

Supporting the Livelihoods of Internally Displaced Persons in Georgia

Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Authorized



A Review of Current Practices and Lessons Learned

May 2013

Social Development
EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA



THE WORLD BANK

Georgia

Standard Disclaimer:

This volume is a product of the staff of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the views of the Executive Directors of The World Bank or the governments they represent. The World Bank does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in this work do not imply any judgment on the part of The World Bank concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

Copyright Statement:

The material in this publication is copyrighted. Copying and/or transmitting portions or all of this work without permission may be a violation of applicable law. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank encourages dissemination of its work and will normally grant permission to reproduce portions of the work promptly.

For permission to photocopy or reprint any part of this work, please send a request with complete information to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, USA, telephone 978-750-8400, fax 978-750-4470, <http://www.copyright.com/>.

All other queries on rights and licenses, including subsidiary rights, should be addressed to the Office of the Publisher, The World Bank, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433, USA, fax 202-522-2422, e-mail pubrights@worldbank.org.

Supporting the Livelihoods of Internally Displaced Persons in Georgia

A Review of Current Practices and Lessons Learned



May 2013

Social Development
EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA



THE WORLD BANK

Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	5
Acknowledgements.....	7
Executive Summary	8
Part 1: Introduction	12
Methodology	13
Structure of the Report	13
Part 2: Context of Displacement	14
History of Conflict and Displacement	14
The Situation of IDPs: Housing	15
The Situation of IDPs: Livelihoods	16
Livelihoods Definition and Sustainable Livelihoods Theory.....	18
Current IDP Livelihood Support.....	19
Part 3: Challenges, Opportunities, and Recommendations for Sustainable Livelihoods of IDPs.....	22
Challenge One: Access to Land.....	22
Challenge Two: Access to Financial Services.....	25
Challenge Three: Social Capital.....	27
Challenge Four: Skills and Knowledge	29
Challenge Five: Psychosocial Issues and Aid Dependency	31
Challenge Six: Extremely Vulnerable IDPs	33
Part 4: Beyond Project-Based Livelihood Support	37
Annex 1. List of Main IDP Communities and Agricultural Resources	40
Annex 2. Guiding Principles for IDP Livelihoods Projects	42
Annex 3. List of Key Stakeholders in IDP Livelihood Support in Georgias	43
Annex 4. Bibliography	47
Annex 5. References.....	49

Acronyms

ACF	Action Contra La Faim
AP	IDP action plan
CARE	Cooperation for American Relief Everywhere
CC	Collective center
CHCA	Charity Humanitarian Centre Abkhazeti
CTC	Centre for Training and Consultancy
DFID	Department for International Development
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
EU	European Union
EVIDP	Extremely vulnerable IDP
FAO	UN Food and Agricultural Organization
GEL	Georgian Lari
IDMC	Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre
IDP	Internally displaced person(s)
IOM	International Organization for Migration
LEPL	Legal entity of public law
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MRA	Ministry for Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Accommodation and Refugees of Georgia
MRDI	Ministry for Regional Development and Infrastructure
NCL IDPs 2008)	New case load IDPs (IDPs from the war of 2008)
NEO	New Economic Opportunities
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
OCL IDPs	Old case load IDPs (IDPs from the wars of the 1990s)

PA IDPs	Privately accommodated IDPs
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategic Paper
ROM	Results-oriented monitoring
SDC	Swiss Development Cooperation
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation
SIIMS	Stabilization and Integration of IDPs into Mainstream Georgian Society Project
SLF	Sustainable Livelihoods Framework
SME	Small and medium-sized enterprise
TEG	Temporary Experts Group
TSA	Targeted social assistance
UMCOR	United Methodist Committee on Relief
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VCA	Value chain analysis
VET	Vocational education and training
VTC	Vocational training center
WFP	United Nations World Food Programme

Acknowledgements

The primary author for the report was Guy Hovey, a consultant to the World Bank. Joanna P. de Berry was the World Bank's task team leader and Elisabeth Huybens was the sector manager. Peer review comments were received from Tina Gewis (NRC), Vara Vemuru, Seenithamby

Manoharan and Eavan O'Halloran (World Bank). Photos for the front cover were taken by Vladimer Valishvili supported by Gabrielle Gunneberg. The report was made possible by funds under the Trust Fund for Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development (TFESSD) of the World Bank.

Executive Summary

Ethnic conflict in Georgia’s Abkhazia and South Ossetia regions in the early 1990s and 2008 caused waves of displacement, and approximately 270,000 internally displaced people (IDPs) remain affected today. IDPs have limited income and livelihood opportunities; unofficial figures suggest that up to 80 percent of IDPs may be unemployed, compared to the official unemployment rate of 15 percent of the overall population.¹ Although the majority of IDPs remain reliant on state subsidies as their main source of income, many have a strong desire to be self-reliant and undertake income-generating activities, not just for financial reasons but also to boost self-esteem, mitigate depression, and facilitate integration.

In 2007, the Georgian government adopted the IDP State Strategy to provide durable housing for IDPs. Currently the government is seeking to develop a complementary livelihood strategy because it recognizes that investments in accommodation need to be sustained by investments in economic and job opportunities for the displaced. The Ministry of IDPs and Refugees from the Occupied Territories in Georgia (MRA) aims to play a more instrumental role in leading and coordinating livelihood support. Until now, livelihood programming for IDPs was mainly implemented by nongovernmental agencies. The current state action plan for IDPs includes plans for a Livelihood Legal Entity of Public Law (LEPL), a quasi-independent department responsible for livelihood issues.

This report aims to contribute to the development of an IDP livelihood strategy and to more comprehensive investments in economic opportunities for IDPs. The report identifies six major challenges, each of

which impede the ability of IDPs to secure sustainable livelihoods: 1) lack of access to land; 2) lack of access to financial services; 3) weak social capital; 4) lack of skills and education; 5) psychosocial issues; and 6) extreme vulnerability.

The report analyzes current projects that seek to overcome those challenges and build economic opportunities for the displaced. Currently projects take one of four main forms:

- **Donations**—of nonfinancial resources such as machinery and livestock to increase agricultural production and strengthen family food security;
- **Education**—such as vocational training to improve IDPs’ knowledge, skills, and attitude so they can better access the labor market;
- **Financial**—providing access to subsidized credit and/or grants to IDPs and host communities for business development;
- **Community mobilization**—empowering communities to increase livelihoods through joint community action.

The report describes these implementation methodologies and identifies replicable best practices that demonstrate understanding of the challenges that face IDPs. Alongside discussion of each challenge, the report identifies current opportunities to address the situation. Recommendations are given to strengthen livelihood support.

Access to land—For IDPs, land is an important potential source of food and income. A 2007 government ruling that local authorities may allocate state agricultural land to IDPs has not been consistently applied. Land rental is a common practice in rural areas, but some IDPs are reluctant to take up this opportunity because they mistrust landlords and have poor knowledge of rental agreements.

1 Government of Georgia figure 2011. See http://www.undp.org.ge/index.php?lang_id=ENG&sec_id=24&info_id=11751 for a fuller discussion of unemployment in Georgia.

Even where IDPs do have access to land, it is often of poor quality. The lack of access to markets, processors, poor infrastructure, and inadequate storage facilities make it hard for IDPs to engage in profitable agricultural enterprise.

There are currently important opportunities to boost agricultural livelihoods for IDPs. Decreasing tensions with Russia and gradually lowering Russian sanctions against Georgia could potentially increase agricultural exports from Georgia. This could provide income for IDP farmers and processing plant workers. Government policy is aimed at boosting the agricultural sector and a number of agricultural subsidy schemes have been launched to encourage increased cultivation, production, and yield. The schemes are available to small and medium producers and represent opportunities to IDPs.

The report urges that a survey be taken of IDP land allocation, including its quality, and that inequities be remedied. This can be done by including IDPs in any new land reclamation and distribution schemes, and by supporting IDPs' understanding of and confidence in land rental. The report recommends that donors and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) analyze the impacts of the government's new agricultural investment programs to ensure benefits and constraints are fully understood. This will facilitate informed choices about where these programs need to be adapted to ensure IDPs' inclusion.

Access to financial services—Many IDPs do not own land and housing, both of which are important sources of collateral for loans. For those IDPs returned to Gali in Abkhazia, this challenge is exacerbated by the unwillingness of both Abkhaz and Georgian banks to lend due to the lack of the rule of law. For those able to borrow, high-interest rates can make repayments prohibitively expensive.

To mitigate these factors, some NGOs operate rotating microcredit funds that provide subsidized credit where interest is reduced by 50 percent. Others provide grants and business training. Some organizations target IDPs and non-IDPs with livestock cost-share programs and have reported a good success rate, particularly with increases in livestock production and

decreases of incidences in which livestock are sold as a result of family crises.

Finance providers agree that such financing schemes require close monitoring and benefit from technical assistance by the provider. To stimulate sustainable job creation, some NGOs work with enterprises to provide business development training such as the use of value chain analysis (VCA) and credit to increase production to meet market demands. Resulting jobs are offered to IDPs and their neighbors.

The new government is launching a one billion GEL rural and agricultural subsidized credit scheme to effectively provide interest-free business development loans and also to provide cost-sharing grants and loans. IDPs will be eligible to apply, but collateral will remain a requirement.

Given IDPs' constraints in accessing finance, it is likely they will require supportive programs for the foreseeable future. The report recommends that NGOs work to strengthen local microfinance capacity and IDPs' credit management skills. VCA should be increasingly used to identify business opportunities.

Social capital—Displacement severs social relations and community networks that were built over generations. This results in fractured communities that have lost the meaningful intracommunity social contacts and ties by which employment was traditionally found. Contacts with the nondisplaced can be superficial, and rarely result in employment opportunities. Types of IDP accommodation can also inhibit social interaction. For example, a large collective center (CC) located on the edge of a community segregates IDPs both physically and visually. The lack of social space within CCs can also inhibit interaction between IDP families. Although some social capital is built through contacts with non-IDP communities (particularly through children attending schools), insecurity of tenure means these can be severed again if the IDP is resettled out of the area.

NGOs have sought to improve cohesion between IDPs and host communities by ensuring both have access to program opportunities and the use of community mobilization to encourage community consensus. Recent housing and privatization programs

have enabled some IDPs to feel more settled in their communities, which may encourage them to interact more with non-IDPs. Likewise, designing new and rehabilitated housing can provide opportunities to add common spaces in which families can interact as a community and build relationships.

Much remains to be understood about the development of social capital and the impact it has on employment and livelihoods. The report recommends that further research be undertaken to better understand the role social capital plays in IDP life in Georgia. It recommends that community mobilization techniques be increasingly used to bring communities together and that IDPs' housing programs incorporate social space for community functions.

Knowledge, skills, and attitude—IDPs can find their skills are outdated or inappropriate for their new communities. The problem is particularly acute for those who were displaced prior to gaining skills, work experience, or education. Large numbers of IDPs are disadvantaged in the job market and have unmet potential. Some NGOs have reported that IDPs have unrealistic expectations of the types of job they can do, which influences the jobs they seek.

NGOs and the government have provided vocational education and training (VET) programs for many years. These have recently developed in quality. Of note are the programs that recognize the need for elements such as languages, decision making, and teamwork to supplement core skills training with attitudinal change. The programs work with employers to identify employment and workplace skills gaps and offer training programs to narrow those gaps.

The report highlights the importance of the vocational training sector and the progress made by the government. Key recommendations for improving this sector include: ensuring that vocational training includes life skills training and is aligned with market requirements; providing close support to IDPs to enable them to manage expectations and provide up-skilling programs; and increasing the availability of vocational training to all IDPs irrespective of age, including provision of separate classes for older students.

Psychosocial issues and dependency—organizations working with IDPs report a range of psychological

and other issues, such as domestic violence and alcoholism. Insecurity of tenure, loss of home, job, and identity, the uncertainty associated with the collapse of the Soviet system (for older IDPs), lack of money, and meaningful employment all contribute to IDP stress. Psychological problems become acute where they impact the livelihoods of extremely vulnerable IDPs (EVIDPs).

IDPs show high levels of economic and psychological dependency on state subsidies. Fear of benefit reductions can impede their desire to find employment. Lack of understanding of the social allowance system and eligibility criteria may also contribute to misconceptions that prevent IDPs from taking jobs, particularly in the formal sector.

Some government and NGOs include a psychosocial component in their livelihood programs—encouraging IDPs to meet their potential. Others encourage self-reliance by requiring beneficiaries to invest financial as well as human capital into the project. Both organizations report lower dropout rates and increased incomes.

The impacts of psychological issues and benefit dependency on IDP livelihoods have not been greatly studied. The report recommends that studies be made and lessons identified. On the program level, counseling components in programming are recommended, as is a case-management approach where required. The government could disseminate clear information on the benefit means-testing system, which may allay IDPs' fears. The government is reviewing the benefit system including proposals to increase the IDP allowance and enable qualifying IDP families to receive both IDP allowance and targeted social assistance (TSA). A 100 percent increase in TSA will start on July 1st. Policy changes must consider the psychosocial impacts of such increases and the further entrenchment of dependency.

Extreme vulnerability—IDPs living in extreme poverty struggle to survive. Daily pressures mean they are unable to pay much attention to planning for future livelihood opportunities. They are also less likely to take risks and plan for the long term. If included in a livelihood program, the slightest financial “shock” such as illness or hunger can cause EVIDPs

to sell or consume livelihood assets.

Few NGOs work with this group of EVIDPs; this group is least likely to show project success, and the pursuit of quantifiable results means many NGOs choose not to target extreme vulnerability per se. However, some NGOs have considerable experience working with EVIDPs and have developed a system of mentoring, counseling, starting micro livelihood activities, and increasing support in incremental steps.

This report recommends that more attention be paid to this group. This can be achieved through analyzing the nature of Georgian poverty and vulnerability and incorporating the lessons into specially tailored EVIDP strategies and programs. The programs will benefit from a multiyear approach with incremental steps to take IDPs from extreme vulnerability to independence.

Beyond Project-Based Support to IDPs

NGO projects can significantly impact individuals and communities, but their limited scope means they are unlikely to influence the wider structural and contextual opportunities and constraints facing both IDP and non-IDP communities. Such issues include new opportunities for agricultural production and the economic and psychosocial impacts of the state subsidy system. These affect IDP livelihoods and require strategic responses.

If trade with Russia resumes, Georgia's agriculture sector will have opportunities to export raw goods and enjoy a new market for processed produce. The government has launched business loan and agricultural subsidy programs to boost the rural agricultural economy. However, because many IDPs do not own land or have collateral, they may not qualify for subsidies (although they may be farmers on rented or borrowed land). The report recommends affirmative action to enable IDPs to access subsidies

if they are producers, even if they do not own land or collateral.

It is expensive for the government to provide the IDP allowance, which is given in recognition of IDP status. For many IDPs it is their only source of reliable regular income, although affluent IDPs arguably do not need this financial support. A national review of IDPs' financial status underpinned by extensive analysis is required to inform future government policy on IDP allowances. Likewise, a close review of social allowance claimants will identify ineligible recipients and potentially release funds to support vulnerable IDPs.

