Socio-Economic Insights Survey (SEIS) - 2024

Protection, Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP), Movement Intentions – Key findings presentation

October 2024

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

UNHCR The UN Refugee Agency

Regional Refugee Response for the Ukraine Situation

Contents

01 Objectives and Methodology

02 Demographics

03 Main Findings

01

Objectives and Methodology

Assessment Objectives

The SEIS aims to inform the **Ukraine Situation Regional Refugee Response Plan (RRP) 2025-2026, and/or inform various stakeholders and programs of humanitarian and development actors** active in the response in Moldova, by providing up-to-date multi-sectoral data about the needs and coping capacities of refugee households displaced from Ukraine in the country following the escalation of the conflict in February 2022.

The SEIS follows the **regional approach** established by UNHCR's Regional Bureau for Europe (RBE), using a harmonized questionnaire to **enable comparisons across countries participating in the Regional RRP**.

Specific Objectives

1

Gain an understanding of the **household composition** of refugees, including key demographics.

2

Identify **the priority needs** of refugee households pertaining to protection, health, including Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS), education, accommodation, livelihood and socio-economic inclusion, and social cohesion.

3

Understand the **coping capacity and vulnerability/resilience** of refugees considering the protracted displacement, including socio-economic inclusion.

4

Understand **refugees' challenges in accessing information and their preferred channels** to receive information and provide feedback to aid providers about the quality, quantity and appropriateness of aid.

5

Identify **household profiles with the most critical needs** to inform programming.

6

Identify **the movement intentions** of refugee households.

Population Coverage and Data Collection

COMPLETED SURVEYS

622

Face-to-face **household (HH)-level surveys** with self-reported heads of HH or another adult member knowledgeable about their HH conditions. The survey included individual-level sections to collect information about each member of the HH, covering a total of **1,204 HH members** from the assessed HHs.

DATA COLLECTION

From **3 June** to **12 July 2024**

POPULATION OF INTEREST

Refugee HHs displaced from Ukraine to Moldova following the escalation of hostilities in February 2022 (including third-country nationals), with a **focus on those living outside of Refugee Accommodation Centres (RACs)**.

Refugee HHs include the refugee respondent from Ukraine plus all individuals, including family or close acquaintances displaced from Ukraine to Moldova who are living with the respondent at the time of interview, and share key resources and expenses (i.e., share income, key resources and expenses beyond rent).

Geographical coverage and Sampling



- National coverage, excluding the Transnistrian region.
- Non-probability purposive sampling approach, constructed based on cross-referenced population figures from the UNHCR Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance (MPCA) beneficiary list, the General Inspectorate for Migration (IGM) Temporary Protection (TP) list, and the REACH area monitoring exercise**. Settlements with fewer than 5 refugee HHs were excluded from the sampling frame.
- Sampling frame at settlement level (admin 2).
- HH surveys were distributed based on regional stratification (North, Centre, South, Chisinau*).
- Primary data was collected through in-person quantitative HH-level surveys.
- Regional weights were applied to national-level findings to adjust for distortions in proportionality created by the sampling design (i.e., stratification by region), as the majority of refugee HHs are concentrated in the Chisinau region, with fewer HHs in other regions.

**Chisinau is not an official region in Moldova, but was extracted from the Centre region to better account for the distribution of refugees within the national territory.*
***Area monitoring was an exercise conducted by REACH through the collection of information on refugees residing outside of Refugee Accommodation Centers (RACs) in various settlements, as reported by local authorities.*

Limitations

- Representativeness: Due to the absence of an official nationwide record of Ukrainian refugees' exact numbers and geographic dispersion in Moldova, a probability sampling method was not possible. Consequently, purposive, non-probability sampling was applied. As a result, the **findings are not statistically representative** of the entire population and should be seen as **indicative only**.
- Geographical Coverage: The SEIS does **not cover the Transnistrian region**, a self-declared autonomous area not controlled by the Moldovan government, due to political sensitivities and access constraints.
- Survey Fatigue: Due to the **length of the survey**, some respondents may have rushed through questions, potentially leading to misinterpretations, inaccurate responses, or errors in data input via the KOBO tool.
- Selection Bias: Although efforts were made to introduce a degree of randomization (interviewing every third person in a line at distribution points) and to diversify the sample (identifying respondents through social media and snowball sampling in settlements with 200 or more refugee HHs), **enumerators frequently visited places where refugees typically gather** (such as aid distribution centres, schools, public parks, etc.) to identify potential respondents, which may have introduced selection bias.
- Data Verification Issues: Data discrepancies and missing values were checked with enumerators and addressed accordingly, though in some cases, these fields could not be verified. Consequently, there may be **some inconsistencies or missing data** remaining in the dataset.
- Sensitive Topics: Respondents may have **underreported** sensitive topics such as protection topics, safety, or security risks.
- Underreporting / Overreporting: Additionally, respondents may have underreported their income sources or overreported their expenses **due to the false expectation that aid could be linked to the outcomes** of these surveys.

