Starting on 24 February 2022, the war in Ukraine triggered an unprecedented humanitarian crisis across all of the country’s sub-regional divisions (oblasts). Between 17 and 23 May, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) conducted the fifth round of a rapid representative assessment of the general population in Ukraine to gather insights into internal displacement and mobility flows, and to assist local needs. This general population survey serves as a preliminary source to identify areas with high humanitarian needs and to inform the targeting of response aiming to assist the war-affected population. The geographical scope of the assessment covers the entire territory of Ukraine, all five macro-regions (West, East, North, Centre, South, and the city of Kyiv), with the exception of the Crimean peninsula. The general population survey was constructed through a random-digit-dial (RDD) approach, and 2,001 unique and anonymous respondents aged 18 and over were interviewed using the computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) method. The estimates rely on the UNFPA population data for Ukraine, agreed upon as the common population baseline by the humanitarian community. Those currently outside Ukraine were not interviewed. For further notes on method and limitations, including IOM’s definition of internally displaced persons used for the purpose of this assessment, see page 11. In addition to this General Population Survey, data on recorded IDP presence at hromada level in Ukraine are available from IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix – Baseline Assessment (Round 3, May 15 2022, HDX – registration required).

INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS

Results of the general population survey show that, as of 23 May 2022, 16.2% of the general population were internally displaced within Ukraine, equivalent to over 7 million individuals. This represents a decrease of nearly 900,000 IDPs (11%) since 3 May, a first estimated reduction in the number of IDPs in Ukraine since 24 February 2022.

*All figures are now rounded to nearest 1,000.
**Starting in Round 3, IOM made a slight adjustment to the estimation method for IDPs in Ukraine to increase the precision of the sampling frame and improve accuracy, while remaining within the original margin of error.
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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.
INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT FLOWS

**Top 5 oblasts of origin of IDPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oblast</th>
<th>% of IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KHARKIV REGION</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYIV CITY</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONETSK REGION</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYIV REGION</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAPORIZHIA REGION</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other oblasts** 25%

**Top 5 oblasts of origin of hosted IDPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oblast</th>
<th>% of IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KYIV REGION</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNIPROPETROVSK REGION</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIV REGION</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHARKIV REGION</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLTAVA REGION</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other oblasts** 52%

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

FURTHER MOVEMENT INTENTIONS

**Among current IDPs, readiness for further mobility remains high since Round 3 (17 April 2022). Among IDPs in the West, 52% intend to move further (any direction, including possible return), as do 48% of IDPs in Centre macro-region, 44% of IDPs in the North, and 31% in the South. IDPs in the East macro-region now indicate an increased intentions of further movement: 43% intend to move from their current location (compared to 26% in Round 4).**

---

Are you considering (further) relocation from your current location? (IDPs only):

- Yes: 44.8%
- No: 40.3%
- "It depends": 10.3%
- Don't know: 3.3%

The share of IDPs considering relocation has more than doubled since 16 March, compared to the relatively small and stable share of those Ukrainians who remain in their habitual places of residence who were asked the same question:

- 3% (Round 1)
- 4% (Round 2)
- 4% (Round 3)
- 3% (Round 4)
- 45% (Round 5)

**Flow of Displacement Movements by Macro-Region**

**Current Location & Origins**

Of those who reported a) not being present in area of habitual residence, and b) indicated current war as reason for their move:

- KHARKIV REGION 13%
- DNIPROPETROVSK REGION 12%
- LVIV REGION 8%
- KYIV REGION 8%
- POLTAVA REGION 7%

**Other oblasts** 52%

**Note:** % numbers reported are rounded for ease of use.

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 International Displacement Report, Round 5, May 2022”.
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INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT FLOWS - ORIGINS & CURRENT LOCATION

IDPs BY MACRO-REGION OF ORIGIN (comparison by rounds)

