

DESK RESEARCH OF THE SURVEYS OF IDPs

PREPARED FOR UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES (UNHCR)

Prepared by:

Inna Volosevych,
Head of Department for Social and Political Research
Inna.volosevych@gfk.com

Tetiana Kostiuchenko,
Senior Researcher, Department for Social and Political Research
Tetiana.Kostiuchenko@gfk.com

Table of contents:

Acknowledgements	3
Glossary	4
Acronyms	5
Key findings	6
Main gaps in IDP surveys	9
1. Methodology	11
1.1 Research objectives and design	11
1.2. Methodological problems which occur in quantitative surveys of IDPs and their solutions	13
2. Demographic characteristics of IDPs in comparison with the general population of Ukraine	15
2.1. Size of the IDP population	15
2.2. Age and gender composition	15
2.3. Ethnicity and language	17
2.4. Disability, health conditions	19
2.5. Areas of origin (rural/urban)	20
2.6. Level of education	20
2.7. Professional background	20
2.8. Psycho-social problems	21
2.9. Household characteristics: household size, marital status, dependency ratios	25
3. Geographic location of displacement	26
4. Displacement and migration	27
4.1 Time of initial displacement	27
4.2 Number of moves after the initial displacement	27
4.3 Reasons for choosing place of settlement	27
4.4 Pendular or seasonal mobility	28
5. Causes of displacement and barriers to return	29
6. Preferences for place of settlement	30
6.1 Preference on future place of settlement	30
6.2 Which conditions should be in place for those who prefer to return	31
6.3 Which conditions should be in place for those who prefer to locally integrate	31
6.4 Which conditions should be in place for those who prefer to resettle	31
6.5 Evidence of migration outside of Ukraine	31
6.6 Solutions proposed by IDPs	32
6.7 Concrete plans for durable solutions	33
7. Returns	34
8. Social integration at place of current residence	36
8.1. Level of sense of belonging to the place of current residence	36
8.2. Measures of general trust in neighbours vs. the Ukrainian population	37
8.3. Participation in community organizations / activities	37
8.4. Discrimination experienced by IDPs on account of their displacement	37
8.5. Families that are separated	39
8.6. Specific situation in particular groups	39
9. Economic integration at place of current residence	41
9.1. Labour force participation and unemployment rate among IDPs comparing to the general population of Ukraine	41
9.2. Main obstacles/constraints to employment	42
9.3. Loans and debts	42
9.4. Sources of livelihood and access to pensions and social benefits	43
10. Housing and property issues	45
10.1. Current residence type	45
10.2. Adequacy/inadequacy of housing	45
11. Legal issues	47
11.1. Registration as an IDP	47
11.2. Risks of statelessness among IDPs	47
Attachment 1. IDP surveys conducted in 2014-2017	48

Acknowledgements

UNHCR and GfK Ukraine would like to express gratitude to the following organizations for access to the data of surveys and statistics on IDPs and IDP-related issues:

- IFES for the data of “Survey of IDPs on electoral issues”
- IOM for the data of all rounds of “National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons”
- The State Border Guard Service for statistics on the number of arrivals and departures from NGCA
- The World Bank for the report on "Socio-Economic Impacts of Internal Displacement and Veteran Return"
- UCBI initiative implemented by Chemonics Int. with the support of USAID for the data of “Social Cohesion and Reconciliation (SCORE) Index – Population Survey”
- UN OCHA for providing estimates of the number of IDPs
- ZOiS research centre (Berlin) for the report on the survey “The Displaced Ukrainians. Who are they, and what do they think?”.

The interpretation of all data used in this desk research is made by GfK Ukraine. Therefore, no claim against the abovementioned organizations should be made for the conclusions.

This publication has been produced with the assistance of the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR). The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of GfK Ukraine and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of UNHCR.

Glossary

Short references to the surveys analyzed

IFES survey – “Survey of IDPs on electoral issues” conducted by GfK Ukraine for IFES. 1,758 adult IDPs were surveyed in all oblasts in December 2016 with a face-to-face survey method. The report is not available in open sources.

IOM combined data – the quantitative survey of IDPs within Round 6 of “National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons” conducted by Ukrainian Center of Social Reforms for IOM. The survey involved 4,134 adult IDPs surveyed in all oblasts in April-June 2017 with face-to-face and phone survey methods.

IOM f2f survey – 1,025 adult IDPs were surveyed in all oblasts in April-June 2017 with face-to-face survey method within Round 6 of “National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons”.

IOM phone survey – 3,109 adult IDPs were surveyed in all oblasts in April-June 2017 with phone survey method within Round 6 of “National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons”.

The report is available via a link: http://iom.org.ua/sites/default/files/nms_report_june_2017_eng_screen_2.pdf

If some data is not available in Round 6 survey, then the data of previous rounds was analyzed with the specification of the number of the round.

SCORE survey – the quantitative survey of IDPs within “Social Cohesion and Reconciliation (SCORE) Index – Population Survey” conducted by GfK Ukraine for Chemonics Int. / UCBI initiative supported by USAID. 1,075 adult IDPs were surveyed in 9 oblasts in April-May 2016 with face-to-face survey method. In this report the IDP survey data is sometimes compared with GCA population survey data: the survey of 7,500 adult respondents on the basis of the sample representative for adult population of GCA of Ukraine was also conducted within this survey with face-to-face survey method.

The report is available via a link:

http://www.scoreforpeace.org/files/year/exec_sum/31/SCORE%20Ukraine%20Executive%20Briefs%20ENG%20&%20UKR.pdf

UNHCR participatory assessment – the qualitative survey of IDPs conducted by UNHCR. 123 FGDs were conducted in 10 regions of Ukraine in February-March 2017 (Kyiv, Poltava, Kherson, Odesa, Kropivnitskiy, Dnipro, Zaporizhzhia, Kharkiv, Severodonetsk, and Donetsk GCA).

The World Bank survey – the quantitative survey of IDPs within “Socio-Economic Impacts of Internal Displacement and Veteran Return” survey conducted by Kyiv International Institute of Sociology / CADMUS for the World Bank. 2,004 adult IDPs were surveyed in all oblasts in October 2016-March 2017 with face-to-face survey method.

The report is available via a link:

<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/571011497962214803/pdf/116489-REVISED-Updated-Report-Socioeconomic-Impacts-Internal-Displacement-Veteran-Ret.pdf>

ZOiS survey – “The Displaced Ukrainians. Who are they, and what do they think?” conducted by ZOiS research centre (Berlin). 1,000 adult IDPs were surveyed in 7 oblasts in November-December 2016.

The report is available via a link:

http://www.zois-berlin.de/fileadmin/media/Dateien/ZOiS_Reports/ZOiS_Report_1_2017.pdf

Acronyms

“DPR” – self-announced “Donetsk People’s Republic”

Donetsk (GCA) - government controlled areas of Donetsk oblast

F2f – face-to-face survey method

FGD – focus-group discussion

GCA – government controlled areas of Ukraine (not including NGCA and occupied areas of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea)

HIV – human immunodeficiency virus

IASC – the Inter-Agency Standing Committee

IDI – in-depth interviews

IDP – internally displaced person

IOM – International Organization for Migration

KI – key informant

LGBTI – lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or intersex

“LPR” – self-announced “Luhansk People’s Republic”

Luhansk (GCA) – government controlled areas of Luhansk oblast

MICS – Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys

MoES – Ministry of Education

MoSP – Ministry of Social Policy of Ukraine

NGCA – non-government controlled areas of Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts

NGO – non-governmental Organization

OSCE SMM – Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Special Monitoring Mission

UN – United Nations

UN OCHA – UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

UNESCO – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

UNHCR – United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

UNICEF – the United Nations Children's Fund

ZOiS – Centre for East European and International Studies

Key findings

The number of IDPs

MoSP has the largest database of IDPs who apply for social benefits (1,487,455 persons as of 07.12.2017), but there are still IDPs who are not registered by MoSP: 5%-9%, according to different surveys. At the same time, the MoSP database may include IDPs who returned to occupied or returned territories after the registration, and IDPs who travel to GCA from NGCA regularly in order to receive social benefits. Specifically, according to the current legislation, NGCA pensioners cannot receive pensions without being registered as IDPs. With this regard, the following recommendation was formulated, according to the UNHCR participatory assessment results:

“Resume payment of pensions to residents of the non-government controlled territories through introduction of mechanism which would allow them receive their pensions at the controlled territory without the need to be registered as IDP by de-linking payment of pensions from IDP registration through amendments to Cabinet of Ministers Resolution #505 of 2014, Cabinet of Ministers Resolution #637 of 2014, Cabinet of Ministers Resolution #365 of 2016 and any other relevant normative acts.”

The only available estimation of the number of IDPs residing more permanently in GCA constitutes 760,000 and was calculated by UN OCHA in October 2017.

Key findings of the surveys of IDPs

The five surveys analyzed in this report were conducted in May, 2016 - June, 2017 by different methods and present different structure of IDPs in terms of age, gender and geographical distribution, but in spite of these limitations the data on conditions and intentions of IDPs has more similarities than differences.

Major problems of IDPs

Major problems of IDPs are caused by economic vulnerability: 24% of IDPs lack money even for food. Besides for economic problems common for all Ukrainian population, IDPs suffer from the necessity to pay rent for housing, high dependency ratio (the number of dependents aged 0-17 years and over 60 to the other population aged 18-59 makes up 79%-92%, according to different surveys, while for the general population of Ukraine it constitutes 67%), and employment constraints including discrimination. The primary sources of income of IDPs are salary (61%) and government IDP support (61%); the share of those who indicate salary as primary source of income is increasing. 22% of IDPs indicated that they had their social payments suspended. In most cases, IDPs faced suspension of government IDP support knew how to renew the payments, but perceived those procedures as humiliating.

Among gender and age categories of the most economically vulnerable IDPs, there are people aged 60+ (both men and women), women aged 18-59 and IDPs with children. In terms of regional distribution, IDPs who live in Donetsk and Luhansk are the most vulnerable, and this correlates with the highest share of pensioners and dependence on social assistance and humanitarian aid in these regions.

Different surveys identified similar three top concerns of IDPs:

1. Housing (including payments for rent, utilities, unsatisfactory living conditions, fear of eviction etc.). Only 2% of IDPs live in own housing. FGD participants mentioned the cases of higher rent prices for IDPs than for the locals. Less than half of IDPs feel financially secure enough to anticipate living in their current accommodation over the next year, and lack of housing solutions is the main factor which forces IDPs to return to NCGA or to resettle in the other settlements.
2. Lack of employment opportunities. According to different surveys, 6%-15% of IDPs who were employed before the displacement were unemployed for the moment of the survey. 14% of IDPs aged 18-59 (12% of men and 15% of women) are unemployed and searching for the job vs. 11% of the general population (12% of men and 9% of women). The employment rate increased from 35% in June, 2016 to 46% in June, 2017. The increasing number of IDPs who feel themselves “integrated” and who don’t want to return is observed in parallel.

At the same time, 91% of those who were working before the displacement had the permanent employment compared to 78% of working IDPs who had the permanent employment at the moment of the survey.

About one third of employed IDPs complained that jobs did not meet their qualifications. Along with the difficulties in finding permanent jobs in line with qualifications, other constraints to employment are lack of connections which can help to find a highly paid job, age and gender discrimination (employers prefer hiring younger to older and men to women), discrimination because of IDP status, family responsibilities (specifically, women complained that childcare that was once provided by relatives in NGCAs was no longer available) and disability.

63% of unemployed IDPs would prefer a direct employment support, others indicate such types of support as startup of own business (10%), retraining (8%), consultation in the employment centre (6%), and education (5%).

3. Healthcare services. Cost of medication is a barrier to healthcare for 50% of IDPs. About one third are extremely dissatisfied with healthcare services, particularly, 10% complained that they had no access to those services at all.

Other non-economic problems revealed by different surveys are the following:

1. Discrimination and social tension. The problem of discrimination is relating to the abovementioned three major problems: IDPs report that cases of discrimination based on their status were experienced in such areas as housing (46%), employment (31%), healthcare (22%), and also daily interactions with the local population (19%). Overall, according to different surveys, 10%-13% of IDPs suffered discrimination. The level of discrimination of IDPs in Donbas and neighbouring oblasts is higher than in the other oblasts, but the social tension is lower. Presumably, higher discrimination in Donbas and neighbouring oblasts could be explained by the fact that there are many IDPs in these oblasts, and they are discriminated as a group which use local resources, while in other oblasts the number of IDPs is low, and they are not perceived as a threat for local resources. At the same time, IDPs in Donbas and neighbouring oblasts could feel hostility and social tension less often than in the other oblasts because they are closer to hosts by mentality. 11% of IDPs feel that they are not welcomed in the host communities, and 31% of IDPs consider that they cannot publicly express their views.

The most discriminated groups are IDPs with double stigma – Roma and LGBTI – and also IDPs with disabilities and Crimean Tatars. IDPs from Crimea state they were informed that, as they were considered non-residents, they had a limited access to government or bank services.

IDPs are deprived of the right to vote at the local elections – only 4% of IDPs voted in the local elections (they don't have a right to vote without the local registration), and only 37% of those who did not vote were not willing to do it.

2. Separated families. 22% of IDPs have relatives in NGCA who did not resettle due to age, bad health or difficulty in moving, fear of unemployment, fear of leaving property unattended, or fear of leaving their businesses. Over a quarter of IDPs fear that they may be forced to return due to economic hardships (including eviction) or to care for relatives remaining in NGCA.
3. Psycho-social problems: 16% of IDPs report that psychological problems are their greatest concern.
4. Registration as IDPs. According to different surveys, 5%-9% of IDPs are not registered by MoSP, and 38% of them have not registered because they have problems with documents required for the registration, while 58% do not want to register.
5. Stateless IDPs. 1% of adult IDPs in Kyiv and Kyiv oblast and 2% in Kharkiv oblasts have no valid passport and possibility of receiving it.

Intentions and integration to local communities

Different surveys show the increasing number of IDPs who feel themselves “integrated” and who do not want to return. Also State Border Guard Service data shows increasing number of checkpoint crossings from NGCA to GCA: in the first 11 months of 2016 there were about 9,000 more crossings to GCA than from GCA, and in the same period of 2017 – 62,000 more.

The returnees to NGCA show a high potential mobility – only 63% of them are planning to stay in NGCA in the next 3 months. As mentioned above, it can be assumed that some part of returnees can regularly travel to GCA to receive social benefits. The share of elders aged 60+ is higher in the households of returnees vs. households of total sample of IDPs, while the share of children is similar. The returnees have a lower income and receive pension and salary less often than the surveyed IDPs in total. Unlike IDPs in GCA of Ukraine whose major problem is housing (rent, utilities and living conditions), the major problem of returnees is safety.

