doi : 10.15407/dse2016.02.208
UDK 314.7.045:365.244(477)
GEL Classification: O15; R31

TETYANA HNATYUK
PhD (Political Science), Researcher
Ptoukha Institute for Demography and Social Studies
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
01032, Ukraine, Kyiv-32, Taras Shevchenko Blvrd., 60
E-mail: tetyana_hnatyuk@bigmir.net

ACCESS OF INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS TO ACCOMMODATION (ACCORDING TO THE RESULTS OF RESEARCH CONDUCTED IN NINE REGIONS OF UKRAINE)

The article describes living conditions of the most vulnerable categories of the internally displaced persons (the elderly (over 60) and families with children) in 9 regions of Ukraine that are "the second circle" of settlement of the internally displaced persons: Vinnytsa, Zhytomyr, Mykolaiv, Odesa, Poltava, Sumy, Kherson, Cherkasy and Chernihiv regions. The study was conducted on the basis of a survey of the internally displaced persons and the local population. Monitoring of prices in real estate markets of 9 regional centers was conducted as well as semi-structured interviews with experts of these real estate markets. The author pays attention to the following aspects: types of accommodation where the internally displaced persons stay; share of income spent by the internally displaced persons on housing; plans of the internally displaced persons for moving to other regions; difficulties and cases of discrimination faced by the internally displaced persons while finding accommodation; attitude of the local population toward the internally displaced persons. It has been established that the share of IDPs to the average number of standard residential population of the region within 2 % will not affect regional real estate markets. The need for permanent housing for the internally displaced persons has been confirmed. That can be achieved by providing social accommodation and targeted payments for rent.

Key words: *internally displaced persons, real estate market, region, Ukraine.*

Т.О. Гнатюк
канд. політ. наук, наук. співроб.
Інститут демографії та соціальних досліджень ім. М.В. Птухи НАН України
01032, Україна, Київ-32, бульвар Т. Шевченка, 60
E-mail: tetyana_hnatyuk@bigmir.net

ДОСТУП ВНУТРІШНЬО ПЕРЕМІЩЕНИХ ОСІБ ДО ЖИТЛА
(ЗА РЕЗУЛЬТАТАМИ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ У ДЕВ'ЯТИ ОБЛАСТЯХ УКРАЇНИ)

Розглянуто житлові умови найбільш уразливих категорій внутрішньо переміщених осіб (особи старше 60-ти років і сім'ї з дітьми) у дев'яти областях України «другого кола» розселення переселенців: у Вінницькій, Житомирській, Миколаївській, Одеській, Полтавській, Сумській, Херсонській, Черкаській та Чернігівській областях. Дослідження виконано на основі опитування внутрішньо переміщених осіб і місцевого населення. Здійснено моніторинг цін у дев'яти обласних містах. Проведено напівструктуровані

інтерв'ю з експертами ринку нерухомості зазначених областей. Увагу приділено таким аспектам: тип приміщення, у якому проживають внутрішньо переміщені особи; визначення частки доходів, яку витрачають переселенці на житло; плани внутрішньо переміщених осіб на переїзд; труднощі і випадки дискримінації, з якими стикалися внутрішньо переміщені особи під час пошуку житла; ставлення місцевого населення до внутрішньо переміщених осіб. З'ясовано, що частка внутрішньо переміщених осіб від чисельності постійного населення області у межах до 2 % не впливає на ринок житла в області. Підтверджено потребу внутрішньо переміщених осіб у постійному житлі, яка може бути задовільнена шляхом надання соціального житла і цільових виплат на оренду.

Ключові слова: *внутрішньо переміщені особи, ринок нерухомості, область, Україна.*

Т.О. Гнатюк
канд. полит. наук, научн. сотрудн.
Институт демографии и социальных исследований
им. М.В. Птухи НАН Украины
01032, Украина, Киев-32, бульвар Т. Шевченко, 60
E-mail: tetyana_hnatyuk@bigmir.net

ДОСТУП К ЖИЛЬЮ ЛИЦ, ПЕРЕМЕЩЕННЫХ ВНУТРИ СТРАНЫ (ПО РЕЗУЛЬТАТАМ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ В ДЕВЯТИ ОБЛАСТЯХ УКРАИНЫ)

