach

**General information for both stages:** The location chosen should allow uninterrupted process throughout the whole session. It is vital that good rapport and relations are established with all participants. In addition to the minute taking, the session will be taped to have a full transcript.

Opening: At the beginning of each session, the process should be well explained. It is important that all questions about the exercise are clarified and that participants feel comfortable about the setting.

Closing: Closing remarks should thank participants and explain what will happen with their inputs. It should be emphasized again that all discussions are confidential and findings will not be attributed to individuals or used in a way that might identify specific individuals.

Stocktaking after the closing: Immediately after the session is closed / participants have left, the moderator and rapporteur should go jointly through the outputs on flip charts and the notes of the rapporteur, in assessing the outputs related to each question and identifying gaps, ambiguities or contradictions.

Impressions and observations should also be discussed and noted down (e.g. related to credibility, seriousness of participants, tensions, major consensus, major conflicts, persistent minority opinions...). Finally, it should be noted down which questions or methods have worked well and which have not.

### **On the RMAP side the FG will be covered by a moderator and a rapporteur.**

The *moderator* is tasked to manage the discussion in an active and sensitive way. He/she is responsible for facilitating the discussion to provide relevant information for the envisaged outputs of each question. His/ her role is to be an active listener and move the discussion in order to ensure that key issues are covered without over directing. He/ she has also to monitor participation (who talks too much / not enough) and (without interrupting) ensure that people participate equally and by posing relevant questions to build consensus on conclusions whilst also avoiding pre-conceptions.

It is also the role of the moderator to lead the discussion in such a way to enable the rapporteur to document the results accordingly. This is in particular relevant in order to try to solicit contrasting opinion, if the group, on first sight, seems to be too homogenous and in firming up the responses at the end of the discussions (e.g. via a ranking). In case the group is answering the questions too fast like a closed questionnaire where they just tick the answers, the moderator may also need to play “devil’s advocate” and question the opinions in order to stimulate a broader discussion.

The *rapporteur* has a similarly vital role that goes beyond simple minute taking. He/ she should take the role of a professional observer, not only recording the points relevant for the required outputs; but also his/ her observations on credibility of discussants, disputes or tensions (this can be done in form of director’s notes, i.e. “fight between X and Y on topic Z”). The rapporteur’s record should focus on the salient points (especially the unexpected) and avoid pre-conceptions. When taking notes he/ she should always keep the envisaged outputs in mind and ensure that **consensus findings** are properly noted while at the same time listening for and recording strongly held **minority opinions**.

FG meetings should not take longer than 2 hrs and it is envisaged that a small incentive would be provided (e.g. lunch, dinner invitation) for participants to participate and engage in discussion. (The choice of incentive should be discussed with municipal counterparts.).

Tools - flipcharts, cards and maps – will also be utilized during the FGs and the Rapporteur should make sure that these tools are available. Flipcharts should be marked by the moderator to keep key issues in mind, and confirm key findings like rankings and consensus and differing views. Maps are particularly helpful for the identification of geographical distribution of vulnerable groups.

The whole session will be recorded on tape and a transcript will be made in order not to lose out salient points and to support the rapporteur task.

**It is important all participants understand the limitations of this approach. FGs obtain views and attitudes, and test these through open discussion, review and questioning. They cannot record definitive discrete data (proportions and quantities).**

### Stage one

**As a first step, the characteristics of poverty in a given municipality as well as identification of most vulnerable groups will be assessed via the use of FGs with representatives (presidents) of MZs.**

MZ coordinator will be asked to nominate people to form a FG, which will run through the questionnaire with the assistance of an RMAP facilitator

Within this group, it is important to ensure

- i) geographical balance & a mix of rural, rural-urban, urban MZs - if there are more MZs than participants)
- ii) different work/ educational backgrounds
- iii) gender and age balance;
- iv) a variety of income and wealth backgrounds (“poor – rich”)
- v) participants not being related to each other or close friends

Local counterparts selecting participants should provide RMAP with a list of MZ representative and should then jointly with RMAP representative select 8-12 members following the above mentioned criteria. The role of the RMAP representative would be to try to ensure that as far as possible criteria are met and a certain balance is kept. (The listing is thus not meant literally but as guidance of biases to be avoided.)

The questionnaire will allow initial open discussion with the moderator tasked to lead discussion, and to home in to more specific questions and eventual firming up of answers (*see guidance in italics*). Outcomes for each question area also given to provide some rigor and definitive findings, within the scope of what are possible. These are generally: **rankings; indications of relativities; and minority versus majority opinions.**

### Stage two

**As a second step, additional focus group meetings would be held with 6-8 representatives of most vulnerable groups identified which should sharpen the assessment of their specific disadvantages.**

Selection of participants in stage two should be made in consultation with representative CSOs and/ or community leaders based on results of the first FG session. (SWC could also be consulted; however one should be aware that selected groups will also judge SWC performance). NGOs could also be partners in this (Merhamet and the Red Cross).

The methodology and approach will be similar to the first round, but moderators should be aware of the impact of having an even more homogenous group and the need to ensure adequate check (e.g. through eliciting contrasting opinions by the moderator).

### FGs groups / meetings per municipality:

- 1 meeting with group of 8-12 citizens / municipality / drawn from MZ representatives
- X Meetings with x vulnerable groups identified (composed of 6-8 citizens identified with the help of local CSOs and/ or community leaders)

Within this group, it is important to ensure

- i) geographical balance if possible;
- ii) gender and age balance;
- iii) displaced persons
- iv) participants not being related to each other or close friends

Local counterparts selecting participants should provide RMAP with a list of representatives and should then jointly with RMAP representative select 8-12 members following the above mentioned criteria. The role of the RMAP representative would be to try to ensure that as far as possible criteria are met and a certain balance is kept. (The listing is thus not meant literally but as guidance of biases to be avoided.)

