

CROSSING THE LINE OF CONTACT

CHECKPOINT SURVEY ANNUAL REPORT



February-December

2018

CONTENTS

	INTRODUCTION	3
	METHODOLOGY	3
	OVERALL SUMMARY	4
1	DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS	5
2	RESIDENCE, DISPLACEMENT AND RETURNS	7
3	REASONS, FREQUENCY AND DURATION OF CROSSING	8
4	CONCERNS WHILE CROSSING THE LINE OF CONTACT	17
5	INABILITY TO CROSS	21
	OBSERVATIONS	22
	RECOMMENDATIONS	27
	ANNEX. EECF CROSSINGS DURING FEBRUARY-DECEMBER 2018	27

INTRODUCTION

This report covers the February to December 2018 period of the survey¹ conducted by the Charitable Foundation «The Right to Protection» (R2P) at the five entry-exit checkpoints (EECPs) to the non-government-controlled area (NGCA). The survey has been administered on a regular basis since June 2017. The survey is part of the monitoring of violations of rights of the conflict-affected population within the framework of the project «Advocacy, Protection and Legal Assistance to the Internally Displaced Population of Ukraine» implemented by R2P with the support of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

(UNHCR). The objective of the survey is to explore the motivations and concerns of those travelling between the NGCA and the government-controlled area (GCA), as well as the conditions and risks associated with crossing the line of contact through EECPs. During the reporting period, respondents faced seasonal weather changes that significantly affected crossing conditions and seasonal changes of the operating schedule at all EECPs. The second half of 2018 was characterized by reconstruction at all five EECPs. While the process itself causes temporary inconveniences to the travellers, the final results bring positive changes.



Hnutove EECP

METHODOLOGY

This report is based on a survey of civilians crossing the line of contact at the five operating EECPs located in Donetsk (Maiorske, Mariinka, Hnutove and Novotroitske) and Luhansk (Stanytsia Luhanska) Oblasts. It should be noted that the survey results should not be directly extrapolated onto the entire population crossing the checkpoints, but it helps identify needs, gaps and trends, and provides an evidentiary basis for advocacy efforts. This round of the survey was carried out from 2 February to 26 December 2018. Data collected in January were not included in the report as the survey questionnaire and approach to data analysis was amended in February in order to collect more precise information. The data were collected during regular

visits to each of the five EECPs on a weekly basis (438 visits in eleven months). The data collection methodology was the same at all EECPs. R2P monitors surveyed civilians queuing at the EECPs. The survey was conducted anonymously and on a voluntary basis. All persons interviewed for the survey were informed about its objective. The survey was conducted in the form of personal interviews with people aged 18 and above. The monitors approached every fourth person in line with a request to complete the survey. If a person refused to participate, monitors proceeded to survey the next fourth person in line. People travelling both to and from the GCA took part in the survey. At no time did the monitors cross the zero checkpoints into the NGCA. As monitors

reach people for the survey during the process of crossing the line of contact, it would be inconsistent to ask about the duration of that particular crossing. As a solution, the question about the previous crossing experience was added to the survey.

To get a better understanding of trends and tendencies regarding crossing the line of contact, the general statistics on crossings from the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine (SBGS) have been used².

¹ More statistical data are available on the Eastern Ukraine Checkpoint Monitoring Online Dashboard – <https://goo.gl/fZxXD1>

² General statistics on crossings are available at the UNHCR dashboard visualizing data from the State Border Guard Service – <https://goo.gl/TZbU8c>