Рассмотрены жилищные условия наиболее уязвимых категорий лиц, перемещенных внутри страны (лица старше 60-ти лет и семьи с детьми) в девяти областях Украины «второго круга» расселения переселенцев: в Винницкой, Житомирской, Николаевской, Одесской, Полтавской, Сумской, Херсонской, Черкасской и Черниговской областях. Исследование выполнено на основе опроса лиц, перемещенных внутри страны, и местного населения. Проведен мониторинг цен на рынке жилья в девяти областных центрах, а также полуструктурированные интервью с экспертами рынка жилья данных областей. Внимание уделено таким аспектам: тип помещения, в котором проживают лица, перемещенные внутри страны; определение доли доходов, которая тратится лицами, перемещенными внутри страны, на жилье; планам лиц, перемещенных внутри страны, на переезд; трудностям и случаям дискриминации, с которыми сталкивались лица, перемещенные внутри страны, при поиске жилья; отношению местного населения к лицам, перемещенным внутри страны. Определено, что доля лиц, перемещенных внутри страны, от численности постоянного населения области до 2 % не влияет на рынок жилья в области. Подтверждено, что лица, перемещенные внутри страны, нуждаются в постоянном жилье. Эта потребность может быть удовлетворена путем предоставления социального жилья и целевых выплат на аренду.

Ключевые слова: *лица, перемещенные внутри страны, рынок недвижимости, область, Украина.*

Introduction. Since the beginning of mass movement of citizens of Ukraine as a result of the annexation of the Crimea and the beginning of the antiterrorist operation in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions, housing remains a major unresolved issue for the internally displaced persons (IDPs), along with employment. Although the problem of emergency resettlement of IDPs is not as acute as it was at the beginning of the mass relocation of people, the protracted character of the conflict and the lack of possibility to return to settlements of previous residence due to various reasons make the Ukrainian society face the question of providing long-term housing for the IDPs. At the same time, developing proposals requires having a clear idea of how the housing problem is solved by the IDPs in the current circumstances.

Study of recent publications. The monitoring of the situation of internal displacement in Ukraine and descriptions of the conditions in which the IDPs live are mostly contained in the reports of international organizations. Thus, the report of the Regional Delegation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) for October 2014 described the general situation with the placement of the displaced persons [1, p. 7]. In 2015 UNHCR conducted a joint assessment of the needs of IDPs in Kyiv and in Kyiv region, which revealed

the major problems as mentioned by respondents: lack of permanent housing, location of places of compact residence in remote areas, landlords biased against migrants [2, p. 3]. In April 2015 UNHCR conducted a needs analysis of IDPs in Luhansk region. Among the key findings were: absence of a comprehensive policy to accommodate IDPs at the national, regional and local levels, lack of places for collective accommodation, high prices for rent, residing in damaged or unsuitable premises [3, p. 18]. In March 2016 the International Organization for Migration and the Ukrainian Centre for Social Reforms held the first round of the National Monitoring of the Situation with Internally Displaced Persons in all regions of Ukraine [4]. Thus, these items of research either describe the situation with housing for IDPs in general or focus on specific territories that have their own characteristics (high concentration of IDPs, proximity to military operations, etc.).

Among the IDPs there are particularly vulnerable groups. Thus, 49.3 % of IDPs are disabled and elderly, and 16.5 % are children [5]. In addition, resettlement of IDPs is uneven per regions of Ukraine. This is affecting the state of local housing markets. Consequently, there is a need for research that would cover the housing issue in respect of the most vulnerable IDPs and take into account the peculiarities of their settlement.

The aim of the article is to determine the living conditions of such groups of IDPs as the elderly (over 60) and families with children in the 9 regions of the «second circle» of IDPs' resettlement: Vinnytsia, Zhytomyr, Mykolaiv, Odesa, Poltava, Sumy, Kherson, Cherkasy and Chernihiv.

To achieve this goal the author used the database of the assessment of local markets in Vinnytsa, Cherkasy, Zhytomyr, Poltava, Sumy, Chernihiv, Odesa, Mykolaiv, Kherson regions within IOM humanitarian programme in Ukraine «Humanitarian Assistance to IDPs in Ukraine using Cash Transfers» which was held in December 2015. IOM provided monetary assistance to the most vulnerable groups of IDPs – «people aged 75 years and older, families with three or more children, and people with the first and second group of disability» [6].

