

UKRAINE RETURNS REPORT

25 NOVEMBER - 5 DECEMBER 2022



Irpin,
© IOM 2022

In partnership with _____



Co-funded by
the European Union



INTRODUCTION

Starting on 24 February 2022, a large-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine triggered an unprecedented humanitarian crisis across the country, characterised by, among other elements, the displacement of a significant proportion of the Ukrainian population.

As early as April 2022, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) began observing significant movements of displaced people back to their habitual place of residence (hereafter, "returns"). Conditions of return vary widely, as returnees arrive back to areas not directly affected by the war, but which have experienced a significant influx of internally displaced people (IDPs), as well as to conflict-affected areas and areas recently retaken by the Government of Ukraine which have sustained severe damage. Due to the volatility of the current situation, it is impossible to determine what proportion of the returns observed at present are permanent or temporary. Existing data shows, however, that the returnee population in Ukraine is characterized by a unique set of needs and vulnerabilities which set it apart from those who had never been displaced as well as from IDPs.

In the context of [the UN Secretary General's Action Agenda on Internal Displacement](#), and to support partners in providing targeted, evidence-based assistance to those returning to their areas of habitual residence following a period of forced displacement, IOM presents the Ukraine Returns Report. This publication analyzes IOM's latest data on the situation and needs of the returnee population and on the conditions of return, collected through the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) assessments conducted in the country.

This report draws on data collected through the eleventh round of IOM's General Population Survey, conducted between 25 November and 5 December 2022. The scope of the assessment covers the adult population across all five macro-regions (West, East, North, Centre, South, and the city of Kyiv), with the exception of the Crimean peninsula and the areas outside the control of the Government of Ukraine. The general population survey was conducted using a random-digit-dial (RDD) approach, and 2,002 unique and anonymous respondents aged 18 and over were interviewed using the computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) method. Readers may also refer to [the Internal Displacement Report \(Round 11\)](#) for detailed analysis of data from this survey as related to the situation and needs of IDPs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	2
DEMOGRAPHICS	3
RETURN DYNAMICS	4
SECTOR SPOTLIGHT: SOLID FUEL NEED AND ACCESS	5
SECTOR SPOTLIGHT: FINANCIAL SAVINGS	6
SECTOR SPOTLIGHT: COPING STRATEGIES	7
SECTOR SPOTLIGHT: MEDICINES AND HEALTHCARE SERVICES	8
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SITUATION AND NEEDS	9
METHODOLOGY	10

A NOTE ON DEFINITION OF RETURN

For the purposes of this report, the terms "return" and "returnee" are used without prejudice to status and refer to all people currently in their place of habitual residence after a significant period of displacement (minimum of two weeks since February 2022*), regardless of whether they returned to these locations spontaneously from abroad or from displacement within Ukraine.

This definition excludes those who have come back to Ukraine from abroad but who have not returned to their places of habitual residence in country.

*This cut-off period has been shown as statistically most meaningful in terms of vulnerability following return as compared to the non-displaced population.

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The information contained in this report is for general information purposes only. The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the report do not imply expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

Unless noted otherwise, data cited in this report were compiled from Round 11 of the General Population Survey, dated as of December 5, 2022.

For further details or information please get in touch: DTMUkraine@IOM.int

© 2022 International Organization for Migration (IOM) All rights reserved. When quoting, paraphrasing or in any way using the information mentioned in this report, the source needs to be stated appropriately as follows: "Source: International Organization for Migration (IOM), Ukraine Returns Report, November/December 2022".

Photo: Residential buildings in the town of Irpin near Kyiv, badly damaged during the hostilities in February-March 2022.

OVERVIEW

5,914,000
EST. INTERNALLY
DISPLACED
-626,000 since 26 October


5,236,000
EST. TOTAL
RETURNEES
-701,000 since 26 October
(incl. 23% returns from abroad)

The full spectrum of results of Round 11 of IOM's General Population Survey is now presented in two complementary products, the [Ukraine Internal Displacement Report](#) and the [Ukraine Returns Report](#). Additional analysis is available upon request to DTMUkraine@iom.int.