OVERALL SUMMARY

- SBGS statistics² shows continuous growth in the number of crossings over the years 2016 (8.569 millions), 2017 (11.842 millions) and 2018 (13.620 millions).
- Reconstruction, seasonal changes in weather and EECP operations are the key influences on the severity of protection risks faced by persons of concern.
- The reasons for crossing the line of contact were strongly affected by administrative burdens imposed by the government of Ukraine. Massive suspensions of social payments starting in May 2018 compelled thousands of people to travel through the line of contact for this reason.
- Stanytsia Luhanska, the only EECP in Luhansk Oblast, is one of the busiest among the five. Even though reconstruction initiated and funded by Oblast administrations generally increased its capacity, launching another EECP in the Oblast is a high priority.
- As in 2017, long waiting times remained the most articulated concern in 2018. Other common issues were related to infrastructure: poor condition of roads, pedestrian areas or the bridge, poor waiting conditions and the need to walk a long distance. In addition, there are no equipped bus stations at EECPs: there is no appropriate place for waiting and no bus schedule at all EECPs except Stanytsia Luhanska.
- Reconstruction of each of the five EECPs commenced in the second half of 2018. This significantly improved the situation at Mariinka, Novotroitske and Stanytsia Luhanska EECPs, where it started earlier, decreasing the level of concern.
- Though shelling and shooting incidents in the vicinity of EECPs are regularly reported, the level of concern was relatively low at all EECPs except Maiorske. R2P monitors noted that over time civilians became so inured to shelling that it rarely elicits any reaction.



Stanytsia Luhanska EECP

1 DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS

During the reporting period R2P monitors interviewed **24,177** persons crossing the line of contact. The proportion of surveyed individuals at each EECP was approximately the same as the percentage of crossings at each EECP. 50.1% of interviews were conducted with people heading to the NGCA, 49.9% of respondents were going to the GCA.

65% of all interviewees were women. The gender ratio was relatively consistent each month despite some minor fluctuations during holiday or vacation periods. It is noteworthy, that according to *Figure 14*, male respondents indicated visiting their relatives at these times slightly less often than female respondents.

The age disaggregation also remained very similar throughout the survey period with the elderly representing the predominant majority of interviewees. This is caused by the administrative burdens older people registered in the NGCA must undergo to receive their pensions.

FIGURE 1
DISAGGREGATION OF RESPONDENTS BY EECP




FIGURE 2
GENDER DISAGGREGATION IN DYNAMICS





FIGURE 3
AGE



«You're waiting there (NGCA), waiting here (GCA), waiting in lines in the bank... It's not a life, just endless waiting» – Larisa, over 60 years old. Maiorske EECF.

The low number of younger respondents demonstrates that they have fewer reasons to cross the line of contact. It is interesting to note that while the share of younger respondents increased in summer months (the number of those going on vacation at that time drastically increased – *Figure 15*), no similar tendencies were observed in the winter holiday season, presumably due to its brevity and the weather conditions. Conversely, the share of respondents over 60 years old significantly increased in November and December. However, this increase seems to be caused by the high number of respondents in that age group trying to avoid the suspension of pensions, rather than the holiday season (the share of those visiting their relatives or going on vacation remained relatively low – *Figure 15*).

Only 7% of respondents were travelling with children, mostly to visit their relatives. Obviously, people see fewer reasons or possibilities to bring children across the LoC, which may be related to security risks, unsuitable crossing conditions, and additional requirements for crossing with children (a power of attorney from one or both parents).

FIGURE 4
AGE DISAGGREGATION BY GENDER





FIGURE 5
AGE DISAGGREGATION IN DYNAMICS




2 RESIDENCE, DISPLACEMENT AND RETURN

Only 11% of respondents indicated the GCA as their place of residence at the time of the survey. This shows that GCA residents have far fewer reasons to travel across the line of contact while NGCA residents must solve issues related to state, legal and banking services, which is impossible or difficult to do in the NGCA. Presumably, if the administrative burdens on NGCA residents were reduced, the flow through EECPs would significantly decline.


95% of all respondents resided in the NGCA prior to the conflict. It is interesting to note that among 1181 individuals (5% of all respondents) who stated that they resided in the GCA prior to the conflict, more than half (722 individuals) were surveyed at Stanytsia Luhanska EECP. Moreover, only at this EECP a significant part of GCA residents (194 individuals) indicated work as one of the reasons for crossing, while those surveyed at Donetsk Oblast EECPs were mostly visiting relatives. According to monitors' observations, such a result is partially attributable to the employment environment in Luhansk oblast, which compelled people to seek opportunities in major cities that are now mostly in the NGCA. It should also be mentioned that a number of respondents (195) changed their place of residence for reasons unrelated to the conflict.

