

Briefing paper
by the Norwegian Refugee Council's Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre
on Internal Displacement in Azerbaijan

12 December 2007

The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), established in 1998 by the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), monitors conflict-induced internal displacement worldwide. The Geneva-based Centre runs an online database providing comprehensive and regularly updated information and analysis on internal displacement in more than 50 countries. Through its work, the Centre contributes to improving national and international capacities to protect and assist the millions of people around the globe who have been displaced within their own country as a result of conflicts or human rights violations. IDMC has monitored the internal displacement situation in Azerbaijan for almost ten years.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Resettled and returned internally displaced people	3
Non-resettled internally displaced people.....	8
Issues common to all areas visited.....	14
Recommendations to the Government of Azerbaijan.....	16

Introduction

More than 13 years after the signing of a ceasefire agreement, there are still 686,000 people internally displaced in Azerbaijan from Nagorno-Karabakh and its adjacent provinces¹. People fled their homes as a result of a territorial dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh in 1988, which quickly escalated into an armed conflict with an ethnic basis. Before the two parties agreed to a ceasefire in 1994, Armenian soldiers were forced from some parts of Azerbaijani territory and a small number of displaced people were able to return to their homes. Negotiations have been ongoing since the ceasefire agreement, but have yet to produce a settlement. In the absence of a resolution to the conflict, Nagorno-Karabakh is a de-facto independent state and the seven provinces surrounding it remain under Armenian occupation, preventing the remaining displaced people from returning to their homes.

In addition to the work of United Nations agencies and international and local NGOs, the government of Azerbaijan has made considerable efforts to improve the situation of internally displaced persons (IDPs). It has established an institutional focal point for IDPs, raised national awareness of internal displacement, trained government officials on the rights of IDPs and adopted hundreds of normative legal acts, including the 2004 “State Programme for the Improvement of Living Conditions and Increasing of Employment for Refugees and IDPs”. As part of this and previous state programmes, the government has resettled some 70,000 of the people living in the direst conditions into 47 new purpose-built villages². All IDPs are entitled to a range of government benefits and services, including monthly cash grants and food distribution, free utilities, heating fuel, free higher education and income tax deductions.

Despite these measures by the government, opportunities for IDPs to generate income and a livelihood remain rare. While many IDPs in urban areas have managed to find jobs, unemployment is rife in rural and semi-rural areas. Few have jobs other than a small number working as teachers, medical personnel, administrative staff, taxi drivers and small retailers. The government has tried to address this issue by introducing financial credit and quotas for employment of IDPs. However, IDPs report that the government quotas have not helped them find employment and that loans are inaccessible due to their high interest rates and the collateral required. Some IDPs also report that employment is economically inaccessible since they must pay bribes in order to be hired. The lack of employment in areas where IDPs live leads to family separation as IDPs leave to find employment elsewhere.

In November 2007, IDMC conducted a field visit to Azerbaijan. As part of this visit, IDMC visited 12 areas where IDPs live: five urban settlements in Baku and Sumgait; five rural settlements in Agdam, Barda, Sabirabad and Bilasuvar; and two semi-rural settlements in Imishli and Agjabedi. IDMC also spoke with people who had returned to their homes in Fizuli over 14 years ago after having been displaced in 1992. Group

¹ Government of Azerbaijan, 21 November 2007.

² Government of Azerbaijan, 31 October 2007, Workshop on IDP Protection, Azerbaijan.

interviews were conducted in rural areas, semi-rural areas and Sumgait, and individual interviews were conducted in Baku.

The information in this briefing paper was collected during interviews with IDPs and is structured according to the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement³. As internally displaced people in Azerbaijan live in some 1,600 settlements⁴, this briefing paper does not provide a comprehensive overview of the internal displacement situation. Rather, it presents only the situation of IDPs visited during the IDMC visit. In addition, no conclusions are drawn as to how the living conditions of IDPs compare to the non-displaced population.

Resettled and returned internally displaced people



Agdam: A new resettlement area less than seven kilometres from the line of contact

³ The Principles, which reflect and are consistent with international human rights and humanitarian law, and analogous refugee law, can be found at <http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu2/7/b/principles.htm>.

⁴ Government of Azerbaijan, 12 March 2007. Information received by Norwegian Refugee Council, Azerbaijan.