**2. QUESTIONS AND GUIDANCE FOR SOCIAL EXCLUSION ASSESSMENT VIA FG WITH LOCAL COMMUNITIES’ (MZ) REPRESENTATIVES (STAGE 1)**

*Note: each group is being asked to reflect on their locale and relative to other parts of the area/ region...*

**1. What does it mean to be poor in your municipality?**

*Listen... Wait...*

*The following are expected to be mentioned: poor shelter and living conditions, poor food and nutrition, poor education, no job, low wages, poor health/ life expectancy, weak political voice, no cultural life.*

**Note:** *If nobody is talking or the moderator feels that after some discussion, major aspects have not been mentioned then he/ she should mention them. But sensitivity is needed and moderators must not lead the discussion in a particular direction. People should not vote on consensus but rather opinions should be discussed and questioned. Minority opinions can be important results.*

**Focus 1:** *Get the meeting to rank the characteristics they think are most important in addition to income. (Use cards and ask each member to put 3-5 characteristics on cards. Put then the cards on flipcharts for discussing the ranking.)*

**Focus 2:** *Probe extreme poverty - does anyone they know in the area regularly: (a) have difficulty making ends meet? (b) Have difficulty keeping dry and warm? (c) Go hungry? How about elsewhere in the municipality?(d).....(e).....(f) etc (i.e. add – or subtract examples of extreme poverty).*

Write these up on the flip chart – take a straw poll.

Outputs: (a) Description of local poverty; (b) Note any views on income versus other forms of poverty; (c) get the meeting to rank the characteristics they think are most important in addition to income (d) getting the meeting to decide whether extreme poverty exists in the municipality.

**Key point:** Leave a short summary (and ranking) of their understanding of poverty on the flip chart – throughout the remaining process of the FG exercise.

**2. How bad would you say is the poverty situation in your municipality relative to BiH and the surrounding areas?**

*Contextualize: Begin by re-stating/ referring to the definition of poverty already arrived at above at (1). Wait... listen...*

**Focus 1:** *Compare Municipality to Entity and BiH... Try using a matrix on the board...keep answers open – “better/ same/ worse” is only for the rapporteur to structure the answers accordingly.*

*Probe the assessments: Ask why they think it is better/same/worse? Again remind them we are thinking of their wide definition of poverty...*

	<i>Neighbouring Areas</i>	<i>Entity</i>	<i>BiH</i>
<i>Municipality</i>			

Outputs: (a) how the Municipality is relative to other areas (surrounding area, Entity, BiH) average/ about same/ worse (see box)?

**3. What is presently done (or what should be done) in your municipality to address poverty?**

*Wait... listen...*

*Discussion expected to come up with: better public services, i.e. better education and health, better employment programmes, access to credit, better, safety nets*

*If not given, again mention any not considered, but also allow participants to reject/ accept.*

**Focus 1:** *try to rank most important policy responses (public services, safety nets, employment measures).*

**Focus 2:** *Ask how well they feel the Municipality responds?*

*Try to obtain views on services, lobbying with higher level governments...*

**Focus 3 (if there is time):** *Ask how, and if, they feel the SWC helps?*

Outputs: (a) identify the top three policy responses needed; and (b) in which area is the municipality responding well in which not (c) How, especially, is the SWC responding (if time permits)?

**4. Are there particular sorts of household which are more/ less affected by deprivation in your municipality?**

*Wait ... listen...*

*Note: the objective is to find out if poverty has a **group** character - but it was agreed, the question could ask generically about 'sorts' of household without mentioning groups – and then **flush out** group versus characteristics during the discussion.*

*Characteristics: large household size, one person household (female, elderly), remoteness, inherently poor living conditions in rural areas...*

*Groups expected to be mentioned: unemployed, female headed, local minorities, Roma, disabled, pensioners...*

**Focus 1:** *Ask for top 5 things (groups or characteristics) mark out any that are very severe... (Use flip chart- mark worst with asterisk)*

**Focus 2:** *Are different groups affected by different pressures?*

Outputs: (a) Identification of whether it is groups versus characteristics which accompany poverty; (b) Ranking deprived categories and groups (this may be difficult – marking out worst may be best we can get); (c) from this you will also have an indication of whether membership in groups or attributes matters more

**5. Are the poor concentrated in some areas in, first specific MZ/ area, and second other parts the municipality?**

*Wait... listen...*

*Note: The question seeks to resolve whether the poor and non poor are co-located. Again avoid mention of groups initially.*

**Focus 1:** *Are there really poor areas? If so look at the MZ or area first... and then wider municipality. Take a map out – put up to assist identification.*

**Focus 2:** *Ask also - what differentiates poor from non-poor areas?*

*Probe what these poor areas have in common – this again will enable consideration of groups versus living conditions as covariant with poverty.*

Outputs: (a) record areas/ group locations within the area of the municipality/ within specific MZs (b) Specifically test if there is a location dimension, and (c) what characterizes it, i.e. what do poor areas have in common.

**6. Do you believe some groups are excluded or discriminated against in your municipality? If so which and how?**

*Wait... Listen...*

*Note this is an a wholly open question... but if answer is an unequivocal ‘no’, probe by challenging that some are excluded by public policy responses (social services ...) and private actions – mention minority populations and Roma to test.*

*Note: here we are not seeking evidence of Municipal driven discrimination, but of wider exclusion by the community – and both public and private actors...*

Outputs: Record if any and which groups regarded as suffering discrimination by mainstream?

### 3. MINUTES OF FG WITH LOCAL COMMUNITIES' REPRESENTATIVES PILOTED IN GORAŽDE MUNICIPALITY

As a first step, a focus group discussion was organised with representatives of local communities (MZs) in order to assess characteristics of poverty and identify the most vulnerable population groups (December 21, 2006).

Participants included: representatives of MZ Goražde 4, MZ Goražde 1, MZ Osječani & Podhranjen, MZ Vranići, MZ Rešetnica, MZ Posestra, MZ Osanica, MZ Hubjeri (9 participants in total, one woman).

---

#### I. What does it mean to be poor in your municipality?

##### (a) Views on income versus other forms of poverty

Most of participants stated that poverty in their local communities was a result of the lack of stable income and employment opportunities that particularly affect BPK Goražde (the poorest Canton in FBiH). Other forms of poverty that were mentioned include poor social welfare, poor housing conditions and lack of own homes (destroyed housing), problem of health insurance and hindered access to healthcare (undeveloped network of outreach healthcare facilities), poor state of infrastructure (road infrastructure in particular), poor quality of education, and limited access to information.