Overcoming the barriers to IDP employment caused by macroeconomic and development policies will require strategic government intervention in combination with project providers and stakeholders. Cross-sectoral support is essential to ensure IDPs achieve sustainable livelihoods. An integrated approach will require strategic partnerships between NGOs, development actors, the government, and the diplomatic community. This will enable advocacy and action at all levels, from grassroots communities to the highest levels of government. The MRA Livelihood LEPL can potentially act as a facilitator to bring together key ministries and organizations.

To support the recommendations set out in this report, new analysis and research will be required. Ongoing reviews of IDP needs building on the baselines set by UNDP's 2013 economic and vulnerability study will support a national debate and raise awareness about IDP issues. A debate will enable the government to publicize its IDP livelihood and other strategies, and garner support for both IDPs and the efforts to solve their problems. This report recommends stronger independent program evaluations. It also recommends analysis of the nature of IDP poverty, the problems of extreme vulnerability, and the importance of social capital to IDP livelihoods. Finally, it could prove useful to conduct research into historical aspects of displacement and how now fully recovered countries overcame the same issues Georgia currently faces.

PART 1

Introduction

Georgia has one of the world’s highest incidences of internal displacement relative to the overall population. In the aftermath of conflicts—initially in 1992 and more recently in 2008—Georgia faced the displacement of more than a quarter of a million persons within the country. Georgia compares relatively well to other countries on adopting a policy framework that supports displaced people. Georgia has both signed and ratified the 1951 UN Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and has expressed commitment to the 1998 Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. A legal reform process in line with these commitments is advanced, though still incomplete.

The Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and Refugees from the Occupied Territories of Georgia (MRA) is the central authority that deals with IDP-related issues. It is responsible for coordinating governmental and nongovernmental agencies’ responses to internal displacement. The MRA led the development of a 2007 state strategy on IDPs and two action plans (APs) on displacement (one for 2009–2011 and one for 2012–2014). Government approval of the strategy and the APs proved to be important steps for framing policy on how to meet IDPs’ needs and, in a remarkable policy shift from an exclusive focus on return, for the first time established government commitment to the provision of durable solutions for IDPs in Georgia.

The state strategy on IDPs articulates the state’s two major goals: (1) to create conditions for the dignified and safe return of IDPs; and (2) to support decent

living conditions for the displaced and to facilitate their participation in society.² In practice, over the past four years, donors and the government have primarily focused on providing support via the provision of housing. Focusing on housing helps provide and improve accommodation for IDPs and to ensure that their physical environment is conducive to well-being. There is risk, however, in focusing resources and attention solely on housing and not on other areas of IDP vulnerability. Global experience shows that in order to provide strong durable solutions for IDPs, four key development areas must be holistically addressed: (1) land, property, and housing; (2) reestablishment of livelihoods; (3) delivery of services; and (4) accountable and responsive governance.³

It is critical to reestablish IDP livelihoods both in order to enable displaced people to live normal lives that minimize their dependency on humanitarian assistance and to help them cope with the challenges of integration (whether that involves returning to their communities of origin, settling in new locations, or integrating into the place of displacement). Without livelihood support there is a high risk that IDPs will become trapped in poverty, unemployment, and hopelessness, and become marginalized. This in turn presents a large fiscal burden to the state, which must care for them, and also prevents IDPs from actively contributing to the national economy.

The MRA has recently launched a process to define

2 Government of Georgia. 2007. *Decree No. 47. On Approving the State Strategy for Internally Displaced Persons—Persecuted*. Tbilisi, Georgia. http://mra.gov.ge/index.php?lang_id=ENG#index/1/ENG.

3 Christensen, Asger, and Niels Harild. 2009. *Forced Displacement—the Development Challenge*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

a strategic response to the livelihood needs of IDPs in Georgia, which can complement the considerable investments in the provision of housing. This review was undertaken with the aim of contributing to that strategic approach. The key intended audience includes the government ministries, donors, and implementing agencies involved in IDP policy and program definition. Specifically, the review takes stock of existing investments in IDP livelihoods in Georgia. Its purpose is to identify challenges, good practices, lessons learned, and improvements still required to make livelihood support programs effective and successful. To this end the review entailed the following:

- collated existing data and documentation on the activities and outcomes from current IDP livelihood support projects in Georgia;
- reviewed achievements made and challenges faced in existing livelihood support to IDPs;
- identified successful interventions with potential for expansion and replication;
- identified barriers to increasing program effectiveness;
- reviewed advantages and disadvantages of current and alternative livelihood support approaches;
- defined recommendations for the strategic improvement of IDP livelihood support;
- identified possible additional studies that will be useful for the development of a strategic approach to IDP livelihood support.

Methodology

This report is based on the findings and follow-up communications from a one-month consultancy in Georgia that took place in February–March 2013.⁴ The consultant worked with the current head of the Technical Working Group on Livelihoods in the

MRA and collaborated with government institutions, livelihood support providers, donors, and members of IDP communities.

Data and information for the assignment was gathered through four main methods:

1. desk study and research;
2. individual interviews with livelihood providers, relevant government ministries and departments, UN agencies, donors, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders;
3. field visits to livelihood programs where meetings were held with local authorities (beneficiary communities and individuals were interviewed via individual meetings and community-based focus groups);
4. peer review feedback of the draft report via e-mail and face-to-face interaction.

Structure of the Report

The report starts with background on the history, scope, and character of displacement in Georgia. Although there is a lack of comprehensive data on Georgian IDPs' living conditions and livelihood status, this section collates what information exists. Part Two defines livelihood support, maps out the sector as currently implemented in Georgia, and describes the types of activities in place to boost IDP employment, production, and enterprise. Part Three is structured around six key challenges that undermine IDPs' ability to achieve sustainable livelihoods and improved income. Each challenge is described and where relevant, examples of current project interventions are offered. Each challenge is also analyzed to include any current opportunities for improvement in current practice. Recommendations for how to enhance or modify approaches to ensure further success are also included. Part Four offers a summary of additional steps and studies that could further define a strategic approach to IDP livelihood support. Case study examples that appear in text boxes illustrate the review findings in more detail.

4 The key consultant undertaking the review was Guy Hovey.

PART 2

Context of Displacement

History of Conflict and Displacement

In the early 1990s separatist wars were fought in both South Ossetia and Abkhazia as the Ossetian and Abkhazian ethnic groups, majorities in their respective regions, fought to break away from Georgia. The wars and ethnic tensions resulted in the displacement of approximately 215,000 ethnic Georgians,⁵ mostly from Abkhazia, who fled mainly to Tbilisi and Western Georgia. These IDPs, who have remained displaced for up to twenty years, are commonly called “old case load” IDPs (OCL IDPs).

In 2008, continuing instability and tension escalated to conflict between Russia and Georgia. This left Russia and its allies firmly in control of both breakaway regions and displaced another 156,000. Most of these IDPs were able to return home in the weeks following the French-brokered peace agreement of August 12, 2008, which resulted in the partial withdrawal of Russian forces from Georgia. However some 22,000 persons were unable to return and required housing and other support in Georgia. These IDPs have been termed “new case load” IDPs (NCL IDPs).

There is some discrepancy in the figures of those currently displaced in Georgia. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that IDPs from both conflicts total 273,997 persons.⁶ January 2013 figures from the MRA supplied by the

Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) indicate there are 245,672 OCL IDPs and 19,913 NCL IDPs, plus 4,153 so-called “double IDPs” – displaced in the nineties and again in 2008 – (totalling 269,738) in Georgia who represent 6.1 percent of the population. WFP figures from 2012 show that of three profiled IDP settlements, an average of 51.3 percent were women, 26 percent were children under 18 years, and 14.5 percent were over 65 years.⁷

Included in the numbers of OCL IDPs are IDPs who have been able to return to the Lower and Upper Gali districts of Abkhazia—a region that was historically inhabited by a Georgian majority and the only region where the de facto Abkhaz authorities will allow Georgians to return. This constrained return is mainly due to the demographic concerns of the de facto authorities,⁸ who worry that allowing further concessions will encourage more Georgians to return⁹ and possibly cause instability. Human Rights Watch roughly estimates that up to 47,000 IDPs have returned to the Gali region.¹⁰ Gali returnees retain their IDP status¹¹ yet remain precariously positioned as they are subject to conflicts, kidnappings, and lack rule of law.¹²

5 IDMC (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre). 2012. “Georgia: Partial Progress Towards Durable Solutions for IDPs.” IDMC. <http://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/georgia>.

6 UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). 2013. “2013 UNHCR Regional Operations Profile—Eastern Europe.” UNHCR. <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49e48d2e6.html>.

7 World Food Programme (WFP). 2012. *Community Profiling Study of IDP Settlements in Georgia*. Rome: WFP.

8 UNHCR. 2009. *Protection of IDPs in Georgia: A Gap Analysis*. Geneva: UNHCR. <http://www.unhcr.org/4ad827f59.pdf>.

9 Minority Rights Group International. 2008. “State of the World’s Minorities 2008—Georgia/Abkhazia and South Ossetia.” Refworld. <http://www.refworld.org/countryGEO,,48a7eac41,0.html>.

10 Gogia, Giorgi. 2011. “Georgians in Gali.” Human Rights Watch. <http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/02/18/georgians-gali>.

11 Gali returnees are usually classed as privately accommodated IDPs (see below).

12 IDMC/NRC (Norwegian Refugee Council). 2012. “Mem-

The Situation of IDPs: Housing

Government data shows that 47,716 IDPs are registered as living in collective centers (CCs) while 222,022 are registered as privately accommodated (PA).¹³ No accurate figures exist for IDPs' rural/urban breakdown, although a generally accepted figure is 50/50. This is because difficulties in obtaining information on IDP locations have undermined attempts to have accurate IDP registration data.¹⁴ An April 2013 initiative to reregister all IDPs was launched in response to a request from the MRA, which hopes to analyze the data and use it to underpin policy decisions.

The wave of displacement caused by the 2008 conflict brought renewed attention to the housing plight of IDPs in Georgia, causing the government to prioritize the provision and improvement of accommodation. Major donors—including the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the European Union (EU), the World Bank, Germany, and the United Nations (UN)—committed US\$400 million for the period between 2009 and 2014. Much of this was allocated to IDP housing.

For NCL IDPs, the government swiftly oversaw the construction of 13 settlements totalling over 3,964¹⁵ single-storey “cottages,” as well as the rehabilitation

of 1,600 apartments in 23 areas. The largest settlement of over 2,000 cottages was constructed at Tserovani, 23 kilometres from Tbilisi. The privatization process for these cottages started in 2012. By the end of 2012, two thirds of the settlements had been involved in the process and completion rates were lower than 50% in 9 out of 25 settlements covered¹⁶. Since 2011, IDPs living in collective centres where privatization has started, irrespective of whether they have applied for privatization or not, are reregistered as PA IDPs. By 2010, the MRA's housing strategy—a document developed to guide IDP resettlement—announced that apart from some “special cases,” all NCL IDPs had received housing support. The government was both praised for its immediate response to the IDP crisis and criticized for construction and design problems that became apparent once IDPs moved into the cottages.¹⁷

The swift response to NCL IDPs' housing plight served to refocus attention on the OCL IDPs, who, since their displacement, had been living in CCs and in private accommodations. OCL CCs were mainly located in abandoned schools, kindergartens, hospitals, and government buildings. Some were in privately owned buildings, such as former hotels. Most IDPs described CCs as “overcrowded,” “congested,” “dilapidated,” “deplorable,” “degraded,” and “extremely sub-standard,”¹⁸

These buildings were never designed to permanently house large numbers of people. The inadequate sanitation, electrical, sewerage, and water systems soon became overwhelmed by the demands of occupation. Despite repair and maintenance work undertaken by the government, UN agencies, international organizations, NGOs, and residents, problems were too widespread to be satisfactorily contained. OCL IDPs experienced regular power outages, electrical fires, leaking roofs, and broken utilities. The neglect of these residences arguably stemmed from the govern-

orandum: Internal Displacement in Georgia.” [http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/%28httpDocuments%29/61AF7555689DA54FC1257AEC004BF787/\\$file/IDMC+Georgia+memo+FINAL+3+Dec.pdf](http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/%28httpDocuments%29/61AF7555689DA54FC1257AEC004BF787/$file/IDMC+Georgia+memo+FINAL+3+Dec.pdf).

13 Privately accommodated, or PA, IDPs live with friends or relatives in rented or other privately owned accommodations. This is distinct from government-allocated accommodations such as collective centers in state or private ownership.

14 Many PA IDPs have moved multiple times but not updated their records despite a legal requirement to do so, making it difficult to verify registration information. Since 2008, the MRA had in addition ceased to register IDP address changes amid concerns that IDPs might abuse the process to be included in government housing programmes.

15 Transparency International Georgia. 2010. “Cottage Settlements for Georgia's New IDPs: Accountability in Aid and Construction.” Transparency International Georgia. <http://transparency.ge/en/post/report/cottage-settlements-georgias-new-idps-accountability-aid-and-construction>.

16 MRA, UNHCR, DRC. 2012 Annual Privatization Report

17 Ibid.

18 Mooney, Erin D. 2009. “When ‘Temporary’ Lasts Too Long.” *Forced Migration Review* 33. <http://www.fmreview.org/en/FMRpdfs/FMR33/FMR33.pdf>.

ment’s policy of regarding internal displacement as temporary.

In 2007, a significant policy change acknowledged the right of IDP return but also the reality of long-term displacement. In response, the first IDP action plan (AP) in 2009 agreed to by the government, international donors, NGOs, and Georgian civil society guided a combined effort to resettle and reintegrate IDPs into wider Georgian society by providing durable housing solutions and other support. Existing CCs were rehabilitated and new housing was constructed, which provided 30,000 OCL IDPs with durable housing solutions. In addition, 539 rehabilitated CCs were privatized. By December 2012 14,634 IDP accommodation units had been fully privatized.^{19 20}

Housing investments under the AP also involved resettling IDPs away from the capital and out of accommodations that the government intended to repurpose for commercial use.²¹ This policy was criticized, as many IDPs were resettled away from their original residence with no livelihood support. For example, IDPs were resettled from Tskaltubo, where they had lived since the mid-1990s, to large new residential districts in Poti. The lack of work meant that many IDPs re-emigrated back to Tskaltubo to earn money.

The MRA database continues to list 849 CCs as state-owned. Compounding IDPs’ problems in these public CCs is the possibility of eviction, as evidenced by the August 2010 evictions of IDPs who occupied government buildings in Tbilisi. Similarly, the government evicted 344 families from the Isani CC which had previously been used by the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development. Alternative accommodation was offered but it was far from the

capital, which effectively cut evictees off from their sources of income, education, and health care.

Many PA IDPs live with relatives and friends. Some live in rented accommodation, some live in homes owned by IDPs, and some illegally occupy privately owned buildings. The legal status of the latter is tenuous, and they also risk eviction. Likewise, IDPs who stay with hosts are insecure; IDPs are sometimes evicted from their relatives’ accommodations,²² particularly as families grow and space becomes crowded. To address this problem, organizations such as the NRC have implemented projects that provide materials to extend host family houses and apartments—for example by enclosing balconies to create an extra room.