Where do those currently displaced by war come from? Data shows a variation in the scope of displacement flows at the macro-region level. As part of the overall 11% reduction in the total stock of IDPs in Ukraine between Rounds 4 and 5, the number of IDPs estimated to be displaced from homes in the Eastern macro-region has increased. In RS, IDPs from the East represent 55% of all IDPs in Ukraine (49% in round 4). The share of IDPs from the North macro-region, on the other hand, shows a significant decrease to 12%, possibly due to the high rate of returns in the area (17% in round 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-region</th>
<th>% of IDPs origin</th>
<th># est. IDPs departed per macro-region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KYIV</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1,124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>3,913,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>930,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRE</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>886,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total est. displaced within Ukraine</td>
<td>7,134,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDPs BY MACRO-REGION OF CURRENT LOCATION (comparison by rounds)

Where are those displaced by war currently located? The most drastic drop in IDPs number is observed in the West, while the macro-region East experienced an increase in hosted displaced population. The overall number of IDPs located in the city of Kyiv has decreased since round 4 (3 May) and remains low compared to other macro-regions. The number of displaced people in the North and South of Ukraine increased slightly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-region</th>
<th>% of IDPs location</th>
<th># est. IDPs per macro-region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KYIV</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>194,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1,794,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>562,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRE</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1,427,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,319,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1,838,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total est. displaced within Ukraine</td>
<td>7,134,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The complexity of the internal displacement flows in Ukraine is reflected in the variation between trends observed across macro-regions. The East macro-region is experiencing a significant new increase in new displacement inflows, hosting the largest share of IDPs of all macro-regions for the first time since 24 February 2022. On the other hand, the IDP stock in the West of Ukraine has dropped considerably, by over one million since beginning of May.

### CHANGES IN ESTIMATED IDP PRESENCE PER MACRO-REGION (ROUNDS 1 TO 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>3 May (Round 4)</th>
<th>23 May, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td>1,123,000</td>
<td>857,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>418,000</td>
<td>357,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>2,586,000</td>
<td>2,927,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1,045,000</td>
<td>1,285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>1,123,000</td>
<td>1,356,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>1,794,000</td>
<td>2,011,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** % numbers reported are rounded for ease of use.
When asked to identify their single most pressing need, cash (financial support) was identified by the largest number of IDPs (57.3%) that indicated this was their most pressing need, followed by medicines (45.5%). The growing need for financial assistance is associated with a lack and a significant decrease in income levels.

**SHARE OF IDP HOUSEHOLDS WITH VULNERABLE MEMBERS:**
Share of IDPs who report one or more of their current household members fall within one of the following vulnerability categories (read as follows: “47% of IDP respondents indicated that at least one member of the family currently with them is a child between ages of 5 and 17”:

- **5%** Infants (<1y.o.)
- **47%** Children aged 5-17
- **21%** Children aged 1-5

56% of IDP confirmed the presence of children in their current households.

**IDP NEEDS over time**
The distribution of IDPs across types of settlements remains stable over time.

**SHARE OF IDP HOUSEHOLDS WITH VULNERABLE MEMBERS:**

- **8%** Pregnant or breastfeeding
- **26%** People with disabilities
- **9%** IDPs from 2014-2015 (with or without formal status)
- **49%** Older persons (>60)
- **31%** Chronically ill
- **4%** Directly affected (harmed) by current violence

Households size: The median size of the current households 4.0 persons

- **1 person** 6%
- **2-3 persons** 38%
- **4-5 persons** 29%
- **6 and more persons** 26%

IDP PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY
The majority of the IDPs feeling “completely unsafe” are currently located in the East (84% of IDPs in the East feeling this way) and South (11.5%). Since May 3 (Round 4), perception of safety has deteriorated among IDPs residing in both these macro-regions, and remained stable in other regions.

**SHELTER**

- Rented dwelling (apartment, house or… 35%
- friend’s or family member’s home 33%
- own home (owned) 10%
- in home of kind strangers 6%
- other: specify 5%
- collective center/camp 4%
- Hard to say/it depends 2%
- hotel/motel/hostel 2%
- basement/bomb shelter/metro etc 1%

*Non-exhaustive list of answers

**IDP NEEDS over time**

- Cash - financial support
- Food
- Accommodation
- Clothes and shoes, other NFI
- Hygiene items
- Medicines and health services
- Transportation
- Information or means of communication

When asked to identify their single most pressing need, cash (financial support) was identified by the largest number of IDPs (57.3%) that indicated this was their most pressing need, followed by medicines (45.5%). The growing need for financial assistance is associated with a lack and a significant decrease in income levels.
INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS

IDP INCOME AND LIVELIHOOD

How has your personal ability to earn income changed since start of the war?