About 25% of IDPs definitely do not want to return, while 50%-78%, according to different surveys, would like to return at the end of war. According to different surveys, only 16-18% would like to return even if the conditions in NGCA do not change. The closer IDPs live to NGCA, the higher their desire to return.

Housing and employment opportunities are named as the main factors motivating to locally integrate and resettle to other settlement in GCA. As for returning, apart from housing and employment opportunities, a peace agreement was named as the main motivating factor by most IDPs.

As for the short-term plans, 77% of IDPs will stay in the current location within the next 3 months, 3% of IDPs plan to return home in the next three months, 2% – to resettle in Ukraine, 0.4% – to move abroad. 17% cannot answer the question about their plans for the next three months – such a high share of those who do not have exact plans for the next 3 months reflects high uncertainty of life conditions of IDPs.

The surveys indicated different shares of “integrated” IDPs – 33%-68%. This is the largest discrepancy among the data of different surveys: the IOM survey showed 68% of “integrated” IDPs in June, 2017 (vs. 56% in March, 2017); the IFES survey showed 60%, and the World Bank showed only 33%. The direct question “whether you feel integrated into local community” was used in all surveys, but the scales were different. At the same time, both IOM and the World Bank surveys show the tendency of the increasing level of integration of IDPs. 35% of IDPs have a local residence registration, and 10% more intend to receive it; 49% feel a stronger attachment to the former community, and 30% – to the present community.

Main gaps in IDP surveys

The main gaps in IDP surveys are the following:

- Lack of comparability between IDP surveys,
- Lack of tracking of IDP and population data,
- Gaps in surveying needs and intentions of IDPs.

Lack of comparability between IDP surveys

As mentioned above, the existing surveys of IDPs present different structures of IDPs in terms of age, gender and geographical distribution. To track the data and to make the surveys comparable we recommend key stakeholders to work out and to confirm the methodology of estimation of the number and structure of IDPs in terms of:

- Gender and age,
- Regional distribution and distribution by settlement size,
- Distribution by registration by MoSP,
- Distribution by place of residence (individual household or collective centre¹).

Using these estimations for the sample design will make different surveys comparable. The alternative method for tracking the conditions of IDPs is the creation of the IDPs panel.

Lack of tracking of IDP and population data

The baseline for the humanitarian action in Ukraine is to reduce the vulnerabilities of IDPs so that IDPs could be in a broadly similar situation to the general population of Ukraine. It is difficult to interpret the vulnerabilities of IDPs and the challenges they face in case of absence of comparative perspective. The best way to provide the comparative perspective is to conduct a similar survey in the host communities, which has been recently done only in the survey of the World Bank. Without the comparative perspective if, for example, we observe the improving of well-being of IDPs, we cannot say whether it is explained by the improving adaptation of IDPs or improving socio-economic situation in the country.

Main gaps in surveying needs and intentions of IDPs

- Future intentions for the specific period. Most of IDPs surveys include the question on their future intentions, but only IOM survey includes this question for the specific period (3 months). Without specification of the period, it turns out that at least half (or more, according to different surveys) of IDPs would like to return after the end of war, but nobody knows when it happens, that is why such a question reflects people's willingness to return, but not their exact plans. The further analysis of profiles and motivation of IDPs with exact plans of staying/resettling/returning is needed. With this regard, more information about the property left in NGCA is required: whether it is accessible or captured by the other people, whether IDPs have documents for this property, and whether it is sold or can be sold.
- Housing is top concern of IDPs and therefore more data is needed on the share of IDPs who pays rent (IOM survey includes this information for all IDPs except for those residing in the apartments of host families, dormitories and collective centers which also can pay rent) and the size of this rent, who is afraid of eviction, who has the official contract for rent, who pays for utilities and who receives subsidy (and if the subsidy is not received – why), etc.
- Evaluation of accessibility of system of social assistance to IDPs. Most surveys include separate questions about the access to different services and types of aid, but none of the surveys contains the comprehensive set of questions for the evaluation of the current system of social assistance to IDPs – awareness of and access to all types of assistance, main obstacles (including administrative) in processing social benefits and fulfilling the rights envisaged by the legislation. Particularly, the access to subsidies should be studied because payments for utilities are among the major concerns of IDPs.
- Integration of IDPs to local communities. The existing surveys measure integration with one self-assessment question and present drastically different results. The methodology of measuring integration should be worked out and measured both for IDPs and host communities. We recommend using Index of

¹ Non-random recruiting methodologies may lead to oversampling of IDPs living in collective centres

Social Exclusion developed in the Netherlands (Coumans & Schmeets, 2015)² . It measures social exclusion in four domains using 46 items: material deprivation, social participation, access to social, rights/institutions and normative integration. The tool allows a comparison of various subpopulations in terms of their degree of social exclusion. We recommend a survey with two samples (population of Ukraine and IDPs) to measure social exclusion among IDPs. For precise comparability, sub-sample of population (that corresponds to IDPs sample by gender, age, region and settlement size) could be separated.

- Information about pendular or seasonal internal labour migration as a possible coping strategy for IDPs.
- Estimation of the number of stateless IDPs (it was recently made for Kyiv and Kharkiv oblasts, but not for the whole country).

² Coumans, M., & Schmeets, H. (2015). The socially excluded in the Netherlands: The development of an overall index. *Social Indicators Research*, 122(3), 779-805.

1. Methodology

1.1 Research objectives and design

According to MoSP as of 07.12.2017, 1,487,455 persons were registered as internally displaced in Ukraine. Considering the situation, UNHCR intends to summarize findings of surveys of IDPs in Ukraine. UNHCR seeks to generate and analyze: 1) country-wide quantitative data scientifically representative to the IDP population and 2) qualitative data with the focus on specific groups about their future intentions and perceived possibility to achieve durable solutions. The aim of the research is to identify similar trends and/or discrepancies between different surveys that have been developed by various organizations with different methodologies in order to get an overview of our knowledge and gaps related to IDP situation in Ukraine. The survey results will complement the existing studies and guide UNHCR internal prioritization, inform the selection of program interventions, and inspire advocacy efforts towards host communities and local authorities, humanitarian partners, the development community, donors, and the private sector. The findings will also assist the design, review and implementation of the Durable Solution Strategy for IDPs in Ukraine. The report is structured according to IASC indicators of durable solutions for IDPs.

The first IDPs began to escape from military actions in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts in April 2014. The first IDP survey which can be found in open sources was conducted in June-July 2014 by OSCE SMM³. The list of all the surveys conducted in June 2014 – January 2017 can be found in Attachment 1. Five surveys were selected for the analysis in desk research by the following criteria:

- The survey was conducted no later than April 2016
- The survey covers all adult IDPs (instead of particular groups of IDPs)
- The survey includes all or most oblasts of distribution of IDPs
- The survey is relevant to the topic of desk research (future intentions and durable solutions)

The report summarizes the data of five surveys described in Table 1:

- The two most recent surveys were conducted within Round 6⁴ of “National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons” conducted for IOM which includes both face-to-face and telephone interviews (hereinafter referred as IOM f2f and IOM phone survey, respectively). The data is analyzed in dynamics (Round 1 was conducted in March 2016), but the socio-demographic structure of IDPs surveyed in different rounds differs significantly especially for the phone survey (for example, there were 42% of respondents aged 60+ in phone survey of Round 4, 25% in Round 5, and 32% in Round 6). If some data is missing in Round 6, then previous rounds’ data is cited in the report.
- “Survey of IDPs on electoral issues” for IFES was conducted separately in households and collective centres, but the number of IDPs living in collective centres constituted about 6,000 in June 2017, according to Collective Centre Monitoring Update as of June 2017⁵ (less than 1% of registered IDPs), so this subsample was neglected in the analysis in this report.
- “Socio-Economic Impacts of Internal Displacement and Veteran Return” survey for the World Bank presents the comparison of IDPs and host population surveys⁶.
- “Social Cohesion and Reconciliation (SCORE) Index – Population Survey” as well as IFES survey was conducted separately in households and collective centres, but the latter subsample was neglected in the analysis in this report. The comparison of the data for the general population of Ukraine which was another component of SCORE survey with IDP survey data is presented in this report⁷.

³ The report is available in open sources: <http://www.osce.org/uk/ukraine-smm/246201?download=true>

⁴ The report is available in open sources: http://iom.org.ua/sites/default/files/nms_report_june_2017_eng_screen_2.pdf

⁵ The report is available via link: https://www.sheltercluster.org/sites/default/files/docs/cc_factsheet_june2017_final_eng.pdf

⁶ The report is available in open sources: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/571011497962214803/pdf/116489-REVISED-Updated-Report-Socioeconomic-Impacts-Internal-Displacement-Veteran-Ret.pdf>

⁷ The report is available in open sources: http://www.scoreforpeace.org/files/year/exec_sum/31/SCORE%20Ukraine%20Executive%20Briefs%20ENG%20%20UKR.pdf

Also some unique findings of Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS) survey “The Displaced Ukrainians. Who are they, and what do they think?” are analyzed in this report, but it was not compared with the five abovementioned surveys because the share of IDPs aged 55+ in ZOiS survey constitutes 6%, while in the five abovementioned surveys the share of IDPs aged 60+ constitutes at least 17%, and this is the most vulnerable age category of IDPs. ZOiS survey includes the comparison between IDPs survey and survey of refugees from Donbas living in Russia⁸.

Table 1.1. Quantitative surveys of IDPs analyzed in the report

Name of the study	National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons, Round 6 ⁹	Survey of IDPs on electoral issues	Socio-Economic Impacts of Internal Displacement and Veteran Return	The Displaced Ukrainians. Who are they, and what do they think?	Social Cohesion and Reconciliation (SCORE) Index - Population Survey
Data owner	The IOM Mission in Ukraine	IFES	The World Bank	ZOiS	Chemonics Int., UCBI initiative supported by USAID
Supplier	Ukrainian Center of Social Reforms	GfK Ukraine	Kyiv International Institute of Sociology / CADMUS	N/A	GfK Ukraine
Fieldwork dates	April-June 2017	December 2016	October 2016 - March 2017	November-December 2016	April-May 2016
Sample size of IDP survey analyzed in desk research	1,025 face-to-face interviews and 3,109 phone interviews	1,748	2,004	1,000	1,075
F2f	+	+	+	N/A	+
Telephone	+	-	-	-	-
Random selection	Phone survey sample	-	-	-	-
Geography (oblast)	All oblasts	All oblasts	All oblasts	Donetsk, Luhansk, Kharkiv, Dnipro, Kyiv, Kyiv city, Lviv	Dnipro, Donetsk (GCA), Luhansk (GCA), Kharkiv, Kyiv, Kyiv city, Odesa, Zaporizhia, Zhytomyr
References in the current report	IOM f2f and IOM phone survey or IOM combined data when the results of both surveys were aggregated in the report. If the data for previous rounds is cited, the reference is put as, for example, “IOM f2f/phone survey of Round 5”	IFES survey	World Bank survey	ZOiS survey	SCORE survey

⁸ The report is available in open sources: http://www.zois-berlin.de/fileadmin/media/Dateien/ZOiS_Reports/ZOiS_Report_1_2017.pdf

⁹ If some data is missing in Round 6, the data of previous rounds is cited in the report

The five abovementioned surveys are based on different survey methods and sample structures¹⁰; four of them are non-random, but in spite of all these limitations the data has more similarities than differences.

The findings of quantitative surveys are also illustrated by findings of qualitative components of the abovementioned surveys and UNHCR participatory survey which includes 123 focus groups with IDPs grouped by age and gender, as well as by diversity and vulnerability criteria (persons with disabilities, serious medical conditions, single mothers, orphans, LGBTI, those living dispersed or in collective centres, in urban and rural settlements), conducted in February-March 2017.

1.2. Methodological problems which occur in quantitative surveys of IDPs and their solutions

Main methodological challenges of surveying IDPs are the following:

1. Lack of reliable information on the number and structure of IDPs population. MoSP has the largest database of IDPs who apply for social benefits, but there are still IDPs who are not registered by MoSP: 5% of IDPs are not registered, according to IOM f2f and the World Bank surveys, while IFES survey revealed 9% of such IDPs. At the same time, the MoSP database may include IDPs who returned to occupied or returned territories after the registration, and IDPs who travel to GCA from NGCA regularly in order to receive social benefits (according to the current legislation, NGCA pensioners cannot receive pensions without being registered as IDPs). Consequently, the number of IDPs in the oblasts adjacent to NGCA can include NGCA dwellers who are not IDPs. UN OCHA provides the alternative estimates of the number of IDPs (see Chapter 2.1 for details). Thus, 1,487,455 of IDPs are registered by MoSP as of December, 2017, and the number of IDPs residing more permanently in government-controlled areas constituted about 760,000 people, according to UN OCHA estimate as of October 2017¹¹.

2. Lack of the database of the general population of IDPs. The only country-wide IDP survey based on random selection of IDPs from MoSP database was conducted by the IOM National Monitoring System on the situation with IDPs – the results of this survey are representative for IDP households with at least one IDP registered by MoSP. MoSP provided the researchers with telephone numbers of IDPs, and the numbers were randomly selected for the survey. All the other surveys used the mixed sources of IDPs' contacts (local authorities and state organizations, volunteers, NGOs, other IDPs, etc.) – so, these surveys cannot be perceived as fully representative for the general population of IDPs (even for the registered ones). Moreover, due to the lack of statistics on the number of IDPs in collective centres it is impossible to control the share of such IDPs in the samples – this category of IDPs could be overrepresented because they are the most easy-to-reach, and according to SCORE survey data, these IDPs are more vulnerable than those living in individual households. GfK Ukraine in SCORE and IFES surveys tried to solve the problem of the biases of non-random selection of IDPs by compiling the database of IDPs randomly found in nationally representative population surveys using the route method of sampling point selection. This database is not large enough to conduct a country-wide survey, so IDPs randomly found during the preceding GfK Ukraine population surveys were considered as “seeds”, and other respondents were found through the network of these “seeds”¹². However, the database does not include IDPs living in

¹⁰ As it is presented further in the report the structure of IDPs in different surveys differs in terms of age and gender. Also in SCORE and IFES surveys the distribution of IDPs among oblasts corresponds to the MoSP data, while in IOM and the World Bank surveys some corrections were applied to avoid overrepresentation of Eastern oblasts. As a result, the share of Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts in these surveys is 60%, 55%, 35% and 37%, respectively, and the share of Kyiv and oblast is 14%, 12%, 20% and 9%, respectively.