Unfortunately, the parameters of the general population are not known. The sample size was 1,350 persons. Selection criteria for respondents were the following: age over 18 years; the IDPs registered in the above regions and residents of the same; of each target group women had to constitute 50 %. As a result, 906 respondents from the category of internally displaced persons (at least 100 people in each region) and 458 representatives of local population (at least 50 people in each region) were polled by telephone interview. The group of the interviewed IDPs has the following characteristics: 51.1 % of respondents are older than 60; 25.8 % are women of working age; respondents with children under 18 years accounted for 37.4 % of respondents. Thus, the sample characteristics of IDPs are comparable with the data of IDPs registered in Ukraine, which are provided by the State Emergency Service of Ukraine [5]. Besides, 37 semi-structured interviews were held with experts in the housing market (at least 4 people in each area): directors or deputy directors of estate agents in the studied areas. Prices in the housing markets of 9 towns of regional importance have been recorded. The author has also used the methods of analysis, synthesis and comparison.

The 9 regions selected for this study (Vinnytsia, Zhytomyr, Mykolaiv, Odesa, Poltava, Sumy, Kherson, Cherkasy, Chernihiv) belong to the «second circle» of settlement of IDPs and the share of IDPs registered in them is no more than 15 % of the total number of IDPs. Besides, the share of the registered IDPs among the average standard residential population of the 9 regions under study is in the range of 0.6% to 2 % (Table 1).

Table 1. **Share of the IDPs among the average number of standard residential population in the region where they are registered**

Region	Average number of standard residential population in 2015 (thousand)*	Number of the hosted IDPs (as of 07.12.2015), (thousand)**	Share of the IDPs among the average number of standard residential population in the region (%)
Vinnytsa	1599,3	12,3	0.8
Zhytomyr	1252,5	7,1	0.6
Mykolaiv	1160,6	8,7	0.7
Odesa	2382,3	34,9	1.5
Poltava	1436,1	28,9	2.0
Sumy	1116,2	16,7	1.5
Kherson	1063,7	11,1	1.0
Cherkasy	1243,8	13,4	1.1
Chernihiv	1041,8	12,6	1.2

Notes: * [7]; ** [5].
Source: Author's calculations.

Basic results of the research. The survey revealed the following features of the living conditions of IDPs. Approximately one third of IDPs rent an apartment or a house (35.1 %), another third live with an acquaintance (33.5 %). A small percentage of IDPs live in their own apartments or homes (3.2 %). The latter number lies within the statistical error (Table 2).

Real estate experts have confirmed these results. Thus, 85.2 % of the experts reported that IDPs turn to them in search of housing for rent, and only 14.8 % said that IDPs approached with a view to buying a residence (experts in Chernihiv and Kherson regions). However, the share of IDPs among the total clients of the surveyed real estate agencies depends on the region: 30% in Poltava region; 10–15 % in Kherson, Chernihiv, Vinnytsa and Zhytomyr regions. Besides, 42.8 % of the experts who answered this question indicated that IDPs made up 3% of their clients.

These results are explained by the fact that the vast majority of IDPs in Ukraine come from Donbass and their resettlement was not planned, and therefore they had not managed to sell their own homes in the zone of hostilities and thus did not have the means to purchase their own residences in the areas of new settlement.

The significant share of IDPs living with acquaintance shows that their circles of relatives were in the places of former residence. Prior to the beginning of military operations Donetsk and Luhansk regions were important industrial centers of Ukraine, whereas the nature of family settlement is usually characterized by density.

According to the survey, almost half of IDPs over 60 live with acquaintance (46.0 %). That is, this category of IDPs cannot afford to rent housing due to poor financial situation of the elderly in Ukraine.

On the basis of the results in Table 2, about half of IDPs bear housing costs (payments for rent and utilities payments). At the same time almost three quarters of IDPs reported the share of their incomes spent on housing. In general, in the 9 areas almost 60 % IDPs spend 20 % of their income on housing. In terms of regions the situation is consistent notwithstanding

Table 2. **Types of accommodation where the IDPs stay (%)**

Type of accommodation	%
Rented apartment/ house	35.1
Rented apartment/ house together with another family	3.8
Rented room	9.3
Rented room with other people	0.6
Rented place in a hostel	2.4
Own apartment or house	3.2
Live with relatives	6.5
Live with acquaintance	33.5
Non-residential premises	5.5
Other	0.1

Source: Author's calculations based on the IDPs and the local population survey, December 2015.

the minor regional differences. Thus, almost 80 % of IDPs in Zhytomyr region spend 20 % of their income on housing; about 60 % of IDPs in Poltava, Sumy, Kherson and Chernihiv regions have the same rate of spending on housing. At the same time, every tenth respondent in Odesa and Poltava regions spends 40 % of income on housing (Table 3). Therefore, we can assume that the IDPs living with acquaintance also have housing costs (for example, utilities payments).

