



This project is funded by
the European Union



FSU u BiH
ФСУ у БиХ



ZSU u BiH
SIF in BiH

Fondacija za socijalno uključivanje u Bosni i Hercegovini
Фондација за социјално укључивање у Босни и Херцеговини
Zaklada za socijalno uključivanje u Bosni i Hercegovini
Social Inclusion Foundation in Bosnia and Herzegovina



“Towards the European Union – Key Social Inclusion Issues in BiH”

Žarko Papić, Ph.D, Maida Fetahagić, mr.sci

Sarajevo, April 2019.

FSU u BiH • ФСУ у БиХ • ZSU u BiH • SIF in BiH

Branilaca Sarajeva 47 • 71000 Sarajevo • Phone + 387 33 219 313 • Fax + 387 33 219 314

E-mail: sif@sif.ba • Web <http://www.sif.ba>

This publication has been produced with the financial support of the European Union and UNICEF. The contents of the publication are the sole responsibility of the Social Inclusion Foundation in BiH and the Initiative for Better and Humane Inclusion and do not necessarily reflect the position of the European Union and UNICEF.

Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	4
1. Towards a new development concept - the need for a novel approach	5
2. Definitions of social exclusion	6
3. Methodological assessments of the degree of social exclusion - differences, advantages and disadvantages.....	13
4. Social exclusion in BiH - Key issues	18
4.1. Social position of children and youth and the demographic situation.....	18
4.2. Poverty, the inevitable centerpiece of social inclusion policies.....	21
4.3. Persons with disabilities - social inclusion vs. discrimination	24
4.4. Gender aspects of social exclusion.....	26
4.5. Senior citizens - situation and the core issue	27
4.6. Ethnic causes of social exclusion	28
4.7. Political participation and civil society - situation and political exclusion.....	28
5. Social inclusion strategies and policies in BiH - Situation, expectations and outcomes ...	29
6. Conclusions.....	31
ANNEX 1:.....	33
ANNEX 2:.....	34

INTRODUCTION

The project “Build up for Social Inclusion Advocacy Platform in Bosnia and Herzegovina #BuildUp4SIAPinBiH” is implemented by Social Inclusion Foundation in BiH (hereinafter: SIF in BiH) and the Initiative for Better and Humane Inclusion (hereinafter: IBHI), with the financial support of European Commission (EC) and UNICEF BiH. Component 1 of the project is the ‘Strengthening of access to rights and of significance of marginalized groups and preparation of the entity and Brčko District social inclusion strategies’. This component includes a preparation of two papers and a study.

The title of the first of these documents is: ‘Towards the European Union – Key Social Inclusion Issues in BiH’.

The second document is: ‘Towards the European Union - Recommendations for Advancement of Social Inclusion in BiH’.

The title of the study is: ‘Foundations and Instructions for Preparation of Entity and Brčko District Social Inclusion Strategies’.

Presented here is the first of the above mentioned papers, which aims to define the approach and concept of social inclusion strategies, taking into account the global situation and the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina (hereinafter: BiH) and, more specifically, the process of accession of BiH to the European Union (hereinafter: EU), which requires developing social inclusion policies. An analysis of core social inclusion issues focuses on identification of several fundamental problems faced by vulnerable groups, a brief examination of causes and consequences and an overview of public policies (strategies, laws) of importance for social inclusion. This supported our overall goal: to strengthen the involvement of marginalized groups in advocacy and in the preparation of social inclusion strategies. To this end, we avoided the academic approach in favor of ensuring that the documents are readable for all stakeholders. Some sections of the paper (sections 2 and 3, in particular) explore the content of social inclusion, as it is still a relatively new topic.

We kept in mind that UNDP BiH was working on the ‘2018 Human Development Report for BiH - Social Inclusion’, whose completion is expected in 2019. The situational analysis and recommendations from that report will be used for the above mentioned second paper, as well as the study.

This approach is in line with the project concept - involving marginalized groups in the preparation of public policies and strategies, all under the tagline ‘Nothing about us without us’. At the same time, such stance enables the creation of firm partnerships with decision makers.

1. Towards a new development concept - the need for a novel approach

During the early 21st century, the world was faced with the first globalization crisis (2008). GDP of BiH plummeted by 8.3% in a year (2008-2009), and the level of GDP from 2008 was attained again only in 2013.¹ The basic socio-economic development indicators for BiH for 2017 are given below in Annex 1.

This is a crisis of the globalization concept based on neoliberalism, 'market fundamentalism' that amplified inequalities on the global scale, reduced the global purchasing power, and forced the production capacities of developing world to cope with low demand. For decades, this situation was 'covered' by artificial reviving of demand, which led to a 'financial bubble' made of credit, bank loans and transactions, and government bonds. In 2014, this 'bubble' was three times as large as the world's annual GDP.²

Instability of the existing model of globalization is leading to a new crisis, as stated in the IMF's warning from February 2019, which announces a crisis in late 2019 and 2020.

Defining a radical new development concept began in 1990 within the UN framework, with the concept of Human Development. The core of the concept is the view that a Human being is both the instrument and the purpose of development. Developing human potential is the basis of human development.³ Economic development does matter, but not just by that fact. Rather, its quality and equitable distribution, as well as expanding human capacities, have positive effects on economic development itself.

Millennium Development Goals (UN, 2000-2015) were the next step in the development of the new model. All of its eight goals focused on strengthening human potential and equality (see Annex 1).

Adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (UN, 2015-2030) was the next step. All 17 goals and 160 indicators, measuring their achievement, develop and concretize a novel, humane development concept (see Annex 1), with the emphasis on sustainable development and a holistic approach, while interweaving three dimensions: economic development, social inclusion and environmental sustainability. Social inclusion is a core instrument for implementation of this model and its goals.

If a Human being is an instrument and purpose of development, then it must be involved in the development of the society liberated of all forms of discrimination. In making this possible, social inclusion policies are important, and their full implementation leads to the development of an inclusive society.

Therefore, social inclusion requires new social policies, but, even beyond that, novel approaches to all development policies, and it opens doors for a new model of humane, sustainable development.

This also requires an identification of priorities for strategies and policies of social inclusion. The central focus should be on human resources, from the very outset of development of those

¹ IMF, Country Report no. 14/189, Bosnia and Herzegovina, July 2014, p. 20

² For more, see: F. Čaušević: Globalization Southeastern Europe, and the World Economy (edition Routledge, New York, 2015, p. 23

³ See: UNDP: "Beyond Transition – Towards Inclusive Societies", Bratislava, 2011

resources. Hence early development and equal opportunities for children in the education system, protection of families with children, which also serves the purpose of demographic renewal in BiH, and support to the youth in finding employment, until their full inclusion into the societal processes.

For marginalized groups, social inclusion is of utmost importance, since it allows them to exercise their human rights, and, most importantly, it develops a society of equal opportunities, which is the purpose of human development.

2. Definitions of social exclusion

The concept of 'social exclusion' emerged in Europe in the debates during the 1980s, when the major focus was on spatial exclusion, and it arose in response to dissatisfaction with the poverty approach that focused solely on income.

The social exclusion concept evolved in line with the notion of social rights, enshrined in the idea of the European welfare state. Within the framework of civil rights, social rights and social justice discourse, the status of 'socially excluded' was not understood as the lack of access to goods, but also as the lack of access to rights. If the poverty is defined in terms of income or material deprivations, social inclusion is defined in terms of social rights, such as the right to work, housing, health care and education.

The UK Department for International Development (DFID) defined social exclusion as 'a process by which certain groups are systematically disadvantaged because they are discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity, race, religion, sexual orientation, caste, descent, gender, age, disability, HIV status, migrant status or where they live. Discrimination occurs in public institutions, such as the legal system or education and health services, as well as social institutions like the household.

The concepts social exclusion and poverty are closely related, although not necessarily mutually reinforcing. Initially, there were attempts to clearly delineate these two approaches, and therefore, most frequently, poverty is described as uni-dimensional and exclusion as a multi-dimensional concept.

Currently, in line with the holistic approach, the term 'poverty' has broadened. In its character and variations, poverty is multi-dimensional. People are poor if they lack resources to meet their material needs and if the conditions exclude them from active participation in the activities considered common in the community. Multi-dimensionality of poverty emerges as a state characterized by long-term or permanent deprivation of resources, capabilities, freedom of choice, security and powers, essential for adequate living standard and exercise of other civil, economic, political, cultural and social rights.

Amartya Sen considers poverty as an absence of the freedom of choice and of fulfillment of human potential, development and welfare. Sen interpreted poverty as deprivation of capabilities, since the access to capabilities focuses on human lives, not solely on the resources people possess or use, on their possessions. "It is frequently believed that income and wealth are the main criteria of human success. By proposing an essential focus shift from the resources for living to actual

capabilities of a person, the capabilities approach aims for a radical transformation of standard evaluative approaches that are widely applied in economics and social studies.”⁴

A relationship between poverty and social exclusion is not just the matter of cause and effect, but also the way concepts are described and positioned in the broader social context. Poverty may be considered as only one dimension of the concept of social exclusion. The contemporary concept of social exclusion in EU considers poverty as just one of many forms of deprivation which together create a state of social exclusion.

As an official EU concept, it is focused on the policy of social inclusion. The Council of the European Union also introduced official definitions of three key terms.

Social exclusion is a ‘process whereby certain individuals are pushed to the edge of society and prevented from participating in social relations and developments to the full extent of their capacity, by virtue of their poverty, or lack of basic competencies and lifelong learning opportunities, or as a result of discrimination. Individuals and/or population groups are thus distanced from job, income and education and training opportunities and hindered from joining and participating in social and community networks and activities. Excluded individuals and/or groups have little and inadequate access to institutions, authorities and decision-making processes’ (Council of EU, 2004: 8).