##### (b) Description of local poverty

- Participants from rural areas agreed that the causes of poverty among the population in their local communities lied in the lack of support for agricultural production (lack of incentives and investments (equipment and livestock), production and storage capacities and lack of market opportunities – inability to sell agricultural products) and the poor state of infrastructure, particularly local roads. (*“There are agricultural producers that throw away tons of apples, because they cannot sell it. Plums are less of a problem, but apples represent a problem due to the limited market opportunities... as well as milk... there is a Dairy in Mravinac, but it takes up to 10 months for people to be paid for their 1 litre of milk... Many sheep breeders throw away or burn the wool because they cannot sell it...”*) Furthermore, a specific characteristic of these local communities is a significant portion of elderly population, often unable to cultivate land. (*“My local community is situated at a height of 1,000 m above sea level with about 98% of population making their living through agriculture. However, for the most part this is elderly population, unable to cultivate land. On the other hand, even if there is a surplus produce, producers do not know what to do with it.”*) MINORITY STATEMENT: One of the participants claimed that around 70% of agricultural land in the municipality is not being used, because people prefer receiving social assistance rather than living from their work.
- In urban areas, unemployment particularly affects youth (those who completed secondary education) and mid-age women. The latter have particular difficulties in finding employment as they cannot return to their pre-war jobs while employers if they employ at all, rather employ men or younger educated persons.
- Local roads are in poor conditions which is another obstacle to development of agriculture in rural areas. Such state of roads hinders access to healthcare and education facilities, particularly in winter period. This is particularly true for higher altitude villages.
- The group considered that the quality of education was lower than before and that in general it did not correspond to the needs of the labour market.

- The amount of social benefits allocated to vulnerable categories was considered to be low and insufficient to satisfy basic needs of these categories. (*“Child allowance amounts to 15 KM, while the benefits for the elderly amount to 70 KM... and what can you do with that?”*); (*“In my local community, there are many disabled children who need wheel chairs.”*)
- Many inhabitants are not covered by health insurance. At the same time, those who are covered still need to participate in the payment of costs of medical treatment and medicaments. The elderly are forced to spend most of their pensions for purchase of medicaments.
- Many inhabitants are still waiting for reconstruction assistance to be able to return to their pre-war homes. Some have returned to reconstructed houses where living conditions are very poor.
- Participants agreed that cultural life was almost inexistent, particularly in rural areas, and was mostly reduced to watching television (*“We do not have time for culture, we are busy with more important issues”*).
- OTHER: Participants also mentioned poor access to information, lack of skilled people in the municipality, lack of entrepreneurial spirit (*“entrepreneurial poverty”*), extensive grey economy (*“In my local community many of those who are working do not receive their salary, while social and health contributions are not being paid for them.”*), workers “on waiting lists” (*“There are around 2,000 workers who are neither employed nor registered as unemployed with the Employment Bureau... they have no protection.”*), aging population (negative rate of natural population growth), large families, etc. The term “moral poverty” was mentioned in relation to children not providing for their parents. It was also mentioned that landslides in some of the local communities make some households more vulnerable. General feeling of insecurity was also mentioned on several occasions.

(c) Ranking the characteristics

1. Unemployment
2. Infrastructure (roads, water and power supply, housing, schools, undeveloped network of outreach healthcare facilities)
3. Lack of social security and inadequate healthcare protection
4. Lack of policies by authorities (in particular at the national level) to promote and support agricultural production
5. Return process has still not been completed (both in urban and rural areas).

(d) Extreme poverty

Participants agreed that there were not many cases of extreme poverty in their municipality. Some mentioned several individual cases but stated that the number of these cases had decreased following interventions by authorities and humanitarian organisations and as a result of solidarity among neighbours.

**II. How bad would you say the poverty situation in your municipality relative to BiH and the surrounding areas?**

Surroundings: The group considered that the situation in Goražde was the same as in the surrounding municipalities. In all these municipalities the industry is destroyed and there are no employment opportunities. (*“Goražde used to be a developed industrial area. Now agricultural production is left as the only option.”*)

FBiH: The situation in Goražde is worse than in other parts of FBiH. The group stated the following reasons:

1. People in other parts in FBiH have more options for employment
2. BPK is the poorest canton in FBiH

3. Goražde does not have good geographic position and good road communications (isolation from the rest of the FBiH – *“Goražde is somewhat of a dead-end.”*)
4. Goražde is completely surrounded by the RS (fear of secession of the RS – *“We often hear the messages on RS secession through referendum.”*)

BiH: The same as above. (*“Eastern Bosnia is the poorest region in BiH.”*)

### III. What is presently done (or what should be done) in your municipality to address poverty?

Several areas where policy responses are needed were mentioned:

- Reverse the trend of low birth rate (*“In my local community (MZ Posestra), there has been no newborn in the last six years.”*)
- Increase and improve security (in all aspects)
- Support to agriculture (promote linkages to the market, in particular, incentives for organic food production and training in agricultural production and marketing) (*“We need someone to train us on how to grow berries and fruits in general, how to pick juniper, how to produce organic food in a way that we can sell it to the EU... we do not need donations in livestock... 30 out of 50 dunums (1 dunum=around 900m<sup>2</sup>) of land that I possess are not cultivated...”*)
- Investments in job creation
- Improve access to capital/better conditions for loans
- Incentives for skilled people in education and health to move to Goražde
- Education and capacity building of human resources
- Construction of the „fast road“ connecting Goražde with Sarajevo
- Public infrastructure (reconstruction of power supply network, water supply network, construction of local water supply networks, etc.)
- Increased support for this area by national authorities and international community
- Mine clearance
- Attracting Diaspora and motivating them to invest in Goražde

(a) Ranking:

1. Investing in infrastructure (electricity network, water supply network) and construction of Goražde-Sarajevo „fast road“
2. Employment creation
3. Increased support for this area by national authorities and international community

(b) In which area is the municipality responding well in which not

Participants agreed that the municipality and BPK responded in all segments, but improved responses are hindered by their difficult financial situation. The same answer was given with regards to the response of the Centre for Social Welfare.