77% of interviewees indicated that they have never moved due to the conflict, so the number of actual or former IDPs is low among respondents. It is important to mention that the disaggregation should not be extrapolated to the whole population of the region as the survey does not cover internally displaced persons or NGCA residents who do not

■ FIGURE 6
DISPLACEMENT



■ FIGURE 7
REASONS FOR RETURN (% OF «DISPLACED BUT THEN RETURNED»)³



travel across the line of contact at all or through official EECPs.

The respondents who moved due to the conflict but then returned named various reasons: security, economic and psychological. The most frequently cited reasons for return were the stabilized situations (2261 individuals), desire to reside at home (2073 individuals), fear

to abandon a household lest it be looted (1533) and high rent (1511). Three respondents returned for other reasons: two were students who had been unable to enroll in higher education institutions in the GCA and one was an elderly woman who returned because she felt like she was a burden for her relatives.

³ Respondents could indicate several reasons for return.


3 REASONS, FREQUENCY AND DURATION OF CROSSING

3.1. Reasons for crossing the line of contact

Overall, the most common reasons for crossing included avoiding the suspension of social benefits and pensions, solving issues with documents, visiting relatives, withdrawing cash and shopping. It is worth noting that while some reasons were relatively consistent (checking on property, shopping), others were significantly affected by seasonal changes (vacation) or administrative constraints (issues with documents, avoiding payment suspension, etc.).

Only 20 individuals during the eleven-month reporting period stated that they were crossing the line of contact for permanent relocation. This demonstrates that there are no signs of active return of internally displaced persons nor are there signs of active displacement.

■ FIGURE 8
REASONS FOR CROSSING



Among the various document issues reported, physical identification and reinstatement of pensions were mentioned the most frequently. The number of people traveling to reinstate their pension payments increased gradually up to September, especially after mass suspensions that began in May. Consequently, the share of those traveling for physical identification increased as well. Other issues were obtaining a passport (internal or international), updating the photo in an existing one, birth or death certificates and power of attorney.

98% of respondents who indicated shopping as one of the reasons for crossing were NGCA residents which might be indicative of the deficit of some categories of goods or higher prices in the NGCA. For the whole survey period, food was the most commonly purchased item, followed by medicines and then clothes. Aside from these items, respondents mostly mentioned household appliances.

FIGURE 9
MAIN REASONS FOR CROSSING IN DYNAMICS
 (% OF ALL RESPONDENTS IN EACH MONTH)




FIGURE 10
TYPES OF DOCUMENT ISSUES (% OF ALL RESPONDENTS)





FIGURE 11
TYPES OF DOCUMENT ISSUES IN DYNAMICS
 (% OF ALL RESPONDENTS IN EACH MONTH)



The reasons for crossing differ substantially for GCA and NGCA residents. GCA residents were mostly visiting relatives and checking on property voluntarily, while NGCA residents had more compelling reasons to visit the GCA. Thus, NGCA residents were traveling to avoid suspension of payments triggered by being away from the GCA for over 60 days, to solve issues with documents, to withdraw cash, to visit relatives and to do shopping.⁴ As noted earlier, this is related to the requirements Ukrainian legislation places on NGCA residents for obtaining their pensions and social benefits.

It should be emphasized that the share of GCA residents traveling through the line of contact for work purposes (7.6% of all respondents who resided in the GCA at the time of the survey) was relatively high. As it was mentioned above, the majority of such respondents come from Luhansk Oblast.

