Executive Summary

The UN in Ukraine launched the humanitarian situation monitoring process to inform planning for immediate response and for adequate preparedness measures in case of further deterioration of the humanitarian situation in Ukraine. The joint assessment was conducted in two phases, applying a multi-sectorial key informant assessment methodology and covering the regions of Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, Kharkiv, Luhansk and Zaporizhia.

This report provides a comprehensive overview of the situation and the current needs as of 18 July 2014 in the two areas directly affected by fighting (Donetsk and Luhansk) and the three neighbouring regions (Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv, Zaporizhia), which were significantly affected by displacement.

The first section of the report contextualizes the assessment by providing an overview of the main drivers and vulnerability factors of the situation, particularly the continuation of fighting in the densely populated urban areas of Donetsk and Luhansk. The basic characteristics of the affected population and major displacement trends are outlined, followed by a general overview of access to services and security situation. The findings confirm that it has been the urban population that has been most affected.

Humanitarian needs are then assessed by cross-sector comparison of severity of situation in the three of the life-saving sectors: food security; water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH); and health. Impact on service provision in the coming months is assessed and a general comparative overview of response and current gaps is provided.

Overall findings, which allow for a degree of prioritisation that can assist in the effective preparation for any future deterioration of the situation, suggest that humanitarian needs are currently limited in geographic and sectorial scope. The assessment confirms that the three most affected basic services were the banking system, law and order and transport. However, as the situation deteriorates and lingers on, services such as water supply, health, education, as well as justice and administrative services are increasingly affected.

Section two of the report provides a detailed sector-specific overview and analysis of the underlying situation, needs, trends and risks, current response and response capacities across the sectors. The following sectors are assessed: health; food security; livelihoods; water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH); education and protection.

Throughout the report, and in particular in the sectorial sections, the sector-specific primary data obtained though the joint inter-agency monitoring in June and July is complemented by the latest secondary sector-specific data. The sectorial sections, therefore, provide a comprehensive analysis to inform humanitarian action, which is principled and firmly grounded in need. The sector analysis sub-sections are concluded with a list of immediate and mid-term priority activities within each sector to guide the future sector response. The methodological overview is included in the annex of the report.
Introduction

In response to the situation in Ukraine, humanitarian partners have launched a humanitarian situation monitoring process (HSM) that informs planning both for immediate response as well as for adequate preparedness measures in case of further deterioration of the humanitarian situation.

The first phase of the HSM was a rapid needs assessment, conducted by telephone with key informants in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts (provinces) in eastern Ukraine.

The extended second phase, for which results are presented in this report, comprised in-person interviews with key informants conducted between 1 and 8 July, direct observation, and secondary data collection and analysis. In addition to Donetsk and Luhansk, this phase also covered three neighbouring regions in the east – Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv and Zaporizhia.

This report provides a comprehensive overview of the situation and current needs in the five areas most affected by fighting as of 18 July 2014. It furthermore provides a substantive and methodological baseline for future monitoring and needs assessments in these as well as other areas affected by fighting or displacement, and aims to contribute to contingency and preparedness planning for a potential significant increase in humanitarian needs.

Main drivers of the crisis and vulnerability factors

Since the political crisis escalated into unrest between the Ukrainian Government and non-state armed groups in the Donbas region of eastern Ukraine (Donetsk and Luhansk) in April 2014, the population of this region in particular have become increasingly vulnerable. The numbers of refugees and IDPs from these areas have increased steadily, also placing pressure on neighbouring oblasts and otherwise less-affected areas of western Ukraine. IDPs are reported to be leaving with few belongings and in need of shelter, food, and non-food assistance.

The population remaining in Donbas region, even those not directly affected by security incidents and fighting, are facing reduced services, particularly in health (including shortages of medications and medical supplies, partially due to increased demand at some areas resulting from incoming displacement flows). Disturbance in water and energy supply has also been reported.

Although a ceasefire was agreed between the Government and the self-proclaimed authorities in Donetsk and Luhansk in late June, it was observed inconsistently and ended on 30 June. The ensuing Government-led military operation in the east shortly afterwards, led to significant territorial gains and the Government retaking on 5 July some of the key cities (Kramatorsk, Krasny Liman, Sloviansk) that had been under control of armed groups since May. Armed groups have retreated towards the cities of Donetsk and Luhansk, the suburbs of which have since seen most of the violence.

The principal driver of vulnerability of the population of Donbas is the continuation of the fighting in densely-populated urban areas. This is likely to lead to increases in casualties among civilians, continued displacement (both cross-border and internal), disruption of services as well as economic losses. Continuation of military action could further exacerbate tensions between groups, particularly Russian-speaking groups in eastern Ukraine, some of whom support the insurgents, and the rest of the population. These tensions and the continued outflow of population could spill over into neighbouring regions.

Affected Population

The five oblasts (level 1 administrative areas) included in this assessment – Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, Kharkiv, Luhansk and Zaporizhia – are largely urbanised, with 85 per cent of the combined 14.4 million inhabitants living in urban areas.1 This ratio is even larger – 89 per cent – in the Donbas region (Donetsk and Luhansk) which has been directly affected by violence. The Donbas region has a large Russian-speaking majority, comprising 73 per cent of the population, with Ukrainian speakers comprising 26 per cent; some 39 per cent of population in Donbas region is ethnically Russian. In Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv and Zaporizhia the numbers of Russian speakers are smaller: 44 per cent, 32 per cent and 48 per cent, respectively. Some 22 per cent of population of the three oblasts is ethnically Russian.2

Given the high levels of urbanisation in this region, the monitoring focused heavily on urban areas, with 79 per cent of assessed sites being classified either as ‘urban’ or ‘industrial centre', and the remaining 21 per

---

1 Ukraine Statistical Office, as at 1 January 2014
2 Ukraine National Census, 2001
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cent as ‘rural’ or ‘semi-urban’. The key informants\(^3\) provided information concerning 35 per cent of the total population of five regions; raions (level 2 administrative area) and sites were purposely selected to ensure all most-affected areas were assessed. Some 41 per cent of assessed sites reported sporadic or frequent fighting.

Identified vulnerable groups generally include the elderly, people with special needs, women and children (although only rarely unaccompanied children). HIV-affected people and other minorities were also reported at most sites in Kharkiv, while to a lesser extent in other assessed oblasts.

**Displacement Trends**

As of 18 July, some 80,000 IDPs displaced from or within Donbas have been reported to UNHCR, together with some 15,000 Crimean IDPs. Due to a lack of a centralised registration system, the exact number is likely to be higher. Limited return has been witnessed in areas retaken by the Government in early July.

The majority of IDP movements have been out of Donbas region (84 per cent), of which a combined 42 per cent have been to the neighbouring oblasts of Kharkiv (23,520), Dnipropetrovsk (5,458) and Zaporizhia (4,551); among the interviewed informants in Donetsk and Luhansk, however, Crimea was the most frequently sited destination of IDP movements. The major urban centres of Kyiv, Odessa and Lviv\(^4\) also received a significant number of IDPs, though Lviv was very rarely mentioned as a destination (at only 3 per cent of sites). Displacement within the oblasts is, however, significant and the movement is not only reported within Donetsk and Luhansk, but also within Dnipropetrovsk and Kharkiv. At some sites in the latter two oblasts, there were indications that people want to leave, which is likely linked to the availability of services at displacement sites in those oblasts.

Some 139,000 Ukrainians have reportedly fled the unrest to Russia\(^5\), including 36,617 Ukrainians who have applied for refugee status or temporary asylum. Flight to Russia is primarily from Luhansk oblast, which has a longer Russian border. Another 750 people have applied for asylum in other neighbouring countries.

Secondary evidence suggests that fewer men than women are being displaced. This could be explained by men having more formal employment responsibilities, despite the increasing unemployment rate; they might be staying behind to fight or protect property; or their flight might be blocked at checkpoints. Women may also be more represented because they accompany children.

While the situation monitoring provided some further insight on displacement trends, more information about the origin, destinations, and demographics of displacement is required for targeted and efficient humanitarian response. Consolidated IDP registration data, currently still missing, remains an urgent priority.

**Access to Services**

Overall, the three most affected basic services according to key informants were the banking system, law and order and transport. Other services affected were water supply, health, education, as well as justice, administrative services, and provision of identity and passport documents.