### IV. Are there particular sorts of households which are more/less affected by deprivation?

Initial ideas:

- Unemployed from 30 to 50 years of age and capable to work (*“People of age 30-50, do not have any chance for employment.”*)
- Population unable to work (including elderly and individuals with special needs)
- Households with greater number of members
- Pensioners – elderly without pensions and family support
- Families of persons with special needs
- Population with low education
- Displaced persons and returnees in general

- Women (*“Women are particularly disadvantaged. For example, when a young woman gets hired, the employer conditions her not to get pregnant for five years.”*)
- Youth with secondary education, without employment opportunities and no perspectives, they also find it difficult to start a family
- People living in rural areas
- MINORITY STATEMENT: *“Some individuals are still expecting the state to take care of them and thus are not eager to find work.”*

Following discussions on particular groups, participants agreed on the following:

Displaced persons in general are not in much worse position than the domicile population. Most of the displaced in Goražde have resolved their housing problems (apart from residents of collective centres), while other problems such as unemployment, education, healthcare affect both groups. The same applies to minority returnees. Furthermore, youth and persons between 40 and 50 years of age with secondary education are vulnerable in the sense that they do not have any employment opportunities and thus no perspectives. Other social categories of population receive some regular income streams (in the form of social benefits).

(a) Ranking:

1. Educated and unemployed, in particular youth and persons between 40 and 50 years of age unemployed and with secondary education
2. Elderly – in particular without income or family support
3. Persons with special needs (*“They at least have social assistance benefits.”*)

\*\*\*Specifically vulnerable are also displaced persons living in collective centres (those that remained in collective centres are mostly elderly without family support and perspective to return as well as individuals with physical or mental disabilities).

**V. Are the poor concentrated in some areas in, first specific MZ/area, and second other parts of the municipality?**

The group agreed that the poor are not concentrated in specific areas, and that population in urban and rural areas was in more or less same situation. (MINORITY OPINION: *“Those living in the city are worse off, as they do not have a possibility to cultivate land and breed animals.”*)

However, it was noted that all collective centres were located in town (Belvedere, Balkan). Commonalities in this specific case include IDP status and living in collective centres, without income, living on social assistance, without family support or possibility of return. Other specific locations where the poor would be concentrated were not identified, and thus no general commonalities could be identified. MZ Osječani was mentioned as a local community detached from the rest of the municipality due to the bad road infrastructure.

OTHER: it was mentioned that two villages are in a risk situation due to the landslides (Đakovići and Ledina).

**VI. Do you believe some groups are excluded and discriminated against in your municipality? If so, which and how?**

The only female representative of MZ stated that there were cases where women were exposed to employment discrimination in private companies. (*“Laws are not being applied in case of maternity leave in private companies.”*)

The moderator has also questioned low participation of women in the representative bodies and work of local communities, but participants have claimed that this is due only to the women lack of interest.

#### **4. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FG DISCUSSIONS WITH THE IDENTIFIED VULNERABLE GROUPS (STAGE 2)**

##### **1. Do you consider “yourself” to be worse off than others in this municipality? If so how?**

*Wait... listen...*

*Check for: poor shelter and living conditions, poor food and nutrition, poor education, no job, low wages, poor health/ life expectancy, weak political voice, no cultural life.*

***Note:** If nobody is talking or the moderator feels that after some discussion, major aspects have not been mentioned then he/ she should mention them. But sensitivity is needed and moderators must not lead the discussion in a particular direction. People should not vote on consensus but rather opinions should be discussed and questioned. Minority opinions can be important results.*

***Focus 1:** differentiate between economic and social conditions / (unemployment etc) versus policy responses (services, safety nets).*

***Focus 2:** Which is the worst constraint? (Use cards and ask each member to put 3-5 characteristics on cards. Put then the cards on flipcharts for discussing the ranking.)*

***Focus 3:** Is the situation getting better or worse? How has it changed in recent times?*

***Focus 4:** Follow ups: of the people they know (including their family), does anyone have difficulty: (i) making ends meet? (ii) keeping warm and dry (iii) getting adequate food and nutrition?*

Outputs: (a) check off dimensions, and ask for ranking.... (b) Determine direction of change in the overall situation - if any – ask if: better/ worse/ same (c) presence of extreme poverty (note down total numbers of cases)

##### **2. Do you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation) have adequate access to key public services? i.e. (a) educational facilities (b) to health facilities (c) others?**

*Wait... listen...*

***Focus 1:** Then probe – if no – why”: problems with physical accessibility, do they have sufficient and up-dated information on available services, distance too far to services, services are too expensive and they cannot afford them, quality of services are insufficient, staff is not professional or discriminating...*

***Focus 2:** Specifically ask about discrimination...how is it reflected? And who discriminates?*

Outputs: general assessment, ranking of problems, is situation worse for specific group? Is discrimination evident?

##### **3. Do you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation) receive social assistance? Which sort and from whom? Does it meet your needs?**

*Wait... listen...*

*Expected that SWC and NGOs will be mentioned...If not mentioned specifically ask if people have experience of SWC services...*

**Focus 1:** How do you assess the work of the SWC in your municipality in serving you? Which is more important SWC or NGOs?

**Focus 2:** Probe this - do you know what type of assistance is available? Do you think there is sufficient information provided on assistance available to people in social need?

**Focus 3:** Is there anyone who is in a similar situation left out completely?

Outputs: (a) check if assistance is being sought and received; (b) obtain majority view of SWC – positive/ neutral/ negative. On probing question – record majority results on awareness, information, outreach?  
Look for particular issues of exclusion - related to access to existing services etc. or something you did not expect.

#### 4. In addition to social assistance, what are you doing to make ends meet?

Clarification – this means in relation to money or accessing essential services....

Listen... Wait...

Focus: check off coping approaches – work in grey sector, subsistence farming, relying on family/ friends, rely on family overseas, rely on NGOs or church/ mosque....