FIGURE 12
TYPE OF GOODS PURCHASED (% OF ALL RESPONDENTS)





FIGURE 13
REASONS FOR CROSSING (BY THE PLACE OF RESIDENCE)⁵



⁴ Respondents could indicate more than one reason for their travel. The percentage was calculated based on the total number of people who indicated either the GCA or the NGCA as their current place of residence.

⁵ Respondents could indicate more than one reason for their travel.

«6 hours of waiting in line. Freezing. We were standing there like penguins on a sheet of ice ... The woman behind me asked to bury her face in my winter coat. I did not mind if it kept her warm and it made me feel warmer too. Another woman complained that her back got very cold and someone gave her a backpack. They were wearing that backpack in turns...» – Stanytsia Luhanska EECF.


Reasons for crossing did not vary significantly by gender. However, male respondents travelled slightly more often for matters related to work, education and for checking on property. Women, in turn, were slightly more often solving administrative issues and visiting relatives.

The dynamical changes were also rather similar for both genders. In the periods of seasonal holidays or administrative constraints, women mentioned visiting relatives and solving issues with documents (relatively) slightly more often.

Naturally, the reasons for crossing also varied depending on the age group. Most respondents aged 18-34 were travelling to visit their relatives. Younger respondents also tended to travel on summer vacations, while respondents over 60 years old almost never mentioned it among their reasons. It is not surprising that respondents in the youngest age group was traveling for educational and work purposes the most often.

Respondents over 60 years old are the ones who are most affected by the administrative burdens. Even though they suffer the most waiting in lines for hours in all types of weather, they remain the largest category of respondents. Their reasons for crossing usually make it impossible to cancel or postpone a trip, even if people are injured or ill.

■ FIGURE 14
REASONS FOR CROSSING BY GENDER




«Recently, another incident requiring a quick and thorough response happened at Novotroitske EECP. Everyone who has ever traveled by the local bus knows that the steps at the entrance are quite high. One of the women injured her leg while getting off the bus. Despite the damage, she attempted to stand up and continue by herself. Her goal was to pass physical identification, which is required for obtaining pensions.

However, her pain was unbearable. I asked the medics from Première Urgence Internationale (who are permanently present at the EECP) to come to the place of the incident. The examination showed a fracture in her foot. Obviously, the woman had to be hospitalized. But she was strongly committed to passing the physical identification anyway. We had no choice but to ask medics to take us to the Oschadbank mobile office. Physical identification was basically conducted in the ambulance car. I assisted, taking a picture of the woman as part of identification procedure. Many thanks to the Oschadbank employees who agreed to help in such a difficult situation.

At some point I realized that the woman was much more concerned about her pension than her own health. Luckily, with the help of others, we were able to settle the matter quickly. The woman calmed down – her pension issue was solved. I knew everything was going to be fine: she will receive the proper medical help in the hospital. I wish that the woman gets better soon and to everyone – to be careful on this arduous road.»

R2P monitor

■ FIGURE 15⁶



⁶ Respondents could indicate more than one reason for their travel.

3.2. Frequency and duration of crossing

«Before 2014 the road to Kramatorsk to my relatives took about an hour. Now it takes 3 to 5. It feels like living on a reservation. Like those Indian reservations in America. We feel like that. No one needs us.» – A man from Horlivka, over 60 years old. Maiorske EECF.

The majority of respondents (65%) stated that they cross the line of contact quarterly. The most considerable difference on this matter is between the age groups. As respondents over 60 years old are mostly traveling to fit in the 60-day limit of being away from the GCA, the majority of them (76%) cross the line of contact at least quarterly. Younger respondents who do not have to meet such conditions and plan their trips based on their own schedules and are not tied to any particular frequency.

As people are surveyed while they are in a process of crossing the line of contact, the questions related to duration are referred to the previous crossing. 84% of all respondents stated that they had previously crossed the line of contact in 2018 (except January). The most frequently mentioned crossing times to pass both GCA and NGCA checkpoints (from 2 to 3 hours – 41%; from 4 to 5 hours – 42%) were almost equal. Although most respondents spent 2 to 5 hours through all eleven months, the disaggregation itself was rather varied. It was significantly affected by seasonal changes, reconstruction at the EECFs etc.