While the restoration of both Government- and privately-provisioned services (the latter including banking and transport) is a higher priority than ‘typical’ humanitarian interventions in health, food or education, significant differences were observed among oblasts. Overall, access to services was more affected in Donetsk than Luhansk. In neighbouring oblasts the impact level was lower, while Zaporizhia was worse affected than Dnipropetrovsk, and Kharkiv was virtually unaffected. Services in urban areas and industrial centres were more affected than in rural areas, with transport perceived as the most greatly affected service in semi-urban areas.

\(^3\) 71 sites were assessed and in total 259 key informants were interviewed, on average 3.6 per site. 61 per cent of key informants were representatives of local authorities; health sector professionals represented 18 per cent of all key informants. 60 per cent of informants were female.

\(^4\) UNHCR (via OCHA) overview of population displacement – see the latest version on 18 July 2014.

\(^5\) As reported to UNHCR by Russian Federal Migration Service, 10 July 2014.
Severity of impact on services, overall and per oblast. Percentage score calculated with 3=very affected in all areas, 2=very affected in some areas, 1=sustained but coping, 0=operating as before.

These average values hide some large differences between different assessment sites. Key informants from Sloviansk in particular (in the north of Donetsk oblast), where there has been sustained fighting, reported a marked worsening in the reported situation in many of the raions assessed in both phases, with more frequent reports of most types of service being very affected in all or most areas.

A comparison between levels of impacts recorded in the Phase 1 assessment in June shows a marked worsening in the reported situation in many of the raions assessed in both phases, with more frequent reports of most types of service being very affected in all or most areas.

Methodology

The assessment was based on interviews with key informants (KIs) conducted mostly in person, and is a purposive, non-representative sample based on perception.

- **Sites** were selected based on criteria including population density, security incidents, income levels, urban/rural and industrial/agricultural differences.
- **Key informants** were identified from a list of functions and professions relevant to each sector.
- **The questionnaire** covered different sections on Population and Displacement, Security and Humanitarian Access, Food Security and Livelihoods, WASH, Health, Education, Access to Resources and GBV. One questionnaire was completed for each site, collating information from between one and nine key informants per site.
- **A total of 259 key informants** were interviewed, covering 71 sites in 60 raions. 59 per cent of informants were female.
- **Further details** on the methodology can be found in the annex to this report.
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Security and Access

Security Incidents

A large number of incidents were reported during June and early July in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts, correlated predominantly with urban areas. The areas around Sloviansk in northern Donetsk oblast, and Severodonetsk in western Luhansk were particular hotspots. By early July, the violence had shifted towards the suburban areas of the two provincial capitals of Donbas region, Donetsk and Luhansk.

The perceived level of fighting and hotspots correlate closely with reported incidents, the areas in which key informants report people feeling unsafe, namely the oblasts of Donetsk and Luhansk. For the 35 sites reporting people feeling unsafe, the reasons given when scored by severity were predominantly the ongoing insecurity, though the impact of increased criminality and access to arms was considered nearly as high. The feeling of lack of safety is, however, also reported outside of areas of violence (i.e., Zaporizhia oblast), with access to services being the predominant reason for people feeling unsafe, which could hint at potential future displacement.

Humanitarian Needs

Severity of Situation

Key informants ranked food security, WASH and health on a severity scale from 0 to 6 to indicate the severity of the current situation in these life-sustaining sectors, and the need for humanitarian assistance. The average scores across the three sectors were 1.49 (food security), 1.55 (WASH) and 1.90 (health), indicating minor to moderate concern. Nevertheless, these scores represent a significant increase over those

---

6 The section refers exclusively to the needs of population in the areas affected by fighting and does not cover IDPs or refugees outside of those areas.
from Phase 1, assessed just a few weeks earlier using similar methodology. Across all sectors, Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts scored higher, with an average score above moderate concern.

The average values hide consistent differences across sites, with key informants in Sloviansk reporting the maximum score of 6 (catastrophic life-threatening situation). Five other sites in Donetsk, and three in Luhansk, have average scores above 3 (at or above major concern). It should however be noted that some of the assigned severity scale scores did not correlate well with other responses at the same site, suggesting that despite training in the scale’s correct use the monitors may have overestimated severity of impact in some instances.

While the severity scores have since likely improved at the most critical locations (primarily Sloviansk, Kramatorsk and the surroundings) and potentially worsened at some other areas, the differences reported, i.e., the deterioration of the situation between the two phases, is indicative of the potential vulnerability of population in the areas affected by fighting.

Whilst this makes it clear that, overall, humanitarian needs are currently limited; this ranking nevertheless allows a degree of prioritisation, which can assist in effective preparation for a future deterioration. As in Phase 1, the reported average severity across sectors was higher in Donetsk than in Luhansk (2.13 vs 2.02), and in both oblasts Health was reported as being the most severely affected. The severity score for WASH was worse than that of Food security in Donetsk, but vice versa in Luhansk.

Service Provision

When asked to evaluate the likely impact on services over the next three months, respondents cited water supply (second most frequently cited at 42 per cent of sites), as well as health (fifth most frequently cited, at 27 per cent of sites) as immediate day-to-day and life-sustaining concerns. Otherwise, concerns over banking and transport continued to predominate, likely due to high reliance of population on social transfers. The increase in ranking of water and health over their ranking in the evaluation of the current service level (above) can be explained by the criticality of these services and respondents recognizing the impact should the situation in the area persist, with increasing concerns about current vulnerabilities translating over the next three months into real and acute needs.

Among IDPs specifically, access to services was among the most frequently cited challenges, together with employment opportunities (both 73 per cent). Banking services were described as a particular problem in Zaporizhia, while shelter was the top concern reported in the sites in Dnipropetrovsk (3 of 4 sites). When asked for reasons, registration difficulties were frequently cited as the problem preventing access to social welfare and pension payments, while the lack of documents also featured heavily in explaining lack of employment opportunities, together with the lack of available jobs. The fewer sites with shelter concerns predominantly indicated that this was due to the temporary nature of their shelter (dormitories or children’s summer camps). Regarding banking, most respondents cited the issue of locked card accounts (rather than banks not being open or too difficult to access).
Significant differences were observed among oblasts. While banking services and water supply are seen as major issues for the next three months in Donetsk oblast, the primary concern expressed by key informants for Luhans were law and order, and transport. Administrative and health service provision was considered of most concern for Kharkiv, transportation for Zaporizhia, and solid waste management for Dnipropetrovsk.

As many of these needs are related to services that rely primarily on local authorities or the private sector to restore, humanitarian action in the short term should be prioritised to feasible interventions in the hardest-hit areas, prioritising sectors that are potentially life-threatening (Health and WASH) and targeted towards the most vulnerable groups.

**Response and Gaps**

The Government of Ukraine has not yet requested international humanitarian assistance in response to the situation in the east. To date, humanitarian needs have been largely addressed directly by the Government, Ukrainian community-based organizations, voluntary assistance by the community, and regional and local authorities.

In the areas directly affected by fighting, response has been limited to individual national and international NGOs and actors providing assistance mainly through the provision of emergency health, water and sanitation services at some locations in Donetsk and Luhansk regions. Response to date has largely managed to meet the immediate needs due to relatively localized occurrence of fighting and unrest. In some of those areas (Sloviansk in Donetsk oblast and Krasnodon and Severodonetsk in Luhansk), the assessment confirmed problems with the delivery of assistance.

Of the areas not affected by fighting, obstacles with delivery of assistance were reported only in Yakymivskyi (Zaporizhia) due to lack of infrastructure as well as the absence of state aid, with assistance provided by religious and volunteer groups only.

While several UN agencies have been responding to individual targeted requests for relief items and services from their counterpart ministries in the Government, the activities of the United Nations in Ukraine have been primarily focused on preparedness and planning for effective future potential humanitarian response. Limited availability of reliable and sector-wide information on needs, response and partner capacity, as well as limited source of comprehensive and verifiable information on the developing situation on the ground remains a major challenge.