Outputs: Main strategies at work – try to differentiate between the more significant and widely used

#### 5. Do you feel part of your local community (i.e. the wider municipality or locality)?

Wait... listen...

**Focus 1:** Do you participate in an adequate way in the political life of your municipality? Then ask how?

Prompt... do people vote? If not, why not? Is it considered useful or pointless?

Outputs: forms of participation, voting (a majority/ minority who vote)... general feelings – And relative to main community?

**Focus 2:** Do you think that you are adequately informed and consulted on public services, plans and policies? Are other people/groups better informed?

Listen....

Follow up: Ask about positive and negative examples.

Outputs: types of information available & relative to main community?

**Focus 3:** Do you take part in the cultural life of your municipality? Is this important for you? And how?

Expected: Theatre, cinema, going out, cultural events organized, youth and school groups, work groups...

Output: are a majority culturally active, and relative to main community?

**6. What would you consider to be a solution to the specific disadvantages faced by you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation)?**

*Discussion expected to come up with: better public services, i.e. better education and health, better employment programmes, access to credit, better, safety nets*

*Listen... Wait...*

*Check off solution and try to find out if there is consensus on some steps / solutions or on their priority...*

**Focus 1:** *try to rank most important policy responses (public services, safety nets, employment measures).*

Outputs: identify the top three policy responses needed
---

## **5. MINUTES OF FG DISCUSSIONS WITH THE IDENTIFIED VULNERABLE GROUPS PILOTED IN GORAŽDE**

In Goražde, second stage focus group meetings were held with representatives of the identified most vulnerable groups in order to deepen understanding of their specific disadvantages. Focus group discussions in Goražde were organised with representatives of the following groups:

1. Unemployed with secondary education aged 40-60
2. Unemployed youth with secondary education
3. Elderly without income or family support
4. Returnees

### **Focus group 1: Unemployed with secondary education aged 40-60 (11 participants)**

Selection of participants was made through the Employment Bureau. Participants were for the most part unemployed since the end war, registered with Employment Bureau and unable to find a job. They were all married and had children. Participants included residents of Goražde and displaced persons (DPs), while one of them was a returnee. Three participants were demobilized soldiers and only one of them went through a professional re-training programme. They all stated that this was the first time in the last 25 years that they were consulted on difficulties/problems that they faced, existing employment policies, and development or community-related issues in general.

#### **I. Do you consider “yourself” to be worse off than others in your municipality? If so how?**

##### **(a) Economic and social conditions versus policy responses**

All participants mentioned the lack of employment and regular income as their particular disadvantage and the factor determining their present situation. They also mentioned that their age was often a limiting factor when it came to their access to employment in private companies. Majority of participants reported that they were members of households with school-age children and no one employed. Education of children represented a particular financial burden to their families (one of the participants stated that her child had to give up studying due to the financial constraints). When it came to their access to health care, some participants mentioned that they had no health insurance, as they had missed the legally prescribed deadline for registration with the Employment Bureau. Moreover, participants with DP status mentioned that following the last re-registration of DPs, relevant documents had not been forwarded to the Cantonal Ministry for DPs and Refugees in a timely manner, thus leaving some of DPs without health insurance. Participants also pointed out unsatisfactory housing conditions. At the same time, they stressed that the policy responses were generally inadequate, while quality of public services was in most of the cases poor.

##### **(b) Constraint ranking**

It was not possible to rank the characteristics, but the following characteristics were mentioned:

- Lack of regular income / no reliable source of income (difficulties to make two ends meet: inability to provide for food and clothes, utility costs)
- Difficulties related to financing of children’s education
- Health issues (physical and mental), limited access to health care and poor healthcare services
- Lack of security and prospects
- Housing issues (without own property, unreconstructed housing units)
- Poor communication with public authorities and public institutions (including Employment Bureau), lack of transparency and information dissemination
- Lack of transparency in employment, nepotism (jobs “reserved” for children of officials), gender and age-based discrimination in employment
- Lack of social mapping and lack of adequate programmes and policies, inadequate targeting
- Poor awareness of rights

(c) Direction of change in overall situation

All participants agreed that the situation had not changed for better in the last several years. It only resulted in stratification and greater inequalities within the society (*“It was much easier during the war, when at least the majority was in the same situation”*). A participant who is a demobilized soldier stated he felt the only improvement immediately upon demobilisation back and 2001 but since then this has been used as an argument why he could not receive any other assistance/jobs.

(d) Extreme poverty

Participants stated that they were aware of people living in extreme poverty, mentioning also that they could also be considered as extremely poor (*“If I counted altogether what I have earned since 2002, it would not be more than 1,000 KM”*).

**II. Do you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation) have adequate access to key public services, i.e. educational facilities, health facilities and others?**

(a) Access to services

Participants mentioned that access to services was generally problematic, particularly for inhabitants of rural areas. In addition to the lack of information on available services, it was reported that services provided were of poor quality, especially when it came to healthcare services (unskilled medical staff, necessity to wait several hours to be provided with care, etc.). Some services were not provided for no obvious reason (i.e. the cantonal hospital possesses a mammogram, which is not being used), and thus patients from Goražde were exposed to additional costs, as they were obliged to seek these services elsewhere. In addition, reimbursement of costs for healthcare services provided outside of Bosnia-Podrinje Canton was defined as very slow.

Due to the unclear administrative arrangements for healthcare provision in BiH (health care system regulated at the entity and cantonal levels and reimbursement of costs between Health Insurance Funds not taking place), returnees to Goražde faced difficulties in accessing health care, as they are obliged to pay for services.

Participants underlined insufficient information dissemination by the Employment Bureau, mentioning in particular that information was provided only when specifically asked for. The same referred to the information provided by healthcare institutions, where a specific example of parcels for newborns was mentioned. Information on public services was sometimes provided through media.

When it came to scholarships for children, there was no adequate targeting and employment status of parents was often not considered at all (scholarships were not necessarily provided to children with both parents unemployed).