¹¹ The following *data sources* were used for assessment:

- Ministry of Social Policy (MoSP), 2015-2017;
- Ministry of Education and Science (MoES) , 2015-2017;
- Ministry of Health, 2016;
- State Statistics Service, 2010-2017;
- Pension Fund of Ukraine data on IDP pensioners, November 2016;
- Sample population surveys (Food Security Assessment 2017, Inter-Agency Vulnerability Assessment 2016, Multi-Sectoral Sector Needs Assessment 2016);
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) National Monitoring System, 2017.

¹² Not more than 10 other IDPs households per one “seed” were allowed

collective centres as these centres are excluded from the random route selection of respondents in country-wide population polls. That is why SCORE and IFES surveys include separate subsamples of IDPs living in collective centres (they were analyzed separately because they are more vulnerable than IDPs living in individual households, and they are the most easy-to-access category of IDPs, on the other hand).

IOM survey provides the possibility of analyzing advantages and disadvantages of usage of phone and face-to-face survey methods – see Table 1.2.

Table 1.2. Advantages and disadvantages of usage of phone and face-to-face survey methods for surveying IDPs

Advantages are marked as “+” while disadvantages as “-”

Phone survey of IDPs	Face-to-face survey of IDPs
+ Random selection of IDPs, equal probability for all registered IDPs to be selected for the survey	- Non-random selection of IDPs, bias towards IDPs “visible” for volunteers and organizations which provide support to IDPs, those living in collective centres and dormitories, etc ¹³
+ Possibility of reaching and analyzing IDPs who have returned to settlements of origin in NGCA	- No possibility of reaching and analyzing IDPs who have returned to settlements of origin in NGCA (unless a special survey in NGCA is organized)
+ Better possibilities of reaching IDPs who live alone or busy and active persons who rarely stay at home ¹⁴	- Bias towards households with many members and IDPs who stay at home more often
- Non-coverage of IDPs who were not registered as IDPs	+ Coverage of IDPs who were not registered as IDPs
- IDPs could be unwilling to discuss sensitive issues via phone or be afraid that their answers can affect receiving social benefits	+ Face-to-face survey method is better for sensitive questions than a phone survey method
- Social-demographic structure of IDPs surveyed in different rounds differs significantly ¹⁵ – it creates a significant barrier to tracking data in dynamics	- Social-demographic structure of IDPs surveyed in different rounds by IOM is rather stable, but the social-demographic structure of IDPs in other face-to-face surveys differs significantly from IOM survey – it creates a significant barrier to comparison of such surveys

¹³ According to IOM f2f survey, 4% of IDPs live in collective centres and 6% - in dormitories, while IOM phone survey of Round 5 presents 1% and 2%, respectively. As mentioned above, according to Collective Centre Monitoring Update as of June 2017, less than 1% of registered IDPs live in collective centres – so, it can be assumed that this category of IDPs is overrepresented in f2f surveys .

¹⁴ For example, IOM phone survey shows that 36% of respondents live alone, while f2f survey shows 18%. And vice versa, phone survey shows 12% of respondents living in households with 4+ members, and f2f survey shows 24%. The higher number of household members, the higher probability for the household to be surveyed via face-to-face method

¹⁵ For example, in phone survey of Round 4 there were 42% of respondents aged 60+, in Round 5 – 25%, in Round 6 – 32%. Possible solution of this problem is to weight the database according to socio-demographic structure of IDPs who agreed and who refused to take part in the survey (if some socio-demographic categories of IDPs refuse more often than others, weight will remove this bias) excluding returnees who belong to 60+ age group more often than IDPs who haven't returned and whose number is growing (in Round 5 there were 8% of returnees in the sample, while in Round 6 there were 13%).

2. Demographic characteristics of IDPs in comparison with the general population of Ukraine

2.1. Size of the IDP population

According to MoSP as of 07.12.2017, 1,487,455 persons were registered as internally displaced in Ukraine. On the one hand, there are still IDPs who are not registered by MoSP. Thus, 5% of IDPs are not registered according to IOM f2f and the World Bank surveys, while IFES survey revealed 9% of such IDPs. On the other hand, as mentioned above, the MoSP database may include IDPs who returned to occupied or returned territories after the registration, and IDPs who travel to GCA from NGCA regularly in order to receive social benefits. Specifically, NGCA pensioners cannot receive pensions without being registered as IDPs. In this regard, the following recommendation was formulated according to UNHCR participatory assessment results “Resume payment of pensions to residents of the non-government controlled territories through introduction of mechanism which would allow them receive their pensions at the controlled territory without the need to be registered as IDP by de-linking payment of pensions from IDP registration through amendments to Cabinet of Ministers Resolution #505 of 2014, Cabinet of Ministers Resolution #637 of 2014, Cabinet of Ministers Resolution #365 of 2016 and any other relevant normative acts.”

Consequently, the number of IDPs in the oblasts adjacent to NGCA can include NGCA dwellers who are not IDPs. Specifically, the share of pensioners in the NGCA neighbouring oblasts is significantly higher than in the other oblasts, i.e. 51%-73% in the neighbouring oblasts comparing to 24%-41% in the other oblasts (the Ukrainian legislation requires persons from NGCA to register as IDPs in order to continue receiving their pensions).

According to UN OCHA estimation¹⁶, the number of IDPs residing more permanently in government-controlled areas made up about 760,000 people as of October 2017.

About 1,5 million of IDPs are officially registered by MoSP as of December, 2017, but this number possibly includes IDPs who travel to GCA from NGCA regularly to receive social payments (mainly pensions: NGCA pensioners cannot receive pensions without being registered as IDPs). The minimum estimate of the number of IDPs residing more permanently in GCA is estimated to be 760,000 persons.

2.2. Age and gender composition

MoSP provides data disaggregated by children, adults of working age and pensioners. According to MoSP data, there are 51% of pensioners among IDPs as of August 10, 2017, whereas the IOM phone survey suggests 32% of persons aged 60+¹⁷ (the explanation of possible overestimation of the share of pensioners in MoSP data is presented in 2.1. Unlike face-to-face surveys, the IOM phone survey includes returnees who are older than IDPs in GCA). At the same time, the share of children is almost identical in MoSP data and IOM phone survey – 15% and 16%, respectively. MoSP data and IOM phone survey present data only for the registered IDPs, but according to IFES survey, the age structure of adult unregistered IDPs is similar to the one for registered IDPs (see Chapter 11.1). According to State Statistics Service of Ukraine, the share of children among the Ukraine population in GCA is 18%, and the share of elderly people aged 60+ is 22%.

¹⁶ The following *data sources* were used for assessment:

- Ministry of Social Policy (MoSP), 2015-2017;
- Ministry of Education and Science (MoES) , 2015-2017;
- Ministry of Health, 2016;
- State Statistics Service, 2010-2017;
- Pension Fund of Ukraine data on IDP pensioners, November 2016;
- Sample population surveys (Food Security Assessment 2017, Inter-Agency Vulnerability Assessment 2016, Multi-Sectoral Sector Needs Assessment 2016);
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) National Monitoring System, 2017.

¹⁷ Absolute majority of pensioners in Ukraine are those aged 60+: according to GfK Ukraine Omnibus survey in 2017 80% of pensioners were those aged 60+

IOM f2f survey shows a significantly lower share of elders (17%) and a significantly higher share of children (27%). Only IOM survey (vs. all analyzed surveys) provides the data on the IDP household structure – other surveys show the household structure for adult respondents only, and this data is presented below.

Table 2.2.1. Age composition of households of respondents of IOM f2f and phone survey in comparison with the Ukrainian population

	State Statistic Service of Ukraine, general population of GCA of Ukraine, 1.01.2016	IOM phone survey	IOM f2f survey
	% of total sample	% of total sample	% of total sample
0-17 years	18%	16%	27%
18-59 years	60%	52%	56%
60+ years	22%	32%	17%

If we take only adults, 60% of IDPs are pensioners, according to MoSP data as of August 2017. Age composition of respondents differs significantly by survey – the minimum share of persons aged 60+ is revealed in SCORE and the World Bank surveys (17% and 18%, respectively), and the maximum – in IOM phone survey (38%) and IFES survey (28%). In the latter, the share of elders increased by weights built according to UN OCHA estimates.

Table 2.2.2. Age composition of adult respondents of the surveys in comparison with the Ukrainian population¹⁸

	State Statistic Service of Ukraine, general adult population of GCA of Ukraine, 1.01.2016	IOM phone survey	IOM f2f survey	SCORE survey	IFES survey¹⁹	The World Bank survey
18-59	73%	62%	77%	83%	72%	82%
60+ years	27%	38%	23%	17%	28%	18%

As for data by gender, MoSP does not provide it as usual, and according to the latest available data of May, 2016²⁰, the share of females among IDPs was 62% at that time (as far as among children the share of males and females is almost equal, we can presumably extrapolate this figure to the adult population). According to State Statistics Service of Ukraine as of 1.01.2016, the share of females was 55% among the adult population of GCA of Ukraine.

The share of females in the households is 56%, according to IOM phone survey data, and 57% – according to f2f survey. As for the other analyzed surveys, the only one survey which indicates a different share of females among the adult IDP population is that of the World Bank. It reveals that there are 70% of females among the adult IDPs.

Table 2.2.3. Gender composition of adult respondents of the surveys in comparison with official data for the general population

	State Statistic Service of Ukraine, general adult population of GCA of Ukraine, 1.01.2016	SCORE survey	IFES survey	The World Bank survey
Male	44%	38%	39%	30%
Female	55%	62%	61%	70%

¹⁸ More detailed age disaggregation is impossible because of different age intervals in different surveys

¹⁹ Unlike other surveys, IFES data was weighted by age and gender according to UN OCHA estimates – unweighted data showed a lower share of IDPs aged 60+.

²⁰ <https://dostup.pravda.com.ua/news/publications/za-rik-kilkist-vymushenykh-pereselentsiv-zbilshylasia-na-pivmiliona>

According to IOM phone survey, children constitute 16% of IDPs, which approximately corresponds to their share among the general population of Ukraine. However, IOM f2f survey shows 27% of children among IDPs. As far as the number of pensioners on the database of registered IDPs which was used for IOM phone survey could include NGCA dwellers who are not IDPs and therefore be overestimated, it can be assumed that children were displaced more often than adults.

The share of persons aged 60+ in most face-to-face IDP surveys varies from 17% to 23%, while among the general population of Ukraine it constitutes 27%. Thus, it can be assumed that persons aged 18-59 were displaced more often than persons aged 60+.

As for the gender distribution, the share of females among IDPs constitutes 56%-62%, according to different surveys, while it equals 55% among the adult population of Ukraine.

2.3. Ethnicity and language

According to IFES survey, 67% of IDPs consider themselves to be Ukrainians, 7% – Russians, 21% – "Russian and Ukrainian equally", and 2% indicate other nationalities. According to GfK Omnibus survey as of April 2015, 88% of the Ukrainian population identified themselves as Ukrainians and 8% – as Russians, but there was no option "Russian and Ukrainian equally" in the GfK Ukraine population surveys.

Interestingly, according to ZOIS survey, 32% of IDPs began to feel more Ukrainians, 3% – more Russians and 15% – more both as a result of displacement (others report no changes in their identities).

Mixed identity in the situation of the Russia-Ukraine conflict seems to be protective response when a person feels safer without being identified with any side of the conflict. According to SCORE survey, IDPs more often experience political ambivalence as to whether Ukraine should in the future be closer to the European Union or to Russia unlike host communities in oblasts remote from the conflict.

According to SCORE survey, 99% of IDPs are fluent in Russian language, while among the Ukrainian population this figure constitutes 86%.

Table 2.3.1. Russian language fluency

	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Fluent	86%	99%
Basic Knowledge	11%	1%
No Knowledge	3%	0%

Source: SCORE survey

At the same time, only 75% are fluent in Ukrainian (in comparison with 91% of the Ukrainian population) – so, 25% of IDPs could face problems with employment, education and even communication due to the lack of knowledge of Ukrainian in case of displacement to the Ukrainian-speaking oblasts.

Table 2.3.2. Ukrainian language fluency

	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Fluent	91%	75%
Basic Knowledge	8%	19%
No Knowledge	1%	5%

Source: SCORE survey

67% of IDPs consider themselves to be Ukrainians, 7% – Russians, 21% – "Russian and Ukrainian equally", and 2% indicate other nationalities. Among the Ukrainian population 88% identify themselves as Ukrainians and 8% – as Russians, but there was no option "Russian and Ukrainian equally" in the recent available surveys. Mixed identity in the situation of the Russia-Ukraine conflict seems to be protective response when a person feels safer without being identified with any side of the conflict.

99% of IDPs are fluent in Russian language while only 75% are fluent in Ukrainian (in comparison with 91% of the Ukrainian population). So, 25% of IDPs may face problems with employment, education and communication due to the lack of knowledge of Ukrainian.

2.4. Disability, health conditions

According to MoSP data, IDPs with disabilities constitute 4% of all registered IDPs comparing to 6% of people with disabilities among the Ukrainian population in 2016²¹.

According to IOM f2f survey, disabled persons are members of 8% of IDPs' households.

According to SCORE survey, IDPs mostly evaluate healthcare services as efficient (this can be explained by the fact that 79% of the surveyed IDPs live in the cities with more than 100 thousand residents where healthcare services are usually better than in smaller settlements vs. 40% of the total Ukrainian population), on the one hand, but on the other hand, 10% of IDPs report about no access to services vs. 6% of the general population.

Table 2.4.1. Evaluation of provision of healthcare

	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
This service is provided, very efficiently	2%	3%
This service is provided, somewhat efficiently	16%	22%
This service is provided, but not very efficiently	38%	37%
This service is provided very inefficiently	35%	24%
This service is not provided at all	6%	10%
Difficult to answer	4%	5%

Source: SCORE survey

According to SCORE survey, cost of medication is a healthcare barrier for 54% of the general population and 50% of IDPs.

Table 2.4.2. Evaluation of provision of healthcare

«To what extent is the cost of medication a barrier to your health?»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Yes, very much	17%	14%
Yes, to some extent	37%	36%
Not really	28%	27%
Not at all	11%	13%
Difficult to answer	7%	10%

Source: SCORE survey

The World Bank survey reveals that the share of IDPs and hosts concerned about healthcare expenses is almost identical – 45% and 47%, respectively. At the same time, IDPs involved in SCORE and the World Bank survey are significantly younger than the population of Ukraine – see Chapter 2.2. IDPs are presumably concerned about the cost of healthcare significantly more than the general population of their age.