Limited information on vulnerable groups was identified within the humanitarian community as one of the major information gaps, as well as the need for more detailed information from the various sectors. Lack of access or limited physical presence is cited as the major obstacles that hinder proper monitoring, documenting and reporting.
Health

Sources and scope of analysis

This analysis is based on a review of secondary data on the current health situation in Ukraine, primary data collected by Health Impact Specialists (HIS) from WHO Ukraine as well as on site, structured key informant interviews conducted between 1 and 8 July 2014.

Of the 259 key informants interviewed for HSM Phase 2, 46 were representatives from the health sector. In total 71 urban, industrial, semi-urban and rural sites were assessed, nine sites in oblast Dnipropetrovsk, 31 sites in Donetsk, nine sites in Kharkiv, 14 sites in Luhansk and eight sites in Zaporizhia. At 39 (55 per cent) assessment sites, at least one health sector specialist was interviewed. The sites included in the study covered a mix of areas differently affected by the fighting, with 54 per cent reporting no fighting in the last 30 days within the vicinity, and 41 per cent reporting sporadic or frequent fighting.

The health sector key informants were asked to rate the overall general status of health in the district/rayon based on a seven-point severity scale, and were asked questions related to the health status of the population, most frequent reported health issues and access and availability to health care services based on visits to three health institutions in 50 km radius of the assessment site. Access of the displaced population to health services, common illnesses affecting children under five and access to reproductive health/family planning services were also assessed.

Please see Annex B for the questionnaire and page 5 for the seven-point severity scale.

Underlying situation

Prior to the escalation for the current situation, all pillars of the Ukrainian health system were challenged. This includes management of tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, and non-communicable diseases as well as low vaccination coverage. Progress of health system reform to ensure universal access to quality health services was limited. Coordination gaps between health stakeholders have been of particular concern, with the poor, vulnerable and marginalized groups having limited access to health services. Essential public health functions have shortcomings. Ukraine is currently at high risk of a polio outbreak and other preventable disease outbreaks. Clearly, the crisis adds even more burden on the already stretched health system.

Overview of recent findings

Affected Areas

On average over all assessed sites, the health sector monitors rated the general status of health in the district/rayon 1.9 (moderate concern) on the seven-point severity scale. This indicates that people can cope with current resources, but there is significant strain and the situation requires very close monitoring. Donetsk (2.45 – moderate to major concern) and Luhansk (2.21) are more severely affected than the neighbouring oblasts.

In Donetsk oblast, rural areas are more severely affected (3.5 – major to severe situation) than urban or industrial areas; however in Luhansk, both rural and urban areas are reported as being roughly equally affected (around 2.0 – moderate concern).

Some raions are acutely affected. Sloviansk city scores 6 (catastrophic problems), Slovianskyi 5 (critical problems), Kramatorsk, Sverdlovsk and Krasnyi Liman 4. (See map).

Despite Donetsk ranking higher on the severity scale than Luhansk, more sites in Luhansk report a serious problem regarding health (Question 2: “Is there a serious problem regarding health system in this district?”).
Overall, 20 per cent of sites report a serious problem, rising to 43 per cent of sites in Luhansk. The urban/rural divide is particularly significant, with all assessed rural sites in Luhansk reporting a serious problem, but only half of the urban sites. Semi-urban sites in Zaporizhia also report serious problems, but no problems are reported in any industrial centres. (See graph below).

Only a few sites in Donetsk indicated a deterioration in people’s health over the previous three months, with the figure for Zaporizhia being worse (an average score of -0.38, where -1 is worse, 0 stable, +1 better), and in Luhansk worse still (-0.5). The situation is worse in rural and semi-urban than in urban areas. (See graph below).

**Needs and Vulnerable Groups**

**IDPs:** Only six sites in Zaporizhia and Kharkiv cited access of displaced population to health services as an issue. The reasons given were the lack of additional medicines to meet the needs of IDPs, their frequent lack of medical documents making it more difficult to ensure proper treatment, the large distances from IDP locations to hospitals, and the IDPs’ lack of money to afford transportation or treatment – in some cases even for basic drugs.

**Children:** 27 of 71 sites mentioned high a incidence of illnesses affecting under-fives, with the majority of these citing respiratory disease and seven sites mentioning diarrhoea or pneumonia.

**Roma:** To meet the needs of the increasing number of displaced Roma, WHO has invited Roma NGOs to join the health sector. A special sub-group of the health sector is coordinating the Roma Health response plans.

**Main Concerns**
The most frequently reported health issues in the key informant interviews were chronic diseases. Only in Luhansk, injuries and psychological trauma were reported more often (see graph below). In Donetsk, “other” was the second most frequently reported category, which represents predominantly cardiological and neurological problems. Respiratory diseases are frequently cited in all oblasts except for Donetsk, while sites in Kharkiv and Zaporizhia frequently mentioned disabilities. Diarrhoea and malnutrition were very rarely mentioned.
Nearly all (89 per cent) of sites indicated problems with availability of health services, and 37 per cent indicated problems with access to health services. Of these, the largest problem concerning availability was the lack of medicines (mentioned by 83 per cent of sites, particularly in the most affected oblasts) and lack of vaccinations for children (71 per cent). The latter was the most pressing problem in Donetsk, Kharkiv and Dnipropetrovsk, though less so in Luhansk and Zaporizhzhya. Lack of medical staff was the biggest issue in Luhansk, but not evident elsewhere, while the lack of ambulances was the most frequently cited concern in Zaporizhzhya. Access was most restricted by limited economic resources (68 per cent overall), particularly in Luhansk, Kharkiv and Dnipropetrovsk, with logistic constraints a more frequently-cited factor in Zaporizhzhya and Donetsk, as well as in semi-urban areas overall. Lack of documents was rarely mentioned. (See graph below).

Lack of access to reproductive health services was reported in three sites: Sloviansk and Sviatohirsk as well as Popasnaya city in Luhansk’s Popasnianskyi raion.

Concerning the types of health services available, there was an 88 per cent average availability across all sites and services reported, however Kharkiv reported an almost complete lack of vaccinations/nutrition surveillance and mental health treatment. Service availability in rural areas was worse than in other types of sites, including a relative absence of blood bank facilities as well as surveillance and mental health (see graph below).
When asked to categorize and rank the health interventions urgently required, supply of medication was overwhelmingly ranked the most important intervention required, though financing was a big concern in the three neighbouring oblasts. Luhansk sites most frequently cited the lack of equipment and vehicles, and in Kharkiv vaccinations were flagged as a comparatively major concern. (See graph below).

**Trends and Risks**

Staffing shortages were frequently reported, mainly due to resignations and problems of access to the workplace (security risks, transport system). Some ambulance and emergency health workers have reported being under fire or threatened in cases of failing to provide medical services.

Occasional power and water supply cut-off disrupted some emergency medical services and pose risks for water- and foodborne outbreaks.

**Current response and response capacities**

WHO, as the secretariat of the health sector and in partnership with the Ministry of Health, is conducting in-depth assessments on health needs as well as regular monitoring through 13 HIS, who liaise on a daily basis with a dedicated coordinator based in the WHO Country office in Kyiv.

Health sector coordination meetings, co-chaired by the Ministry of Health and WHO, are conducted on a weekly basis and mental health and psychosocial support sub-sector meetings, co-chaired by UNICEF and WHO, on a bi-weekly basis to ensure a concerted effort and to avoid gaps and overlaps in service provision. The sector has been strengthened by additional WHO staff capacity, supported by WHO Regional Office for Europe and Headquarters.

The Health sector invites all partners to mobilize volunteer health workers from all disciplines from abroad. An inter-agency flash appeal is under preparation.

WHO will provide trauma kits to Donbas area with quantities currently negotiated with the Ministry of Health.

**Information gaps**

The rapidly changing situation and needs make the understanding of regional needs difficult, particularly due to rapid reallocation of available resources within the region. Comprehensive pre-crisis data on outbreaks and recent health seeking behaviours is not always readily available. Data from different sources is sometimes incoherent or contradictory.

These gaps will be addressed through further assessments and regular monitoring through the 13 WHO HIS.