Three resettlement areas were visited in addition to two returnee families. Two of the resettlement areas had opened to IDPs in 2006, while the other had opened in 2003. IDMC visited returnees in Fizuli.

Adequate standard of living (Guiding Principle 18)

Essential food and potable water (Guiding Principle 18.2a)

Resettled IDPs received land adjacent to their house, but there is a limited ability to feed oneself directly from this land. Those who moved four years ago received 12 ares of land, while those who moved more recently received nine ares. Each household in a given resettlement area was allocated the same amount of land independent of the number of people in the household. Smaller families are able to grow enough vegetables for themselves on this land, while larger families are not. The land was reportedly fertile in the two newer resettlement areas, but visibly salty in the third older resettlement area. All resettlers interviewed were growing food on the land allocated to them, but people in the newer settlements were able to harvest more types of vegetables than those living in the older resettlement area. IDPs in one of the newer resettlement areas reported that there was not enough water to care for their gardens, although people were nevertheless able to grow some vegetables. Resettlers were limited to accessing land adjacent to their homes for harvesting.

In addition to gardens, resettlers acquire food from animals, government distributions and local shops. Fewer than half of the resettlers in any area had animals such as chickens, pigs and cows, and some of those were using the land allocated to them to grow food for their animals. In addition to fuel for cooking and heating, resettlers also receive flour, oil, rice and sugar from the government on a monthly basis, though the quantity was not enough to cover the minimum usual diet of most families. Those living in resettlement and return areas had safe physical access to shops that stocked basic necessities, but they did not always have the means to buy food. Many resettlers commented on the rising prices of basic food items, which hindered their economic access to food and compromised their attainment and satisfaction of other basic needs. It was not possible to determine whether the diet of displaced people was sufficient to satisfy their dietary needs, or whether the food available was free from contamination.

In all settlements people stated that they have access to water within 30 metres of their home for at least two hours per day. In one area, displaced people drink the water and reported that the quality is satisfactory, while in the two other resettlement areas people drink the water only after boiling it since it is salty and comes from old pipes. IDPs in these areas could not confirm whether an analysis of the water had been done. There is water in villages where people have returned to their homes, but returnees drink the water only after boiling it. In one settlement there is access to a river, but resettlers do not use the water from this river since it flows from Armenia and they fear it is contaminated. In all areas there was one common bathing area for over 100 households, which over time will give rise to health problems.

Basic shelter and housing (Guiding Principle 18.2b)

As part of the 2004 state programme for displaced persons, the government established purpose-built villages and handed over new houses and a small plot of land to IDPs. Resettlers were granted the right to use the houses and land until return to their original homes becomes possible, at which point they must return the houses and land to the government in the same condition in which they received them. Resettlers receive a number for their house that is registered in their name, but are not given titles to their land and houses as they remain the property of the government. As a result, they can neither sell or exchange the land and houses with another party, nor pass the land and houses on to their children. Without secure legal tenure, IDPs are not protected against forced eviction.

While it was clear that resettlers must pay for their own improvements to the house and will not be compensated for such renovations when they leave, resettlers were unsure who is responsible for general house repairs, which in fact lie within the responsibility of the local authorities. All resettlers reported that they had not been involved in the planning or construction of the villages. The government runs a tender process for construction of new settlements, and it could not be determined whether the process maximised local livelihood opportunities by using locally sourced labour and materials, or whether the procurement of materials and labour and the supervision of the construction process had been transparent and accountable.



Fizuli: Zubchuk, a new resettlement area into which IDPs will move in 2008

All resettlers commented that the quality of their accommodation had improved on their resettlement. They believed their new houses provided adequate space, protection from the elements and disease-carrying organisms, though one family reported that the house did not protect against dampness and they believed they were sick more often as a result. All houses received a free and more or less continuous supply of electricity. Services provided in the resettlement area included medical centres, schools and garbage collection, though there were few opportunities for income-generation and recreational activities, and no cemeteries. Public transportation was not available, which limited access to places of employment other social services and markets. Resettlers said they used private taxis to reach other areas, and commented that the cost of getting to and from district centres was placing excessive demands upon their budgets.