IOM phone, the World Bank and IFES surveys indicate that the main concern of IDPs is housing (namely, high expenses for rent and/or utilities, bad living conditions etc.). As for other top concerns, they are healthcare and employment (the questions in the surveys are not comparable, but they show rather similar tendencies).

The share of IDPs with disabilities varies from 4% to 8% of all IDPs, and this figure is approximately the same as among the general population of Ukraine (6%).

The surveys indicate that the main concern of IDPs is housing (namely high expenses for rent and/or utilities, bad living conditions etc.). As for other top concerns, they are healthcare and employment. About one half of IDPs as well as the general population of Ukraine are concerned about healthcare expenses. However, the surveyed IDPs are significantly younger and twice more often live in the cities with the population of 100,000+ than the general population of Ukraine. Thus, IDPs are presumably concerned about the cost and access to healthcare services significantly more than the general population of their age and geographical distribution.

²¹ <https://dostup.pravda.com.ua/request/22356/response/41390/attach/2/660%200%20132%2017%20id1112316.pdf>

2.5. Areas of origin (rural/urban)

According to IOM phone survey of Round 5, 87% of IDPs are from urban settlements and 13% are from rural. According to State Statistic Service of Ukraine data, there were 11% of the rural population in the area which is now NCGA before the military conflict. Hence, the displacement from rural areas is approximately the same as from the urban.

87% of IDPs are from urban settlements and 13% are from rural. This distribution approximately corresponds to the pre-conflict distribution of the population in the settlements which currently belong to NCGA as of 1.01.2014. Hence, the displacement from rural areas is approximately the same as from the urban ones.

2.6. Level of education

According to SCORE survey, 37% of IDPs have higher education vs. 29% of the general population. At the same time, in Ukraine younger age categories have a higher educational level than the older people, and IDPs involved in the SCORE survey are significantly younger than the general population – see Chapter 2.2.

IFES survey reports the same share of IDPs with higher education – 38%, while IOM f2f survey shows 44%.

Table 2.6.1. Level of education (the highest completed)

	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Primary / Unfinished Secondary	4%	2%
Secondary Academic	19%	11%
Secondary Vocational	39%	39%
Unfinished Higher	9%	11%
Higher	29%	37%

Source: SCORE survey

IDPs have higher levels of education than the general population of Ukraine: 37% of IDPs have higher education vs. 29% of the general population of Ukraine

2.7. Professional background

Unfortunately, none of the analyzed surveys gives the possibility of comparing professional background of IDPs vs. general population.

According to IFES survey, a significant number of IDPs are labourers (40%).

Table 2.7.1. Fields of employment

	IDPs
Skilled labourer	29%
Executive or professional at mid-level (Government or private)	17%
“Intellectual” worker (i.e. teacher, journalist, writer)	12%
Unskilled labourer	11%
Student	6%
Executive or professional at senior-level (government or private)	5%
Other: private entrepreneur	1%
Military serviceman/woman	1%
Other: did not work / was unemployed	1%
Difficult to answer	2%
Refused	16%

Source: IFES survey

According to IOM f2f survey, “the sectors with IDPs employed in before the displacement are similar to those after displacement. In comparison to the pre-conflict period, the share of those employed in industry decreased (from 14% to 9%) and those employed in public administration increased (from 11% to 15%)”.

Table 2.7.2. Changes in sectors of employment by type of activity before and after displacement

	Employed after displacement	Employed before displacement
Services	27%	25%
Trade	16%	16%
Public administration	15%	11%
Education	12%	14%
Industry	9%	14%
Health care	7%	5%
Transportation	4%	4%
Construction	4%	5%
Self-employment	2%	3%
Agriculture	2%	1%
Other	2%	2%

Source: IOM f2f survey

According to both IOM f2f and the World Bank surveys, jobs met the qualifications of IDPs in most cases (74% and 70%, respectively). According to the World Bank survey, “IDPs also typically work in the same professions, including machine manufacturers, technical specialists and sales and service workers (70%), and IDPs that were self-employed prior to displacement typically continue working independently in displacement. However, many complain of a decreasing number of clients and income compared to their experience prior to displacement”.

40% of IDPs are labourers and 34% are "white-collar" professionals. The sectors with IDPs employed in before the displacement are approximately similar to those after displacement. However, the share of those employed in the industry decreased, and the share of those employed in public administration increased. IDPs that were self-employed before the displacement mostly continue working independently, but they complain of a decreasing number of clients and income.

2.8. Psycho-social problems

According to SCORE survey, 8% of IDPs report that recollection of a traumatic event often or very often bothers them vs. 4% of the general population.

Table 2.8.1. Recollection of a traumatic event

«I have experienced or seen a severe traumatic event (accident, fire, assault, rape, etc.), and it still bothers me»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Never or rarely	71%	70%
Sometimes	21%	17%
Often	3%	6%
Very often	1%	2%
Difficult to answer	4%	5%

Source: SCORE survey

The SCORE data below does not show the evidence of psychological problems. It reveals rather psychological differences between IDPs and the general population, which may build barriers for communication or positive well-being.

27% of IDPs disagree with the statement “I easily laugh” vs. 21% of the general population. Generally, elder people in Ukraine have a significantly more negative well-being than younger people, and IDPs surveyed in SCORE survey are significantly younger than the general population – see Chapter 2.2.

Table 2.8.2. Readiness to laugh

«I easily laugh»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Strongly disagree	3%	4%
Somewhat disagree	18%	23%
Somewhat agree	45%	43%
Strongly agree	24%	21%
Difficult to answer	10%	9%

Source: SCORE survey

16% of IDPs disagree with the statement “There are strong bonds in my family” vs. 11% of the general population.

Table 2.8.3. Evaluation of family bonds

«There are strong bonds in my family»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Strongly disagree	1%	1%
Somewhat disagree	10%	15%
Somewhat agree	48%	50%
Strongly agree	34%	28%
Difficult to answer	7%	6%

Source: SCORE survey

14% of IDP do not expect the best in uncertain times vs. 11% of the general population.

Table 2.8.4. Optimism in uncertain times

«In uncertain times, I usually expect the best»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Strongly disagree	2%	3%
Somewhat disagree	8%	11%
Somewhat agree	51%	47%
Strongly agree	33%	34%
Difficult to answer	5%	5%

Source: SCORE survey

11% of IDPs do not have positive expectations vs. 8% of the general population.

Table 2.8.5. Optimism

«Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Strongly disagree	1%	1%
Somewhat disagree	7%	10%
Somewhat agree	49%	39%
Strongly agree	34%	39%
Difficult to answer	10%	12%

Source: SCORE survey

19% of IDPs feel that they process information not so quickly and accurately as the others vs. 14% of the general population.

Table 2.8.6. Self-estimation of processing the information

«I don't seem to process information as quickly or as accurately as the others»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Never or rarely	45%	46%
Sometimes	35%	24%
Often	11%	14%
Very often	3%	5%
Difficult to answer	7%	10%

Source: SCORE survey

Moreover, IDPs smoke tobacco and marijuana more often than the general population (it might be explained by the younger age of IDPs). However, they drink alcohol less often.

Table 2.8.7. Smoking

«I smoke tobacco cigarettes»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Never or rarely	45%	46%
Sometimes	35%	24%
Often	11%	14%
Very often	3%	5%
Difficult to answer	7%	10%

Source: SCORE survey

Table 2.8.8. Alcohol drinking

«I drink alcohol beverages (Beer, Wine, Liquor)»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Never or rarely	35%	39%
Sometimes	55%	49%
Often	7%	5%
Very often	1%	2%
Difficult to answer	2%	6%

Source: SCORE survey

Table 2.8.9. Smoking marijuana

«I smoke marijuana ('cannabis', 'plan', 'drap')»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Never or rarely	94%	89%
Sometimes	3%	4%
Often	1%	2%
Very often	0%	1%
Difficult to answer	2%	4%

Source: SCORE survey

Generally, IDPs are more opposed to violence than the general population – 27% among IDPs agree that violence is sometimes necessary vs. 34% among the general population (considering the aggregated % of those who selected scores from 6 to 10 on a 10-point scale).

Table 2.8.10. Attitude towards the use of violence

«Some people believe that violence is sometimes necessary to achieve a national or political goal, while others disagree. On a scale from 0 to 10, which of these two statements is closer to your own views on the use of violence?»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Use of violence makes social divisions worse and ultimately doesn't solve any problems	15%	17%
1	9%	15%
2	7%	6%
3	7%	4%
4	5%	3%
5	10%	11%
6	7%	6%
7	7%	5%
8	8%	5%
9	5%	6%
Use of violence is sometimes necessary to protect the integrity of the country	7%	5%
Difficult to answer	11%	18%

Source: SCORE survey

Psychological problems are not among top concerns of IDPs: as mentioned above, IOM phone, the World Bank and IFES surveys show that housing is the main concern for IDPs (namely, high expenses for rent and/or utilities, bad living conditions etc.). As for other top concerns, they are healthcare and employment.

However, 16% of IDPs report that psychological problems are their greatest concern vs. 8% of hosts, according to the World Bank survey. 7% of IDPs vs. 1% of hosts used psychological services, and IDPs were less satisfied with these services than the hosts (3.3. vs. 4.1 on a 5-point scale).

Moreover, IOM conducted the key informants survey²² along with IDP surveys, and 35% of key informants reported that IDPs addressed them for psychological support, while only 21% mentioned healthcare assistance (at the same time, 63% were addressed for monetary assistance and presumably money was needed for healthcare among other needs).

Psychological problems are not among top concerns of IDPs, but they show higher vulnerability than the general population: 16% of IDPs report that psychological problems are their greatest concern vs. 8% of hosts, according to the World Bank survey. IDPs more often experienced traumatic events (8%), feel pessimism (14%) and do not feel strong family support (16%) than the general population of Ukraine (4%, 11% and 11%, respectively). The difference is not drastic, but the surveyed IDPs are significantly younger than the general population; and in Ukraine, elder people have a significantly more negative mood than younger people. So, it can be assumed that IDPs feel significantly worse than people of their age. In spite of worse well-being, IDPs are more opposed to violence than the general population – 27% among IDPs agree that violence is sometimes necessary vs. 34% among the general population.

In addition, IDPs smoke tobacco and marijuana more often than the general population (it also might be explained by the younger age of IDPs), but drink alcohol less often.

²² IDP surveys do not include the questions on psychological problems. Most of the key informants worked in non-governmental organizations (40%), and a significant share of key informants represented institutions of social protection (22%). In addition, 16% were employed as local authorities, 8% worked in healthcare establishments, 2% were engaged in educational institutions, while 12% worked in other organizations.

2.9. Household characteristics: household size, marital status, dependency ratios

IOM phone survey of Round 5 shows the average IDP household size as 1.97 comparing to 2.73 in IOM f2f and 2.5 in the World Bank surveys (and the average household size of the surveyed hosts is the same). The difference between phone and f2f surveys can be explained by the following factors:

- f2f surveys always have bias to a larger household size because in the larger household the probability of “catching” a potential respondent at home is higher)
- phone survey involved older people (see Chapter 2.2), and elderly respondents live alone more often (mostly because of higher life expectancy for women comparing to men).

The average household size for the general population of Ukraine was 2.6 in 2015²³.

According to SCORE survey, 63% of IDPs reside with a spouse/partner vs. 67% of the general population. This difference can be explained by the younger age of the surveyed IDPs. IFES survey suggests the same figure – 63%.

Table 2.9. Marital status

	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Single	16%	19%
Cohabiting	6%	11%
Married	61%	52%
Divorced / Separated	6%	9%
Widowed	10%	8%
Difficult to answer	1%	0%

Source: SCORE survey

According to IOM phone survey, the dependency ratio (for this survey it is a measure showing the number of dependents aged zero to 17 years old and over the age of 60 to the other population aged 18 to 59) constitutes 92%, comparing to 79% indicated in IOM f2f survey. The reasons for this difference can be found in Chapter 2.2. According to State Statistics Service of Ukraine as of 1.01.2016, the dependency ratio in GCA of Ukraine constitutes 67% – so, even if we consider f2f survey data instead of that of the phone survey, the dependency ratio among IDPs is higher than among the general population.

The average size of IDPs' households is 1.97-2.73, according to different surveys, while for the Ukrainian population it constitutes 2.6. The number of dependents aged 0-17 years old and over the age of 60 to the population aged 18 to 59 equals 79%-92%, according to the different surveys, while for the Ukrainian population it makes up 67%.

63% of IDPs reside with a spouse/partner vs. 67% of the general population. This difference can be explained by younger age of the surveyed IDPs.

²³ <http://www.kiev.ukrstat.gov.ua/p.php3?c=495&lang=1>

3. Geographic location of displacement

As mentioned above, the share of pensioners in the Donbas neighbouring oblasts is significantly higher than in the other oblasts, according to MoSP data: 53%-76% in Donetsk, Luhansk and Zaporizhia oblasts comparing to 16%-44% in the other oblasts. If we exclude oblasts with the share of pensioners higher than 50%, the average share of pensioners among IDPs constitutes 30%, according to MoSP data. Table 3.1 presents the estimated distribution if we accept the hypothesis that the average share of pensioners in the oblasts adjacent to NGCA is 30%.

Table 3.1. Distribution of IDPs by oblast

	MoSP data, August 2017	Estimated distribution if we accept the hypothesis that the average share of pensioners in the oblasts adjacent to NGCA is similar to the share in the other oblasts
Donetsk oblast*	37%	30%
Luhansk oblast	19%	12%
City of Kyiv	10%	13%
Kharkiv oblast	8%	16%
Dnipropetrovsk oblast	5%	6%
Kyiv oblast	4%	5%
Zaporizhia oblast	4%	3%
Odesa oblast	2%	3%
Poltava oblast	2%	2%
Vinnytsia oblast	1%	1%
Kherson oblast	1%	1%
Cherkasy oblast	1%	1%
Lviv oblast	1%	1%
Sumy oblast	1%	1%
Chernihiv oblast	1%	1%
Mykolaiv oblast	1%	1%
Kirovohrad oblast	0,5%	1%
Zhytomyr oblast	0,5%	1%
Khmelnyskyi oblast	0,5%	1%
Ivano-Frankivsk oblast	0,2%	0,3%
Zakarpattia oblast	0,2%	0,3%
Rivne oblast	0,2%	0,3%
Volyn oblast	0,2%	0,3%
Ternopil oblast	0,2%	0,2%
Chernivtsi oblast	0,2%	0,2%

*Oblasts with the highest share of pensioners among the registered IDPs are marked in bold

According to IOM phone survey of Round 5, 87% of IDPs live in urban areas and 13% in rural areas, while 31% of the Ukrainian population live in rural areas.

