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INTRODUCTION
The Local Responder Area Profile aims to collect actionable, area-based information on local non-governmental actors (LNGAs)¹ needs, capacities, ways of working, and preferences for international support, to give international organisations (IOs) data they can use to avoid duplication, support LNGAs directly, and improve international integration with local systems on local terms. This research covers LNGAs operating out of Zaporizhzhia city. The research includes both quantitative data and qualitative data, which were obtained from different LNGAs. All findings are indicative only. See p. 5 for full methodology.

RAION-LEVEL ACTIVITIES COVERAGE OF LNGAS
Areas where LNGAs are reportedly conducting activities, by number of LNGAs reporting:

- KHERSONSKYI: 26 - 55 LNGAs
- KAKHOVSKYI: 11 - 25 LNGAs
- BERYSLAVSKYI: 4 - 10 LNGAs
- KRYVORIZKYI: 1 - 3 LNGAs
- KAMIANSKYI: 35 LNGAs
- NIKOPOLSKYI: 24 LNGAs
- DNIPROVSKYI: 20 LNGAs
- ZAPORIZKYI: 14 LNGAs
- VASYLIVSKYI: 12 LNGAs
- POLOHIVSKYI: 5 LNGAs
- VOLNOVASKYI: 2 LNGAs
- SYNELNYKIVSKYI: 2 LNGAs
- NOVOMOSKOVSKYI: 1 LNGAs
- PAVLOHRADSKYI: 1 LNGAs
- KRAMATORSKYI: 1 LNGAs
- BAKHMUTSKYI: 1 LNGAs
- POKROVSKYI: 1 LNGAs

ACTIVITIES OVERVIEW ²
Distribution of in-kind goods
- Food: 42 LNGAs
- General hygiene supplies: 38 LNGAs
- Items for babies/children: 16 LNGAs
- Clothing: 15 LNGAs
- Medicines: 14 LNGAs
- Bedding/blankets: 12 LNGAs
- Items for older adults: 12 LNGAs
- Water: 9 LNGAs
- Any items asked: 7 LNGAs
- Cooking supplies: 6 LNGAs
- Winterization items: 5 LNGAs
- Light shelter repair supplies: 4 LNGAs
- Assistive devices for those with limited mobility: 4 LNGAs
- Education materials: 3 LNGAs
- Lighting substitutes: 3 LNGAs
- LNGAs involved in distribution: 51 LNGAs

Frontline and first response
- Evacuation: 13 LNGAs
- First responder (EMS, fire brigade, S&R, etc.): 4 LNGAs
- Animal rescue: 4 LNGAs

Information and coordination
- Assessing/monitoring needs: 12 LNGAs
- Awareness-raising/sharing information: 7 LNGAs
- Coordination: 6 LNGAs

KIs reported that LNGAs provided such awareness-raising activities as mental health awareness, as well as education for violence against women/domestic violence and mine risk, legal rights.

10 LNGAs reported heavy shelter repair activities.

KIs reported that LNGAs provided cash assistance with bank transfer modality. The main types of it assistance were general and food.

1 Throughout this factsheet, "LNGA" refers to Ukrainian non-governmental actors including national NGOs operating out of Kryvyi Rih, registered civil society organisations (CSOs), and volunteer groups that met inclusion criteria (see p. 5).
2 Displayed by number of LNGAs reporting participation in each activity. LNGA respondents could select more than one option.
3 Emergency medical support
4 Search and Rescue
5 Mental health and psychosocial support
6 LNGAs involved in services for the general population: 36 LNGAs
7 LNGAs involved in services for IDPs/returnees: 9 LNGAs
8 Services for general population:
   - MHPSS ³ services: 23 LNGAs
   - Legal assistance: 17 LNGAs
   - Education for <18 children: 12 LNGAs
   - Livelihoods support: 10 LNGAs
   - Other support for children: 8 LNGAs
   - Healthcare services: 6 LNGAs
   - Assistance for survivors of domestic violence: 5 LNGAs
   - Housing assistance: 4 LNGAs
   - Support with finding/applying for assistance: 4 LNGAs
   - Transportation services: 3 LNGAs
   - Light shelter repair: 2 LNGAs
   - Home-based care for those w/ limited mobility: 2 LNGAs
   - Services targeting veterans: 1 LNGAs
   - WASH facilities repair: 1 LNGAs