PA IDPs have generally not received the same level of housing or livelihood assistance as IDPs who live in CCs. Although organizations such as the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), the Swedish International Development Cooperation (Sida), the NRC, and UNHCR have offered some support to PA IDPs, they remain a difficult group to target. This can in large part be attributed to a lack of accurate data, poor visibility, and inadequate representation.²³

A study by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) states that IDPs are the most vulnerable sector of Georgian society in terms of land and housing. Despite the government’s focus on housing as a mechanism to reduce vulnerability, the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC)²⁴ found that low quality construction and inconsistent resettlement policies could increase IDPs’ vulnerability, especially those who gave up their job and were resettled far from their original CC.

19 IDPs living in privatized CCs are now classed as privately accommodated.

20 Although the privatization of IDP CCs was a stated aim in the AP and housing strategy, it was a slow process until a government initiative to accelerate it in 2012. Assisted by the UNHCR and DRC, the MRA was able to privatize approximately 7,650 accommodation units in that year—up from only 397 in 2011.

21 This policy has now been reversed by the new government.

22 However, a draft amendment to current IDP legislation seeks to regulate the eviction of IDPs from private accommodation when they have permission to be there.

23 For a full review of the situation of PA IDPs, see: Kochlashvili, Natia. 2013. *Privately Accommodated IDPs in Georgia: A Needs Assessment*. Tbilisi, Georgia: NRC.

24 IDMC/NRC. 2012. “Memorandum.”

The Situation of IDPs: Livelihoods

No nationally significant data disaggregates poverty rates between IDPs and non-IDPs, so it is impossible to accurately assess their poverty in relation to the overall population. However, a proxy indicator for poverty could be taken from figures on who qualifies for and claims targeted social assistance (TSA), which is aimed at bolstering the income of the very poor. Twelve percent of IDPs receive TSA compared to nine percent of the overall population, suggesting that poverty rates are higher among IDPs²⁵.

An important buffer against poverty is the fact that the state provides an allowance to each person registered as an IDP (including children of original IDPs). A recent UNDP study highlighted IDP allowances as key to providing a regular income.²⁶ These are graded according to accommodation type. PA IDPs receive an allowance of 28 Georgian Lari (GEL) per person per month; those in CCs receive 22 GEL.²⁷ In addition, if their level of poverty is ranked high enough, IDPs are entitled to free health care insurance. If they opt to, IDPs can be assessed for TSA eligibility, through which the head of household receives 30 GEL/month and remaining family members receive 24 GEL/month. Currently an IDP who claims TSA is required to give up their IDP allowance.²⁸

While the UNHCR and others²⁹ have highlighted

25 Some commentators feel many IDPs who would qualify for TSA do not apply. Thus IDP poverty rates could be higher than stated.

26 UNDP. 2013. *Economic and Social Vulnerability in Georgia*: UNDP

27 The official poverty line for Georgia for 2010 was 90 GEL/month. The subsidy can be compared to a monthly state pension of 125 GEL/monthly, and the average teacher salary of 311 GEL/month.

28 IDPs and non-IDPs are entitled to TSA if, following a thorough assessment by the Ministry of Social Welfare taking into account family income and living conditions, they achieve a “poverty ranking” of 57,001 points or less. A ranking of 70,001 or less points entitles the family to medical insurance.

29 UNHCR. 2012. *Returned but Still Reintegrating: Partici-*

flaws in the benefits system, the medical assistance, IDP allowance, and TSA programs are a vital part of IDP income strategies.³⁰ A 2010 survey conducted by the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP) in new settlements found that 81 percent of those interviewed relied on government allowances for their main income source.³¹

Unemployment remains a considerable problem throughout Georgian society; the nationwide unemployment rate is 15 percent. Again, official figures do not disaggregate unemployed IDPs from the overall unemployment figures. There is some evidence that IDPs are more acutely affected by unemployment than the non-displaced. Research among OCL IDPs by Conciliation Resources in 2011 found an OCL IDP unemployment rate of 82 percent among those questioned.³² This disproportionate rate is reinforced by research undertaken by the DRC in 2008; they identified an IDP unemployment rate of 69 percent while studying 3,000 IDPs nationwide.³³ Further analysis of statistics supplied by the Georgian Statistical Office shows that urban IDPs are up to 3.5 times more likely to be unemployed than their non-IDP counterparts. By contrast indications from an unpublished FAO baseline assessment found unemployment rates in some NCL settlements was close to that of host communities.

patory Assessment of the Humanitarian Situation and Progress Made in the Re-integration Process of IDPs Who Returned to the Shida Kartli Region, Georgia. Geneva: UNHCR.

30 Meetings with Oxfam and IDPs, March 2013.

31 NRC analysis from January 2013 shows that 33,873 IDPs claim TSA, 37,038 IDPs in CCs claim the IDP allowance, and 190,251 PA IDPs claim IDP allowance. The NRC calculated the monthly cost to the government at 7,037,988 GEL (approximately US\$4.26 million). Plans to double the TSA on July 1, 2013, and to allow IDPs to have access to TSA without losing their IDP allowance will greatly increase the fiscal impact of these subsidies.

32 However, some commentators argue that many IDPs are occupied in growing food and other endeavors and thus are engaged in livelihood activities and not seeking formal employment.

33 Nadareishvili, Mamuka, and Vasil Tsakadze. 2008. *Housing and Socio-economic Conditions of IDPs in Georgia*. Tbilisi, Georgia: DRC.

Where IDPs are formally employed, they typically work low-paid jobs that involve arduous work. Fieldwork undertaken for this review involved a qualitative assessment of employment in one NCL IDP settlement. IDPs universally held cleaning and (mainly night-time) security jobs at factories and businesses in the area. Their average wage was 150 GEL per month—less than a quarter of the national average salary of 636 GEL in 2011.³⁴

Informal part-time and seasonal employment (which involve either working for cash or for goods) offer income-generating opportunities.³⁵ Anecdotal evidence suggests that community and family connections make non-IDPs much more likely to secure informal employment than IDPs. As discussed below, this appears to be caused by IDPs' lack of social capital, which offers the connections required to access jobs and other economic opportunities.

Lack of meaningful networks is one of many reasons why many IDPs experience continuing socioeconomic vulnerability. Displacement is disruptive and causes people to lose education and skill-building opportunities, which in turn causes many, particularly older, IDPs to lack the experience and expertise required in the job market. This problem is compounded by a lack of access to credit to start or expand a business (particularly for NCL IDPs), and also by the fact that IDP accommodations often have inadequate or unreliable utilities, which further impedes efforts to successfully operate a business. Even when an IDP is presented with a livelihood opportunity, their extreme poverty can inhibit their ability to make a success of it, or even to take advantage of it.

As a result, many OCL IDP families have lived in poverty for up to twenty years. The generally accepted entry point of a family into the “poverty cycle”³⁶—

in which the family cannot escape poverty without significant outside intervention—is when three generations have been born and no one in the family can provide the intellectual, social, and economic capital required to escape poverty.³⁷ Many Georgian IDP families are in danger of falling into this cycle.³⁸

Livelihoods Definition and Sustainable Livelihoods Theory

A generally accepted definition of livelihood was offered by Chambers and Conway in 1992:

“A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (stores, resources, claims and access) and activities required for a means of living: a livelihood is sustainable which can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, and provide sustainable livelihood opportunities for the next generation; and which contributes net benefits to other livelihoods at the local and global levels and in the long and short term.”³⁹

The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (SLF), introduced by the Department for International Development (DFID) in 1999, provides a useful framework for understanding livelihoods. It recognizes that a family's or individual's ability to support their needs is not based solely on their access to income generation or food production, but rather is dependent on access to a wide range of assets (also referred to as capital):

- natural (environmental) assets: natural resources (land, water, wildlife, biodiversity,

34 Figures from the National Statistical Office of Georgia (GeoStat). <http://www.geostat.ge>.

35 Some IDPs report preferring informal employment because if they enter the formal employment sector, they will be registered with the tax authorities. This will trigger a poverty reassessment with the danger of losing health insurance and other benefits. Therefore, many IDPs reluctantly choose not to take a formal job and instead remain unemployed and retain their benefits.

36 Marger, Martin. 2008. *Social Inequality: Patterns and Pro-*

cesses, vol. 4. New York: McGraw-Hill.

37 Ibid.

38 For a study of Georgia's IDPs and the poverty cycle, see: Willems, Daphne. 2012. “Settling After War: Analyzing Economic Development of IDPs in Georgia.” Master's thesis, University of Amsterdam.

39 Chambers, R., and Conway, G. 1992. “Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century.” IDS Discussion Paper 296. Brighton, UK: IDS.

environmental resources)

- physical assets: basic infrastructure (water, sanitation, energy, transportation, communications), housing, and the means and equipment of production
- human assets: health, knowledge, skills, information, ability to labor
- social assets: social resources (relationships of trust, membership of groups, networks, access to wider institutions)
- financial assets: financial resources available (regular remittances or pensions, savings, supplies of credit)

Modification of the SLF since 1999 has stressed that the range of assets do not in themselves provide livelihood opportunities. The ability to access and take advantage of assets is always mediated by a range of institutions and contextual factors; how these affect individuals depends on their relative power or vulnerability. Increasingly the emphasis of livelihood analysis has been to understand the political-economic context that may constrain or facilitate the effective deployment of assets for livelihood opportunities. These contextual factors are especially salient for IDPs. The loss of so many normal assets and opportunities (from land to social relations) means that IDPs are more dependent on a wider institutional context (for example, relying on state subsidies) while at the same time are more vulnerable within this context. However, there is still a long way to go until political-economy analysis is used effectively to define and design appropriate IDP livelihood interventions on the ground.⁴⁰ This is the case in Georgia, where interventions and projects have largely focused on providing assets without always fully exploring or engaging the larger power structures and institutional limitations. This makes IDPs especially vulnerable. A more strategic approach for IDP livelihood support in Georgia will need a stronger political-economic dimension.

40 World Bank. 2013. *Assessment of Livelihood Support for Displaced Persons and IDPs*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Current IDP Livelihood Support

To date, livelihood support for IDPs in Georgia has largely been delivered through NGOs and small-scale projects; there is no overarching national or strategic approach to livelihood support at any scale for IDPs.

The types of activities currently being delivered can be classified into the following broad types:

Providing inputs and natural assets for IDPs to pursue agricultural production. The provision of livestock and other agricultural inputs has been a widespread part of NGOs' IDP livelihood investments. Variations on these include recipients who pay back in kind to another vulnerable person. An example of this "passing on the gift" approach might include the donation of a pregnant cow, where the beneficiary gives the calf to another vulnerable beneficiary; likewise, the provision of tools to a craftsman might be repaid by the recipient undertaking free work for a vulnerable person. The UN Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) implemented another variant: a cost-share scheme for IDPs which enabled IDP farmers to buy livestock or equipment.

Although OCL IDPs came from a mix of rural and urban backgrounds, the majority of NCL IDPs were displaced from rural communities. Their agricultural experience is reflected in a 2009 FAO/UNIFEM survey that found that 41 percent of NCL IDPs preferred farming as a livelihood. Recognizing their experience, the government allocated small areas of land to use as vegetable gardens adjacent to the cottages in the new settlements constructed in 2008. In addition, the government allocated 860 hectares of land, including some areas of fruit trees adjacent to the settlements, for NCL IDP agricultural activities.⁴¹ Some agricultural plots adjacent to cottages were privatized, but others, particularly those that are separate from the cottage or settlement, remain state property. In 2007 the government passed a law authorizing local authorities to allocate agricultural land to OCL IDPs.⁴²

41 IDMC. 2012. *Property, Livelihoods, Education and Other Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. Geneva: IDMC.

42 Article 5 of Law #335-IIS on Forcibly Displaced Persons—

NGOs have supplemented this initiative by providing seeds, tools, and fertilizer to allow IDPs to cultivate both the vegetable gardens and the agricultural land.

Delivering vocational training to improve human assets, knowledge, and skills. Organizations such as the NRC, the Cooperation for American Relief Everywhere (CARE), New Economic Opportunities (NEO)/USAID, and UNDP have all implemented vocational training programs to improve IDPs' human assets and skills. Programs such as the USAID-funded NEO provide training courses to both IDPs and non-IDPs in plumbing, tiling, and carpentry. Previous USAID-funded programs have targeted IDPs directly by building dedicated vocational training centers (VTCs) in IDP settlement areas. Multi-agency initiatives have worked with regional governments to support vocational schools in Kutaisi, Kobuleti, Batumi, and elsewhere.

Increasing access to financial assets by providing grants and loans. There are many different permuta-

tions to grant and credit programs. Some offer financial resources that aim to alleviate immediate poverty. NGOs often try to match financial assets with natural and physical assets (such as livestock and equipment), and with technical support and training, to help IDPs acquire vocational and/or business skills. This is intended to allow them to improve the profitability of existing income-generating activities or start up new microenterprises. NGOs have given cash transfers or grants to IDPs, such as the project implemented by the Centre for Training and Consultancy (CTC) with funding from USAID. With maximum grants of US\$1500 and average grants of US\$1150, IDPs are encouraged to utilize their skills and start or develop a business. There is some evidence that this is a successful livelihood support strategy—CTC data suggests that 208 grants resulted in 170 operational microenterprises with an average household income increase of 27 percent in 2011 and 37 percent in 2012.⁴³ Another example is the Stabilization and Integration of IDPs into Mainstream Georgian Society Project (SIIMS), implemented by

Persecuted from the Occupied Territories of Georgia.

43 CTC program monitoring figures, April 2013.

Box 1: Changing Lives Through Livelihoods Projects

CARE International: The Stabilization and Integration of IDPs into Mainstream Georgian Society Project (SIIMS)

Khizanishvili worked in a bakery close to the Karaleti settlement. The bakery was busy but a lack of capital held back its development. In 2011 Khizanishvili received a US\$1000 grant. Khizanishvili used the money to purchase a grill to roast chicken and an oven to bake khatchapuri, traditional bread. Buying the equipment made Khizanishvili a shareholder in the business and allowed the bakery to add one permanent and one part-time employee. The business now employs five people. "I did not expect to win this grant," she said. "Somehow it saved me. I woke up and I became more active. Now I'm searching for more opportunities. I am more motivated."

CHCA, UNHCR

Zurab Chikvatia lives in a Tbilisi IDP CC. He has expertise in the production of sunflower seeds and operated as a bulk sunflower seed seller. His experience taught him he could add value and increase his profits by packaging his seeds and selling them wholesale.

With a 4,800 GEL soft loan funded by UNHCR in 2011, Chikvatia procured packaging machines and materials. He now successfully produces and sells his seeds packaged in varying weights. His profits have increased considerably and he employs nine IDPs.

CARE. This program supported IDPs with financial grants and equipment. Increasingly, however, donors prefer implementing partners to provide loans in which capital and interest are repaid into a community or other fund to prevent dependency and engender beneficiary independence. Some schemes provide cofunding to scale up existing and well-established businesses.

