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Abstract

Since the annexation of Crimea and the outbreak of war in the Donbass region in Eastern Ukraine in 2014 hundreds of thousands of people have been forced to leave their homes and seek refuge elsewhere in Ukraine. The 1.7 million Ukrainians that have left the Crimea and Donbass regions to escape the violence and suppression mainly came to Kiev and the large cities in East and South Ukraine – Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhia and Odesa. The situation of the internally displaced people (IDP) in their host communities was and still is vulnerable and marginalized although various actors have tried to help IDPs to integrate successfully.

This research aims to analyse the relevance of civil society organisations (CSOs) in the successful integration of IDPs in Ukraine by looking at the role civil society plays in improving the socio-economic situation of IDPs; how do they respond to the influx of refugees to the cities? How can they complement government support to IDPs and thereby improve their living situations? Questions like these need to be answered in order to help in building a national strategy to solve the problems faced by internally displaced persons within Ukrainian society. This research sees development as a vital and integral part of peacebuilding, because integrating peacebuilding practices by means of development can be a pathway to building a peaceful society, both on a local and on a national level. This research is an analysis of the experiences of IDPs in Ukraine with local organizations and government organizations respectively, in helping to resettle in other parts of Ukraine so as to build a new future outside the conflict region. In order to study the role of local organizations in everyday life, IDPs have been asked about their experiences since they arrived in Kiev (or other big cities) through qualitative interviews. They were asked who have been crucial in helping to receive the refugee status, in applying for social benefits, in housing and job employment.

The perceptions of IDPs and CSOs on how to improve the socio-economic situation of IDPs differ. The assumption that CSOs only aim at short-term relief is not entirely correct, according to the results. CSOs step in with humanitarian relief projects that provide people instant aid. As time passed by, CSOs sensed they had to move on to durable, long-term projects, at the same time preventing people from getting aid-dependent. IDPs’ perspectives on long term support means having their own house, since that is seen as a prerequisite for independence. Most IDPs, however, think it is impossible to get their own house with the resources they have and therefore hope for a change in policy for IDPs to help them with housing.

CSOs provide security for IDPs that became marginalized by the conflict. IDPs’ perception on security that is provided by the government is that it lacks support. People look for CSOs for support and try to become self-reliant by having one or more jobs, but this is not enough to cover their living expenses. Most IDPs see less possibilities for an autonomous life than CSOs.

CSOs have different perceptions on the situation of IDPs; on the one hand they find that IDPs are more able to become independent if they are really motivated, on the other they see that not all IDPs are able to get a job easily, because of prejudices, age or personal reasons. IDPs experience their living situation as difficult, having less choices in job and housing possibilities. Indicators for the socio-economic situation that were discussed in interviews are possibilities to improve the living situation, quality of life, well-being in health, housing and education. IDPs experience they don’t have much choice, since they have to take every opportunity to improve their situation. Children and students find it most difficult to adjust to their new environment, they mentioned more emotional motives for their living situation.
CSOs had both positive and negative perceptions of the government. On the one hand, organizations perceive the financial support as an important supplement for IDPs and a privilege that poor non-IDPs do not have. But on the other hand, organizations are negative about the lack of government support for the projects of CSOs; they expect the government to contribute to local projects and they have the feeling that the government is neglecting that task. Most IDPs are negative about the way government authorities have treated them, although the allowance for their IDP status is perceived as very useful. A large number of IDPs appears to have different expectations from government support than what they actually received. IDPs are looking for high quality service at lower costs, because they want to improve their socio-economic situation.

Both CSOs as IDPs view the role of CSOs in the improvement of the socio-economic situation as crucial. CSOs experience that the government is not helping sufficiently and that local organizations achieve more for IDPs than the government is doing. Both CSOs and IDPs experience that access to CSOs is easier, compared to government institutions, and CSOs are offering more customized support to IDPs.
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1. Introduction

Finding a solution for the 65 million refugees who are displaced from their homes is an issue that is increasingly important on every government’s agenda, especially against the background of the conflicts in the Middle East and the authoritarian regimes in Africa that are causing mass movements of people towards neighbouring countries and regions. These mass movements are affecting the communities that are hosting refugees, sometimes fuelling xenophobic rhetoric.

The World Bank Group (2017) published an extensive report on the influence of the forced displacement of people on host communities and the need to fully understand the situation of these displaced people. The report addresses the socio-economic deterioration of refugees and host communities alike. A magic word that is often used by researchers, governments and international organizations like the World Bank, United Nations or OECD to help improve the living situation of refugees is ‘civil society’. Ever since the Age of Enlightenment civil society organizations (CSOs) have become more important in Western society; the role of the government became increasingly questioned and ordinary citizens participated more and more in public debates on the design and functioning of society (Zaleski, 2008). Throughout history there have been different views on the role of civil society, in particular also regarding peacebuilding practices. Contemporary approaches to cooperation with civil society can be defined as “locally led, locally owned, and locally delivered” (Hayman, 2013:18). The locally-led approach, or local agency approach, attributes the largest importance to local actors, because they set out a specific (peace) project and international organizations providing the resources and connections. In the locally-owned approach an international organization has a peacebuilding strategy and cooperates with local organizations to implement it. The locally-delivered approach means that a (peace) project is created by an international organization, but the execution of it should be taken up by a local organization. The latter approach is often being criticized by alternative development theorists, because projects are imposed on a CSO top-down and can lack understanding on where assistance is most needed.

Furthermore, in their policy reports international organizations like the World Bank (2013), OECD (2012:7) and United Nations Development Programme (2016a) increasingly attach great importance to civil society; they describe civil society as non-governmental, non-state related organizations that represent the interests of the members of public life. Specific tasks that are attributed to civil society are often not mentioned, but an overall description is that CSOs play an important role in democracy, development, good governance, human security and the promotion of human rights.

Nevertheless, CSOs still experience many difficulties in delivering humanitarian aid while operating in countries with fragile governments. Although an advantage of CSOs is that they are based on voluntary involvement, a shared problem among them is a lack of financial means. Some NGOs that are named among civil society as good might receive proper funding, but because of that they are sometimes considered to be less independent of the state. Other CSOs that have broader membership among a community receive little funding and face difficulties in fulfilling their goals (Paffenholz & Spurk, 2006). According to the UNDP (2016a), fragile countries are not just countries that are involved in violent conflicts but also countries that are fighting corruption, underdevelopment or other sources of tension. Fragile governments are often unable to distribute international aid effectively among their citizens due to unsound policies and ineffective institutions. Therefore, CSOs sometimes take over operational tasks in sectors that used to be governmental responsibilities, because the services delivered by the state are considered to be too weak.
The UNDP (2016a) has made governance and peacebuilding part of the notion of development. That is an interesting approach, since in academic literature the terms ‘peacebuilding’ and ‘development’ often overlap, although they are addressed as separate areas. Therefore, seeing development as a vital and integral part of peacebuilding, offers a contribution to the literature on peacebuilding practices. Although the comprehensive approach to governance and peacebuilding is not the only strategy in achieving peaceful and inclusive societies, it is important to acknowledge that integrating peacebuilding practices by means of development can be a pathway to building a peaceful society.

1.1 Overview of the case

Being welcoming to refugees – or closing the door to them; in the media these are often the two opposite extremes presented to the people and to politicians. We are expected to make a choice on which side we stand. But, isn’t there something in between these choices? For instance, what if the refugees are not distant ‘others’, but close fellow citizens, would that change anything?

Ukrainians have faced similar questions since the 2014 annexation of Crimea by Russia and the outbreak of war in the Donbass region in Eastern Ukraine that have forced hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians to leave their homes and seek refuge elsewhere in the country. The 1.7 million Ukrainians that have left the Crimea and Donbass regions to escape the violence and suppression came mainly to Kiev and large cities in East and South Ukraine – in particular, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhia and Odesa. In a recent survey of the UN refugee agency (UNHCR, 2016), the attitude of Ukrainians in host communities towards internally displaced persons (IDPs) has been analysed, as well as the impact of IDPs on the daily lives of local citizens. It turned out that over 80 percent of the people in Ukrainian cities with the largest share of IDPs are positive – or at least neutral – towards IDPs. However, information on the impact of IDPs on host communities can be contradictory; challenges that are addressed in other surveys (OSCE, 2016; CrimeaSOS, 2015; Smal & Poznyak, 2016) include an increased pressure on employment, housing, education and public facilities in eastern Ukrainian cities. The national government was and still is clearly not prepared for dealing with the consequences of conflict and providing comprehensive help to IDPs.

According to the so-called Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, providing protection and assistance to IDPs is the prime responsibility of a national government (UNOCHA, 1998). It should provide or facilitate the necessary aid and prevent social marginalization of IDPs, but today this is often not the reality in Ukraine. Only in October 2014, the Ukrainian government adopted a law in which IDP became an official status, confirming the rights of people that fled conflict-affected areas in Ukraine and entitled them to social benefits in accordance to their status (UNHCR, 2014). However, this does not guarantee these (financial) benefits are sufficient for the IDPs, because a much broader spectrum of problems has to be addressed, such as access to jobs, housing, education, health care. IDPs often experience a lack of assistance by the state in their successful reintegration in another city. Instead, they are to a larger extent supported by civil society organizations (CSOs) in Ukraine, often small organizations run by volunteers, who notice a lacking government response to the influx of IDPs and the negative effects of the Donbass conflict on the socio-economic situation in the country. They see the humanitarian assistance offered by the government as insufficient and therefore are taking over these tasks themselves, while at the same time they often do not receive adequate government funding, but have to rely mainly on foreign donors like USAID, the European Union (EU) or the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). In general, Ukrainian CSOs see their role in offering humanitarian assistance as very significant, but also argue that it could be improved (OSCE, 2015).
Instead of choosing to close the door for their refugees, Ukrainians have welcomed their fellow citizens in their cities by sharing the – sometimes meagre – resources they have. This does not mean the humanitarian assistance is perfect or even sufficient, but it provides some relief for conflict-affected people. IDPs find a helping hand in people that offer clothes, food or household items, housing or assistance in getting access to health care or social services, and even psychological support. This is typical for a recent trend in peacebuilding efforts by international and humanitarian organizations, i.e. building a strong civil society and involving it in humanitarian programs. International and humanitarian organizations attach a greater importance to the role of civil society organizations in state- and peacebuilding processes, because CSOs often have a better understanding of the social and political situation to which they have to adapt their projects, an understanding that international organizations do not directly have. However, CSOs experience many problems, varying from financial to social issues, because of a lack of national and international backing, although the role of CSOs for IDPs is significant. Therefore, it is important to address the relevance of CSOs in improving the (socio-economic) situation of IDPs.

1.2 Research relevance

Most IDPs would arguably like to return to their homes, but they can only return under the primary condition that the violence and hostilities have stopped in the place where they come from. This is mainly the case for IDPs from the Donbass region who were forced to leave their homes abruptly and often did not have time to prepare their leave, in contrast to the IDPs from Crimea. Most of the IDPs see their situation as only temporary, but currently it is unclear whether or not they can ever return. Even if the war in eastern Ukraine comes to an end, it is unclear whether they return to undamaged houses or houses that have been destroyed in the war. Also, it is questionable if political and ideological conflicts with the people who stayed behind in the Donbass region will be over and whether the region is able to re-develop its economy (UHCR, 2016). This means that the settlement of IDPs in other cities of the country could be more permanent, which makes investments in the integration and adaptation of IDPs in host communities even more important. In other words, the role of CSOs in providing humanitarian assistance in these processes remains a relevant issue in the long-term development of host communities.

When an IDP first arrives in a host community there is a need for basic humanitarian assistance, but over a longer period of time the communities need to find solutions for unemployment among IDPs, for the provision of health care services, as well as for psychological help, access to education and social reintegration. The OSCE released a research report (OSCE, 2016) on the impact of the conflict on IDPs and on their relations with host communities. Host communities and IDPs are faced by problems such as a lack of employment and inadequate housing opportunities which can potentially become major triggers for strained relations. CSOs might help in solving these problems. CSOs are seen as bottom-up organizations that are better aware where aid should be allocated; therefore, investing in organizations like these can give them greater capacity to improve the humanitarian situation of people. The OSCE uses broad descriptions for its missions abroad, because the OSCE uses a comprehensive approach to security. This comprehensive approach means that security is not just about conflict resolution, but also about avoiding conditions that could trigger (recurring) conflict. The notion of development has become an important part of the security programmes of international organizations. The idea is that without peace there is no development, but without development there is no stable peace. Development programmes include humanitarian assistance to IDPs to improve their socio-economic situation. This research can contribute
to the question to what extent CSOs can play a role in the improvement of the socio-economic situation of IDPs and in this way take away tensions in host communities.

This research further elaborates upon the concepts of civil society in peacebuilding efforts. Civil society is considered increasingly important by international organizations. Much research has been conducted on how their input can be used in post-conflict situations. Civil society has multiple roles; in the literature it is attributed importance to state- and peacebuilding processes. In state-building processes civil society can take the role of drivers behind reforms – or revolution – because of its ability to mobilize large numbers of people in protest for civil and political rights. In peacebuilding processes, civil society is seen as an important actor in development projects, because it can integrate development in local contexts. This study focuses on the latter, given the tensions between the useful contribution CSOs offer to development and the degree to which these organizations are self-sufficient and can fuel development. There is a theoretical difference between these two ends; the first is about adding something to development, while the second is about initiating development independently. Research shows that civil society is often dependent on national and international actors. In a local context, civil society provides customized help to people which increases the efficiency of development aid. However, civil society has not yet proven to fuel development on a larger scale and often needs funding itself in order to keep providing humanitarian assistance. This research will focus on the problems and benefits of interaction between civil society and governmental organizations and what kind of cooperation between government organizations and CSOs is successful in times of economic and political instability.

The research also provides insight in the choices people (in this case, IDPs) make in looking for aid through informal rather than formal channels. This involves the individual level and how people are motivated in their decision-making. Social networks are a form of informal aid channels. Networks play a significant role in migration; it can decide the place of destination, the way of transport, the opportunities to integrate and the adaptation to the new environment. Government institutions are the formal aid channels and give people legal instruments to social benefits and ways to integrate and adapt in the new environment. However, research shows that in weak states or so-called ‘fragile’ states, state institutions are often not reliable sources of aid, because of a lack of legislation and resources, and also because of people’s distrust in state institutions.

1.3 Research objectives

This research aims to further analyse the relevance of CSOs in peacebuilding processes by looking at the role civil society plays in improving the socio-economic situation of IDPs; how does it respond to the influx of refugees to the cities? How can it complement government support to IDPs and in this way improve the living situations of IDPs? Questions like these need to be answered in order to contribute to building a national strategy to solve the problems faced by IDPs within Ukrainian society. The notion of socio-economic development in peacebuilding contributes to a stable environment for people, on a local as well as on a national level. This research is based on an analysis of the experiences of Ukrainian IDPs with local organizations and government organizations respectively, in helping to resettle in other parts of the country so as to build a new future outside the conflict region. In order to study the role of local organizations in everyday life, IDPs have been asked about their experiences since they arrived in Kiev (or other big cities), who have been crucial in helping to receive the refugee status, in applying for social benefits, or in housing and job employment?
1.4 Research questions

The central question to be answered in this research is:

“To what extent do civil society organizations (CSOs) in Ukraine contribute to the improvement of the socio-economic situation of IDPs coming to their cities?”

