

IRAQ MULTI-CLUSTER NEEDS ASSESSMENT (MCNA) VII

Key Findings – Returns Working Group

November 2019



OCHA

REACH Informing
more effective
humanitarian action

CONTENT

1 – Introduction

- Purpose of the MCNA
- Institutional framework
- The MCNA within the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO)
- Methodology, data collection & coverage
- Challenges and limitations

2 – Key cross-sectoral findings & trends

- Movement intentions
- Accountability to affected populations (AAP)
- Vulnerabilities: Female-headed households, disability, coping strategies, income

3 – Key Sectoral findings & trends

- Durable Solutions
- Livelihoods

4 – Conclusion

1 - INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE MCNA

The purpose of the MCNA is to provide impartial and evidence-based information to clusters for strategic planning within the Humanitarian Planning Cycle:

- Inform multi-sectoral humanitarian planning throughout Iraq
- Provide a comprehensive evidence base to inform the 2020 HNO and the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)
- Support inter-sectoral humanitarian planning and response
- Develop an evidence-based analytical framework for prioritization and ranking of severity of needs

INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The MCNA is an initiative of the Assessment Working Group (AWG):

- Chaired by OCHA
- Co-chaired by REACH

Involvement of the humanitarian community in all stages:

- Design of indicators and tools
- Endorsement of indicators, tools, and the terms of reference (through the AWG and the inter-cluster coordination group (ICCG))
- Partner collaboration in data collection
- Bilateral consultations and presentations to individual clusters
- Joint analysis exercise across all sectors and partners
- Presentation of full data and cross sectoral findings

METHODOLOGY & DATA COLLECTION

Scope

- Covering all populations affected by the 2014 displacement crisis, including Internally Displaced People (IDP) in camp, IDP out of camp, and returnee.
- Nationwide: all districts with at least 200 IDP and/or returnee households (based on the International Organization for Migration (IOM) Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) figures and list of locations).
- Host communities hosting IDPs in 9 selected districts surveyed as well, for parallel research on the potential effect of varying IDP caseloads (not covered in this presentation).


Population group	Sampling methodology	Population data source	Level of confidence / margin of error
IDP households in camp	Random sampling	CCCM* June 2019 camp masterlist	90 / 10 camp level
IDP households out of camp	Cluster sampling	IOM DTM (April 2019)	90 / 10 district level
Returnee	Cluster sampling	IOM DTM (April 2019)	90 / 10 district level
Host communities	Cluster sampling	Estimates based on World Pop data (2015)	90 / 10 district level

*Iraq Camp Coordination Camp Management cluster.

DATA COLLECTION & COVERAGE

Data collection

- Between mid-June and mid-August 2019
- 63 districts (coverage in map)
- 13,086 households surveyed:
 - 3,209 IDP in camp,
 - 5,902 IDP out of camp,
 - 3,249 returnee,
 - 726 host community
- Data collected by 19 partners: NRC, Mercy Corps, SIF, Caritas CZ, IOM, SSORD, OXFAM, REACH-Iraq, Medair, People in Need, ZOA International, ACF, Save the Children, Human Appeal, COOPI, INTERSOS, Justice Center, IRC.



CHALLENGES & LIMITATIONS

- Surveys were conducted with one respondent (usually the head of household) only, who answered on behalf of the household, including for individual level questions on other members of the household.
- The month of Ramadan which ended two weeks prior to data collection may have impacted certain survey responses that had a recall period of 30 days (coping strategies, income, expenditure, etc.)
- Collaboration between 20 organizations collecting data may have led to some minor inconsistencies in terms of data collected.
- Some areas were inaccessible due to authorization restrictions, or security limitations, which meant that target samples were not fully achieved there.
- Only districts with 200 IDP and/or returnee households were surveyed. Therefore, districts with less than 200 households are not included in the scope of the assessment.

2 - KEY CROSS-SECTORAL FINDINGS & TRENDS


DEMOGRAPHICS

Family composition and size were similar across the three population groups:

- The average household size for all population groups was **6 members**.
 - *The household is defined as individuals who share housing, food, and income with other members.*
- The average family size for all population groups was **5 members** for all but IDP out of camp families, for which the average was 6.
 - *The family includes individuals under the guardianship or responsibility of a family unit (parents and their children), such as disabled relatives, separated children, or elderly relatives under their care.*
- The ratio of male to female within families was close to 1-1:
 - On average, 49% (IDP in-camp) to 52% (returnee) members were female.
- The ratio of children to adult within families was close to 2-3 for all three population groups:
 - For IDP households in camp, 43% were children;
 - For IDP households out of camp, 40% were children;
 - For returnee households, 36% were children.