9 Services for IDPs and returnees:
   - Housing assistance: 6 LNGAs
   - MHPSS ³ services: 5 LNGAs
   - Other services: 5 LNGAs
   - Healthcare services: 4 LNGAs
   - Livelihoods support: 3 LNGAs
   - Legal assistance: 3 LNGAs

³ Mental health and psychosocial support
⁴ Search and Rescue
⁵ Mental health and psychosocial support
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**SECTORAL RESPONSE CAPACITY**

Perception of LNGAs on how local capacity can address sectoral needs, by number of LNGAs reporting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Perception of LNGAs on how local capacity can address sectoral needs, by number of LNGAs reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter assistance</td>
<td>28 / 13 / 17 / 5 / 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>15 / 14 / 26 / 8 / 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFIs</td>
<td>15 / 7 / 22 / 13 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social protection</td>
<td>13 / 9 / 22 / 13 / 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12 / 19 / 17 / 4 / 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>12 / 6 / 23 / 13 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>10 / 9 / 19 / 15 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation</td>
<td>9 / 5 / 22 / 10 / 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/nutrition</td>
<td>7 / 7 / 18 / 15 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>7 / 6 / 26 / 14 / 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about assistance</td>
<td>2 / 2 / 16 / 19 / 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Very poorly or fairly poorly (can’t meet many needs, at least some unmet needs are considered urgent or life-threatening)
- Somewhat poorly (can meet less than half of needs)
- Neither well nor poorly/sector not needed here
- Somewhat well (can meet more than half of needs but with notable gaps)
- Fairly well (can meet many needs but missing a few groups/areas)
- Very well (can meet all/most needs in coverage area)

**LOCAL PERCEPTION OF PRIORITY NEEDS**

Top 3 priority needs in their area of coverage, by number of LNGAs reporting:

- **Food**
  - Provision of accommodation: 34
  - Provision of medicines: 32
  - Livelihoods support: 23
  - Hygiene NFIs: 23
  - Healthcare: 19
  - Shelter repair: 9
  - Financial assistance to repay debt: 8

A couple of KIs (2) noted that there was a need for food storage space. Another KI pointed out that there was almost no support from IOs to provide food to people in need. This was explained by the fact that logistics/delivery was very expensive, as was renting a warehouse for storing food.

- **Provision of support by international organisations, by number of LNGAs reporting:**
  - Reported IOs providing support in all relevant coverage areas and priority need categories: 51
  - Reported IOs providing support in all relevant coverage areas, but not for all priority need categories: 13
  - Reported IOs providing support for other needs but not the top 3 priority needs identified: 1
  - Reported IOs not providing support to this area: 1

**Shelter response capacity**

One KI reported the need for shelters to cover utility costs. This was explained by the fact that government cash assistance for IDPs was reduced and left only for vulnerable IDPs. Therefore, IDPs without vulnerabilities could not afford to cover utilities in shelters. Moreover, KI from CSOs indicated that the lack of employment opportunities and the fear of conscription forced IDPs to return to the areas from where they were evacuated.

Likewise, one KI highlighted that decisions related to shelter issues should be made more quickly.

**People from a vulnerable groups support capacity**

One KI pointed out that the problem of assisting people with low mobility was complex. The KI explained that on the one hand, it was impossible to evacuate such people to a geriatric boarding house, due to the restriction on the activities of such institutions closer to 100 km from the front line (Zaporizhzhia city was approximately 30 km from the front line). On the other hand, people with low mobility refused to be evacuated to other oblasts. Another KI indicated that in general, the cities that assist people with disabilities, and the city in general, are poorly equipped for the movement of such people.

Also in the quantitative part of the assessment, older persons and people with disabilities were the two groups most commonly reported as having unmet social protection needs.

**Healthcare response capacity**

One KI explained that there were problems with access to medicine in rural areas, as well as the need for updated facilities and additional staff for medical facilities.

---

*6 LNGA respondents could select more than one option.*
Barriers to operational needs:
Funding and staff resourcing
A couple of KIs (2) highlighted that they could not open new areas of activity due to a lack of funding. One KI reported that their activities are volunteer-based and do not come with salary or benefits, leading to a reduction in staff. Another KI indicated the reluctance of men to be officially employed due to fear of conscription.

Fuel and vehicles
A couple of KIs (3) noted that the lack of vehicles and/or fuel for them forced their CSOs to reduce the coverage area of their activity, which led to a decrease in the number of beneficiaries.