Facilitating social, physical, and financial assets through community mobilization. Community mobilization approaches to IDP livelihood support assume that IDP communities share common goals. Meeting those goals is intended to enhance the livelihood environment of all IDPs within that community. The process of community mobilization usually entails in-depth participatory consultations in which community members identify their livelihood priorities and needs. Community members are then offered resources they can use to act on or invest in those priorities. A community management structure is often set up to supervise the implementation and use of

the community asset and secure its ongoing operation and maintenance.

In the Georgian context, an example of a community-focused approach is the development of agricultural associations by organizations such as USAID/Chemonics/NEO, FAO, UNHCR, and Action Contra La Faim (ACF). The associations manage infrastructure such as irrigation projects. These enable member farmers to enhance crop yields and use equipment they would not normally have access to as individual farmers. Joint purchase and coordinated selling also enable farmers to grow crops with fiscal efficiency and maximize profits. ACF and other organizations that specialize in agricultural associations have noted that memories of Soviet collectivization remain strong in Georgia, which generates antipathy towards such associations. As a result they have had to develop especially robust mobilization techniques that bring together communities and local authorities to maximize associations' effectiveness and ensure that what is owned by all is used and cared for by all.

PART 3

Challenges, Opportunities, and Recommendations for Sustainable Livelihoods of IDPs

Assessing the effectiveness of IDP livelihood support programs in Georgia is hampered by the lack of full-scale project and program evaluations.⁴⁴ Some projects do generate ongoing and end-of-project results data, but usually this type of assessment concentrates on output level results (such as the number and type of assets provided). There is a lack of strong analysis of outcomes and changes for IDP incomes and employment, and of the factors that facilitated or hampered success. Even where impact evaluations exist, the lack of comparable indicators across projects constrains comparative analysis of the effectiveness of different types of project activities.

Taking this into account, this review used results data where it exists. It complemented this with interviews in which practitioners were asked to reflect on their experiences with IDP livelihood support. This enabled the review to identify six major circumstantial challenges that impede IDPs' ability to secure sustainable livelihoods: 1) lack of access to land; 2) constrained access to financial services; 3) depleted skills and knowledge; 4) lack of social capital; 5) psychosocial issues and aid dependency; and 6) the extreme vulnerability of some IDPs. While some of these challenges are relevant to many of Georgia's poor, they are especially acute in the lives of IDPs. Each challenge is described and where relevant, examples of current project interventions are offered. Each challenge is also analyzed to include any current opportunities for improvement in current practice. Recommendations for how to enhance or modify approaches to ensure further success are also included.

44 This problem is not unique to Georgia; a recent review of IDP livelihood support schemes for IDPs worldwide noted a complete dearth of independent impact evaluations or assessment of lessons learned (World Bank, 2013).

Challenge One: Access to Land

Despite the fact that many IDPs prefer agricultural livelihoods, and in spite of the government's attempts to apportion land to NCL IDPs, some IDPs still face considerable constraints in pursuing agricultural production. In the NCL settlements, the size and quality of land and kitchen gardens mean that few IDPs are able to earn an income; agricultural activities are largely subsistence in nature.⁴⁵ Annex 1 gives an overview of land and resource allocation to the main NCL IDP settlements.⁴⁶

The allocation of land to OCL IDPs has been inconsistent. In 2011 some IDPs reported they had not been allocated land by local authorities. Even where OCL IDPs have access to land, its quality can be too poor for viable production. For example, in fieldwork undertaken for this review, both IDPs and host community members in the Shida Kartli region reported that unreliable irrigation systems meant they were unable to risk expanding crop production.⁴⁷

One option for IDPs who do not own land is to rent or share unused land from their non-IDP neighbors. Some IDPs have taken this route to proactively increase their land assets. A small study by WFP⁴⁸ found

45 FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations) and UNIFEM (United Nations Development Fund for Women). 2009. *Needs Assessment: A Gender Approach to Conflict-Affected Populations in Rural Areas*. Rome: FAO.

46 Baseline Assessment Report from May 2013, for the FAO project OSRO/GEO/101/EC.

47 However, Shida Kartli is an area targeted for irrigation projects by NGOs and the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA).

48 WFP (World Food Program) and MRA (Ministry for Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Accom-

that a few households in the NCL settlements farmed land through informal land rental arrangements with host communities. Land rentals average about 100 GEL per year for a hectare of unirrigated land, while irrigated land rents for 500 GEL.⁴⁹

However, many IDPs appear to lack of confidence in rented land. Rural IDPs interviewed for this review suggested that landowners may rent uncultivated land to IDPs and take the land back for their own use when the land has been cleared and brought into cultivation. IDPs appear to be unaware of the use of contracts for agricultural land rental, which are enforceable within the civil law norms that govern leasing relations.⁵⁰

Difficulty accessing land is not the only barrier IDPs face in agricultural enterprise. Even when IDPs have access to land and can engage in surplus production, their ability to generate more significant income from agricultural activities can be severely hampered by poor marketing opportunities. Several factors con-

tribute to this. The first is a wider geopolitical context that affects the macro Georgian economy: restricted access to the Russian export market.⁵¹ The second is a lack of supporting infrastructure required to create the preconditions for successful trade in some remote areas. A poor (but improving) primary road and rail network means goods can be delayed and/or damaged in transit. While this affects the entire Georgian population, IDPs are especially vulnerable because many of their residences and CCs are located in remote areas. NCL IDP settlements have a noticeable lack of agricultural storage facilities, which means that crops are sold in bulk and cheaply, so they can be moved before they rot. Thirdly, there is a lack of technical understanding about constraints or opportunities for marketing, profitability, and how to adapt activities to achieve more income.

Current Opportunities

A number of factors bode well for revitalizing Georgia's agricultural production. Relations between Georgia and Russia have thawed since the 2012 elec-

modation and Refugees of Georgia). 2012. Community Profiling Studies of IDP Settlements in Georgia. Rome: WFP.

49 Interview with Dragan Angelovski, UN FAO, February 21, 2013, Tbilisi, Georgia.

50 Correspondence with Georgian Young Lawyers Association (GYLA), March 1, 2013.

51 Analysis of Georgian exports shows that prior to the 2008 conflict, Georgia's main export market was Russia. According to Geostat, a 2005 high of US\$150 million worth of exports had dropped to US\$45 million in 2012. The Russian trade embargo reduced Georgian exports by 82 percent at its peak and remains reduced by 70 percent.

Box 2: Lack of Land and Lost Opportunities

Members of an IDP community who lived in government-owned buildings in very poor conditions successfully practiced good husbandry and managed to increase the number of chickens, cattle, ducks, and other livestock provided through a project by the NGO Consent. Community members were also given equipment and technical assistance. Two years after the project began, community members built rudimentary greenhouses utilizing plastic sheeting provided by an international organization. Greens and herbs were grown and consumed by participating families, which saved them from needing to buy food at the market.

City authorities own the land on which the greenhouses were built. Hoping to expand their activities, the IDPs developed well thought-out expansion and marketing plans that could have helped the effort transition from subsistence agricultural activities to livelihood and employment. The plans proposed the use of more land, and the community asked authorities for permission to use an area of unused scrub land nearby. The request was denied on the grounds that the land was for public use. Thus, the IDPs remained unable to scale up their production.

tions, and this has provided increased business opportunities both for export and foreign investment by Russia. Simultaneously the Georgian government recently announced they would prioritize large investments in agriculture. Currently, approximately 50 percent of arable land in Georgia is not used for agriculture.⁵² There is increasing political commitment to bring more arable land into production by improving irrigation and drainage, enhancing security of land tenure, providing agricultural equipment, and enhancing financial resources.

While not specifically targeted at IDPs, the increase in cultivatable land may enable entrepreneurial IDPs to rent and farm land. There is often considerable underutilized land and other resources close to IDP settlements,⁵³ and these could be rented and cultivated. This can be complemented by providing legal and protection services to IDPs, such as the work undertaken by the Georgian Young Lawyers Association, which has worked to strengthen farmers' and IDPs' understanding of contracts and land leasing. Even if IDPs remain unwilling to rent land, the increased livelihood potential for non-IDP farmers will correspondingly increase the need for labor, which may provide IDP employment opportunities.

Another major government initiative aims to direct financial support to 640,000 small farmers covering 5 million hectares.⁵⁴ Known as the "Small Land-Owners Farmers Support Programme," the scheme will provide direct payments via vouchers totalling more than 180 million GEL. Payments are set on a sliding scale. Landowners with up to 0.25 hectares of land (which encompasses the majority of land-owning IDPs) will receive a voucher worth 100 GEL that can be exchanged only for agrochemicals and agricultural equipment. Land owners with 0.25–1.25 hectares of land will receive vouchers redeemable for land cultivation services as well as agrochemicals and equipment.⁵⁵ These proposed vouchers will increase the

physical assets for agriculture. The challenge will be to inform IDPs about and include them in the various program benefits.

Recommendations

Many IDPs would benefit from improved access to and formal ownership of irrigated, fertile agricultural land. Land could also serve as collateral and allow IDPs to access formal financial services. To enable this, the following is needed:

- The MRA, donors, and NGOs should coordinate with the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) to ensure IDPs are considered key stakeholders in new initiatives to bring arable land back into production. IDPs need to be included as a special target group in new land reclamation and distribution schemes. For example, some negotiation may be needed to ensure that IDPs benefit from improved irrigation in arable lands close to IDP settlements.
- The government, NGOs, UN organizations, and donors can take a comprehensive nationwide stock of access to land by IDPs, leading to further land allocation where necessary to address inequities in current land distribution to IDPs;
- The MRA and MoA should launch information campaigns that allow IDPs to be educated and equipped to register their land title;
- The MRA and MoA legal departments, with the support of Georgian NGOs such as the Georgian Young Lawyers Association (GYLA), can help IDPs engage in the land rental market through improved understanding of the mechanics and protection of land rental contracts.

Even with improved access to good quality land, there are multiple obstacles that must be overcome to help the rural population profit from their agricultural pursuits. It is recommended that the MRA and the MoA establish a coordination mechanism to identify ways in which generic agricultural investments intended to benefit the whole rural population need to

52 Angelovski, interview.

53 WFP and MRA. 2012. *Community Profiling Studies of IDP Settlements in Georgia*.

54 Ministry of Agriculture of Georgia. <http://moa.gov.ge/?lang=en>.

55 Ibid.

be modified, and to identify special outreach activities that would allow IDPs to benefit. For example, IDPs should be considered as key stakeholders in Georgia's infrastructure planning and investments so that infrastructure is designed and routed in such a way that IDPs settlements are included and IDPs gain infrastructure benefits.⁵⁶

Challenge Two: Access to Financial Services

IDPs are subject to the same commercial loan conditions as non-IDPs—that is, they must provide collateral or financial guarantees. Through housing investments, some IDPs have received privatized accommodation that can be used as collateral.⁵⁷ However many IDPs have not been through the privatization process or are PA renting or living with friends and relatives who possess no collateral. Their lack of credit history and chronic unemployment compounds the problem. Therefore, IDPs wishing to start or expand a business are excluded from credit because they do not meet credit conditions. They remain dependent on friends, families, and the NGO sector for financial services.

The situation is exacerbated for IDPs who have returned to the Gali region of Abkhazia. Organizations that have worked or funded projects in the Gali region⁵⁸ state that although a banking sector exists in Abkhazia, it is not available to anyone who is non-Abkhaz. The DRC was told that commercial banking credit facilities cannot be extended to the Gali region, as Abkhaz banking staff fear retribution when visiting Georgian clients. This means that collateral assessments would be impossible, as would be realizing any

56 A precedent for the inclusion of IDPs into infrastructure planning has been set by a recent ACF project, funded by the EU, which worked with the Ministry of Rural Development and Infrastructure to assess where infrastructure development could be redesigned in order to have maximum benefits for IDPs.

57 Statement by MRA during meeting with author, March 2013. At the same meeting, the MRA stated that some IDPs had lost possession of their privatized properties due to repossession by banks.

58 Principally, the ACF, DRC, EU, NRC, SDC, and UNDP.

security in the case of default and repossession. Likewise, banks and microcredit institutions from other parts of Georgia are unable to lend to clients in the Gali region because the lack of jurisdiction and rule of Georgian law in Abkhazia means collateral could never be monetized in the case of default. Therefore Georgian IDPs in Abkhazia lack opportunities to start or expand businesses.

NGOs have sought to fill the credit gap for IDPs with various schemes for grants or loans. One variation is an interest subsidy program like the one implemented by the Centre for Training and Consultancy (CTC), a Georgian NGO. This initiative reduced the interest rate for livelihood development loans to CTC beneficiary IDPs from the bank rate of 36 percent to 17 percent.

Experience increasingly shows that the success of financing provision relies on providing parallel technical assistance and ongoing support for IDP grant or loan applicants. Several projects now only allow a loan application to be submitted after an applicant successfully completes a business-training course run by the project provider. The client also receives regular advisory visits from project staff. Technical assistance may encompass a range of topics, including money management and value chain analysis (VCA). VCA helps beneficiaries identify the inputs, processes, or activities (for example, packaging or different marketing techniques) by which a company or individual adds value to an article or service. Clients can then manage those value-added processes themselves to retain more profit. Good quality VCA requires understanding the political economy of livelihoods, above and beyond the provision of assets. This may include analysis of how community relations—including historic animosities and mistrust—may affect value chain actions. NGOs in Georgia are learning that when correctly applied, political economy assessment and VCA can have a transformative impact on project success.

Financing schemes and VCA technical assistance for microenterprise appear to be especially effective when used to scale up an already established microenterprise. Multiple permanent jobs can be created by carefully selecting skilled individual IDP entrepreneurs whose businesses require specific investment

to expand. The key to project success tends to be the human capital of the targeted clients.

Current Opportunities

The new government has formed a one billion Lari “Rural and Agricultural Development Fund” with which it plans to subsidize commercial agricultural loans. This fund would be used to pay all or part of a loan’s interest, thus effectively making the loan interest free. The interest subsidy will be on a sliding scale according to the land owned by the applicant. The problem for IDPs is that collateral will still be required, meaning that access to credit is likely to remain a problem.

There is increasing expertise in Georgia on offering VCA technical assistance to IDP recipients of loans and grants. NGOs have found it particularly effective to follow VCA up by making connections between beneficiaries and partner agencies that can practically illustrate value-adding actions. For example, ACF is working with EU funding to engage with existing agricultural businesses to transfer knowledge and expertise to Georgian farmers. Another example is CARE’s agricultural “best practice” demonstration plots, which showcase productive farming methods.

Recommendations

Given IDPs’ challenges in accessing financing, it is likely that some form of targeted financing provision will benefit this sector for some time to come. However, it will be difficult for the international NGO sector to sustain this provision, given the large

overheads and diminishing funding for these types of projects. Therefore, the following is recommended:

- International NGOs should seek to improve the capacity of the local microfinance and credit union sector in Georgia. They should equip local providers to take on this role while at the same time advocating for national level structures that can regulate and support the sector at an institutional level.