According to MoSP data, 56% of IDPs live in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts and 17% – in the three neighbouring oblasts. As for the other regions with the highest share of IDPs, they are Kyiv city (10%) and Kyiv oblast (4%). 87% of IDPs live in urban areas vs. 69% of the general population of Ukraine.

4. Displacement and migration

4.1 Time of initial displacement

IFES and IOM combined data surveys show rather similar figures of the time of first displacement – the majority of IDPs have been displaced for more than 2 years.

Table 4.1.1. Time of initial displacement

	IOM (combined data)	IFES survey
Up to 6 months	6%	3%
6-12 months	11%	2%
12-18 months	4%	7%
18-24 months	13%	21%
More than 24 months	66%	63%

Source: IOM combined data and IFES surveys

As for the duration of residence in the settlement where the survey took place, 59% of IDPs live there for more than 2 years and 33% - from 1 to 2 years, according to the IFES survey.

Most IDPs (63%-66%, according to different surveys) are displaced for more than 2 years. In the settlements where the survey took place, 59% live for more than 2 years and 33% - from 1 to 2 years.

4.2 Number of moves after the initial displacement

IFES, the World Bank and IOM combined data surveys show rather similar figures of the number of moves: 82%, 84% and 76%, respectively, of those who have moved only once.

However, the World Bank and IOM f2f surveys reveal different figures regarding the rest of options of displacement frequency (if taken as 100%), presumably because of small subsamples. According to IOM f2f of Round 5, 57% of IDPs were displaced twice and 43% more than twice, while the World Bank survey data suggests 87% and 13%, respectively.

According to IOM f2f survey, the main reasons for changing the place of displacement are problems with housing (49%), lack of employment opportunities (34%), and high rents for housing (27%).

Most IDPs (76%-82%, according to different surveys) were displaced to one settlement only. For the rest, the main reasons for changing the place of displacement are problems with housing (49%), lack of employment opportunities (34%), and high rents for housing (27%).

4.3 Reasons for choosing place of settlement

According to the World Bank survey, "IDPs had differing reasons for why they chose to move to their displacement locations. Most respondents in rural areas away from Donbas state that the key factor for choosing a place of refuge was the presence of family or friends. With relatives and friends in a new location, IDPs had some flexibility in their length of stay, the ability to put off negotiating a lease, deferring rent or utility payments or contending with other burdens associated with independent housing. However, more IDPs in urban areas (>50,000) were pulled there rather in search of employment than to be close to relatives. Respondents settled in Donbas and the conflict neighbouring regions were more influenced rather by proximity to home areas than family or employment. As for other less influential factors affecting settlement patterns, they are available housing and a desire to be far away from conflict-affected areas of the country".

The major reasons for choosing the place of displacement were presence of family or friends, employment opportunities, available housing and proximity to home areas (for IDPs living in Donbas and the conflict neighbouring regions).

4.4 Pendular or seasonal mobility

None of the surveys reveals data on pendular or seasonal mobility of IDPs on the GCA of Ukraine. State Border Guard Service of Ukraine provides data on the number of crossing the checkpoints between GCA and NGCA. According to the data of 2016 and 2017, the highest number of crossings is recorded for summer (the peak is in August) and the lowest – in winter.

As for visits to NGCA, about half of IDPs visited NGCA since their displacement, according to IOM f2f survey, IFES and the World Bank survey. According to IOM f2f survey, “the main reasons to travel to the NGCA were visiting and maintaining housing (63%), transportation of belongings (52%), and visiting friends or family (49%)”.

According to IFES survey, 16% of IDPs visit NGCA “occasionally” and 6% - “regularly”. The World Bank survey concludes “15 percent visited 2 to 3 times a year; and only 7 percent of respondents indicated that they visited it more frequently. IDPs who left the areas that are now back under government control indicate that they visit their original homes more often with 29 percent returning once per year or less frequently; 16 percent returning several times a year; and 20 percent returning more frequently. Nearly all IDPs state that visits to home areas in NGCAs and GCAs are 30 days or less in duration”. The primary reasons why IDPs travel to home areas are to look after their property and to visit relatives and friends. At times, this assumes bringing medicine or necessities to relatives, settling business-related issues, selling property, or collecting documentation”.

According to IOM combined data, only 0.2% of IDPs had experience in working abroad during the last three years. About 5% of IDPs have relatives who had such experience. Poland, Canada and the USA were the most preferable countries for IDPs to look for a job abroad.

Each fifth IDP visits NGCA at least several times a year. The main reasons to travel to the NGCA were visiting and maintaining housing (63%), transportation of belongings (52%), and visiting friends or family (49%). Nearly all IDPs state that their visits to home areas in NGCAs and GCAs last for about 30 days.

Only 0.2% of IDPs had experience in working abroad during the last three years.

5. Causes of displacement and barriers to return

According to the World Bank survey, “while all IDPs from Eastern Ukraine cited physical security as the primary driver of their displacement, nearly all IDPs from Crimea cited differences in political orientation as the reason why they left their home areas”. Overall, 85% indicated physical threats as the main reason for displacement.

Table 5.1. Reasons for displacement

«What were the main reasons of displacement?»	IDPs
Physical threat to life and health	85%
Absence or lack of livelihood	32%
Destruction of housing, utilities (water, electricity etc.)	24%
Political reasons	19%
Lack of access to services (medicine, education etc.)	18%
Moving the employer or educational institution to another city	7%
Other	2%
Difficult to answer, refuse	1%

Source: The World Bank survey

According to the World Bank survey, the following factors prevent IDPs from returning:

- Security reasons;
- Political orientation and social tension. According to the report, “focus-group participants cite “being viewed as an enemy there”;
- Poor employment prospects.

Security, poor employment prospects and political reasons are the main reasons for displacement and barriers against returning.

6. Preferences for place of settlement

6.1 Preference on future place of settlement

Most of the surveys involving IDPs include the question on their future intentions, but only IOM survey includes this question for a specific period (3 months – see Chapter 6.7). Such questions reflect rather willingness to return than real intentions, because most of those who declare the intention to return would do it only in case of ending of the military conflict, and nobody knows when it happens.

The SCORE survey had a 10-point scale with the statements "I am certain that I will not return to my original region of residence" as 0 and "I will definitely return to my original region of residence, eventually" as 10. So, 17% selected answers closer the first statement, 53% – to the second and 30% were neutral (5 was chosen as a medium point) and "don't know".

According to the World Bank survey, "a quarter of IDPs have no intention to return. Another quarter are prepared to return when conditions are right, and half of IDPs express uncertainty about returning home at all". Also "just over a quarter of IDPs fear that they may be forced to return due to economic hardships (including eviction) or to care for relatives remaining in NGCAs".

According to IOM survey, 25% are sure that they will not return, 62% – that they will return (namely, 44% will return at the end of conflict, and 18% "maybe in future") and 13% could not answer the question.

The SCORE fieldwork was conducted about 6 to 13 months before the World Bank and IOM surveys, respectively. The share of those who did not want to return could have increased since that time. The tendency of the increasing share of those who do not want to return and of those who are uncertain is also revealed in the World Bank survey report.

According to IFES survey, 78% agree "to go back to old homes when the situation becomes better with all the relevant safety conditions", but only 16% agree "to go back to old homes if the situation does not change", and 19% - "when the situation becomes better, but without all the relevant safety conditions". However, 65% would agree to stay in host communities, and 26% – to resettle in the other territory of Ukraine.

Thus, the majority of IDPs would return only in case of the conflict end, and only 16%-19% would return if the conflict is not solved.

SCORE, the World Bank and IOM surveys find out similar trend: the closer IDPs live to NGCA, the higher their desire to return. Furthermore, the World Bank report describes the following characteristics of those who want to return and who do not want to: "Overall, more educated, highly skilled and younger IDPs are less inclined to return". However, SCORE researchers did not find any interrelation between age or education level and the desire to stay or return.

Table 6.1.1 Characteristics of those who prefer staying or returning

Associated with the <u>desire to stay</u>	Associated with the <u>desire to return</u>
Low income	Female gender
Suffering from post-traumatic stress	Religious
High social skills & civic engagement	Trait optimism
Pro-EU orientation	High information consumption
	Pro-Russia orientation

Source: SCORE survey

About 25% of IDPs definitely don't want to return, while 50%-78% would like to return at the end of war. Only 16-18% would like to return even if the conditions don't change, according to different surveys. At the same time, over a quarter of IDPs fear that they may be forced to return due to economic hardships (including eviction) or to care for their relatives living in NGCA. The number of IDPs who don't want to return tends to increase. IDPs who live closer to NGCA express a stronger desire to return.

6.2 Which conditions should be in place for those who prefer to return

As mentioned above, there was a 10-point continuum between "I am certain that I will not return to my original region of residence" and "I will definitely return to my original region of residence, eventually" in the SCORE survey, so 53% gave answers closer to the second statement. For these respondents the main factors of returning are: "if my property was returned to me, along with cash assistance to fix it, if necessary" (56% mentioned this factor as strongly motivating); "if there is Peace agreement" (56%); "if I could find a good job there" (47%); "if nearby schools and hospitals were available to me" (36%); and "if other displaced persons from my village / neighbourhood returned" (13%).

The World Bank survey: "The primary condition for any return is the end of the conflict, yet the overwhelming majority of IDPs see no end in sight to the violence in the East".

According to IOM phone survey, 73% of returnees in NGCA mention that the most important reason behind their return was owning a private property in NGCA and no need to pay for renting. It is followed by the family reasons (45%).

According to IOM face-to-face survey, 55% of those who would like to return after the end of the conflict state that their housing is not damaged, while among those who are not willing to return only 18% know that their housing is not damaged. Overall, 58% of IDPs report that their housing is not damaged, but the questions whether it is acceptable or can be sold were not put in the survey – for example, it can be captured by other people, the documents can be lost, etc.

Housing, peace agreement and employment opportunities are the main pre-conditions for returning.

6.3 Which conditions should be in place for those who prefer to locally integrate

As mentioned above, there was a 10-point continuum between "I am certain that I will not return to my original region of residence" and "I will definitely return to my original region of residence, eventually" in the SCORE survey, so 17% gave the answers closer to the first statement. For these respondents the main factors of staying are: appropriate housing (67% mention this factor as strongly motivating); "a good job here for me and/or my family members" (65%); the availability of nearby schools and hospitals to me and my family (56%); the welcoming local hosting population (38%); decision of the other displaced persons to stay (35%).

Housing, employment opportunities and availability of healthcare and education services are the main preconditions to stay.

6.4 Which conditions should be in place for those who prefer to resettle

Only the data for those who have already resettled is available from the analyzed surveys – thus, according to IOM f2f survey, problems with housing (49%), high rents for housing (27%), lack of employment opportunities (34%) were the main reasons for IDPs to resettle.

Housing and employment opportunities were also the main reasons for resettling.

6.5 Evidence of migration outside of Ukraine

Since the beginning of the armed conflict in early 2014 and as of December 2016, 427,240 applications were submitted by the Ukrainians to the Russian Federation²⁴.

In May-June 2017, GfK Ukraine conducted 200 face-to-face interviews in the so-called "LPR" and 200 face-to-face interviews – in the so-called "DPR" – 7% among the first sample and 28% among the second were displaced to the Russian Federation for some period (vs. 19% and 17% of those who were displaced to Ukraine).

²⁴ Russian Federation Government Data, UNHCR

As mentioned above, only 0.5% of IDPs had experience in working abroad during the last three years, according to IOM f2f survey.

The IOM combined data indicates that 0.4% of IDPs are going to move abroad in the next three months.

Since the beginning of the armed conflict in early 2014 and as of December 2016, 427,240 applications from the Ukrainians were submitted to the Russian Federation. There is a preliminary evidence suggesting that at least some have returned to NGCA.

0.5% of IDPs had experience of working abroad during the last three years.

6.6 Solutions proposed by IDPs

As mentioned above, employment is the second key concern of IDPs after housing. According to IOM f2f survey, the possible solution mentioned by the unemployed respondents is direct employment support (63%). This type of solution is preferred by 58% of women and 82% of men. Retraining and startup of own business are more popular among women (9% mention retraining and 11% – own business) comparing to men (1% and 8%, respectively). Overall, 10% indicate startup of own business, 8% – retraining, 6% – consultation in the employment centre, 5% - education.

However, a significant part of salary is spent on rent even in case of successful employment. According to IOM f2f survey, only 2% of IDPs live in own housing, while 65% rent flats, houses or rooms. 10% use such solutions as dormitories and collective centres (6% and 4%, respectively)²⁵, but such opportunities tend to decrease (thus, according to IOM f2f survey, 22% of IDPs used these solutions in March 2016 (Round 1)). On the one hand, it may indicate a better adaptation of IDPs in line with an increasing employment rate, which is concluded by IOM f2f survey. On the other hand, housing is the main concern of IDPs, and in this context shortage of affordable housing option is a negative trend.

According to UNHCR participatory assessment, the following housing problems are reported:

- High rent and discrimination on the part of landlords. According to the report, “it was reported in the FGDs held in Schastia and Stanitsa Luhanska that the rent prices for IDPs were higher than for locals”, “landlords were often unhappy with verification visits”,
- No mortgages, loans or state programs available,
- Fear of being evicted,
- Overcrowdness and poor living conditions; particularly, conditions in most collective centres deteriorated,
- High utility costs; according to the report, “bureaucratic obstacles combined with lack of cooperation from landlords rendered access to subsidies complicated”.

According to the World Bank survey, “less than half of IDPs feel financially secure enough to anticipate living in their current accommodation over the next year, despite programs aimed at helping IDPs secure shelter”. As mentioned in Chapters 6.2. and 6.4, lack of housing solutions is the main factor forcing IDPs to return to NCGA or to resettle in the other settlements.

Less than half of IDPs feel financially secure enough to anticipate living in their current accommodation over the next year, and lack of housing solutions is the main factor forcing IDPs to return to NCGA or to resettle in the other settlements. Mortgages, loans or any support in renting accommodations would be helpful solutions for 98% of IDPs who do not have own housing.

Lack of employment opportunities is the second major concern of IDPs after housing: 63% of unemployed IDPs would prefer direct employment support, while the others report such types of support as start-up of own business (10%), retraining (8%), consultation in employment centre (6%), and education (5%). So, loans for start-up of own business or retraining/receiving the second education are also demanded by IDPs.

²⁵ According to Collective Centre Monitoring Update as of June 2017 less than 1% of registered IDPs are living in collective centres so oversampling of such respondents could probably take place.