Social inclusion is ‘a process which ensures that those at risk of poverty and social exclusion gain the opportunities and resources necessary to participate fully in economic, social and cultural life and to enjoy a standard of living and well-being that is considered normal in the society in which they live. Social inclusion ensures greater citizen participation in decision-making which affects their lives and access to their fundamental rights’ (Council of EU, 2004: 8).

Poor individuals or families are those whose resources (assets, monetary income and services from public and private sources) are so inadequate as to preclude them from having a minimum acceptable way of life in the Member State in which they live (Council of EU, 1975).

2.1. Human development and human exclusion/inclusion

Human development - People-centered approach

With the publication of their first Human Development Report (HDR) in 1990, UN introduced the concept of human development, with a holistic vision of development that places people at the center of all development processes: all aspects of life - economic, social, political, cultural and environmental are seen from the perspective of enlarging the freedom of choice and opportunities and advancement of human lives.⁵ The paradigm of human development emphasizes two parallel processes: shaping human capabilities and the ways people use them. Therefore, it is the purpose,

⁴ A. Sen (2017), *Ideja pravednosti*, Znanje d.o.o., Zagreb, p. 243.

⁵ The origin of the concept of human development is tied to the vision of Mahbub ul-Haq, a Pakistani economist who wanted to assess the world’s economic and social progress in a different way, by departing from conventional income and economic growth analysis. The human development approach was profoundly inspired by pioneering works of Amartya Sen on economics of wellbeing, social choice, poverty and scarcity, and on development economics. Sen’s ‘access to capabilities’ and the notion of ‘development as freedom’ provided the grounds for a new paradigm in economics and social sciences in general.

the goal of social and political processes, as well as a strategy. It concerns development processes and results, such as enlarging people's choices, capabilities and freedoms.

The first HDR in 1990 promoted human development as a process of enlarging people's choices and the level of acquired wellbeing. This is the essence of the idea of human development. After over 20 years of practice and academic studies of human development and the capabilities-based approach, HDR 2010 redefined human development: "Human development is the expansion of people's freedoms to live long, healthy and creative lives; to advance other goals they have reason to value; and to engage actively in shaping development equitably and sustainably on a shared planet. People are both the beneficiaries and the drivers of human development, as individuals and in groups. "

The 2010 report also introduced a special index that takes into account inequality, thereby placing social exclusion at the forefront of the global debate.⁶

Social exclusion: Constrained participation

In the human development context, social exclusion is seen as a process and as an outcome. It is a process whereby certain individuals are pushed to the edge of society and prevented from participating fully in relevant social, economic, cultural and political processes. As an outcome, it refers to the status and characteristics of an excluded person. The social exclusion status has numerous dimensions - poverty, lack of basic competencies, limited employment and education opportunities, as well as inadequate access to social and community networks and activities. The distinction between exclusion as a 'process' and 'status' is important for understanding dynamic relationships between various dimensions of social exclusion.

According to Sen, the social exclusion process is at its core related to denial of freedom and may lead to deprivation of capabilities⁷. Reduced capabilities in one field may account for deprivation in other areas of life, which further impels the social exclusion process. Sen interpreted it as a 'capabilities shortfall', in which, he believes, the social exclusion had the instrumental role. Social exclusion is multi-dimensional, and it includes economic, social and civic dimensions. Deprivation along one dimension may reinforce deprivations in another, and such multiple deprivations may lead to social exclusion.

Social exclusion does not involve merely material deprivation, but also the sense of inferiority, alienation, loss and shame. Being socially excluded is both a status and a self-perception. Social exclusion reflects an individual's status in relation to the general society, which is much more than income poverty.

Exclusion is generated by action (or inaction) of a person, group or an institution. An opposite of social exclusion is social equity, which is not just the matter of 'exclusion', but of an expansion of capabilities to participate in economic, social, and civic processes that are deemed normal in the

⁶ HDR 2010 introduced the Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index (IHDI). IHDI captures inequalities across all three dimensions of the Human Development Index (HDI), thereby adjusting its value by the loss in income distribution, education and health, i.e. by the value of inequality. See: Technical note 2 at http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr2016_technical_notes.pdf.

⁷ Sen's capabilities approach is based on the notions of 'function' and 'capability'. 'Functioning' is what an individual can do or be in leading his life, such as having a healthy body, be educated, have self-respect, participate in the life of the community etc. 'Capabilities' are combinations of various functions that enable an individual to lead the life he or she wants. For more detail, see in: Sen, Amartya (2001), *Development as Freedom*, Oxford University Press, U.K.

community. This links the concept closely to the human development approach and highlights limited freedoms and factors which contribute to social exclusion: discriminatory practices, failure in state responsibilities and institutional obstacles that obstruct access to public services and political participation.

Social inclusion: Expanded opportunities

Social inclusion refers to a 'redistribution of social circumstances' among all segments of the population. It may be assessed according to the 'quality of life' criteria, which people hold valued. It includes participation and integration into institutions and community networks.

Social inclusion does not simply mean the reversal of social exclusion in terms of status. The elements of the social inclusion process that contribute to overcoming social exclusion (such as action and involvement) have intrinsic value. Social inclusion involves at least two steps. One is elimination of obstructions in the broader sense: obstructions to action and to the access to resources and opportunities. The other one concerns attitude change. Although there are legal structures, policies are needed to cultivate solidarity, to suppress rooted social prejudices and to encourage the participation of individuals who are faced with obstacles.

All of these are important elements of the social inclusion process, which involves a change of attitudes of what is accepted as 'normal'.⁸ Promotion of social inclusion requires understanding of fundamental causes of social exclusion, such as discriminatory practices, failure in state responsibilities and institutional obstacles that obstruct access to public services and political participation.

Social inclusion requires that these issues be addressed as well. Therefore, a human rights-based approach may be an important political instrument.

The EU has improved the concept of social inclusion through direct policies in Member States. The concept is also undergoing a process of 'rediscovery' through the Europe 2020 programme, the EU growth strategy for this decade. The continued evolution of the social inclusion concept reflects a need to examine multiple deprivations besides income, a step towards the human development approach, i.e. towards conceptual convergence between social inclusion and human development.

Social exclusion, social inclusion and human development

Social inclusion and human development have become significant over the last two decades, although they have largely developed independently of each other.

Human development is the goal of development; social inclusion is a means of its achievement. Social inclusion involves elimination of impediments that prevent people from fulfilling their capabilities. However, social inclusion is more than the mere 'absence of exclusion'. Human development is only partly achieved by reduction of social exclusion. Achieving human development requires considered inclusive processes that enlarge human freedoms and create an inclusive society where diversity is a source of strength.

⁸ Successful social inclusion policies, supported by effective implementation mechanisms, demonstrated that prejudices should not be transmitted from one generation to the next. For instance, in most OECD countries, the social norms that excluded women or segregated minorities in 1960 became socially unacceptable by late 1990s.

These three concepts are complementary. The human development paradigm adds value to social exclusion and inclusion. At the same time, human development is both an evaluation framework, as well as a political action framework. As an evaluation framework, human development identifies shortcomings and unequal opportunities for the development of capabilities which contribute to social exclusion. In addition, it evaluates the outcomes of the social inclusion process through various indicators. As an action-driven political framework, human development aims to empower people to pursue better social, cultural and economic environment. It helps in identifying approaches that target social exclusion, takes into account the context - widening the focus beyond the excluded population. In addition, human development helps in identifying structural failures that prevent people from developing their capabilities.

Social exclusion and inclusion add value to human development by providing the perspective to the process, i.e. "agency" of social exclusion on the concept of human development. This reinforces the very concept of agency that exists within the framework of human development because it examines the mechanisms of exclusion, why people are excluded, and the causes of action that led to exclusion. Therefore, agency⁹ is a crucial element in the study of social exclusion and the common denominator between social inclusion and human development.

2.2. Detecting social exclusion

Measuring social exclusion is related to the definition of social exclusion. There are various approaches to defining social exclusion in developing countries. This includes efforts to determine whether people benefit from general progress or fall below the average achievement. Approaches may be based on preconceived ideas about which groups are excluded or on surveys that assess which groups are considered excluded. There can be no single set of indicators that is equally relevant to all contexts, because exclusion is different across countries, particularly if their level of development or income group vary, both regionally and globally.

Gathering multi-dimensional data - including economic, social and political dimensions - is critical to effective policy design and monitoring, and the proper focus on reducing group inequalities and increasing social inclusion. Without such data, it is difficult to know which type of action is needed and whether it was effective.

Qualitative and quantitative data are used for identification of social exclusion, and there are various non-monetary and subjective indicators that need to be studied in correlation. Disadvantages that the excluded persons feel are multi-dimensional and overlapping. The particular characteristics and the context of the given country are central to determining which dimension is most important for exclusion of any given group.¹⁰

2.3. Causes and forms of social exclusion

Excluding processes may have different dimensions:

⁹ This concept of 'agency' deserves an explanation. In the original, Sen used the term 'agency' in its older and fuller sense of an entity that acts and achieves changes and whose achievements can be evaluated in the context of own values and goals. For more detail: Sen, Amartya (2001), *Development as Freedom*, Oxford University Press, United Kingdom

¹⁰For instance: In some societies or in among some groups, participation in the labor market may be the central element which collected other deprivation elements, while someplace else religious identity may be more important.