ESTIMATED LOCATION OF RETURNEES BY MACRO-REGION*



DISPLACEMENT AND MOBILITY TRENDS



The [IOM glossary](#) defines **return** as "the act or process of going back or being taken back to the point of departure". Return can take place within a country's territorial borders, or between a country of destination or transit and a country of origin. National regulatory and legal frameworks in Ukraine do not offer an explicit definition of a returnee – a person who was forced or obliged to leave their habitual place of residence due to war and later returned. Practically, return can only be inferred through the cancellation or expiration of a previously secured status confirming displacement: a registration as an IDP on the basis of the Law of Ukraine "On Ensuring the Rights and Freedoms of Internally Displaced People" (June 1, 2014).

Alternatively, in cases of cross-border displacement, the expiration or cancellation of an international protection status in another country, e.g., Temporary Protection as granted by countries of the European Union to citizens of Ukraine who left the country

starting from February 24, 2022. Cancellation or expiration of the above, however, does not guarantee that a return has taken place. It is also well understood that not all displaced people register their displacement status. In the absence of a clear legal definition of a "returnee" in Ukrainian legislation, for the purpose of the assessment, IOM has identified returnees as those who are currently in their place of habitual residence, who indicate they have returned following a minimum of 2 weeks in displacement due to the war (since February 2022).

In Round 11 of the survey, of all respondents currently in their place of habitual residence, 15 per cent fall within the returnee definition, equivalent to an estimated 5,236,000 returnees as of 5 December. It is impossible to determine whether returns are permanent or temporary, though among returnees, 79 per cent indicate they are planning to remain in their homes (equivalent to 4.1 million), and 80 per cent have been in their homes for a period longer than one month.

*A macro-region is a territorial unit comprised of multiple oblasts (regions), as defined by the Law of Ukraine "On the Principles of State Regional Policy" (Article 1, item 2).

DEMOGRAPHICS

As of 5 December, and in line with demographics of the displaced population, the majority of returnees are female. Almost a quarter are infants and children under 18. Compared to October figures (Round 10 of the General Population Survey), IOM notes a slight increase in the proportion of male returnees.

In comparison to IDPs, a slightly higher proportion of the returnees were adults aged 18 to 59 (58%). As in Round 10, the share of elderly individuals among returnees (18%) is lower than among IDPs (21%), suggesting that elderly people continue to face substantial barriers to return.

Round 11 data indicate that there are around one million school-aged children in returnee households (5-17 years old), a number similar to results from Round 10 of the survey.

Returnee population demographic estimates (only HH containing members having experience of return)

Percentage of Returnees	Total	Male	Female
Infants (U1)*	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
Children U5 (excl. U1)*	5.1%	2.3%	2.7%
Children 5-17	18.8%	8.7%	10.1%
Adults 18-59	57.6%	23.9%	33.7%
Elderly (60+)	17.7%	7.4%	10.4%
Total	100.0%	42.6%	57.4%


Estimated group size	Total	Male	Female
Infants (U1)*	44,000	20,000	24,000
Children U5 (excl. U1)*	265,000	23,000	142,000
Children 5-17	983,000	455,000	528,000
Adults 18-59	3,016,000	1,250,000	1,766,000
Elderly (60+)	928,000	385,000	543,000

**The gender shares for children under 5 years old are estimated by applying the 2020 male to female birth ratio as reported by the State Statistics Service of Ukraine. All other data is based on the General Population survey.*

TYPE OF SETTLEMENT

The majority of returnees reside in large cities (52%), or in the suburbs of large cities (8%). Comparatively few returnee families had returned to rural areas (15%).

Percentage of returnee respondents by type of settlement



HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION


Returnee households commonly have three members (mean). However, 29 per cent of returnee households have four or more members. The majority of returnee families have one child (53%) with a further 34 per cent having two children.