Resettlers in the newer resettlement areas were concerned that their physical security was at risk. The government cleared the resettlement villages of mines before opening them to IDPs, and maintains that resettlement areas are not located close to the line of contact, but the two new settlements visited during this mission were situated only about seven kilometres from the line of contact. Resettlers reported regularly hearing fighting between the Armenian and Azerbaijani forces, sometimes lasting a minute, sometimes longer. As a result they do not feel entirely safe, and they fear that they will be displaced a second time if a sustained conflict flares up again. One group of resettlers asked the government to build a road out of their village so that they would not have to enter and leave on the side nearer the area of hostilities, but they had not yet received a response.

In terms of social security in the resettlement and return areas, village groups were resettled and returned together with their existing social networks maintained.

Voluntary return and resettlement (Guiding Principle 28.1)

All resettlers responded that their decision to move to the resettlement areas was voluntary. One group of IDPs that was scheduled to resettle before the end of 2007 explained that government officials had offered them the move to a new village. This group continued that some IDPs preferred not to resettle and had declined the offer, opting to rent an apartment in order to maintain employment. Those who chose not to resettle did not receive any assistance from the government to secure alternative accommodation. A few families had visited the new villages before resettling at their own expense, but the majority of resettlers had not been to the village before moving.

Participation of IDPs in the planning and management of their resettlement (Guiding Principle 28.2)

Resettled IDPs reported that they had not participated in the planning and management of their resettlement. Those to be resettled in spring 2008 commented that the timing of their resettlement was not ideal as it would interrupt the school year. They were also concerned about how to heat their new homes during the winter. In addition, some people did not know when they would move although the date had apparently been announced on television. Future resettlers were also trying to decide what they would grow on their land, but had not received information from the government on its fertility. This could impact the plans of resettlers for feeding their families and income generation activities.

The government has acknowledged the need of a broad information campaign for IDPs. This is especially pertinent for IDPs who will be offered resettlement to new purpose-built villages, for whom access to objective, current information on the conditions in the resettlement area, as well as their responsibilities and those of the government, would reduce the current and future anxiety and distress. The full participation of IDPs in the planning and management of their resettlement is important not only in ensuring that such movements are voluntary, but it helps to facilitate resettlement.

Recovery or compensation for lost property and possessions (Guiding Principle 29.2)

All returnees reported that their homes were mostly destroyed when they returned. There were no remedies for those who returned to destroyed property and as a result, they had carried out all repairs at their own expense or with the assistance of international humanitarian organisations. The position of the Azerbaijani government is that the government of Armenia should provide a remedy for returnees in these cases, as Armenian forces had been responsible for the property destruction after occupying the area. The government also continues to classify returnees as IDPs since they are living close to the line of contact with Armenia in an IDP-like situation.

Non-resettled internally displaced people



Sumgait: Informal IDP settlement where IDPs have been living without security of tenure for over 15 years

Displaced people who were not included in the resettlement plans of the government were interviewed in urban, rural and semi-rural areas. In Baku, three public buildings were visited, and in Sumgait one public building and one informal settlement was visited. Two semi-rural settlements were visited in Imishli and Agjabedi, and two rural settlements were visited in Barda and Sabirabad.

Adequate standard of living (Guiding Principle 18)

Essential food (Guiding Principle 18.2a)

The government provides over 500,000 internally displaced people with a monthly food subsidy of approximately ten dollars and 140,000 internally displaced people with food assistance⁵. IDPs reported varying content, quantity and regularity of this assistance. While IDPs in new settlements receive flour, oil, sugar and rice on a monthly basis, non-resettled IDPs in rural and semi-rural areas stated that they receive flour, oil and sugar every two months. Displaced people living in urban areas do not receive food assistance at all. Those who do receive food assistance said it fails to cover the needs of their family

⁵ Government of Azerbaijan, 31 October 2007, Workshop on IDP Protection, Azerbaijan.

for the period until the next distribution. Food distribution rightly targets IDPs in areas where there are few income generation opportunities, though it was not clear why those in new settlements receive more food and more often than those in rural and semi-rural areas. This may be due to the fact that the Government of Azerbaijan runs part of the food programme, while the UN's World Food Programme runs the other part. Furthermore, while the food assistance ensures that financial resources are available for other necessities, the effects of this food security programme on the livelihoods of IDPs are not being monitored. Prolonged food distribution does not uphold the dignity of IDPs, nor does it support livelihoods. Limited access to income generation and employment activities in rural and semi-rural areas also impairs the food security of displaced people and prolongs their dependence on food distribution.