FIGURE 16
FREQUENCY OF CROSSING THE LINE OF CONTACT





FIGURE 17
DURATION OF PREVIOUS CROSSING⁷



⁷ This and the following graphs comprise answers about respondents' previous crossing experiences within the reporting period.

The tendencies at each EECp were also substantially different. The highest average share of respondents who spent 2-3 hours to cross the line of contact was at Hnutove EECp, which is the least loaded one. Times at Maiorske EECp were relatively stable with a slight improvement in December as the flow of people through the EECp has become less intense (Figure 27).

During the last months of 2018 most of the respondents who stated that it took 4 to 5 hours to cross the line of contact were at Mariinka and Novotroitske EECps. However, the vast majority of respondents at these EECps also claimed that it took longer to pass the NGCA checkpoints' segment. According to the information from monitoring visits, it usually took 2 to 5 hours of waiting at the NGCA checkpoints, caused by the long passport control procedures in the NGCA.

Among all five EECps the highest share (on average) of those who spent over 5 hours to cross the line of contact was observed at Stanytsia Luhanska EECp. However, the peak number of such respondents was in June when not only the flow through the EECp was continuously increasing due to the massive suspension of payments and the summer vacation season, but the EECp itself was sorely lacking both technical equipment and human resources to ensure sufficient capacity. In September, with the beginning of reconstruction, the situation has changed for the better. Despite this, Stanytsia Luhanska remained the only EECp where the majority of respondents (76% in average) stated that it took longer to cross on the GCA side. According to information received during monitoring visits, the control procedure in the GCA is more thorough.

FIGURE 18
DURATION OF PREVIOUS CROSSING (AVERAGE BY EECp)







FIGURE 19
DURATION OF PREVIOUS CROSSING




DURATION OF PREVIOUS CROSSING (HNUTOVE)




DURATION OF PREVIOUS CROSSING (MAIORSKE)



DURATION OF PREVIOUS CROSSING (MARIINKA)



DURATION OF PREVIOUS CROSSING (NOVOTROITSKE)



DURATION OF PREVIOUS CROSSING (STANYTSIA LUHANSKA)






FIGURE 20
SIDE OF CHECKPOINT WITH LONGER DURATION OF CROSSING



Hnutove EEC


4 CONCERNS WHILE CROSSING THE LINE OF CONTACT

«It really is well-built. Seeing this, you can tell immediately that the war will not be over any time soon» – Woman, 60 years old, regarding reconstruction at Mariinka EECP.

Long lines remain the major concern at all EECPs. Although reconstruction and some administrative changes radically improved the situation at GCA checkpoints, long lines still occur due to the intense flow of people, power-supply disruptions that happen from time to time, etc. Moreover, monitors reported numerous complaints regarding intentional protractions at NGCA checkpoints.

The situation is especially dire at Stanytsia Luhanska EECP. The only road through the line of contact in Luhansk Oblast leads across a bridge that was severely damaged by shelling. Consequently, it takes about an hour of walking between the GCA and NGCA checkpoints, which causes a lot of concern regarding poor condition of the bridge and long distance to travel on foot.

■ FIGURE 21
CONCERNS




The condition of the road and pedestrian area was also unsatisfactory during the cold season due to melting snow, mud, slippery surfaces and insufficient maintenance at EECPs.

Though incidents of shelling and shooting periodically occurred in the vicinity of all EECPs, the level of concern was relatively low at all EECPs except Maiorske. Monitors noted that over the time civilians became so inured to shelling that they rarely elicit any reaction.

It is noteworthy that there was no tangible difference in concerns between male and female respondents.


FIGURE 22
CONCERNS (BY EECP)⁸



⁸ Respondents could indicate several concerns.

Respondents could indicate more than one concern, and older respondents selected more concerns than younger ones. In general, older respondents were more concerned about every issue at the EECPs except for confiscation/restrictions on goods, which was reported slightly more by people aged 18-34.