In-kind distribution
One KI reported the need for rare medicines for children with disabilities, as well as baby food and hygiene kits. Another KI indicated that the oblast generally lacked a partner who would provide food on a permanent basis.

Decision-making within and among local actors
More than half of the KIs (8) reported that decision-making within their CSO takes into account discussions leading to collective decisions and considering the vulnerability of the potential beneficiary when deciding on the assistance provision. About half of KIs (6) noted that decision-making in the region takes place through the created coordination structure, which has collegial bodies. At the same time, a third of KIs (4) indicated that they did not know about the existence of a decision-making structure or believed that such structures do not work.

TOP REPORTED OPERATIONAL NEEDS
Most reported operational needs across all assessed LNGAs facing resource gaps, by number of LNGAs reporting (n=42):⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Need</th>
<th>Number of LNGAs Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles for transportation of staff or beneficiaries</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor/human resources</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind distribution items for beneficiaries</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment (excluding vehicles)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises/space for activities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for displaced or unhoused beneficiaries</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information in an unfamiliar topic or Office utilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of funding reportedly needed to meet resource gaps, by number of LNGAs reporting (n=42):⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Funding Needed</th>
<th>Number of LNGAs Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5,000 USD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10,000 USD</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-35,000 USD</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,001-60,000 USD</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 60,001 USD</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 LNGA respondents could select more than one option.
Perception of cooperation successes and challenges

When asking about the imagined successful experience of cooperation with IOs, a couple of KIs (2) highlighted that such cooperation should include a transparent system of providing humanitarian aid to people, reporting to IOs about the aid provided, as well as a personal factor in building relations between CSOs and IOs.

Based on their cooperation experience with IOs, three-quarters of KIs (9) explained that they did not see any problems finding information about cooperation opportunities with IOs. A third of KIs (3) highlighted that one common barrier they encountered was IOs that avoided cooperation with small CSOs, which lacked staff, storage space, etc. A couple of KIs (2) indicated that there was a problem with the operation of bank accounts of CSOs registered in this oblast, some foreign banks consider this area occupied, which led to funding delays and sometimes non-cooperation.

A couple of other KIs (2) noted such problems of cooperation with the IOs, such as:

- the lack of funds to cover administrative costs;
- the lack of opportunities for in-person meetings with representatives of the IOs;
- the lack of feedback from the IOs;
- the presence of certain mistrust due to corruption risks.

Preferences for cooperation with international actors

The majority of KIs highlighted that the ideal cooperation with the IO could be based on:

- providing training/education for CSO staff before the start of implementation (8 KIs);
- personal communication/cooperation is considered more attractive/productive, for example through in-person visits by an IO representative (7 KIs);
- using flexibility in the work format (5 KIs).

Also, about a third of KIs (4) reported that ideal cooperation with an IO should include:

- coordinating the actions between the three main actors in the region (local CSOs, authorities, IOs);
- communication in the Ukrainian language;
- direct communication with a representative of an IO who makes decisions;
- documentation of implementation (reporting, photo documentation, etc.);
- quick decision-making.

A couple of KIs (2) pointed out the importance of avoiding situations where the same people receive humanitarian aid all the time, while those who truly need it do not receive anything.

LOCAL COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION

Among assessed LNGAs, 52 of 66 reported that they had some kind of local mechanism for coordinating the emergency response.

57 of 66 assessed LNGAs reported being aware of GCM⁸ meetings run by OCHA.

Main means by which LNGAs communicate with their target population, by number of LNGAs reporting:⁹

- Telegram 44
- Face-to-face in office 34
- Facebook 33
- Phone call 27
- Instagram 27
- Viber 17
- Face-to-face at beneficiary home 14
- Hybrid meetings (other than GCM⁸) 14
- Group or channel on social media¹¹ 13
- Informal in-person or phone communication 13
- Virtual meetings (other than GCM⁸) 13
- Hybird meetings (other than GCM⁸) 13
- E-mail 7
- OCHA GCM⁸ 7

Local coordination

Half of the KIs (6) explained that the Coordination Council was the coordination mechanism and reaction in the region. Almost a third of KIs (3) also highlighted that coordination meetings are held on a regular basis, as well as there was a certain coordination tool, in the form of a table where there was data about the needs of the people/oblasts and how much these needs were covered. Also, almost a third of the KIs (3) indicated that other coordination mechanisms work under the oblast/district authority.