Key demographic figures (as of 5 December 2022)

2.80 average returnee household size (returnee-only households) as of 27 October


1.60 average number of children per returnee-only household as of 27 October

Percentage of returnee respondents by number of household members and by number of children (among those with children)



HOUSEHOLD VULNERABILITIES

Percentage of returnee households reporting vulnerable household members (only HH containing members having experience of return)



Notably, 36 per cent of returnee families contain at least one elderly person aged 60 or above. A significant proportion of returnee households have at least one member who is chronically ill (33%), or has a disability (19%), and 12% of households have a child under five or an infant.

The proportion of households with vulnerable members does not differ significantly between IDP and returnee households for any category of vulnerability.

RETURN DYNAMICS

Between 27 October and 5 December, **the total stock of returnees decreased, from 5,936,000 to 5,236,000 individuals.** The decrease in Returnee estimate generated from Round 11 data is likely at least partially related to severe power cuts and disruption of phone networks, resulting in a sample with relatively fewer respondents in the North Macro-region (-3% compared to average of R10 and R9), an area with large concentration of returnees.

RETURNS AREAS RETAKEN BY GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE


Only 10 per cent of returnees have returned to areas that were recently retaken by the Government of Ukraine. However, in the North macro-region, around one in four returnees resides in areas that were brought back under the control of the Ukraine Government in March and April 2022 (27%). Returns to areas, previously not under the control of the Government of Ukraine in the east, have been less extensive. Only 11 per cent of returnees in the East reported that their current location was previously not under the Government of Ukraine's control, reflecting the more recent retaking of territory in the East as well as the volatile security situation and the extensive infrastructural and residential damage in many areas, all of which preclude returns (see page 5 for IDPs 'reasons for not returning').

TIME SINCE RETURN

134 average days elapsed since return following 284 days of war (as of 5 December 2022)
days

In Round 11 of the General Population Survey, 80 per cent of returnees reported having returned more than 30 days ago. Around one in three returnees returned to their place of habitual residence 5-7 months ago, primarily to Kyiv City and to the north of Ukraine once the territories returned under the control of Ukraine in March and April 2022. In the East of Ukraine, around one in four returnees had returned in the last 30 days and – given the volatility of the security situation and the extensive damage to residential buildings and infrastructure in territories, previously beyond control of the Government of Ukraine – those returning to the east may find successful return and reintegration the most challenging.

Share of returnee population by time elapsed since return




Returnees in the North and Kyiv City macro-regions typically returned earlier in the year (155 and 157 days on average, respectively), while returnees in the East, South, and Centre macro-regions have returned more recently on average (110, 99, and 131 days on average).

RETURN ROUTES

Data from Round 11 of the General Population Survey show a continuation of trends observed in Rounds 9 and 10. A growing proportion of returnees report returning home from places further away. In this vein, the data show a continuation of the share of individuals returning from abroad (also 23% in Round 10, up from 15% in Round 8). As of 5 December, an estimated 1,204,000 have returned spontaneously from abroad, compared to 1,366,000 estimated in Round 10 of the survey (as of September 26).

Percentage of returnees by type of location from which they returned



Returnees by macro-region

Macro-region of return	Share of returnees	Est. returnees
Kyiv	28%	1,488,000
East	22%	1,165,000
South	7%	377,000
West	11%	574,000
North	26%	1,345,000
Centre	5%	287,000
TOTAL	100%	5,236,000

Top five oblasts by share of returnees

Oblast	Share of returnees*	Est. returnees
Kyiv City	28%	1,487,000
Kyiv Region	15%	806,000
Kharkiv Region	13%	665,000
Odesa Region	5%	267,036
Dnipropetrovsk Region	5%	251,000
Other regions	34%	-

*Disclaimer: Origin and distribution of returnees by oblast (region) is only indicative – the sample is representative at the macro-region level.

RETURN DYNAMICS

Est. **582,000** IDPs considering return in the two weeks following the survey.