Most displaced people in rural areas have vegetable gardens adjacent to their homes and are able to grow cabbages, onions, tomatoes, potatoes and cucumbers for themselves. However, IDPs in two areas visited, who had the skills to work the land, reported that it was infertile and they were not able to grow vegetables. Displaced people living in urban and semi-rural areas did not have land for a garden and were dependent on buying food at local shops and markets, where they commented on the rising prices of basic food items. A minority of families in urban, semi-rural and rural areas have animals such as cows, chickens and pigs.

Physical access to food was unhindered in all areas visited, as stores with basic food items and other essential commodities were open and within safe reach. However, several groups commented on the current rise in food prices and for some this implied limited economic access to food, which compromised the satisfaction of other basic needs.

It was not possible to confirm whether the quality and quantity of food is sufficient to satisfy the nutritional and micronutrient needs of IDPs, but some reported cases of malnutrition in their village.

Water and hygiene (Guiding Principle 18.2a)

In most locations IDPs accessed water within ten metres of their homes. However, in one rural and one semi-rural village the water access point was not operational. IDPs living in these villages explained that they pay for potable water to be delivered to them. According to the IDPs, the cost was not prohibitive, but the purchase of water, in addition to payments for public transport, medical services and treatment was compromising the purchase of other basic necessities. IDPs access water in rural and semi-rural areas at an outdoor tap and in some areas over 100 families were sharing eight such taps. Although physically accessible to all on an equal basis, safe physical access to the water points was difficult for the elderly in semi-rural areas. Those occupying rooms on the upper floors of apartment buildings must carry the water up to their room and then carry it down for disposal. In some rural areas water taps were constantly running. All of the displaced people visited in urban areas have access to a communal water tap on their floor of residence.

In urban areas, water is provided only a few hours per day and as a result, residents collect and store water during this period. Water collection and storage containers are a combination of plastic and metal open containers with wide necks, which affects water quality and, ultimately, personal hygiene and health. Collected water is used for cooking, washing utensils and laundering clothes. In urban areas, there is no private laundering area for women to wash and dry undergarments and sanitary cloths.



Imishli: Common shower for over 100 families

Displaced people in rural and semi-rural areas reported that the water they access is unpalatable. Many IDPs stated that the water tasted salty, but that they drink it anyway. Although taste in itself is not a direct health problem, IDPs have no confirmation the water they use is safe to drink. According to IDPs in most rural and semi-rural villages, there was no municipal water filtration. Furthermore, they had never witnessed anyone taking routine samples at the water point. One group had asked the government to do a water analysis, but had not received a response.

Toilets were sufficiently close to dwellings at less than 50 metres away. One group of IDPs in a semi-rural area had pooled their money and over time built their own toilet

behind the public building in which they live. In urban and semi-rural areas there was often an insufficient number of hygiene facilities as some 40 people shared one shower and two toilets. Some IDPs in urban areas even paid to use public baths in their neighbourhood. The rural areas visited did not have adequate public or private bathing areas and residents of one rural village had no physical access to bathing facilities since the closest was not in safe walking distance and was not in any case operational.

Displaced people living in public buildings in urban areas share communal facilities such as water access points, toilets, cooking and laundry areas. Users of the facilities took turns cleaning these facilities on a rotational basis. The government or international organisations had renovated the common areas approximately five years ago, but there was little sense of ownership of the facilities among the users. Maintenance of the areas was an issue as the need for general repair was immediately apparent, though none of the residents felt it was their responsibility to repair the common areas.



Barda: Rural settlement where IDPs have been living for over 15 years

Basic shelter and housing (Guiding Principle 18.2b)

IDPs live in a range of housing conditions. In rural areas, some IDPs have lived in improvised shelter of poor structural quality for almost 15 years, with building materials such as mud-bricks, rocks, bamboo-like sticks, cardboard and scrap metal all held

together with wood and random plaster. The roofs of these houses are also unstable and the one in the photo above had flown off several times. With no heating system or proper windows, this shelter fails to provide sufficient warmth, ventilation, physical security or privacy. The floors inside the house in the photograph were covered with scrap material, but this did not protect against the reportedly regular entry of mice and snakes.

Displaced people in semi-rural and urban areas live in crowded conditions in multi-level buildings with no heating systems. These buildings were formerly used as dormitories or kindergartens. Although individual households are separated, families occupy one or two rooms with no separation of the sexes or age groups. All IDPs repair their housing at their own expense, though the government and international organisations have renovated communal areas in some public buildings. All IDPs reported that they had electricity free of charge, that was more or less always available, and those without gas supply receive fuel on a regular basis for five months in the winter from the government.

