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 June, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) conducted the sixth round of a rapid representative assessment of the general population in Ukraine to gather insights into internal displacement and mobility flows, and to assess 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 conducted 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 5, June 22 2022, HDX – registration required).

INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS

Results of the general population survey show that, as of 23 June 2022, 14% of the general population were internally displaced within Ukraine, equivalent to over 6.27M individuals. This represents a decrease of nearly 900,000 IDPs (12%) since 23 May, a second consecutive reduction in the number of IDPs within 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.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (IOM)
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.
Of those who reported a) not being present in area of habitual residence and b) indicated current war as reason for their move

Top 5 oblasts of origin of IDPs** | % of IDPs
--- | ---
DONETSK REGION | 21%
KHARKIV REGION | 21%
KYIV CITY | 11%
KYIV REGION | 10%
LUHANSK REGION | 9%
Other oblasts | 29%

Top 5 oblasts of origin of IDPs** | % of IDPs
--- | ---
DNIPROPETROVSK REGION | 16%
POLTAVA REGION | 9%
KHARKIV REGION | 9%
KYIV CITY | 7%
KYIV REGION | 6%
Other oblasts | 52%

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

For data on recorded IDP presence at hromada level, see IOM’s DTM Baseline Area Assessment for Ukraine (As of June 11, data available for 13 oblasts).

The dataset is available for humanitarian partners on HDX for registered users, on IMAC SharePoint, and upon request dtmukraine@iom.int.

FURTHER MOVEMENT INTENTIONS

For the first time since R1 (17/3), IOM notes a decrease in overall readiness for further mobility among IDPs. Among IDPs in the West, 46% intend to move further (any direction, including possible return), as do 45% of IDPs in the North macro-region, 40% of IDPs in the South, and 36% in the Center. Only 18% of IDPs in the East macro-region now indicate an intention of further movement – a decrease from 43% in R5 (23/5).

Not able because security situation (or occupied territory)
“it depends” 11%
Don’t know 3%
No 51%
Yes 34%

Are you considering (further) relocation from your current location? (IDPs only): 18% 30% 42% 44% 45% 34%

The share of IDPs considering relocation remains high at 34% 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:

**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 6, June 2022.”
INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT FLOWS - ORIGINS & CURRENT LOCATION

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 12% reduction in the total stock of IDPs in Ukraine between Rounds 5 and 6, only the number of IDPs estimated to be displaced in the Northern macro-region has increased. In R6, IDPs from the East represent 61% of all IDPs in Ukraine (55% in round 5).

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

<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>11%</td>
<td>669,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3,838,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRE</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>949,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total est. displaced within Ukraine: 6,275,000

Where are those displaced by war currently located?
The largest decrease in estimated IDP presence is observed in the North, but South and West also experienced over 300,000 reduction in numbers of IDPs each. East and Kyiv are the only macro-regions experiencing an increase in hosted displaced population. The overall number of IDPs located in the city of Kyiv has doubled since round 5 (23 May) and surpassed South by more than 100,000 estimated IDPs.

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

<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>7%</td>
<td>431,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1,855,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>324,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRE</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>668,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1,574,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total est. displaced within Ukraine: 6,275,000

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 6, June 2022.”
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 linear increase in displacement inflows, still (same as in R5) hosting the largest share of IDPs of all macro-regions. On the other hand, the IDP stock in the West of Ukraine continues to drop considerably since the beginning of May (Round 5).

**IDP DECISION-MAKING**

In Round 6 of the General Population Survey, IOM inquired about decision-making considerations among all respondents who had previously left their homes due to the war (IDPs as well as returnees). Among those who are or were displaced to the West of Ukraine, majority selected the current location due to perception of safety or based on suggestion, e.g. by employer.

Those who came to Kyiv macro-region most frequently indicated ease of transport as a key decision-making consideration. Among IDPs in the East, a significant proportion (15%) indicated they had no other option.

There are no large differences in motivations for choice of destination between returnees and those who remain in displacement. Among IDPs, 72% indicated they had family or friends in the location of their displacement, while only 58% of returnees stated the same. Among current IDPs, 21% indicated they or their family owned a property in the location chosen, while among returnees this share is only 11%. Among returnees, higher share – 61% indicated that their location was suggested by someone else, while among those who remain in displacement only 45% indicated having received and followed a suggestion. While a single most important decision-making point for only 15%, nearly two thirds indicated they did not have a choice in their destination (62% among IDPs, 69% among returnees).