In Round 11 of the General Population Survey, 10 per cent of IDPs reported that they were considering return to their area of origin within two weeks of the interview. At the macro-regional level, this equates to around 219,000 IDPs currently displaced in the East of Ukraine (12%), the majority of whom are displaced from other locations in the East. Around 93,000 IDPs in central Ukraine (8%) and 88,000 in Kyiv (17%) also reported that they were considering returning in the two weeks after the interview. However, consideration of return does not necessarily equate to a journey being undertaken, and factors such as the ongoing disruption to utilities may impact upon the eventual decisions of displaced households to return.

Estimated number of IDPs considering return by macro-region of displacement



79% returnees plan to remain in their current location

Est. **430,000** returnees are considering leaving their current location.

Among all returnees, eight per cent, equivalent to 430,000 people were considering leaving their current location. A further 10 per cent, equivalent to 538,000 returnees may consider leaving, depending on situation. Returnees in the east of Ukraine were the most likely to be considering re-displacement (11%, est. 126,000) followed by Kyiv (7%, est. 108,000). As many as 13 per cent of the returnees in the west of Ukraine, equivalent to around 72,000 people, are also considering leaving their location of origin. The proportion of returnees considering return will likely remain notable while conditions in areas of return remain severe, particularly with regard to utilities and long-range attacks by Russian Federation armed forces.


Estimated number of returnees considering leaving their current location or who may leave depending on the situation, per macro-region



BARRIERS TO RETURN

Over half of all IDPs who do not intend to return stated that a main reason was the poor security situation in their area of origin - including active fighting, the threat of air strikes and other security concerns (55%). Around one in three IDPs who do not intend to return believe that access to essential services – such as education, healthcare and government services – is not sufficiently available in their area of origin (33%). A similar proportion stated that their area of origin is under the temporary military control of the Russian Federation (27%). Damage or destruction of their home in the area of origin was a main reason for not returning for 19 per cent of IDPs who do not intend to return.

Proportion of IDPs by the reasons given for not returning to their area of origin (AoO)




REASONS FOR CONSIDERING REDISPLACEMENT



of returnees who are considering leaving reported that they feel they would be safer in another location.

Among returnees considering leaving their current location, the primary reason was the perception that they would be safer in a different location. This was followed by concern about further utility disruption (33%), the inability to make sufficient income or find suitable work in their area of origin (17%) and a desire to reunite with family elsewhere (13%).

Motivations to return among IDPs planning return in the following two weeks




SECTOR SPOTLIGHT: SOLID FUEL NEED AND ACCESS



Of returnee respondents reported the need for solid fuel for heating, such as coal, wood, pellets and briquettes. Although, this is as high as 18 per cent among returnees in the East.

Despite the widespread and continued disruption to utilities, only 12 per cent of returnees reported that they needed and lacked solid fuel. This is notably less than the proportion of IDPs (23%) or the non-displaced population (19%), which may reflect the fact that civilian infrastructure equipped for multiple heating modalities is more prevalent in areas of return, particularly in densely populated urban areas.


Similar to the IDP and non-displaced population, the primary solid fuel needed by returnee households is wood (20%). Of those that identified the need for wood, 86 per cent reported that wood was available for purchase in their current location. A smaller proportion of returnees reported the need for briquettes (10%) and coal (8%). These needs have remained relatively constant since Round 10, in October, suggesting that the onset of cooler temperatures in November and December has not increased the need for solid fuels.



The need for solid fuel was most prevalent in the East, where around one in five returnees reported this need (18%). Among returnees in this macro-region, 26 per cent reported the need for wood and 19 per cent need briquettes. The primary barrier may be **lack of access** to these solid fuels, with 23 per cent of returnees in the east reporting that wood was unavailable in their area and 67 per cent reported the unavailability of briquettes.

In the north of Ukraine, 16 per cent of returnees identified the need for solid fuel, with 27 per cent of returnees reporting the need for wood. However, in the north the key barrier may be the **affordability** of wood, given that 85 per cent of returnees in this macro-region reported wood was available in their area.

Share of returnee respondents that lack solid fuel by macro-region



For more information see latest DTM Solid Fuel Assessment, outlining to current heating systems and the estimated cost of solid fuel items per oblast based on field data collection ([Reliefweb](#)).