- Political exclusion may include deprivation of civil rights, such as political participation and the right to organize, and also personal security, rule of law, freedom of expression and equal opportunity.
- Economic exclusion included lack of access to labor markets, credit and other forms of 'capital assets'. Although this exclusion matters to the reproduction of inequality, it is itself an outcome of inequality in the access to resources, employment, education and public services.
- Social exclusion may take the form of discrimination across a range of dimensions, including gender, ethnicity and age, which prevents such groups from access to social services and restricts their participation in the labor market. Social exclusion is often a consequence of the process of discrimination of 'the other' on the grounds of cultural, community and/or racial identity. Such discrimination may generate strong exclusio processes. In the context of social status and identity, exclusion also may occur on the basis of: gender, caste, race, ethnicity and culture, religion, sexual orientation, ancestry, age, disability, HIV-positive status.
- Cultural exclusion refers to the degree of acceptance and observance of various values, norms and styles of life.

Such relations are interlinked and overlapping and, in view of the complexity of influence on individuals, detecting one particular cause in the context of social exclusion is impossible.

Exclusion may be caused by spatial inequalities that include inequalities between rural and urban areas, as well as between geographically suitable and vulnerable areas. Spatial disadvantages may be a consequence of the remoteness of the place, which makes participation for individuals in wider socio-economic processes difficult.

Exclusion may be a consequence of migration, which might act as a way of eviction from poverty and as a cause of social exclusion. Migrants in rural and urban communities, for instance, often do not have the same political, social and economic rights as other residents.

2.4. Significance of social exclusion dynamic

Social exclusion, as a process, may involve systemic deprivation of rights to resources and services, and deprivation of rights to participation under equal terms in social relations in the economic, social, cultural or political areas.

It is possible to distinguish three types of attitudes and social practices that cause exclusion.¹¹ These may be conscious or unconscious, intentional or unintentional, explicit or informal. These are:

1. Mobilization of institutional bias: it relates to the existence of a 'dominant set of values, beliefs, rituals and institutional procedures that operate systemically and consistently to benefit certain persons and groups at the expense of others'. This mechanism operates without conscious decisions of those representing the status quo.
2. Social closure: It is the way for 'the social collectives to strive for maximization of rewards by restricting access to resources and opportunities to a restricted eligible group'. This includes monopolization of certain opportunities that are based on group attributes, such as race,

¹¹ According to: <https://gsdrc.org/topic-guides/social-exclusion/dynamics/social-exclusion-as-a-process/>

language, social background, and religion. State institutions cause exclusion when they are intentionally discriminating in their legislation, policies and programmes.

3. Irregular practices: it refers to the gap between the rules and their enforcement. Institutions maintain exclusion informally when public sector employees reflect their communities' prejudices through their positions; in this way, they institutionalize some form of discrimination.

2.5. Impact of social exclusion

Presence of social exclusion exacerbates meeting certain societal goals, such as reduction of poverty and malnutrition, because often there are hidden obstacles that the socially excluded are unaware of. In general, social exclusion involves exclusion in more than one dimension, and these may be mutually reinforcing. For instance, a combination of economic and educational exclusion makes it harder to achieve progress on both fronts.

It is indisputable that greater poverty of socially excluded groups affects their weaker health and education levels, particularly when their poverty is combined with remoteness and the scarcity of infrastructure and social services.

Social exclusion might lead to and cause disparities in the distribution of income, as the richest segments of a country's population receive the greatest share of the national income. Income inequality arises from inequalities in the distribution of assets such as land, access to capital and access to education (which also affects human capabilities). In this fashion, inequalities reinforce social exclusion.

Cultural exclusion can also result in ambivalence to education, which adds to the likelihood on income inequality.

There is evidence that economic growth is positively correlated with equality. An explanation is that, with greater equality comes more investment in education, health and nutrition. There is also evidence that policies geared to combating social exclusion may lead to more equitable forms of growth, since excluded groups are gradually winning better access to education, employment and business opportunities.

However, the effects of economic growth that reduce poverty decline with rising inequality. Besides, interaction of economic with other inequalities of that may cause negative consequences for growth. Greater equality in political institutions is also considered favorable to growth, as it is correlated with broader provision of better-quality public education services, which translates into better labor force.

When individuals and groups, particularly the youth, feel excluded from power structure and deprived of legitimate opportunities to express their discontent, and violence may give them an opportunity to have a voice and to get control of their own lives.

There is a close correlation between social exclusion and violent conflict and insecurity, in the sense of both causes and consequences. Some forms of social exclusion create the condition for a conflict to occur, and it may vary from civil unrest to violent armed conflicts and terrorist activities.

Social exclusion may emerge as a consequence of a conflict, which could marginalize an entire community and is the key cause for movement of refugee, who are then excluded either in their home country or in the destination country.

Psychological aspects of exclusion also matter. This involves absence of power, voice and independence, and vulnerable to exploitation and humiliation.

3. Methodological assessments of the degree of social exclusion - differences, advantages and disadvantages

3.1. “Laeken indicators “and “Arope measures” – reliance on poverty risk

When adopting the Lisbon Strategy 2000, which envisaged coordination of European social policies on the national level on the basis of a set of common goals, for the first time EU set social inclusion goal in addition to economic goals. The established common goals of the social inclusion strategy are: promotion of participation in employment and access to all assets, services, resources and rights; prevention of social exclusion; support to most vulnerable and mobilization of all relevant bodies. The strategy for combating social exclusion included the ‘open coordination method’, which implies commonly agreed social exclusion indicators (Laeken indicators).

The Laeken indicators were established in the European Council in December 2001 in the Laeken suburb of Brussels, Belgium. They constitute a set of common European statistical indicators of poverty and social exclusion. This is a standardized methodology that implies application of common indicators and a single data collection process. The Laeken indicators comprise three levels:

- ten primary indicators concern the poverty in the financial sense and material deprivation, employment, health care and education,
- secondary indicators are complementary to the basic set of indicators, but serve to elaborate them further,
- the indicators that the Member States decide to include in their own national plans.

All indicators should be considered a consistent whole that reflects a balanced presentation of EU’s social issues. They capture four important dimensions of social inclusion - financial poverty, employment, health care and education - which highlight the multidimensional nature of the social exclusion phenomenon.

The first attempt at calculation of all Laeken indicators for BiH was made in the NHDR 2007.¹² The existing data that was collected by the statistical institutions in BiH, and the results of numerous studies of specific topics, such as the social inclusion study conducted for the purposes of NHDR 2007, served as the statistical basis.

In 2010, the Lisbon Strategy was replaced by Europe 2020 – A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, where inclusive growth constitutes strengthening of the economy of high employment, social and territorial cohesion.

¹² For more detail, see: Izvještaj o humanom razvoju 2007, Socijalna uključenost u Bosni i Hercegovini, available at: http://www.ba.undp.org/content/bosnia_and_herzegovina/en/home/library/nhdr/nhdr-2007.html.pg.185-196.

In the context of Europe 2020 Strategy, in June 2010 the European Council adopted as the main goal of social inclusion that by 2020 there should be at least 20 million fewer people in EU who are exposed to the risk of poverty or social exclusion.

Monitoring progress towards this core objective is measured with the AROPE (At Risk of Poverty or Social Exclusion) rate, which is the crucial indicator for tracking poverty within the EU 2020 Strategy. The AROPE rate represents the share of total population exposed to the risk of poverty or social exclusion and combines the poverty rate risk, rate of severe material deprivation and the share of people in households with very low labor intensity.

In 2017, there were 112.8 million people in EU-28 countries who lived in households in risk of poverty or social exclusion, which corresponds to the AROPE rate of 22.4% for the entire population. The persons in this population were at least in one of the following situations: risk of poverty after social transfers (income poverty); severely materially deprived, or live in households with very low labor intensity.¹³

The estimate of the AROPE rate for BiH was carried out in the 'Analysis of the Deficiencies in the Area of Welfare and Inclusion Policies'.¹⁴ According to the estimates in the above mentioned studies,

- 32.4% population in BiH (1,514,576 inhabitants) was exposed to poverty risk;
- 19.1% of the population suffering from severe material deprivation, but that are not at risk of poverty (891,614 inhabitants);
- 6.5% of the population with low labor intensity (305,641 inhabitants).

The AROPE rate for BiH was 58%, or 2,711,831, of the population exposed to the risk of poverty and social exclusion.

Above mentioned data, put in international perspective, indicated that the risk of poverty and social exclusion in BiH, measured by the AROPE indicator, is far greater in BiH than in most other European countries, and it is only similar in Bulgaria, at 49%.¹⁵

Both the Leaken and AROPE indicators are doubtlessly a major instrument of development policy used to map poverty and population at risk of poverty. Still, the Leaken indicators are much more complex, because they encompass financial poverty, unemployment, health and education, which are important dimensions of both poverty and social exclusion.

Poverty and social exclusion are closely related terms, but there are differences. Exclusion is seen more as a process that prevents individuals to participate in all aspects of a community's life, on account of their poverty, lack of basic competences, or discrimination. On the other hand, poverty is seen predominantly as a state of insufficient resources, primarily income, to allow adequate participation in social life.

People who are socially excluded are in general also poor, particularly if poverty is defined in the multi-dimensional sense. However, there are certain key differences between the concepts of

¹³ Source: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/People_at_risk_of_poverty_or_social_exclusion, accessed on: 03 March 2019

¹⁴ UNICEF, Sarajevo, November 2013

¹⁵ For more detail, see: Ibidem, p. 14.

poverty and social exclusion: (i) most people in a society may be poor, but it does not seem sensible to refer to a majority as excluded; (ii) in most cases, social exclusion implies inequality, or relative deprivation, which does not apply to poverty; (iii), social exclusion implies that there are exclusionary processes and institutional processes and parties responsible for exclusion, which does not apply to poverty.