The lack of legal security of tenure for some IDP housing means they have no legal protection against forced eviction. Some people fled to the Sumgait area during the conflict and bought land from the municipal authorities. They were not given a title for the land at the time of purchase and still do not have such a document. They have since built houses and settled in this area. A local legal aid centre has brought this issue to the attention of the local authorities and believes that it will be resolved in favour of the IDPs. In the meantime, however, IDPs fear they may be forcibly evicted at any time.



Sumgait: Electricity line repair in an informal settlement

IDMC visited one of these informal settlements in Sumgait and found displaced people enduring dire and unsafe living conditions, living in unheated railway wagons, meagre undersized shacks and decrepit public buildings without government services such as solid waste collection and sanitation.

As in two resettlement areas visited, some non-resettled IDP rural villages are located close to the ceasefire line. Displaced people living in these villages reported that they regularly hear hostilities between Armenian and Azerbaijani forces. Like resettlement areas visited, these villages lack public transport and are in areas with limited employment options, health care services, childcare centres and other social facilities. To access these services and opportunities, displaced people must take private taxis, the financial costs of which can place an excessive demand on their budget.

Sanitation (Guiding Principle 18d)

All rural and semi-rural areas lack functioning sewage systems, though public buildings in urban areas did have sewage systems. In one area, exposed stagnant wastewater was located within 20 metres of the water point and the dwelling.

Refuse disposal was not always provided in areas where IDPs live. Solid waste lies loose and uncovered in an open unfenced area, and so is accessible to children and rodents. In one semi-rural area there was one open waste pile for a building of over 100 families. This waste is not regularly collected, despite regular requests made by IDPs to the government. Some residents remove the garbage themselves. Constant exposure to this waste aggravates the health of those living in the area as the environment becomes contaminated.

Recognition before the law (Guiding Principle 20)

All residents of Azerbaijan must register their place of residence. None of the urban IDPs visited were registered at their current place of residence. While some had not applied for registration, in other cases the authorities had refused to register them at their current residence for reasons unknown to the applicant. This prevents IDPs living in urban areas from accessing government assistance and benefits at the current place of residence.

Participation of IDPs (Guiding Principle 28)

The level of engagement of government officials with IDPs varied between settlements, with the participation of some IDPs in the civil affairs of their community obstructed. In most areas, IDPs receive regular assistance from the authorities; while in one semi-rural settlement government officials no longer answer requests from displaced people under its jurisdiction. Furthermore, one group of urban IDPs reported that after voicing a complaint to the government about the quality of the renovation of their communal facilities, they were silenced by government officials. According to one of the IDPs who made the complaint, he and another IDP resident in the building were taken to a local police station and were pressured to withdraw their complaint. The benefits of increased consultation with IDPs, such as better needs assessments, improved sustainability of the state programme, as well as the empowerment and capacity building of displaced communities, have not been sought.

Issues common to all areas visited

Non-discrimination among IDPs (Guiding Principle 4)

According to government legislation, the children of displaced fathers inherit IDP status, but the children of displaced mothers do not. However, IDP status can be transmitted to widows or divorcees of displaced husbands. This practice is discriminatory and impedes recognition of certain IDP children as internally displaced persons before the law.

Essential medical services (Guiding Principle 18.2d)

IDPs reported that the most common medical conditions in their communities were high blood pressure, diabetes, rheumatism, colds, kidney problems, dental problems, anemia and malnutrition. There were also isolated cases of malaria and tuberculosis.

All IDPs could identify the location of the nearest medical clinic. There was no evidence of discriminatory treatment in access to medical services. However, there were issues with regard to the physical and economic accessibility of medical services. Such services were not always within safe physical reach of displaced people living in rural areas, and with no public transport infrastructure where they live the rural displaced reported that they pay for private taxis to shuttle them to the nearest medical clinic or hospital, up to 20 kilometres away.

As in villages where non-resettled displaced people live, resettlers and returnees face limitations to physical and economic access to medical services as well as a lack of reproductive health care for women. Clinics were often more physically accessible than hospitals, but provided only limited treatment. With no access to private or public transport or the funds to pay for a taxi, all of those interviewed had limited physical accessibility to hospitals. In addition to having to pay for transport to such facilities, all of the displaced reported that they were made to pay fees for medical services and medication, even though displaced people are legally exempt from paying fees for treatment and most medicines. Displaced households were incorrectly burdened with health expenses by this discrepancy between the law and practice, although it should be noted that all citizens, whether displaced or not, are subject to informal fees.