In order to answer the central question, the following sub-questions are formulated:

- What constraints do IDPs experience when they are displaced to other cities in Ukraine?
- What are the current social and economic problems in cities in Ukraine?
- What initiatives are government organizations offering to provide humanitarian assistance to IDPs and to what extent are these initiatives successful according to IDPs?
- What initiatives are CSOs offering to provide humanitarian assistance to IDPs and to what extent are these initiatives successful according to IDPs?
- How do IDPs experience the role of CSOs and government organizations respectively to improve their socio-economic situation?

This study will offer a closer look at how recipients of humanitarian assistance experience the role of CSOs in improving the socio-economic situation in their cities. The research contributes to more knowledge of and insight in the role of CSOs for conflict-affected people and gives an answer to the question what are the most important means for IDPs in Ukraine to build a new life elsewhere.

1.5 Outline

This thesis consists of six chapters. This first chapter introduces the topic of the thesis and the background and relevance of CSOs in peacebuilding and development efforts. The main research questions and thesis statement are addressed here as well. Chapter 2 is the theoretical framework of the thesis that gives insight in the various perspectives of other scholars who have done research on the role of CSOs in humanitarian aid situations. Chapter 3 discusses the methodology that has been used to answer the research questions. Chapter 4 gives a context of the situation of IDPs in Ukraine and Kiev in order to give an answer to the questions “What constraints do IDPs experience when they are displaced to other cities in Ukraine?”, “What are the current social and economic problems in cities in Ukraine?”, and “What initiatives are government organizations offering to provide humanitarian assistance?” Chapter 5 consists of the results of interviews taken in Kiev among CSOs and IDPs, addressing their personal experiences with humanitarian assistance and the difficulties faced in daily life due to the conflict in the eastern part of Ukraine. This chapter answers the questions “To what extent are government initiatives successful according to IDPs?”, “What initiatives are CSOs offering to provide humanitarian assistance to IDPs and to what extent are these initiatives successful according to IDPs?”, and “How do IDPs experience the role of CSOs and government organizations respectively to improve their socio-economic situation?” Finally, Chapter 6 answers the main research question of this thesis, “To what extent does humanitarian assistance of civil society organizations in Ukraine contribute to the improvement of the socio-economic situation of IDPs coming to their cities?” The conclusion is followed by a discussion and reflection on the main findings and how they can be interpreted in different ways.
2. Theoretical framework

According to the UN (2010:5), “there is no simple, clear cut definition of peacebuilding that sets it apart from conflict prevention, peacekeeping, peacemaking, humanitarian and development assistance. For one thing, there is considerable overlap of goals and activities along the spectrum from conflict to peace. For another, various peacebuilding activities may take place in each phase of the spectrum.”

The academic literature offers a variety of theoretical approaches to peacebuilding. In recent years, literature on peacebuilding increasingly focuses on the role of civil society. Researchers debate the theoretical foundation of this practice, because it is based on two assumptions: (1) civil society plays a role in peacebuilding; and (2) cooperation between local and (inter)national actors needs to be better. The literature addresses the role of civil society in peacebuilding or what it can contribute, but it remains rather vague on the effectiveness of aid in the perception of the people that receive it. The role of civil society in development and aid has been explained to be only effective when recipient countries adopt sound policies and nurture effective institutions. These debates are further elaborated upon in this theoretical framework. This chapter also provides the operationalisation of the various concepts that are used in this research. The key concepts that are explained, are ‘peacebuilding’, ‘security’, ‘development’, ‘governance’ and ‘civil society’ which are interrelated and are used in analysing the contribution of CSOs in providing humanitarian assistance to IDPs. Further, the relevant literature on the various viewpoints on the role of IDPs on the socio-economic situation in host communities is addressed.

2.1 Peacebuilding: moving to a comprehensive approach

Galtung (1976) introduced the term peacebuilding as an approach to reach peace on all levels of society by addressing the causes of war and to build institutions that provide an alternative to war. He responded to the tendency in Western peacebuilding that focused on liberal peace, while he argued that often a mixture of local and liberal methods was important. During the Cold War, Western states mainly invested in the structuring of international and financial organizations that were able to control the resources and political situation at the time.

In 1992, then UN Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali addressed the changing context in which conflicts took place after the Cold War and used the recommendations of Galtung (1975) and others for a new framework for peacebuilding. According to Boutros-Ghali (1992), international organizations should cooperate with regional and local actors, because the latter have the capacity to involve citizens in peacebuilding projects. However, he noted that activities of local actors were only beneficial when they “were undertaken in a manner consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations” (Boutros-Ghali, 1992:214). There was a tendency among international (peace) organizations to view local actors as valuable stakeholders in implementing peace policy instead of equal cooperation and adopting indigenous peace methods.

Lederach (1997:20) understands peacebuilding as “a comprehensive concept that encompasses, generates, and sustains the full array of processes, approaches, and stages needed to transform conflict toward more sustainable, peaceful relationships”. Peacebuilding practices include both short-term and long-term goals to end conflict. Short-term practices are concerned with immediate relief, while long-term practices are directed at the transformation of a society to move away from a vulnerable situation towards sustainable development. Lederach attributes an important role to civil society in this approach, but argues that civil society lacks enough resources and skills to achieve peacebuilding without external
coordination and management. Lederach’s approach is still directed at large-scale activities and results of organizations, while it is often argued that peacebuilding efforts of CSOs are aimed much more locally. Therefore, results of small-scale activities of CSOs can highlight the relevance of their contribution to peacebuilding efforts.

During the previous decades, the thinking of peacebuilding practices has developed into a more integrated or comprehensive approach. The definitions of peacebuilding that are currently used by relevant international organizations focus on involvement of local actors. The central question of this research focuses on the role of civil society organizations and how they contribute to the improvement of the socio-economic situation of IDPs in host communities. Although this research acknowledges the importance of ‘grass roots’ approaches for peacebuilding and development, it favours a more comprehensive approach in which (inter)national and local actors complement each other in their development efforts; the concepts of peacebuilding, civil society and socio-economic development are interrelated. Civil societies are situated in a larger setting in which they need overarching governance that can tackle the wider political and economic problems communities are facing (Radcliffe, 2015). The idea behind the comprehensive approach is that peace and development are intertwined; by improving the socio-economic situation of IDPs and host communities through peacebuilding practices of national and civil society actors, present tensions should be taken away.

The comprehensive approach means that efforts to strengthen security, governance and development reinforce each other. Therefore, in supporting the research questions with theory, the concepts of ‘security’, ‘development’, ‘governance’ and ‘civil society’ are discussed in the following sections. The assumption is that weak governance, instability, poverty and underdevelopment are a source of national or even regional insecurity. The goal is to effectively address the problems that are present in fragile states by improving coordination and coherence between the various actors involved in security, diplomacy and development issues (Brunk, 2016).

2.2 Security in host communities

Security is the main goal of peacekeeping, the pursuit of human rights, development and peace-building. It includes institutional stability, law and order, satisfying basic human needs and respecting human rights. On an individual level, security is also referred to as ‘human security’, which means that people have their own autonomy in political, social, cultural and economic life (Richmond, 2013). To understand what kind of security measures are needed in a community that is hosting a significant number of IDPs, it is important to know what kind of situations and processes these communities are dealing with.

Several case studies on host communities show that taking up a large number of refugees in a region or city creates tensions in economically already poor societies. The World Bank Group (2017) classifies refugees and IDPs under the same label of ‘forcibly displaced’. However, in other literature, a distinction is made between refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), the latter of which is the focus of this research. A main feature of internal displacement is the movement and settlement of people elsewhere within the same country. This is often the result of a prolonged conflict within national borders over ethnic or territorial disputes which the government is not able to solve. The conflict is also often coupled with economic deterioration (Türk, 2011; World Bank Group, 2017). IDPs often face vulnerability, marginalization and poverty, as illustrated by little or difficult access to housing, basic services and opportunities for self-reliance. To rule out the security problems faced by IDPs, root causes like economic underdevelopment or bad governance should be tackled (Türk, 2011), this perspective attributes a greater
importance to the wider circumstances IDPs are living in for their security situation. Hébert and Mincyte (2014) describe self-reliance and autonomy as either individual entrepreneurialism or the basis for communitarian localism. They define self-reliance as a form of everyday autonomy that can be seen as a path toward an economically and environmentally more sustainable future, but also to a more sustainable future for the social well-being of an individual. In the perspective of Hébert and Mincyte, the individual has an important role in being self-reliant and autonomous. In this thesis, in order to determine IDPs’ personal experiences with security and attempts to improve their security situation, both the context that IDPs are in and their individual role of self-reliance and autonomy is taken into account.

The presence of refugees increases the costs of goods, services and business activities; there is a stronger pressure on resources and facilities, an increased social tension within a community and deteriorating environmental resources (Codjoe et al., 2013; Asfaw & Jones, 2014; World Bank Group, 2017). Murdoch and Sandler (2002:92) state that “aid decisions need to address the direct consequences on economic growth in countries experiencing civil wars”. They study the direct and indirect spill-over effects on economic growth of a conflict-ridden country and its neighbours. From the empirical findings of this study, Murdoch and Sandler draw a set of policy recommendations that can counteract the harmful consequences of a conflict on people. Firstly, assistance should be focused on efforts of peacebuilding to contain economic contagion (the loss of foreign investments, disappearance of private and social capital, trade and supply disruptions, and aid spending) stemming from conflicts, and secondly, efforts should be made to invest in schooling and education of people (Murdoch & Sandler, 2002). This approach primarily focuses on the economy, however, while it is important to take into consideration other important elements of development like governance and law, because these dimensions build the framework for economic development.

An important challenge to the international security system at the global and regional levels is the fragility of states that are not capable to manage the spill-over effects of conflict on their territory. Neighbouring countries or regions are often affected by the conflict taking place near them. The impact can be direct military action with neighbouring countries or armed groups, but also indirect negative consequences for the economy, the financial position due to aiding and housing refugees from the conflict area, and for peace and security in one’s own communities (Carmignani & Kler, 2016). These spill-over effects call for a strong role of a country’s government. A government has a role in the political situation of a country and needs to avoid polarizing society and identity politics. Secondly, a government needs to respond to the spill-over effects on its economy, because instability and conflict drive foreign investments away to less risky and politically more stable countries, the disappearance of private and social capital, disruptions in trade and input supplies, and spending on aid and housing of refugees (Murdoch & Sandler, 2002). Finally, a social response is needed for people affected by the conflict like refugees and host communities, because people have often lost their assets and financial resources which increases their vulnerability and inequality in host communities.

In this thesis, human security is important for IDPs to achieve their own autonomy in political, social, cultural and economic life, because if someone is autonomous in a host community it means that people have been able to rise up from a marginalized living situation to a situation in which they are autonomous. Indicators of human security like access to housing, basic services and opportunities of self-reliance, mentioned by Türk (2011), are used in the methodology and interviews to research the security of the living situation of IDPs. Root causes of security problems faced by IDPs like economic underdevelopment
and bad governance will also be addressed to help answer the question what initiatives play a role in improving the situation of IDPs.

### 2.3 Socio-economic development

In order to research how the situation of IDPs is perceived by various actors, it is important to explain what is meant by socio-economic development in this thesis, because socio-economic development is a broad concept that can involve many things. In this thesis, socio-economic development is seen on the individual level, therefore this section will focus on what socio-economic development means at an individual level and what indicators are used in the literature to research this concept in a person’s life, because these indicators form a guideline for conducting interviews with IDPs and CSOs.

Through time the concepts of development have been diverse, because they reflect different social, economic, political and even moral viewpoints. Modernization theory assigns an important role to government in development and foc uses on economic growth. Income is one element of development, but also health and education are important components of development in people’s life. During the 1970s and 1980s, the approaches to development became more focused on social well-being and freedoms of people (Potter et al., 2012). Scholars began exploring the socio-economic dimensions of development in what became known as human development. It is a process of enlarging people’s choices to live long, healthy and creative lives. The economic dimension of human development is concerned with stability, security and citizen’s relative prosperity. The social aspect of human development in turn deals with literacy, education, social relationships and the quality of living (Haynes, 2008).

According to Goulet (1992), development can have two meanings; it is either “the vision of a better life, a life materially richer, institutionally more modern and technologically more efficient” or it is “a system of means for achieving that vision. These means range from economic planning, mass education campaigns, and comprehensive social engineering to sectoral interventions of all kinds aimed at altering values, behaviours, and social structures” (Goulet, 1992:246). For this research, the first meaning is especially relevant when looking at development from the receiver’s perspective, because it says something about one’s own socio-economic situation. The second meaning is relevant when looking at development from the helper’s perspective; however, it is important that development actors take into account the vision of a better life and whose vision they use for their development planning. Goulet does not only focus on economic development as part of human development, but argues that development is about increasing the possibilities for people to improve their quality of life.

To fully understand and measure the situation of forcible displacement, the World Bank focuses on the assessment of the socio-economic situation of refugees and IDPs and the evaluation of the host community (World Bank Group, 2017:29). This approach is challenged by several methodological issues like the limited scope quantitative data offer on the situation of internal displacement. Therefore, qualitative methods will provide more information on the quality of life of IDPs and the host community, because it offers a view on the perspective of people that are experiencing the life in host communities themselves. Both residents and IDPs are pursuing livelihood goals in host communities that make them able to maintain or improve their quality of life. It can help them in relying on new social networks, coping with property loss, traumatic experiences, social dislocation and finding a place to settle in the host community (Davies, 2012).
Goulet (1992:251) argues that development looks at the societal conditions that lead to unhappiness in people’s life. This can often not be measured by direct indicators, but it can be measured indirectly by external conditions, facilities, infrastructure and levels of well-being. Development should reduce the causes of collective unhappiness, such as war, poverty, oppression, sickness or the denial of people’s freedom. It is important to have proper indicators of development, because policy-makers use them as a guide to determine societal conditions. Policy-makers use the measurement results as the main source for their development plans and therefore it is important that there are qualitative indicators focusing on people’s socio-economic situation and quality of life, because this is an important aspect of the individual development of people. Therefore, Goulet (1992) has created a set of indicators that form an alternative to measure development from a qualitative dimension. Every dimension has its own quantitative indicators, or indirect quantitative proxies, that measure qualitative dimensions of development. These indicators include:

- an economic component, dealing with the creation of wealth and improved conditions of material life, equitably distributed;
- a social component, measured as well-being in health, education, housing, and employment;
- a political component, including such values as human rights, political freedom, enfranchisement, and some form of democracy;
- a cultural component, in recognition of the fact that cultures confer identity and self-worth to people; and
- a spiritual component, a full-life paradigm which comprises systems, symbols, and beliefs concerning the ultimate meaning of life and history (Goulet, 1992:248).

Other authors use a quantitative approach in measuring socio-economic development which includes a list of indicators that measure economic, social, cultural, ecological and political aspects (Takamori & Yamashita, 1973; Peach & Petach, 2016). However, this research will adhere to a limited number of indicators mentioned by Goulet (1992) and Haynes (2008), because it leaves more space in interviews for new perceptions on socio-economic development.