**Priority activities over next 30 days**

Priority activities to address the needs of the affected population include:

- Continuous coordination of the health sector response.
- Facilitate and support the supply of drugs and consumables.
- Prevention, timely detection and rapid response to public health emergencies caused by any hazard, including infectious disease outbreaks, especially to any case of poliomyelitis caused by wild poliovirus (WPV).
- Ensuring access to quality primary, hospital and referral health services.
- Prevention of excess morbidity and mortality from TB and HIV to prevent growth of resistance to anti-TB drugs and transmission within the communities affected and beyond.
• Increased access to antiretroviral drugs and harm reduction (particularly opioid substitution therapy) for treatment and prevention of HIV infection across the HIV cascade of care especially for injecting drug users and other key populations.
• Continued access to treatment of chronic non-communicable diseases, including opioid substitution therapy.
• Access to community based mental health / psychosocial support to people affected by the crisis.
• Technical assistance on other key public health issues, including preparedness and response to CBRN incidents.

Food security

Sources and scope of analysis

This analysis is based primarily on the results of the HSM Phase 2, which was conducted through observation and key informant interviews in the oblasts of Donetsk, Luhansk, Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv and Zaporizhzhia. Additional data from secondary sources and reports from the field were also used to supplement the analysis. All statistics in the following section on the underlying situation are from the State Statistics Service. (Available online at [http://ukrstat.org](http://ukrstat.org)).

Underlying situation

As a net exporter of food, Ukraine is not expected to face food availability issues at the national level in spite of the ongoing situation in the east of the country, which disrupts agricultural activities. Household food production is an integral part of the Ukrainian food culture, which supplements the household with fresh fruits and vegetables. In 2012, food produced by households accounted for almost 50 percent of the gross agricultural production, with 66 percent of potatoes, 64 percent of dairy, 53 percent of vegetables, and 52 percent of fruits.

The household garden plot as well as home-production income comprise, on average, one fifth of aggregate household resources. Median monthly income was 4,176 UAH (approximately US$357) in 2013, and the average monthly subsistence level was 1,108 UAH (approximately US$95). In 2013, food expenses accounted for 53 percent of aggregate household expenditures. Rural households allocated a larger share of aggregate expenditures to food than urban households, at 57 and 51 percent respectively. Rural dwellers consume 1.7 times more potatoes, 1.3 times more bread and bakery products, and 1.2 times more sugar, vegetables and gourds than urban dwellers. At an average of 2,956 kcals (in 2013), the caloric intake for the average Ukrainian is well above the recommended limit of 2500 kcals per person per day.

Overview of recent findings

Affected Areas

According to the primary data analysis for the HSM second phase, the most affected oblasts in terms of food security are Donetsk and Luhansk, followed by Zaporizhzhia. No reports from any of the sites in Kharkiv or Dnipropetrovsk indicated problems of food insecurity. This assessment took place before the Ukrainian army regained control over most of northern Donetsk oblast and the current situation of food security in these areas has improved.

Availability: Overall food production in the eastern region of the country is not a concern, despite minor reports of a decline in local food production and disruption of industrial agricultural activities as a result of the ongoing crisis. However, there are indications that reduced household food production will likely affect negatively local food availability, especially for fruits, vegetables and dairy products in Donetsk and Luhansk. Also food supply to Donetsk and Luhansk is constrained...
owing to security threats and the destruction of bridges and roads. Hence, the diversity of food products in
the market is reportedly reduced, although no data on specific products in short supply are available.

Access: Physical and economic food access are currently affected in the following ways: 1) the local
population faces security threats when shopping for food; 2) public transportation is disrupted in the
hotspots; 3) food prices have moderately increased; and 4) household incomes have moderately decreased,
either through non-payment of salaries or loss of jobs.

Approximately half of the sites surveyed in Donetsk reported that food supply is reduced both in terms of
quantity and diversity. However, the main concern in this oblast is increasing cost of food coupled with a
decline in available income. At the same time, it was also reported that cost of food and services was not
significantly higher in recent weeks, therefore results are not definitive at this time. Raions of potential
concern are: Avdiivka, Druzhivka, Deshynsk, Kramatorsk, and especially Sviatogirsk and Sloviansk.
In Luhans, security and logistical constraints, which limit access to markets, were also cited as factors
negatively affecting food security, in addition to reduced quantity and diversity of food in the markets, and
increased cost of food and declining household incomes. Luhans city is of particular concern, as well as
Rovenky raion. In both Donetsk and Luhans oblasts, salaries are reportedly not being paid as normal,
primarily in the private sector, while pensions are generally received without disruption.

In Zaporizhia oblast, a receiving area for IDPs, the primary issues reported were related to a lack of cooking
facilities and utensils, and a decrease in the supply of infant formula\(^7\). As with Donetsk and Luhans, it was
reported that some types of food are too expensive and that there is insufficient money to purchase food.

Utilization: Food utilization has been indirectly affected as a result of constraints on food access. The
results of the survey could not show clear impacts on the dietary quantity and quality. Since the baseline
status of individual calorie consumption was relatively high, the low number of sites reporting a decrease in
dietary quantity and quality is not a concern.

\(^7\) It should be clearly noted that the use of infant formula is not promoted and exclusive breastfeeding of infants until six months of age is
the recommended infant feeding practice. However, in cases where lactating women are unable to produce sufficient breast milk
appropriate supplementation with infant formula may be necessary.
Needs & Vulnerable Groups

The current situation will affect more those already spending a higher percentage of their income on food, i.e. those unemployed or not being paid on time and in full, those with mobility challenges, those with small children or elderly to take care of, and pregnant and lactating women. Special attention should be paid to the situation of residents in semi-urban areas without some of the coping mechanisms available to urban residents (e.g., closer proximity to markets) and rural residents (e.g., the ability to continue to engage in household food production. Furthermore, semi-rural areas in Zaporizhia have received many IDPs, whose priority needs are cooking facilities and utensils.

Main Concerns

The overarching concerns are the lack of food supplies in some areas in terms of quantity and diversity, the cost of the food in the market, and access to markets. More than half of the reporting areas indicated an issue with food supply. At a more localized scale, the reports of low supplies of infant formula and baby food in some raions in Donetsk and Zaporizhia should be followed up, especially in areas with active security concerns and especially given the psychological stresses the current situation may be placing on breastfeeding mothers impacting their ability to produce adequate milk.

Trends and Risks

While data are insufficient to describe trends, the results of this survey reinforce the information gathered in Phase 1.

Risks include: increasing levels of violence, which prohibit supplies from reaching markets and shops; damage to infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and electricity grids, thereby limiting availability of food and increasing prices; local insecurity preventing people from shopping and/or gardening; decrease in availability of fresh foods because of supply disruptions and power outages causing spoilage; continued decline in available income; and increased or continued hosting of IDPs in shelters without cooking facilities. Each of these risks depends on the evolution of the situation and can change for the better or the worse.

Current response and response capacities

Response capacities among relevant actors, including the Government, are under discussion. There is no existing structure or network in Ukraine to address the current food security disruptions. As a result, localized small scale requests for in-kind food assistance in specific areas are met in an ad hoc manner, with support and management of civil society groups and/or local authorities. The Government has recently made steps towards addressing food security needs.

Information gaps

The current information gaps include: 1) disaggregated data on types of food products available in local markets (i.e., fresh produce, dairy, meat, staples); 2) food price monitoring; 3) supply chain constraints for food commodities; and 4) current household coping strategies.

The Joint Needs Assessment cannot differentiate circumstances of residents, host communities, and/or IDPs. Further data collection is needed to identify the variable needs of these groups of people.

Assessment and monitoring activities are currently ad hoc in nature; however, actors in the food security sector are increasingly coordinating and sharing information. Further information is needed on Government capacities and intentions to intervene in order to identify possible gaps between needs and support, and to identify specific entry points for assistance by other actors.

Priority activities over next 30 days

According to survey responses, 41 per cent of the 71 surveyed sites ranked highest food security interventions to increase food supply, both in terms of quantity and diversity. Logistics and timely provisioning are noted as important in Luhansk, whereas safety and security are a greater concern in Donetsk. In Zaporizhia the need for infant formula and baby food was indicated as the priority.