Both the Leaken and AROPE indicators fail to cover the entire range of significant social inclusion indicators, including non-monetary indicators, subjective ones, civic and community participation, political exclusion, cultural exclusion, spatial exclusions, communication exclusion, access to services... exclusion due to the lack of choice and opportunity.

But social exclusion is multi-dimensional, just like poverty, particularly in the context of a holistic approach to development and human development, where poverty is viewed as a form of deprivation, or as an absence of choice and opportunities for fulfillment of basic human capabilities.

Multi-dimensionality of social exclusion makes it necessary to take into account multi-dimensional data, including economic, social and political dimensions. In addition, particularities of each country imply understanding of the context, it is often difficult to compare the context of social exclusion in the countries of various levels of development, various regions, cultures, etc.

3.2. Human Social Exclusion Index – a larger concept offering a fuller picture of exclusion

In the 2007 Human Development Report, the methodology was developed to measure social exclusion by taking the same approach used for standard human development indicators.¹⁶

It is clear that social exclusion is a multi-dimensional, and therefore complex, measurable concept. Human development focused on the opportunities and options in the following key dimensions: living standards, employment, inadequate qualifications, poor housing condition and poor health condition. The selection of indicators from 2007 NHDR study is based on the particularities of BiH itself, not only because of the country's socio-economic and political systems in the country, but also due to four years-long war, whose consequences were inestimable.

The report quantifies the socially excluded population in BiH. On the basis of the information from the 2007 NHDR study, estimates were provided of the Human Social Exclusion Index (HSEI), Extreme Social Exclusion Index (HSEI-1) and Long-term Social Exclusion Index (HSEI-2).

The Human Social Exclusion Index (HSEI) calculated on the basis of seven indicators, which reveal the dimensions of social exclusion in various ways.

Dimension	Indicators - Variables
1. Living standard	1. Population below the poverty line 2. Long-term unemployment
2. Healthcare	3. Population without health insurance

¹⁶ For more detail, see: Izvještaj o humanom razvoju 2007, Socijalna uključenost u Bosni i Hercegovini, available at: http://www.ba.undp.org/content/bosnia_and_herzegovina/en/home/library/nhdr/nhdr-2007.html, pg.179

3. Education	4. Population over 15 without elementary education or without completed elementary education
4. Participation in the community	5. Population not voting in the elections 6. Population not participating in the activities of community organization
5. Access to services	7. Apartments without a phone line

Estimated HSEI of 50.32% means that one in two citizens of BiH are socially excluded in some way. The Extreme Social Exclusion Index (HSEI-1) indicates that around 22% of the population in BiH belongs in the category of severe social exclusion in the human development context. These are the inhabitants without any income, without communications in the apartment (phone), no health insurance and did not complete elementary education.

The Long-Term Social Exclusion Index HSEI-2 shows that 47% of the total number of employees in the situation (at risk) that can be described long-term social exclusion. These are employees without prospects, with little or no pension insurance, as they worked in the informal economy. In the long term, they have no prospects and are heading towards social exclusion.

HSEI is based on a broader concept of understanding social exclusion in the context of human development. The index is multi-dimensional, because it seeks to capture the complex phenomenon of social exclusion, by incorporation of multiple dimensions. HSEI reflects the BiH context and is very simple to understand. The calculation methodology is open for possible promotions. An important result in this sense is starting a debate on the intrinsic assessment of social exclusion.

The options to select certain indicators are open and adjustable to overall socio-economic changes and progress. From the today's perspective, this can be considered a change in the selection of certain indicators. Thus, for the access to services dimension, the residences without a phone line, may be replaced or amended by the data on the population without the Internet connection. This index was an exceptional analytical instrument of development policy, because the composition of the index reveals causes of social exclusion and weak points that require action.

A key shortcoming of the index is that it required a separate study, because the official statistics does not track many indicators. Besides, the index is context-specific for BiH and therefore it cannot be applied to other countries in its original form. But the understanding of the methodological approach and selection of the dimensions and indicators opens the possibility for other countries to conduct their own assessments.

3.3. Index of social exclusion in BiH

To quantify social exclusion in BiH today, an assessment of socially excluded population was conducted by adapting the calculation methodology for HSEI Social Exclusion Index, since the calculation of HSEI requires a separate study. The new assessment is based on the following:

- it retained the same dimensions of social exclusion: living standard, health, education, social participation and access to services.
- the world database indicators were used to select the indicators,

- a necessary conditions for the indicators on the coverage of the population is that they are expressed in percentages,
- The countries of former Yugoslavia were taken as comparators, because of their similar socio-economic backgrounds, and some of them are nowadays EU Member States, while others have the EU candidate status.
- it was essential for the selected indicator to exist for all countries.

Taking into account the subjective perception of social exclusion and the approach to human development, two indicators that were published in the human development reports were used. These are: Health care quality¹⁷ and Freedom of choice¹⁸.

Dimension	Indicators/Index (Population, and %)	Territory/Country	BiH	Croatia	Montenegro	Serbia	Slovenia	Northern Macedonia
Living standard	The poverty gap of \$3.20 on the given day (Purchasing Power Parity for 2011) (in % of population), 2015	S ₁	0.2	0.6	...	0.2	0.0	...
	Long-term unemployment (in % of unemployed), 2017, BiH 2014	S ₂	78.0	42.5	77.3	60.5	48.4	78.4
Health care	Prevalence of malnutrition (% of population)	S ₃	2.5	2.5	2.5	5.6	2.5	4.1
	Health care quality (% of dissatisfied), 2012-2017	S ₄	46.0	4.0	59.0	47.0	21.0	47.0
Education	Population without any secondary education (over 25), 2017	S ₅	21.1	4.3	10.6	11.4	1.9	52.2
Participation in the community	Freedom of choice (% of dissatisfied) 2012-2017	S ₆	47.0	29.5	39.0	35.5	8.5	26.5
Access to services	No fixed phone lines (per 100 people), 2017	S ₇₁	78.3	66.5	75.8	62.5	65.5	82.7
	People not using Internet (in % of population), 2017	S ₇₂	30.5	32.9	28.7	29.7	21.1	27.8
	Individuals not using Internet or fixed telephony (average, in % of population), 2017; $S_7 = (S_{71} + S_{72})/2$	S ₇	54.4	49.7	52.3	46.1	43.3	55.3
Index, in % of population		HSEI	49.4	34.6	49.9	40.6	30.8	50.8
HSEI Ranking			3	5	2	4	6	1
HDI 2018 Ranking			77	46	50	67	25	80

$HSEI = (((S_1^a + S_2^a + S_3^a + S_4^a + S_5^3 + S_6^a + S_7^a))/7)^{(1/a)}$, where: $a=3$

Sources:

¹⁷ Satisfaction with health care quality: Percentage of respondents choosing "satisfied" as the response to the Gallup World Poll question, "Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the availability of quality healthcare?"

¹⁸ Satisfaction with freedom of choice: Percentage of respondents choosing "satisfied" as the response to the Gallup World Poll question, "In this country, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your freedom to choose what you do with your life?"

- Poverty gap at \$3.20 a day (2011 PPP), and Prevalence of undernourishment (% of population) <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator>, accessed on 10 March 2019.
- Long-term unemployment rate (% of unemployed), <https://www.ilo.org/ilostat> accessed on 10 March 2019 for BiH (2014) and Serbia (2017); <https://data.oecd.org/unemp/long-term-unemployment-rate.htm>, accessed on 10 March 2019 for Croatia, Slovenia and Northern Macedonia; <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/lfs/data/database>, accessed on 10 March 2019 for Montenegro.
- Health care quality and Freedom of choice (author's calculations, % of dissatisfied), http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2018_human_development_statistical_update.pdf, pg. 74.
- Population without at least some secondary education (over 25), http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2018_human_development_statistical_update.pdf pg. 54.
- Without fixed telephone lines (per 100 people), Individuals not using the Internet (% of population), Individuals not using internet nor fixed telephony (average, % of population), (author's calculation, % without or not using), <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator>, accessed on 10 March 2019.

According to the Social Exclusion Index, 49.4% of the population in BiH are socially excluded on some grounds, which means that BiH ranks third of the neighboring countries for which an assessment has been conducted. Variations in the value of the Index between Macedonia Serbia and BiH are insignificant. Over 50% of the population living in Macedonia are socially excluded, and, in the 80th place, it also has the lowest HDI ranking. The EU Member States, ranked by HDI in 25th (Slovenia) and 46th place (Croatia) are the countries with a very high human development. According to the Social Exclusion Index, these countries also have considerably lower socially excluded populations.

In the composition of the Social Exclusion Index, the weakest spots in BiH are unemployment and education, which is a message to the authors of development policies.

4. Social exclusion in BiH - Key issues

4.1. Social position of children and youth and the demographic situation

4.1.1. The demographic situation in BiH is very poor, with a worsening tendency. From the standpoint of sustainable human development, the loss of human resources is the greatest threat to the country's future.

Demographic losses as a consequence of the war in BiH were very high. This has, to a considerable extent, affected the trend of the constant population decline and worsening of the age structure. The birthrate in BiH, which had been higher than the EU 1996-2016 average prior to the war, is still lower than the average of EU Member States and other Western Balkan countries. In 1996, the share of children in the total population was 22%, but it dropped to 16% by 2016.¹⁹

This process continues, and in the first nine months of 2018 there were 21,006 births and 27,182 deaths in BiH, which constitutes a negative natural increase of 6,176, justly called 'the birth dearth'. In 2017, negative natural increase was 7,792, so for the post-census period 2013-2018, we can estimate that the overall negative natural increase was around 35,000 more deaths than births.