The quality of medical services was also an issue. Several groups of IDPs reported that hospitals do not always have the appropriate specialists and that they must travel farther to access treatment for complicated disorders. After paying for transport and the initial consultation, IDPs reported that they lack the funds to travel to and pay for a consultation with a specialist or surgeon. As a result, illnesses have often gone untreated.

Reproductive health services for displaced women, including access to family planning, pre-natal and post-natal care are largely absent. The majority of displaced women were giving birth at home, and there were no gynecologists in rural and semi-rural areas where IDPs live.

Recognition before the law (Guiding Principle 20)

Displaced people reported no difficulty in acquiring personal identification documents. However, they did state that application for an IDP status certificate is burdensome and expensive, since it costs approximately eight dollars and they often have to travel to a district centre to make the application. Therefore many IDPs have opted not to apply for the IDP status certificate since they receive government assistance without the document. However, many IDPs reported having to pay bribes to government officials for registration of their temporary residence. This impedes their recognition as a person before the law as well as prevents their access to services and employment at their current residence.



Agdam: School in new resettlement area

Primary school is compulsory and free (Guiding Principle 23.2)

Schools existed in all areas visited, but attendance was not always free. The school in the informal settlement in Sumgait had opened on the initiative of an IDP, who contributed funds of his own and raised funds externally. IDPs in resettlement areas reported that they must pay for textbooks and clothing for children in order to send them to school, which was in their opinion a considerable family expense. One group in an urban settlement reported that textbooks were provided free of charge by the state. Almost all children were going to school, with isolated reports of children dropping out of school at age 14 since the family lacked money for clothing and school supplies. These children were working in construction and cotton picking.

Some schools had received computers as part of a government school computerisation programme, but did not have the space or the training to operate them. Some schools accommodated only displaced children, for example in resettlement areas, whereas other schools in semi-rural and urban areas were mixed with displaced and non-displaced children. There were enough teachers in all areas visited, but teachers in one rural area reported that there were not enough books and textbooks.

Recommendations to the Government of Azerbaijan

Property

- Take measures to confer legal security of tenure upon displaced households that lack titles for their property in new and informal settlements as well as villages of return.

Participation and consultation of IDPs

- Create an “IDP Hotline” through which internally displaced people can inquire about matters affecting them and provide input and feedback on IDP programmes;
- Invite persons being resettled, including women, children and elderly, to participate in the planning, design and equipment of new settlements;
- Organise “go and see” visits for leaders of IDP communities that will be resettled.

Registration

- Simplify and facilitate the provision of IDP certificates and the registration of internally displaced people at their actual place of residence.

Livelihoods

- Develop and implement a comprehensive livelihoods strategy to create employment opportunities for displaced people in their current place of residence through a consultative process and on the basis of the 2007 amendments to the “State Programme for the Improvement of Living Conditions and Increase of Employment for Refugees and IDPs”;
- Offer IDPs financial credit with more favourable terms than those currently available, such as a lower interest rate and longer repayment schedule;
- Establish public transportation infrastructure in rural areas where IDPs are being resettled.

Education

- Ensure that all internally displaced children attend school in line with legislation.

Adequate standard of living

- Assess living conditions of IDPs in informal settlements with a view to possibly including IDPs living there in future resettlement plans;
- Ensure that solid waste is removed on a regular basis from IDP settlements in urban, rural and semi-rural areas;

- Monitor the wider food security situation of displaced people in order to assess the overall impact and benefit of food subsidies and distribution;
- Ensure medical care is physically and economically accessible for displaced people and that they receive treatment free of charge in line with legislation.

Policy

- Implement Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly Resolution 1497 (2006) on refugees and displaced persons in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia;
- Incorporate into the next IDP action plan the Council of Europe's Parliamentary Assembly Recommendations 1771 (2006) on the establishment of a Stability Pact for the South Caucasus; 1790 (2007) on the situation of women in the South Caucasus; and 1797 (2007) on missing persons in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia from the conflicts over Nagorno-Karabakh, Abkhazia and South Ossetia regions.