6.7 Concrete plans for durable solutions

According to IOM combined data survey, 77% of IDPs will stay in the current locations within next 3 months, 3% will return, 2% will move elsewhere in Ukraine, 0.4% will move abroad, and 17% cannot answer the question – this high share of those who do not have exact plans for 3 months reveal high uncertainty about life conditions for IDPs.

So, among those who have specific plans for the next three months, 93% plan to stay, 4% – to return, 2% – to resettle in Ukraine, and 1% – to move abroad.

77% of IDPs will stay in the current location within the next 3 months, 3% of IDPs plan to return home, 2% - to resettle in Ukraine, 0.4% - to move abroad. 17% cannot answer the question about their plans for the next three months – such a high share of those who do not have specific plans for the next 3 months suggests high uncertainty about life condition for IDPs.

7. Returns

As a result of IOM phone survey, 13% respondents who returned to the NGCA and lived there were identified as IDPs. According to the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine, the migration to GCA tends to increase: whereas in the first 11 months of 2016, there were about 9,000 more crossings to GCA than from GCA (3,941, 000 vs. 3,932 000, accordingly), in the first 11 months of 2017 there were about 62,000 more crossings to GCA than from GCA (5,374 000 and 5,312 000, respectively).

The portrait of returnees in comparison with the total sample of IDPs surveyed via phone is given below. There are no differences in terms of gender, but returnees are older than the total sample by age.

Table 7.1. Comparison of returnees with the total sample by age

Age distribution of household members of IDPs	Total sample	Returnees to the NGCA
0-4 years	7%	7%
5-17 years	9%	9%
18-34 years	21%	21%
35-59 years	31%	30%
60+ years	32%	47%

Source: IOM phone survey

Returnees have a lower income than the total sample.

Table 7.2. Comparison between returnees and the total sample by income

Average income per IDP household	Total sample	Returnees to the NGCA
Less than 1,500 UAH	6%	13%
1,500 – 3,000 UAH	28%	35%
3,001 – 5,000 UAH	19%	10%
5,001 – 7,000 UAH	6%	2%
7,001 – 11,000 UAH	3%	1%
More than 11,000 UAH	1%	0%
No income	1%	5%
Difficult to say / No response	36%	34%

Source: IOM phone survey, Round 5

Returnees have a pension and a salary less often.

Table 7.3. Comparison between returnees and the total sample by income source

Main sources of income in IDP households in the past 12 months	Total sample	Returnees to the NGCA
Retirement pension	66%	51%
Salary	29%	22%
Other retirement pension	0%	11%
Financial support from relatives residing in Ukraine	5%	6%
Humanitarian assistance	5%	6%
Social assistance	12%	5%
Social pension	3%	4%
Irregular earnings	3%	4%
Government IDP support	28%	2%
Disability assistance	3%	2%
Remittances from relatives/friends in migration	1%	2%
Savings	0%	1%

Main sources of income in IDP households in the past 12 months	Total sample	Returnees to the NGCA
Other	1%	1%
No income	1%	5%
No response	1%	3%

Source: IOM phone survey, Round 5

Returnees have housing problems less often, but they face problems with safety more often. The FGD participants in IOM survey were very satisfied with the prices for utilities in NGCA, and respondents mentioned that the prices were significantly lower than in the GCA of Ukraine.

Table 7.4. Comparison between returnees and the total sample by problematic issues, according to IOM phone survey

	Total sample	Returnees to the NGCA
Safety	7%	46%
Payment for utilities	49%	21%
Access to medicines	17%	19%
Access to health services	7%	11%
Suspension in social payments/ pensions	3%	9%
Unemployment	5%	8%
Living conditions	28%	8%
Malnutrition	1%	4%
Delays in payment of wages	0%	3%
Payment for rent	27%	3%
Other	2%	1%
None of the above	24%	21%

Source: IOM phone survey, Round 5

The satisfaction with an accessibility of healthcare services is almost identical among the total sample and returnees (90% and 87%, respectively). However, the returnees who had participated in Round 5 mentioned that they had an access only to the basic medical services, while the access to specialized services was problematic because of the insufficient number of specialists and the prices for medicines, which in the NGCA were more prohibitive than in the GCA.

Table 7.5. Comparison between returnees and the total sample by satisfaction with public services, according to IOM phone survey

	Total sample	Returnees to the NGCA
Accessibility of health care services	90%	87%
Possibility of receiving pension or social assistance	88%	67%
Employment opportunities	67%	61%
Accessibility of administrative services	78%	60%
Possibilities of obtaining education and enrolling children in schools/ kindergartens	68%	60%

Source: IOM phone survey, Round 5

Only half of the returnees (52%) express satisfaction with their decision to return. 14% are not satisfied, and a significant share of returnees (34%) refuse to answer this question or do not know how to answer.

According to Round 5 results, 63% are planning to stay in NGCA in the next 3 months vs. 74% of those who are going to stay among the total sample.

Table 7.6. Comparison between returnees and the total sample by plan for the next three months, according to IOM phone survey

	Total sample	Returnees to the NGCA
Plan to stay (in the NGCA – for returnees)	74%	63%
Plan to move to another oblast (GCA – for returnees)	2%	16%
Plan to move abroad	1%	1%
Plan to return	4%	-
Other	0%	1%
Difficult to answer	18%	17%
No response	0%	2%

Source: IOM phone survey, Round 5

As for the visits to GCA, 9% of returnees visit GCA at least once a month, 14% – once every 2-3 months, 12% – less often, and 54% make no visit at all.

In May-June 2017, GfK Ukraine conducted 200 face-to-face interviews in the so-called “LPR” and 200 face-to-face interviews in the so-called “DPR” – 19% of the first sample and 17% of the second were displaced to GCA for some period (another 7% and 28%, respectively, said that they had been displaced to Russia). There were 70 respondents of that kind.

70 respondents is too a small subsample for the reliable statistical analysis, but some tendencies could be traced:

- 66% of returnees were registered as IDPs by MoSP;
- there are no significant differences between returnees and the total surveyed NGCA population in terms of age, gender, employment, and education;
- 42% of returnees consider themselves to be Ukrainians vs. 52% of the total surveyed NGCA population; 58% identify themselves as Russians vs. 48% of the total surveyed NGCA population;
- the level of income of returnees is significantly higher than that among the total NGCA population.

GfK Ukraine survey did not include the question on the reasons to return. As mentioned above, according to IOM phone survey, 73% of returnees in the NGCA mentioned that the most important reason behind their return was owning a private property in the NGCA and no need to pay for rent. As for family reasons, it was the second factor mentioned (45%). Among the other economic reasons, there are lower prices for utilities and presumably the possibility of receiving both pension in GCA of Ukraine and social assistance in NGCA, though none of the analyzed surveys covered the latter issue.

The share of elders aged 60+ is higher in the households of returnees vs. households in the total sample of IDPs, while the share of children is similar. The returnees have a lower income and receive a pension and salary less often than IDPs in total. Unlike IDPs whose major problem is housing (rent, utilities and living conditions), the major problem of returnees is safety. The concern about payment for utilities comes in second – 21% indicate it vs. 49% of IDPs in total. The FGD participants were very satisfied with the prices for utilities in NGCA comparing to the prices in GCA. In addition to affordable housing and family reasons, ethnic identity may also affect decisions to return – preliminary evidence suggests that 58% of returnees to NGCA consider themselves to be ethnically Russians compared to 7% of IDPs in GCA of Ukraine.

The satisfaction with the accessibility of healthcare services is quite similar in the total sample and returnees, but returnees mentioned that they had an access only to basic medical services, while the access to specialized services is problematic because there are not enough specialists and the prices for medicines in the NGCA are more prohibitive than in the GCA. Overall, only 52% are satisfied with their decision to return.

8. Social integration at place of current residence

8.1. Level of sense of belonging to the place of current residence

68% of IDPs feel themselves integrated, according to IOM f2f survey (vs. 56% in Round 5). This figure is 60%, according to IFES survey, while the World Bank survey shows 33% of those who are integrated ("yes" answers). Apart from the differences in the sample design, this difference in figures can partly be explained by different types

of scales: IOM used a 3-point scale (yes, partly, no), IFES – a 4-point scale (totally and somewhat agree / totally and somewhat disagree), and the World Bank – a 2-point scale (yes/no options).

Moreover, according to IFES survey, 35% have a local residence registration, 10% intend to receive it; 49% feel a stronger attachment to the former community, and 30% – to the present community.

According to World Bank survey, "hosts and IDPs tend to report that relations have improved over time as hosts and residents grow more familiar with other's lives and share many of the same hardships. Key exceptions to this integration are pensioners that appear to be more socially isolated as unemployed IDPs and those living in sanatoriums (collective housing for IDPs). Nevertheless, despite improvements in social relations, IDPs state they rarely feel "at home" in their locations. They cite being unable to own a home, to have a large networks of family and relatives around them, and to have economic safety nets that come with strong family bonds as factors in their alienation".

The surveys indicated different shares of "integrated" IDPs – 33%-68% – partly because of different scales and formulations measuring the level of integration. Different surveys show the tendency of increasing number of "integrated" IDPs. 35% of IDPs have the local residence registration and 10% intend to receive it; 49% feel a stronger attachment to the former community, and 30% - to the present community.

8.2. Measures of general trust in neighbours vs. the Ukrainian population

64% of IDPs vs. 73% of the general population trust their neighbours.

Table 8.2.1 Comparison between the general population and IDPs by trust to neighbours

	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Fully Trust	18%	6%
Somewhat Trust	55%	58%
Somewhat Mistrust	12%	15%
Fully Mistrust	6%	9%
Difficult to answer	9%	12%

Source: SCORE survey

64% of IDPs vs. 73% of the general population trust their neighbours.

8.3. Participation in community organizations / activities

According to the World Bank survey, "IDPs and hosts tend to participate in civic activities in the same proportion (18% of IDPs and 20% of hosts)".

According to IFES survey, 40% agree that they are active members of the community, while 45% disagree with it.

IDPs and hosts tend to participate in civic activities in the same proportion: 18% of IDPs and 20% of hosts. At the same time, 45% of IDPs consider themselves to be active members of the community.

8.4. Discrimination experienced by IDPs on account of their displacement

According to IFES survey, 81% of IDPs confirmed that they were welcomed by host communities, while 11% denied that.

According to IOM f2f survey, discrimination based on a IDP status was experienced by 10%. The IDPs reported that cases of discrimination based on their status were experienced in the following: housing (46%), employment (31%), healthcare (22%), and daily interactions with the local population (19%).

In the World Bank survey two types of discrimination were measured – discrimination by local authorities (10%) and by other residents (13%).

According to the World Bank survey, IDPs in Donbas and neighbouring oblasts feel discrimination from residents more often (about 15%) than in the other oblasts (about 10%).

However, the SCORE survey shows the opposite tendency when measuring social tensions: “In some areas, there are significant social tensions and hostility between the permanent residents and the IDPs (especially in Zhytomyr, Chernihiv, Odesa and Lviv oblasts, and Kyiv (urban)). Basically, more tension and hostility is observed in the areas which are away from the conflict zone”. Presumably, a higher discrimination in Donbas and neighbouring oblasts could be explained by the fact that there are many IDPs in these oblasts, and they are discriminated as the group which uses local resources, while in the other oblasts the number of IDPs is low and they are not perceived as a threat for local resources. At the same time, IDPs in Donbas and neighbouring oblasts could feel hostility and social tension less often than in the other oblasts because they closer to hosts by mentality.

It is notable that 31% of IDPs believe they cannot publicly express their views vs. 24% of the general population, according to SCORE survey.

Table 8.4. Comparison between the general population and IDPs by estimation of freedom of speech

«To what extent do you feel that the communities you identify with can publicly express their beliefs and ways of life?»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Yes, very much	15%	12%
Yes, to some extent	38%	28%
Not really	16%	20%
Not at all	8%	11%
Difficult to answer	22%	30%

Source: SCORE survey

According to the UNHCR participatory assessment the worst situation is recorded for the persons who referred to vulnerable groups before their displacement: “IDPs with disabilities or of Roma or Crimean Tatar origin complained of experiencing discrimination based on their disability or ethnic/religious backgrounds. LGBTI group says that aggression and assault were more prevalent in their home regions, especially in Crimea, and they felt safer in Kyiv. A transgender couple complained about inability to change their names in any documents in accordance with their gender identity, thereby exposing them to significant protection risks”. Roma IDPs mostly experience discrimination in all the areas; they are also often illiterate and have no documents. Moreover, they report about double stigma as Roma and IDPs:

“We used to tell others that we are from Dagestan, so that others could talk to us as to normal people. Since they know that we are Roma from Donetsk, I am afraid of walking with my children freely outside in the yard. Local children call my children with bad words and beat them; they call us “dirty refugees”.
(Roma IDP from Donetsk living in Kyiv)

IDPs from Crimea indicate they had a limited access to government or bank services when they were considered non-residents.

IDPs are also deprived of the right to vote at the local elections. According to IFES survey, only 4% voted at the local elections in 2015, and the same figure is revealed by IOM combined data. According to IFES survey, only 37% of those who did not vote were not willing to vote – the majority of the others consider that they don't have a right to vote, and this is true in case of absence of the local residence registration (according to IFES survey, only 35% of IDPs have got it).

Only 7% voted at the national parliamentary elections, while only 39% of those who didn't vote were not willing to do it – the majority of others consider that they don't have a right to vote. If IDPs are registered by MoSP, there is the procedure for them to register to vote at the national elections, but the survey shows that IDPs are mostly unaware of this procedure.

According to different surveys, 10%-13% of IDPs suffered discrimination from hosts and 10% – from the local authorities. The level of discrimination of IDPs in Donbas and neighbouring oblasts is higher than in the other oblasts, while the social tension is lower. Presumably, the higher discrimination in Donbas and neighbouring oblasts could be explained by the fact that there are many IDPs in these oblasts, and they are discriminated as the group which uses local resources, while in the other oblasts the share of IDPs is low, and they are not perceived as a threat for the local resources. At the same time, IDPs in Donbas and neighbouring oblasts could feel hostility and social tension less often than in the other oblasts because they are closer to hosts by mentality.

The most discriminated groups are IDPs with double stigma (Roma and LGBTI) and IDPs with disabilities and Crimean Tatars. IDPs from Crimea indicate they had a limited access to government or bank services as they were considered non-residents.

IDPs are deprived of the right to vote at the local elections – only 4% of IDPs voted in the local elections (they don't have the right to vote without the local registration), and only 37% of those who didn't vote were not willing to do it.