It is important that IDPs are financially literate and equipped with the skills to manage and invest credit effectively. VCA offers an important tool to allow IDPs to design and adapt their microenterprises, but there is room to improve the systematic application of VCA alongside the provision of grant or credit resources. While VCA can be effective it is a relatively unknown concept in Georgia and considerable government efforts will be required to maximise its impact. Therefore, there is scope to:

- Bring together livelihood service providers to compare VCA methodologies, which enables the comprehensive identification of multiple constraints and opportunities faced by farmers and producers, processors, traders, and other businesses at multiple levels and points along a given value chain. This could lead to the standardization of tools.
- Train staff in how to apply the VCA tools to IDP beneficiaries.

Box 3: Supporting Successful Business Models

After competitively evaluating small businesses and individual entrepreneurs by value chain and verifiable market analysis, the DRC awarded the strongest proposals interest-bearing cash loans or grants of equipment. In return, the business or entrepreneur provided full-time employment to an agreed number of IDPs and non-IDPs.

An internal evaluation showed that 58 percent of funded projects reported an increase in monthly profits of more than 300 GEL. In addition, 38 percent of beneficiaries reinvested the increased profit into the business, 17 percent considered their knowledge of business management increased as a result of the project, 57 percent considered their customer numbers increased, and 92 percent continued to generate profitable income one year after the disbursement.

1. Danish Refugee Council (DRC). 2010. Durable Solutions: A Way Forward for IDPs in Georgia. Annual report. Tbilisi, Georgia: DRC.

Challenge Three: Social Capital

Social networks through which individuals and families derive social capital⁵⁹ can take generations to build. In Georgia, these networks are especially important for disseminating information about employment opportunities, facilitating contacts, and making the kinds of connections useful for getting introduced to potential employers or to collaborate on income-generating activities such as sharing risk, equipment, and labor.

As more recent arrivals in communities or because of their residence in physically segregated CCs, IDPs are often not fully part of broader social networks and are therefore unable to take advantage of the opportunities they present. A survey in a CC in Tbilisi found, “These types of spaces do not promote social interaction within the local urban community, as they are spaces closed off from the outer environment, both symbolically and literally.”⁶⁰ In addition, insecurity

59 For more information on building social capital, see: Wilson, Patricia A. 1997. “Building Social Capital: A Learning Agenda for the 21st Century.” *Urban Studies* 34 (5–6): 745–760.

60 Singh, Namrita, and Courtland Robinson. 2010. “Support Systems Among Urban IDPs in Georgia.” *Forced Migration Review* 34. <http://www.fmreview.org/en/urban-displacement/FMR34.pdf>.

related to eviction or unclear messages about the possible resettlement of IDPs can undermine IDPs’ willingness or ability to invest in social networks, as they cannot envision anything other than residing temporarily in that locality. However, visits to settlements and CCs undertaken for this review found that issues around social capital can be nuanced: community leaders in one NCL settlement, for example, said that young people had developed links with the non-IDP community through school and other activities. It was unclear, though, if these new links had resulted in employment for significant numbers of younger IDPs, as many are still in school.

Even within IDP communities, social networks can be weak. While some IDPs may live in the same CCs and NCL settlements, residents can originate from diverse areas. These collections of fractured communities have not had sufficient time to develop networks, hence social capital within settlements tends to remain within families. This is borne out by a 2012 WFP survey that identified as a constraint in IDP settlements “the reluctance of many IDPs to co-operate with each other on agricultural activities which would enable them to increase their production and output.”⁶¹

NGOs have sought to address this difficulty by apply-

61 WFP and MRA. 2012. *Community Profiling Studies of IDP Settlements in Georgia*, p. 62.

Box 4: Livelihood Changes Through Collective Action

With funding from the U.S. Department of State, UNHCR set up community livelihood projects, including a community chicken farming business in Shida Kartli. A key component has been partnering with an organization that has outside expertise—the Institute for Regional Development-Shida Kartli. A chicken farm was constructed in a remote building located near the Berbuki IDP settlement in Shida Kartli. The community-based organization Association Kheltubani 2010, composed of 20 IDP families, was established to run the farm. The Kheltubani chicken farm opened in January 2011 and now counts 3,000 chickens, with the capacity to expand to 6,500 heads. The first round of chickens was sold in February 2011 at 6 GEL per kilo, generating an overall income of 29,480 GEL. The partner agency applied VCA to guide design decisions, such as the positioning of the farm close to a source of workers and the choice of business. The farm’s operation by a community-based organisation means the enterprise has workers who have a stake in the business, the necessary technical knowledge, and a product with a ready market.

ing community mobilization approaches to livelihood support programs. They have encouraged community members to collaborate with each other and to build social capital within their place of residence by defining and acting on common goals. For example, FAO provided wells and irrigation pumps to groups of ten households in IDP settlements. The recipients had to work together and share the costs and maintenance of the equipment. The program increased production by up to 53 percent and by an average of 26 percent across all types of crops.⁶²

The risk with such approaches is that the conclusions reached by the community actually only reflect the views of the dominant families and individuals. They thus serve to increase their power and influence at the expense of the more vulnerable. Special efforts and intensive facilitation are required to ensure that vulnerable and voiceless community members are included in community mobilization efforts.

Current Opportunities

The large investment in IDP housing over the past five years has helped give some IDPs a more secure sense of place and more incentive to invest in social relationships. Where IDPs are more permanently settled, the time is ripe for investments, which can strengthen social interactions and connections. Initiatives that fund for IDP and host or local community initiatives to plan joint activities (from cultural events to physically improving the local area) can incentivize cohesion. That the provision and improvement of housing accommodation for IDPs is still ongoing offers another opportunity. Sympathetic construction and rehabilitation design would include spaces for social interaction and to host social events such as weddings and funerals, which are very important for forming social bonds within IDP communities.

62 Mollet, Matthias. 2011. *Evaluation of FAO Agricultural Livelihoods Improvement for IDP Settlements Programme*. Rome: FAO. The following increases in production were reported against crops: garlic (23 percent), onion (22 percent), fruit vegetables (29 percent), herbs (19 percent), potatoes (39 percent), root vegetables (11 percent), grapes (10 percent), fruit trees (20 percent), maize (53 percent), cabbage (23 percent), beans (33 percent).

Recommendations

Much remains to be understood about the pathways by which IDPs develop useful social capital and how this may increase their livelihood and employment opportunities. Therefore it is recommended:

- To undertake further qualitative research; such research would identify the points at which outside facilitation and intervention can facilitate the formation of more robust social connections within IDP communities and between IDPs and the nondisplaced that could lead to livelihood outcomes.
- In the meantime, the following actions are likely to help build IDPs' social capital and bolster their sense of empowerment:
- Expand the use of community mobilization approaches, where groups of IDPs collectively identify their development priorities and are supported to take responsibility for actions to address those problems;
- Design investments for IDPs to encourage cross-community contact and collaboration between IDPs and non-IDPs. This will encourage social capital to form between IDPs and the rest of society. To enable this, livelihood opportunities should be offered to host communities as well as IDPs.
- Given that schooling plays an important role in allowing young IDPs to meet peers from nondisplaced communities, ensure that IDP children participate fully in all aspects of school, college, and university life, including recreation. They should not suffer discrimination or marginalization within their classes or from their teachers and peers.

Avoid housing IDPs in geographically isolated locations. Housing investments (such as new settlements or rehabilitated CCs) should incorporate spaces for community social interaction and lifecycle events such as marriages and funerals.

Challenge Four: Skills and Knowledge

In Georgia, there is commonly a mismatch between skills provided by the education system and the skills demanded by the labor market.⁶³ This situation is compounded for IDPs who have often found that skills that served them well in Abkhazia or South Ossetia are not so relevant in their new environment. Even transferable skills such as farming can be less applicable in areas that support different kinds of crops. As time passes, (especially for OCL IDPs, who have been displaced for up to twenty years), skills such as carpentry or engineering become outdated as new technology and materials enter the market.⁶⁴ An unquantifiable number of IDPs therefore remain disadvantaged in the employment market and trapped in a cycle of unemployment or low-paid jobs because they have missed out on the education, apprenticeships, work experience, and training that would make them competitive in the contemporary marketplace.

Vocational training has increasingly met this challenge over the years. Programs have moved away

63 World Bank. 2013. *Skills Mismatch and Unemployment: Labor Market Challenges in Georgia*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

64 For example, “new” technology started to become common in cars fifteen to twenty years ago. Even “older” vehicles in Georgia contain engine management systems requiring diagnostic knowledge and tools not possessed by mechanics who have been unable to keep abreast of changes. Without this knowledge and equipment, these IDP mechanics are excluded from an increasing number of potential repair jobs, and thus their skills become less relevant.

from the short training sessions that were designed to cover a maximum number of students and often left them ill-equipped for the workplace. Service providers⁶⁵ now invest in vocational training of sufficient length and depth and are aligned with local employers’ needs. For example, the Kobuleti Vocational Training Center (VTC),⁶⁶ which targets IDPs, liaises with businesses to identify skills that businesses require, and then provides tailored training in those skills. Students are offered recognized certification and business start-up options when they successfully graduate. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) has complemented vocational training by implementing job placement programs in coordination with the government and employers. The advantage of such an approach is to make the non-IDP business community aware of the “underutilised resource”⁶⁷ of IDPs and gain from their skills, experience, and labor.⁶⁸

One significant challenge agencies face in job placement schemes is IDPs’ unrealistic expectations re-

65 Including the Ministry of Education and Sciences, UNDP, USAID, EU, NRC, and DRC.

66 Supported by Sida, USAID, NRC and IOM.

67 UNDP interview, February 15, 2013.

68 Deloitte. Implementing the Economic Prosperity Initiative (EPI) project uses a more macro approach by seeking investment into and expansion of Georgian industry. Recent investments by foreign garment manufacturers have resulted in Deloitte and the Ministry of Education and Sciences (MoE) providing training in production-line garment making. The aim is to develop skills and a “culture of garment production” as opposed to traditional bespoke tailoring. The scheme has provided twenty trained students to factories who, seeing the benefit of training, are now providing their own training facilities.

Box 5: Vocational Training for Employment

Staff at the IOM job counseling and placement program identified job vacancies, matched them with profiles of job seekers and VTC graduates, and provided potential candidates for interviews. The program placed 30.1 percent of registered job seekers over a twenty-five month period, creating 7,110 new jobs. The synergy between business, government, support providers, and students was especially successful in placing people in jobs in areas where the tourist industry is strong.

1. IOM Job Counseling and Placement Project in Georgia. “Statistics by Region.” IOM. <http://www.jcp.ge/index.php?a=main&mid=20&lang=en>.

garding the types of jobs for which they are qualified. The IOM's employment placement project, run in connection with VTCs, has attempted to address this issue through a case-management approach that assesses an individual's strengths and weaknesses and pairs them, either directly or via training, with an employer. The project provides job counseling in which clients are apprised of their job prospects. At this stage, their expectations are aligned with the reality of the job market. Other organizations, such as CTC, offer IDPs job counseling. They view the issue of expectations as part of the overall psychosocial struggles of IDPs, discussed below.

With USAID funding, Deloitte works with the government to attract foreign investment. A key requirement of investors is an available and skilled workforce. The program has been training IDPs and non-IDPs in garment machining and reports a high employment rate among graduates. With the program's help, garment factories are now able to set up their own vocational training programs to align graduates' skills with their requirements.

Current Opportunities

In Georgia, programs designed to meet these challenges now benefit from over a decade of experience.

Increasingly they emphasize comprehensive courses designed with businesses so that students graduate with skills the market demands. The positioning of initiatives, such as IOM's employment program within VTCs and the closer involvement of the Ministry of Education and local businesses, has offered examples of how cooperation and coordination can develop IDP livelihoods.

A growing body of global experience on best practices for vocational training schemes can be used to enhance programs in Georgia. For example, VTCs in Georgia are already benefiting from lessons from the German government's vocational education and training (VET) program. This stresses how important it is for the unemployed (and in particular youth) to learn new skills and keep current skills relevant. It also recognizes that many long-term unemployed lack sufficient schooling and life skills. As a result, VTCs in Georgia now provide life skills training to young students. They also cover some taboo subjects, such as drugs and sexuality. Anecdotal evidence suggests that a holistic approach that incorporates life skills and psychosocial support increases students' confidence and can benefit their studies.

Box 6: Expectations and Jobs Mismatch

A DRC project aimed to provide permanent full-time work for newly relocated IDPs. Preliminary project design work with both businesses and IDPs identified very strong support for the project from both parties as well as local government. One hundred and fifty potential workers registered for jobs. As the project was implemented, thirty eight job vacancies were created. The jobs were mostly unskilled or low-skilled posts but represented permanent formal employment. When the NGO approached the IDPs with job opportunities no IDPs applied and the project did not reach its initial targets. The posts were subsequently offered to PA IDPs and the vacancies filled. The mode has been modified and is no longer in use in its original form.

Evaluation analysis showed that two key factors influenced the behaviour of the IDPs, who initially expressed enthusiasm for the project. The first was fear over the potential loss of government benefits. The second was that IDPs had unrealistic expectations.

The project surveyed IDPs' job skills and employment experience. Analysis showed a low level of skills and experience. However, when asked which jobs they sought and were qualified for, the IDPs said they wanted to work in office, administration, government, and highly skilled technical trades. Many regarded the length and conditions of their displacement as qualifications for a well-paid skilled job irrespective of their experience. High expectations manifested themselves when employment opportunities were presented and they turned them down on the grounds the posts were unsuitable.

Recommendations

IDPs must become more competitive in the marketplace. They can achieve this by acquiring professional skills that will increase their chances of securing more lucrative and stable employment or by seeking more competitive and profitable market niches. The models piloted by NGOs with donor funding could be adopted and expanded by the Georgian government. Within enlarged schemes there would be a continued need to:

- Align vocational training schemes with professions for which there is market demand.
- Facilitate the entry of IDPs into the job market with job placement support using a case-management approach.
- Work with individuals to identify and manage their expectations in relation to employment realities, ensuring that the client understands the parameters of the program and what can be achieved.
- Refine such programs to allow a tailored response. The program should be adapted to the realities of the beneficiary rather than expecting conformity amongst all beneficiaries. As such, programs could encompass a range of needs and accommodate both IDP entrants without any skills and those whose skills are in need of updating or enhancing.
- Ensure VTC courses provide personal, social, and technical life skills, which will lead to stronger confidence and higher self-esteem among graduates.

Challenge Five: Psychosocial Issues and Aid Dependency

The psychological impacts of displacement in Georgia are well documented: the IDMC's 2012 paper, "Mental Health of IDPs,"⁶⁹ provides a good overview

69 IDMC. 2012. "Mental Health of IDPs." IDMC. [http://www.internal-displacement.org/idmc/website/countries.nsf/\(httpEnvelopes\)/9C67D59952A3E2A1C12579C7000A872B?OpenDocument](http://www.internal-displacement.org/idmc/website/countries.nsf/(httpEnvelopes)/9C67D59952A3E2A1C12579C7000A872B?OpenDocument).

of the main issues. Depression is particularly prevalent among male IDPs; alcoholism, domestic violence, listlessness, and "routine time-passing"⁷⁰ are especially common among the long-term displaced.