At the same time, the process of emigration, in evidence since the end of the war, intensified significantly in recent years. According to some estimates, in the last five years, more than 173,000 inhabitants left BiH.²⁰ It is revealing that poverty and unemployment are no longer the causes of

¹⁹ World Bank Group, "World Development Indicators" database and data of BiH Agency for Statistics

²⁰ See the statement by M. Zvizdić, Union for Sustainable Return and Integration in BiH, 26 February 2016

emigration. Families with children are emigrating from BiH, with an increasingly frequent explanation that they seek better conditions to raise children, from education and security to health care.

Relative to the 2013 census, when the BiH Agency for Statistics determined that the population was 3,531,159, the number of inhabitants declined by 208,000, i.e. 5.8%. If these trends were to continue for 85 years, by the end of this century BiH would lose all its population.

4.1.2. The social position of children²¹ in BiH is extremely unfavorable, and it is one of the main causes of negative demographic processes.

Studies have shown that, in the 5-15 years age group, 73.8% of children are deprived along at least one dimension, and 22.8% along three or more dimensions. Nearly one-third (30.6%) of children in this age group are poor, below the absolute poverty line, which is also an essential cause of deprivation along other dimensions.

Younger children (0-4 years) are mainly deprived in terms of nutrition (71.8%) and child development (65.7%).²² Roma children and children with some form of disability are in the condition of chronic multi-dimensional poverty, which is a result of generational social exclusion, discrimination and inherited family poverty. It is estimated that 6.5% of 2-9 year olds have some form of disability, and they are the most marginalized and excluded group in our society.²³

This data constitutes a very severe criticism of the system of protection of families with children. Although child protection benefits in RS are harmonized through the Public Child Protection Fund in Republika Srpska (hereinafter: RS), these benefits are equal in all forms for all children (although inadequate). In RS, the child allowance is BAM 39.60 for the second and the fourth child, and BAM 79.20 for the third child, if the families are below the means-tested threshold. In addition, children with developmental disabilities are also entitled to child allowance (assuming they are able to provide an opinion of the expert commission of the centers for social work) that is, children who are entitled to care and assistance from others. These children are entitled to allowance regardless of the income per household member, the value of the movable property, and regardless of the order of birth, and the amount is the same for all categories, which is currently 101,20 KM. The situation is different in Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (hereinafter: FBiH). Since this issue is a cantonal competence, benefits vary considerably. For instance, child allowance is not paid in some cantons, and very greatly in others (between BAM 9 - BAM 50). In addition to the inadequacy of these benefits, children and their families are obviously victims of territorial discrimination in FBiH.

4.1.3. Consequently, the enrollment in elementary and secondary schools was down 1.7% and 2.1% respectively in 2016/2017 school year, relative to the preceding year. At the same time, in RS 6.2% of persons aged 16 and above have no educational degrees, while in FBiH this percentage is 5.4%.²⁴

²¹ For children 5-15 years of age, the social position is measured with the indicators of deprivation/scarcity, such as: child nutrition, education resources, free time, social participation, information, housing.

²² L. Fennore, Y. Chzhen; "Child Poverty and Deprivation in Bosnia and Herzegovina", UNICEF, April 2015, p. 6-11.

²³ UNICEF; Multiple Indicator Survey, New York, 2006

²⁴ DEP, "Izvještaj o socijalnoj uključenosti u BiH – Godišnji izvještaj 2017", Sarajevo, December 2018, pp. 7-8.

4.1.4. The share of children below the age of 18 with developmental difficulties in the total population is 0.9%, or 6,239 (3,639 boys, 2,690 girls).

Inclusive education for children with developmental difficulties in BiH is at the stage of organizational inception. In FBiH, there are 27 special elementary education classes, with 522 pupils, and 11 secondary schools, with 280 students. In RS, there are 24 special elementary education classes, with 394 pupils, and 4 secondary schools for children with difficulties, with 118 students. In the Brčko District, there are two special elementary education classes, with 7 pupils.²⁵

Participation of children in preschool education is on a low level, while in the special schools and special classes, technical capacity of professional personnel is poor when it comes to the rights of children with difficulties. In this regard, NGOs and organizations of people with disabilities, and international organizations are considerably more active than the institutions.

4.1.5. The child protection index (UNICEF) measures five dimensions: Law and policy, Services, Capacity, Coordination, and Accountability, and it comprises 626 indicators grouped in 4 measures, as follows: 1) Child vulnerability; 2) governance; 3) ending and preventing violence and strengthening care and protection of children, and 4) capacities for social work.

According to the child protection index in BiH, the children vulnerability index is 0.472 out of possible 1.0. In terms of the results in the area of child protection, the value of the child protection index is 0.3 of possible 1.0, which ranks BiH last of the group of eight comparator countries (Serbia, Kosovo*, Georgia, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Armenia, BiH).²⁶

4.1.6. The education system and unemployment, and their mutual incompatibility, have the greatest impact on the social position of young people. Along with the declining enrollment in secondary education, the major problem in the higher education is its lack of responsiveness, i.e. absence of adaptation to the needs of the labor market. In addition, numerous private universities, of doubtful reputation, costly education even at public universities, and increasingly widespread practice of purchasing degrees from 'diploma mills' have de facto undermined the system of university education.

The youth (15-24) unemployment rate in BiH was 45.8% in 2017, compared to the general unemployment rate of 20.5%, which shows that young people have huge difficulties in entering the labor market. Active employment measures have contributed to partial lowering of the general unemployment rate, while their effect with regard to youth has been neutral.²⁷

In 2017, BAM 132,751,315 was spent for active and passive employment measures. The support to employment and rehabilitation, for which in 2017 FBiH allocated BAM 36 million, RS BAM 5 million, and BD BAM 880 thousand, should have some effect. BAM 15 million was allocated for enterprise start-ups in FBiH, BAM 3.6 million in RS and BAM 500 thousand in BD. 15,341 unemployed persons benefited from active employment measures.²⁸

²⁵ See UNICEF BiH/Amer Kapetanović "Situaciona analiza djece sa poteškoćama u Bosni i Hercegovini", November 2017, p. 69

²⁶ See UNICEF BiH/Amer Kapetanović, ibidem

²⁷ See DEP, ibidem, p. 54

²⁸ See DEP, ibidem, p. 14-17

On the other hand, as budget support for employment does not guarantee its sustainability, remaining employed after the budget support ends, the effectiveness of such measures is uncertain.

As we have seen, it is dire that active employment measures have no effect on the reduction of youth unemployment rate.

4.2. Poverty, the inevitable centerpiece of social inclusion policies

4.2.1. The official statistics in BiH measures poverty by establishing a relative poverty line, which is defined as 60% of the median equivalent consumption of inhabitants. In simpler terms, everyone whose consumption is below 60% of the average consumption in a given country is relatively poor. The key word here is 'relatively', because the poverty line depends on the level of consumption in a given country, and it is higher in rich countries than in poor ones. This methodology does not provide an answer about the real poverty in BiH.

For transition countries such as BiH, the absolute poverty line, which sets the consumption threshold of 2,100 calories per day for adults, in other words it includes only sustenance, is more relevant, as well as a wider consumption threshold which includes non-food products, depending on the characteristics of the given country.

The UN absolute food poverty line is USD 1.50 per day and it is defined as extreme poverty appropriate for underdeveloped countries.

According to the BiH Agency for Statistics, the relative poverty rate in BiH was 16.9% in 2015, i.e. it was 1 percentage point lower than in 2011. The relative poverty threshold for a single-person household was BAM 289.26 (60% of the median equivalent consumption), so in 2015 more than 500,000 inhabitants were relatively poor.

"Although relative poverty declined, it does not mean that absolute poverty decreased. A lower rate of relative poverty means that the entire population spent less."²⁹ The poor logic of using relative poverty as a measure of poverty in BiH is evident in the comparisons with other countries. In Croatia (an EU Member State), 19.4% of the population were relatively poor, in other words, taken literally, they are a poorer country than BiH. In Albania, it was 14.3%, which should mean that they are a wealthier country than BiH. The average relative poverty threshold for EU Member States in 2016 was 24%, which implies that there are many more poor people in EU than in BiH, which is in contrast with reality. Absolutely all other economic and social indicators prove the pointlessness of measuring poverty in BiH with the relative poverty methodology.³⁰

4.2.2. The absolute poverty line, also calculated on the basis of the household budget surveys, yields entirely different results.³¹

Starting from the methodology of calculating absolute poverty (BiH Agency for Statistics 2007, which was the last year it was calculated), it was found that, in 2011, 23.4% in BiH, 22.7% in FBiH and 25.3%

²⁹ See DEP, *ibidem*, p. 19

³⁰ UNDP; „RISK-Profiling the Western Balkans“; HDR 2016.

³¹ See more in: IBHI, Maastricht School of Government, „Siromaštvo u BiH 2011 - Trendovi i dostignuća“ (Poverty in BiH in 2011 - Trends and Achievements), Sarajevo, June 2013; www.ibhi.ba

in RS were below the absolute poverty line (BAM 238 for an adult, in 2007 prices). On this basis, it is possible to estimate the percentage of the population below the absolute poverty line in 2016.

This estimate was obtained through extrapolation of the rising poverty trend in BiH, FBiH and RS between 2007 and 2011, i.e. it was assumed that the average annual poverty increases in 2007-2011 period continued in the 2011-2016.

The validity of this approach was based on the fact that the average GDP growth rate during the period was only around 1.7%, and that unemployment declined slightly only in 2016.

In the above fashion, we obtained the estimate that 28% of the population of BiH, 28% of FBiH and 30% of RS were below the absolute poverty line. This means that there are around 900,000 people in BiH who live below the absolute poverty line. This is indirectly corroborated by international organizations' 2016 estimates.