02

Demographics

Demographics: Respondents

% of respondents by gender & age* (n=622)



% of respondents by citizenship* (n=622)



** Respondents could select multiple responses*

% of HHs by ethnic group or background (self identification)* (n=622)



** Respondents could select multiple responses*

** Some results do not add up to 100% due to rounding.*

The large majority of respondents (85%) were **women**, while **men** made up only 15% of the sample. This gender imbalance could be attributed to women being more present at distribution sites, which may have influenced the sample. In terms of age, almost half of the respondents (48%) were **between 35-59 years old**, reflecting a predominant working-age population. Nearly all respondents (98%) were **Ukrainian citizens**, with a small minority holding **Moldovan** (2%) and **Russian** (1%) citizenship. Additionally, most HHs (94%) identified as being **of Ukrainian ethnic background**, while smaller proportions also identified as **Moldovan** (9%) and **Russian** (3%).

Demographics: Oblast of Origin in Ukraine

% of HHs by Oblast of origin in Ukraine



Almost half of the surveyed HHs originate from the **Odeska Oblast** (47%). The following most reported Oblasts of origin were:

- **Mykolaivska** Oblast (10%),
- **Khersonska** Oblast (9%),
- **Kharkivska** Oblast (7%),
- **Kyiv** (6%), and
- **Donetska** Oblast (5%).

Demographics: HH Composition

1.94 HH members
Average HH size

1,204 HH members

10% of HH members with disability (at least level 3 in WGSS)

24% of HHs have children (under the age of 18)

47% of HHs have older persons (60+ years)

5% of HHs have pregnant or breastfeeding women

% of HH members by age group and gender (n=1204)



% of HH members by estimated length of residence in Moldova (in months), by region* (n=1180)



** Some results do not add up to 100% due to rounding.*

03

Main Findings

Protection

Protection: Legal Status

% of respondents by current legal status in Moldova (n=622)



% of HH members by type of ID documents they hold (if any)* (n=1204)



* Respondents could select multiple responses

Among respondents who were granted TP or applied for TP and were waiting for a decision (n=574), 99% did **not experience any difficulties during the TP or asylum application or extension process**. A small number of respondents (n=29) did **not hold or did not apply for TP or asylum**.

Nearly all HH members (99.9%) held **legally recognized identity documents or credentials**. Of HHs that needed to replace identity documents (n=112), 48% were **unable to replace or renew their identity documents in Moldova**. Reasons included long processing/waiting times, could not afford administrative or other associated costs, and documents are not issued in Moldova.

Protection: Civil Status

% of HHs reporting changes to their family composition/civil status since departure from Ukraine (n=622)



% of HHs reporting changes to their family composition/civil status since departure from Ukraine*, by type of change (n=622)

* Respondents could select multiple responses

The large majority of HHs (91%) reported **no changes to their family composition or civil status** since departure from Ukraine.

Among the HHs who reported changes in their family composition or civil status (n=58), 98% did **not experience any challenges** in registering the changes to the authorities of Moldova.

Protection: Safety or Security

% of respondents reporting awareness of protection services in the area of residence* (n=622)



** Respondents could select multiple responses*

Only a small number of respondents (5%) reported that they were **unaware of any protection services mentioned in this question** in their area of residence, while 9% stated that they did **not know in general**. Respondents in both rural and urban areas reported at similar rates.

% of respondents reporting feeling safe walking alone in their area/neighborhood after dark, by degree of safety (n=622)



Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP)

AAP: Aid received

% of respondents that received aid in the 3 months prior to data collection (n=622)

94%

The majority of respondents (94%) reported having **received aid in the 3 months prior to data collection**, with no significant differences observed across regions or between rural and urban areas.

Among those who received aid in the 3 months prior to data collection (n=586), the most common type of aid received was **humanitarian financial aid (cash)**, reported by 95% of respondents.