SECTOR SPOTLIGHT: FINANCIAL SAVINGS

Around 34 per cent of returnees have exhausted their savings, with 27 per cent of households reporting they had done so more than 30 days ago (compared with 46% of returnees who reported having exhausted their savings in September, Round 9). In addition, five per cent of returnees did not have savings prior to their displacement. Combined, this means that 39 per cent of returnee families have no financial savings, increasing their vulnerability to future shocks and potentially undermining their sustainable return and reintegration.

Returnees in the East seem most vulnerable in this regard - around 40 per cent have exhausted all their savings, with a further 11 per cent reporting that they did not have any savings before displacing. The East of Ukraine also has the highest proportion of returnees who exhausted their savings in the last 30 days (12%). One in three returnee households in the South (33%) and West (34%) of Ukraine exhausted their savings more than 30 days ago,

Share of returnee respondents by remaining financial savings per macro-region



of all returnee households in Ukraine have completely exhausted their savings

Share of respondents by remaining financial savings and population group

SECTOR SPOTLIGHT: COPING STRATEGIES



Of returnee respondents reduced their usage of utilities such as gas, electricity and solid fuel as a coping strategy to the financial exigencies of displacement.

Overall, fewer returnee households reported engaging in coping strategies in Round 11 than in Round 9, conducted in September 2022. This is true of each coping strategy provided to respondents except for the reduced usage of utilities, a strategy that potentially increases the vulnerability of returnee households as temperatures fall below freezing across the country.

In terms of household consumption, returnee families were marginally less likely to have switched the cheaper food or reduced their food consumption. They were also less likely to have reduced the quality and quantity of non-food items, such as hygiene items or clothing. However, as of December 5, more than half of all returnee households have engaged in these coping strategies.


In Round 11, 41 per cent of returnees had reduced their expenditure on healthcare (compared with 48 per cent in Round 9). Additional health related coping strategies were provided as options in Round 11, which revealed that 39 per cent of returnee households had self-medicated for an illness or injury, without consulting a health-care professional (41% of non-IDPs and 40% of IDPs reported the same coping mechanism). Around one in three returnee households also reported using traditional medicines, a similar proportion to other population groups. Finally, 18 per cent of returnee households reported reducing the dosage or frequency of medication.

In terms of financial coping strategies, fewer returnee households reported taking on new loans in Round 11 (20%), compared with Round 9 (30%).


COPING STRATEGIES: GENDER DIMENSION

Overall, female returnees were moderately more likely than male returnees to have employed each coping strategy, except the reduction in utilities. Returnees of both genders were marginally more likely than other groups to have reduced utility expenditure. Female returnees were significantly more likely to have reduced household consumption of food and NFIs or to have switched to using cheaper products to meet household needs.


Share of respondents by coping strategies and by gender



Share of returnee respondents by coping strategies adopted



*Coping strategy options not included in Round 9 survey.



Of female returnees reported having reduced health-care expenditures, while a similar proportion reported self-medication (43%) and the use of traditional medicine (34%).

The higher prevalence of these health-related coping strategies applies to returnee and non-displaced women also. Those with chronic health conditions are prevalent in IDP and returnee households and these coping strategies may negatively impact this vulnerable group.


SECTOR SPOTLIGHT: MEDICINES AND HEALTHCARE SERVICES

MEDICAL SERVICES AND MEDICINES AVAILABILITY

As of the beginning of December 2022, 10 per cent of returnees reported insufficient access to medical services and medicines. Overall, among the returnee population who indicated a need for medicine and medical services, 42 per cent felt a lack of medicine, and 34 per cent experienced a lack of medical services.

Forty-one (41%) per cent of the returnee respondents had to reduce healthcare expenditures to meet the basic needs of their households. The majority of those were in the eastern macro-region (51%). In the same macro-region, the share of the returned people who applied at least one coping strategy related to health was the highest.