In the EU assessment, BiH is among five poorest European countries.

UN studies show that one in six inhabitants of BiH subsist on BAM 3-5 per day (BAM 90-150 per month), i.e. 17% of the population is in extreme poverty, far below the absolute poverty line, while 700,000 people lives on the edge of poverty.³²

Independently of the chosen poverty calculation methodology (relative or absolute), families with children, and particularly those with more children, are the category that is most severely affected by poverty.

4.2.3. As regards the structure of sources of poverty (not captured by official statistics), it is very important to note that one-quarter of employed people in BiH could not make sure that they would keep their four-person families above the BAM 600/month consumption threshold, which left them below the absolute poverty line. A combination of various methodologies, with reliance on the absolute poverty calculation methodology, along with the examination of the number of workers who are paid minimum wages, the average monthly salaries in lowest-paid sectors, and the hot meal allowance, it was estimated that 25% of all employed workers are working poor.³³

This closes the poverty cycle, the poverty of workers who are excluded from the social protection system can only be reproduced generationally. The children of the poor, even of the working poor, will remain deprived and candidates for poverty when they reach adulthood.

The major cause is the huge increase in social inequality, which originates to a great extent from the post-war 'robber privatization', which allowed ones to enrich themselves at the expense of 'others'. The poverty of 'others' is reproduced generationally, so social inequality becomes 'stabilized' and deepens.

4.2.4. Under social protection, we understand a narrower term than social security, i.e. the subject of regulation of the social protection laws in the entities and BD. Social protection of persons with disabilities will be examined separately, so it is not included here. In 2017, there were 73,016 social

³² See Ž. Papić „Siromaštvo i radničko siromaštvo u BiH“ (Poor and Working Poor in BiH), Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, p. 4

³³ Ž. Papić, ibidem, p. 14-15

protection beneficiaries in FBiH (63,749 adults and 9,267 children) in various forms. 8,771 persons received permanent cash benefits.³⁴

In RS, the total number of beneficiaries in 2017 was 49,199, and the 4,751 persons received permanent cash benefits.³⁵

In BD, in December 2017 there were 10,877 beneficiaries of various types of social protection.³⁶

Social protection of BiH suffers from two core problems.

The estimate that around 4% of GDP is allocated for social protection comes from 2017 analysis of the World Bank. Ever since then, it has been claimed that this was fiscally unsustainable.

The point here is that the analysis erred by adding up the outlays for the traditional social protection and for veterans' and disability benefits created because of the war in BiH. The benefits for veterans account for over two-thirds of the total allocations for social protection, with only 1.2% of GDP earmarked for social protection of the poor and socially excluded.³⁷

We have some more precise data for 2012 (unfortunately, the last year when this problem was analyzed).

The social protection transfers (permanent cash benefit, child protection, protection of civil victims of war, civil persons with disabilities and veterans' benefits, including war disabled) totaled 3.39% of GDP on the level of BiH (FBiH - 3.47%; RS - 3.39%). Out of this percentage, non-veteran benefits, i.e. conventional social protection accounted for 1.36% of GDP on BiH level (FBiH - 1.52%, RS - 1.1%).³⁸

It is inappropriate to compare BiH, which spends 3.39% of GDP on non-contributory cash benefits for social protection, as BiH still bears the consequences of the war, with the countries in the region which do not bear war consequences and which allocate on average 1.6% of GDP for social protection (i.e. there are no veterans' benefits).

It becomes clear that the allocations for social protection in BiH are below the regional average.

The existing, status-based, social protection system is completely passive with respect to beneficiaries' employment activation, it keeps them in the state of social exclusion.

The system of social protection itself is not focused on beneficiaries' real needs. This is the reason why in 2011 the poorest quintile of the population of BiH received only 17.3% of total transfers (FBiH - 15.4% and RS - 20.07%), while the richest quintile of the BiH population received 20% of total transfers (FBiH - 21.2% and RS - 18.1%).

Territorial discrimination of the poorest in, who receive permanent cash benefits through centers for social work, is one of the more important issues in social protection in FBiH.

³⁴ See Federation Ministry of Labor and Social Policy, "Korisnici socijalne zaštite za 2017, po kantonima i zbirno, February 2019.

³⁵ See RS Ministry of Health and Social Welfare; Bilten socijalne, porodične i dječije zaštite, 2017, Banja Luka, 2018

³⁶ See Brčko District, Welfare Subdivision, "Isplata po Zakonu o socijalnoj i dječijoj zaštiti za 2018, po mjesecima, February 2019.

³⁷ UNICEF, "Gap Analysis in the Area of Social Protection and Inclusion Policies in BiH," Sarajevo, November 2013, p. 19

³⁸ For more, see IBHI, Maastricht School of Government, "Non-contributory Cash Benefits for Social Protection in BiH - What Works and What Does Not?" June 2013 (www.ibhi.ba)

The amount of permanent cash benefit in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina varies between cantons and between municipalities (from BAM 45 - 120 per month) and is inadequate for meeting the basic needs. The situation is similar with the one-time cash benefit. In the Republika Srpska, since the social protection system is integrated on the entity level, the Republika Srpska Law on Social Protection established a single level of cash benefits for individuals and families. However, even these cash benefits are inadequate for meeting beneficiaries' basic needs.³⁹

Therefore, the existing system of social protection is failing to reduce poverty while, on the other hand, it aggravates inequalities in the society. A comprehensive reform of the system is needed.

At the same time, social entrepreneurship, as an important instrument of beneficiaries' employment activation and social inclusion, is neglected in BiH. Some legislation is missing, such as, for instance, the Law on Social Enterprises, which would establish the statistical classification of social enterprises and support policies for them. The funds for professional rehabilitation, training and employment of persons with disabilities in FBiH and RS are almost the only functional mechanisms for supporting social entrepreneurship.

In the context of the social situation, social entrepreneurship constitutes an important factor of reform and the system of social protection, as well as the strengthening of active labor market measures focused on employment. Social entrepreneurship represents a combination of social protection and employment, a transition from 'dole' to employment, therefore it is significant in both social and economic sense. At the same time, it is an instrument of social inclusion of those who are excluded, from the unemployed to vulnerable groups (persons with disabilities, Roma, women, etc.). It activates passive systems of social protection and employment, so it is important for implementation of reforms. Thus this is the right time to develop policies and measures that would develop social entrepreneurship and mitigate the social crisis.⁴⁰

4.3. Persons with disabilities - social inclusion vs. discrimination

A precondition for the social inclusion process is to eliminate discrimination in general, and in particular with regard to persons with disabilities. In other words, the frontline of the social inclusion struggle is to eliminate the discrimination of persons with disabilities.

Persons with disabilities comprise 8.3% of the total BiH population. Taking into account their families, it is estimated that nearly one-third of the population in BiH suffers in some way the consequences of disability.

According to 2017 data of the Agency for Statistics of BiH, 46,686 adult disabled persons were beneficiaries of social protection, compared to 45,361 beneficiaries in 2016. Most are in the category of physically disabled persons, and, according to the latest data of the Agency for Statistics for 2017, this category comprised 18,619 persons, and this number also rose relative to 2016, when it was 16,723 persons. The values for this indicator are rising from year to year.⁴¹

³⁹ For more, see the Federation Ministry of Labor and Social Policy, RS Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, *ibidem*.

⁴⁰ SIF in BiH & IBHI, "Zašto nam treba socijalne poduzetništvo u BiH", www.sif.ba

⁴¹ See DEP, *ibidem*, p. 28-29

The number of persons with disabilities who are entitled to a range of benefits, from the personal cash benefit to carer's allowance, is very hard to establish, because of the differences in the laws of RS and FBiH. In 2018, there were 32,433 beneficiaries of the veteran's cash benefit and 1,312 beneficiaries of the individual cash benefit. The entitlement to carer's allowance, available to civilian persons with disabilities in 2017 was approved for 25,512 beneficiaries, as governed by the RS Law on Social Protection. The base for calculation of the veteran's benefit and individual benefit in 2018 was BAM 580.18 and BAM 435.12 respectively, which means that individual cash benefits are around 25% lower than the veterans' benefits.⁴² This gap reveals that civilian persons with disabilities are at a disadvantage. Discrimination on the basis of the cause of disability is in contravention of all international instruments ratified by BiH (UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, etc.).

According to 2018 data, in FBiH there were 42,238 of civilian persons with disabilities, 48,850 disabled war veterans, and 10,016 of civilian victims of war (persons with disabilities eligible for these entitlements).

The current practice in FBiH is in total collision with the Law on Prohibition of Discrimination and the UN Convention of BiH, as well as with other documents adopted by FBiH (the situation is similar in RS).

There is discrimination between civilian persons with disabilities and disabled war veterans in the categorization of disability: Disabled war veterans are entitled to the disability benefits with a disability of 20%-100%, pursuant to the regulations on disabled war veterans in FBiH; civilian victims of war with the degree of disability of 60% or more are entitled to disability benefits; according to the current FBiH Law on the Basics of Social Protection, Protection of Civilian Victims of War and Protection of Families with Children, persons with non-war-related disabilities acquire the title to individual cash benefit, carer's benefit and orthopedic allowance at 90-100% of disability.

Discrimination is even more evident in the differences and amounts of cash benefit by category: Disabled war veterans with 100% disability receive a total of BAM 1,903 per month as personal disability benefit, carer's allowance and orthopedic allowance, while non-war-related disabled persons with 100% disability receive only BA 403 per month for the same benefits, while civilian victims of war who are 100% disabled receive BAM 1,314 per month for the same benefits (data for 2015).