In order to provide a more comprehensive view on IDPs’ experiences with their socio-economic situation and quality of living, and the extent to which CSOs and government organizations contribute to improvement of the situation of IDPs, indicators mentioned by Goulet (1992) and Haynes (2008) will be used in the methodology and interviews. The indicators mentioned by Goulet that involve the economic component are dealing with the creation of wealth. In this research this is seen as an important part of improving one’s situation, because it answers the question on how people improve their situation. However, the concept of the creation of wealth is overlapping with the indicator of employment of the social component, because both are means to improve one’s financial situation. Therefore, as a matter to simplify the use of the indicators of Goulet, I will use well-being in employment to also indicate the creation of wealth. The indicators of the social component are well-being in health, education, housing and employment, which are basic aspects of daily life and can clarify how people experience their situation. In addition to Goulet’s social indicators, Haynes (2008) explains that the social aspect of development is also concerned with social relationships and the quality of living. In this research, people have been asked about their quality of living and their perceptions, because people can differ in what they find important to have or experience in life. In this way, conversations with people may give different results for how one’s quality of living is experienced, which offers a more comprehensive view on how people perceive their situation.
2.4 Good governance

In a stable country, society has particular expectations of the state regarding the protection of human rights, security and in providing adequate public goods and services. In exchange, society hands over certain freedoms to the state. In academic literature this is referred to as ‘good governance’, the process of decision-making and implementation by international, national or local institutions. In a fragile country, however, governance support cannot fulfil these expectations and is often too weak to provide effective humanitarian assistance in development issues (UNDP, 2016b).

There is a dichotomy in thinking on what good governance means. One group of authors (Rotberg, 2014; Andrews, 2008; Grindle, 2017) sees good governance as the policy path that gives the best socio-economic outcomes for citizens. The other group (Fukuyama, 2013; UNDP, 2016b) looks at the way in which policy is made and implemented; do people have access to state protection and public services, and are they treated equally within legislation? Like Rotberg (2014), Andrews (2008) focuses on the outcomes of good governance, in which good governance is measured by the effectiveness of its decisions.

Fukuyama (2013:350) defines good governance as “a government’s ability to make and enforce rules, and to deliver services, regardless of whether that government is democratic or not.” Grindle (2017) considers this as too ambitious, because it is already difficult for a well-functioning country, let alone for fragile countries. Like Grindle, Rotberg (2014) is also critical of Fukuyama’s definition of governance, because he believes it is about the result of governance, not about the input measures at the beginning of it. He argues one should not look at the perceived quality of government’s operations, their impartiality or their capacity to work together with citizens, but rather at the performance of a government and the actual services it delivers. Therefore, in order to measure governance from this perspective, quantitative data are needed that can give a real indication of how well the state of governance is in a specific country. However, this approach does not acknowledge the way in which development is achieved. If one only looks at the end result and not at the quality of it, marginalized groups become easily overlooked. In this thesis, the focus of research is also on people that are in a marginalized situation who need government policy to have equal access to state protection and public service. Good governance does not only mean looking at end results of particular policies and comparing these with the ones in other countries, it is also about inclusiveness and equality for all citizens to enjoy the advantages of development. Especially in fragile countries, it is often the elite and upper-middle class people that profit from policies, while the people that need it most do not see the end result of it.

To put it in the perspective of Fukuyama (2013), the term ‘good’ governance is mainly used to fight problems like corruption, discrimination of ethnic groups, inequality, or underdevelopment. Therefore, a high standard definition like the one of Fukuyama or the UNDP is not that ambitious at all. It suggests that governments have the responsibility to provide ‘good’ governance rather than ‘bad’ or unfair governance. ‘Bad’ governance would then refer to a government that is made up of people that are only taking care of the interests of the elite, formulating policies that might look good on paper but that do not implement them in reality; it is a government that only allocates financial incentives to their own resources instead of looking for overall development of their country, and it is a government that does not feel responsible for governing its country at all, but is there just for itself. Political power is an important instrument of economic power. It sets the rules and determines the allocation of employment, of a government’s economic and social investments, and of incentives for private investment. Consequently, reforms in a fragile state that faces state corruption are difficult to implement, because political power is used as a means to secure economic resources (Stewart, 2000).
Fukuyama (2013) questions whether it is important to have quantitative measures at all, as opposed to qualitative descriptions of processes or case studies of particular areas of governance. According to him, good governance by states refers to capacity and autonomy, that is, to what extent is a government capable to provide its citizens with public goods and services with its own resources. The answer to this question, Fukuyama states, is often based on opinions, feelings, codes and perspectives of people, because people experience their access to state protection and public services differently and local, national or international actors can have different expectations (or interests) about the quality of governance. In their review on improving the provision of basic services for the poor in fragile environments, Pavanello and Darcy (2008:6) list three main actors in the delivery of basic services: policy-makers, service providers like public, private and civil society actors, and clients. All these actors have very different perspectives on what good governance is. Policy-makers look at service delivery at the lowest costs. Service providers look at good financial investments in their services and compensation for what they deliver. Clients are mainly looking for high quality services at the lowest costs. Looking at the important role of the government in the development process within a country, this thesis not only studies the end results of government measures to support IDPs in their socio-economic situation, but also how these results were achieved. When policy-makers are lacking in their governance efforts, CSOs might provide a key contribution to the service provision and ensure the quality and continuity of it. Focusing on the opinions, codes and feelings can therefore be a valuable way to research the effectiveness of a government’s response to the situation of marginalized groups in society.

2.5 Civil society

Civil society can be described as all non-governmental organizations which are non-state related and represent the interests of the members of public life, dealing with issues like democracy, development, good governance, human security and the promotion of human rights (World Bank, 2013; OECD, 2012; UNDP, 2016a). The increased attention to the role of civil society in peacebuilding is named the ‘local turn’, referring to a situation where local organizations have become more assertive while large international organizations became more pessimistic about their peacebuilding efforts that often seemed to fail. Local initiatives are created by local people and have become more successful in bringing different groups together (MacGinty & Richmond, 2013). In countries with fragile governments or critical financial problems, local initiatives to improve the situation may sound like the ideal solution to all kinds of problems. Local organizations make positive efforts in the field of democracy development, establishment of good governance, and promotion of human rights. They also provide education, support in local issues, health care and refuge during conflicts. They have grass-roots knowledge of needs in developing countries, expertise in specific sectors, while taking public opinion into account (Dagher, 2017:55). Local initiatives are set up by people with the intention to improve their own and others’ situation, but that does not mean they have all the means necessary to provide humanitarian assistance (Richmond 2001). Therefore, in this research it is important to acknowledge the challenges CSOs are confronted with.

In a case study by Stewart and Dollbaum (2017) on Ukraine’s CSOs, the most important constraints mentioned were the precarious financial conditions. Stewart and Dollbaum argue that the combination of financial insecurity, insufficient capacity and low levels of trust in government authorities makes CSOs a weak service provider, since CSOs are not able to offer coordinated and systematic humanitarian projects. Their conclusion is that CSOs cannot replace government institutions, although since 2014 they have partly substituted the government in some areas of support, but their influence has only been notable on a
relatively small scale. It is questionable, however, whether small-scale initiatives cause problems for people, because the way support is experienced by IDPs is important as well.

In the current political and economic climate citizens experience both a challenge and opportunity to take matters in their own hands and become self-reliant. In fragile countries or in situations where state capacity is shrinking, governments have problems maintaining high quality service provision for their citizens. In their research, MacGinty and Richmond (2013) state that CSOs have the need to undertake activities themselves in order to benefit from processes of peace and development. Therefore, they create their own networks for distributing development aid to local communities and use their own resources to support people in everyday life. Initiatives can range from looking after parks and playgrounds, social groups for the elderly, organising festivals or sports events to running a social enterprise, delivering housing or health care services, investing in regenerating a neighbourhood or village centre, or expanding work and training opportunities (Healey, 2015:12). Healey (2015) shares her experiences in working with CSOs in the UK and explains the harsh effect of cuts in government spending on the functioning of CSOs and the initiatives they can carry out. Although the economic situation in the UK obviously differs from the one in fragile states, the trend of cuts in government support and a higher expectation of citizens to provide services for themselves are similar. To continue supporting the community, an organization needs to capture political attention and actively lobby for public resources for which it needs a vigorous voice and good networking skills. Agency power has been strengthened by promoting the community as a culture to which staff and trustees are committed. According to Healey (2015:19), “key qualities that belong with this culture are an entrepreneurial mind, a preparedness to challenge and experiment, and flexibility in relation to changing opportunities and threats”. This combination of agency powers and the availability of structural opportunities makes a CSO successful, but there is a constant need to gain legitimacy among investors and the community to sustain respect and trust with the people with whom they interact.

Radcliffe (2015) takes a critical stand on the current development policy of self-reliance. She argues that governments and development organizations focus on increasing the poor’s risk avoidance, but the needs of poor people can be different from what is offered by a government or development organization. Governments stimulate local organizations to look for privately-held resources they can call upon in case of emergency, but the increasing attention to CSOs in the role of development programs does not take into account that these organizations are also exposed to changing political and economic situations. Local organizations cannot always easily adapt their capacity to the needs of the people they help. This approach to development cannot prevent that communities, households and individuals are expected to lift themselves out of their poor position.

Another challenge is that international organizations do see the advantage of cooperating with CSOs to gain more legitimacy, but Roll (2016) argues that international organizations often fail to recognize the role local peacebuilding has in society. Involvement by international actors can even hinder peacebuilding and conflict-resolution efforts; they cooperate with local organizations but have their own agenda and peacebuilding plans. This can result in initiatives that are no longer customized to the local people. Healey (2015) argues that governments and international organizations therefore need to be challenged by CSOs to show them alternative ways of generating development; local initiatives seek to satisfy human needs by building networks at various scales to fund and implement plans. In this way, CSOs can act as an intermediary between local people and the agencies of formal government, NGOs and businesses. This point of view is interesting, because it attributes a lot of power and vigour to CSOs and sketches a hopeful
future for solving development-related problems in communities. It raises the question, however, whether or not every person or community is capable of creating networks and finding the right key contacts to achieve successful projects.

CSOs are also challenged to be non-discriminatory, putting their personal preferences and vision aside when it is about the decision to whom aid should be delivered – aid should not be reserved to one specific group only. According to Dagher (2017), incorporating CSOs in government structures might tackle difficulties that come along with locally established organizations, like discrimination. There are examples of local initiatives that have certain preferences for a specific target audience and therefore discriminate other people who are in need. It is difficult to monitor the initiatives of different organizations and their neutrality, because policies and organisations are a lot less formal and traceable. Incorporating CSOs into the government structure, however, can have an influence on the success of a CSO, because the strengths of a CSO are its higher flexibility to adapt to changes in society and the greater willingness and openness to change their development programs. Therefore, making CSOs part of the government structure is debatable.

For this thesis, it is important to recognize the role of CSOs in development projects in Ukraine since the Ukrainian government is not only faced with political problems, but also with social and economic ones. The capacity of the Ukrainian government to deal with these problems is undermined by a lack of resources and corruption issues, which leads to inadequate development policies. When IDPs experience a lack of government response, they often turn to other sources of support: family, friends or CSOs. CSOs are often able to give more support than family or friends, at the same time they face the challenges of the political and economic context they operate in; this often results in small scale initiatives. It is therefore relevant to analyse the effectiveness of CSO initiatives and how IDPs experience the role of CSOs in the improvement of their socio-economic situation. In conclusion, by researching the perceptions among IDPs about their socio-economic development and human security, it should become clear how they experience their socio-economic situation. However, this research also focuses on how government and CSO initiatives contribute to the improvement of the socio-economic situation from IDPs and to what extent this initiatives have been successful. Indicators for good governance and civil society are therefore used to analyse the effectiveness of government and CSO support.
3. Research methodology

This research focuses on individual experiences of IDPs with access to humanitarian assistance and how they perceive the role of government organizations and CSOs, respectively, in peacebuilding processes. It also offers a closer look at how CSOs organize themselves in order to have an effect on the daily lives of the people they try to help.

3.1 Research methods

The research questions and sub-questions are meant to gain more in-depth knowledge of and insight in the role of CSOs for conflict-affected people and answer the question what the most important means for IDPs in Ukraine are in building a new life elsewhere. I chose to use qualitative methods, because based on this approach I can further elucidate how CSOs are making changes in people’s daily lives and the environment they live in. The topics addressed in this thesis can be experienced by people as sensitive; in that respect a qualitative approach is also more suitable, since it entails more personal contact with the participants – the researcher builds more trust with people and a more comfortable space to touch upon sensitive topics. The strength of qualitative research is based on the use of multiple methods, like a literature review, interviews and observation – this results in a large amount of detailed information on personal stories of IDPs and their experiences with humanitarian assistance.

An important criticism of qualitative research deals with the role of so-called inter-subjectivity, where the findings of a research project are influenced by the interpretation of the researcher her/himself. However, through a process of critical reflexivity the researcher can reflect on the subjectivity of her/his own interpretations and discuss how this might influence the findings of the research (Yauch & Steudel, 2003). Another point of criticism is that qualitative research is very time- and place-specific and therefore cannot be generalized to other case studies; this is a reason for quantitative critics to draw the scientific usefulness of this research approach into question (ACAPS, 2012). However, it is not true for every qualitative research that one cannot generalize the results. It all depends on how specific the case context and the research topic are. In this case, the context can be compared to many other contexts in the world where a government is not able to provide for all its citizens a home, a job and/or an education. Stories about peoples’ experiences and resources are very applicable to other cases as well.

Writing a research thesis about the experiences of IDPs in Ukraine, specifically those located in Kiev, made a case study the most appropriate method to use. The case study is used to review the past and current policies and projects for IDPs by government authorities and local organizations in Ukraine since 2014. A challenge of using a case study as research method is to uncover the meaning of the social and political situation in Ukraine that can be generalized and related to other cases. The purpose of this case study is to evaluate existing theories on the role of CSOs in peacebuilding efforts and to examine the experiences of IDPs with these organizations. Therefore, it is important to keep a critical and reflective perspective on the role of the researcher and to keep looking for neutrality in the research by following scientifically grounded guidelines for data collection.

Answering the research question also means that the policies of the national Ukrainian government have to be analysed, since the national legislative framework on internally displaced persons might differ from how it is implemented by authorities on a local level. Therefore, an analysis of government documents, policies and papers has been conducted to answer the questions to what extent government initiatives do succeed in providing humanitarian assistance to IDPs and what this means for the role of civil society
organizations in peacebuilding processes. The method of in-depth interviews with Ukrainian IDPs on the one hand and individuals working for CSOs on the other has been used in order to answer questions concerning the constraints experienced by IDPs and their perceptions on the role of CSOs.

3.2 Research area and selection of participants
The research area obviously is located in those areas of Ukraine where a significant population of IDPs live, who, like the local people of the host communities, are dealing with the impact of the conflict and where the economic and political environment has resulted in tensions between the local community and IDPs. The research questions focus on areas where there is a large influx of IDPs from the Donbass region. In 2014, IDPs were primarily moving to neighbouring regions, given the proximity to their hometowns, but also social networks played a role in this decision. According to the Ministry of Social Policy of Ukraine (MSP, 2017), in July 2017 there were 1,580,646 IDPs registered nation-wide. Taking the travel advice of the Dutch government into account, it made no sense to plan doing research in areas close to the conflict zone. Also, the use of the English language is larger in big cities like Kiev, Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv and Zaporizhia. I finally chose to conduct the research in Kiev, because there are currently around 176,569 IDPs registered in Kiev (Figure 1), which makes it the city with the highest rate of IDPs of all Ukrainian cities.