Among the local populations almost half of respondents said they spend up to 20 % of income on housing. But it is not possible to compare the results of the two target groups, since the structure of the local population significantly differs from that of IDPs. Respondents from among the local population were by three-quarters made up of people of working age and mostly lived in their own apartments or houses (87.1 %).

Table 3. **Share of income that the internally displaced persons spend on housing (payments for rent and utilities payments), (%)**

Region	5 % of income	10 % of income	20 % of income	30 % of income	40 % of income
Vinnytsa		27.5	15.0	17.5	6.3
Zhytomyr		43.2	36.5	12.2	5.4
Mykolaiv	19.2	16.7	7.7	23.1	7.7
Odesa		6.2	14.8	14.8	13.6
Poltava		40.6	18.8	17.2	12.5
Sumy		38.8	20.0	10.0	8.8
Kherson		40.3	20.8	6.5	6.5
Cherkasy		29.9	20.7	19.5	5.7
Chernihiv		40.5	20.6	15.5	7.5

Source: Author's calculations based on the IDPs and the local population survey, December 2015.

Table 4. **Monitoring of property prices in regional centers of the 9 regions as of 25–30 November 2015, UAH**

Kinds of property	Sumy	Odesa	Vinnytsa	Mykolaiv	Cherkasy	Zhytomyr	Chernihiv	Poltava	Kherson
Minimum price per 1 sq. m. in **newly built residential real estate market for purchasing 1-room flat**	7000	12179	9000	12213	10000	7500	9000	8100	10000
Minimum price per 1 sq. m. in **secondary residential real estate market for purchasing 1-room flat**	9000	13857	11430	10051	7000	11104	10000	11666	15000
Minimum price per **renting 1-room flat**	1200	1500	1500	1400	1500	1200 + utilities	1200	2000 + utilities	1600
Minimum price per **renting 2-rooms flat**	1600	2000	2500	2100	2000	1700 + utilities	1300	2300 + utilities	2500
Minimum price per **renting 3-rooms flat**	2000	2500	3000	2600	2500	2200 + utilities	1500	3000 + utilities	3000
Minimum price per **renting a room in a flat**	650	600	1000	600	1000	800	1000	700-1200	1000
Minimum price per **renting a bed in a flat**	450	500	700	500	450	500	450	700	700
Minimum price per 1 sq. m. in **newly built resi-dential real estate market for purchasing a house**	17000	17300	12000	16500	9000	11965	5000	6250	10000
Minimum price per 1 sq. m. in **secondary resi-dential real estate market for purchasing a house**	14000	9583	11460	15066	5000	8506	12000	16666	6000
Minimum price per **renting a house**	1000	2500	1400	680	2000	1000 + utilities	1000	1000	3500
Minimum price per **renting a room in a house**	600	1000	600	550	400	750	400	500 + utilities	1500
Minimum price per **renting a bed in a hostel**	350	500	250	250	300	100	300	400-500 + utilities	500

Source: The IDPs and the local population survey, December 2015.

The study also included a monitoring of real estate prices in regional centers of the 9 regions. The monitoring was conducted on 25–30 November 2015 (Table 4). The results of the analysis indicate that Poltava leads with the highest minimum prices for 6 positions of 12, which also include the most popular positions: renting a one-room apartment (studio) and renting a room. Kherson follows with 5 positions of 12. The lowest minimum prices have been registered in Chernihiv (5 positions of 12).

Of all the studied regions Poltava region has the highest proportion of IDPs among the average standard residential population of the region – 2 %. (Table 1). The experts interviewed in Poltava region reported that IDPs breathed new life into the rental market and raised prices. Recently a stabilization of prices has been registered. The experts explain this by the decrease of the inflow of IDPs. Thus, the data on property prices in Poltava, the expert opinions and the share of income spent by the IDPs in Poltava region confirm that the real estate prices in the region soared due to the significant influx of settlers.