- Hard to answer/Refuse, 1%
- More money than before the war, 2%
- As much as before the war, 8%
- Less money than before the war, 19%
- Do not earn any money now, 57%

*Note: Displaced women more frequently mentioned not having had a job prior to the war compared to men (19% and 5% respectively).

Since February 2022, income has declined significantly for displaced households. As of May 23, every fifth IDP interviewed noted that they had no income at all. Thirty-three (33%) per cent of respondents said the income level of their households was no more than UAH 5,000, which is UAH 1,500 less than the minimum wage in January 2022. The number of those who reported no household income in May was 12% lower than in April. It seems to suggest that IDPs might have found employment in place of displacement or resumed employment remotely.

1 APRIL 2022 (Round 2)

1% No household income
1% Less than 1,500 UAH
4% 1,501-3,000 UAH
6% 3,001-5,000 UAH
8% 5,001-7,000 UAH
13% 7,001-10,000 UAH
13% 10,001-15,000 UAH
12% 15,001-20,000 UAH
31% More than 20,000 UAH
13% I don’t know/Refuse

23 MAY 2022 (Round 5)

1% No household income
1% Less than 1,500 UAH
1% 1,501-3,000 UAH
5% 3,001-5,000 UAH
8% 5,001-7,000 UAH
13% 7,001-10,000 UAH
13% 10,001-15,000 UAH
16% 15,001-20,000 UAH
19% More than 20,000 UAH
6% I don’t know/Refuse

Caveat: The chart does not show a complete list of options. The top 10 sectors are presented.

IDP EMPLOYMENT

Prior to displacement, services, trade, healthcare, education, construction, and transport were the main sectors of employment among those current IDPs who held a job.

Previous employment sectors among IDPs

Services 19%
Trade 13%
Health care 7%
Education 7%
Construction 6%
Transport 6%
Energy 5%
Public administration 5%
Heavy industry 5%
ICT 5%

Caveat: The chart does not show a complete list of options. The top 10 sectors are presented.

Among IDPs interviewed, 13% lived in single female-head households*. Among them, more than 70% mentioned having no income or having income less than UAH 5,000.

*Households with only females and children under 18 years.

Fifty-two (52%) per cent of IDPs who lost their job due to the war or those who were unemployed before the displacement mentioned that they have attempted to find work in their location of displacement. Only 9% managed to find a new job as of 23 May.

Seventy (70%) per cent of those who did not search for a job or did not find it after moving from their habitual place of residence intended to do it in the future. Their main plan was to look for work in the service or commercial sectors.

Sectors for current and future job search (top five)

- Services 15%
- Trade 11%
- Transport 7%
- Construction 6%
- ICT 5%

*Note: 29% of respondents did not look for work, 17% did not have a need to work (retired, disabled, maternity leave, etc.), and 1% did not answer the question.
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Note: % numbers reported are rounded for ease of use.

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 Internal Displacement Report, Round 5, May 2022.”
The ratio of return origins has not changed between Rounds 4 and 5. Only 7% of returnee respondents in Round 5 indicated that they have returned to their places of habitual residence from abroad. The figure estimated by this survey is in contrast with known border crossing statistics, which indicate that since 28 February 2022, 1.8M or more Ukrainian citizens have entered the country (Border Guard Service of Ukraine, UNHCR). The reported numbers of individual crossings back into Ukraine are not necessarily “returnees”, however, and may include repeated entries and returns as well as a variety of other movements. Border crossing movements can be pendular considering the situation remains highly volatile.

