

NATIONAL MONITORING SYSTEM OF THE SITUATION WITH INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS

Round 3 — May 2016, Ukraine

The International Organization for Migration (IOM), in cooperation with the Ukrainian Center for Social Reforms and with the financial support of the European Union, conducted the third round of the survey on internally displaced persons in Ukraine to contribute to the establishment of a National Monitoring System (NMS) in the country based on the approaches

used for the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM). More detailed information on the methodology is given in the annex.


In this report you will find the data based on face-to-face interviews with IDPs for round three of the survey, which first started in March 2016, namely:

- Social and demographic characteristics of IDPs
- Employment of IDPs
- Well-being of IDPs
- Access to social services
- IDPs' mobility and their integration

SUMMARY


32%

of people who moved are between 35 to 59 years old.



1,459

UAH is the average monthly income per IDP household member in May.




32%

of people older than 18 years are engaged in full-time employment.




73%

of IDP households have members who fall under vulnerable categories (children, students, pensioners, disabled people).



85%

of IDPs are satisfied with the social environment.




38%

of IDPs have been employed for more than a year.




69%

rent different types of accommodation.



13%

of IDPs decided to stay at the current place of residence.



SOCIAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF IDPS

During the survey, respondents were asked about all household members who live with them, so the information on age, sex and social status of household members of surveyed IDPs was received.

The demographic characteristics of IDPs remained almost unchanged in all three rounds. Thus, the sex disaggregation of IDP household members over three rounds is presented in figure 1. The prevalence of women is steady in all rounds of the NMS survey with a 57% share of women and 43% share of men among IDP household members. The figures are close to the State Statistics Service's estimates for the general population of 46% men and 54% women¹.

As per figure, the largest share of people who moved are the age group from 35 to 59 years old (32% in the third round), followed by the 18 to 34 age group with 26%. These two categories make up 58% of people of an employable age (18-59 years)².

Figure 1. Sex disaggregation of IDP household members, %





Figure 2. Age disaggregation of surveyed IDP household members, %



¹ According to data as of January 1, 2016, as estimated by State Statistics Service of Ukraine based on administrative data and latest census data http://ukrstat.gov.ua/operativ/operativ2007/ds/nas_rik/nas_u/nas_rik_u.html

² According to data as of January 1, 2016, as estimated by State Statistics Service of Ukraine based on administrative data and latest census data, the share of people at employable age makes up about 60% http://ukrstat.gov.ua/operativ/operativ2007/ds/nas_rik/nas_u/nas_rik_u.html



Socially vulnerable groups needing priority assistance from the state include: pensioners, the disabled, families with children, orphaned children, youth, women, the unemployed, victims of the Chernobyl accident, poor people, and marginalized sections of the population (homeless, addicted to alcohol and drug addicts).

Table 1. Households with members of vulnerable categories (children, students, pensioners, disabled people), % of surveyed households

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Households with members of vulnerable categories	81	73	73
Households with members of no vulnerable categories	19	27	27

Table 2. IDP households with pensioners as household members, % of surveyed households

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Households with working/non-working retired pensioners (according to respondents)	28	29	30

Table 3. Households with disabled persons (1-3 groups, disabled since childhood), % of surveyed households, % of surveyed households

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Households with disabled persons	14	10	9
Households with no disabled persons	86	90	91

Figure 3. Children in the family, %




Figure 4. Households with children, % of surveyed households




Table 4. Households with students, % of surveyed households

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Households with students	3	7	5
Households with no students	97	93	95

With regard to social characteristics, certain changes have been observed

IDPs engaged in full-time employment – 32% in the third round (Table 8) – represent a plurality based on the social status of respondents in the IDP households over the age of 18. The unemployed (that is without work, but available for work and seeking work) account for 15% of IDPs in the third round, and less than a half of them receive unemployment benefits. During the observation period, there was a steady increase (by 4% each round from 24% to 32%) in the share of people who work full-time. At the same time, the share of unemployed without unemployment benefits decreased by six per cent in the third round as compared to the first round (from 15% to 9%). This could suggest an improvement in employment opportunities for IDPs and social protection of unemployed IDPs.

