

OHR RRTF Report April 1997 – Annex 3

RRTF: Report April 1997

Annex 3

“Implementation Capacity”

April 1997

- In 1996, according to data available to the Housing Task Force about \$230 million was disbursed in the housing reconstruction sector. This involved almost 30 different implementing organisations/agencies with activities ranging from provision of glazing materials through to complete reconstruction of private houses and apartment blocks.
- Over 40,000 dwellings were repaired in some way, ranging from provision of glazing material to complete reconstruction. It should be pointed out however that possibly up to 80% of these dwellings were already occupied by their owners who received assistance to improve their living conditions.
- The process of beneficiary identification was relatively simple as they were either displaced persons or, as pointed out above, resident in their own homes. The ‘pressure’ to perform on the implementing agencies was therefore relatively low. The size and scope of projects undertaken were in accordance with the performance abilities of the different players.
- Projects ranged from repair of 20-25 houses by smaller NGOs to repair of 400 houses with associated infrastructure by the larger implementing bodies.
- The estimated requirements for housing for the returnees

poses a daunting task. If the upper figure of 50,000 dwellings is accepted, it represents 250 'manageable' projects each of 200 houses. This assumes that projects are not spread out and of course that beneficiaries are readily identifiable.

- The implementing organisations referred to above will not be able to cope with such an undertaking.
- In this context it is vital to consider how best to increase (maximise) implementation capacity. The only logical approach is to use the returnees themselves. Through the use of loans or cash grants they can undertake the responsibility for the repair of their own property.
- In this way also, funding will percolate out into the local economy through the engagement of small local firms/suppliers. Another advantage is the elimination of the need to identify groups of beneficiaries and their place of return in order to then define a project. Identification and formulation of projects can take too much time, which it appears we do not have.
- Use of the returnees as implementors will also free up agencies/organisations for other necessary works such as repair of schools, ambulancias, local water networks etc.

Source IMG

[Back to Index](#)

**Office of the High Representative
Reconstruction and Return Task Force**