FIGURE 23
CONCERNS (BY AGE)⁹



Maiorske EECP

⁹ Respondents could indicate several concerns.

«Do something to prevent people from fainting, please! It's suffocating in here!» – the same comment from people of different ages and gender, Stanytsia Luhanska EECP.

Waiting conditions were a cause of concern of 18.5% of all respondents. The level of concern regarding this issue varied based on seasonal changes, reconstruction, etc.

The lowest number of respondents that did not indicate any concerns was at Stanytsia Luhanska EECP. Despite major reconstruction improvements, some drawbacks were still causing complaints. For instance, new latrines that were installed as a part of reconstruction, were still closed as of late December.

Among complaints regarding waiting conditions, the lack or inappropriate condition of sun/rain shades at all EECPs continues to be the main issue at all EECPs, especially during the summer and winter months. Such complaints were the most acute in summer at Stanytsia Luhanska and Mariiinka EECPs, however in September (due to the reconstruction and milder weather) the situation changed for the better. In December many respondents at Maiorske EECP were concerned about the lack of sheds, as all sheds and seats were dismantled as a part of reconstruction. Even though the situation is temporary, spending hours in lines during winter months can be hazardous for health.

FIGURE 24
ISSUES WITH WAITING CONDITIONS





FIGURE 25
MAIN ISSUES WITH WAITING CONDITIONS IN DYNAMICS
(% OF ALL RESPONDENTS IN EACH MONTH)



5 INABILITY TO CROSS

«Every life story is unique, but the most touching to me are those ones about family ties. That's why the story of this woman from Kyiv impressed me so much. 80-year old grandmother resided in Makiivka (NGCA). During the time they have not seen each other, the woman became a mother. The child was only two months old when the woman was told her grandmother was very ill and apparently was close to death. The woman decided to visit her to say farewell. She brought her baby so the grandmother could at least see her once.

The young mother arrived at Novotroitske EECP where the problem occurred. The crossing permit was not found in the database. She was in a rush, collecting documents and applying for the permit. Apparently, her data was still processing.


The main problem was that Coordination Group representatives were not present at Novotroitske EECP. It was impossible to solve the issue without them. The case was complicated, time was limited, and she had a baby in her arms. So, we brought them to Marinka EECP with our driver. We explained the situation to the Coordination Group representatives. Thankfully, they expressed sympathy and assisted in solving the issue. The woman was allowed to cross the line of crossing and, hopefully, was there in time to say farewell to her grandmother.»

R2P monitor

3% of all respondents (736 surveyed individuals) mentioned incidents of not being able to cross the line of contact in the six months prior to the time of their survey, mostly due to lack of permits in the SBGS database¹⁰ and long lines. Even though the share is relatively small, such incidents can severely affect individuals with low income.

The lack of Coordination Group¹¹ representatives at Hnutove, Novotroitske and Stanytsia Luhanska EECPs still prevents obtaining a permit at the EECP. The State Border Guard Service at these EECPs can assist in obtaining a crossing permit for emergency cases by an expedited procedure, but in all other cases people have to travel to Coordination Groups offices in the GCA.

■ FIGURE 26
REASONS FOR INABILITY TO CROSS



¹⁰ The SBGS database is an inter-institutional system that is used to monitor individuals and vehicles crossing the line of contact.

¹¹ National Police of Ukraine unit established to organise the issuance of permits and to check individuals crossing the line of contact.

OBSERVATIONS

In addition to the survey, R2P monitors conducted protection monitoring by observation at all five EECPs. The information below describes the situation as of late December.

Monitors at all EECPs highlighted the lack of direction signs. Consequently, many people feel disoriented upon arrival at EECPs.

One of the negative features of EECP transportation is that there are no equipped bus stations: there is no

comfortable place to wait for buses and see the full schedule at all EECPs except Stanytsia Luhanska. Moreover, different buses stop at two different places at Mariinka, Novotroitske and Hnutove EECPs, which creates additional difficulties and confusion.