Table 5. Distribution of households of surveyed IDPs by social status of 18+ respondents

Social Status	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
In full-time employment	24	28	32
In part-time employment	6	8	8
Working retirement pensioners	1	2	1
Self-employed	1	1	1
Non-working retirement pensioners	20	22	22
Unemployed without unemployment benefits	15	12	9
Unemployed, receives unemployment benefits	5	5	6
Do not work, receive pension or benefits (disabled persons; persons on maternity leave)	16	13	13
Unemployed (householder; students)	11	7	7
Other	1	2	1



Photo: Ben Robinson/IOM 2016

Centre for early childhood development, established by IOM-supported IDPs in Odesa



The project is funded by the European Union



The project is implemented by IOM

EMPLOYMENT OF IDPS

Less than half of the IDP households surveyed have regular income from employment. In the third round, there is still an uptick of 5% in the share of IDPs who name a salary as one of the sources of income for their household and of 5% in the share of IDPs with irregular side jobs as compared to the first round. However, the second round had shown an increase of 8% from the first round in the share of irregular side jobs. Such fluctuations are not unusual for this income-generating modality (Table 6, please see Table 10 for a more detailed breakdown of income sources).

The involvement of IDPs in employment is quite low at the new places of residence. Thirty-five per cent of IDPs consider themselves as employed in the third round, or four per cent more than the relevant share in the first round of the survey (Table 7).

If we compare the structure of employment after displacement with the structure of employment before displacement for three rounds, we can note fluctuations in the share of people employed in activities related to industry (Table 8).

Table 6. IDPs citing income from employment as main income source of their households, %

Household Income Source	Share of IDPs with Relevant Income Source		
	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Salary	40	41	45
Irregular side jobs	14	22	19

Note. Respondents could select several options.

Table 7. Change in employment status after displacement, %

Currently employed	Employed before displacement					
	Round 1		Round 2		Round 3	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Yes	27	4	28	5	31	4
No	39	30	34	34	28	37

Table 8. IDPs employed before and after displacement by sector of activity, %

Sector of Activity before Displacement	Share of people employed in the relevant sector out of all people employed before displacement			Share of people employed after displacement out of those engaged in the relevant sector		
	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Industry	22	15	17	10	12	17
Transportation	4	5	3	2	2	4
Trade	17	19	19	17	19	19
Services	24	20	24	30	28	26
Construction	4	4	6	7	4	6
Other	28	10	6	34	14	4
Education	—	9	10	—	7	11
Public administration	—	12	11	—	9	10
Health care	—	6	4	—	4	3

IDPs who managed to find a job after displacement mostly have stable jobs. Thirty-eight per cent in the third round have been in their current jobs for more than a year. The category of “more than one year in employment” is the largest one in this round followed by “from 6 months to one year” that had the highest value in the previous round (Figure 5).

Most IDPs who do not have a job reported the need for support in finding employment. The main type of possible solution that IDPs prefer is the direct provision of a job. Ten per cent of the unemployed are interested in starting their own business (Table 9).

Figure 5. IDPs employed after displacement by duration of employment, %




Table 9. IDPs who do not have jobs by type of preferred support, %

Type of Support	Round 1 (%)	Round 2 (%)	Round 3 (%)
Retraining	4	9	6
Employment	39	31	38
Support in establishment of own business	7	10	10
Consultation in employment center	4	4	1
Other	7	3	3
Do not need a job	36	39	36
Did not respond	3	4	6



Photo: Ben Robinson/IOM 2016

IOM-supported IDP engaged in furniture production in Odesa



The project is funded by the European Union



The project is implemented by IOM

WELL-BEING OF IDPS

The average monthly income per IDP household member for 50 percent of the surveyed IDPs is up to 1,330 UAH, down from 65 percent in the first round. Forty per cent have 1,331-2,500 UAH on average per household member, and ten per cent have more than 2,501 UAH (Figure 6). There is a noticeable increase by 12% in the share of people who state having an income within 1,331-2500 UAH per household member that could explained by some rise in social benefits implemented by the state³.

The main sources of income for people in displacement are given in table 10. The most important source of income is provided by social benefits and IDP allowances. Salaries and pensions also comprise a significant share in the total income of IDP households. For a third of respondents, humanitarian aid is an important source of subsistence. Irregular earnings and family support are the main sources of income for 19% and 16% in the third round, respectively (Table 10).

In case respondents will have no job or livelihood opportunities, most of them (61%) will cut down their expenses first to cope with this and then work more hours (27%), address relatives/friends (28%) and various agencies for support (52%). Five per cent of respondents will decide for return to NGCA (Table 11).