The majority of returnees do not intend to leave their places of habitual residence again in the future. Estimated 403,000 returnees are considering to leave their homes again, however (9%). The share of returnees who plan to leave their homes again due to the war is highest in the East macro-region, where 18% of returnees indicate that they consider leaving again. In the North and Center, 7.7% and 8.3% of returnees respectively indicate that they are considering to leave again due to war.

47 days is the mean length of displacement among returnees following 87 days of war as of May 23.

Despite having returned, 35% of returnees perceive their currently location as somewhat unsafe, and 5% perceive it as completely unsafe. Only 10% of returnees indicated that they believe their current location is completely safe as of May 23.

Among IDPs, 23.1% indicated that they plan to return to their places of habitual residence within the upcoming 2 weeks, marking a slight decrease increase since Round 4 result (26%). The survey data indicate that the majority of IDPs who plan to return in the upcoming two weeks are from Kyiv, West, and North macro-regions of Ukraine.

Table 1: Share of returnees in the upcoming two weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-region</th>
<th>Share of returnees</th>
<th>Est. returnees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KYIV</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>941,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>807,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>448,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>358,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1,703,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRE</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>224,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,481,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NON-DISPLACED POPULATION IN UKRAINE

SHARE OF NON-DISPLACED HOUSEHOLDS WITH VULNERABLE MEMBERS  Share of respondents who report one or more of their current household members fall within one of the following vulnerability categories (read as follows: “37% of non-displaced respondents indicated that at least one member of the family currently with them is a child between ages of 5 and 17.”):

- **4%** infants (0-1y.o.)
- **14%** Children aged 1<5
- **7%** Pregnant or breastfeeding
- **53%** Older persons (>60 y.o.)
- **3%** IDPs from 2014-2015 (with or without formal status)
- **1%** Directly affected (harmed) by current violence
- **37%** Children aged 5-17
- **23%** People with disabilities

NEEDS among those not displaced

Share of respondents who remain in their places of habitual residence who report currently being in need of the below:

- **Cash - financial support** 57%
- **Transportation** 34%
- **Medicines and health services** 24%
- **Money access (receiving money, no money in ATM)** 20%
- **Food** 14%
- **Information or means of communication** 10%
- **Hygiene items** 10%
- **Clothes and other non-food items incl. blankets** 8%

When asked to identify their **single most pressing need**, financial support (cash) was identified by the largest number of non-IDP respondents (36% indicated this as their most pressing need), followed by medicines and health services (7%). As the most pressing need, medication and healthcare were more often mentioned by respondents residing in small towns (10% respectively).

MOBILITY INTENTIONS among not displaced

The figure has remained stable across time.

- **56%** Another place in Ukraine
- **23%** Another country
- **21%** Don’t know

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (IOM)

Note: % numbers reported are rounded for ease of use.

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 International Displacement Report, Round 5, May 2022.”
SECTORAL ANALYSIS

A snapshot of data relevant to diverse humanitarian sectors is presented below, covering the general population unless specified otherwise:

WASH

Sizeable proportion of IDPs and non-IDPs respondents indicated that they are in need of hygiene items (18% among IDPs, 10% among non-IDPs). Nearly than half (47%) of those respondents indicated the need for menstrual hygiene items, and an additional 23% the need for diapers (baby and/or adult). Lack of safe toilet access was reported by very few respondents – less than 2% of displaced persons and 2% of those remaining in their habitual place of residence.

Access to running water continues to represent an issue for a growing share of respondents in the East (with 3% lacking water altogether and 9% with unstable supply) followed by those in the South (4% lacking, and 10% with unstable supply). Access to running water has improved in all other macro-regions since Round 4.

Reported unstable or no running water (all respondents, through time):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHELTER AND NFIs

8.5% of all respondents indicated home (primary residence before war) was damaged by attacks/war. Among IDPs, this figure rises to 24%, but may be over-estimated (due to lack of access). Among returnees, 9.9% indicate damage to their homes.

24% among IDPs reported the need for non-food items, for example blankets, compared to 21% as of May 3 and 18% as of April 17. Among returnees, 12% indicated need for NFIs.