(b) Discrimination

All participants stated they felt discriminated against based on their age by potential employers. Moreover, cases of gender-based discrimination were also evident (allegedly in *Bekto* International Company woman employees were required to sign an agreement by which they guaranteed not to get pregnant within a 5-year period). On the other hand there were examples of affirmative actions being taken for employment of families of fallen soldiers, although they already received relatively high benefits. A DP participant mentioned that DPs were even more disadvantaged than the domicile population when it came to access to employment.

**III. Do you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation) receive social assistance? Which sort and from whom? Does it meet your needs?**

Participants reported that they, as unemployed persons capable to work, received no social assistance through the CSW. One-time financial assistance (150 KM) was provided by the Canton, but access was not equal for everyone (*“Generally, it is the same people always receiving one-time financial assistance”*). The Municipality also provided one-time financial assistance (up to 100 KM), but people

were generally not aware of this possibility and therefore did not request it. No assistance was provided by NGOs.

For returnees, reconstruction assistance was insufficient and selection procedures were generally slow (i.e. construction material is provided in instalments, insufficient funding for skilled labour).

#### **IV. In addition to social assistance, what are you doing to make ends meet?**

Among coping strategies, participants mentioned periodical employment in the grey or informal economy, subsistence farming, remittances from family members residing abroad, and minor irregular support provided by religious organisations.

#### **V. Do you feel part of your local community (i.e. the wider municipality or locality)?**

Most of participants stated they felt alienated from regular social processes and their community. Their reiterated that the FG was the first time someone had asked for their opinion.

##### **(a) Forms of participation and information**

Most of the participants reported they voted, but stressed that they felt there was no use (*“It takes more than four months for governments to be established”*). Media was generally considered as an only source of information. Local authorities rarely or never paid visits to local communities (MZ). Participants also mentioned the GROZD platform signed by political parties, but pointed out that citizens’ activism produced no concrete results in this case. Participants explained that they never tried to organise themselves as a group, as they did not think this would help them in any way.

##### **(b) Participation in cultural life**

Some participants stated they had lost interest for cultural life as they were overwhelmed with their existential problems. There were not many cultural events in rural areas and every visit to town required additional expenditures. It was also mentioned that youth in rural areas mostly spent their free time in local cafés.

#### **VI. What would you consider to be a solution to the specific disadvantages faced by you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation)?**

Participants mentioned the following:

- Employment and retirement policies targeting in particular unemployed of this age group, effective implementation of employment programmes with private companies, and greater engagement of municipal authorities in this area
- Professional re-training programmes
- More active role of the Employment Bureau in following and reacting upon changes and demands of labour market
- Greater support to development of crafts by putting in place similar measures that exist in case of agricultural producers
- Greater support to sustainable return
- Reform of the social welfare system at the national level
- Implementation of laws through penalties/fines
- Harmonisation of education system with the labour market

## **FG 2 - Unemployed youth with secondary education (8 participants)**

Selection of participants was made through the Employment Bureau. Participants were youngsters aged 18-25, for the most part unemployed, with periodical short-term employment. Some of them were university students. All of them were registered with the Employment Bureau and unable to find a job.

### **I. Do you consider “yourself” to be worse off than others in your municipality? If so how?**

#### **a) Economic and social conditions versus policy responses**

All participants stated that they were often unable to find a job considering that previous working experience was a requirement. This created a vicious circle, as they could not find a job without previous experience and at the same time could not gain experience without a job. In addition to the lack of employment opportunities in the municipality, they reported that the nepotism limited their access to employment. Existing employment programmes implemented through the Employment Bureau did not represent an adequate solution, as the unemployed were requested to find themselves an employer willing to engage them before reaching an agreement with the Employment Bureau.

Participants also mentioned lack of opportunities for them to develop any additional skills, including knowledge of foreign languages or IT skills (one of the participants collected and sold old steel to pay for an English language course), in addition to high costs of obtaining a driver’s licence.

All participants stated they lived with their parents, with no prospects of founding their own family (inability to find an employment and get a housing loan). One of the participants reported he was married and had a child, but lived with his parents and relied on their support. Other participants also relied on their parents and in some cases the only family income was financial support provided by the CSW (around 75 KM per month). For those studying, education costs were covered by their families, while no scholarships were available for irregular/ part time students. Lack of income affected family relations and their general well-being. (*“I live in a five-member household, with no one employed.”*)

#### **b) Constraint ranking**

It was not possible to rank the characteristics, but the following characteristics were mentioned:

- Inability to find a job/lack of income/dependence on parents
- Lack of working experience
- Lack of possibility to separate from parents or to plan family
- Inability to study as regular students
- Lack of health insurance (students who did not register with the Employment Bureau within the legally prescribed deadline)
- Lack of information
- Nepotism and corruption (*“Jobs are being “purchased!”*)
- Inability to choose foreign language at school (i.e. some participants studied Arabic at school and could not opt for another language).

#### **c) Direction of change in overall situation**

Participants agreed that the situation had not changed for better in the last several years. Even though new jobs had been created, participants had not had a chance to get them due to the widely spread nepotism and corruption.

#### **d) Extreme poverty**

Participants stated they were aware of people living in extreme poverty (i.e. unemployed couples with children hardly making ends meet).

## **II. Do you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation) have adequate access to key public services, i.e. educational facilities, health facilities, others?**

### a) Access to services

Participants stated that the provision of healthcare services was poorly organised, medical staff was not always available, general treatment of patients was unprofessional, and adequate information was not provided. They also mentioned that the corruption was present even in healthcare institutions. According to them, insufficient and sometimes contradictory information was provided by the Employment Bureau, and available information was only posted at the notice board of the Employment Bureau. Additionally, employment procedures were not transparent, and favouritism and nepotism were also mentioned. It was also reported that returnee population faced difficulties in access to public services due to the poor condition of roads in rural areas, as well as the lack of transportation services.

### b) Discrimination

All participants stated they felt discriminated against based on their age since they were usually not taken seriously by any public institution or potential employers. Gender-based discrimination was mentioned in case of public works, as it was made clear in advance to all those interested that public works were meant for men only. They also reported that they were not treated equally in the process of scholarship allocation, as some of them did not receive it, even if they fulfilled the requirements.