Figure 6. Distribution of IDP households by income level and average monthly income per household member, %




Table 10. Main sources of income in IDP household, %

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Salary	40	41	45
Part time or irregular job	14	22	19
Pension	38	36	32
Support of relatives	13	12	16
IDP allowance	44	54	48
Social benefits	45	44	46
Humanitarian assistance	30	37	32

Table 11. Coping strategies in case of no job and livelihood opportunities, % of respondents

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Reduce household expenditures	45	61	61
Will agree to unsafe or illegal job	5	6	6
Will agree to work on weekend or more hours per day	22	22	27
Will sell things	8	3	5
Receive support from relatives and friends	19	21	28
Try to address state authorities	32	29	29
Try to access NGO or international organization	26	31	23
Return to place of living before displacement	8	6	5

³ According to Article 7 of the Law of Ukraine "On State Budget of Ukraine for 2016", the minimum monthly subsistence level per capita established by the state for 1 January-30 April 2016 is 1,330 UAH, and for 1 May-30 November 2016 is 1,399 UAH. The minimum subsistence level for people able to work is 1,450 UAH since May 1, 2016 (<http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/928-19>).

LIVING CONDITIONS AND ACCOMMODATION TYPES

According to the results of round III, most IDPs live in and pay for their accommodation. Sixty-two per cent (62%) live in rented separate accommodation – rented apartments (47%) and rented houses (15%). A significant share of IDPs (20%) live with relatives or hosting families. Seven per cent of IDPs live in dormitories, 2% stay in collective centers and 15% rent a room in an apartment (Figure 7).

Most IDPs are satisfied with their living conditions. Major complaints refer to insulation and living space as well as sewerage and heating (Figure 8). Fewer concerns relate to safety and the availability of electricity.

Figure 7. IDP accommodation type, %




Figure 8. IDP satisfaction with living conditions, % of respondents




Photo: Ben Robinson/IOM 2016

IDP family trying to make their current home in Zaporizhia look beautiful



The project is funded by the European Union



The project is implemented by IOM

ACCESS TO SOCIAL SERVICES

The accessibility of social services for IDPs reveals the ability to meet the needs of IDPs in vital services and is an important aspect of their integration into the host community. The main point of respondents' concern is the lack of employment opportunities (Figure 9 and 10).

The vast majority of respondents (85%) are satisfied with the social environment of their current place of residence in the third round. This is 11% higher than in the first round, and that is an important illustration of the positive attitude of host communities to IDPs and IDPs' own inclination towards integration. Only 3% of respondents are not satisfied with the social environment.

The levels of IDPs' satisfaction with the possibility of receiving social assistance (72%) and pensions (49% – down from 68% in round one) are relatively high. Nine per cent (9%) and three per cent (3%) of respondents, respectively, are dissatisfied with the aforementioned services (Figures 9 and 10). Table 9 provides more detailed information on responses of households which members receive pensions.

The accessibility of such important public services as education and medical care raises some concerns amongst IDPs. Nine per cent (9%) of respondents are dissatisfied with the possibilities for accessing medical care in the third round, while 7% neutrally evaluate the issue, 80% are

satisfied, and the rest either did not respond or are undecided. A considerable uptick (by 21 %) in the IDP satisfaction level with the medical care facilities during the observation period of March-May 2016 should be noted.

Three per cent (3%) of respondents are dissatisfied with the possibilities of obtaining an education or enrolling children in schools and/or kindergartens, almost eight per cent (7%) of respondents are neutral about access to education, twenty per cent (20%) are undecided, sixty per cent (60%) are satisfied with existing capabilities to obtain education, the remaining share refer to no response (Figures 9 and 10).

Table 12. Satisfaction of IDPs with the possibility of receiving a pension, %

	Speaking about your current place of residence, how satisfied are you with the possibility of receiving a pension ⁴ , %						
	Totally satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Totally dissatisfied	Do not know	No response
Households with working and non-working pensioners	62.3%	20.5%	6.4%	2.6%	3.4%	2.9%	1.9%
Households with members with special needs	41.6%	29.6%	13.7%	4.0%	5.9%	2.2%	3.0%

⁴ The Law of Ukraine on "Pension Provision" differentiates the following types of pensions: labour pension, pension by age, pension by disability, pension for loss of breadwinner, long-service pension (<http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1788-12>). Disability pension is assigned for the duration of disability and are to be re-confirmed. When people with disabilities reach the retirement age, the disability pension is appointed for life and re-examination of such people are conducted only at their request. In case of change of disability group, the amount of pension is also changing.

Job opportunities raise the most concerns. Twenty-six per cent (26%) of respondents noted that they are dissatisfied with opportunities to get a job, while sixteen per cent (16%) are neutral, and thirty eight per cent (38%) are satisfied.

It is also confirmed by the responses of IDPs on the reasons behind further displacement — that problems with housing, high rental payments and lack of employment opportunities are the most challenging (please see Figure 9 below for more detailed information). All other areas — health, education, social protection, public services — are considered by most of key informants to be rather accessible for IDPs

The main reasons for IDPs' dissatisfaction with public services is the lack of jobs (56%), lack of funds (21%), lack of information support (21%), gross attitudes towards displaced (14%) and corruption (15%) (Table 13).