Despite temporary inconveniences, conditions at all EECPs are expected to be improved within reconstruction. It is also important to consider the imperfections that were already spotted at Mariinka in

order to prevent them from happening at other EECPs (for more details see the sections below).

Representatives of the State Fiscal Service highlighted issues related to Order 39, which determines the list of goods allowed through the line of contact. It is recommended to replace it with a list of forbidden items in order to facilitate the inspection process.

■ HNUTOVE

Hnutove remains the least busy among all five EECPs. Such contrast is related to its location and the poor condition of the road on the NGCA part. However, this direction is convenient for those who decide to travel between Donetsk and Mariupol. The overall situation

at Hnutove compares favourably with other EECPs and more improvements are expected due to the ongoing reconstruction. Reconstruction at Hnutove started on November 5.

One of the largest drawbacks at Hnutove EECP was the poor condition of latrines.

As of late December, they still were in crucial need of disinfection due to deficient maintenance.

During monitoring R2P representatives noted the benevolent attitude of the EECP staff towards civilians.

	Amount	Condition	Location
Sun/rain shade	☹️	😊	☹️
Seats	☹️	😊	☹️
Beds/bed linen (in SES tents)	😊	😊	😊
Information stands	😊	😊	😊
Potable water	😊	😊	☹️
Sanitary water	😊	😊	😊
Garbage bins	☹️	☹️	☹️
Latrines	😊	☹️	😊
Direction signs	☹️	☹️	☹️

😊 – sufficient amount/proper condition/convenient location

☹️ – insufficient amount/poor condition or inappropriate maintenance/inconvenient location

☹️ – absence of such facilities

■ MAIORSKE

Reconstruction of Maiorske EEC started on November 15 and all sun/rain sheds and seats were temporarily dismantled due to ongoing works. By the end of December, the new sheds were still not installed, and people had to spend extended hours in lines under adverse weather conditions.

According to the monitors, many people feel disoriented arriving at the EEC. They lack information about available services like the mobile Oschadbank office and available bus schedules.

	Amount	Condition	Location
Sun/rain shade	☹️	☹️	☹️
Seats	☹️	☹️	☹️
Beds/bed linen (in SES tents)	😊	😊	😊
Information stands	😐	😐	😊
Potable water	😊	😊	😊
Sanitary water	☹️	☹️	☹️
Garbage bins	😊	😊	😊
Latrines	😊	😊	😊
Direction signs	☹️	☹️	☹️

😊 – sufficient amount/proper condition/convenient location

😐 – insufficient amount/poor condition or inappropriate maintenance/inconvenient location

☹️ – absence of such facilities



Maiorske EEC

■ MARINKA

Mariinka EECP was the first one where the reconstruction was completed (September 17). Conditions at the EECP were significantly improved. However, some flaws were observed in the last months of 2018. For instance, the location of State Fiscal Service counter by the exit of the terminal is inconvenient: after passing the inspection of personal belongings, civilians cannot stay in the terminal any longer and have to wait outside. Monitors highlighted that

placing a noticeable bus schedule inside of the terminal could solve the problem as people would be able to stay in the terminal until the bus arrives.

The construction of terminals also had some flaws. As the snow melted at Mariinka EECP, the roof of the terminal started leaking and piles of snow were falling from the shed on cars causing significant damage.

As an extremely intense flow of people goes through Mariinka, there is a high

demand for an equipped bus station beyond the territory of EECP. Currently people who are waiting for buses do not have access to terminals and latrines.

EECP staff complained about inappropriate working conditions due to the lack of heaters in the SBGS modules. Overall, the intensive load on Mariinka EECP is stressful for both civilians and EECP staff, causing numerous conflicts between them.