## **III. Do you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation) receive social assistance? Which sort and from whom? Does it meet your needs?**

It was reported that there was no social assistance available for unemployed youth, who for the most part relied on parents' support and irregular, temporary jobs. Public works during the summertime were also mentioned, but the selection process was defined as non-transparent with the same group of people always getting these jobs.

## **IV. In addition to social assistance, what are you doing to make ends meet?**

All participants stated that they relied on their parents' support, although in majority of cases even their parents were not employed (in some cases parents received social assistance only or were engaged in subsistence farming). They mentioned that on average they spent 100-150 KM a month for their own needs. Occasional support from friends was also mentioned, as well as rare temporary jobs (cleaning, collecting old steel and selling it, public works during the summertime, etc.). No support was provided by NGOs or religious organisations, although it was also mentioned that some support could be there by Wahhabis, but *“one must play by their rules”*.

## **V. Do you feel part of your local community (i.e. the wider municipality or locality)?**

Most of participants stated they felt alienated from regular social processes and their community.

### a) Forms of participation and information

Participants reported that they regularly voted, but felt that they were not contributing to any positive changes through their elected representatives. None of them was involved in the decision-making, and their opinion was never sought (*“If anyone asked us anything, they would not spend public money on concerts of folk singers at the summer music festival, especially considering that these concerts contributed only to greater consumption of alcohol and street fights”*).

Participants were not aware of the Youth Centre established within the GAP project (IT equipment provided for free use by youth). They were aware of GROZD activities, particularly in relation to organising branch department of the Faculty of Economics in Goražde. They all claimed they generally lacked information. They received information through media or friends.

b) Participation in cultural life

Participants agreed that cultural and sport activities were generally available, although to a lesser extent in rural areas. They were all engaged in some cultural or sport activities, in addition to socialising with their friends on weekend.

**VI. What would you consider to be a solution to the specific disadvantages faced by you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation)?**

The following was mentioned:

- Better employment policies (Employment Bureau, Municipality)
- Job creation
- Professional re-training programmes
- Eradicating nepotism
- Ensuring compatibility between secondary education and labour market demands, professional orientation
- Removing existing limitations in enrolment in secondary school (i.e. each year gymnasium takes only 30 students).
- Fulfilment of pre-election promises by political parties
- Ensuring validity of degrees and diplomas obtained through higher education

### **Focus group III - Elderly without income or family support (12 participants, out of which 8 women)**

Participants included elderly individuals from urban and rural areas without income or family support. Some of the participants lived in collective centres (displaced persons - DPs), while one of them was a returnee to Republika Srpska (this person was recommended by the CSW as he is still registered in FBiH and continues to receive social welfare in Goražde). Four of the participants were illiterate. Only two participants were able to come to the meeting without any assistance, while the transportation was provided to the rest of participants. All participants stated this was the first time ever they were given a chance to be heard and talk about problems they faced.

#### **I. Do you consider “yourself” to be worse off than others in your municipality? If so how?**

##### **(a) Economic and social conditions versus policy responses**

All participants agreed that their particular disadvantage was the fact that they did not have any or had insufficient income for covering their basic needs. They all reported they were surviving with less than 100 KM per month (“*And for instance, I have to pay around 30 KM for electricity costs only*”). They also stated that they struggled to secure enough food for themselves every month. Nevertheless, one participant mentioned that young people without employment could be in a worse position than the elderly.

Covering of medication and medical treatment costs was defined as one of the burning issues for this population group. All participants mentioned they had housing problems either because they did not possess own houses (DPs in collective centres) or because they lived in inadequate conditions (i.e. without water). Heating was also mentioned, especially in relation to the high costs of the firewood.

As for the returnees, their return was not made sustainable – their homes were reconstructed, but no additional support was provided (i.e. cattle or tools for agricultural production). Inhabitants of rural areas, and especially returnees, were identified as even worse off, considering their rather difficult access to public services, in particular access to health care.

##### **(b) Constraint ranking**

1. Bad health conditions and high medical costs (limited accessibility, in particular for those in rural areas, lack of medicine aids, necessity to participate in medical treatment costs)
2. Difficult economic situation/lack of income (existing not sufficient for food and utility costs)

In addition, participants mentioned the following: housing problems (without own property, unreconstructed houses, hindered access to safe water), lack of support for sustainable return (lack of agricultural production for own needs), heating problems (securing funds for fire wood).

##### **(c) Direction of change in overall situation**

The participants agreed that the situation had only improved related to freedom of movement. Otherwise, the situation did not change for the better. As for DPs, those living in collective centres live without any prospects.

##### **(d) Extreme poverty**

Participants mentioned examples of people who lived in extreme poverty (i.e. a mentally ill person in one of the collective centres without enough to eat). They also considered themselves to be extremely poor, as for instance they were rarely in position to buy and eat meat, and some of them did not even have running water in their houses.

#### **II. Do you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation) have adequate access to key public services, i.e. educational facilities, health facilities, others?**

##### **(a) Access to services**

Although majority of participants agreed that elderly in general had access to health care, they pointed out the difficulties in access for returnees given the current system of health care on the entity level.

Moreover, they mentioned that the access to healthcare institutions was hindered due to the poor state of roads in rural areas.

Participants stated that they were being informed through electronic media, in case of those owning a TV set. Representatives of public institutions did not visit elderly in order to inform them or find about their problems, and this especially implied to returnees to Republika Srpska. As particularly vulnerable were mentioned elderly with special needs.

(b) Discrimination

Discrimination was mentioned by the returnee to Republika Srpska (Oglečeva) who feels abandoned and forgotten by all. Participants (DPs) also stated that they felt bad about living in someone else's property, but return to their villages of origin in Republika Srpska was also not perceived as an option. In case they returned, they would lose social assistance obtained in the FBiH, in addition to being lonely in distant rural areas, disconnected due the bad road connections, and uncared for by authorities.