Figure 1: Internal Displacement in Ukraine, as of October 12, 2017


This research tries to analyse the role of CSOs in providing humanitarian assistance as seen through the eyes of IDPs – this will show why people have chosen the formal and/or informal way to humanitarian assistance and what value they have added to the aid. For the selection of interviewees, I relied upon local
organizations and key figures that were active in supporting IDPs. The main organizations in the field are Logos, the Salvation Army and various churches that cooperate with these organizations. Through these organizations, I came into contact with IDPs as well as individuals working for humanitarian CSOs. In general, the number of in-depth interviews depends on whether the research questions have been answered sufficiently enough or not (‘t Hart & Boeije, 2005). For this thesis, I have conducted sixteen interviews with eighteen IDPs. In addition to these IDPs, it was also necessary to have in-depth interviews with people working for CSOs, because they can explain how they provide humanitarian assistance to IDPs and what in their view is necessary aid to offer on a local level. I have conducted four interviews with CSOs. CSOs often had connections with IDPs and so I was able to meet other IDPs in their network. The challenge was that the group of interviewees might have become a very select group; therefore, during the interviews stories of other IDPs were addressed as well. According to Rubin & Rubin (2005:64), results based on qualitative research and in-depth interviews gain credibility when “the conversational partners are experienced and have first-hand knowledge about the research problem” and the selected interviewees have views that “reflect different, even contending, perspectives”. In order to have a representative sample of the IDP population in Kiev, people from various ages and with different educational backgrounds were interviewed. Table 1 shows an overview of the persons I interviewed, when the interviews took place, at what location and whether the interview was recorded or not.

Table 1: Overview of respondents, date, location and record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person interviewed</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Location of interview</th>
<th>Interview recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. UNDP Country Director</td>
<td>12 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. IDP woman 35</td>
<td>19 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IDP woman 37</td>
<td>19 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. IDP pensioners</td>
<td>19 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IDP woman 60</td>
<td>20 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. IDP woman 34</td>
<td>20 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. IDP student 17</td>
<td>20 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. IDP man 30</td>
<td>20 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Logos</td>
<td>25 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. IDP woman 36</td>
<td>26 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. IDP woman 27</td>
<td>26 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. IDP woman 41</td>
<td>26 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. IDP woman pensioner</td>
<td>26 April 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. IDP woman 40</td>
<td>3 May 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. IDP woman 38</td>
<td>3 May 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. IDP woman 36</td>
<td>3 May 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. IDP man / woman 36</td>
<td>3 May 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Salvation Army</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Jeremiah’s Hope</td>
<td>18 May 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. IDP student 21</td>
<td>20 May 2018</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Data collection

Data collection took place through document analysis and in-depth interviews. I analysed government documents, in particular those of the Ministry of Social Policy in Ukraine, UNHCR reports and reports of CSOs. In the analysis I not only focused on key information about IDPs and their quality of life, but also on organizational aspects of running local projects and information on IDP policies, because this provided me with answers on the questions to what extent government and CSO initiatives succeed in providing humanitarian assistance to IDPs and what this means for the role of CSOs in peacebuilding processes.

As already stressed, an important part of the data collection were the interviews and the individual stories of people coming from the East, telling about the support they received (or not) from various sources in helping them to resettle. In the interviews, their experiences with humanitarian assistance in everyday life were discussed. My role was to direct the interview in a semi-structured way – prevent them from telling a lot about their history, why they fled, and what happened when the war broke out, but rather about how they got in touch with these organizations and how the support they received from various resources was effective (or not). It was useful to follow a semi-structured course, because on the one hand it prevented the interview from going into irrelevant topics, but, on the other, gave people more space for their own input in the interview; this might lead to new angles and perspectives of a research topic. The task of the researcher is to guide the conversation in an extended discussion (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). During the interviews I assisted the interviewees in reflecting on the research questions, without sending him/her in a particular direction. In the interviews with IDPs I first asked them questions about their personal experiences with humanitarian aid to find out from what sources (CSOs or government organizations) they had found support and to what extent they experienced that support as successful. Then I asked questions about their integration in their new place of residence and their socio-economic situation to understand what indicators were important to successfully integrate in their host-community and also to what extent they were able to be self-reliant. The concluding question was about how IDPs compared the different kinds of organizations they received help from, because this gives information about how they experienced the role of CSOs and government organizations respectively. The interviews with CSOs were comparable with the interviews with IDPs, but it showed the perspectives of CSOs themselves about their role and support to IDPs (See Annex 1 and 2 for the interview guide). I also made concluding remarks based on their own thoughts. This was sometimes a challenge, because the answers to the questions are very specific and not the same for everyone. Although for the purpose of the analysis the different stories should be compared, looking for similarities, addressing the nuances of people’s perspectives is just as important.

Before every interview, the respondent received an informed consent and topic list with information about the subjects that were to be discussed during the interview, how the conversation would be processed for research purposes, as well as a guarantee of privacy protection. The interviewees were asked for the consent to be recorded, since the data has to be traceable in order to be reliably processed. The informed consent also stated that the participant’s name and address would not be mentioned in the research, but direct quotes from the interviews can be used, referring only to characteristics of gender, age and place of the interview. Over a period of five weeks I interviewed eighteen IDPs and four individuals working for humanitarian agencies, which includes Logos, UNDP, Salvation Army and Jeremiah’s Hope; the interviews lasted 30 to 45 minutes. Also, the language barrier had to be taken into consideration, since most IDPs did not have a fluent demand of English. It was important to make plans for using a translator in order to have a backup if the research was hindered by language barriers. During the field work I decided to use a
translator in every interview with an IDP. However, in the case of CSOs all the participants had a basic to excellent knowledge of English and therefore interviews were held without a translator.

During the fieldwork I noticed the interviews evolved in three phases. In the first phase, I asked the participants about their road to support for their situation. After transcribing the first interviews, I began asking more questions about what the concept ‘quality of life’ entails for them, while during the third phase together with the interviewees I tried to reflect upon their situation and their own role, because I realized that there is a group of IDPs that is managing fine after a couple of years of struggle, but there is also a group of IDPs that is still severely struggling. If possible, I wanted to find out if this was because of too little support from government authorities and local organizations or because the role of the individual plays a more important part.

3.4 Data analysis

The data of the interviews have been analysed by using codes and code trees in which common themes and topics were selected by relevance. The results of this analysis are descriptions of the field findings using theoretical concepts. For analysing the interviews, the transcripts were coded. The choice of coding was made, because the data existed of twenty interviews which contained a lot of information. Therefore, a systematic analysis by coding was a convenient way to provide a clear overview of the findings. Analysing data by coding means that the answers were categorized in data units to find connections between answers and to formulate interpretations. Data units are blocks of information that share common themes or topics (codes) within one interview, but also across all interviews. Coding is an iterative process where themes in the data are organized and reorganized. There are different steps in coding. The first step is ‘open coding’, only describing questions on the ‘how, what, where and when’. The second step is ‘axial coding’, which categorizes the data units in (main) themes involving the research questions. In the last step the codes are selected on relevance for the conclusion of the research (Hay, 2010). In this case the analysis took place by using the processing program Excel. During the first step, the most important data units from the transcripts were entered into the Excel work sheets and assigned a certain code. The advantage of this was that I could easily group and sort codes and data units. Next, the data units were categorized in specific themes. Finally, the most relevant codes were selected and they were used for the narrative description in the results. These steps automatically generated analysing sheets and a code tree in which the relations and hierarchy between the various codes are displayed clearly. Table 2 shows how themes and codes are divided and connected to each other. I will use this structure in Chapter 5 of the results.

I determined the codes in the first step by using the theoretical concepts described in Chapter 2 of this thesis, because the interview questions were based on the knowledge that was gained through the theoretical analysis of the literature. From the theory I derived indicators about the socio-economic development of IDPs in host communities: well-being in health, education, housing, employment and quality of living. The indicators for human security that are mentioned in the theory are access to housing and basic services, but also autonomy and self-reliance. Therefore, human security was researched by giving codes to data units that involved a person’s autonomy and capability in self-reliance, and access to housing and basic services.

Table 2: Code tree
To research the expectations and role from government organizations in supporting IDPs or CSOs I used codes that refer to good governance (see Section 2.4), involving investment in employment and social services like allowances and housing benefits and the providing of equal treatment and public goods and services by the government to IDPs. To research the expectations and role from CSOs I used the indicators that are mentioned in the theory about civil society (see Section 2.5), involving the types and extent of (in)formal support by CSOs and in what way CSOs are networking and lobbying to achieve their goals. The theoretical framework also provided information about the challenges and constraints IDPs experience in their host communities and the (dis)advantages of CSOs in providing humanitarian aid. This information was included in the interviews and could therefore add another dimension to the results, because it shows how people perceived the role of CSOs and government organizations respectively.

In the second step, I decided on how to name the sub-themes of the theoretical concepts. The data units that were linked with the indicators of socio-economic development were categorized under socio-economic development. The data units that were linked with the indicators of human security were categorized under security. However, the data units that were linked with the indicators for good governance, were now categorized under either expectations people have from the government or the role of the government in helping IDPs or CSOs. The difference between these sub-themes is that some data units gave information about what people expected from the government during the time they needed support and other data units simply gave an indication of the kind of support the government
offered them. The data units that were linked with the indicators of civil society were also categorized under either expectations people have from CSOs or the role of CSOs in helping IDPs.

To structure the data results further, I categorized the sub-themes in main themes. I decided to categorize the sub-themes socio-economic development and security under the main theme of socio-economic situation, because both sub-themes give information about the conditions IDPs are living in. The sub-themes about the expectations from the government and the role of the government were categorized under the main theme of the experiences of IDPs with government support. The sub-themes expectations from CSOs and the role of CSOs were categorized under the main theme of the experiences of IDPs with CSO support.

I used Table 2 to systematically categorize the relevant data from the interviews, which resulted in 272 data units. I brought together all those data units where a similar concept was discussed and I further examined the various views of people on specific concepts and themes by indicating whether people were positive, negative or neutral about it. Chapter 5 shows the data analysis where each main theme of this research is dealt with in a separate section. For each main theme, a short overview of the most important results is shown at the beginning of each section in a simple table, because it will contribute to a systematic analysis of the research data. Furthermore, the relevant sub-themes are discussed in each section by summarizing the results in an understanding of the overall narrative of the facts that matter to this research.
4. The context of IDPs’ living conditions in Ukraine and Kiev

Every conflict consumes energy or resources from people – be it a life that is taken or someone that is left wounded by the conflict. A conflict can also take away people’s resources like houses, businesses, salaries; it can leave a country behind in economic struggles because of all the additional measures that need to be taken for recovery from the conflict. Ukraine is no exception, as it is facing the consequences of violence and tensions between various parties. However, at the same time there are bright spots to find as well, looking at the support offered by international organizations and local communities or initiatives. Research already illustrated the significant role CSOs can have in peacebuilding efforts, in which development plays a significant role. To create clarity on how the war in Donbass region has affected the IDPs from Eastern Ukraine and what kind of support was available for them to integrate successfully into their new environment, this chapter answers the questions, “What constraints do IDPs experience when they are displaced to other cities in Ukraine?” , “What are the current social and economic problems in cities in Ukraine?” and “What initiatives are government organizations offering to provide humanitarian assistance?”

4.1 Why people leave the Donbass region

In 2014, after president Yanukovich stepped down and fled Ukraine, rumours spread about a law that would disfavour the Russian language. This sparked serious discontent, primarily among the people living in the Eastern part of Ukraine since they are traditionally more focused on Russia, for economic as well as social reasons. For some, more radical groups it was reason to get involved in violent clashes with the local pro-Ukrainian authorities. Russia intervened by arming insurgents that took control over several cities in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions. It eventually resulted in a full-fledged armed conflict between Ukrainian military forces and pro-Russian separatists; up till now the conflict has cost over 10,000 lives. Pro-Russian separatists called for independence of the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts. In response, President Poroshenko issued a decree to shut down all governmental institutions and banking services and cutting state-funding to separatist-held areas; ordinary citizens immediately felt the consequences in the payments of their salaries and subsidies. It was reported that separatists in the so-called non-government controlled areas (NGCA) were threatening, attacking and beating up hundreds of people whom they suspected of being pro-Ukrainian. Even executions have been reported, as well as the existence of underground bunkers where people were detained and abused (HRW, 2015). During the interviews, people also came up with stories of violence in their hometowns:

“They didn’t plan to leave Gorlovka, but suddenly they discovered that people started to kidnap people […] they had these skilful, professional shooters near their house – near his sister’s house – Natasha, and she had three kids and she was pregnant with the fourth one. So they said, they told her, ‘let’s go’, because it’s like really dangerous to be here. People are shooting everywhere […] they knew and they saw this situation when these people killed the guy who was protecting the Ukrainian flag […] they killed him very brutally. Everyone saw it and that was really dangerous, even then, for people to live in that place, in the city. So they decided to leave and they had their own car, but the car was kind of old and they didn’t have enough place to put things. They just took only necessary things and they saw the people who were in the main railway station trying to go away by train and there were not enough places in the train. There was really a huge panic everywhere.” – IDP pensioner, 2018
People left their houses and their place of living, because of atrocities they saw or knew of. Separatists put people in detention without a legal warrant and kidnapped people. Atrocities like these were also committed by Ukrainian forces, but on a different scale. Certain categories of civilians were specifically targeted by separatists, because of their political affiliation, their occupation or their religion. Another reason to leave the conflict zone was the constant shelling; both parties used heavy weapons, even in densely populated areas. The shelling caused damage to property and infrastructure, and people’s lives were at stake. The shelling also prevented food, medicine and other basic supplies to reach the area which caused severe shortages. Humanitarian organizations were hindered in their work to bring assistance to the conflict-affected people. In light of the threats to their lives and the worsening living conditions people felt forced to leave. Most people that left did not think the conflict would last very long, however, and counted on coming back real soon. Currently, almost five years later, there are still around 1.5 million IDPs that have been forced to flee the conflict zone (FIDH-CCL, 2015).

4.2 Constraints IDPs experience in their new environment

Most people fleeing the conflict zone moved to government-controlled areas in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts or to three other neighbouring oblasts (73%), because of available housing, the presence of family and friends and/or because it was closer to their home areas and felt more familiar. Kiev has the highest share of IDPs (10%). The main reasons for choosing Kiev for resettlement were employment opportunities or the fact that people already had connections in the city. Only a very small percentage, 0.2%, of IDPs went abroad for work, mainly to Poland, Canada or the USA. An unknown number of IDPs went to Russia (UNHCR, 2017).

Ever since the beginning of the refugee flows, the Ukrainian authorities have struggled to provide sufficient help and assistance to IDPs. Government organizations tasked with coordinating the housing and social assistance programmes lacked resources and knowledge to effectively deliver the necessary support (HRW, 2015). The main fields where IDPs need support are housing, employment opportunities, and access to health care services.