Given the current situation, a large scale food security intervention is not recommended, unless the situation deteriorates drastically. Therefore, it is advised to maintain strategic monitoring activities and continue with preparedness planning for potential targeted food assistance, taking into consideration groups with special needs such as infants and young children, pregnant and lactating women, should the context further deteriorate.
Livelihoods

Sources and scope of analysis

This subchapter is aimed to provide a short overview of the eastern regions’ economy, as well as impact of the crisis on income generation, jobs, and prices in the affected areas. The analysis is based on the results of the assessment conducted in Donetsk, Luhansk oblasts, as well as Kryvyi Rih, Zaporizhia and other territories adjacent to the areas of fighting. The core data come from the 71 informants enriched with media information. As the situation in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts change dynamically, the assessment does not take into account the situation appeared after the recapture of Sloviansk, Kramatorsk, Druzhkivka, and other cities in Donetsk oblasts by the Ukrainian military.

Underlying situation

Donbas area Donetsk and Luhansk is a highly industrialized region where coal-mining, metallurgy and chemical industries are crucial for local economies. Some sectors – e.g., coal mining - rely on significant subsidies from the central Government, while many cities are so-called "mono-cities" where the fabric of economic activities is reliant on a single production plan which creates the bulk of the local budget.

The economic situation in the regions affected by fighting was deteriorating long before 2014. After virtually no GDP growth in 2012 and 2013 in the country, the economic and political crisis led to significant drop in regional product by 4.9 per cent in Donetsk in the first quarter 2013 (-2.9 per cent in 2012), while industrial production which is the basis of local economy dropped by 6.4 per cent in 2013, and 12.1 per cent in January-May 2014 (compared to the same period of 2013). In Luhansk the industrial drop amounted to 7.5 per cent in 2013, 8.9 per cent in 2013 and 2.0 per cent for the period January-May 2014.\(^{8}\)

In the first quarter of 2014 – before events in the region started - unemployment in Donetsk amounted to 9.4 per cent of the workforce\(^{8}\) (8.2 in 2913), and 8.8 per cent in Luhansk (6.7 in 2013). The average nominal salary amounted to UAH 3,811 ($322) in Donetsk and UAH 3,490 ($295) in Luhansk oblasts in May 2014. The total workforce in both regions has oscillated from 71 to 75 per cent in 2014. According to official statistics in 2012 the share of population with equivalent per capita income below the subsistence level amounted to 9.3 per cent in Luhansk and 3.5 per cent in Donetsk.

Several key events in June will contribute to the shape of the Ukrainian economy (with significant impact on the economy of affected regions) in the upcoming years. Most important developments include the signing of the economic part of the Association Agreement, which includes the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement between the EU and Ukraine, stop of the industry operation during current insecurity and economic stagnation of these regions (which made 15.7 per cent of Ukraine’s GDP in 2012), as well as failed gas talks between Russian in Ukraine (lack of agreement on price and payment modality led to the mutual suits in the Arbitration Institute of the Stockholm Chamber of Commerce). These three factors may bring significant challenges to the Government in dealing with current crisis, although international support to Ukraine remains high in the current volatile situation.

Overview of recent findings

The regions affected though being the industrial heart of Ukraine are diversified in terms of the income sourced for the population – starting from the provision of services, industrial production, trade, agriculture and others. Naturally, in cities, especially large ones like Donetsk, Kharkiv and others – the share of the agriculture is lower in economy (or none) compared to other areas.

According to most informants surveyed during the assessment, the income has decreased in most of the affected areas (77 per cent of sites). The areas covered by the military operations representing most unanimous answers are in Donetsk, Luhansk, Antraststyt, Sloviansk, and Kramatorsk. Disruptions in salaries are noted by 39 per cent of sites (respondents on 49 per cent of sites say there are no changes). Again, most affected areas are those affected by military operations, including Donetsk, Luhansk, Avdiivka, Horlivka, and Druzhkivka. As pensions are one of the major income sources for a significant part of population (the retired make around 40 per cent in both regions) the blockade of the Treasury accounts (suspension of operation) is a major risk for this vulnerable group in Donetsk and Luhansk. According to the mayor of Donetsk only 18 per cent of pensions were paid since beginning of July. After the recapture of Sloviansk, Kramatorsk and a number of other locations (after the joint assessment was carried out) the State Treasury...
resumed the payments there, thereby mitigating the financial crisis in many families. Inaccessibility to pensions remains one of the major concerns in the affected areas.

Respondents in 54 per cent of sites reported cuts in the number of jobs in the past month. Similar to other cases, job cuts took place in the most vulnerable areas. Cuts are the results of business closure – 44 per cent of respondents reported closures of business, which affected local economies (only 25 per cent did not report closures, and this was in areas distant from the fighting, like Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhia, Kryvyi Rih). This information is confirmed by Ukrainian state officials. According to the secretary of the Parliament’s committee on national security and defence, 60 per cent of enterprises of Donetsk oblast are not operational, which in the opinion of the Donetsk administration led to 40 per cent of industrial production decline. According to the Ministry of Revenues and Dues many large companies of Donbas are reregistering in other regions of Ukraine. Many small and medium enterprises suspend or close their operation in affected areas, and some of them relocate the production. According to the state statistics committee enterprises of the Donbas showed 37 per cent more losses than on average in Ukraine in the first quarter of 2014.

Prime Minister Aresniy Yatseniuk on 19 June assessed that the state budget may receive UAH 1 billion less from the affected regions, although the recent information from the State Treasury informs that revenues of the state budget for the period of January–June 2014 increased by UAH 13.1 billion (ca. $1 billion), or 8.1 per cent compared to the same period of 2013. There are a number of ground reports on attacks on enterprises – on Mine “Komsoemolets Donbas” (on 21 June 2014) (DTEK company), “Bakhmutskiy agrarniy Soyuz”, “Machinery Plant of Novgorlovka”, Gorlovka Chemical Plant, “Strof” and Azot chemical plants, Energomashspetstal, Machine building plant in Luhansk and Privolnyanska mine in Luhansk oblast, and many others. Denis Pushilin, one of separatist leaders, stated on 29 June, that enterprises which do not pay taxes to the Donets People Republic and do not cooperate with DPR authorities will be “nationalized”.

Despite problems in the business sector information received shows that pension system was operational in majority of locations in both regions – 87 per cent respondents informed that pensions are paid as normal in the assessed locality. Those localities where disruptions to pension payments were indicated included Kramatorsk, Sloviansk and Sloviansky district, Antratsyt, Rovenky, Rubizhne, Severodonetskt. It is important to underline that since the assessment time all cities mentioned were recaptured by the Ukrainian army and when operation of the State Treasury recovered pensions were paid. The main military forces of separatists moved to Donetsk and Luhansk cities, and this led to a change of the geographical picture of socio-economic impact of the fighting. Currently enterprises in Donetsk and Luhansk are being closed and the State Treasury suspended operations on its accounts in those two cities and immediate suburbs currently affected by the fighting.
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All respondents reported increased prices of everyday services and foodstuffs (92 per cent noted the change of prices, and 100 per cent informed about significant or slight increase). 90 per cent of respondents reported changes in basic food staples, and 97 per cent said prices increased (81 per cent - increased significantly). In addition to the food deficits in areas affected by fighting, the unanimity of answers can be explained by the overall prices increase in the whole Ukraine. The overall inflation in June reached 12 per cent in year-on-year terms, with highest increase in foodstuffs, health care, and transport-related items (up to 60 per cent in certain categories of products). The official statistics already reflected a gas price increases in May noting 62.8 per cent jump. It is expected that the inflation will further increase due to drop in industrial production, currency volatility and political instability in the Donetsk and Luhansk.

**Needs and vulnerable groups**

Key needs relate to the provision of pensions and social assistance payments (like disability allowances) in the affected areas and mitigating the short-term disruptions of the income due to closure of business. The most vulnerable groups include disabled and pensioners, who have significantly lower saving capacities than the rest of population (and are not able to sustain themselves on savings for a longer period of time).

**Trends and risks**

The main trend currently is the reduction of the territory covered by the Government’s *anti-terrorist operation* and intensification of military operations in the affected areas (with the use of heavy armament, including volley fire systems). Significant life risks to the local population, access to food and services are accompanied with the rapid outflow and closure of businesses. Military operations and fighting in the Donbas area brought a collapse of its long-term investment attractiveness, and will trigger an economic downturn in the future. Propositions of the self-proclaimed Donetsk People Republic about nationalization of enterprises, as well as the unpredictability of the outcome of the situation, already “washed out” some of the most innovative and dynamic companies, especially in the area of IT and financial services.