Many factors contribute to the lack of psychosocial well-being among Georgian IDPs. Like displaced persons all over the world, Georgian IDPs suffer a residual sense of loss for all they were forced to give up when fleeing from conflict. The uncertainty of their current situation and the day-to-day pressures of poverty compound these feelings. The stress of "living in limbo," hoping to return to their places of origin but unsure if they will ever do so, can be particularly exaggerated for those who live in insecure residences and face possible eviction or further dislocation and resettlement.

The impact of psychosocial stress on IDPs' ability to secure sustainable livelihoods is profound. It is likely that psychologically "living in limbo" affects IDPs' social, investment, and employment choices, making them less likely to develop long-term asset-management strategies or to make ambitious livelihood choices.⁷¹ A 2003 study conducted among Georgian IDPs correlated psychosomatic illness and depression with feelings of despondency and passivity, leading to an inability to interact socially and become economically self-reliant.⁷² Many IDPs appear to have created a "comfort zone" of daily chores and routines; they use this as coping strategy to whittle away long empty hours. But these routines can stifle creativity, initiative, and motivation; people can become dependent upon their routine to the exclusion of other activities or opportunities.⁷³

70 Ibid.

71 Holtzman, Steven B., and Taies Tezam. 2004. *Living in Limbo: Conflict-Induced Displacement in Europe and Central Asia*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

72 Sumbadze, N., & G. Tarkhan-Mouravi. 2003. *Development Strategy for Akhalkalaki and Akhaltsikhe Districts of Samtskhe-Javakheti*. Concept paper commissioned by the Open Society-Georgia Foundation, Tbilisi, Georgia.

73 Selig, Meg, 2010, September 14. "Routines: Comforting or Confining?" *Psychology Today*. <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/changepower/201009/routines-comforting-or-confining>.

As with many long-term unemployed, IDPs can fear returning to work. Taking up a new job requires ambition, initiative, and a feeling of self-worth, all attributes easily eroded by depression and reliance on daily routines. Although an IDP may desire employment, transitioning into a job can be a bewildering experience—a transition many IDPs are unwilling or unable to make.

In focus group meetings held for this review, IDPs reported that taking work in the informal economy (where available) has become the norm; they hold no reservations about such work. However, they reflected that joining a commercial company as a permanent employee presents particular concerns, including: Will the family lose entitlements to state benefits? Is the job secure, or will the IDP shortly be made redundant? How will s/he cope, perform, get on with the workforce? Will s/he encounter discrimination from fellow workers? How will s/he find the time to do all the things in their daily routine if holding a full time job?⁷⁴

Another consequence of IDPs' depressed psychosocial profile is their sense of feeling dependent on others to provide livelihoods for them, rather than

74 Focus group meetings, March 2013.

acknowledging their own resources and competencies. Aid dependency is an acknowledged problem worldwide.⁷⁵ For Georgian IDPs, it manifests itself in very high levels of financial and emotional reliance on government subsidies and benefits. The possibility of losing these benefits, especially subsidized access to medical insurance,⁷⁶ can be a crippling worry, preventing IDPs from seeking out alternative, more lucrative livelihood options.

If the family's income rises above a certain level and their poverty ranking decreases, there is a chance they will lose benefits. While the loss of cash benefits concerns IDP families, the loss of medical insurance worries them most. These fears are compounded by the fact that many IDPs do not understand the social benefits system and the consequences employment has on access to subsidies. This is enough to hold some IDPs back from pursuing formal employment.

75 However, aid dependency has diminished markedly in many countries since 2000, and some commentators argue it is not as much of a problem as commonly perceived. See: Sullivan, Laura. 2011. "Real Aid Can End Aid Dependency." ActionAid. <http://www.actionaidusa.org/eu/2011/05/real-aid-can-end-aid-dependency>.

76 However, this concern may be alleviated as the government plans a free universal health care service.

Box 7: Participation Encourages Long-Term Investments

A cost-share scheme implemented by FAO gave individual farmers an opportunity to purchase livestock with assistance from FAO if they contributed US\$400-500 from their own savings. Many farmers who could afford to participate successfully kept their livestock for production, rather than for their own consumption or to sell. The number of livestock sold or slaughtered for food under the program was negligible, and the proportion of newborn livestock was greater under the program than for farmers who received grant aid.

A 2011 evaluation found the approach did not suit everyone; 76.5 percent of people targeted could not afford the cost-share component. But when people were able to afford it, the approach was successful. Recipients raised funds by using their own savings (48 percent), borrowing the money (34 percent), accessing credit through financial services (13 percent) and selling assets (5 percent).

According to an evaluation, a sense of commitment contributed to the program's success, in that program participants took a long-term view of their investment. They considered their priority to be to raise their income via an increase in stock, while grant recipients regarded their livestock more as a source of immediate/short-term food and/or income. Following requests from IDPs who have been successful through this program, the FAO is now increasing the amount of cost share to US\$2,500.

Many organizations provide support in terms of community mobilisation and business and vocational training and development, but few provide support specifically aimed at enabling IDPs to become psychologically prepared for a return to work. CTC is unique in trying to tackle psychological problems among IDPs when providing small start-up and business development loans. Under the project, they provide specifically designed psychological counseling programs aimed at building confidence, relieving anxieties, and providing information so potential clients can make free and informed decisions. The methodology includes working on an individual basis when possible. The NGO reports that when coupled with a psychosocial component, there is higher, more confident, and ultimately more successful take up of the opportunities presented.

Other programs have tried to address the dependency risk by designing activities that attempt to instil a sense of self-reliance and responsibility in beneficiary IDPs. The FAO cost-share program, for example, was identified by an EU results-oriented monitoring (ROM) evaluation as an example of good practice in instilling a sense of commitment in participants.⁷⁷

Recommendations

NGOs and project implementers can do more to incorporate attention to IDPs' psychosocial needs into project activities:

- Livelihood programs will benefit from continuing to adopt a case-management approach to beneficiaries. This will allow them to fully explore and understand the psychosocial needs and constraints of each individual, putting in place tailored support packages that may include community-based psychosocial networks.
- A psychosocial counseling component will help mitigate psychological barriers to returning to work and psychologically prepare the IDP to return to work.
- At a more strategic level, the government of

Georgia will need to play a significant role in tackling the dependency syndrome of IDPs. This can be done by:

- Encouraging national discourses that frame IDPs as resilient and important potential contributors to the Georgian economy, rather than passive victims.
- Undertaking further analysis of any possible disincentives posed by the social welfare and medical insurance benefits system. A reform of the IDP law and eligibility for the monthly IDP allowance may prove to be too politically sensitive to achieve. But it would be apt to explore what poverty and social impacts transforming the subsidies from a status-based to needs-based assessment would have.
- Simplifying and disseminating information about the social assistance assessment methodology and poverty ranking system more widely among IDPs.

Challenge Six: Extremely Vulnerable IDPs

NGOs that monitor the provision of cash, equipment, or livestock activities realized that some IDP recipients had sold the equipment or slaughtered the livestock within one year of receipt. Upon analysis, the NGOs found the majority of cases were people who lived in extreme poverty or other forms of extreme vulnerability.

A 2011 evaluation of the FAO IDP livelihood support program found that 32 percent of beneficiaries who sold donated livestock did so because they needed money, while 56 percent said they needed to pay for medicines. Fifty three percent of beneficiaries in the same program said they consumed their livestock because they needed food.

EVIDPs are often unable to benefit from livelihood support programs; their struggle for survival is all consuming. For example, efforts to offer equipment and grants to IDP graduates of a VTC to start businesses proved challenging: of 76 grants of €450, only 42 graduates took up the offer. While some were in-

⁷⁷ EU ROM evaluation, November 5–16, 2012.

experienced in business start-up, a focus group found the need to earn money to support families was a key reason *not* to start a business.⁷⁸

EVIDPs fill their days meeting their many challenges, which include finding/growing food, looking for very low-paid day labor jobs, repairing poor shelter, caring for children, and traveling to obtain government subsidies. No time is left to work at developing new livelihoods. EVIDPs are also unable to take even simple risks connected to new livelihood strategies. The psychosocial impacts of displacement are often especially acute for this group. Additionally, many EVIDPs consist of female/single headed households, widows, disabled, and youth—people often physically unable to take advantage of livelihood opportunities, particularly labor-intensive ones.

EVIDPs have very little protection from financial shocks. When faced with a crisis, such as a medical

emergency, their only option is to sell or consume any livelihood assistance they have received. Charity Humanitarian Centre Abkhazeti (CHCA) found that 80 percent of failed livelihood loans were due to a medical emergency. Such medical needs are common; an evaluation of FAO’s agricultural programs in new settlements found that “56 percent of households had at least one member of their family sick during the previous three months and 30 percent of the children holding families have at least one child with growing difficulties.”⁷⁹

NGOs that deliver livelihood support programs are paying increasing attention to the special needs of EVIDPs. An important strategy is to use better targeting and to differentiate beneficiaries who may benefit from programs to start or grow existing businesses from EVIDPs who need to secure enough resources to stabilize their poverty. For example, in the Gali region of Abkhazia, the DRC implements a project that differentiates sustainability grants of up to US\$1,000 for extremely vulnerable families from business ex-

78 Hovey, Guy. 2010. *Monitoring and Evaluation Report for the Swedish International Development Cooperation (Sida) on Their “Durable Solutions: A Way Forward for IDPs in Georgia Programme.”* Stockholm: Sida, p. 20.

79 Mollet. 2011. *Evaluation of FAO Agricultural Livelihoods Improvement for IDP Settlements Programme.*

Box 8: Striking the Balance—Support and Poverty

The overarching strategic aim of the CHCA program is to enable clients to raise themselves out of poverty by offering them graduated support so they can eventually enter the commercial banking system as successful entrepreneurial customers. CHCA developed three stages of support designed to meet the varying needs of clients. They recognized that different levels of need require different levels of resources and that the monetary support required was inversely related to poverty levels:

Stage 1: Small Trader	Up to 500 GEL low-interest loan
Stage 2: Medium Trader	500–2,000 GEL medium-interest loan
Stage 3: High Volume Trader	2,000–5,000 GEL higher-interest loan

Small traders consist mainly of elderly EVIDPs who operate within the informal economy selling products such as sunflowers and khajipuri. The small loan enabled recipients to purchase goods to sell in markets and door to door, thus widening their income-generating potential. The income from such small-scale income-generating activities serves to supplement pensions and state benefits.

Stages 2 and 3 are utilized by those clients who have stabilized their domestic situation and are increasingly entrepreneurial. Loans are used to grow and expand existing or new livelihood ideas. These stages are mainly utilized by younger clients. Clients in Stage 3 who require further capital are encouraged to approach microfinance institutions or banks, thus exiting the program and entering the commercial world.

Table 1. A Graduated Program Approach to Tackling Extreme Vulnerability: The UMCOR BiH Example

Stage	Duration (years)	Client criteria	Product	Repayment
1	1	EVIDP/EVI	100% in-kind grant to stabilize vulnerability	None or minor "passing of the gift"
2	6 months	EVIDP/EVI from Stage 1	Follow on in-kind stabilization and income-generating grant	Community payback
3	1–2	Clients from Stage 2	Business expansion cash grant/loan through a commercial bank ⁸⁰	50%–80% repayment, very low interest
4	1–2	Clients from Stage 3	Business expansion cash loan through a commercial bank	100% repayment, mid-level interest
5	1–3	Clients from Stage 4	Business expansion loan from the bank, no UMCOR involvement	100% repayment, commercial interest rates (no subsidy)

United Methodist Committee on Relief (UMCOR) Bosnia and Herzegovina. 2005. "Building Reintegrated and Prosperous Communities." UMCOR BiH. http://gbgm-umc.org/umcor/ngo/balkans/bosnia/bih_usaid2.cfm.

pansion grants of up to US\$3,000 for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

Current Opportunities

The IDP livelihood sector has benefitted from the experience gained by more closely targeting beneficiaries and offering support more appropriately geared to their needs and abilities. Grants and loans can positively impact EVIDPs when used at the correct stage of development. There is a need to understand the nature of people's needs and their ability to capitalize on program inputs. For EVIDPS there is a clear need to define an incremental and coherent path from poverty to independence.

Global experience indicates that this approach can be taken to even more sophisticated levels. For example, a program in Bosnia funded by USAID adopted a case-management approach in which staff worked

intensively with extremely vulnerable clients and helped transition them into the formal commercial sector. While they provided mentoring, education, training, and business advice, the key financial support was graduated to reflect the client's journey to independence.

This methodology proved successful in the very difficult post-war reconstruction and return period and beyond. A 2004 independent evaluation of the program across 56 municipalities by the Sarajevo-based research company Prism Research found a majority of households had a perception that income had increased; 52 percent who had started a business had increased their income and 25 percent were obtaining credit from a commercial source.

Such examples offer important lessons for Georgian organizations regarding how to prevent uncoordinated assistance, which may leave IDPs without con-

tinuing support at a crucial phase of their business development.

Recommendations

In an effort to assist the most vulnerable, NGOs have attempted to fit EVIDPs into livelihood programs more appropriate for those in more secure economic situations. But only when the family is financially, psychologically, emotionally, and physically stable will it be able to capitalize on livelihood programs that require more risk and investment. Not all IDPs stabilize at the same rate, and more basic inputs and

80 The NGO deposited a substantial amount with two banks, agreed on a disbursement and repayment procedure with them, and provided a default insurance product.

assistance may be more appropriate for the extremely vulnerable. Therefore:

- IDP livelihood support programs will benefit from designs that allow them to target different households in different ways and from multileveled approaches that help people transition from extreme vulnerability to sustainable livelihoods over many years.
- This approach will only be possible with better data on the vulnerability of IDP beneficiaries. Vulnerability can be better understood among Georgian IDPs by taking poverty data into account as well as other dimensions of well-being, including psychosocial profiles and access to different types of assets. This will allow EVIDPs to be more clearly identified and more accurately targeted.

PART 4

Beyond Project-Based Livelihood Support

This review has shown that NGO projects have had reported success and impact at the individual level; the recommendations above are tailored to improve that practice. But the sheer scale of IDPs' problems with employment and accessing income indicates that organizations should consider the viability of small short-term projects compared to more strategic approaches that incorporate understanding not just of the improved provision of assets but also of the fuller political economy of livelihood support. NGO projects are often focused on providing assets and do not sufficiently craft development support that transforms the structural barriers that keep IDPs in poverty, such as access to employment, commercial markets, and urban biases. A more comprehensive macro approach is required to address these issues.⁸¹

Such a strategic approach will need several strands. First, support for IDP livelihoods cannot be effective if delivered in isolation of other elements of assistance. A holistic approach, for example, would ensure that projects consider how housing provision is linked to and can facilitate livelihood opportunities. If IDPs are relocated in areas with markets, employment opportunities, and access to land, they have a far greater chance of attaining sustainable incomes than if they are accommodated in remote, impoverished areas. Any future housing investments for IDPs will need to consider the residence's economic and social viability before relocation takes place.

A nationwide rehabilitation/resettlement strategy detailing all IDP CCs and settlements and the government's plans for their closure/resettlement, reha-

bilitation, and privatization will enable IDPs to plan future livelihood activities. If IDPs know their CC will be rehabilitated and they will remain in the area, they are more likely to engage in planned economic activity. Uncertainty about their residence will keep IDP investment at a minimum.