Before the conflict, 87% of IDPs owned their own dwelling (IOM, 2018). In Ukraine, it is necessary to own your own apartment or house, since most people have rather low incomes and monthly rents are relatively high. People can barely afford a small rental home. Although rents in Ukraine vary geographically, in Kiev the average monthly rent is estimated at 179 dollar, not including additional monthly utility expenses of 67 dollar. The average housing expenses in Kiev are almost 250 dollar a month, while most IDP households only receive a salary of 53 to 176 dollar. An IDP household consisting of two working parents with two children receives an average payment by the government of around 125 dollar; for most people this is barely enough to rent an apartment and pay for other living expenses. A significant share of IDPs has found alternative housing with family or friends, in collective housing centres run by humanitarian organizations or in a single room in a shared apartment. More than half of the IDPs do not know whether they can stay in their accommodation for the next year. This lack of affordable housing is the main factor that forces IDPs to return to NCGA; returnees report that housing problems were a main reason to return to the conflict zone, because at least they have their own property there. However, UNHCR has reported about the dangerous and equally poor living situation in the NGCA, which makes the need to give IDPs sufficient support even more urgent (UNHCR, 2017).

Regarding job opportunities, only 46% of IDPs have found a job, whereas 61% did have a job before the conflict started. In comparison to the ‘native’ population, IDPs have problems getting a permanent
contract from their employer. The labour market is characterised by a shortage of jobs due to the
economic crisis, low wages, and poor working terms and working conditions. IDPs suggest that it is difficult
to find a well-paying job without connections, which they obviously often lack in their new place of
residence. Another problem, especially faced by women, is the fact that they often used to live close to
relatives who could take care of the children, which made it possible for most women to work. However,
most pensioners stayed behind and childcare services are usually too expensive, which makes working not
rewarding. Nevertheless, and on the positive side, an increasing number of IDPs are feeling integrated in
their new place; this can be explained by the amount of time that has passed since the first IDPs arrived in
their new place of living (UNHCR, 2017).

IDPs that need special medical attention and pensioners are reporting difficulties in accessing health care
services. The main barrier is the cost of medication, which is not covered by health care insurance (UNHCR,
2017). Especially the combination with other costs that are needed for regular living expenses, makes this
group very vulnerable for financial setbacks.

4.3 Social and economic problems after 2014

Not just IDPs are facing the poor living situations. The general population also has its financial difficulties;
key problems are social inequality, a low GDP per capita, and a strong urban-rural divide across the
country. IDPs are more vulnerable to financial shocks, however, because they can no longer rely on
property assets since these are located in occupied territory. The current social and economic problems in
Ukraine put a severe strain on the financial resources of the government. The international community
expects the government to finance the rebuilding of damaged infrastructure and buildings on its own
territory. Whether or not the Ukrainian government is also responsible for the damaged infrastructure
and properties in occupied areas is still debated. The government also has to invest in normal living
conditions and functioning enterprises. At the same time the financial resources of the government are
already exhausted by military expenses. People have little confidence and belief in the government’s
efforts to restore the economy. Weak governance and high levels of corruption are a source for ineffective
and incompetent decision making and implementation (Grigoriev et al., 2016).

Reports about corruption related to development aid are published by the US Helsinki Commission
(Helsinki Commission, 2017). The main reason for the persistent corruption in Ukraine is the resilience and
influence of Ukraine’s oligarchs. Oligarchs have infiltrated the Ukrainian government, ruling out non-
corrupt political parties and competing amongst each other how to take Ukraine’s financial resources for
themselves. Corruption runs through every sector in Ukrainian society. This makes access to all kinds of
services even more difficult, especially for vulnerable people. One of the obstacles to fighting corruption
is the relatively low awareness of the fact that ordinary people also contribute to the problem of
corruption. Reforms to fight corruption that were taken after 2014 may even be reversed by new
government laws. This reversal is directed at two reforms in particular, namely the creation of the National
Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine and the launch of an electronic system disclosing the assets of public
officials. However, the reversal has not been finalised yet, because international donors like the European
Union threaten to stop all aid if the Ukrainian government does not meet their anti-corruption demands
(PISM, 2017).

Since the start of the conflict, a total of $3.8 billion in aid has been provided to Ukraine, including low
interest loans. However, the Ukrainian authorities have only kept track of $920 million. Foreign aid donors
are therefore afraid their money is either stolen or wasted, because foreign aid is obviously poorly
controlled and it can easily end up in someone’s own pocket. And as far as loans are concerned, eventually it will be the Ukrainian citizens that have to repay it all. Several experts recommend foreign aid donors to stop giving money to Ukrainian officials, and instead execute relevant projects on their own or in close cooperation with development partners (Shkarpova & Ostapchuk, 2016; Galante, 2018).

4.4 Government assistance to IDPs

Initially government assistance to IDPs was carried out through law making and implementation, as well as through providing subsidies to individuals. IDPs mention government support as the second source of income (salary being the first one). The share of IDPs receiving support from the government is still significant, IDPs still strongly rely on government assistance. Table 3 shows the amount of government support every IDP individual is entitled to on a monthly basis.

Table 3: Monthly amount of government support for different IDP categories in 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDP category</th>
<th>Amount of government support (dollar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pensioners</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &lt;18 y/o</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with working ability &gt;18 y/o</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IOM, 2018

At the beginning of the conflict, Ukrainian law was in no way prepared for an inflow of IDPs and the arrangements that were necessary. By October 2015, IDPs got extended a specific set of rights, including protection against discrimination and forcible return, at the same time simplifying access to social and economic services (HRW, 2015). The most recent law-making initiative to meet the needs of IDPs took place on November 15, 2017, by issuing the No. 909-r Decree by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (KMU). Where the aim of law-making right after the start of the conflict was mainly directed at short-term aid solutions, the aim of current law-making is to provide long-term solutions to improve IDPs’ integration in their new place of residence. Significant gaps remain in place, however, concerning the way in which government authorities are communicating and responding to IDPs (NRC/IDMC, 2018).

The Decree sets out a strategy aimed at long-term solutions to the problems of IDPs. Specific assistance regarding protection and movement and equal rights are no longer needed, given that these issues have already been covered in previous laws. The KMU now tries to solve the main problems of IDPs regarding living conditions and access to housing. The focus is on “protection of their rights, namely property rights, access to adequate housing, rights to restore documents certifying their Ukrainian citizenship or a special status, restore livelihoods, as well as to exercise electoral rights and access information” (KMU, 2017:3). A majority of IDPs has received humanitarian assistance, but after four years they are expected to be become more independent, at least less dependent on state support. The Decree should therefore provide the implementation of long-term decisions for the social and economic integration of IDPs. The KMU provides an outline of the various measures that should solve problems with housing, job opportunities and access to health care.

The main difficulty for IDPs is still access to adequate housing. A majority of IDPs indicate they want their own permanent and affordable housing, but they are not allowed mortgage loans by banks and are therefore unable to own their own property. New financial regulations should provide IDPs with the opportunity to purchase permanent and affordable housing and introduce reduced tax rates specifically
for IDPs. Also, changes in national legislation should give priority to IDPs, so they can receive social and temporary housing and free legal assistance in the process of concluding housing agreements.

Another important problem the Decree focuses on is the protection of property rights of lost property in Eastern Ukraine. By creating a special register of destroyed and/or damaged property as a result of armed aggression in the NGCA, verification of property rights should make way for the possibility of IDPs to receive compensation for their financial losses. Plans are also made to restore property once the occupation of Ukrainian territory comes to an end. It is made clear that compensation will only be given after occupation has ended. It is of course not clear, however, if and when the occupation will end. Property loss without compensation puts a major constraint on people’s financial resources, because they are not insured and therefore have little rights to receive compensation (KMU, 2017).

The KMU proposes various measures to overcome difficulties with job opportunities for IDPs. According to the KMU, the main reasons for being rejected on the job market are the “absence of job openings, unwillingness to employ a person who lived in a temporarily occupied territory or a territory where state authorities temporarily do not exercise their powers, or lack of experience for a particular job opening” (KMU, 2017:8). To provide IDPs with a stimulus for overcoming employment difficulties, the KMU introduces tax breaks and credit mechanisms for small and medium-sized businesses run by IDPs. IDPs might also get vocational retraining and advanced training to create more employment opportunities.

To meet the needs of the most vulnerable groups within the IDP population – like pensioners or people with disabilities – a new mechanism should enable people to receive their pension at their place of residence. For those who need health care services, access should be made easier. However, the issue of corruption is in no way mentioned in improving access to health care. Solutions rather focus on a better registration of IDPs, and allocating more medical equipment to health care facilities in places where there are large numbers of IDPs. A short note is given to “creating effective mechanisms for ensuring proper service of internally displaced persons in healthcare facilities without restrictions as compared to other persons” (KMU, 2017:10), but what that proper service entails is not made clear.

4.5 International assistance to IDPs

As of the Summer of 2018, international organizations have carried out 302 projects for IDPs in Ukraine. The total budget of international assistance being implemented in Ukraine amounts to 3.7 billion dollar. The UNHCR (2017) constantly points at the importance of not only recording the damages and property losses caused to individuals as a result of the conflict, but for the government also to give compensation to the IDPs who have lost their property. The government is reluctant to pay compensation to those who have damaged or lost properties located in occupied areas; even conflict-affected people in government-controlled areas have not seen any compensation yet. The UNHCR also recommends the state to provide IDPs with housing funds for temporary accommodation.

However, for the national government the amount of support IDPs need for protection and humanitarian assistance is too high, because at the same time Ukraine has to struggle with many other problems. Therefore, for additional assistance the Ukrainian authorities need to cooperate with national and international humanitarian organizations. The most important international aid partners in Ukraine are the various UN agencies: UNOCHA, UNDP and UNHCR. Their projects are briefly addressed to show their scale and the outreach to IDPs.
OCHA (2017) coordinates humanitarian aid operations and made 25 million dollar available for conflict-affected people. A total of 48 organizations have received OCHA funding for the implementation of 111 projects, but since 2017 there has been a reduced presence of humanitarian organizations due to a lack of funding. UNDP (2017) primarily coordinates cooperation between the national government of Ukraine, local government and local organizations, since it prefers a community-based approach. The main project is financed by the EU and co-financed and implemented by UNDP. The objective is to promote sustainable socio-economic development at a local level by strengthening governance and local organizations across Ukraine in helping IDPs. The project provided 80,000 IDPs with humanitarian assistance, whereas 3,500 IDPs were provided with temporary accommodation. The UNHCR also turned to a more local approach in working with communities. This approach is characterised by integrating local projects and initiatives for protection and empowerment of IDPs, but UNHCR also directly supports IDPs.

4.6 Presence of CSOs in Kiev

IRIN (2015) reports the significant role local organizations have played in organizing and delivering aid. Local organizations include the Red Cross and various NGOs. Working with and through local organizations in crisis situations is sometimes the only option for reaching those most in need. For practical reasons this case study specifically deals with the situation in Kiev. However, the humanitarian situation of IDPs across Ukraine is very similar to that of the IDPs in Kiev. The following section contains an overview of the local organizations that are involved with IDPs in Kiev and how they organize their projects, looking at the type and scale of support, funding and cooperation with other organizations.

The initial projects of CSOs I contacted were usually targeted at a specific group within society. Logos International Centre, a humanitarian organization, for example, focussed on housing the vulnerable like homeless people, orphans, single mothers, substance addicts, etc. When the war in the East broke out, Logos immediately responded to the changing events in the country and since 2014 it has provided shelter for 200 IDPs from Eastern Ukraine. Logos closely cooperated with other CSOs, because it sheltered a large number of IDPs that needed basic issues like food, clothing, money, etc.; this was provided by other CSOs.

The Salvation Army in Kiev also tries to help vulnerable at-risk groups, although it had no shelter accommodation; therefore it focused on providing material aid like food kits and clothing. Aid was distributed through the centres of the Salvation Army in the larger cities – like Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Lviv and Kiev –, in close cooperation with other CSOs that were involved in supporting IDPs, because this way it was easy to reach the people that came from Eastern Ukraine and really needed this kind of help. The Salvation Army initiated a program aimed at long-term solutions by helping fifty families – the so-called Integration Mission program, offering various activities for IDPs, such as computer courses, English classes, medical aid and consultations with professionals.

During the interviews many IDPs specifically mentioned Samaritan’s Purse as a provider of material support. I was not able to talk to a representative of this organization in person. Samaritan’s Purse is an international charity organization providing support to victims of war, poverty, natural disasters and famine. In Ukraine, it organizes camps for children from poor families and provides presents for children during Christmas season (Samaritan’s Purse, 2018). Since 2014, it has extended its projects by giving food and clothing to IDPs, distributed in the Logos centre.

Another organization interviewed is Jeremiah’s Hope. Jeremiah’s Hope runs several projects for mainly children, but since 2013 it also helped in shipping and distributing humanitarian aid to people affected by
the war in eastern Ukraine. It receives funds from individuals, churches and organizations from around the world, mainly from the USA. The US government provides free shipping for the supplies and a network of Ukrainian churches and ministries distributes the humanitarian aid to the places where it is needed most. In 2014, it gave fifty people from eastern Ukraine shelter, according to the director and coordinator of Jeremiah’s Hope.

Figure 2 lists the UNHCR partner organizations in Ukraine that are involved in assistance to IDPs, as well as to refugees, asylum seekers and stateless persons. The organizations that are specifically involved with IDPs in Kiev are CrimeaSOS, the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), Right to Protection (R2P), and Rokada. UNOCHA (2017) also made a list of all CSOs running IDP-related projects and the financial requirements for the project (Annex 3). This is not an exhaustive list, but gives an indication of the number of initiatives for IDPs.

Figure 2: Presence of partner organizations UNHCR in Ukraine, as of April 4, 2018

Foreign governments are an important donor for local organizations as well. Various donations have been given by the United States, Belgium, the United Kingdom, Norway, Japan, etc. They occasionally finance local projects through special programs. The UK Foreign Office (FCO), for example, has set out yearly contests for projects of civil society organisations alongside government bodies in all regions of Ukraine, so as to support local initiatives and human rights with a maximum contribution of $20,000. The projects support the policy goals of the UK, such as developing democracy and supporting reforms in public institutions in Ukraine (British Embassy Kiev, 2018). It is interesting to see that by setting out a contest, a foreign aid donor ultimately holds the power to decide what kind of project will be funded. Policy goals and social preferences can be carried out through local organizations without adjusting the initial project.
Local initiatives can also anticipate on the preferences of a foreign aid donor by adjusting their projects to it.

In this chapter, I focused on the constraints and socio-economic problems experienced by IDPs when they are displaced. I also examined what initiatives government organizations offer(ed) to provide humanitarian assistance to IDPs. The main constraints IDPs experience are difficulties in finding housing, employment opportunities and access to health care services. People lost their property in Eastern Ukraine; it has not always been destroyed, but people are not able to use or sell it. This resulted in a double burden for people, because they had invested in a house in Eastern Ukraine and now have to invest a house in Kiev. Since the start of the conflict in 2014, the Ukrainian authorities have struggled to provide sufficient help and assistance to IDPs in these matters. The government has been implementing new legislation to meet the needs of IDPs in getting easier access to housing, health care and job opportunities. However, the government is reluctant to pay IDPs compensation for property loss. This means that IDPs face a disadvantage in Kiev society, because they lack a social network and job opportunities that are needed to improve their socio-economic situation. CSOs have tried to meet the basic needs of IDPs. The overall conclusion in this chapter is that government initiatives exist next to CSO initiatives to support IDPs. The next chapter will analyse how IDPs perceive government and CSO initiatives and to what extent these initiatives have contributed to their integration in Kiev.
5 Results

During my fieldwork in Kiev in April-May 2018, I was welcomed by an employee of Logos International Centre who introduced me to the organization and helped me locate other humanitarian organizations and people from Eastern Ukraine that were willing to participate in my interviews. I was able to conduct twenty interviews, most of the time with one person, sometimes with two persons. This chapter provides a detailed overview of the interviews held with IDPs and CSOs during the fieldwork in Kiev. The data analysis is structured in three sections dealing with the socio-economic situation of IDPs, and the experiences of IDPs with government and CSO support respectively. The information of the interviews provides an answer to the questions, “What initiatives are government organizations offering to provide humanitarian assistance to IDPs and to what extent are government initiatives successful according to IDPs?”, “What initiatives are CSOs offering to provide humanitarian assistance to IDPs and to what extent are these initiatives successful according to IDPs?”, and “How do IDPs experience the role of CSOs and government organizations respectively to improve their socio-economic situation?”