**Main concerns**

The economic recovery of the territories will require enormous infrastructure investments (including the restoration of bridges, which are crucial for the transportation of coal, raw materials and final products, as well as resumption of the companies’ operation, which lost some of their equipment). For example, seven bridges in Donetsk and Luhansk were blasted by insurgents, and several others are mined. The Ministry of Infrastructure assessed that the reconstruction of these bridges will cost UAH 50 million ($4 million). Moreover according to estimates, the restoration of the gas-mining companies will cost UAH 100 million ($8 million), and the restoration of the Sloviansk thermal power station will cost UAH 400 million ($33 million).

**Current response and response capacities**

The Government was able to restore some basic services (electricity, pension payments) in the first days after the recapturing of Sloviansk, Kramatorsk and other cities. This may create grounds for the resumption of businesses operations in affected areas.

The state’s response capacities for the recovery must be developed. A recovery strategy, which would identify goals, activities, risks and challenges, coordination mechanisms, and an algorithm of economic revival, must be worked out by the state to address the medium and long-term development issues in Donetsk and Luhansk.

Response capacities are still limited, while the economic recovery can be addressed only on the territories currently controlled by the Ukrainian Government, where the situation remains volatile in terms of security and access.

UNDP has finalized the first phase of its infrastructure damage assessment, and will share the report with Government partners to discuss the recovery strategy based on the assessment.
Information gaps

There is a lack of consolidated and reliable information on business operation in the affected areas. Sector partners will address and agree on the mode of assessment to obtain and monitor this information going forward.

Priority activities over next 30 days

Priority activities to address the needs of the affected population include:

- Set-up livelihoods and early recovery sector coordination.
- Consolidate other ongoing assessment efforts, consolidate and disseminate results.
- Mapping of available resources for recovery activities.
- Mapping of ongoing recovery activities.
- Draft sector response plan.
- Close coordination with the ongoing Government recovery activities and initiatives.

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

Sources and scope of analysis

The assessment covers both rural and urban centres of the Donetsk (4.4 million) and Luhansk (2.3 million) regions, with focus on areas that have been exposed to a significant deterioration of the security situation. In addition to the assessment results, secondary data is reviewed from the MICS survey of 2012.

Underlying situation

In Ukraine, as per MICS 2012, overall, 98.2 per cent of the population uses an improved source of drinking water - 98.6 per cent in urban areas and 97.1 per cent in rural areas. 40.6 per cent of household’s members do not use any water treatment methods, (32.2 per cent in urban areas, and 62.5 per cent in rural areas). Boiling water is used by 39 per cent of household members, (43.9 per cent in cities and towns, and 26.1 per cent in rural communities). Almost one-third of household members – predominantly urban – tend to use water filters to treat water. Quite a popular method is to let water stand and settle – it is used by 13.8 per cent of household members.

Overall, 95.9 per cent of the household population of Ukraine use improved sources of drinking water and improved sanitation facilities. Accessibility of improved water sources and sanitation for rural residents (93.5 per cent) is lower than that for urban households (96.9 per cent). As for the regional availability of these conditions of comfort living, it is lower in the centre (92.7 per cent) and in the south (93.5 per cent).

In urban settlements, 78.8 per cent of the population uses drinking water piped into a dwelling, whereas in rural areas this type of water supply is only available to 25 per cent of the population. At the same time, depending on the wealth index, this indicator ranges from 9.2 per cent in the first quintile (the poorest) to 89.8 per cent in the fourth, and 88.6 per cent in the fifth quintile (the richest), which can be explained by a stronger disposition of rural population towards lower wealth levels.

Almost half of the rural population (48.3 per cent) uses a protected well as the main source of drinking water, while this percentage is smaller among the urban population (5.7 per cent). The proportion of the population using a protected well as the main source of drinking water ranges from 56.8 per cent in the poorest quintile to 0.1 per cent in the richest.

Almost the entire population of Ukraine (98.9 per cent) lives in households that have improved sanitation facilities. In Ukraine the use of improved sanitation is closely linked to households’ wealth and living conditions. The rural population tends to use pit latrines with slabs (almost 60 per cent), while the most widespread sanitation facility in urban settlements is a flush toilet with connection to a sewage system or septic tank.

Specifically, the urban household population typically use flush toilets (74.9 per cent of households), while a smaller percentage use pour flush systems piped to a pit latrine (10.8 per cent), and pit latrines with slabs (9.9 per cent). Flush toilets are predominantly used by the richest households (99.7 per cent) and those of the fourth quintile (96.0 per cent), while pit latrines with a slab are the most common type of sanitation facility used by the poorest (74.0 per cent) and second quintile (38.4 per cent).
Overview of recent findings

The results of the assessment indicate that in the areas of fighting in and around Donetsk city, Kostiantynivsky raion and Sloviyansk there are serious issues with access to potable drinking water, ranging from significant to severe. The major disruption to the city main supply has the potential, if not fixed in the near future, to cause critical problems for up to four million people in and around Donetsk city. When water supplies are periodically interrupted, there can be a build-up of silt deposits and other contaminants. These can cause the purity of water supplies to be questionable, causing sickness to occur. The figures from Debaltseve, Druzhkivka, and Khartsyzk would appear to indicate that water pollution is already present to some extent. Although just a snapshot of the possible problem, there is a potential for a significant number of the 174,343 population who live in those areas being affected. It should be noted that in Donetsk only certain areas have problems, with some areas questioned reporting no problems at all. Areas of active fighting, as well as the areas affected by the damaged main are most, in some cases, in desperate need. However it should be also noted that the areas of fighting are changing, with resulting needs in appearing in areas that were previously not affected. Krasnamerski Raion in Donetsk oblast has been seriously affected with water shortage for days, with the constant shelling and bombing close to the Karlovka water reservoir. The pumping stations have been affected and water has stopped flowing from the main water system, depriving the raion of safe drinking water. The area is not accessible.

Sloviyansk stands out as an area of multiple issues ranging from water shortages, purity of supply and ill health.

Those areas in Luhansk city covered by the survey also indicate ‘severe’ levels. Shortage of water due to damaged lines and decreased maintenance due to the ongoing situation, and accidental breaks/leaks. Restoration of a reliable water system came out as the most sought after result in all affected areas in both Donetsk and Luhansk.

Needs & Vulnerable Groups

Potable drinking water as well as reasonable clean water for washing/hygiene needs are essential to the continued health and wellbeing of everyone, but with particular emphasis on children (especially very young children between the ages of 0 – 5) and vulnerable mothers, either pregnant or lactating. For those babies who are being bottle fed there is added danger from potentially polluted water systems. It is noted that the proportion of females questioned in this survey was almost double the size of men. This is significant in that they understand directly the results of bad or shortage of water on the health of their children.
Main Concerns

Shortage or polluted water causing sickness or death in significant numbers of young children.

With the shortages of water personal hygiene problems will escalate and significantly raise the risk of sickness and possible death. This is further aggravated by the movement and close confinement of IDPs fleeing the fighting.

Challenges

The current challenges include funding, access, reliable information, safety and security both personally and for partner organisations and beneficiaries from consequences of the fighting, including, armed groups, criminal elements, UXOs and suspected indiscriminate mine laying. Furthermore, there is lack of identified implementing partners, limited prepositioning in secure locations in both Donetsk and Luhansk, limited stocks of humanitarian aid sourced in country, and limited access to out-of-country stocks of humanitarian aid due to restrictions on and delays with importing e.g., water purification tablets.

Priority activities

- Carry out field visits and situation analysis of the identified IDP sites.
- Respond to requests for hygiene materials and support hygiene promotion.
- Develop a WASH supply plan and identify partners for future distributions.
- Procure and distribute locally developed and sourced hygiene consumables (individual and family kits) to enable IDPs to ensure daily personal and public hygiene.
- Provide safe drinking water, through family filtration units, or purification tablets.
- Advocate and support, where necessary, affected population with basic sanitation facilities.
- Identify partners in Donetsk and Luhansk.
- Preposition stocks of hygiene kits in those two areas.
- Start hygiene awareness campaign for affected IDPs.
- Identify water supply problems of purity and respond where possible with water testing, water purification tablets (when allowed to bring them into the country) and/or family filtration units and water containers.
- Identify water shortage problems and propose possible solutions – transporting and storage of clean water.
Sources and scope of analysis

The assessment covers both rural and urban centres of the Donetsk (4.4 million) and Luhansk (2.3 million) regions, focusing on areas that have been exposed to a significant deterioration of the security situation. In addition to the assessment results, secondary data is reviewed from the MICS survey of 2012.