Second, there is critical need for stakeholders who primarily focus on IDPs to engage with actors involved in broader development investments. This will ensure that IDPs are included in wider national, regional, and local development strategies. It is essential that IDPs are seen as a legitimate constituent of mainstream development, lest they risk being excluded and marginalized from broader economic and social benefits. At the same time, while IDPs still suffer from greater disadvantage than other groups in Georgia, there is a justified place for targeted support to ensure they gain parity with the nondisplaced through additional resources. IDPs' unique needs may become subsumed should livelihood development programs increasingly target poverty reduction without differentiating between IDPs and non-IDPs.

Advocacy efforts must therefore simultaneously focus on inclusion and designated targeting. The livelihood strategy currently under development by the MRA will be critical to supporting IDPs and keeping their needs on the political and assistance agenda. Coordination is also key for a strategic approach. At the local delivery level there is need for stronger project coordination and coherence both within the organization and with other providers. An example would be a grant/loan program that provides good quality but one-time assistance without providing either a range of different products (to enable IDPs to work their way from extreme poverty to self-sustainability) or links to other support programs that provide the next stage of development. Government, NGOs, and donors need to work together to coordinate IDP liveli-

81 World Bank. 2011. *Scoping Study on Internal Displacement*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

hood programs in a way that enable IDPs to transition from one program to the next along a structured pathway to independence. To this end, in 2010 the MRA compiled a list of NGOs and their programs.⁸² This has not been updated since. This report should be updated and distributed to providers to assist in program coordination. A list of key livelihood stakeholders and providers from the report is attached as Annex 3.

At the national level there is need for all stakeholders in the livelihood sector to better communicate and join efforts through regular planning and coordination meetings. These organizations would include (but not be limited to) the MRDI, the Prime Minister's office, the MRA, the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, the MoA, the Ministry of Economic Development, the IDP Steering Committee, relevant municipal authorities, relevant business associations, donors, and NGOs.

The recently registered MRA Livelihood LEPL could be the IDP livelihood coordinating body and be responsible for bringing together agencies and other stakeholders to improve program quality, reach, and geographic spread. The LEPL should be mandated to provide singularity of effort and disciplined programmatic coordination and coherence. The LEPL could share best practices and learning in livelihood support and set and monitor standards for livelihood practices, such as the Livelihood TEG "Guiding Principles for Livelihood Projects" (Annex 2), which provides a clear 16-point guide to planning livelihood projects.

The new government has identified the agricultural sector as underdeveloped but with potential to drive the rural economy. To boost development it has launched large national loan and agricultural subsidy programs. These initiatives coincide with the gradual thawing of relations with Russia and anticipate further lowering of trade barriers, which began with an agricultural embargo in December 2005. Agricultural produce is viewed as a key export growth area. Issues with food hygiene certification for Georgian produce (a requirement to import food into Rus-

sia) may prove problematic and the government will need to address this (though some wine makers have recently been certified by Russian inspectors for export). Georgian exports have found alternative markets since 2005. According to the Government's statistical office, *GeoStat*, exports in agricultural and nonagricultural sectors increased from US\$1677 million in 2010 to US\$2377 million in 2012. In agriculture, though, the trade deficit remains stark. FAO reported that in the third quarter of 2011 agricultural exports were US\$96,697,955, but imports amounted to US\$225,744,157.⁸³ While agricultural produce barriers have not yet been lifted, IDP farmers may find opportunities in agricultural produce production and processing for the Russian market when barriers are removed.

IDPs' chances to benefit from agricultural exports will improve if they can access government subsidy programs that will enable them to grow produce to meet demand. Currently many IDPs may not meet the qualifying criteria, as they do not own land or have collateral. As subsidy initiatives are rolled out and the agriculture sector grows, IDPs could increasingly be left behind—willing to work but unable to take advantage of government support. In the longer term, IDPs may find work on farms or in future processing plants, but may not have the opportunity to be the producers that supply them.

The government could level the playing field and enable IDPs to access credit by modifying the need to provide collateral for loan subsidies. It could also include IDPs in agricultural subsidy programs if they can demonstrate they have been farming land or have access to it. This can be verified by specifying the production of a legally drawn up and registered land rental agreement.

In 2003, Georgia produced a Poverty Reduction Strategic Paper (PRSP). The last review of the PRSP was in 2006 and the strategy has been discontinued. The MRA livelihood strategy currently under devel-

82 MRA. 2010. *Overview of Activities Related to Socio-economic Integration of IDPs*. Tbilisi, Georgia: MRA.

83 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Georgia and Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Georgia. 2012. *Agriculture Sector Bulletin 2012*. http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/tc/tce/pdf/Georgia_Agriculture_Sector_Bulletin_-_2012.pdf.

opment should not be a stand-alone document. For maximum impact the strategy should join with other sectoral strategies to become an integral part of an overarching government strategic plan aimed at reducing poverty. A review of the 2003 PRSP will provide a baseline of comparable data and initiatives to support the development of an updated version. A new PRSP will bring coherence to development initiatives and link them with NGO and other projects.

Georgia's benefit system provides a monthly allowance to IDPs. Qualifying families can apply for TSA, as was discussed earlier. Every IDP has the right to IDP allowance in recognition of their IDP status. Social assistance is needs based and determined by rigorous means testing. However, once registered, IDPs are rarely re-evaluated for eligibility. The Social Security Agency (SSA) reported in an interview⁸⁴ that a recent internal review found a significant number of IDPs had failed to declare increases in income since registering a claim many years previously. Some annual incomes were found to exceed 100,000 GEL. Clearly, a close review of the social allowance registers is required to remove ineligible claimants. Likewise, a review of the IDP allowance and its award by virtue of status rather than need will also prove useful.

A move from status- to needs-based assistance would not only reduce the fiscal impact on the economy but would release funds that could be used to help society's most needy move to a state of independence. Withdrawing the IDP allowance from those with an annual income above (for example) 20,000 GEL could release government funds to support the most vulnerable with livelihood and other opportunities through the MRA's Livelihood LEPL. More immediate (but smaller) benefit savings could be achieved by phasing out the IDP allowances from families registered for property tax which applies to families with a declared income above 40,000 GEL.

Many non-IDPs have misconceptions about IDPs. Conversations with non-IDPs commonly elicit accusations of IDPs being lazy, taking jobs from host communities, and keeping wealth hidden while

claiming benefits from the state. Such feelings are spurred by the privatization process, IDP allowances, fuel subsidies, and other issues. A nationwide discussion of the problems IDPs face and the government's future assistance plans will raise IDPs' profile, enable the government to gauge Georgian sentiment, set out plans to deal with resettlement and economic recovery, and start the sensitization process to transition from status- to needs-based assistance.

Further research and analysis entailing comprehensive political economy dimensions will be key to grounding a more strategic approach to IDP livelihood support. This analysis will need to feature:

- Comprehensive and nationally significant data on the poverty and employment situation of IDPs in relation to the nondisplaced and within the IDP population. This will be an important contribution to a revised PRSP for Georgia; the last one conducted in 2003 is now outdated.
- Stronger evaluation, especially at the outcome and impact level, of the successes and weaknesses of IDP livelihood support. It would be especially beneficial to revisit past livelihood programs and document successes and failures. Interviewing program clients could reveal how the program could have been better, from their perspective.
- Research into social capital and how to mitigate its absence and stimulate its development. This would offer a clearer picture of the hidden problems faced by IDPs that could inform program strategy and planning.
- Investigation into the multiple dimensions of IDP vulnerability in order to better understand the situation of EVIDPs and their potential pathways out of extreme poverty.
- Examples from global and historical experience, gathering valuable lessons from how other governments and countries have been able to recover livelihoods after the destruction of conflict. This research cuts across the IDP resettlement and reintegration issue and would provide valuable insight into dealing with IDP issues in Georgia and beyond.

84 Interview by Thea Siphashvili with Social Services Agency, May 23, 2013.

ANNEX 1

List of Main IDP Communities and Agricultural Resources

Settlement	HHs	Type	Kitchen gardens	Plots (Ha)	Plots/HH	Irrigated
Metekhi	35	Village	Yes	9	0.26	Yes
Teliani	54	Village	Yes	20	0.37	Yes
Berbuki	124	Village	Yes	62	0.50	Yes
Karaleti	283	Village	Yes	62	0.22	Partly
Khurvaleti	139	Village	Yes	70	0.50	No
Shavshebi	177	Village	Yes	22	0.12	No
Skra	86	Village	Yes	15	0.17	Yes
Akhalsopheli	100	Village	Yes	25	0.25	Yes
Mokhisi	58	Village	Yes	47	0.81	Yes
Prof Tech	48	Building	Common Yard	0.48	0.01	No
El.Tech	60	Building	Common Yard	0	0.00	No
Tsilkani	400	Village	Yes	0	0.00	Partly
Prezeti	298	Village	Yes	0	0.00	No
#2 Kindergarten	22	Building	No	0	0.00	No
Prof Tech #4	28	Building	No	0	0.00	No
Surami	38	Building	Common yard	0	0.00	No
Poladi	40	Building	Common Yard	0	0.00	No
Lagodekhi	21	Building	No	5	0.24	No
Telavi	26	Building	Common Yard	0	0.00	No
Kvemo Bolnisi	20	Building	Common Yard	7	0.4	No
Sakhasheti	100	Village	Yes	20	0.2	Yes
Bazaleti	103	Building	Common Yard	0	0.00	No

Saguramo	65	Building	Common Yard	0	0.00	No
Tsinamzggvriantkari	101	Building	No	21	0.21	No
Gadabani	121	Building	No	31	9.26	No
Sagerejo	24	Building	No	12	0.50	No
Shaumiani	197	Building	No	97	0.50	No
Gori Music School	40	Building	No	0	0.00	No
Blood Transf. Centre	11	Building	No	0	0.00	No
Narco Centre	65	Building	No	0	0.00	No
Others	2500	Village	Yes	0	0.50	No
Shindisi	100	Building	No	50	0.50	No
Tserovani	2500	Village	Yes	0	0.00	No
Verkhvebi	300	Village	Yes	0	0.00	Yes
Koda	443	Building	No	221	0.50	No
Postko Etseri	264	Building	Common Yard	2	0.00	No
Source: FAO Tbilisi March 2013.						

ANNEX 2

Guiding Principles for IDP Livelihoods Projects

The MRA technical working group has advocated that livelihood projects should:

1. Be designed with the active participation and contributions from government, private sector, civil society, and the target beneficiaries.
2. Be “mainstream” and inclusive, promote gender equality, and be open to all members of the community to facilitate social cohesion and integration.
3. Measure the quantifiable impact of the project on the beneficiary’s income.
4. Foster long-term, self-sustaining economic impact for the beneficiaries and wider economy by creating new jobs, business activities, and economic wealth.
5. Be commercially viable and profitable for all participants, including IDPs.
6. Be based on market demand.
7. Analyze and identify the target market, the impact on existing businesses, and avoid creating market distortions.
8. Be sufficiently capitalized and holistic in nature, considering all funding, human resource, safety, security, cultural, and value chain factors that need to be in place for success during the project’s timeframe.
9. Promote any policy and practice reforms that may support meeting project objectives and create a more enabling environment.
10. Ensure the protection of land and property rights of the target populations.
11. Involve local implementing partners and local government, and build their capacity throughout program implementation.
12. Give priority to expending project financial resources in Georgia, using local labor and supporting local markets.
13. Be scalable and replicable.
14. Assess the possible environmental impacts of the activities and mitigate any negative impacts identified.
15. Follow the principles of “Do No Harm”.
16. Be consistent with the ten principles of the UN Global Compact.⁸⁵

85 “Do No Harm: Action, as well as inaction, can have unintended negative consequences. We must ensure that our actions and interventions (or lack thereof) do not adversely affect individuals and their communities, our partners or colleagues, or expose them to any harm. Before taking action, we must anticipate the consequences and assess any potential risk factors, and take measures to eliminate or minimize such risks.” <http://www.humanitarianreform.org/humanitarianreform/Portals/1/cluster%20approach%20page/clusters%20pages/Protection/Protection%20Handbook/foundations%20of%20IDP%20protection.pdf> *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—Or War*, (Lynne Rienner Publisher, Boulder, Colorado)

ANNEX 3

List of Key Stakeholders in IDP Livelihood Support in Georgias

1. International Organizations and NGOs

Acción Contra el Hambre (ACF)

Tbilisi
Mtskheta Street 37, 3rd floor
Phone: +995 (32) 293924
E mail: coordtech-sc@acf-e.org

Association for Protection of Landowners' Rights (APLR)

Tbilisi
27 Pekini Avenue, 5th Floor
0160 Georgia
Tel: (995 32) 206 207
Fax: (995 32) 376 088
E-mail: office@aplr.org
www.aplr.org

Caritas

Tbilisi
3a Nutsbidze Plateau II
Tel/fax: (+995 32) 21 78 19, 25 01 93
E-mail: Ettore Fusaro: (ettore.fusaro@caritas.ge)
Liana Mkheidze (liana.mkheidze@caritas.ge)
Website: www.caritas.ge

CHF (formerly Canadian Hunger Foundation)

Tbilisi
3 Mtskheta Street
Tel: 22 69 02; 25 16 72/74
E-mail: info@chf.ge

Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs (CNFA)

Tbilisi
47 Kostava Street
Phone: 99 58 30
Shalva Pipia, Program Manager: spipia@cnfageorgia.org

Cooperation for American Relief Everywhere (CARE)

Tbilisi
49b Chavchavadze Avenue, 3rd floor, 0162
Tel: (+99532) 29 13 78; 29 19 41; 29 15 31;
Fax: (+99532) 29 43 07
Director: Thomas Renolds : E mail: treynolds@care.org

Counterpart

Tbilisi
15 Razmadze Street
Phone: 48 29 43
Marina Bilanishvili, PR Manager: bilani@counterpart.ge

Danish Refugee Council (DRC)

Regional Head Office
88 Paliashvili Street, 3rd floor, flat 7
0162 Tbilisi
Phone: +995 (32) 230659
Fax: +995 (32) 232437
South Caucasus Representative: Paul Mackintosh
E mail: pmac@drc.dk

DVV International

Tbilisi
Apt. 5, # 4 Napareuli Street
0179 Tbilisi
Tel/Fax: (+995 32) 913475, 251752
Website: <http://www.dvv-international.ge/>
Director Georgia Project Office: Levan Kvatchadze (kvatchadze@dvv-international.ge)

Eurasia Partnership Foundation

Tbilisi
3 Kavsadze Street
Phone: 25 27 78/82
Zaal Anjaparidze, Program Manager: zanjaparidze@epfound.ge

Hilfswerk Austria

Brigitte Stoeppler: stoeppler@hwa.or.at

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

Tbilisi

Kedia Street

Phone: 35 55 10

E-mail: tbilisi.tbi@icrc.org

International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Tbilisi

41 Gogebashvili Street

Phone: 25 22 16

Program Officer: Natia Kvitsiani (natia@iom.ge)