5.1 Socio-economic situation of IDPs

This section deals with how IDPs perceive their own situation and whether or not they experience an improvement in their integration in Kiev. I used the indicators of socio-economic development and human security to give an image of the socio-economic situation of IDPs, because the perception of IDPs regarding their socio-economic development and human security can give an image of what their living situation is and whether or not they are capable of building a future in Kiev.

From the data obtained by the interviews, 114 data units are derived that give information about the socio-economic situation of IDPs. Table 4 presents a simple overview of the personal experiences expressed in the interviews and how socio-economic development and human security are perceived by IDPs and CSOs.

Table 4: Overview of personal experiences with the socio-economic situation of IDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic situation</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Socio-economic development</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Human security</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Private data sheet, 2018

Negative perspectives about their socio-economic situation were mentioned in 42.1 percent of the data units from sixteen different respondents. Positive perspectives about their socio-economic situation were mentioned in 25.4 percent of the data units from fourteen different respondents. In 32.5 percent of the data units there was no value attached to how people perceived their socio-economic situation. These data units simply provided information about people’s socio-economic development or security. At first sight, there is not a large difference in how often socio-economic development and human security were mentioned. The perceptions on socio-economic development were stronger than the perceptions on human security, however; in the overall situation socio-economic development scores higher, both as far as negative perceptions and positive perceptions are concerned. Next, I will go into more detail to explain the differences in analysing what issues people mentioned the most in the interviews and were most concerned about.
5.1.1 Socio-economic development

To research the concept of socio-economic development and IDPs’ perspectives, I derived the following theoretical concepts from the literature; well-being in health, education, housing and employment; and quality of living. Based on the data obtained by the interviews, 60 data units from nineteen different respondents gave information about the socio-economic development of IDPs. Table 5 presents an overview of the personal experiences expressed in the interviews and how the various theoretical concepts are perceived.

### Table 5: Overview of personal experiences with the socio-economic development of IDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well-being in:</th>
<th>Negative (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Health</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employment</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of living</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Private data sheet, 2018

Well-being in employment and quality of living were mentioned the most by respondents when talking about socio-economic development, in respectively 35 and 31.7 percent of the data units. Negative perceptions on the well-being in employment (10 percent) were mainly about difficulties in finding jobs. The difficulties IDPs experienced in finding jobs were bad working conditions due to irregular work hours, low salaries and the type of work. Discrimination during the interview process also played a role for respondents; discrimination because of age and/or by prejudices about Eastern Ukrainians. The following quote summarizes the difficulties mentioned by IDPs.

“Some of them were professionals back in Eastern Ukraine and they cannot find that kind of professional work in Kiev so they have to resort to construction work, cleaning houses, working at stores. [...] Because of prejudice and because it’s more competitive here. So even some who have an education and experience they are competing against those who not only have education and experience, but their education has been from Kiev.” – Logos worker, 2018

People were positive about their well-being in employment (15 percent) when they did not experience difficulties in getting a job. Five respondents told they had found a job easily and the job was what they had in mind; all five respondents being (at least at that time) younger than thirty years of age and therefore not having to do with age discrimination yet. People were also positive about their employment situation when they had multiple jobs, giving them more financial security.

Negative perceptions on the quality of living (16.7 percent) were sometimes based on how IDPs’ living conditions were when they were still in the conflict area; they obviously perceived their living situation then as unsafe, but they have seen an improvement since their arrival in Kiev. Three respondents mentioned they see their current situation as an improvement compared to when they just arrived in Kiev in 2014, because back then there were no places that provided sufficient and safe shelter for IDPs. Four
respondents said they still find it difficult to get used to the shelter at Logos and therefore had also negative perceptions about their quality of living, although all respondents staying at Logos Centre indicated they were grateful for their stay at the centre. Four out of five respondents that were sharing a positive perception on their quality of living mentioned the living conditions at Logos as an important factor.

Only two respondents had negative perceptions on their well-being in housing they were currently in, due to the fact they had only one room. Three other respondents addressed their negative views on the housing situation they were previously in. For two respondents the crowdedness and tensions with other families were a main reason to leave Logos Centre. One positive perspective on well-being in housing came from the UNDP Country Director, stating that moving in with family or friends was seen as a contribution to integration.

Well-being in education was mentioned in less cases, in only 11.7 percent of the data units. A respondent still in school at the time mentioned that it took some time to integrate within the new environment of the school and it brought along stress; nevertheless, the respondent was positive about the present situation and said it was improving. Another difficulty shared by the average Ukrainian citizen is the financial cost of studying that can give parents headaches about whether or not they will be able to afford higher education for their children. Although most IDPs brought up their financial problems, all respondents were able to let their children go to university or college, sometimes thanks to additional help from charity organizations or relatives.

Well-being in health was mentioned the least by respondents, only 6.7 percent of the data units indicates a negative perception of health. This refers to people who are under medical care and face difficulties in financing their medicines and medical care. Although well-being in health care is mentioned the least, people who are in need of medical care can be seen as the marginalized group of people that is discussed within the sub-theme of human security in the next section.

5.1.2 Security

To research the concept of human security and IDPs’ perspectives, I derived the following theoretical concepts from the literature; autonomy and self-reliance; access to housing and basic services. In the data obtained by the interviews, there are 54 data units from sixteen different respondents that give information about the human security of IDPs. Table 6 presents an overview of the personal experiences expressed in the interviews and how the various theoretical concepts are perceived.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy &amp; self-reliance</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to housing and basic services</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Private data sheet, 2018

During the fieldwork the theoretical concepts of autonomy and self-reliance were mentioned in 64.8 percent of the data units. Eight respondents were negative about their ability to be self-reliant and autonomous, five of whom indicated they are still dependent on support from charity organizations,
because they cannot afford their own housing. In the quote below the role of money and social networks is addressed in being self-reliant.

“So then, fundamentally they are Ukrainians, the law is against them for the largest of parts and of course I mean in terms of social networks, in terms of climbing any ladder, yes they are disadvantaged, there is no doubt about it.” – Country Director UNDP, 2018

Only 9.3 percent of the data units are positive about the autonomy and self-reliance of IDPs. During the interviews, in general there were two perceptions on how easy or hard it is for IDPs to build their own lives in Kiev. One perception was that IDPs should try more to become independent. Two IDPs mentioned that IDPs that are still dependent on support can become self-reliant if they work hard for it. The other perception is that people are marginalized because of their situation and therefore need support to successfully integrate in Kiev. Marginalized groups that are mentioned are IDPs, elderly, orphans, people without education and single mothers. Interestingly, the two perceptions are sometimes voiced by the same organization; on the one hand it is acknowledged that people are stuck in a difficult situation, while on the other hand organizations experience that most IDPs supported by them have jobs and should be able to live independently.

Access to housing and basic services were mentioned in 35.2 percent of the data. Negative perceptions on the access to housing and basic services (16.7 percent) were based on the perceptions of seven respondents. The main concern about access to housing and basic services by IDPs is that these are (too) costly for the average Ukrainian citizen. Only when you have enough money, it might be easy to get access to good housing and services. Therefore people in a marginalized position have a negative perception on their access to housing and basic services. Only 9.3 percent of the data units share a positive perception on access to housing and basic services for IDPs. For three out of five respondents the reason for positive perceptions on access to housing and basic services was attributed to the role of support by strangers and organizations in offering basic goods. However, at the same time this caused insecurity for people, because they were not sure for how long they could continue to receive this kind of support. It is doubtful this can be counted as a long-term solution for getting access to housing and basic services, because in the interviews it became clear that in the current situation support from strangers or organizations was dwindling. A more systematic solution for getting access to housing and basic services that was mentioned in the interviews is legislation providing the possibility for IDPs to get easier access to housing, ensuring they are not marginalized in society. Expectations of equal treatment by the government is also discussed in the next section.

In this section, I focused on how IDPs perceive their own situation and whether or not they experience any improvement in their integration in Kiev. What constraints do IDPs experience after they were displaced to Kiev? In the analysis it became clear that sixteen respondents had negative perspectives on their socio-economic situation, but at the same time there were also fourteen respondents that mentioned positive perspectives. This is not surprising, given that the perspectives on the socio-economic situation has been analysed on the basis of various indicators; people might perceive their situation on one indicator better than on another. Besides, the sixteen respondents were responsible for 42.1 percent of the negative data units, while the fourteen respondents were only responsible for 25.4 percent of the positive data units. The main reasons for IDPs and CSOs to have a negative perspective on their socio-economic situation are the quality of living and their autonomy and self-reliance. People were not happy about their situation in
shelters, because they preferred to be independent and to have their own place, but also mentioned that they could not do without CSO support. In conclusion, IDPs experienced an improvement of their socio-economic situation thanks to CSO support. However, this does not mean they have successfully integrated in Kiev, because they are still dependent on government support and, according to three respondents, to a larger extent on CSO support.

5.2 Experiences of IDPs with government support

In this section, I will analyse the experiences of IDPs and CSOs with government support for IDPs in Kiev. I used the indicators of good governance to analyse the experiences of IDPs and CSOs with government support, the expectations people have from the government and the role of the government in helping IDPs or CSOs, because some data units gave information about what people expected from the government during their time they needed support and other data units simply gave an indication of the kind of support the government offered to them. The experiences of IDPs and CSOs with government support can give an answer to what extent the Ukrainian government has been capable to provide IDPs with public goods and services with its own resources.

From the data obtained by the interviews, 51 data units are derived that give information about the experiences people (IDPs and CSOs) have with government support. Table 7 presents a simple overview of the personal experiences expressed in the interviews and how the expectations and the role of the government are perceived by IDPs and CSOs.

| Table 7: Overview of IDP and CSO experiences with government support of IDPs |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Experiences of IDPs and CSOs with government support | Negative (%) | Neutral (%) | Positive (%) | Total (%) |
| - Expectations people have from the government | 35.3 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 39.2 |
| - Role of the government in helping IDPs or CSOs | 35.3 | 23.5 | 2.0 | 60.8 |

Source: Private data sheet, 2018

People had negative experiences with government support in 70.6 percent of the data units from fourteen different respondents. Only the UNDP country director brought up a positive experience with government support, because he looked at the overall situation of IDPs in Ukraine and was also able to compare it with his experiences with government support in other countries. In 27.4 percent of the data units there was no value attached to how people experienced government support. These data units simply provided information about people’s experiences with government support. There is a significant difference in how often people mentioned the expectations they had from the government (39.3 percent) and their perceptions on the kind of support they received from the government (60.8 percent). Interestingly, negative experiences with the expectations and the role of the government were both mentioned as often by people, as well as for positive experiences with these sub-themes. The difference between the sub-themes was that people shared more experiences about the role of the government in helping IDPs or CSOs, without attaching a specific value to it. In the next two sections, I will go into more detail to explain the comparisons and differences and I will make some concluding remarks on these findings.
5.2.1 Expectations people have from the government

To research the expectations people have from the government and people’s experiences with this, I derived the following theoretical concepts from the literature that were mentioned as indicators for good governance: social investment; providing people with equal treatment; and providing people with public goods and services. From the data obtained in the interviews, there were 20 data units from twelve different respondents that gave information about the expectations IDPs and CSOs have from the government. Table 8 presents an overview of the personal experiences expressed in the interviews and how the various theoretical concepts are perceived.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social investment</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing people with equal treatment</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing people with public goods and services</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Private data sheet, 2018

When talking about expectations people had from the government, in 65 percent of the data units people stated they expected the government to provide them with public goods and services. Most of the expectations people had in this case were negative (60 percent), because they expected more (financial) support from the government, mostly for housing, but did not receive this or just too little according to nine respondents. It is not surprising that people did not bring up positive expectations, because there were no respondents who experienced they received more than what they needed.

Negative experiences about the expectations regarding social investment by the government (20 percent) were mentioned by five respondents. The expectations were mainly – from IDPs as well as the UNDP – to change legislation in such a way that it helps them in improving the situation of IDPs. Three IDPs mentioned the need for social investment in affordable housing; this was often mentioned in combination with a solution that could really help them: getting a house from the government as compensation for the house they lost (two IDPs, both in their sixties), or arrangement with banks of getting loans with low interest rates so as to be able to afford a house (IDP woman, 35 years old).

CSOs expected more cooperation from the government, and felt the government was not involved enough in helping IDPs. I categorized this expectation under social investment, because cooperation with the government can mean different things; not just financial support, but also active involvement in aid projects.

Expectations of equal treatment was only mentioned by two respondents and both experiences were negative. However, negative expectations of social investment and the government providing them with public goods and services often coincided with feelings of unequal treatment. Therefore it was difficult to separate these two concepts. Negative expectations of equal treatment were due to feelings of being left alone and the government not caring about those who are at risk in Ukraine, which could also be read in answers about the role of the government, discussed in the next section.
5.2.2 Role of the government in helping IDPs or CSOs

To research the role of the government and people’s experiences with it, I derived the following theoretical concepts from the literature that were mentioned as indicators for good governance: social investment; providing people with equal treatment; and providing people with public goods and services. In the data obtained by the interviews, there were 31 data units from sixteen different respondents that gave information about how the role of the government is perceived by IDPs and CSOs. Table 9 presents an overview of the personal experiences expressed in the interviews and how the various theoretical concepts are perceived.