The survey of the IDPs showed that only 10% of respondents in this group moved to less comfortable accommodation due to the difficult financial situation. Although such cases have occurred in all regions surveyed, the highest numbers were recorded in Mykolaiv (16.0 %), Poltava (11.0%) and Kherson (10.0 %) regions. Given the fact that according to the monitoring of prices Poltava and Kherson occupied the leading positions among the cities with the highest housing prices, one could assume that IDPs were often forced to change accommodation in these areas due to rising prices for renting properties.

According to the survey, most IDPs have not experienced difficulties or discrimination when looking for housing. Thus, almost 80 % of IDPs have not faced any difficulties in finding housing after relocation (Table 5). The majority of the surveyed IDPs do not consider that in comparison with the locals the housing search process (Table 6) or prices (Table 7) have been different for them. Since about half of the respondents (43.2 %) live with acquaintance, relatives or in their own dwellings, these results are quite reasonable. That means that the respondents went to a new place of settlement with knowledge where they would live and did not look for housing.

Table 5. **Answers of the IDPs to the question «Have you ever faced any difficulties in finding housing after relocation?», by regions (%)**

Region	No	Yes
Vinnytsa	73.1	26.9
Zhytomyr	83.0	17.0
Mykolaiv	52.0	48.0
Odesa	80.4	19.6
Poltava	82.0	18.0
Sumy	77.5	22.5
Kherson	83.0	17.0
Cherkasy	73.0	27.0
Chernihiv	98.0	2.0
Total in 9 regions	**77.9**	**22.1**

Source: Author's calculations based on the IDPs and the local population survey, December 2015.

Table 6. **Answers of the IDPs to the question «Is finding housing different for IDPs and for the local population?», by regions (%)**

Region	No difference	It is more difficult to find housing for IDPs than for the local population	It is easier to find housing for IDPs than for the local population
Vinnytsa	66.3%	15.4%	18.3%
Zhytomyr	76.0%	18.0%	6.0%
Mykolaiv	57.0%	43.0%	0.0%
Odesa	54.9%	43.1%	2.0%
Poltava	77.0%	21.0%	2.0%
Sumy	82.4%	10.8%	6.9%
Kherson	68.0%	32.0%	0.0%
Cherkasy	78.0%	22.0%	0.0%
Chernihiv	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total in 9 regions	**73.2%**	**22.8%**	**4.0%**

Source: Author's calculations based on the IDPs and the local population survey, December 2015.

Only respondents in Mykolaiv (48.0 %), Vinnytsa (26.9 %) and Cherkasy (27.0 %) regions reported on difficulties in finding housing. About a third of IDPs in southern regions believe that finding housing is more difficult for IDPs than for the local population: Odesa (43.1 %), Mykolaiv (43.0%) and Kherson (32.0 %) regions. Also, respondents from Mykolaiv (41.0 %), Vinnitsa (39.4%) and Odessa (32.4 %) regions believe that prices for migrants are higher than for the local population.

Table 7. **Answers of the IDPs to the question «Are prices for renting housing different for IDPs and for the local population?», by regions (%)**

Region	No difference	In general, prices are higher for IDPs than for the local population	In general, prices are lower for IDPs than for the local population
Vinnytsa	58.7	39.4	1.9
Zhytomyr	91.0	5.0	4.0
Mykolaiv	59.0	41.0	0.0
Odesa	54.9	32.4	12.7
Poltava	75.0	4.0	21.0
Sumy	79.4	15.7	4.9
Kherson	83.0	17.0	0.0
Cherkasy	82.0	18.0	0.0
Chernihiv	100.0	0.0	0.0
Total in 9 regions	**75.7**	**19.3**	**5.0**

Source: Author's calculations based on the IDPs and the local population survey, December 2015.

88.1 % of surveyed IDPs answered the question «Have you been denied in renting housing because of your status of internally displaced person?» Of these, only 7.0 % gave affirmative answer. At the same time in all regions except Chernihiv there were respondents who have suffered from such experience. Most of such cases were reported in Cherkasy (17.3 % of all respondents region), Mykolaiv (10.8 %) and Vinnytsa (10.7 %) regions.

The experience of prejudice in solving housing issues was reported by 14.0 % of IDPs. In terms of regions such cases have been reported by about a quarter of respondents from Odesa (27.5 %) and Vinnytsa (23.1 %) regions, and almost 20 % of respondents from Mykolaiv region.