International Orthodox Christian Charities (IOCC)

Tbilisi

90 Barnov Street, Apt. 1

Tel/Fax: 25 19 98

Chrysanthe Loizos: cloizos@ioccc.org

Darejan Dzotsenidze: ddzotsenidze@ioccc.org

Mercy Corps

Tbilisi

16 Radiani Street

Phone: 25 24 71

George Sadunishvili: gsadunishvili@mercy corps.ge

Irakli Kasrashvili: ikasrashvili@mercy corps.ge

Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)

Tbilisi

19a Tabukashvili Street

Phone: 92 31 62

Fax: 99 97 89

E-mail: nrc@nrc.ge

Oxfam Great Britain

Tbilisi

47a Paliashvili Street

Phone: 25 28 81/83

Keti Getiashvili (kgetiashvili@oxfam.org.uk)

People in Need (PIN)

Tbilisi

12 Ingorokva Street

Head of Mission: Pavel Pinkava (pavel.pinkava@

peopleinneed.cz)

Save the Children

Tbilisi

20 Gotua Street

Phone: 24 45 20/21/28

Fax: 37 79 63

Program Director: Natia Deisadze

Transparency International

Tbilisi

26 Rustaveli Ave

Executive Director: Eka Gigauri

E mail: ekag@transparency.ge

Phone: 92 14 03

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

Tbilisi

9 Eristavi Street

Phone: 25 11 26

E mail:

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Tbilisi

9 Eristavi Street

Phone: 25 11 26

Giorgi Nanobashvili: giorgi.nanobashvili@undp.org

Nils Christensen: nils.christensen@undp.org

United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

Tbilisi

5 Radiani Street

0179 Tbilisi

Phone: +995 (32) 227705

Emergency Coordinator: dragan.angelovski@fao.

org

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Tbilisi

2 Kazbegi Ave

Phone: 38 62 02

E mail: geotb@unhcr.org

World Health Organization (WHO)

Tbilisi

9 Eristavi Street

Phone: 232872

Fax: 998073

E mail: WHOGEO@euro.who.int

World Vision International (WVI)

Tbilisi
18/19 Imedashvili Street
Phone: 43 35 50/51
E mail: ana_chkhaidze@wvi.org

2. Local NGOs

Atinati

Zugdidi
94 Rustaveli Street
Zugdidi, 2100 Georgia
Phone: 8 215 5 00 56
Fax: 8 215 5 00 54
E-mail: office@atinati.org

Association of Young Economists of Georgia (AYEG)

Tbilisi
Orbeliani Street #35
Tbilisi, 0105, Georgia
Tel: (+995 32) 2922839; 2990443; 2936475;
2923122;
Fax: (+995 32) 2922461
Website: <http://www.economists.ge>
E-mail: office@economists.ge
Head of the Board: Ana Katamidze (ani@economists.ge)

Charity Humanitarian Centre Abkhazeti (CHCA)

Tbilisi
Tbilisi - 0171
69/1 Balanchivadze Street
Tel: +995 32 233 23 79
Fax: +995 32 233 23 79
E-mail: tbilisi@chca.org.ge

Civil Development Agency (CiDA)

9/1 Pirosmiani Street
Rustavi, 3700, Georgia
Tel/Fax: +995 0341 25 88 22
E-mail: pr@cida.ge
Website: www.cida.ge
Every Child
Andro Dadiani: androdadiani@everychild.ge

Georgian Association for Social Workers (GASW)

Tbilisi
44 Kazbegi Avenue
0177 Tbilisi, Georgia
Tel: + 995 32 239 00 71
E-mail: gasw@gasw.org
Website: <http://www.gasw.org>

International Executive Service Corps (IESC)

1900 M Street NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 589-2600
Fax: (202) 326-0289
Irina Salukvadze: irina.salukvadze@iesc.ge

3. Donors

European Commission (EC)

38 Nino Chkheidze Street
0102 Tbilisi
Phone: +995 (32) 943763
Fax: ++95 (32) 943768
Website: <http://www.delgeo.ec.europa.eu/>

German Organisation for Technical Cooperation (GIZ)

GIZ Office South Caucasus
4, Elene Akhvlediani Agmarti
0103 Tbilisi
Phone: +995 32 2201800
Fax: +995 32 2201801
E mail: giz-georgia@giz.de

Swedish International Development Cooperation (Sida)

Tbilisi
12 T. Tabidze Street
Phone: +995 32 55 03 20, Fax: +995 32 25 12 26
E mail: ambassaden.tbilisi@gov.se

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)

Swiss Cooperation Office Tbilisi
Embassy of Switzerland
9/12 Radiani Street
Tbilisi
Phone: +995 (32) 2237211 / 227863
Website: <http://www.swisscoop.ge/>
Tamuna Tsvitsivadze: tamuna.tsvitsivadze@sdc.net

United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

USAID/Caucasus Mission
11 George Balanchine Street
0131 Tbilisi, Georgia
Tel: (995-32) 254-40-00
Fax: (995-32) 254-41-45
E mail: mjaparidze@usaid.gov

World Bank

World Bank Country Office
5A, Nino Ramishvili Str.
Tbilisi
Georgia 0179
Phone: (995 32) 291 30 96, Fax: (995 32) 291 34 78
E mail: ipaichadze@worldbank.org

4. Government

Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Accommodation and Refugees (MRA)

Tamarashvili Street N 15A
Tbilisi, Georgia 0177
Tel: (995 32) 31 15 77
Fax: (995 32) 31 15 96
E mail: Info@mra.gov.ge

Municipal Development Fund (MDF)

Tbilisi
150 David Agmashenebeli Ave
Tbilisi, Georgia 0112
Tel:
Website: www.mdf.ge

Ministry of Education and Sciences

Dimitri Uznadze N 52
Tbilisi, Georgia 0102
Tel: (995 32 2) 200 220
E-mail: pr@mes.gov.ge

Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure

Tbilisi
12 Al.Kazbegi Avenue
Tbilisi
Tel: +995 32 2510591, +995 32 2510698 E mail:
press@mradi.gov.ge

ANNEX 4

Bibliography

Web Resources—Organizations

Action Against Hunger. <http://www.actionagainsthunger.org/taxonomy/countries/asia/georgia>.

ActionAid. *Real Aid: Ending Aid Dependency*. http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/newfunct/pdf/luxembourg_real_aid_3.pdf.

CARE International Georgia. <http://www.care-caucasus.org.ge/en/index.php>.

Center for Training and Consultancy (CTC). <http://www.ctc.org.ge>.

Central Asia–Caucasus Analyst. <http://www.caciana-lyst.org/>.

Charity Humanitarian Center “Abkhazeti” (CHCA). <http://www.chca.org.ge>.

Conciliation Resources. <http://www.c-r.org>.

Danish Refugee Council (DRC). <http://drc.dk/relief-work/where-we-work/caucasus/georgia/>.

Democracy & Freedom Watch. <http://www.dfwatch.net>.

Department for International Development. <http://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-international-development>.

DVV International Georgia. <http://dvv-international.ge>.

Eurasianet.org. <http://www.eurasianet.org>.

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. <http://www.ebrd.com/pages/country/georgia.shtml>.

Human Rights House: Georgia. <http://humanrightshouse.org/Members/Georgia/index.html>.

Human Rights Watch: Georgia. <http://www.hrw.org/europecentral-asia/georgia>.

Institute for Governance and Policy Studies. <http://igps.victoria.ac.nz/>.

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC). <http://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/georgia>.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). <http://operations.ifad.org/web/ifad/operations/country/home/tags/georgia>.

International Organization for Migration: Georgia. <http://www.iom.ge>.

IOM Job Counseling and Placement Project in Georgia. <http://www.jcp.ge/?lang=en>.

Mercy Corps: Georgia. <http://www.mercycorps.org.uk/georgia>.

Norwegian Refugee Council. <http://www.nrc.no/?did=9168164>.

Overseas Development Institute (ODI). <http://www.odi.org.uk>.

Psychology Today. <http://www.psychologytoday.com>.

Refworld. <http://www.refworld.org>.

Swiss Development Cooperation: Georgia. http://www.sdc.admin.ch/en/Home/Countries/Commonwealth_of_Independent_States_CIS/Southern_Caucasus_Georgia_Armenia_Azerbaijan.

Transparency International: Georgia. <http://www.transparency.ge/en>.

UN Data: Georgia. <http://data.un.org/CountryProfile.aspx?crName=GEORGIA>.

UN Food and Agriculture: Georgia. <http://coin.fao.org/cms/world/georgia/en/Home.html>.

UNHCR: Georgia. <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49e48d2e6.html>.

UNICEF: Georgia. <http://www.unicef.org/georgia/>.

United Nations Development Programme: Georgia. <http://www.undp.org.ge>.

University of Texas–San Antonio. <http://www.utsa.edu>.

World Bank. <http://www.worldbank.org>.

ANNEX 5

References

- Article 5 of Law #335-IIS on Forcibly Displaced Persons—Persecuted from the Occupied Territories of Georgia.
- Chambers, R., and Conway, G. 1992. “Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century.” IDS Discussion Paper 296. Brighton, UK: IDS.
- Christensen, Asger, and Niels Harild. 2009. *Forced Displacement—the Development Challenge*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Danish Refugee Council (DRC). 2010. *Durable Solutions: A Way Forward for IDPs in Georgia*. Annual report. Tbilisi, Georgia: DRC.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations) and UNIFEM (United Nations Development Fund for Women). 2009. *Needs Assessment: A Gender Approach to Conflict-Affected Populations in Rural Areas*. Rome: FAO.
- FAO in Georgia and Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Georgia. 2012. *Agriculture Sector Bulletin 2012*. http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/tc/tce/pdf/Georgia_Agriculture_Sector_Bulletin_-_2012.pdf.
- Gogia, Giorgi. 2011. “Georgians in Gali.” Human Rights Watch. <http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/02/18/georgians-gali>.
- Government of Georgia. 2007. Decree No. 47. *On Approving the State Strategy for Internally Displaced Persons—Persecuted*. Tbilisi, Georgia. http://mra.gov.ge/index.php?lang_id=ENG#index/1/ENG.
- Holtzman, Steven B., and Taies Tezam. 2004. *Living in Limbo: Conflict-Induced Displacement in Europe and Central Asia*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- IDMC (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre). 2012. “Georgia: Partial Progress Towards Durable Solutions for IDPs.” IDMC. <http://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/georgia>.
- IDMC. 2012. “Mental Health of IDPs.” IDMC. [http://www.internal-displacement.org/idmc/website/countries.nsf/\(httpEnvelopes\)/9C67D59952A3E2A1C12579C7000A872B?OpenDocument](http://www.internal-displacement.org/idmc/website/countries.nsf/(httpEnvelopes)/9C67D59952A3E2A1C12579C7000A872B?OpenDocument).
- IDMC. 2012. *Property, Livelihoods, Education and Other Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. Geneva: IDMC.
- IDMC and NRC (Norwegian Refugee Council). 2012. “Memorandum: Internal Displacement in Georgia.” [http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/%28httpDocuments%29/61AF7555689DA54FC1257AEC004BF787/\\$file/IDMC+Georgia+memo+FINAL+3+Dec.pdf](http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/%28httpDocuments%29/61AF7555689DA54FC1257AEC004BF787/$file/IDMC+Georgia+memo+FINAL+3+Dec.pdf).
- IOM Job Counseling and Placement Project in Georgia. “Statistics by Region.” IOM. <http://www.jcp.ge/index.php?a=main&mid=20&lang=en>.
- Marger, Martin. 2008. *Social Inequality: Patterns and Processes*, vol. 4. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ministry of Agriculture of Georgia. <http://moa.gov.ge/?lang=en>.
- Minority Rights Group International. 2008. “State of the World’s Minorities 2008—Georgia/Abkhazia and South Ossetia.” Refworld. <http://www.refworld.org/country,,,GEO,,48a7eac41,0.html>.
- Mollet, Matthias. 2011. *Evaluation of FAO Agricultural Livelihoods Improvement for IDP Settlements Programme*. Rome: FAO.
- Mooney, Erin D. 2009. “When ‘Temporary’ Lasts Too Long.” *Forced Migration Review* 33. <http://>

- www.fmreview.org/en/FMRpdfs/FMR33/FMR33.pdf.
- MRA (Ministry for Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Accommodation and Refugees of Georgia). 2010. *Overview of Activities Related to Socio-economic Integration of IDPs*. Tbilisi, Georgia: MRA.
- Nadareishvili, Mamuka, and Vasil Tsakadze. 2008. *Housing and Socio-economic Conditions of IDPs in Georgia*. Tbilisi, Georgia: DRC.
- National Statistical Office of Georgia (GeoStat). <http://www.geostat.ge>.
- Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) 2013. *Privately Accommodated IDPs in Georgia: A Needs Assessment*. Tbilisi, Georgia
- Selig, Meg. 2010, September 14. "Routines: Comforting or Confining?" *Psychology Today*. <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/changepower/201009/routines-comforting-or-confining>.
- Singh, Namrita, and Courtland Robinson. 2010. "Support Systems Among Urban IDPs in Georgia." *Forced Migration Review* 34. <http://www.fmreview.org/en/urban-displacement/FMR34.pdf>.
- Sullivan, Laura. 2011. "Real Aid Can End Aid Dependency." ActionAid. <http://www.actionaidusa.org/eu/2011/05/real-aid-can-end-aid-dependency>.
- Sumbadze, N., & G. Tarkhan-Mouravi. 2003. *Development Strategy for Akhalkalaki and Akhaltsikhe Districts of Samtskhe-Javakheti*. Concept paper commissioned by the Open Society–Georgia Foundation, Tbilisi, Georgia.
- Transparency International Georgia. 2010. "Cottage Settlements for Georgia's New IDPs: Accountability in Aid and Construction." Transparency International Georgia. <http://transparency.ge/en/post/report/cottage-settlements-georgias-new-idps-accountability-aid-and-construction>.
- UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). 2009. *Protection of IDPs in Georgia: A Gap Analysis*. Geneva: UNHCR. <http://www.unhcr.org/4ad827f59.pdf>.
- UNHCR. 2012. Returned but Still Reintegrating: Participatory Assessment of the Humanitarian Situation and Progress Made in the Re-integration Process of IDPs Who Returned to the Shida Kartli Region, Georgia. Geneva: UNHCR.
- UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). 2013. "2013 UNHCR Regional Operations Profile—Eastern Europe." UNHCR. <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49e48d2e6.html>.
- Willems, Daphne. 2012. "Settling After War: Analyzing Economic Development of IDPs in Georgia." Master's thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- Wilson, Patricia A. 1997. "Building Social Capital: A Learning Agenda for the 21st Century." *Urban Studies* 34 (5–6): 745–760.
- World Bank. 2011. *Scoping Study on Internal Displacement*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2013. *Assessment of Livelihood Support for Displaced Persons and IDPs*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2013. *Skills Mismatch and Unemployment: Labor Market Challenges in Georgia*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Food Program (WFP) and MRA. 2012. *Community Profiling Studies of IDP Settlements in Georgia*. Rome: WFP.



THE WORLD BANK
1818 H, Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433
www.worldbank.org