Table 9: Overview of personal experiences with the role of the government in helping IDPs or CSOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social investment</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing people with equal</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing people with public</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goods and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Private data sheet, 2018

In talking about people’s experiences with the role of the government, in 64.5 percent of the data units people mentioned the role of the government in providing public goods and services. Around half of these data units attributed a negative role to the government (32.3 percent). Three respondents experienced a lot of corruption throughout the government system and stated that therefore one should simply not expect anything from the government. The UNDP country director addressed the role of legislation for the socio-economic situation of IDPS; the law is very static which makes it difficult for people to move to other places in Ukraine when they are dependent on pensions and allowances. Three other respondents experienced that the support offered by the government was not what they needed at the time or not sufficient as illustrated in the quote below:

“Yes, some programs were for IDPs. The government was finding some houses in villages that people didn’t want or just wanted to grant it for refugees, but no more other help. Just a house without any services. Also government was offering refugees to stay in sanatoriums in all of Ukraine. But the problem was that it was cold already and sanatoriums are not build for winter, they are built only for summer and people were cold there. And they couldn’t pay for their living so who would pay for them. Therefore the sanatoriums closed soon and people were supposed to find something else themselves.” – IDP woman, 38 years old, 2018

The role of the government in providing people with equal treatment was mentioned in 16.1 percent of the data units by only three respondents; all had negative experiences. Two respondents mentioned that at the start of the conflict they had to be registered, because out of fear they could be separatists. As a consequence, in one case where families wanted to use a facility the government provided in 2014, men and women had to be separated. Another reason that was mentioned for the unequal treatment of IDPs was corruption in the government system; in Ukraine, more things are possible for someone with a lot of money than for someone who is poor. The next quote describes it very clearly:
“It’s a very heavy law and also the Ukrainians are a very bureaucratic country, it’s big, very corrupt and with corruption goes bureaucracy, because bureaucracy and corruption are basically they are feeding of each other. And in such a situation anybody who is a bit different, first can’t get their rights, or, in a corrupt society have to pay a lot of money to get what they want or what you need. Which of course for IDPs is a hopeless situation, because many of them if you left behind all your stuff in a conflict, maybe you don’t come with a lot of money.” – Country Director UNDP, 2018

The role of the government in providing people with social investment was mentioned in 19.4 percent of the data units. Only three respondents shared negative experiences with the role of the government in social investment; they were negative about the lack of communication by the government or they did not perceive the support they received for social welfare as sufficient. People did not share any positive experiences about this concept. From the interviews, it can be concluded that there have been government initiatives to raise social investment, but it was perceived as not being enough. This perception can be linked to the expectations people have from the government, because the information people shared about what they did not like about government support indirectly gave information about what they would like to receive from the government.

In this section, I focused on the opinions, codes and feelings of IDPs and CSOs on the government’s response to the situation of marginalized groups in Ukrainian society. What government initiatives did IDPs and CSOs mention in their interviews and to what extent were these initiatives successful according to them? What does it mean that 70.6 percent of the data units (shared by fourteen respondents) only attributed a small or negative experience with government support? From the analysis it became clear that there were two main reasons why people experienced the government’s support as negative. The first reason was the lack in support people had experienced from the government. People had expected to receive more support from the government, but did not receive it and instead were rather experiencing an unwillingness from the government. The second reason was that people did not attribute a large role to the government, because of corruption in the government system. This means that the role of the government is smaller compared to a situation where society expects the government to take care of vulnerable people. The overall conclusion in this section is that more than half of the respondents experienced the support from the government as negative and it did not meet their expectations. This means that IDPs and CSOs have perceived the government’s response to the situation of marginalized groups in society as insufficient for the integration of IDPs.

5.3 Experiences of IDPs with CSO support
In this section, I will analyse the experiences of IDPs and CSOs with CSO support for IDPs in Kiev. I used the indicators of civil society to analyse the experiences of IDPs and CSOs with CSO support, but I made a distinction between the expectations people have from CSOs and the role of CSOs in helping IDPs, because some data units gave information about what people expected from CSOs during their time they needed support and other data units simply gave an indication of the kind of support CSOs offered. The experiences of IDPs and CSOs with CSO support can answer to what extent local initiatives improve the socio-economic situation of IDPs.

From the interviews, 107 data units have been derived that give information about the experiences IDPs have with CSO support. Table 10 presents an overview of the personal experiences expressed in the interviews and how the expectations and role of CSOs are perceived by IDPs and CSOs.
Table 10: Overview of the personal experiences with CSO support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences of IDPs with support from CSOs</th>
<th>Negative (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Expectations people have from CSOs</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Role of CSOs in helping IDPs</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Private data sheet, 2018

People had negative experiences with CSO support in 12.2 percent of the data units from eight different respondents. In 54.2 percent of the data units there was no value attached to how people experienced CSO support. These data units make up a significant part of the data, therefore I will discuss it in further detail in the next two sections. Thirteen respondents expressed in 33.6 percent of the data units their positive experiences with CSO support. There is a significant difference in how often people mentioned the expectations they had from CSOs (13.9 percent) and their perceptions on the kind of support they received from CSOs (86 percent). At first sight, there does not seem to be much difference in people’s expectations from CSOs, but in the next two sections, I will look in further detail into the expectations people have of CSOs. Within the sub-theme of the role of CSOs in helping IDPs, positive experiences with the kind of support that people received from CSOs is significantly higher than the negative experiences. Next, I will go into more detail to explain the differences and I will give an analysis regarding what issues people mentioned the most in the interviews and were most concerned about.

5.3.1 Expectations people have from CSOs

To analyse the expectations people have of CSO support and people’s related experiences, I derived the following theoretical concepts from the literature that were mentioned as indicators for civil society: informal support from CSOs; networking and lobbying by CSOs. In the data obtained by the interviews, there were 15 data units from nine different respondents that gave information about the expectations people have of CSOs. Table 11 presents an overview of the personal experiences expressed in the interviews and how the expectations and role of CSOs are perceived by IDPs and CSOs.

Table 11: Overview of the personal experiences with expectations people have of CSOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(In)formal support from CSOs</th>
<th>Negative (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking and lobbying by CSOs</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Private data sheet, 2018

According to Table 9, there did not seem to be much difference in the expectations of people regarding CSO support. However, when looking more in-depth at people’s expectations, it can be noted that 86.7 percent of the data units are about informal support. Informal support are local initiatives, created by local people that can consist of a number of types of support. In the theoretical framework, different challenges for and constraints of informal support were debated. The constraints and challenges that were
mentioned in the interviews were financial insecurity and insufficient capacity (Stewart & Dollbaum, 2017); delivering housing or health care services; expanding work and training opportunities (Healey, 2015:12); and equal treatment (Dagher, 2017). I categorized the types of CSO support and the various constraints and challenges as mentioned in the theoretical framework under informal support. In 46.7 percent of the data units people had negative expectations of informal support, while 26.7 percent of the data units was positive about it. The main reason why IDPs had negative expectations from informal support of CSOs was that people thought they would get CSO support but did not receive it. People expressed their dissatisfaction with this. This was substantiated by the negative experience of CSO employees about IDPs expectations of the support they gave. One CSO employee mentioned that IDPs expected support from their organizations, but at the same time experienced IDPs were hostile towards them. Another CSO employee summarized it as follows:

“I think the ones that we are aware of are that they feel like they have a sense of entitlement and a sense of feeling like we own them. So I don’t know if it’s fear to leave or they just don’t want to leave. It’s a pretty comfortable place for living. They don’t have to do a whole lot. They don’t have to worry about some of the things they would need to worry about if they were living on their own. They can try to refuse to pay for certain things if they don’t want to. And so this organization has sort of having some difficulties trying to push the people into independence. So they feel this sense of entitlement and kind of like you owe me and so therefore we are just going to stay. And you can’t do anything about it.” – Logos worker, 2018

Four respondents share their positive expectations of informal support by CSOs and all mentioned that they were thankful for all the support they received. IDPs heard about the possibility of receiving support from CSOs and when they contacted the organizations they did receive the support, which contributed to positive expectations of informal support by CSOs.

Expectations of networking and lobbying was only mentioned briefly by one respondent, but this concept became more concrete within the next sub-theme of role of CSO support, discussed in the next section.

5.3.2 Role of CSOs in helping IDPs

To research the role of CSO support and people’s experiences with this, I derived the following theoretical concepts from the literature that were mentioned as indicators for civil society: informal support from CSOs; networking and lobbying by CSOs. In the data obtained by the interviews, there were 92 data units from all 22 respondents that gave information about how the role of CSOs is perceived by IDPs and CSOs. Table 12 presents an overview of the personal experiences expressed in the interviews and how the expectations and role of CSOs are perceived by IDPs and CSOs.

Table 12: Overview of personal experiences with the role of CSOs in helping IDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(In)formal support from CSOs</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking and lobbying by CSOs</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Private data sheet, 2018
When talking about people’s experiences with the role of CSO support, people mentioned the role of informal support from CSOs in 82.6 percent of the data units. In 50 percent of the data units people gave information about the informal support from CSOs. The main points that were discussed were the motivation of CSOs to support people, how CSOs provide support to IDPs that they do not receive from government organizations and what kind of support IDPs were receiving.

For three IDPs, negative experiences with informal support from CSOs were mainly of a discriminatory nature, because people mentioned unequal treatment by people that supported them and were therefore denied support. For three CSO employees, negative experiences with informal support were about their doubts whether they should continue their support to certain people, because they thought people were making use of them and not doing their best to become self-reliant. The declining funds for IDP projects also played a role for CSOs in whether or not they were able to afford giving support at the same level as they have done since 2014. There have been initiatives to give more responsibility to IDPs, but this was not well-received by all CSOs.

Positive perceptions on informal support from CSOs (26.1 percent) were mentioned by eleven respondents and all were about how effective CSOs support had been for them. There was a difference in the data units from CSOs themselves and IDPs. A lot of positive experiences expressed by CSOs relate to a situation where they could provide IDPs with long-term assistance, while IDPs expressed positive experiences for all types of support they received, although these were mainly short-term solutions for their situation. 44 out of 92 data units refer to a positive experience with CSO support, because the people perceived the type of support as effective, even though it was not always long-term support.

Networking and lobbying by CSOs were mentioned in 17.4 percent of the data units by seven different respondents. In the theoretical framework, various authors named reasons for CSOs to network and lobby for their organizations: for distributing development (MacGinty & Richmond, 2013); out of necessity (MacGinty & Richmond, 2013; Healey, 2015:19; Rudcliffe, 2015). I categorized the social networks for distributing development and the necessity of social network and lobbying under networking and lobbying by CSOs. Among the seven respondents, there were four employees from CSOs. Although the focus in this research is on what is told in interviews by IDPs, CSOs can offer an interesting angle on the experiences of IDPs and could place different feelings and experiences in perspective. There were no negative experiences with networking and lobbying by CSOs. Five respondents shared neutral perceptions on this concept. CSOs used their social networks for fundraising and for reaching IDPs in order to distribute their support to them. The three IDP respondents experienced the last reason as positive:

“I don’t know for sure how it happened, but the coordinators who were looking after us were probably finding the organizations through the internet and calling them and then when those organizations came they give supplies to the coordinators. Then the coordinators distributed it to them and he didn’t ask where it came from.” – IDP man, 30 years old, 2018

CSOs were positive about their networking and lobbying, because it helped them in distributing their support among IDPs and it was also useful in receiving funds for their organizations and projects.

In this section, I focused on the experiences of IDPs and CSOs with the role of CSO support. What CSO initiatives did IDPs and CSOs mention in their interviews and to what extent were these initiatives successful according to them? And what do they regard as effective for a successful integration? From the
analysis it became clear that the division in the sub-themes of expectations people have from CSO support and the kind of support IDPs received from CSOs was helpful, because it showed that almost half of the data units regarding the expectations of informal support were negative. The main reason why IDPs had negative expectations from informal support of CSOs was when they thought they would get CSO support, but they did not receive it. However, at the same time IDPs were also grateful for the support they did receive. The subdivision was also helpful for addressing the role of networking and lobbying in CSO support, which was seen as positive, because it helped CSOs to distribute their support among IDPs and it was also useful in receiving funds for their organizations and projects. Interestingly, CSOs were struggling whether they should continue to support IDPs, because they experienced that IDPs got used to CSO support and did not prepare to become self-reliant. All IDPs expressed positive experiences with CSO support, whether it was with informal support or the social network of CSOs. In conclusion, all IDPs were positive about the initiatives from CSO in supporting them, even though it did not always meet their expectations. CSOs showed another perspective on this by stating they had doubts whether their support to IDPs had helped to integrate in Kiev. This means that the extent IDPs have perceived initiatives from CSOs as sufficient for the integration of IDPs, but CSOs have different expectations from the support they give to IDPs.

5.4 Overview
This chapter did not only analyse the perceptions of IDPs regarding government organizations and CSOs respectively, but also the perceptions of CSOs themselves. The perceptions of IDPs and CSOs on how to improve the socio-economic situation of IDPs differ. Based on the analysis, the assumption that CSOs only aim at short-term relief is not entirely correct. CSOs stepped in with humanitarian relief projects that provided IDPs with instant solutions to their problems related to housing and basic services. As time passed by, CSOs sensed they had to move on to durable, longer-term projects as well to prevent people getting aid-dependent. However, to a greater or smaller extent, CSOs have difficulties with the question of how much longer they need to continue their support.

IDPs’ perspectives on long-term support mainly means having one’s own house, because they perceive having an own property a prerequisite to become independent. Most IDPs see it is impossible to get their own house based on the resources they have and therefore they hope for a change in policy for IDPs, so as to help them with the housing issue. However, people that had recently been living without any CSO support, said it was difficult, albeit possible and they did not need financial assistance for the long term, just well-paying jobs.

CSOs provide security for IDPs that have become marginalized by the conflict. Those with money are already secured of access to housing, basic services and an autonomous life. IDPs’ perception on the security that is provided by the government is that it lacks support. People look for CSOs for support and try to become self-reliant by having one or more jobs, but this is often not enough to cover their living expenses. The financial issues are affecting people’s access to housing, education and medical services. Most IDPs see fewer possibilities for an autonomous life than CSOs.

The overall situation of IDPs is regarded as positive by the UNDP. CSOs have different perceptions on the situation of IDPs; on the one hand they find that IDPs are able to become independent easily if they are really motivated, on the other they acknowledge that not all IDPs are able to get a job easily, because of prejudices, age considerations or personal reasons. IDPs experience their living situation as difficult and experience they have little choice in job and housing possibilities. Indicators for the quality of life that were
discussed in interviews are possibilities to improve the living situation, health, security, respect, personality, harmony with nature, and friendship. IDPs experience they have little choice as far as job and housing possibilities are concerned, because they have to take every opportunity to improve their situation. Children and students found it most difficult to adjust to their new environment, and they often brought up emotional motives for their living situation.

CSOs had positive perceptions of the government as well as negative. On the one hand, organizations perceived the financial support as an important supplement for IDPs and a privilege that poor non-IDPs do not have. But on the other hand, organizations are negative about the lack of government support to the projects of CSOs, because they expect the government to contribute to local projects and they have the feeling that the government neglects that task. Most IDPs are negative about the way in which government treated them, although the allowance for their IDP status was perceived as very useful. Many IDPs appear to have had different expectations from government support in relation to what they eventually received. IDPs are looking for high quality service at lower costs, because they want to improve their socio-economic situation.

Both CSOs as IDPs see the role of CSOs in the improvement of the socio-economic situation as crucial. CSOs experience that the government is not helping sufficiently and that local organizations are achieving more for IDPs than the government is doing. Both CSOs and IDPs experienced that access to CSOs were easier, compared to government institutions, and CSOs were offering more customized support to IDPs.
6. Conclusion and discussion

6.1 Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to analyse to what extent civil society organizations (CSOs) can improve the socio-economic situation of IDPs from Eastern Ukraine. I also focused on the difficulties CSOs encounter in assisting IDPs. I have examined as well what support government organizations provided and cooperation between CSOs and government authorities. Special attention was paid to the personal experiences of IDPs with humanitarian assistance they received from CSOs.

The research question was:

“To what extent do civil society organizations in Ukraine contribute to the improvement of the socio-economic situation of IDPs coming to their cities?”

This research question involves three answers: how is the living situation experienced by IDPs themselves; what role do CSOs and the government have in improving the living situation of IDPs and socio-economic development; and how do IDPs experience the (peacebuilding) initiatives of both actors.