**III. Do you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation) receive social assistance? Which sort and from whom? Does it meet your needs?**

While some participants reported that they were beneficiaries of the SWC, others were pensioners, but they all agreed that their income was insufficient to meet their needs. Those living in collective centres received additional, but irregular assistance, while no assistance was provided to those living alone.

**IV. In addition to social assistance, what are you doing to make ends meet?**

Among coping mechanisms, half of participants mentioned small gardens where they grew vegetables for their own needs. Moreover, irregular support by the Red Cross and Merhamet was also mentioned (especially during the Aid holidays when Merhamet provided meat for the poor).

**V. Do you feel part of your local community (i.e. the wider municipality or locality)?**

All participants felt they were not part of their community, as they were left on their own, with very little or no support from the society.

(a) Forms of participation and information

Four of the participants stated that they were illiterate. All of them voted, but felt this was of no use to them. They never had a chance to present their problems and difficulties, nor were they consulted on anything.

(b) Participation in cultural life

All participants reported they did not take part in the cultural life of their community in any way.

**VI. What would you consider to be a solution to the specific disadvantages faced by you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation)?**

The following was mentioned:

- Regular and sufficient financial support for all, regardless whether in the RS or FBiH,
- Securing enough food and firewood,
- Providing health protection for all elderly and enlarging the list of essential medicines,
- Adequate housing conditions (dry, warm with water and electricity connections).

#### **Focu group IV – Returnees (10 participants – 3 women and 7 men)**

All participants were returnees of Serb ethnicity, both from urban and rural areas. At the beginning participants stated that they felt forgotten by all and that for most of them this was the first time since they returned that someone consulted them and asked them about their problems.

#### **I. Do you consider “yourself” to be worse off than others in this municipality? If so how?**

##### **(a) Economic and social conditions versus policy responses**

All participants agreed that their particular disadvantage was the fact that they were all unemployed and that their return had not been sustainable, as they had not received any cattle or tools for agricultural production. Furthermore, for some of the returnees the reconstruction of houses had not been completed. Returnees who are pensioners received minimum pensions, while there were returnees with no income at all.

Participants also stated that access to health care was difficult, as they were not registered within the FBiH system. Some of the returnees were completely left outside of the healthcare system, and the situation was particularly difficult for those diagnosed with tumour. Nevertheless, there was also a positive example mentioned by a returnee who was registered within the system of FBiH and who received all needed medical services in Goražde and was satisfied with the quality.

As for **education**, participants stated that their children went to school in Republika Srpska, to Čajniče and Novo Goražde. This represented an additional cost for parents, although the Municipality of Novo Goražde covered transport costs for Serb children attending school in this municipality. However, a returnee who has two children going to school in Goražde stated these were unnecessary costs as education in Goražde was available to all and was of good quality and therefore there was no reason for Serb children to go to school elsewhere. As for religious classes, primary schools in Goražde did not succeed in organising religious orthodox lessons for Serb children.

Some returnees, especially those from the rural area, participated in cultural events, while others reported that they did not take part in the cultural life.

##### **(b) Constraint ranking**

Unemployment and lack of stable and regular income were ranked as priority issues, while other problems were considered only as consequences. Other constraints mentioned included lack of effective support to sustainable return (slow and inadequate reconstruction process, lack of support to cattle-breeding or agricultural production in general), poor quality of education and other problems with schooling.

##### **(c) Direction of change in overall situation**

Participants agreed that there was no progress in the last years. They felt neglected by all sides (RS and FBiH political structures), describing access of their children to education as difficult, and complaining about weak engagement of their representatives (i.e. Regional Board for Return to Eastern-Bosnia).

##### **(c) Extreme poverty**

Participants stated that even though the situation of the group was particularly difficult there were no cases of extreme poverty as everyone had a small garden that enabled them to survive.

#### **II. Do you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation) have adequate access to key public services, i.e. educational facilities, health facilities, others?**

##### **(a) Access to services**

Participants mentioned that access to services was particularly difficult for those not being registered in Goražde. This applied to all services, and in particular to healthcare services. It was also reported

that the returnees were not sufficiently informed or that they generally received information too late. The lack of information was particularly evident in rural areas. Returnees received some information from the Regional Board for Return to Eastern-Bosnia, the Serb Civic Council and some other NGOs, especially while different records of returnees are being produced. Participants felt that the information dissemination concerning returnee rights was neither transparent nor efficient. It was also mentioned that there was no solidarity among citizens.

(b) Discrimination

Returnees to Goražde generally did not feel discriminated against while seeking different public services. However, they felt discriminated against in access to employment, pointing out that the nepotism is one of the significant problems. One returnee also mentioned a case when his mother had been initially denied primary healthcare assistance because she was insured with the health insurance of Republic of Srpska, but eventually she was provided with the health care in Goražde.

**III. Do you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation) receive social assistance? Which sort and from whom? Does it meet your needs?**

It was reported that the SWC occasionally provided support, but only in cases the returnees were registered in Goražde and they specifically asked for assistance. However, they did not see this as a long term solution, as the only thing they would need is employment.

**IV. In addition to social assistance, what are you doing to make ends meet?**

Among coping mechanisms participants mentioned: subsistence farming, milk production and distribution, raspberry growing, employment in the informal economy, support from family members, collecting and selling of old steel, etc.

**V. Do you feel part of your local community (i.e. the wider municipality or locality)?**

(a) Forms of participation and information

Participants stated that they never were invited for a meeting and neither were they consulted on any issues related to their community. Also, they had never been invited to meetings of their local communities (MZ), which was particularly the case with returnees in rural areas, while the situation in urban areas was described as better.

All participants reported that they regularly voted, but they had the feeling that the situation was getting only worse. They also shared their feeling of being neglected by all.

(b) Participation in cultural life

Only few returnees from urban area take part in cultural events, while for the others, especially those in rural areas, cultural life is reduced to watching TV.

**VI. What would you consider to be a solution to the specific disadvantages faced by you (or other people you know that are in a similar situation)?**

Participants mentioned the following:

- Effective support to sustainable return (jobs, cattle, tools for agricultural production, etc.)
- Support to returnee children in their schooling
- Employment programmes