Need for building/reconstruction materials to repair current shelter

The need for shelter repair materials has increased significantly across Ukraine with the exception of Kyiv. Nearly doubled, particularly among returnees: - 21.5% returnees overall reported being in need of shelter repair materials (as opposed to 11.9% returnees in Round 4.

FOOD AND NUTRITION

Respondents were asked whether the food stores in their area were well stocked. Differences between macro-regions have emerged, with 6.7% of respondents reporting that almost all food products were missing from stores in the South and 5% in the East of the country, compared to 0% in Kyiv and West macro-regions.

INFANT AND CHILD NUTRITION

Among respondents who report infants or children under 5 years of age in their household (displaced and non-displaced): they experience problems in getting enough food for their baby/babies since the start of the war (e.g. formula), compared to 27% as of May 3. Among IDPs this issue is even more severe – 44% IDP households with infants and children under age of five reported struggling.

Note: % numbers reported are rounded for ease of use.
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 International Displacement Report, Round 5, May 2022”
A snapshot of data relevant to diverse humanitarian sectors is continued below, covering the general population unless specified otherwise.

**HEALTH**

Reported availability of pharmacies across regions of Ukraine

The availability of pharmacies has improved significantly in Kyiv, where only 1% of respondents indicated in Round 5 that no or very few pharmacies were operational near them, compared to 23% in Round 2 (April 1st). The figure also remains low among respondents in the West (8%) and Centre (11%). In the North macro-region, 22% reported no or few pharmacies operated near them. The share of respondents indicating no or little access to pharmacies was the highest in the East (25%) in mid-May 2022. As well, pharmacy accessibility was high in the southern macro-region.

**DEMAND FOR MHPSS**

Among all respondents, 19% requested to receive the number of IOM’s free psychological support hotline, compared to 16% in Round 2, and 11% of respondents in Round 1 of the survey. Among IDPs, 16.1% requested the hotline number for support in Round 3.

Among all the respondents, 13.1% mentioned that they or someone in their family needed psychological counseling. The need was indicated more often by respondents who confirmed that their homes had been damaged by military attacks (23%).

**TOP NEEDS PER MACRO-REGION (all respondents)**

Respondents were asked to identify their one most pressing need out of a randomly rotating list of options. Figures reported represent the share of respondents in a macro-region who selected the most frequent choices per macro-region.
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. Fifth round of data collection among a set of unique 2001 adults (18 years and above) was completed between 17 and 23 May 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 programme.

Using this methodology, for Round 4, interview teams were able to successfully complete the surveys with 2,001 unique eligible and consenting adult respondents. While the response rate using the RDD approach in Ukraine has typically yielded a response rate of cca 7–8%, in Round 5 of this survey a response rate of 14.7% was achieved. A total of 34 interviewers were employed for this work. The team was composed of 4 male and 30 female interviewers, and interviews were conducted in Ukrainian (76%) and Russian languages (24%), with language selection following respondents’ preference. After data cleaning, the sample used for analysis was reduced to 2,000 respondents due to non-responses in questions related to the current location.

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 a mobile phone. 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 the high level of civilian infrastructure damage such as Mariupol, Kharkiv, or Irpin 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 the NGCA Donets and Luhans.

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=2,000). The needs assessment and all other analysis is done using all available sample (considering question refusal rate).

### Sample allocation and number of interviews per macro-region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-region</th>
<th>Total interviews (trim/no answer)</th>
<th>Interview share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KYIV</td>
<td>133 (68/65/0)</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>439 (239/200/0)</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>239 (136/103/0)</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>494 (295/198/1)</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>409 (231/179/0)</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRE</td>
<td>286 (159/127/0)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed location</td>
<td>1 (1/0/0)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ukraine</td>
<td>2,001 (1,129/871/1)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-region</th>
<th>Sample error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KYIV</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRE</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ukraine</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95% confidence Level: +/-8.5% +/-4.7% +/-6.3% +/-4.4% +/-4.8% +/-5.8%

**Definitions:** The IOM Glossary on Migration defines Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) as persons or groups of persons 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 persons 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 the 24th of 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.