The number of persons with non-war-related disabilities who are not eligible for benefits (disability below 90%) is several times greater.⁴³

At the same time, both groups of persons with disabilities in both entities are discriminated in many other aspects: access to the life in the community and adequate housing, lack of sensitive health care and labor market policies, physical and communicational accessibility, etc.

⁴² RS Ministry of Labor and Veterans' Issues: „Pregled ukupnih izdvajanja za boračku i invalidsku zaštitu i zaštitu civilnih žrtava rata od 2006-2018“, Banja Luka 2019; and RS Ministry of Labor and Social Protection, ibidem, Banja Luka, 2018.

⁴³ See Elvira Bešlija, „Analiza sistemske diskriminacije osoba sa invaliditetom po osnovu uzroka invalidnosti između ratnih i neratnih OSI“, FSU u BiH, November 2016, p. 16

The essence of elimination of all forms of discrimination against persons with disabilities is to enable equality of opportunities, which initiates the process of their social inclusion.

4.4. Gender aspects of social exclusion

Women remain insufficiently represented in politics and public life. According to data from January 2017, in comparison with 186 countries in the world, BiH was ranked 67th by the participation of women in ministerial positions (22%), and 78th by the percentage of women in the Parliament (23.8%). In the 2018 elections, 6% fewer women were elected in all parliaments in BiH (BiH, FBiH, RS, cantons in FBiH and BD) than in 2014.

The percentage of women without education is more than four times greater than for men. 9% women aged 16 and over lack education, while for men this percentage is 2%. This difference is pronounced also for older women. According to the latest official data of the Agency for Statistics of BiH for people over the age of 64, the percentage of uneducated person is 6.3% for men and 29.7% for women. Furthermore, among women over the age of 74, 43.8% have no educational background, while this figure is far lower for men - 10%.

A household with a women as its head is at a considerably greater risk to fall into poverty.

Single mothers or women who are providers in the household are the most vulnerable group. The level of education also affects the weaker position of women. According to the data of 2013 census, there are 146,078 persons aged 15 and over who have no education, and 84% are women. The unemployment rate for women in 2017 was 23.1%, and it was nearly 7% lower compared to 2016. Women make 37.6%, or 307,000, out of 816 employed people, and 60.2% of 1,381,000 inactive population.

Absence of effective enforcement of regulations on prevention and protection from gender-based violence, and particularly from family violence, still remains a grave problem. Relevant legislation has not yet been harmonized with the Istanbul Convention on Prevention and Combating Family Violence, which is the cause of its ineffectiveness.

There remains a need to harmonize systems for monitoring and collecting data on cases of violence against women, especially entity laws. In relevant institutions, as well as in the police and public sector, there are no departments specialized in cases of gender-based violence. Access to free legal aid and representation in courts is very limited. The number of protective measures adopted is still low, and the general system for responding and supporting victims needs to be improved. "Safe Houses" are still in most cases still modestly financed, which is contrary to existing acts regulating this area and which is why some of them had to be closed.⁴⁴ The core problem is that the laws do guarantee full gender equality, but in practice the situation is different.

Gender inequality in practice is largely a consequence of the strengthening of conservative, patriarchal awareness in BiH. This is a consequence of the widespread nationalistic ideologies and awareness inherent in the non-acceptance of gender equality. The same reasons are at the roots of

⁴⁴ DEP, *ibidem*, p. 25

the discrimination of LGBT population, whose very appearance in the public space is exposed to radical homophobia. This goes much beyond exclusion, it strives for elimination of their very existence.

Gender equality in practice requires an alteration of social consciousness, democratization and raising awareness of citizens, which will necessarily accompany adoption of EU standards.

4.5. Senior citizens - situation and the core issue

Senior citizens comprise 14.2% of BiH population and their share is constantly rising.⁴⁵

The pension system is the most important element of social security for persons of the third age. The pension system is a part of the social security system, i.e. part of socio-economic policies that serve to avert the risk of poverty in case of old age and work-related disability. In addition to economic shifts, this system is heavily impacted by demographic changes. The trend of faster population aging represents a burden for the pension system and it required reforms of the pension insurance systems.

The number of pensioners in BiH continues to rise. In FBiH in December 2017 there were 412,539 pensioners (3,204 more than in 2016), with the average monthly pension of BAM 371.59 (in 2016 it was BAM 368.93). The large majority of the beneficiaries receive old-age pensions - 221,390 pensioners, followed by family pensions - 118,422 beneficiaries and disability pensions - 72,727 beneficiaries.

In RS, the number of pension beneficiaries is also continually on the rise. As of 31 December 2017, the total number of beneficiaries entitled to a pension in the Republika Srpska was 260,580 (2,971 more than in 2016), and the number of insurance payers was 300,202 (7,391 more than in 2016). Out of this total, 145,374 beneficiaries receive old age pensions, 76,163 are beneficiaries of family pensions, while the number of beneficiaries who receive pensions on any other grounds was 282.

The second part of the problem is the disproportion between the low number of employees contributing to their future pensions and the growing number of pensioners, which is a consequence of stagnation in economic development. Our pension system based on generational solidarity (Bismarck model) is sustainable only if one retired employee comes to four employees. In both entities this ratio is completely disrupted, with nearly one pensioner to one employed person. The solution to the problem is a significant increase in employment, i.e. in accelerated economic development.

Specific needs of this category of the population and their dependence on the assistance of others place them in a particularly difficult position. Retired women are generally in a more difficult position, because as a rule they performed lower-paid jobs and consequently earned lower pensions. A large share of the total public spending goes to pensions where the greatest problem is the possibility of privileged and early retirement.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ BiH Agency for Statistics, "Popis stanovništva, domaćinstava i stanova u BiH 2013 – rezultati popisa".

⁴⁶ DEP, ibidem, pp. 27 and 28

4.6. Ethnic causes of social exclusion

The situation of national minorities in BiH is specific in comparison with the definition of ethnic minorities in other countries. Namely, the parts of the constituent peoples (Bosniaks, Croats, Serbs) who reside in municipalities, cantons or entities are a minority if they comprise less than half of the majority nation in that area. The conditions and statistical data on 'constitutional minorities', vary on different levels of BiH constitutional system, which also reveals a degree of ethnic and territorial homogenization. In BiH, 23% of the population are minorities, they live in entities where the other nation makes up 75% of the population (2% is undetermined), in FBiH the minorities comprise 27% of the population, but only 8% in the cantons. In BD, 22% of the population are a minority, 10% are a minority in RS and RS municipalities, and 7% in FBiH municipalities. In figures, 384,000 Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs may be considered as peculiar 'constitutional minorities'.⁴⁷

Their actual socio-economic position is very poor in comparison to the majority ethnic group, while the constitutional laws that guarantee their equal rights (to education, employment, etc.) are not enforced. This makes them socially excluded to a considerable extent.

In the political system, paradoxically, their exclusion is defined by the Constitution of BiH as the passive suffrage is restricted by the 'territorialization' of constitutionality. E.g. a Serb from FBiH has no right to run for the post of a Serb Member of Presidency of BiH. That is an exclusive right of the Serbs from RS. The same situation applies to Croats and Bosniaks from RS, who cannot represent their peoples in the BiH Presidency. The decisions of the European court of human rights in Strasbourg in cases Sejdić-Finci; Pilav and Zornić, which would extend this right to 'minority' Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs, have never been enforced.

Roma (13,000) and other ethnic minorities (20,000) constitute another category of classic minorities (17 in BiH). Regardless of the census results, there are estimates that the number of Roma is considerably greater (70-80,000), but they, for the most part, declare themselves to be members of the majority ethnic group in their own community. From the standpoint of social exclusion, Roma are in the worst position in every aspect of social life in comparison to the 'constitutional' and other classic minorities.

4.7. Political participation and civil society - situation and political exclusion

Civil society organizations were supposed to act as one of the main levers of political participation, political inclusion and citizens' activism. Unfortunately, that has not happened.

Considerable external funding support to NGOs, similar to the situation in other post-conflict societies, resulted in a creation of an 'NGO elite' and 'project industry', rather than encouraging progress in development of civil society. With the decline of foreign financial support, NGOs focused on their 'market' sustainability and survival, forgetting their mission.

One aspect of this phenomenon relates to increasing domestic funding of NGOs, which would have been commendable if such funds were not non-transparent and often 'indirectly' politically

⁴⁷ Agency for Statistics of BiH, *ibidem*

conditioned. The total transfer of the public sector for the nongovernmental sector in the 2007-2012 period were: 2007 - BAM 107.2 million, 2008 - BAM 118.0 million; 2009 - BAM 114.1 million; 2012 - BAM 100 million.⁴⁸

The transformation of NGOs from civil society organizations into a 'project industry' and financial predominance of domestic sources of funding, caused citizens to have a very low level of trust in NGOs, as evident from numerous surveys.

In parallel, these surveys show that citizens, and young people in particular, have little influence on decision making. Fewer than half of young people, 46.4%, believe that they have influence at work, at their school or university, and only 7.4% believe that they have influence on political or nongovernmental organizations. 90.8% of young people did not contact politicians even a single time, 87.6% did not attend a single public event on political and social issues, while 90.9% took no part in public protests, etc.⁴⁹

The data from this research reveal a very obvious political exclusion of young people and the failure to motivate them for political participation. Very similar information is found in the surveys of the entire BiH population.

On the other hand, the support of several remaining international donors, primarily of EC and of its Delegation to BiH, to the civil society organizations helps some CSO to 'remain standing'. This predominantly takes the form of successful implementation of projects, such as 'E-consultations', which permit participation of CSOs and citizens in the process of government institutions' policy development activities.