	Amount	Condition	Location
Sun/rain shade	😊	😊	😊
Seats	😐	😐	😐
Beds/bed linen (in SES tents)	😐	😐	😊
Information stands	😐	😐	😐
Potable water	😊	😊	😊
Sanitary water	😊	😊	😊
Garbage bins	😊	😊	😊
Latrines	😊	😐	😐
Direction signs	😞	😞	😞

😊 – sufficient amount/proper condition/convenient location

😐 – insufficient amount/poor condition or inappropriate maintenance/inconvenient location

😞 – absence of such facilities



Mariinka EECP

■ NOVOTROITSKE

According to monitors, the situation at Novotroitske EECP has significantly improved since reconstruction started. New terminals and sheds, as well as toilets were installed. Major works within reconstruction were already completed as of late December. Nevertheless, some works are being postponed to 2019 due to some bureaucratic processes.

Just as at Hnutove, Mariinka and Maiorske, there is no equipped bus station at Novotroitske EECP. Consequently, people have no access to terminals or latrines while waiting for a bus. There is also no bus schedule available.

	Amount	Condition	Location
Sun/rain shade	☹️	😊	😊
Seats	☹️	😊	😊
Beds/bed linen (in SES tents)	😊	😊	😊
Information stands	☹️	☹️	☹️
Potable water	☹️	😊	☹️
Sanitary water	😞	😞	😞
Garbage bins	☹️	☹️	☹️
Latrines	☹️	☹️	😊
Direction signs	☹️	☹️	☹️

😊 – sufficient amount/proper condition/convenient location

☹️ – insufficient amount/poor condition or inappropriate maintenance/inconvenient location

😞 – absence of such facilities



Novotroitske EECP

■ STANYTSIA LUHANSKA

Reconstruction of Stanytsia Luhanska was completed in December. According to information from monitoring visits, conditions at the EECP were considerably improved. The most important change was the increased capacity (both the number of counters and EECP staff).

However, the new toilets that were installed at the GCA checkpoint during reconstruction are still closed. At the same time latrines at the “zero” checkpoint are in crucial need of maintenance.

	Amount	Condition	Location
Sun/rain shade	☹️	😊	😊
Seats	☹️	😊	☹️
Beds/bed linen (in SES tents)	☹️	😊	☹️
Information stands	☹️	☹️	☹️
Potable water	☹️	☹️	😊
Sanitary water	☹️	☹️	☹️
Garbage bins	☹️	☹️	☹️
Latrines	☹️	☹️	☹️
Direction signs	☹️	☹️	☹️

😊 – sufficient amount/proper condition/convenient location

☹️ – insufficient amount/poor condition or inappropriate maintenance/inconvenient location

☹️ – absence of such facilities



Stanytsia Luhanska EECP

RECOMMENDATIONS

Taking into account the results of the survey and observations, R2P considers the following actions necessary:

- To replace Order 39, which determines the list of goods allowed through the line of contact, with a list of forbidden items in order to clarify the inspection process.
- To ensure the presence of Coordination Group representatives at each EECP.
- To open another EECP in Luhansk Oblast to reduce the flow of people through Stanytsia Luhanska and enable vehicle traffic.
- To arrange major reconstruction of the bridge at Stanytsia Luhanska EECP.
- To install bus stations equipped for waiting near Hnutove, Novotroitske, Mariinka and Maiorske EECPs.
- To install direction signs (movement direction, fiscal control, passport control, medical aid points, toilets, Oschadbank offices, SES tents, etc.) at all EECPs in order to ease the process of crossing the line of contact.
- To install and regularly update the bus schedules in terminals and bus stations.

To ensure proper maintenance of infrastructure at all EECPs, it is recommended:

- To keep the pedestrian area clean to prevent puddles and slippery surfaces.
- To install overhead protection to prevent snow falling on people or cars off the roofs.
- To recruit additional EECP staff to provide sufficient maintenance of toilets and latrines.

ANNEX.

EECP CROSSINGS DURING FEBRUARY-DECEMBER 2018

■ FIGURE 27
MONTHLY NUMBERS OF CROSSINGS BY EECP