% of respondents by main reported type of aid received (among those who received aid in the 3 months prior to data collection)* (n=586)



** Respondents could select multiple responses*

AAP: Satisfaction with Aid Received

% of respondents satisfied with the aid they received in the 3 months prior to data collection (among those who received aid)* (n=583)



** Don't know and prefer not to answer accounted for 0.3% and 0.1% of responses, respectively. Some results do not add to 100% due to rounding.*

% of respondents dissatisfied with the aid received by reason for dissatisfaction (among those who were dissatisfied with the aid they received in the 3 months prior to data collection)* (n=47)



** Respondents could select multiple responses*

Most respondents (89%) reported being **satisfied with the aid received** in the 3 months prior to data collection. Among those who received aid and were dissatisfied (n=47), **dissatisfaction was most reported with humanitarian financial aid (cash)** (82%) **and humanitarian distributions (non-food items, clothing, food, etc.)** (41%).

AAP: Access to Information

% of HHs by main preferred means (channel) of receiving information* (n=622)



** Respondents could select multiple responses*

% of respondents by challenge faced in accessing needed information (including information on rights and entitlements, access to services)* (n=622)



** Respondents could select multiple responses*

HHs most commonly identified **Viber** (62%), **Phone call / Helpline** (44%) and **SMS** (29%) as the preferred means of receiving information. The majority of HHs (90%) reported **no challenges faced in accessing needed information**, with similar rates across **rural areas** (87%) and **urban areas** (90%).

Respondents in the **Centre** were slightly **more likely to not know where to look for information** (13%), compared to 6% in **Chisinau**, 6% in the **North**, and 2% in the **South**.

AAP: Priority Needs

% of HHs with reported priority needs (n=622)



% of HHs by reported top 3 priority needs* (n=622)

Healthcare services	Employment / Livelihoods support	Medicines
35%	33%	28%

** Respondents could select up to 3 responses*

Top 3 most commonly reported priority needs*, by settlement type (n=622)



In addition to the top three priority needs mentioned, 21% of HHs also identified **clothes/winter clothes** as a priority need, followed by **food** (19%), **accommodation** (17%), and **hygiene products** (16%).

HHs in the **South** were more likely to report **sanitation** (46%) and **clothes/winter clothes** (29%) among their top three priority needs, while HHs in the **Centre** were more likely to report **education for children under 18** (25%) as a priority need, and HHs in the **North** were more likely to report **medicines** (49%).

AAP: Feedback & Complaint Mechanisms

% of respondents that reported access to safe and confidential reporting channels to obtain information, seek assistance or report issues (n=622)



% of respondents who received an appropriate response through reporting channels (n=622)



Respondents aged 60 and older reported having similar access to safe and confidential reporting channels (87%) compared to respondents below the age of 60. Respondents in both rural and urban areas also reported similar levels of access.

Nearly a quarter of respondents (24%) indicated that they had not used or never tried using reporting channels. Male respondents reported this at a higher rate than female respondents (37% and 22%, respectively). Additionally, respondents from the Centre were more likely to report not using or never having tried these channels (62%) compared to other regions: Chisinau (20%), North (16%) and South (25%).

AAP: Satisfaction with Aid Workers Behaviour

% of HHs satisfied with aid workers' behaviour in the area (n=622)



% of respondents who know where to report inappropriate behaviour from an aid worker, by region (n=622)



% of respondents by top 3 preferred channels to provide feedback to aid providers about inadequate behaviour and other sensitive issues* (n=622)



** Respondents could select multiple responses.*

Overall, a quarter of respondents (25%) reported that they do **not know where to report inappropriate behaviour from an aid worker**. Respondents from the **South** were most likely to be **aware of where to report inappropriate behaviour from an aid worker** (92%), while those from the **Centre** were least likely to know this (47%).

Female respondents were also **more likely than male respondents** to be aware of where to report such behaviour (70% versus 53%, respectively).

Child Protection

Protection: Child Protection

Top 3 most serious risks faced by boys under the age of 18, as reported by HHs with at least one boy* (n=178)

Top 3 most serious risks faced by girls under the age of 18, as reported by HHs with at least one girl* (n=138)



** Respondents could select up to 3 responses*

The findings revealed that the **top 3 most serious risks were the same for both boys and girls**. Most HHs reported that there were **no discernible protection concerns** for boys and girls (67% and 67%, respectively).

Nearly all surveyed HHs reported being **aware of channels they would feel safe and comfortable contacting and reporting** a case of violence, exploitation, or neglect to children in the community, with **Police** (95%), **NGO (including NGO Helplines)** (23%), and **Government services** (15%) being the most frequently reported.