The Cooperation Agreement between the BiH Council of Ministers and non-governmental organizations in BiH signed in November 2017 envisaged institutionalization of this cooperation. Unfortunately, this agreement has not yet been implemented.

5. Social inclusion strategies and policies in BiH - Situation, expectations and outcomes

A UN study⁵⁰ identified all shortcomings of the strategic planning processes in BiH in a very appropriate manner: lack of integrated methodological approach, lack of operationalization (i.e. lack of logical matrixes or action plans), a lack of monitoring and evaluation of the implementation, lack of indicators and of budget funds allocated for their implementation.

So, for instance, out of 69 analyzed strategic documents on the level of BiH, only 56% include budget allocations, and 81% involves indicators, in RS, 16% includes budget allocation, and 4% involves indicators.

Therefore problems arise in the implementation of strategic documents, and goals are hard to achieve.

⁴⁸ SIF in BiH, CPCD, "Pismo-glava izdvajanje vladinog sektora za nevladin sektor za 2012. god." Sarajevo 2013, str. 9. Unfortunately, there are no more recent relevant studies.

⁴⁹ Prism Research Consulting d.o.o., „Glasovi mladih-istraživanja o mladima u BiH“ UD dijalog za budućnost, Sarajevo, May 2016, pp. 60-62

⁵⁰ UN; "Implementing the 2030 sustainable development goals in BiH – Rapid integrated assesment of key strategic documents", July 2018, pp. 15-16

In general terms, previous assessments also apply to strategic documents in the field of social inclusion, which we summarize below.

The 'Social Inclusion Strategy in Bosnia and Herzegovina 2010-2013' (BiH Directorate for Economic Planning) was prepared between 2008 and 2010, with the support of DFID. It envisaged preparation of an action plan and a financial framework for its implementation. It was adopted only by the Federal Government and Brčko District, but not by the Government of RS and Council of Ministers of BiH. Even where it was adopted, the action plans were not implemented.

The entity strategies for improving the position of persons with disabilities have yielded considerably better results.

The 'Strategy for Equalization of Opportunities of Persons with Disabilities in FBiH 2011-2015' was adopted in FBiH.

An analysis of its implementation showed that the Strategy has set up highly ambitious goals that well cover the priority areas and that it is a document which is an outstanding baseline for action/planning for further actions. However, only part of the activities has been implemented, and a great deal remains to be done. Namely, the Strategy is based on a multi-sectoral approach, so it is very difficult to ensure its implementation within a decentralized and fragmented government system of the Federation. Moreover, the awareness of this issue and the related positive legislation and obligations assumed by BiH vary across communities, and are generally not high.⁵¹

The "Strategy of Enhancement of the Position of Persons with Disabilities in RS 2010-2015" was adopted in RS. An analysis of its implementation provided a similar general impression as in the previous case, stressing as an implementation difficulty low awareness of the importance of the matters of persons with disabilities, and highlighting examples of good practices.⁵²

A continuity in development of strategic documents was achieved, which is a very positive development. The 'Strategy of Enhancement of Social Position of Persons with Disabilities in RS 2017-2026' and the "Strategy for Enhancement of Rights and Position of Persons with Disabilities in FBiH 2016-2021" were adopted in RS and FBiH, respectively.

The implementation of both of these strategies may exercise a considerable influence towards social inclusion of persons with disabilities. This will depend on the implementation of their action plans in practice.

Laws on education, health care and social protection are not sensitized with regard to social inclusion. On the other hand, there is a considerable number of good practices, especially in the field of early development of children, which were created with the support of international organizations, UNICEF in particular.

It is important to note the importance of a number of legal initiatives. In FBiH, the Law on Protection of Families with Children has entered into parliamentary procedure. It eliminates territorial discrimination with regard to the amount or availability of child allowances, which will reduce the

⁵¹ Custom Concept d.o.o. „Analiza implementacije Strategije za izjednačavanje mogućnosti za OSI u BiH 2011-2015“; UNICEF BiH, UNDP, January 2016, p. 4

⁵² Custom Concept d.o.o. „Analiza implementacije Strategije unaprijeđenja položaja OSI u RS 2010-2015. UNICEF BiH, UNDP, March 2016, pp. 5 and 10

poverty of youngest children. The Law on Unified Principles and Framework for Support to Persons with Disabilities, Law on Associations of Persons with Disabilities, Law on Social Services, etc. are in preparation.

In RS, a pronatality fee was introduced for the third (600, 00 KM) and the fourth child (450,00 KM), and the Demographic Policy Council has been established. Also, the project "Socialization of the Children of the Republika Srpska" is being realized in order to meet the developmental needs of children.

"Economic Reform Programme of the Republic of Srpska for the period 2018- 2020", in the chapter 'Social inclusion, poverty reduction and equal opportunities' proposes to define social security criteria for persons with disabilities that would guarantee all persons with disabilities the same quality of services, regardless of the sector which provided for vesting their rights. The Draft Law on Amendments to the Law on Social Protection introduces the right to personal disability.

6. Conclusions

1. The path to EU membership will require consistent social inclusion policies. This does not concern only the 'welfare', but also all policies, most of the chapters of the EU acquis where standards must be aligned with the EU standards prior to accession.
2. Therefore the social inclusion strategies, on the level of FBiH, RS and BD, pursuant to the Constitution of BiH, represent the most effective tools of importance for social inclusion.
3. The brief situational analysis revealed a lack of effective policies, their lack of harmonization and a large number of open, systemic issues that obstruct social inclusion.
4. Combating systemic discrimination of marginalized groups is a precondition of their social inclusion.
5. It is important to upgrade the statistical system so the situation and problems of social inclusion could be tracked in a real manner. Each country is specific in its own way, and poverty and social assessment methodologies must take that into account.
6. A novel approach to development concepts, with the focus on human resources, also requires a different approach to the priorities of the social inclusion strategy. In the place of the 'sectoral' (employment, education, health care, etc.) approach, the focus should be on marginalized, vulnerable groups, and coordinated policies across all 'sectors' ought to be developed from their perspective.
7. Budget allocations for most vulnerable categories - this is not a fiscal expense, but an investment in human resources, unlike fiscal costs (such as the costs of administration). Therefore, they are developmentally sustainable. Social inclusion strategies and policies must take this as their starting point. To be effective, they must secure budget allocations for their implementation, indicators for tracking implementation and for evaluation, and be transparent.
8. The previous approach was followed by an analysis of the key problems of social inclusion. Therefore, children and young people, as the most important vulnerable group, in the context of future human resources, are necessarily the first priority of social inclusion strategies. The poor, persons with disabilities, senior citizens, ethnic minorities, both

'constitutional' and classical, and marginalization of political participation constitute other key priorities for the social inclusion strategies.

9. It is extremely important to strengthen public awareness about the significance of social inclusion and real problems of exclusion of marginalized groups.
10. These conclusions, as well as the assessments from this document, must be 'inclusive', they are open to all stakeholders, and principally to marginalized groups, to take part in their review, rewriting and further concretization.

ANNEX 1:

Bosnia and Herzegovina - Key Indicators, 2017

Official name	Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH)
Geographic location	BiH is situated in the western part of the Balkan Peninsula
Neighboring countries	Croatia in the north, west and south, Serbia in the east, Montenegro to the southeast
Administrative organization	BiH is divided into two entities the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) and the Republika Srpska (RS), and the Brčko District
Entity structure	FBiH is administratively divided into 10 cantons; The cantons are divided into a total of 79 municipalities; Republika Srpska is administratively divided into 62 municipalities; The City of Brčko is a separate administrative unit, the District
The capital of BiH (HDR 2018)	Sarajevo The country with high level of human development
Income group (World Bank Group)	Upper middle-income country
Total surface area (km ²)	51,209.2: land: 51,197, sea: 12.2
Population	3,437,453 (2017 estimate)
Population density	67.1 inhabitants/km ²
Ethnic composition of the population	Bosniaks, Croats, Serbs, Others and members of other ethnic groups
Population by gender	50.9% women, 49.1% men (2013 census)
Average life expectancy at birth, in years	77.1 (women 79.6, men 74.6)
GDP per capita, (BAM)	8,841
GDP per capita (2011 PPP \$), (HDR 2018)	11,714
Gross domestic product (in BAM billion)	32,332
GDP, total (2011 in PPP \$ billion), (HDR 2018)	41.1
Human Development Index, HDI (HDR 2018)	0.768
Gender Development Index, GDI (HDR 2018)	0.924
Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index, IHDI (HDR 2018)	0.649
Total development loss due to inequality (in %) (HDR 2018)	15.5
Multi-dimensional poverty index, MPI (in % of the population) (HDR 2018)	0.008
Poverty below \$3.20 per day (2011 PPP) (in %), 2015	0.2

Sources: BiH Agency for Statistics, Institute for Statistics of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Institute of Statistics of Republika Srpska and, where so noted, Human Development Report 2018, Country Profile

ANNEX 2:

1. Millennium Development Goals (UN, 2000)

- To eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
- To achieve universal primary education
- To promote gender equality and empower women
- To reduce child mortality
- To improve maternal health
- To combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases
- To ensure environmental sustainability
- To develop a global partnership for development

2. Sustainable Development Goals (UN, 2015)

- No Poverty,
- Zero Hunger,
- Good Health and Well-being,
- Quality Education,
- Gender Equality,
- Clean Water and Sanitation,
- Affordable and Clean Energy,
- Decent Work and Economic Growth,
- Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure,
- Reducing Inequality,
- Sustainable Cities and Communities,
- Responsible Consumption and Production,
- Climate Action,
- Life Below Water,
- Life On Land,
- Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions,
- Partnerships for Sustainable Development.