**ANTICIPATED RETURNS AMONG IDPs**

Among IDPs, 15% indicated that they plan to return to their places of habitual residence within the upcoming 2 weeks, marking a significant decrease since Round 5 result, when 23% IDPs indicated this intent. Relatively large proportion of IDPs (12%) stated it will depend on further situation development. Similarly to previous rounds, most IDPs who plan to return in the upcoming two weeks are from Kyiv (60% of those intending to return), and North (23%) macro-regions.
**INTERNALLY DISPLACED PEOPLE (IDPs)**

**DEMOGRAPHICS (IDPs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of men within the IDP population continues to shrink</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondents’ Age Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only adults were interviewed for this survey*

Seventy-seven (77%) per cent of current IDP household contained at least one boy and 84% had at least one girl between the ages of 5 and 18. At the end of June 2022, there was a median of 1.20 boys and of 1.30 girls under 18 per IDP household.

**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: “42% of IDP respondents indicated that at least one member of the family currently with them is a child between ages 5 and 17”):

- 4% Infants (<1y.o.)
- 20% Children aged 1-5
- 42% Children aged 5-17
- 5% Older persons (>60)
- 9% Pregnant or breastfeeding
- 24% People with disabilities
- 12% IDPs from 2014-2015 (with or without formal status)
- 5% Directly affected (harmed) by current violence

**IDP SITUATION AND NEEDS THROUGH TIME**

- Cash - financial support: 49% to 77% between Round 1 and Round 6
- Clothes and shoes, other NFI: 30% to 77%
- Medicines and health services: 31% to 77%
- Food: 23% to 41%
- Money access: 41%
- Accommodation: 15% to 25%
- Transportation: 15% to 21%
- Information or means of communication: 15% to 19%
- Hygiene items: 15% to 21%

*Note: The option “Refuse” included in the analysis since Round 3*

When asked to identify their single most pressing need, cash (financial support) was identified by the largest number of IDPs (58.4% indicated this was their most pressing need), followed by accommodation (45.5%). The need for food continuously increases since Round 2.

**IDP PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY**

Among IDPs in the South, 47% report feeling completely or somewhat unsafe. In the East, 31% of IDPs feel this way. Since May 23 (Round 5), perception of safety has deteriorated considerably among IDPs residing in both these macro-regions, and remained stable or improved in other regions.

**SHELTER**

A majority of IDPs (44%) are currently living in rented dwellings and almost a third are staying in a place that belongs to family or friends.
Of all respondents currently in their place of habitual residence, in Round 6, 17% indicated they have returned following a minimum of 2 weeks in displacement due to war, equivalent to estimated 5,547,000 returnees (24% more than in Round 5: 4,481,000). The South is the only macro-region with a drop in estimated returnee numbers, in line with deteriorating perception of safety reported by all respondents in the macro-region (45% feel somewhat or completely unsafe). It is unfeasible to determine with certainty the definite nature of these return movements and if they are permanent or temporary, though in Round 6, among returnees 74% (equivalent to est. 4,105,000) had indicated they were planning to remain in their homes. The number of returns is balancing the decrease in IDP stock in Ukraine, with nearly half of those who had left their places of residence since February 24th now having returned.

54 days is the mean duration of displacement among returnees following 119 days of war (23 June 2022)
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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: “36% 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.)
- 15% Children aged 1-5
- 36% Children aged 5-17
- 23% People with disabilities
- 54% Older persons (>60 y.o.)
- 8% Pregnant or breastfeeding
- 2% IDPs from 2014-2015 (with or without formal status)
- 3% Chronically ill

*returnees are included in the non-displaced category to accurately reflect current needs in locations of habitual residence, regardless of past experience of displacement.

AGE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP (in years)</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: 54%
- Transportation: 20%
- Medicines and health services: 16%
- Food: 13%
- Money access (receiving money, no money in ATM): 10%
- Information or means of communication: 9%
- Hygiene items: 7%
- Clothes and other non-food items incl. blankets: 6%

More than half of the non-displaced population indicated currently lacking financial support (54%). Twenty (20%) per cent individuals lack transport and 16 per cent medicine or access to services. Thirty-five (35%) per cent individuals lack menstrual hygiene items and 20 per cent lack in diapers.