Underlying situation

In terms of school readiness, 78.5 per cent of children in Ukraine who at the time of the survey attended the first grade of primary school attended preschool (78 per cent for boys, 79.2 per cent for girls). Figures differ significantly for children living in rural areas (69.4 per cent) compared with children living in urban areas (83.1 per cent). Regional differences exist: the highest proportion of children who attended pre-school in the previous year are in the centre and in the north (98.9 per cent and 83.6 per cent, respectively), the lowest proportion is in the south (69.8 per cent) and the west (70.9 per cent).

Indicators for primary and secondary school attendance include:

- Net intake rate in primary education;
- Primary school net attendance ratio (adjusted);
- Secondary school net attendance ratio (adjusted);
- Female to male education ratio (or gender parity index – GPI index articles) in primary and secondary school.

Indicators of school progression include:

- Children reaching last grade of primary school;
- Primary school completion rate;
- Transition rate to secondary school.

According to Article 36 of the Law of Ukraine «On Education», paragraph 3, children start primary school at ages six or seven upon the discretion of their parents/caretakers. Of children who are of primary school entry age (age seven) in Ukraine, 94 per cent are attending the first grade of primary school (Table ED.3). In terms of timeliness, no differences in primary school entry by gender, residence (urban/ rural) or mother’s education were observed for first grade children aged seven years. The situation is slightly different across regions: almost all children aged seven years went to the first class in the western and central regions (99.3 per cent and 98.9 per cent respectively), whereas only 89.4 per cent of children this age did so in the eastern region.

In terms of primary school attendance, the share of children in the age group 11–17 attending secondary school was 93.1 per cent. At the same level was the percentage of children by sex and by place of residence. Secondary school attendance of children aged 11 years was 95.4 per cent. The net rate of secondary school attendance for children aged 12–15 years was high and ranged from 97.9 per cent to 99.9 per cent. For children age 16 this ratio dropped to 95.3 per cent, and for children age 17 the ratio decreased further to 66.6 per cent. The primary school completion rate constituted 95.1 per cent in Ukraine. Considering the rate by place of residence, it constitutes 94.8 per cent for urban and 96.2 per cent for rural respectively.

The transition rate to secondary school in Ukraine amounted to 91.1 per cent. Disaggregated by gender, the transition rate to secondary school of girls was 92.5 per cent and boys 89.9 per cent. Transition rate to secondary school of children from wealthiest households was 93.6 per cent while that of children from the poorest households was 81.8 per cent.

Gender parity for primary and secondary education in Ukraine is 1.00. No differences are observed in attendance of primary and secondary schools between boys and girls. No differences in primary school attendance and secondary school were found when disaggregated by the area of residence, mother’s education and household wealth.

Overview of recent findings:

As the educational facilities are on summer shut down, a comprehensive picture was not obtainable. However of those responding on average 23 per cent felt the education services had gotten worse since fighting broke out, with up to 100 per cent in certain areas such as Sloviansk. Of those responding in the Donetsk area, 25 per cent overall felt education was suffering significantly, with much higher percentages in...
Dzerzhynsk and Kramatorsk as well as Sloviansk. In Luhansk the average was slightly lower at 21 per cent, with Krasnodon, Krasnyi Lyman and Luhansk city reporting largest perceptions of deterioration. As with WASH results, the areas most affected by the fighting are reporting significant disruption whilst other areas report no change.

Needs & Vulnerable Groups

The Government has carried out its own survey of school buildings damaged in the fighting, and has identified 46 so far. Those schools damaged or abandoned by the fighting will have to have significant repairs carried out before they can be used as schools. Teachers have fled as IDPs and may or may not come back, if and when the fighting stops. Children will of course suffer the worst with damaged buildings, no teachers, little or no teaching aids, disrupted water and hygiene facilities. Those still in the area of fighting and those who fled all lost valuable teaching time and will inevitably suffer academically, before the added trauma of psychological harm inflicted on them is considered.

Main Concerns

Those children most affected will lose out in the field of education, which will have long term implications on their ability to become happy contributing citizens.

Challenges (trends, risks, capacity)

Funding, access, reliable information on extent of damage to schools, shortage of teachers, shortage of teaching aids, lack of parental funds for school books/uniforms, etc., safety and security both personally and for partner organisations and beneficiaries from consequences of the fighting, including, armed groups, criminal elements, UXOs and suspected indiscriminate mine laying, identified implementing partners, prepositioning secure locations in both Donetsk and Luhansk.

Priority activities

- Conduct further needs assessment in affected areas (Donetsk, Luhansk and Eastern Ukraine) and continuous monitoring and assessing to identify gaps in provision of education services to children.
- Provide short Intensive Summer Education Camps from July to August to enable IDP children to catch up on missed school lessons during the months of March to May.
- Provide appropriate basic education, early learning and recreational materials in support of provision of psychosocial.
- Establish safe play and education spaces for children, provision of psychosocial recreational activities to foster psychological healing process.
- Provide information package containing information on child rights, HIV/AIDS, basic hygiene, parents’ guide to dealing with stress, available services, identifying abuse and neglect, etc.
- Strengthen capacity of the professionals from education sector (school psychologists and from the state centres, teachers, social workers and NGOs) to enable them better support parents and children in their needs.
- Conduct assessment of situation regarding mines and UXO in affected regions, and develop mine risk education (MRE) programmes, including MRE information materials and communication outreach and MRE training sessions in schools and within communities.
- Develop and implement in coordination with MoE awareness about the risks of mines and how to stay safe through school programmes and a community poster campaign as an effective means for raising children’s awareness.
- Through the Education Sector facilitate the provision of structural repairs to damaged schools to enable pupils to receive their education.
- Through the Education Sector facilitate the provision of appropriate school supplies for the most vulnerable individual pupils.
Protection

Sources and scope of analysis

Situation reports from UNHCR and NGO implementing partners based in Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv and Zaporizhia; reports of the Human Rights Monitoring Mechanism (OHCHR); UNICEF’s assessment of the psycho-social condition of children in Donetsk/Luhansk oblasts; OSCE daily and weekly monitoring reports.

Underlying situation

Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts were normal middle-income regions of Ukraine within eastern Europe prior to the intensification of political tensions in the area. A heavily industrialised region, they had a normal range of security and social problems related, with the majority of the population living with little economic prosperity.

Overview of recent findings

Affected Areas
The number of IDPs in Ukraine has increased dramatically since mid-June as a result of the on-going localized military operations between Government forces and armed groups in Donetsk and Luhansk. The results of the assessment indicate that IDPs remaining in Donetsk and Luhansk have mostly been displaced within the oblasts themselves, though some sites reported presence of IDPs who had moved from Donetsk to Luhansk. According to the Ukrainian authorities, most IDPs are currently displaced within Donetsk oblast or have moved to Kharkiv oblast, although the full picture regarding internal displacement in Luhansk oblast is not available.

Needs & Vulnerable Groups
Many IDPs, especially those with disabilities, sick and older persons, are particularly vulnerable and face challenges in leaving the affected areas to which international humanitarian actors currently do not have access. Those who remain in the affected areas lack access to medical care, food, water and other services. Certain minority groups, especially Roma, may have little trust in local authorities and therefore are unlikely to register, and there are reports that they may be facing discrimination in some areas.

Main Concerns
Likely further deterioration of the situation as viable initiatives to negotiate cessation of hostilities or political resolution is currently absent.

Fighting recently shifted towards the sub-urban and urban areas of Donetsk and Luhansk, with numbers of casualties surpassing 1,000, including civilians. The results of the assessment confirm that most incidents were reported by a higher percentage of sites in Luhansk than in Donetsk.

IDPs from eastern Ukraine report to UNHCR and its NGO partners that they have left home predominantly due to security concerns, including the risk of being caught in crossfire, while some IDPs expressed individual fear of persecution due to their political views or ethnicity, and indicated that they would not be willing to return even after the active phase of the military operation ceases. Many people queue for hours to catch trains leaving the areas of fighting.