IDPs are concerned about their security regarding housing, basic services but mainly, and in general, self-reliance. All respondents have had a relatively good life in their hometown in Eastern Ukraine before the war started. They had their own house, job and cars; their family lived close by, so it was not difficult for a woman to have a job. Their lives were not very different from people I met in Kiev. The average Ukrainian citizen can be self-reliant, have a job and own a house, although there is little room left for other major expenses. The war came very sudden, and citizens and the government alike were surprised by the eruption of violence and destruction in Eastern Ukraine.

For IDPs, two main problems arose. First, they had to leave their houses and possessions behind. People arrived in Kiev with only the money in their bank account and had to rebuild their life almost from scratch. Second, national policies and legislation were not adjusted to people who had lost everything; insurances are not very common in Ukraine. IDPs did not receive compensation for their houses that had been damaged, destroyed or were not accessible. The existing legislation did not include lenient regulations, for instance for mortgages to enable IDPs getting their own house.

Main problems IDPs experience are housing, lack of employment opportunities and health care services. House rents are said to be too high for IDPs, because their salaries cannot cover the rent and other expenses for basic living conditions. Reasons for problems with employment among IDPs are job shortages, low salaries, poor working conditions and age discrimination. In particular single mothers and pensioners are vulnerable groups in this respect, because of the social and economic problems they face. Single mothers experience difficulties with the combination of job and childcare, while pensioners experience problems with their health and low pension allowance. Another group that is vulnerable are people dealing with health issues, because this puts an additional constraint on their living expenses. Support for these specific groups is therefore extra relevant. As mentioned, integration of IDPs who are relatively wealthy is obviously easier thanks to their financial reserves. Another group of IDPs for whom it is easier to integrate in society are those people that were able to find a well-paid job right from the beginning.
The government is expected to play an important role in providing shelter and integration of IDPs by the IDPs themselves, because they see it as a state responsibility to offer a solution for their situation. However, people have varying opinions on whether or not the government provides sufficient help to IDPs. Young people are more positive about the financial support they receive from the government. They perceive fewer difficulties for their future; they are positive about their job opportunities and living expenses for basic needs. However, in general people are less positive about the support from the government concerning issues as housing, jobs or health. IDPs as well as persons attached to CSOs come up with various reasons why the government is not providing sufficient support. The poor economic situation in the country is perceived as playing a role in this respect, since the government simply does not have all the necessary means to compensate for the situation of IDPs. Another reason mentioned is the fragile state of the government, given the widespread corruption, the inexperience of dealing with IDPs, and also an unwillingness to help IDPs. This alleged unwillingness to help IDPs is subjective, however, and might actually be influenced by the present frustrations about a lack of humanitarian assistance, experienced by both IDPs and CSOs.

Employees of CSOs were able to describe in very clear terms what kind of support they expect from the government; more financial support for CSOs and more commitment to the integration of IDPs. CSOs observe that IDPs are still in a difficult position and need support regarding housing accommodations and job opportunities. They want the government to offer more support to IDPs so they can become self-reliant, especially since CSOs have had problems with IDPs that were not self-reliant, even after four years. This makes CSO support to IDPs a long-term commitment. However, CSOs have less financial means than (inter)national institutions to provide such long-term assistance; their main sponsors are individuals that do only donate small amounts of money.

The overall aim of this research project was to analyse the relevance of CSOs in peacebuilding processes. It has become clear that both CSOs and IDPs perceive the role of CSOs as crucial for the living situation of IDPs, because people can ask for more customized support to their needs. This is very important, since the main problems CSOs help with are housing, access to health care services, and sometimes providing employment opportunities. IDPs consider the financial support from the government as necessary, even something they are entitled to, given their position. It is certainly something they cannot miss. In discussing the IDPs’ experiences with CSO support, IDPs state they cannot do without this support; they also show more gratitude for this kind of support, since it is not considered as support they are entitled to. The other way around, however, the sheer fact that they are not entitled to this support, makes it insecure in the eyes of IDPs. IDPs acknowledge that CSO support is not for the long term but they do not know how to do without it.

For certain groups of IDPs that are still receiving necessary help from CSOs, it can be argued that their integration has not been very successful so far. Integration means that people are self-reliant and experience the quality of their life as positive. In every society, single mothers, elderly and sick people without an adequate social network are vulnerable, but more so in Ukraine that does not provide sufficient care for these categories of people. Therefore, long-term assistance specifically for these people is necessary. For the people that do not belong to one of these groups, it can be said that CSOs and government institutions alike have not provided the support that is necessary to help these people properly integrate in society. Of course, CSOs and their employees and volunteers want to help people, because they have the intention to do good and to improve their own and others’ situation, but that does not mean they have all the necessary means to provide humanitarian assistance or to offer the support
that can help IDPs to reintegrate. During the field research it became clear that a large part of those IDPs that previously had received CSO support were self-reliant by now, but also that another – large – part still faces difficulties with their socio-economic situation and are only partly self-reliant. It is unclear why a smaller part is still dependent on CSO support.

In summary, the answer to the main question is that according to IDPs civil society organizations do indeed contribute substantially to the improvement of the socio-economic situation of IDPs, in particular compared to the role of government organizations, especially where this support is complementing the government support. Initially, both kinds of support were necessary, and for some IDPs the combination is still necessary, because it ensures people are able to receive their basic needs that are not taken care of through national legislation and organization. However, it is also clear that this support cannot last forever, because the justified expectation is that people eventually will be self-reliant again.

6.2 Discussion

This research contributes to the literature on the role of civil society organizations through the field research in Kiev. The interviews have given more insight in how the role of CSOs in improving the socio-economic situation has been experienced by both IDPs and CSOs themselves. However, I would like to reflect on the following aspects.

In my research, I describe the socio-economic situation of IDPs based on literature research and field research. I determined that the social dimension of one’s situation also involves human security and that concept includes notions of autonomy, vulnerability, marginalization and poverty. The economic dimension mainly covers people’s purchasing opportunities and whether or not they have jobs. These various notions all lie close together, and I do not consider that problematic, because I wanted to pay special attention to the personal experiences of IDPs; people can perceive their socio-economic situation very differently, even when it is comparable. This was not a problem, because it shows what people found important for their living situation and what not. I have tried to put that into perspective, by putting opinions next to each other.

This brings me to the next element. This research has paid special attention to people’s experiences, which not necessarily means it cannot give a valid conclusion on the role of CSOs in the situation of IDPs. I have also taken the relevant literature into account and have interviewed a UNDP representative, which both give a more objective perspective on the presence of CSOs in Kiev and Ukraine. I do realize, however, that the selection of respondents does not represent the general opinion of all IDPs in Ukraine. The selection of participants was narrowed down to those people that still receive support from organizations and therefore it can give a more negative view on the socio-economic situation of IDPs than is justified. This research did not focus on experiences of IDPs that have by now successfully integrated in Kiev; therefore, in further research, it would be useful to examine the factors that helped other IDPs to integrate successfully.

I would also like to reflect on my own position as a researcher and the influence it had in the field research. Firstly, I do not speak the language and therefore I needed a translator. My translator was very helpful and experienced in translating, which contributed to smooth interviews with my respondents. However, as a consequence of this process of translation answers were second-hand and sometimes the answers of various respondents were translated in a very similar way. I have tried to solve that by directly asking short follow-up questions to specify the answers and so reduce the influence of second-hand information on my
research results. Secondly, the key figure I found to introduce me to IDPs and other CSOs, was also working for a CSO and we talked a lot about the situation. This gave me advance information about the role of CSOs and government organizations in Kiev that could have biased my view on CSOs. However, I had done literature research on the role of CSOs and the situation of IDPs before starting the field research and therefore I could place the conversations in perspective and in the context of my research.

6.3 Recommendations and further research
This research has shown that IDPs experience the role of CSOs in improving their living situation as crucial. IDPs and CSOs address the need to become self-reliant as a condition to successfully integrate in society. What comes forward is that IDPs were first considered a vulnerable group, but after so many years the attention to this group has declined. Nowadays, for IDPs that do not belong to a certain vulnerable group there is no special programme to help them integrate and become more self-reliant. My recommendation would be that more should be invested in programmes to coach people and offer courses to achieve successful integration, because IDPs still undergo the negative consequences of losing their capital. Without customized help, this might take many years to overcome. These programmes could be implemented both by CSOs as the government and ideally in cooperation with each other, it would be more efficient if these two actors would work together more.

Further research in the constraints in closer cooperation between CSOs and government institutions in Ukraine would be useful, because CSO workers addressed the difficulties they experience to find support and cooperation with government institutions. More detailed information about where these difficulties come from would help to achieve closer and efficient cooperation, because it helps to see where there are elements in CSO-government relations to improve and how to solve strained relations between both actors and improve communication in this way.
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Appendix


Introduction

Thank you for participating in this interview. I want to talk with you about the contribution of civil society organizations in Ukraine to the improvement of the socioeconomic situation of IDPs.

1. Can you tell me in short who you are, where you come from and what is your background?

Personal experiences with humanitarian aid

Let’s now talk about your own experiences with humanitarian aid. To start with how you are doing now:

2. Could you tell me how your situation was when you first got in Kiev? Did you know people here, did you have some sort of plan in your mind when you went to this city?

3. Can you explain how you got in to touch with this organization and what kind of support are you getting here?

4. What initiatives are government organizations offering to help you out, is there any legislation regarding to allowances, education, health care, housing, etc. that you can make use of?
   • And to what extent are government’s initiatives successful according to you?

5. Did or are you still you receiving more kinds of support through other organizations, family or individuals?
   • What kind of support do you consider as most helpful and effective? And why do you think that is?

Integration in new place of residence

6. What kind of constraints do and did you experience when you had to move to Kiev? (enrolment in education, housing, job employment and access to social services.)
   • How was it for you to look for housing, get your children enrolled in schools, jobwise and also for you access to social services.
   • Are you entitled for allowances and do you receive them here in Kiev from the government?

7. If you look to your future, do you feel like you are able to get your old life back only then in Kiev?

8. The main aspects of reintegration are employment and livelihood. Do you consider integration in Kiev as a challenge and why?

9. What short term measures are needed to help you in fulfilling this community life? And what would do you think you need for the long run?

Socioeconomic situation

10. To what extent did your situation improved in this centre? What achievement did you make?

Everyday life in Kiev

11. If you look to the current social and economic problems in cities in Ukraine like poverty, job unemployment, corruption, would you say your situation is comparable with those of ‘native’ citizens of Kiev, do you feel like you have the same chances as people that have lived here longer to build a good life for yourself?
Conclusion

As a concluding question:

12. How do you experience the role of civil society organizations, these are organizations like Logos, but also individuals that are setting up projects or churches that are helping people out. If you compare the role of these kind of organizations with government organizations respectively how did they help you out to improve your social and economic situation?

Introduction

Thank you for participating in this interview. I want to talk with you about the contribution of civil society organizations in Ukraine to the improvement of the socioeconomic situation of IDPs.

1. Can you tell me in short who you are, where do you come from and what is your background?

Personal experiences with humanitarian aid

Let’s now talk about your own experiences with humanitarian aid, specifically involving IDPs in Ukraine. To start with a general question:

2. What can CSOs mean in development aid, why do you think it is important that CSOs are contributing to the improvement of livelihoods of IDPs?

3. Could you tell me, people that fled Eastern Ukraine, they come to Kiev or another big city. How do they find their way to government support or other forms of humanitarian assistance?
   • Is there a specific target group you want to help? Why did you choose that group?
   • Where do you find funding for projects?

4. What initiatives are government organizations offering to help IDPs, is there any legislation regarding to allowances, education, health care, housing, etc. that IDPs can make use of?
   • And to what extent are government’s initiatives successful according to you?

5. What kind of support is your organization giving to IDPs in 2018?
   • Why did you decide to give them this kind of support?
   • How do you reach IDPs in need that come to a city?

6. When you look to what your organization is contributing to the improvement of livelihoods of IDPs, in what kind of fields are they helping IDPs out the most? And why do you think that is?

7. To what extent do you communicate with government institutions regarding to IDPs?
   • What does this communication look like or what do you think of closer cooperation with government institutions, is that something that is possible?
   • What constraints do you come across if you look to the help you want to give? And how do you solve them?

Integration in new place of residence

8. What kind of constraints do IDPs experience when they are displaced to other cities in Ukraine? (enrolment in education, housing, job employment and access to social services.)

9. An important aspect of reintegration of IDPs are employment and livelihood. Do you consider integration of IDPs in society as a challenge and why?

10. What short term measures are needed to help people integrate in the community life? And what long term measures?

Socioeconomic situation

11. To what extent did the situation of IDPs improved in your centre? What achievement did you make?

Everyday life in Kiev
12. If you look to the current social and economic problems in cities in Ukraine, would you say the situation of IDPs comparable with those of ‘native’ citizens of Kiev, do IDPs have the same chances as ‘native citizens to climb on the social ladder?

Conclusion

As a concluding question:

13. How do you experience the role of CSOs and government organizations respectively to improve the socioeconomic situation of IDPs?
Annex 3 – UNOCHA (2017), Participating organizations & funding requirements.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>REQUIREMENTS US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addresses of Mercy</td>
<td>532,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventist Development and Relief Agency</td>
<td>10,685,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development</td>
<td>1,736,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Ukrainian Charitable Foundation &quot;Right to Protection&quot;</td>
<td>1,810,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Ukrainian Network of PLWH</td>
<td>3,627,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund Deutschland e.V.</td>
<td>865,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arche Nova E.V. - Initiative for People in Need</td>
<td>3,338,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caritas Germany (DCV)</td>
<td>1,603,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Organization &quot;All-Ukrainian Charity Foundation &quot;Gorenie&quot;</td>
<td>582,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Organization Charitable Foundation &quot;Donbass Development Center&quot;</td>
<td>5,988,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Refugee Council</td>
<td>5,521,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe</td>
<td>1,675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donetsk Regional Organization Variant</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorcas Aid International</td>
<td>390,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondation Humanitaire Internationale AICM Ukraine</td>
<td>2,230,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondation Suisse pour le Démage</td>
<td>788,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
<td>5,022,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALO Trust</td>
<td>5,622,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HelpAge International UK</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Charitable Foundation &quot;Yellow-Blue Wings&quot;</td>
<td>690,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Medical Care</td>
<td>74,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International NGO Safety Organisation</td>
<td>836,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
<td>16,198,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Women's Rights Center “La Strada-Ukraine”</td>
<td>420,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malteser International</td>
<td>580,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Médecins du Monde</td>
<td>1,890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO &quot;Country of Free People&quot;</td>
<td>761,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Open Policy Foundation</td>
<td>349,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Proliska</td>
<td>1,106,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council</td>
<td>4,722,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
<td>3,305,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
<td>1,662,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in Need</td>
<td>11,442,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Humanitarian Action</td>
<td>1,174,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Première Urgence Internationale</td>
<td>6,365,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td>16,847,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Save Ukraine” Help Center</td>
<td>430,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Federation of Greek Societies of Ukraine</td>
<td>53,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Path of Goodness</td>
<td>2,588,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Génération Humanitaire</td>
<td>4,805,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine NGO Forum</td>
<td>285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
<td>23,599,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>1,420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
<td>24,240,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
<td>4,892,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Men’s Christian Association</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>