Thus, the majority of respondents have not suffered discriminatory treatment, but some cases of discrimination have been registered, especially in the areas where the share of IDPs among the average standard residential population ranges from 1 % to 1.5 % (Table 1). The only exception is Mykolaiv region, where the share of IDPs among the average standard residential population of the region is only 0.7 %. However, these results can be explained by the fact that after the conflict military units have been relocated to the region. Their presence puts certain pressure on the housing market of the area.

Despite the unresolved issue of housing in the long term, 80 % of respondents from the group of IDPs are not going to move to another locality in the next 12 months. The persons who reported their intention to relocate amounted to only 7.4 %. Of these, the vast majority is going to return home or to their region. Thus, the need for permanent housing for vulnerable IDPs remains an important issue. Given the small number of IDPs in the areas of «second circle», the issue can be resolved through social housing, or targeted financial assistance for renting housing.

According to the local population, the resettlement of IDPs has not affected the housing market in their regions. Such observations are shared by the interviewed experts. The vast majority of local people do not believe that the settlement of IDPs has complicated their finding solutions to housing issues (Table 9), or has affected the growth of prices for renting housing in the regions (Table 8). At the same time 19.2 % of respondents said that IDPs contributed to the growth of prices for rented housing. This observation has been made by more than a quarter of respondents in Poltava, Sumy, Mykolaiv and Kherson regions.

Table 8. **Answers of the local population to the question «Has the settlement of IDPs affected the growth of prices for renting housing in the regions?», by regions (%)**

Region	No	Yes
Vinnytsa	79.6	20.4
Zhytomyr	98.1	1.9
Mykolaiv	71.4	28.6
Odesa	98.0	2.0
Poltava	62.0	38.0
Sumy	62.7	37.3
Kherson	75.0	25.0
Cherkasy	88.5	11.5
Chernihiv	90.4	9.6
Total in 9 regions	**80.8**	**19.2**

Source: Author's calculations based on the IDPs and the local population survey, December 2015.

Table 9. **Answers of the local population to the question «Has the settlement of IDPs complicated solving your housing issues (finding accommodation/renting) in your region?», by regions (%)**

Region	Very much	Somewhat	No
Vinnytsa	22.4	30.6	46.9
Zhytomyr	9.6	3.8	86.5
Mykolaiv	12.2	26.5	61.2
Odesa	0.0	11.8	88.2
Poltava	0.0	38.0	62.0
Sumy	29.4	39.2	31.4
Kherson	21.2	26.9	51.9
Cherkasy	5.8	42.3	51.9
Chernihiv	0.0	11.5	88.5
Total in 9 regions	11.1	25.5	63.3

Source: Author's calculations based on the IDPs and the local population survey, December 2015.

In addition, almost 40% of respondents from the local population believe that access to the solving housing issues has been complicated to a certain degree by the inflow of settlers. Especially respondents in Sumy (68.4 %) and Vinnitsa (53.1 %) regions indicated this.

At the same time, most locals believe that IDPs face difficulties with renting housing. It has been said by nearly 70 % of respondents. Solving the housing problem is considered fundamental for IDPs by 40 % of respondents. Moreover, most landlords treat IDPs neutrally or positively. This was reported respectively by 52.9 % of local respondents and 14.7 % of experts who answered the question. However, 29.4 % of experts mentioned that in general landlords had negative attitudes to IDPs, mainly in Mykolaiv, Poltava, Odesa and Chernihiv regions. Among the main causes of the negative attitude were: doubts about the solvency of migrants, distrust, negative behavior of the IDPs (failure to pay for housing, housing encroachment) and others. Thus, local population assesses the situation of IDPs' access to housing as more complex and critical than the IDPs themselves, which may be a result of the prevailing media image.

Conclusions. The survey results have proved once again the need to provide permanent housing for IDPs. Currently, the most vulnerable IDPs live either in rented premises or with acquaintances. At the same time, the vast majority of respondents intend to stay in new places. This issue can be solved by building social housing in the 9 regions studied.

Determining the share of IDPs in relation to the average number of standard residential population showed increased tension in the housing markets along with increase of the share of IDPs. The critical point of 2 % to the number of average standard residential population has been found (the case of Poltava region), which caused a rise in prices in the housing market and a rise in the number of cases of discrimination against IDPs. In the areas where the IDPs share ranges within 1 %–1.5 %, there has been recorded a slight increase in property prices and cases of minor discrimination against IDPs. Thus, the share of IDPs to the average number of standard residential population of the area within 2 % does not affect the housing market in the region. Therefore, this number of IDPs can be accommodated without causing substantial local market turmoil.