OHCHR and NGOs report of continued cases of abduction, torture, extortion and harassment: railways are being attacked; more landmines are being discovered

Various sources confirm job losses and disruption in services in the context of the overall deteriorating socio-economic situation around the cities of Donetsk and Luhansk, which is likely to lead to a much larger scale of displacement than was earlier predicted.

UNICEF reports increasing levels of fear and anxiety among children in eastern Ukraine as a result of the fighting. The need for psycho-social support to address trauma among children has become apparent in
certain collective shelters. In light of the recent Amnesty International report on widespread torture in the areas of active fighting, the need for legal, medical and psycho-social support to victims of torture could emerge in displacement areas.

With the approaching winter season starting in mid-October, the fact that many of the existing collective shelters are summer camps, unsuitable for accommodation during winter and the destruction caused in violence-affected areas, contingency plans must be developed to accommodate IDPs during the winter months, both in displacement areas and in areas of active fighting, to be able to face a potential situation of massive return, should the current military offensive be successful in bringing hostilities to an end before winter sets in. NFIs and/or cash assistance to enable the provision of clothing, blankets and heating must also be planned as of now. These are, of course basic needs, not a protection issue, but are included here to ensure it is part of the plan.

**Trends and Risks**

The number of IDPs from the Donbas region has increased dramatically since mid-June and is expected to gradually increase pending the on-going localized military confrontation between Government forces and armed groups in Donetsk and Luhansk.

Access to affected populations in Donetsk and Luhansk remains a major challenge. Some delivery of assistance has been possible to the IDPs in the areas of Donetsk oblast recently retaken by the Government forces.

The breakdown of public order and services has happened quite quickly, accelerating since the beginning of June. If these trends continue, there is a risk of humanitarian crisis—no access to water, electricity, banking, medicine, food.

Persons face security problems in leaving the affected areas—extortion, detention and threats.

The large-scale movements could lead to family separations. Recent trends show that women and children are leaving the region, leaving men and elderly relatives behind. Disabled and sick people are often unable to leave.

**Current response and response capacities**

The response to the displacement is largely led by non-state actors. However, in the areas recently retaken areas by the Ukrainian military, it is led by local authorities, with some assistance from the civil society and international actors.

In the affected areas, OHCHR continues to closely monitor and report on key human rights protection issues to those either caught in the crossfire of the fighting and those who still remain in the areas controlled by the armed groups, where increased levels of violence and fighting raises serious human rights protection.

UNHCR is working with the Ministry of Justice on developing IDP legislation and establishing a comprehensive and straightforward registration system with a central database.

Information on available assistance mechanisms to IDPs is currently provided in an uncoordinated manner by central and local authorities, as well as a number of NGOs working in the field. There are also contradictions in the number of shelters available for IDPs in different oblasts provided by different Government sources. The Government is in the process of setting up coordination mechanisms to deal with IDP assistance needs both at the central and provincial levels, but it may require technical guidance and
support from the international community to ensure these mechanisms are effective in preventing gaps and duplications.

**Information gaps**

The accurate number of IDPs and their specific needs are unknown due to the absence of a centralized registration system. Various Governmental sources provide conflicting information on IDP numbers. The accurate number of people who have been killed and injured is also unknown.

UNHCR has been advocating for and supporting the Government in establishing an effective registration procedure and a central database on IDPs. UNHCR will continue providing guidance to the Government in this connection.

**Priority activities over next 30 days**

- Assist the authorities in developing a law on IDPs that would effectively respond to the actual needs of the current displacement.
- Support the authorities in establishing an effective registration procedure and a central database on IDPs. UNHCR has already provided guidance to the Government in this connection.
- Pending the availability of humanitarian access, deliver ad-hoc assistance as per assessed needs in the affected areas, with particular attention to vulnerable groups (elderly, disabled, persons with medical conditions).
- Support national and local authorities, as well as civil society, in establishing systems for reception of a large numbers of IDPs.
- Continued monitoring and documenting by OHCHR of human rights protection concerns.
The methodology combined a secondary data desk review with primary data collection.

- The secondary data review was done by the UN agencies for their respective areas of responsibility. Secondary data analysis used pre- and in-crisis secondary information to form a clear and up-to-date picture of the situation and promote a common understanding.

- The primary data collection was done by monitors on the ground, provided and managed by different partner agencies but trained together on the methodology and questionnaire. The sampling approach was purposive (non-representative) and based on the Multiple-cluster/sector Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) methodology. Primary data collection was done through structured interviews with key informants and observations. The key informants included, amongst others: directors of banks, hospitals, and schools, shop owners, community leaders, representative of local administration etc. In total, 259 key informants were interviewed over 71 sites, of which 59% were female. Data was collected and entered between 1 and 8 July 2014, and consolidated and analysed with the KoBo Coordinated Assessment Toolkit [www.kobotoolbox.org].
Site selection

The purposive selection of sites was based on a combination of criteria including population density, reported security incidents; industrial/agricultural, richer/poorer. A detailed list of these selected cities and raions can be obtained upon request.

Organisation

The assessment was carried out under the auspices of the Resident Coordinator, and coordinated by OCHA, which also provided information management support to the process. IOM, OHCHR, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, and WHO jointly undertook the secondary data review. The first data analysis from primary data collection was made by OCHA. Further joint analysis was then coordinated by OCHA, with a joint analysis workshop held. Each agency then provided inputs for their sectors, which was then combined into this written report.
B. Questionnaire

UKRAINE Questionnaire – Situation Monitoring (Version 3 – 19.06.2014)

A. Population and displacement

- Are there children at risk due to the ongoing displacement? [Yes No] (If Yes, please indicate)
- Are there adults at risk due to the ongoing displacement? [Yes No] (If Yes, please indicate)
- Are there elderly and disabled at risk due to the ongoing displacement? [Yes No] (If Yes, please indicate)
- Are there pregnant women at risk due to the ongoing displacement? [Yes No] (If Yes, please indicate)

B. Security and Humanitarian Access

- Are there any security concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)
- Are there any humanitarian access constraints in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)

C. Food Security and Livelihoods

- Are there any food security concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)
- Are there any livelihood concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)

D. Health Concerns

- Are there any health concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)
- Are there any water or sanitation concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)

E. Economic Concerns

- Are there any economic concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)
- Are there any housing concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)

F. Education Concerns

- Are there any education concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)
- Are there any child protection concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)

G. Environmental Concerns

- Are there any environmental concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)
- Are there any natural disaster concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)

H. Humanitarian Needs

- Are there any humanitarian needs in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)
- Are there any non-humanitarian needs in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)

I. General Concerns

- Are there any general concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)
- Are there any other concerns in your area? [Yes No] (If Yes, please provide details)
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### UKRAINE Questionnaire – Situation Monitoring (Version 3 – 19.06.2014)

#### 6.1. What factors have most recently contributed to the current humanitarian situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic sanctions and displacement</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War and conflict</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic instability</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.2. What is the current humanitarian situation in your area?

- Food insecurity
- Access to basic services
- Health care availability
- Safety and security

#### 6.3. What are the main challenges faced by your community?

- Food scarcity
- Access to water and sanitation
- Health care services
- Education opportunities

**SITE LEVEL QUESTIONNAIRE** - 75

---

#### 6.4. What is the current humanitarian situation in your district?

- Food insecurity
- Access to basic services
- Health care availability
- Safety and security

#### 6.5. What are the main challenges faced by your community?

- Food scarcity
- Access to water and sanitation
- Health care services
- Education opportunities

**SITE LEVEL QUESTIONNAIRE** - 135

---

#### 6.6. What is the current humanitarian situation in your country?

- Food insecurity
- Access to basic services
- Health care availability
- Safety and security

#### 6.7. What are the main challenges faced by your community?

- Food scarcity
- Access to water and sanitation
- Health care services
- Education opportunities

**SITE LEVEL QUESTIONNAIRE** - 69
C. Analytical Supplement

A comprehensive analytical supplement, detailing the responses to all questions in the questionnaire, is available on request or can be downloaded from this link:

https://www.dropbox.com/s/rx6l05j1pm8h/HSM%20Phase%202%20Round%20Analytical%20Supplement%20140713.pdf