- Menstrual Hygiene items: 35%
- Diapers (baby or adult): 20%

ENVISAGED USAGE OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT
Respondents who mentioned a need for financial assistance were asked to determine three items they would spend money on. Most of those surveyed would cover food (59% and utility bills (60%).

- Food: 59%
- Utility bills: 56%
- Health: 53%
- Building materials: 25%
- Clothing: 17%
- Debt payment: 16%

PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY self-reported among non-displaced
The majority of non-IDPs feeling “completely unsafe” and “somewhat unsafe” are currently located in the East (50%), South (44%), and North (37%) indicated that felt this way. Those in the West and Central macro-regions most commonly report feeling completely safe (respectively 27% and 28%).

- Completely unsafe: 9%
- Somewhat unsafe: 28%
- Completely safe: 17%

MOBILITY INTENTIONS among non-displaced

Figure has remained stable across time:

- 89% Not considering leaving
- 1% Yes
- 4% It depends
- 5% No
- 0% Not able
- 1% Don’t know

Top countries of destination considered:
1. Poland
2. United States
3. Spain
4. Italy
5. Canada

Figures relating to the intended foreign destination countries are not published due to low sub-sample size, graph is presented for indicative purposes only.

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 Internal Displacement Report, Round 6, June 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 IDP respondents indicated that they are in need of hygiene items (19%), while the need dropped to 5% among non-IDPs. Over a third (36%) of those respondents indicating needs specified they needed menstrual hygiene items, and an additional 19.7% the need for diapers (baby and/or adult). Lack of safe toilet access was reported by very few respondents – 3.8% of displaced persons.

Access to running water continues to represent an issue for a growing share of respondents in the East (with 4% lacking water altogether and 10% with unstable supply) followed by those in the South (5% lacking, and 7% with unstable supply). Access to running water has deteriorated slightly in all other macro-regions since Round 5.

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

![Water Access Map]

SHELTER AND NFIs

9% of all respondents indicated home (primary residence before war) was damaged by attacks/war. Among IDPs, this figure rises to 29%, but may be over-estimated (due to lack of access). Among returnees, 15% indicate damage to their homes, compared to 10% in R5.

27% among IDPs reported the need for non-food items, for example blankets, compared to 24% as of May 23. Among returnees, 5% 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 South and Center. Reported needs were particularly high among returnees – 18% overall reported being in need of shelter repair materials, compared to 17% non-IDPs.

![Shelter Repair Needs Map]

FOOD AND NUTRITION

Respondents were asked whether the food stores in their area were well stocked. Amid a general improvement country-wide, differences between macro-regions persist, with 38% of respondents reporting that some food products were missing from stores in the East, and 21% in the West of the country. Fewer than 2% of respondents in the East indicated that almost all products were missing or there were no functioning stores.

Almost all food products are missing, 0.5%

Some food products are missing, 30.5%

Yes - all food products are available, 66.8%

INFANT AND CHILD NUTRITION

Among respondents who report infants or children under 5 years of age in their household (displaced and non-displaced):

say they experience problems in getting enough food for their children since the start of the war (e.g. formula), compared to 30% as of May 23. Among IDPs this issue is even more severe – 41% IDP households with infants and children under the age of five reported struggling.

26%
Following the end of the school year in Ukraine, IOM inquired about school access since the start of the war among all respondents who indicated having children between the ages of 5 and 17 in their household. Respondents reported that the main obstacles to accessing education were poor or no internet access (38% of those reporting issues with access to education and 46% among IDPs reporting issues with access), closure of schools due to war (24.4%), nature of evacuation (120%, such as stay in collective shelters, travel etc.), lack of teachers (19%), and lack of electronic devices (10%) [multiple choices were possible].

In view of informing cohesion and recovery efforts, IOM included indicators relevant to community perceptions, engagement, and resilience in Round 6 of the survey.

The attitude of host communities towards internally displaced persons has not changed significantly between Rounds 2, 4 and 6 of survey. Positive attitudes prevail across all macro-regions of Ukraine.