8.5. Families that are separated

According to the World Bank survey, 78% of IDPs indicate they left no members of their household behind in NGCAs; the rest report that their relatives remained in NGCA did not resettle due to age, bad health or difficulty in moving, fear of unemployment, fear of leaving property unattended, or fear of leaving their businesses.

According to IOM f2f survey, relatives and friends residing in NCGA are the source of information about NCGA for 47% of IDPs.

22% of IDPs have relatives in NGCA who did not resettle due to age, bad health or difficulty in moving, fear of unemployment, fear of leaving property unattended, or fear of leaving their businesses.

8.6. Specific situation in particular groups

According to SCORE survey, 24% of IDPs lack money for food and/or clothes vs. 14% among the general population. As for the age categories of IDPs, persons aged 60+ are the most economically vulnerable – 45% of them lack money for food and/or clothes vs. 19% among IDPs aged 18-59. The same situation is recorded for the general population of Ukraine, but IDPs aged 60+ are more vulnerable than the general population of Ukraine aged 60+ (25% among the latter lack money for food). There is no difference in vulnerability of men and women aged 60+, but women are significantly more vulnerable than men among those aged 18-59 – 23% of women vs. 12% of men of this age category lack money for food.

Table 8.6.1. Comparison between IDPs aged 18-59 and 60+ by self-evaluation of wellbeing

«Which of the statements best describes your current financial situation and your family living with you?»	IDPs 18-59 y.o.			IDPs 60+ y.o.		
	male	female	Total	male	female	Total
We lack money even for food	12%	23%	19%	50%	42%	45%
We have enough money for food, but are not always able to buy clothes	46%	45%	46%	35%	47%	43%
We always have money for food and clothes, but we cannot always afford household electronics or other expensive goods	37%	27%	30%	12%	10%	11%
We have enough money for household electronics or other expensive goods, but we cannot afford a car or an apartment	5%	4%	4%	2%	1%	1%

Source: SCORE survey

Table 8.6.2. Comparison between IDPs aged 60+ and the general population of Ukraine aged 60+

«Which of the statements best describes your current financial situation and your family living with you?»*	IDPs 60+ y.o.			Population 60+ y.o.		
	male	female	Total	male	female	Total
We lack money even for food	50%	42%	45%	22%	27%	25%
We have enough money for food, but are not always able to buy clothes	35%	47%	43%	49%	47%	47%
We always have money for food and clothes, but we cannot always afford household electronics or other expensive goods	12%	10%	11%	27%	23%	24%
We have enough money for household electronics or other expensive goods, but we cannot afford a car or an apartment	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	3%
We can afford a car or other goods of similar cost, when needed	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%

Source: SCORE survey

According to the SCORE survey, IDPs aged 18-59 with children are slightly more vulnerable than those without children – 66% vs. 62%, respectively, lack money for food and/or clothes – but this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 8.6.3. Comparison between IDPs aged 18-59 with and without children by self-evaluation of wellbeing

« Which of the statements best describes your current financial situation and your family living with you?»	IDPs without children (<60 y.o.)	IDPs with children (<60 y.o.)
We lack money even for food	19%	19%
We have enough money for food, but are not always able to buy clothes	43%	47%
We always have money for food and clothes, but we cannot always afford household electronics or other expensive goods	32%	30%
We have enough money for household electronics or other expensive goods, but we cannot afford a car or an apartment	5%	4%
We can afford a car or other goods of similar cost, when needed	1%	1%

Source: SCORE survey

Among gender and age categories of the most economically vulnerable IDPs there are those aged 60+ (both men and women), women aged 18-59, and IDPs with children.

9. Economic integration at place of current residence

9.1. Labour force participation and unemployment rate among IDPs comparing to the general population of Ukraine

Due to the different age structure of the sample (see Chapter 2.2.) it is problematic and incorrect to compare labour participation rate revealed by different surveys – the share of IDPs aged 60+ and students is higher, while the labour participation rate is lower. Comparison of labour participation rate before and after the displacement is more informative: according to IOM f2f survey, 61% of IDPs were employed before the displacement vs. 46% after the displacement. The World Bank survey shows a significantly smaller difference – 47% vs. 41%. At the same time, 91% of those who were working before the displacement had permanent employment compared to 78% of working IDPs who had permanent employment at the moment of the survey.

Table 9.1.1. Employment of IDPs before and after displacement

	IOM f2f survey		The World Bank survey	
	Before displacement	After displacement	Before displacement	After displacement
Employed	61%	46%	47%	41%
Unemployed (including temporarily unemployed and looking or not looking for a job, etc.)	39%	54%	53%	59%

According to IOM f2f surveys, the employment rate increased from 35% in June 2016 to 46% in June 2017.

GfK Ukraine researchers extracted the subsample of IDPs aged 18-59 from the IFES survey database and compared the employment rate of this age category with the respective age category in the general population: 49% among IDPs of this age category are employed vs. 66% of the general population, as revealed by GfK Ukraine Omnibus data in December 2016 (the same period when IFES survey fieldwork was performed). 14% of IDPs aged 18-59 (12% of men and 15% of women) are unemployed vs. 11% of the general population (12% of men and 9% of women). The unemployment rate is the lowest in the oblasts neighbouring to Donbas (10%), while in Donbas and the other oblasts it is similar (about 14%).

Table 9.1.2. Employment of IDPs aged 18-59

	Male	Female	Total
Employed full-time at one job	47%	29%	36%
Employed part-time at one job	6%	6%	6%
Employed at more than one part-time job	6%	2%	4%
Private entrepreneur	4%	2%	3%
Student	11%	5%	7%
Pensioner	8%	7%	8%
Not employed, not seek for a job	1%	4%	3%
Not employed, seek for a job	12%	15%	14%
Temporarily not working (i.e. on maternity leave or illness)	1%	18%	11%
Homemaker, look after family members (except for maternity leave)	1%	10%	6%
Don't know	1%	0%	0%
Refused	1%	2%	2%
Other - Volunteer	1%	0%	1%

Source: IFES survey

According to IFES survey, 10% work part-time among the employed IDPs aged 18-59 comparing to 8% among the general employed population, as revealed by GfK Ukraine Omnibus.

According to different surveys, 6%-15% of IDPs who were employed before the displacement were unemployed at the moment of the survey. 14% of IDPs aged 18-59 (12% of men and 15% of women) are unemployed and searching for the job vs. 11% of the general population (12% of men and 9% of women).

In addition, 91% of those who were working before displacement had permanent employment compared to 78% of working IDPs who had permanent employment at the moment of the survey.

9.2. Main obstacles/constraints to employment

As mentioned above, according to both IOM f2f and World Bank surveys, about one third of IDPs complained that jobs did not meet their qualifications (namely, IOM f2f survey revealed a declined share of those employed in the industry and the increased share of those employed in the services sector after displacement). At the same time, a few among the unemployed IDPs would like retraining/receiving education or starting own business, according to IOM f2f survey (see Chapter 6.6.).

According to FGD results of IOM survey of Round 5, "IDPs reported they had problems with employment due to low salaries and lack of opportunities in the labor market in rural areas and small towns. FGD participants named age and disability as restraining factors for employment, and corruption as the main constraint. These barriers were named as relevant for both local residents and IDPs"

According to the World Bank survey, "the reasons why IDPs find difficulties in finding more predictable and permanent employment are the shortage of jobs (layoffs, closure of enterprises due to the economic crisis, the seasonal nature of some employment), as well as low wages, poor terms, and exploitative working conditions. Many respondents believe that it is difficult to find a highly paid job without connections, something that IDPs generally lack in their new place of residence. Several IDPs in focus groups also complain of discrimination against Donbas residents in hiring practices (some well-paid jobs are described as "hereditary"). Women's employment is limited by their family responsibilities. Female IDPs in focus groups suggest that childcare that was once provided by relatives in NGCAs was no longer available. Other female participants mention that employers prefer hiring men to women since women may take maternity leave and are perceived as taking sick leave more often."

About one third of IDPs complain that jobs do not meet their qualifications. Along with difficulties in finding permanent jobs in compliance with their qualifications, other employment constraints are lack of social ties which could help find a highly paid job), age and gender discrimination (employers prefer hiring younger to older, and men to women), family responsibilities (women complained that childcare that was once provided by their relatives in NGCAs was no longer available), and disability.

9.3. Loans and debts

According to IOM f2f survey, 5% of IDPs had loans or debt obligations (vs. 9% in Round 4).

Considering a low financial status of IDPs, some improvements in the access to credits for home owning, home repairing and business for IDPs are recommended with the other measures, in the World Bank survey report.

In spite of financial difficulties, only 5% of IDPs had loans or debt obligations.

9.4. Sources of livelihood and access to pensions and social benefits

According to IOM f2f survey, the most important sources of income are salary and government IDP support (61% for each). One in three (35%) of respondents mentioned social assistance and retirement pensions as important sources of subsistence. The share of those who indicate salary as primary source of income is increasing within Rounds 4-6.

Table 9.4.1. Main sources of income in the IDP surveyed household in the past 12 months

	IDPs
Salary	61%
Government IDP support	61%
Retirement or long service pension	35%
Social assistance	32%
Irregular earnings	16%
Humanitarian assistance	14%
Financial support from relatives	8%
Disability pension	6%
Social pension	4%
Other	2%

Source: IOM f2f survey

IOM phone survey of Round 5 revealed the tendency that the share of IDPs who stated salary as the main source of income increased as they moved from the contact line – presumably, it correlates with a decreasing share of pensioners.

The World Bank survey confirms this tendency: “the average income of IDP household is somewhat higher in the oblasts located further from the conflict zone; while the level of social assistance and humanitarian aid as a percentage of income declines with a distance from Donbas». In Kyiv and Kyiv oblast, the salary is mentioned as the main source of income, while in the Donbas region, «pensions are a greater source of income for IDPs. This may be due to the increased numbers of older residents and IDPs in Donbas with large numbers of the youth (<35 years of age) having left for urban areas westwards. IDPs from the territories located near the conflict zone more often mention receiving humanitarian aid and having the access to reserves of food and other essentials”.

The World Bank survey reveals 74% of IDPs who receive social support payments, but "social assistance infrequently totals more than 1000 UAH per month, and salaries are the main source of income for nearly half of IDPs, followed by social assistance and pensions".

As mentioned in IOM survey, 22% of IDPs indicate that they had their social payments suspended. 89% of them specified that they faced suspension of the government IDP support, 9% - suspension of retirement pension, 8% - allowances for children, and 5% - disability assistance.

Table 9.4.2 Distribution of IDPs by type of suspended social payments, % of respondents who have had social payments suspended

	IDPs
Government IDP support	89%
Retirement pension	9%
Allowance for children	8%
Disability assistance	5%
Other type of pensions	3%

Source: IOM f2f survey

Out of IDPs who had experienced the suspension of social payments, 72% did not receive any official notification of the suspension nor information on the procedures to renew the payments, while 72% were aware of the procedure on how to renew the payments.

According to the FGD results of the IOM survey, "the suspension of social payments had extremely negative consequences for the well-being of some IDPs, as they lost their main source of income for a period of two to six months."

According to the UNHCR participatory assessment, IDPs perceive inspections as humiliating:

"I can compare our current lives with the life in the deportation settlement back in the Soviet Union, as on a monthly basis we have to appear in front of authorities to confirm we are still here. We are being treated as the prisoners of Ukraine."

Man, aged 65, displaced to Kharkiv from Donetsk

The primary sources of income of IDPs are salary and government IDP support. The average income of IDP households is higher in oblasts located far away from the conflict zone, while the level of social assistance and humanitarian aid as a percentage of income declines with a distance from Donbas. It correlates with a decreasing share of pensioners.

22% of IDPs state that they had their social payments suspended. In most cases, IDPs faced suspension of government IDP support. Mostly, they knew how to renew the payments, but perceived those procedures as humiliating.

10. Housing and property issues

10.1. Current residence type

According to IOM f2f survey, 65% of IDPs live in rented housing and “even when employed, renting was identified as a serious problem for IDP families and purchasing their own housing viewed as impossible”. 23% of IDPs live with relatives or hosting families, and only 2% of IDPs – in their own housing in GCA.

The World Bank survey shows that 27% of IDPs own an apartment and 12% – a house or a summer house. Unfortunately, there was no question whether this property is in GCA or NGCA. However, according to IOM survey (which shows only 2% of those who live in own housing), we can assume that it remained in NGCA/contact line/“liberated areas”.

Table 10.1. IDPs accommodation types

	IDPs
Rented apartment	42%
Host family / relatives	23%
Rented house	16%
Rented room in an apartment	7%
Dormitory	6%
Collective centres ²⁶	4%
Own housing	2%

Source: IOM f2f survey

As mentioned above, according to UNHCR participatory assessment, “it was reported in the FGDs held in Schastia and Stanitsa Luhanska that the rent prices for IDPs were higher than for the locals”.

Fostering of more regulation and formality in establishing legal contracts and leasing in the local housing market are recommended by the World Bank report.

65% of IDPs live in rented housing, 23% – with their relatives or hosting families, 10% live in dormitories and collective centres and only 2% – in own housing. FGD participants mentioned the cases of higher rent prices for IDPs than for locals.

10.2. Adequacy/inadequacy of housing

According to SCORE survey, the level of satisfaction with housing is lower among the IDPs – 54% comparing to 65% among the general population of Ukraine.

Table 10.2.1 Satisfaction with housing

«To what extent are you satisfied with housing?»	General adult population of GCA of Ukraine	IDPs
Yes, very much	19%	16%
Yes, to some extent	46%	38%
Not really	22%	29%
Not at all	9%	12%
Difficult to answer	4%	5%

Source: SCORE survey

However, the majority of IDPs were satisfied with the utilities, insulation and living space according to IOM f2f survey. At the same time, FGD results showed that “In order to limit expenses, some IDP families jointly rented housing”.

²⁶ Ibid.

Table 10.2.2 IDPs satisfaction with living conditions

	IDPs
Electricity	95%
Safety	93%
Sewerage	89%
Water supply	88%
Heating	81%
Insulation	80%
Living space	75%

Source: IOM f2f survey

The level of satisfaction with housing is lower among the IDPs comparing to the general population of Ukraine - 54% vs. 65%. Living space is the most problematic issue – 25% of IDPs are dissatisfied with it.

11. Legal issues

11.1. Registration as an IDP

According to IOM f2f survey and the World Bank survey, 5% of IDPs are not registered, while IFES survey revealed 9% of such IDPs. According to IFES survey, 38% have not registered because they have problems with documents required for the registration and 58% – because they don't want to.