On the other hand, one KI noted issues with coordination of frontline access: the military restricted access to areas near the front line and reportedly the ability to visit these areas was built more on personal connection than on a clear mechanism.
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METHODOLOGY OVERVIEW

The Local Responder Area Profile (LRAP) assessment aims to collect actionable, area-based information on local non-governmental actors’ (LNGAs) needs, capacities, ways of working, and preferences for international support, in order to give international actors information that they can use to avoid duplication, support LNGAs directly, and improve international integration with local systems on local terms.

Zaporizhzhia city was chosen for this assessment based on its relevance as a “coordination hub” from which local and sometimes international non-governmental actors conduct activities both within the city and outside of it, including throughout Zaporizka oblast and to some extent other oblasts as Donetska, Dnipropetrovska and Khersonska. Initial field information about the relevance of Zaporizhzhia city as a coordination hub, and the value of an LRAP on Zaporizhzhia to international organisations carrying out activities in Zaporizka and surrounding oblasts, was confirmed via informal consultation with OCHA East on February 27, 2024. This discussion also confirmed the existence of information gaps particularly around LNGAs in the area, demonstrating the value of an LRAP to international organizations that carry out activities in Dnipropetrovska, Donetska, Zaporizka and Khersonska oblasts.

REACH used a mixed method approach for this assessment, beginning with a quantitative phone-based survey to as many Zaporizhzhia-based LNGAs as could be identified, and following up with a smaller set of the originally-identified LNGAs for more in-depth in-person qualitative key informant interviews (KIs).

Quantitative data collection was conducted between 18-29 March. REACH field teams attempted to contact all LNGAs that were able to be identified as operating out of (i.e. had an office or consistent presence in) Zaporizhzhia city and whose activities included humanitarian support for civilians; the threshold of inclusion for more informal volunteer groups was a group with a minimum of 3-4 members, a clear focal point who could be contacted, and sustained support activities. Ultimately, a total of 66 Key Informants (KIs) representing 66 LNGAs completed the quantitative survey. This number is consistent with scoping estimates from key stakeholders stating that approximately up to 100 civil society organisations (CSO) were operating in Zaporizhzhia. The quantitative portion focused on LNGAs’ activities, coverage, operational needs, coordination awareness and perception of local capacity by sector.

Rapid analysis of the quantitative data was used to identify follow-up KIs for the qualitative portion, focusing on LNGAs who confirmed insufficient resources, whose activities overlapped with sectors reported as being in a situation of undercapacity in the quantitative survey, or who worked with vulnerable populations such as women, children, older people, and people with disabilities. Qualitative KIs were then conducted between 08-13 April with representatives of 10 LNGAs, focusing on LNGA perceptions of benefits, challenges, and preferences for cooperation with international actors, local decision-making, and perceived reasons behind operational needs and local capacity gaps. In addition, 2 KIIs with local authorities were conducted to triangulate responses on local sectoral capacity gaps and cooperation with international actors.

LIMITATIONS

REACH cannot guarantee that the field department was able to identify all relevant LNGAs operating out of Zaporizhzhia city. Additionally, although REACH contacted as many LNGAs as they were able to identify that met the inclusion criteria, a small number did not answer or chose not to participate in the survey. As such, there are likely LNGAs in Zaporizhzhia whose perspective has not been included in this study. Results also cannot be assumed to be statistically representative of this group, given that the baseline population total of Zaporizhzhia-based LNGAs is not clearly known. As such all findings are indicative only. Furthermore, the area-based approach is not generalisable to the broader context, and these findings may not be relevant for LNGAs in other areas. Finally, certain qualitative questions based on individual LNGAs’ quantitative responses, particularly questions following up on specific operational needs, were asked on a case-by-case basis instead of across all KIs, indicating nuances of specific LNGAs’ experiences in the operating environment. These findings in particular are highly individual and are not generalisable.

ABOUT REACH

REACH Initiative facilitates the development of information tools and products that enhance the capacity of aid actors to make evidence-based decisions in emergency, recovery and development contexts. The methodologies used by REACH include primary data collection and in-depth analysis, and all activities are conducted through inter-agency aid coordination mechanisms. REACH is a joint initiative of IMPACT Initiatives, ACTED and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research - Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNITAR-UNOSAT).