This being said, 9% of IDPs surveyed stated that they or their family member suffered from discrimination on the basis of not originating from the area of displacement. This figure is significantly higher among IDPs residing in the West of Ukraine, where 14% indicated having experienced discrimination. Interacting with the local population, access to humanitarian assistance, public transport, and local institutions and organizations (such as schools) were mentioned most frequently as circumstances and locations where IDPs felt discriminated against. On the other hand, healthcare facilities, when with local authorities, and workplaces were not indicated by IDPs as situations where they experienced discrimination.

Competition over essential resources in communities is more frequently perceived to exist by non-migrant members of host communities – 13% overall perceive some or great competition. This sentiment is systematically highest among returnees in the South, West, and in Kyiv, where up to 23% of returnees feel this way. Among IDPs, 10% report they perceive some or great competition over resources in their current locations.

Additional data on school closures are available upon request.

8% of IDP households reported their children had no access to education since February 24

Access to education has been particularly precarious among children in IDP households. Compared to 75% among non-IDPs, only 62% of IDP households with one or more children aged 5-17 indicated their child(ren) had full access to education (on- and offline). Access to education among IDP children also differs significantly across macro-regions of Ukraine. In Kyiv, 83% of children in IDP households accessed education fully, while in the North, only 50% of IDP children did, and 52% in the Center macro-region. In the East macro-region, 16% of IDP households with children of school age indicated they had no access at all, followed by 14% in the Center macro-region.

Spheres of engagement in local decision-making differ between IDPs and members of host communities. Host community members report significantly higher rates of engagement than IDPs in education, provision of humanitarian assistance, environmental issues, arts, sports and culture, but IDPs are equally engaged as locals in decision-making processes related to housing and communal services. When influencing local decision-making, respondents most frequently engage with government bodies or authorities (33%), housing associations (18%), NGOs (17%), and school administrations and teachers (16%).

Note: not all the options of scale are displayed. The total not equal to 100%
HEALTH

Across Ukraine, 14% report lack of access to health services and medicines. This issue is particularly pressing among IDPs – 20% country-wide report lack of access. In the East, 31% and in the South, 27% IDPs struggle to access health care or medicines.

The availability of pharmacies has improved significantly in Kyiv, where only 1% of respondents indicated in Round 6 that no or very few pharmacies were operational near them, compared to 23% in Round 2 (April 1st). In the East macro-region, however, 17% reported no or few pharmacies operated near them.

AVAILABILITY OF MEDICATION

Among all respondents, 23% indicated that they or someone within their family had to stop using their medication because of the war. Among those 80% indicated they were not able to secure the medicines due to availability, and 54% stated they could not afford to buy the medicines (respondents could indicate multiple reasons). Among IDPs, a higher share – 30% indicated they or their household members stopped taking their medication due to the war.

Among those who reported they or their family member stopped taking their medication due to the war, the below share identified a specific type of medication lacking:

Cardio vascular disease medications | 58%
Hypertension medications | 50%
Antibiotics | 19%
Diabetics | 19%
Cancer medications | 12%
Other (don’t specify) | 53%

MENTAL HEALTH AND PSYCHOSOCIAL SUPPORT NEEDS

Among all respondents, 20% 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, 26.5% requested the hotline number for support in Round 6.

Over 16% of all respondents directly reported that they or someone on their household would need psychological counselling. The highest needs for counselling were reported among IDPs:

Non-displaced | 14.3%
IDPs | 21.3%
Returnees | 19.3%

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 6, June 2022.”
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. Sixth round of data collection among a set of unique 2,001 adults (18 years and above) was completed between 17 and 23 June 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 6, 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 6 of this survey a response rate of 12.4% was achieved. A total of 30 interviews were employed for this work. The team was composed of 4 male and 26 female interviewers, and interviews were conducted in Ukrainian (78%) and Russian languages (22%), 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 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 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 Luhansk.

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=2,001). The needs assessment and all other analysis is done using all available sample (considering question refusal rate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-region</th>
<th>Total interviews (f/m/no answer)</th>
<th>Interview share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KYIV</td>
<td>169 (90/79/0)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>487 (280/206/1)</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>184 (112/72/0)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>453 (258/195/0)</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>389 (232/157/0)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRE</td>
<td>318 (180/137/1)</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed location</td>
<td>1 (0/1/0)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ukraine</td>
<td>2,001 (1,152/847/2)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample allocation and number of interviews per macro-region

<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>

Sample error

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.

Starting with Round 6, IOM plans to publish the Ukraine Displacement Report at a regular, monthly frequency.