% of children below 18 (n=361) who were the biological or legally adopted children of a HH member (part of the nuclear family)

96.2%

Gender Based Violence (GBV)

Protection: Gender-Based Violence (GBV)

% of respondents aware of existing GBV services available in their area, by type of services* (n=622)



** Respondents could select multiple responses*

% of respondents by perceived main barriers that survivors could face when trying to access GBV services* (n=622)



** Respondents could select multiple responses. Graph displays only the 5 perceived barriers selected by the most respondents.*

A small percentage of respondents, 11%, reportedly were **unaware of any existing GBV services** available in their area.

In terms of availability of existing GBV services in their area, **respondents in Chisinau** were **more likely to report having no awareness** across all types of services (15%, compared to 2% in the **Centre**, 3% in the **North**, and 5% in the **South**).

Respondents in urban areas were reportedly slightly **more likely than respondents in rural areas** to report having **no awareness** across all types of services (12% in **urban areas**, compared to 5% in **rural areas**).

Protection: Safety or Security Concerns for Women

% of respondents who reported at least one perceived safety or security concern for women in their area of residence (among HHs with at least one woman) (n=554)



% of respondents by top 3 perceived safety or security concerns for women in their area of residence (among HHs with at least one woman)* (n=554)



** Respondents could select up to 3 options.*

Among HHs with at least one woman (n=554), most respondents (77%) reported **no safety or security concerns for women** in their area of residence. Additionally, **female respondents aged 60 and above** were **less likely to report concerns** (4%) compared to female respondents **aged 18-34** (19%) and those **aged 35-59** (15%).

Of the top three perceived safety or security concerns for women, there were **more concerns reported in Chisinau**, compared to the other regions.

Protection: Safety or Security Concerns for Men

% of respondents who reported at least one perceived safety or security concern for men in their area of residence (among HHs with at least one man) (n=189)



% of HHs by top 3 perceived safety or security concerns for men in their area of residence (among HHs with at least one man)* (n=189)



** Respondents could select up to 3 options.*

Among HHs with at least one man (n=189), most respondents (79%) reported **no safety or security concerns for men** in their area of residence.

The primary safety or security concern for men in their area of residence was **being deported**, though this concern varied by region. In the **South**, 18% of respondents cited deportation as a concern, while no respondents from the Centre reported it being a concern. In the **North**, **being deported was the only concern** for men in their area of residence (mentioned by 3% of respondents), while 11% of respondents from the same region reported that they did **not know any concerns**.

Intentions and Returns

Protection: Intentions

% of HHs by movement intention within the 12 months following data collection (n=622)



% of HHs of by movement intention within the 12 months following data collection, by region (n=622)



While most HHs (78%) plan to **remain in their present location**, 17% did **not know their movement intentions for the next year** at the time of data collection. HHs from the **Centre** were slightly **more likely to plan moving to another country** (10%) compared to the other regions. No HHs in the North or South planned to move to another country.

Single-headed male HHs (n=77) tended to be **less certain** about their movement intentions within the next 12 months (30%) and were the least likely to plan to **remain in Moldova** (56%).

Protection: Return

% of HHs where one or more HH members have been back to visit Ukraine after 24 Feb 2022 (n=622)



% of HHs by main reported reasons for not being able to visit Ukraine (among those who reported not being able to visit Ukraine after 24 Feb 2022)* (n=87)



** Respondents could select multiple responses*

Slightly over half of surveyed HHs (55%) reported to have **visited Ukraine after 24 February 2022**. Overall, the top reported reason for not being able to visit Ukraine was **security concerns**, with some variation by region. In the **North**, the most reported reason was **lack of funds to cover transport** (83%), while in the **South**, it was the **need to take care of children or other dependents** (67%).

Protection: Return

% of HHs by reason for visiting Ukraine (among those who visited Ukraine after 24 February 2022) (n=323)***



** Graph displays only the five reasons selected by the most respondents.*

***Respondents could select multiple responses*

% of HHs by type of document required from Ukraine (among those who visited to obtain documentation) (n=52)***



** Graph displays only the five type of documents selected by the most respondents.*

***Respondents could select multiple responses*

Duration of stay in Ukraine during last visit (among those who visited after 24 February 2022) (n=323)



Among HHs that visited Ukraine after 24 February 2022 (n=323), nearly half of HHs (51%) reported **visiting Ukraine to visit relatives**. In addition, 11% of HHs said they visited Ukraine **to access healthcare**.

Among HHs that visited Ukraine (n=323), the majority (87%) **stayed for less than two weeks**, suggesting short visits.

No HHs experienced difficulties returning to Moldova after traveling back from Ukraine.

For inquiries

Caroline Hui, caroline.hui@impact-initiatives.org

Ross McDonald, ross.mcdonald@impact-initiatives.org

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action