According to IFES survey, most of the unregistered IDPs are males (61%). No significant differences with the total IDP population are observed in terms of age structure. Unregistered IDPs are more often employed and have a higher income. However, a higher income in this group is recorded because of those who do not want to register as IDP (thus, do not seek for IDP payments), those who would like to register have low incomes.

According to different surveys, 5%-9% of IDPs are not registered by MoSP, and 38% have not registered because they have problems with documents required for the registration, and 58% – because they don't want to.

11.2. Risks of statelessness among IDPs

According to the survey of stateless persons in two oblasts conducted by GfK Ukraine for NGO "Right to Protection" with the support of UNHCR, 1% of adult IDPs in Kyiv and Kyiv oblast and 2% in Kharkiv oblasts have no valid passport and possibility of receiving it. One stateless IDP-child was identified in Kyiv.

1% of adult IDPs in Kyiv and Kyiv oblast and 2% in Kharkiv oblasts have no valid passport and possibility of receiving it.

Attachment 1. IDP surveys conducted in 2014-2017

1. Name of the study: [Thematic report "Internal displacement in Ukraine"](#)

Data owner: SMM OSCE

Supplier: SMM OSCE

Fieldwork dates: June-July 2014.

Sample: mixed (individual households and collective centres) – 400 IDPs through interviews and FGDs

Geographical coverage: Is not indicated

2. Name of the study: [Representative public opinion polls of citizens of Ukraine](#)

Data owner: PACT Inc. / UNITER project funded by USAID

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: September 2014.

Sample: collective centres – 198 IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kharkiv oblast; Kyiv oblast; Zaporizhia oblast.

3. Name of the study: [Human Trafficking Risk Assessment for Internally Displaced Persons in Ukraine](#)

Data owner: International Women's Rights Centre "La Strada-Ukraine"

Supplier: The Ukrainian Institute of Social Studies of O.Yaremenko

Fieldwork dates: December 2014 - January 2015.

Sample: individual households²⁷ - 1000 IDPs; Special groups of IDPs – 403 returned IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Is not indicated.

4. Name of the study: Survey on trust towards the government and reforms expectations²⁸

Data owner: Mason Change Communications

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: wave1: November – December 2014 / Wave 2: February-March 2015.

Sample: individual households* – 400 IDPs; collective centres – IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kharkiv oblast; Kyiv oblast; Zaporizhia oblast.

5. Name of the study: [Regarding internally displaced persons' need of employment](#)

Data owner: State Employment Service of Ukraine (SES)

Supplier: State Employment Service of Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: May 2015.

Sample: special groups of IDPs – 3391 IDPs-applicants to SES.

Geographical coverage: Is not indicated.

6. Name of the study: [Employment needs assessment and employability of internally displaced persons in Ukraine](#)

Data owner: International Labour Organization (ILO)

Supplier: Kyiv International Institute of Sociology

Fieldwork dates: June 2015.

Sample: mixed (individual households and collective centres) – 2000 IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kharkiv oblast; Kyiv oblast; Luhansk oblast (GCA); Lviv oblast; Odesa oblast; Poltava oblast; Zaporizhia oblast; Kyiv city.

²⁷ Hereinafter, "individual households" mean that collective centres are excluded or not mentioned in the survey description

²⁸ Hereinafter, absence of hyperlink means that the report is not available in open sources

7.Name of the study: [Shelter & NFI Needs Assessment](#)

Data owner: Emergency Shelter / NFI Cluster in Ukraine

Supplier: REACH, Norwegian Refugee Council, Danish Refugee Council, UNHCR

Fieldwork dates: June-July 2015.

Sample: individual households – 2573 IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kharkiv oblast; Luhansk oblast (GCA); Zaporizhia oblast.

8.Name of the study: [Comfort index of IDP](#)

Data owner: Community initiative “Restoring Donbass”

Supplier: Kantar TNS Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: July-August 2015.

Sample: individual households – 1000 IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Luhansk oblast (GCA); Lviv oblast; Mykolaiv oblast; Zaporizhia oblast; Kyiv city.

9.Name of the study: [Study of needs of communities participated in project “Community stabilization assessment in Donbass region”](#)

Data owner: The IOM Mission in Ukraine

Supplier: IOM and local initiative teams coordinated by sociologist M. Savva

Fieldwork dates: October-November 2015.

Sample: individual households – 239 IDPs and 10 collective interviews (92 IDPs)

Geographical coverage: Donetsk oblast (GCA); Luhansk oblast (GCA).

10.Name of the study: The survey of Kharkiv residents towards the European integration and related issues

Data owner: International Renaissance Foundation (IRF)

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: October-November 2015.

Sample: collective centres – 150 IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Kharkiv oblast.

11.Name of the study: [Sociological survey aimed at defining vulnerabilities of human trafficking and level of awareness regarding human traffic of children and youth](#)

Data owner: International Organization for Migration (IOM).

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: October-December 2015.

Sample: special groups of IDPs – 200 children-IDPs aged 13-17.

Geographical coverage: Cherkasy oblast; Chernihiv oblast; Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kharkiv oblast; Kherson oblast; Khmelnytskyi oblast; Kyiv oblast; Luhansk oblast (GCA); Lviv oblast; Odesa oblast; Poltava oblast; Rivne oblast; Sumy oblast; Ternopil oblast; Vinnytsia oblast; Volyn oblast; Zakarpattia oblast; Zaporizhia oblast; Zhytomyr oblast.

12.Name of the study: Socio-economic vulnerability and institutional fragility in Ukraine

Data owner: UNDP

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: wave1: June-July wave2: October-November 2015.

Sample: individual households – 1000 IDPs; collective centres – 1000 IDPs

Geographical coverage: Cherkasy oblast; Chernihiv oblast; Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Ivano-Frankivsk oblast; Kharkiv oblast; Kherson oblast; Khmelnytskyi oblast; Kyiv oblast; Kirovohrad oblast; Luhansk oblast (GCA); Lviv oblast; Mykolaiv oblast; Odessa oblast; Poltava oblast; Sumy oblast; Vinnytsia oblast; Zaporizhia oblast; Zhytomyr oblast; Kyiv city.

13.Name of the study: Outcome Evaluations and Perceptions Surveys

Data owner: Chemonics Int., UCBI initiative supported by USAID

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: 2015-2016.

Sample: individual households – 3 FGDs with IDPs; 50 in-depth telephone interviews with IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kharkiv oblast; Lviv oblast; Odesa oblast; Zaporizhia oblast; Kyiv city.

14.Name of the study: [Identification problems related to the access to secondary education for the children of IDPs](#)

Data owner: UNICEF

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: January 2016.

Sample: special groups of IDPs – 5 FGDs with children-IDPs aged 14-17 y.o. who continuously or regularly do not attend school (not including those who have completed 9 grades and finished studying); 5 FGDs with IDP parents whose children in the school-age continuously or regularly do not attend school.

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kyiv.

15. Name of the study: Roma Health and Nutrition Survey

Data owner: World Health Organization

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: February-April 2016.

Sample: special groups of IDPs – 234 Roma IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kyiv oblast; Kirovohrad oblast; Odesa oblast; Rivne oblast; Zakarpattia oblast;

16. Name of the study: [National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons - Round 1](#)

Data owner: The IOM Mission in Ukraine

Supplier: Ukrainian Centre for Social Reforms

Fieldwork dates: March 2016

Sample: mixed (individual households and collective centres) – 600; special groups of IDPs – 2048 IOM beneficiaries & 473 KI (incl. IDPs).

Geographical coverage: The survey was conducted throughout all regions of Ukraine, except for occupied territories of Crimea and Donbas

17.Name of the study: [National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons - Round 2](#)

Data owner: The IOM Mission in Ukraine

Supplier: Ukrainian Centre for Social Reforms

Fieldwork dates: April 2016.

Sample: mixed (individual households and collective centres) – 600 IDPs

Special groups of IDPs: 1114 IOM beneficiaries & 600 KI (incl. IDP).

Geographical coverage: The survey was conducted throughout all regions of Ukraine, except for occupied territories of Crimea and Donbas.

18.Name of the study: [Monitoring collective centres for internally displaced persons in Dnipropetrovs.k, Donetsk, Zaporizhzhya, Luhansk and Kharkiv Regions](#)

Data owner: Charity Fund "Right to Protection"

Supplier: Charity Fund "Right to Protection"

Fieldwork dates: April 2016.

Sample: collective centres – 329 IDPs

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kharkiv oblast; Luhansk oblast (GCA); Zaporizhia oblast.

19. Name of the study: Focus groups on political issues

Data owner: IRI

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: March-April 2016.

Sample: individual households – 2 FGDs with IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA).

20. Name of the study: [Social Cohesion and Reconciliation \(SCORE\) Index - Population Survey](#)

Data owner: Chemonics Int., UCBI initiative supported by USAID

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: April-May 2016.

Sample: individual households – 1075 IDPs; collective centres – 525 IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kharkiv oblast; Kyiv oblast; Luhansk oblast (GCA); Odesa oblast; Zaporizhia oblast; Zhytomyr oblast; Kyiv.

21. Name of the study: [National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons - Round 3](#)

Data owner: The IOM Mission in Ukraine

Supplier: Ukrainian Centre for Social Reforms

Fieldwork dates: May 2016.

Sample: mixed (individual households and collective centres) – 600 IDPs.

Geographical coverage: The survey was conducted throughout all regions of Ukraine, except for occupied territories of the Crimea and Donbas.

22. Name of the study: [Community stabilization assessment in Eastern Ukraine](#)

Data owner: International Organization for Migration (IOM).

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: May-July 2016.

Sample: individual households – 118; special groups of IDPs – 450 interviews with IOM beneficiaries who received grants for small business development & 165 KI (incl. IDPs).

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kharkiv oblast; Luhansk oblast (GCA); Odesa oblast; Poltava oblast; Zaporizhia oblast.

23. Name of the study: [Inter-agency vulnerability assessment in Luhansk and Donetsk oblasts](#)

Data owner: REACH as chair of the Technical Assessment Working Group (TAWG)

Supplier: ADRA, DRC, GOAL, HelpAge International, NRC, OCHA, PIN, R2P, UNHCR, UN Women

Fieldwork dates: July-August 2016.

Sample: individual households – 1149 IDPs.

Geographical coverage: Donetsk oblast (GCA); Luhansk oblast (GCA).

24. Name of the study: [All-Ukrainian survey of internally displaced persons and residents of host communities](#)

Data owner: Internews Network

Supplier: Kyiv International Institute of Sociology

Fieldwork dates: July-August 2016.

Sample: individual households – 1003 IDPs.

Geographical coverage: The survey was conducted throughout all regions of Ukraine, except for occupied territories of the Crimea and Donbas.

25. Name of the study: [National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons - Round 4](#)

Data owner: The IOM Mission in Ukraine

Supplier: Ukrainian Centre for Social Reforms

Fieldwork dates: September 2016.

Sample: mixed (individual households and collective centres) – 2000 f2f & 2532 telephone; special groups of IDPs – 792 KI & 6 FGDs with KI (incl. IDPs).

Geographical coverage: The survey was conducted throughout all regions of Ukraine, except for occupied territories of Crimea and Donbas.

26. Name of the study: Behavioural practices of HIV-positive adults

Data owner: All-Ukrainian Charitable Organization 'All-Ukrainian Network of PLWH'

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: August-November 2016.

Sample: special groups of IDPs – 251 HIV-positive IDPs.

Geographical coverage: The survey was conducted throughout all regions of Ukraine, except for occupied territories of Crimea and Donbas.

27. Name of the study: [Socio-Economic Impacts of Internal Displacement and Veteran Return](#)

Data owner: World Bank Group

Supplier: Kyiv International Institute of Sociology / CADMUS

Fieldwork dates: November-December 2016.

Sample: mixed (individual households and collective centres) – 2000 IDPs.

Geographical coverage: The survey was conducted throughout all regions of Ukraine, except for occupied territories of Crimea and Donbas.

28. Name of the study: Survey of IDPs on electoral issues

Data owner: IFES

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: December 2016.

Sample: individual households – 1748 ; Collective centres – 410.

Geographical coverage: Cherkasy oblast; Chernihiv oblast; Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kharkiv oblast; Kherson oblast; Khmelnytskyi oblast; Kyiv oblast; Kirovohrad oblast; Luhansk oblast (GCA); Lviv oblast; Odesa oblast; Rivne oblast; Sumy oblast; Zaporizhia oblast; Zhytomyr oblast; Kyiv city.

29. Name of the study: [National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons - Round 5](#)

Data owner: The IOM Mission in Ukraine

Supplier: Ukrainian Centre for Social Reforms

Fieldwork dates: February-March 2017.

Sample: mixed (individual households and collective centres) – 1025 f2f & 3132 telephone; special groups of IDPs – 410 interviews with KI & 5 FGDs with KI (incl. IDPs and returnees to the non-government-controlled area)

Geographical coverage: The survey was conducted throughout all regions of Ukraine, except for occupied territories of Crimea and Donbas.

30. Name of the study: [The Displaced Ukrainians. Who are they, and what do they think?](#)

Data owner: Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS)

Supplier: N/A

Fieldwork dates: November-December 2016.

Sample: individual households – 1000.

Geographical coverage: Dnipropetrovsk oblast; Donetsk oblast (GCA); Kharkiv oblast; Kyiv oblast; Luhansk oblast (GCA); Lviv oblast; Kyiv.

31. Name of the study: UNHCR participatory survey

Data owner: UNHCR

Supplier: UNHCR

Fieldwork dates: February-March 2017

Sample: 123 focus groups with IDPs grouped according to their age and gender as well as to diversity and vulnerability criteria (persons with disabilities, serious medical conditions, single mothers, orphans, LGBTI, those living dispersed or in collective centres, in urban and rural settings)

32. Name of the study: Survey of stateless citizens in Kharkiv and Kyiv oblast

Data owner: Charity Fund "Right to Protection"

Supplier: GfK Ukraine

Fieldwork dates: April 2017.

Sample: individual households*– 400; special groups of IDPs – IDIs with stateless IDPs

Geographical coverage: Kharkiv oblast; Kyiv oblast; Kyiv city.

33. Name of the study: [National monitoring system of the situation with internally displaced persons - Round 6](#)

Data owner: The IOM Mission in Ukraine

Supplier: Ukrainian Centre for Social Reforms

Fieldwork dates: April-June 2017.

Sample: mixed (individual households and collective centres) – 1025 f2f & 3109 telephone; special groups of IDPs – 411 interviews with KI & 2 FGDs with KI, 2 FGDs with IDPs and one FGD with returnees to the NGCA.

Geographical coverage: The survey was conducted throughout all regions of Ukraine, except for occupied territories of Crimea and Donbas.