Photo: Ben Robinson/IOM 2016

IOM-supported IDPs growing strawberry in Zhytomyr Region



The project is funded by the European Union

Figure 9. IDPs satisfaction with public services and environment, % of respondents




Figure 10. IDPs dissatisfaction with public services and environment, % of respondents




Table 13. Reasons for IDPs' dissatisfaction with public services, % of respondents who responded positively

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Lack of necessary documents	13	8	7
Lack of funds	44	24	21
Lack of information	30	34	21
Corruption	20	21	15
Brusque treatment	28	22	14
Transport accessibility	5	9	10
Other	27	13	12
Lack of job vacancies	—	38	56

IDPS' MOBILITY AND THEIR INTEGRATION

Almost 99% of the surveyed IDPs come from the Donbas, and the number of people who left Donetsk Oblast is nearly twice the number of those who were displaced from Luhansk Oblast (Table 14).

The interviewed IDPs reside in host areas for quite a long time. The share of people staying 18 months and more at the current place of residence was steadily increasing from round to round and comprised 45% in round 3 (25% growth in the category) (Table 15).

Table 14. Distribution of IDPs by place of origin, %

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
AR Crimea	1.3	1.4	1.6
Donetsk Oblast	63.5	66.9	66.4
Luhansk Oblast	35.2	31.7	32.0

Table 15. Distribution of IDPs by duration of stay in current place of living by rounds, %

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Up to 6 months	8	11	5
6-12 months inclusive	21	17	16
12-18 months inclusive	51	35	34
More than 18 months	20	37	45

Table 16. Distribution of IDPs by number of movements in displacement, % by place of origin

	Round 1				Total	Round 2				Total	Round 3				Total
	AR Crimea	Donetsk Oblast	Luhansk Oblast	Total		AR Crimea	Donetsk Oblast	Luhansk Oblast	Total		AR Crimea	Donetsk Oblast	Luhansk Oblast	Total	
Did not move after displacement from place of origin	80	72	71	71	96	75	74	75	75	80	82	83	82		
Moved farther, including:	20	28	29	29	4	25	26	25	25	20	18	16	18		
Once	1	15	7	12	0	10	6	9	9	0	8	5	8		
Twice	0	8	13	10	4	8	13	10	10	0	7	6	7		
Three and more	19	5	9	7	0	6	7	6	6	20	3	5	3		

For the vast majority of IDPs, the current place of residence is the first location after displacement, where they have lived for at least a month. IDPs who initially moved from Crimea most rarely moved, as compared to people displaced from the NGCA of Luhansk Oblast (Table 16).

The main reasons that prod IDPs to move again after displacement are issues with housing. On the other hand, the unavailability of health care facilities and lack of educational possibilities have rarely been determined as reasons to move farther (Table 17).

According to the third round data, every eighth IDP intends to remain permanently in the current place of residence. The highest rate is for IDPs from Crimea, and the lowest is for

**Table 17. IDPs' reasons to move again after displacement
(% of people who responded to the relevant question)**

	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Lack of employment opportunities	17	14	12
Problems with housing	40	41	41
High rental payment for housing	29	36	36
Safety issues	12	9	7
Lack of education possibilities	2	1	4
Inaccessibility of healthcare facilities	2	2	3
Social environment	3	6	6

IDPs coming from Donetsk Oblast. Over one-half of IDPs plan to remain in the current settlement till the end of the conflict (52%) or for at least a year (10%) (Table 18). The vast majority of those who intend to relocate plan to settle in Ukraine.

Almost one-fifth of IDPs are willing to return at some point in time to

the NGCA. The majority of IDPs with such intentions come from Donetsk Oblast. About half of the IDPs from Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts and more than one-third of the IDPs from Crimea are undecided about their intentions to return to their place of residence before displacement (Table 19).

Table 18. Distribution of IDPs by intention to stay in the current place of living, %

Do you plan to stay in the current place of living?	Round 1				Total	Round 2				Total	Round 3				Total
	AR Crimea	Donetsk Oblast	Luhansk Oblast	Total		AR Crimea	Donetsk Oblast	Luhansk Oblast	Total		AR Crimea	Donetsk Oblast	Luhansk Oblast	Total	
Yes, forever	20	10	17	13	23	11	15	12	17	14	11	13			
Yes, at least for a year	0.0	12	1	11	16	9	14	11	10	7,5	16	10			
Yes, till the conflict ends	52	54	41	49	18	54	40	49	23	53	52	52			
Yes, other	14	1	3	2	4	2	9	4	0	1	2	2			
No	8	5	10	7	1	5	5	5	4	4	4	4			
Difficult to respond / no response	6	18	18	18	38	19	17	19	46	28	15	19			