LITERATURE

1. Profiling and Needs Assessment of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). October 23, 2014 [Електронний ресурс] // UNHCR. The UN Refugee Agency. – Режим доступу: http://unhcr.org.ua/attachments/article/971/IDP.pdf.
2. Participatory Assessment Report. Kyiv and Kyiv Oblast, 2015 [Електронний ресурс] // UNHCR. The UN Refugee Agency (знято з екрану вересень 2015 р.). – Режим доступу: http://unhcr.org.ua.
3. Participatory Assessment Report. Luhansk Region, Ukraine, April 2015 [Електронний ресурс] // UNHCR. The UN Refugee Agency (знято з екрану вересень 2015 р.). – Режим доступу: http://unhcr.org.ua.
4. Національна система моніторингу ситуації з внутрішньо переміщеними особами. 1 раунд. Березень 2016 [Електронний ресурс] // Міжнародна організація з міграції: офіц. сайт (знято з екрану 14 квітня 2016 р.). – Режим доступу: http://www.iom.org.ua/sites/default/files/iom_nms_r1_ukr.pdf.
5. Про надання інформації щодо розміщення внутрішньо переміщених осіб: Лист Державної служби України з надзвичайних ситуацій № 02-18015/161 від 09.12.2015 р.
6. 16 тисяч уразливих вимушених переселенців отримують грошову допомогу від Євросоюзу, Німеччини і Норвегії [Електронний ресурс] // Міжнародна організація з міграції: офіц. сайт (знято з екрану 7 квітня 2016 р.). – Режим доступу: http://iom.org.ua/ua/16-tysyach-urazlyvyh-vymushenyh-pereselenciv-otrymayut-groshovu-dopomogu-vid-yevrosoyuzu-nimechchyny.
7. Чисельність населення (за оцінкою) на 1 січня 2016 року та середня чисельність у 2015 році [Електронний ресурс] // Державна служба статистики України: офіц. сайт (знято з екрану 15 березня 2016 р.). – Режим доступу: http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/.

REFERENCES

1. Profiling and Needs Assessment of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). UNHCR. The UN Refugee Agency. *unhcr.org.ua*. Retrieved from: http://unhcr.org.ua/attachments/article/971/IDP.pdf [in English].
2. Participatory Assessment Report. Kyiv and Kyiv Oblast. (2015) UNHCR. The UN Refugee Agency. *unhcr.org.ua*. Retrieved from: http://unhcr.org.ua [in English].
3. Participatory Assessment Report. Luhansk Region, Ukraine. (2015) UNHCR. The UN Refugee Agency. *unhcr.org.ua*. Retrieved from: http://unhcr.org.ua [in English].
4. Natsionalna systema monitorynhu sytuatsii z vnutrishno peremishchenymy osobamy. 1 raund. Berezen, 2016 [The national system of monitoring the situation of internally displaced persons. Round 1. March, 2016] (2016). International Organization for Migration. *iom.org.ua*. Retried from http://www.iom.org.ua/sites/default/files/iom_nms_r1_ukr.pdf [in Ukrainian].
5. Concerning information about settlement of the IDPs: Letter of the State Emergency Service of Ukraine № 02-18015/161. (2015) [in Ukrainian].
6. 16 tisyach vrazlivikh vimushenikh pereselentsiv otrimuyut' groshovu dopomogu vid Evrosoyuzu, Nimechchini i Norvegii [16,000 Vulnerable IDPs in Ukraine to Receive Cash Assistance from the EU, Germany and Norway]. International Organization for Migration. *iom.org.ua*. Retrieved from: http://iom.org.ua/ua/16-tysyach-urazlyvyh-vymushenyh-pereselenciv-otrymayut-groshovu-dopomogu-vid-yevrosoyuzu-nimechchyny [in Ukrainian].
7. Chyselnist naselennia (za otsinkoiu) na 1 sichnia 2016 roku ta serednia chyselnist u 2015 rotsi [Population (estimated) on January 1, 2016 and the average number in 2015]. (2016). State Statistic Service of Ukraine. *ukrstat.gov.ua*. Retried from http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/ [in Ukrainian].

Article received on 19.04.2016 journal.

Стаття надійшла до редакції журналу 19.04.2016.