Proportion of returnees who used at least one health related coping mechanism, by current macro-region



HEALTH EXPENDITURES

One-third of the returnee respondents confirmed their healthcare expenditures make up 10-25 per cent of their HH income.

Household income expenditures on medical services and medicines




AVAILABILITY OF MEDICATION

Among all returnee respondents, 22 per cent indicated that they or someone within their family had to stop using their medication in the past month because of the war. While in households containing members with illnesses requiring constant care, one-third or respondents (30%) confirmed stop taking medication last month. Among those returnees, 66 per cent indicated they were not able to find appropriate medicines due to unavailability, and 52 per cent stated they could not afford to buy the medicines (respondents could indicate multiple reasons). Most often, the respondents reported that they had suspended taking hypertension and cardiovascular disease medications.


BARRIERS TO ACCESS TO MEDICAL SERVICES AND MEDICINES

Cumulatively, 22 per cent of returnees noted at least one barrier to access to medical services, and another 27 per cent reported at least one barrier to access medicines. The most frequently mentioned barrier in both cases was the lack of funds. Barriers related to infrastructure were less common. Nationwide, only 5 per cent of returnees confirmed that they have to spend more than an hour, regardless of the means of transportation used, to get to the nearest medical facility where they can receive treatment or medicine.

Barriers for accessing health services by HH health vulnerability [returnee respondents]



Barriers in accessing medicines by HH health vulnerability [returnee respondents]



COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SITUATION AND NEEDS

Those who are displaced from - or have returned to - their habitual residence face critical needs. The profile and situation of the sub-groups differ slightly, thus requiring tailored support. The overview below highlights group differences within IOM's Round 10 sample of the general population.

MOST PRESSING NEED

Cash (financial assistance) as well as medicine and health services continue to be among the most pressing needs identified among all respondents, who were asked to select their **one most pressing issue**. With decreasing temperatures, solid fuel is also a pressing need for many. For example, 7% of IDPs identified solid fuel as their most pressing need.



Cash – Financial Support

44% Non-IDPs 53% IDPs 46% Returnees



Solid fuel – coal, wood, etc.

10% Non-IDPs 7% IDPs 8% Returnees



Heating appliance

4% Non-IDPs 5% IDPs 7% Returnees




Medicine and health services

5% Non-IDPs 7% IDPs 4% Returnees

Read: "Among IDPs, 7% identify medicine and health services as their most pressing need"

NEEDS: GENDER DIMENSION

While the need for financial assistance was ubiquitous, female IDPs were most likely of all population groups to report this need (69%). Comparatively, returnees of both genders were less in need of financial assistance (44% of male returnees, 46% of female returnees). Of those female returnees who reported the need for hygiene items,



COMPARATIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

All respondents were asked to indicate whether they were in need of support in each of the categories listed below. Needs vary by displacement status, in line with situation. For example, IDPs are in a higher need of heating appliances compared to non-displaced and returnee populations nationwide.

Note: % indicate those who answered "Yes" and "Partially yes" in each of the category of needs

Read: "67% of IDPs are in need of financial assistance"

	Non-IDPs	IDPs	Returnees
Cash - Financial support	47%	67%	46%
Menstrual hygiene items*	36%	43%	45%
Clothes, shoes and other NFIs	8%	31%	7%
Heating appliances	13%	29%	13%
Medicine and health services	16%	25%	10%
Solid fuel for heating	19%	23%	12%
Baby and adult diapers*	28%	23%	20%
Food	11%	22%	10%
Hygiene items	6%	19%	7%
Access to money	20%	18%	23%
Information or communication with others	15%	18%	15%
Transportation	12%	15%	11%

*Note: Among those who indicated the need for hygiene items

around half reported the need for menstrual hygiene items (45%), with 20 per cent identifying the need for diapers.

Returnees of both genders were most likely to identify the need for access to money, such as functioning ATMs or post offices, reflecting the difficulty accessing services in many areas of return (21% of returnee males, 24% of returnee females).