Table 19. Distribution of IDPs by intention to return to their places of living before displacement, %

Do you plan to return to your place of living before displacement?	Round 1				Total	Round 2				Total	Round 3				Total
	AR Crimea	Donetsk Oblast	Luhansk Oblast	Total		AR Crimea	Donetsk Oblast	Luhansk Oblast	Total		AR Crimea	Donetsk Oblast	Luhansk Oblast	Total	
Yes	8	47	39	44	8	43	24	37	20	40	25	33			
No	22	19	27	22	58	17	28	21	31	20	28	27			
Difficult to respond / no response	70	34	34	34	34	40	48	42	49	40	47	40			



ANNEX. METHODOLOGY

The information support of NMS in the third round is performed by combining data obtained from multiple sources, namely:

- administrative data;
- data of sample surveys of IDP households;
- available relevant data from other sources.

The object of the NMS is the IDP population at their place of settlement in 24 oblasts of Ukraine and the city of Kyiv.

The subject of this survey is the situation and problems related to IDPs' location, their movements or intentions to move further, return intentions, and local communities' perception of the IDPs' situation in 24 oblasts of Ukraine and the city of Kyiv.

Target groups — IDP individuals and

households.

The survey collects information on: socioeconomic characteristics of IDPs and IDP households, IDP trends and movement intentions, employment and livelihood of IDPs, IDP access to social services, preferred sustainable solutions and assistance needs as well as analysis and recommendations on the ways to solve the problems.

With the purpose to conduct face-to-face interviews with key informants and IDP households, a territorial sample comprising 300 units was devised (sample distribution by oblasts is provided in Table 1). The general population of registered IDPs as of December 2015 was stratified by oblast. The selection of territorial units was carried out with the probability proportional to the number of

registered IDPs in each of them. In each territorial unit, two key informants and two IDP households were selected for the third round of the NMS.

The sample survey of IDP households for face-to-face interviews envisages the formation of a stratified multistage probability sample of households. The monthly sample size makes up no less than 600 households. The cumulative sample size will be no less than 2,400 households. This will provide a reliable assessment of key indicators at the national level (on a monthly basis) as well as a regional one based on data consolidated during March-May 2016. The distribution of IDP households for face-to-face interviews within the second round of the NMS is provided in Table 2.

Photo: Ben Robinson/IOM 2016



IDP child in Zhytomyr

Table 1. Distribution of the sample for territorial units within oblasts of Ukraine

Oblast	Number of territorial units selected
Total	300
Vinnitsia	5
Volyn	5
Dnipropetrovsk	13
Donetsk	88
Zhytomyr	5
Zakarpattia	5
Zaporizhia	18
Ivano-Frankivsk	5
Kyiv city	18
Kyiv oblast (excluding Kyiv)	7
Kirovohrad	5
Luhansk	35
Lviv	5
Mykolaiv	5
Odesa	6
Poltava	5
Rivne	5
Sumy	5
Ternopil	5
Kharkiv	30
Kherson	5
Khmelnysky	5
Cherkasy	5
Chernivtsi	5
Chernihiv	5

Table 2. Distribution of IDP households for face-to-face interviews

Oblast	Number of key informants
Total	600
Vinnitsa	10
Volyn	10
Dnipropetrovsk	26
Donetsk	176
Zhytomyr	10
Zakarpattia	10
Zaporizhia	36
Ivano-Frankivsk	10
Kyiv city	36
Kyiv (excluding Kyiv)	14
Kirovohrad	10
Luhansk	70
Lviv	10
Mykolaiv	10
Odesa	12
Poltava	10
Rivne	10
Sumy	10
Ternopil	10
Kharkiv	60
Kherson	10
Khmelnysky	10
Cherkasy	10
Chernivtsi	10
Chernihiv	10

Monthly assessments of situation with internally displaced persons (IDPs) in all oblasts of Ukraine are implemented within the framework of the EU-funded project 'Comprehensive Stabilization Support to IDPs and the Affected Population in Ukraine', implemented by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), Mission in Ukraine in partnership with the Ukrainian Center of Social Reforms.



For more information
please contact
International Organization
for Migration (IOM)
Mission in Ukraine:
8 Mykhailivska Street,
Kyiv, Ukraine, 01001
Tel: (044) 568-50-15
Fax: (044) 568-50-16
E-mail: iomkievcomm@iom.int



The project is funded by the European Union



The project is implemented by IOM