BRIEF NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

The data presented in this report was commissioned by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and collected by Multicultural Insights through a rapid phone-based survey. The tenth round of data collection among a set of unique 2,002 adults (18 years and above) was completed between 25 November and 5 December 2022. This probabilistic sample, representative of over 30 million Ukrainian adults (18 years or older), was stratified to achieve representativeness at the level of 6 macro-regions of Ukraine. The sample frame was constructed by developing a list of 100,000 ten-digit phone numbers created by combining the three-digit prefix used by mobile phone operators with a randomly generated seven-digit phone number. The generated sample frame was proportional to the national market share of the six phone networks covered in the study. Using the random-digit-dial (RDD) approach, phone numbers were randomly generated, producing a new number every milli-second interval. Interviews were anonymous, and respondents were asked for consent prior to starting an interview. Interviewers used a structured questionnaire and the computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) technique to directly enter the results into a data entry program.

Using this methodology, for Round 11, interview teams were able to successfully complete the surveys with 2,002 unique eligible and consenting adult respondents. While the response rate using the RDD approach in Ukraine has typically yielded a response rate of ca 7-8%, in Round 10 of this survey, a response rate of 10.7% was achieved. A total of 30 interviewers were employed for this work. The team was composed of 5 male and 21 female interviewers. Interviews were conducted in Ukrainian (82%) and Russian languages (18%), with language selection following respondents' preference.

Limitations: The exact proportion of the excluded populations is unknown, and certain considerations are to be made when interpreting results. Those currently residing outside the territory of Ukraine were not interviewed, following active exclusion. Population estimates assume that minors (those under 18 years old) are accompanied by their adult parents or guardians. The sample frame is limited to adults that use mobile phones. It is unknown if all phone networks were fully functional across the entire territory of Ukraine for the entire period of the survey; therefore, some numbers may have had a higher probability of receiving calls than others. Residents of areas with a high level of civilian infrastructure damage may have a lower representation among the sample – one may assume the needs in the report are skewed towards under-reporting. Among the people surveyed are not those residing in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (ARC) or areas in Donetsk and Luhansk regions not under the control of the Government of Ukraine since 2014.

Caveat: The survey collected information on the people's characteristics, their current locations and/or locations after the displacement (geographical information), intentions to move and planned destinations, needs, and issues faced by the people during the crisis. The analysis relies on two approaches when assessing the population profiles, their issues, and needs. The analysis of geographical profiles utilizes the data, excluding the missing values identified at the macro-region level (n=2,002). The needs assessment and all other analysis is done using the available sample (considering the question refusal rate).

Sample allocation and number of interviews per macro-region

Macro-region	Total interviews (f/m/no answer)	Interview share
KYIV	218 (124/94/0)	10%
EAST	486 (286/199/1)	24%
SOUTH	195 (112/83/0)	10%
WEST	472 (281/190/1)	23%
NORTH	336 (187/148/1)	16%
CENTRE	293 (172/121/0)	15%
Undisclosed location	2 (0/2/0)	0%
Total Ukraine	2,002 (1162/837/3)	100%

Sample error

Macro-region		95% confidence Level
KYIV	+/-	7%
EAST	+/-	4%
SOUTH	+/-	7%
WEST	+/-	5%
NORTH	+/-	5%
CENTRE	+/-	6%
Total Ukraine	+/-	2%

Definitions: The [IOM Glossary on Migration](#) defines **Internally Displaced People (IDPs)** as people or groups of people who have been forced or obliged to flee, or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border. Operationally, for this exercise, interviewers define and understand IDPs as people who left their habitual place of residence due to the current war.

IOM defines a **returnee** as a person who had undergone a migratory movement and arrived back to their original place of habitual residence. For purposes of the present analysis, IOM identified as returnees those respondents who indicated having left the place of their habitual residence since 24 February due to the current war for a period of a minimum of 2 weeks (14 days), but who have indicated that they had since returned.

The 1951 Refugee Convention defines a **refugee** as: *Someone who is unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion.*

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the report do not imply expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries. The opinions expressed in the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the IOM.



IOM UKRAINE



IOM

UN MIGRATION