IDP MOVEMENT INTENTIONS


Three-month movement intentions for IDP households nationwide:



A vast majority of IDP households did not intend to return to their Area of Origin (AoO) within the 3 months following data collection, in particular those living in camps.

IDP MOVEMENT INTENTIONS


One year movement intentions for IDP households nationwide:



- Intentions to return to AoO within the year slightly increased compared to intentions to return during the three months following data collection.
- Meanwhile, the proportion of households that reported not knowing considerably increased, in particular for IDP households living in camps (from 9% to 28%). **This is particularly relevant within the context of camp consolidations and closures.**

IDP MOVEMENT INTENTIONS – DISTRICT LEVEL

One year movement intentions for IDP households, by district:




Intention to remain in current areas of displacement within 12 months differed across districts, but was mostly similar within regions of the country:

- In northern districts (mainly in Duhok), 76% to 100% of households reported they intended to remain in current area of displacement.
- In Southern districts, intention to remain was usually under 50% (with the exception of Al-Hindiya in Babil) of households.
- In the Ninewa plains, Kirkuk, Sulaymaniyah, intentions to remain in current area of displacement were mainly between 51% and 75% of households.

RETURNEE MOVEMENT INTENTIONS


Three-month movement intentions for returnee households nationwide:



Only 1% of returnee households indicated they intended to re-displace in the three months following data collection, citing, for the most part (60%), lack of stable security in their area. Other reasons cited were lack of livelihoods (17%) and lack of basic services (12%).

IDP MOVEMENT INTENTIONS - REASONS

Primary reasons for intending to return, among IDP households intending to return (national level):




Primary reasons for not intending to return, among IDP households not intending to return (national level):



Obstacles to return were similar to previous rounds of intentions surveys, underlining issues relating to security, housing and livelihoods as persistent barriers.

AAP – AID RECEIVED & SATISFACTION


% households that reported receiving aid in the 30 days prior to data collection:



Among households that received aid, 33% of IDP households in camp said they were not satisfied with the aid they received, followed by IDP households out of camp (30%), and returnee households (13%).

VULNERABILITIES – COPING STRATEGIES

% households that relied on coping strategies in order to meet basic needs, in the 30 days prior to data collection:



Overall, a higher percentage of IDP households in camp reported relying on coping strategies in the month prior to data collection, including emergency strategies.

VULNERABILITIES – DISABILITY

14 - 15 % of IDP households in camp, IDP households out of camp, and returnee households reported having at least one household member with a physical and/or cognitive difficulty.*


At the district level:

- The proportion of households reporting having at least one member with physical and/or cognitive difficulties ranged between less than 1% and 54%.
- The highest proportion were in Rutba (54%), Kaim (32%), Ana (30%), Hawiga (30%), Baiji (35%).

*As per Washington Group guidance, this included individuals that had "lots of difficulty" or "could not do at all" one of the following activities: seeing, hearing, walking/climbing steps, remembering / concentrating, self-care, communicating).

VULNERABILITIES – FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLDS

% female Headed households, by population group



- The proportion of female-headed households in camp was substantially higher than for IDP households out of camp and returnee households.
- Female Headed households might be more prone to vulnerabilities, including with regards to income. For example, **a higher proportion of female-headed households had income from employment and pension in the month prior to data collection lower than 480,000 IQD, than all households:**
 - IDP households in camp: 90% rather than 85%
 - IDP households out of camp: 76% rather than 63%
 - Returnee households: 77% rather than 62%

3 – KEY SECTORAL FINDINGS & TRENDS

DURABLE SOLUTIONS


DURABLE SOLUTIONS

% households falling under each indicator, by population group:

Durable Solutions pillars	Indicators (household-level)	IDP in camps	IDP out of camps	Returnee
1. Long-term safety, security, and freedom of movement	Experience movement restrictions in daylight.	47%	30%	61%
2. Adequate standard of living	Evicted from previous shelter/housing in the 12 months prior to data collection	6%	6%	5%
	Lack of access to essential health services (emergency, maternity, pediatric and surgical within 10km)	60%	48%	48%
3. Access to livelihoods & employment	Do not own or have secure rights over agricultural lands	77%	74%	76%
4. Access to effective mechanisms to restore housing, land and property (HLP) or to provide compensation	Unable to access property compensation (among those with damaged housing that requested compensation)	90%	96%	93%
5. Access to and replacement of personal and other documentation	At least one key household or individual document missing	99%	98%	97%
6. Voluntary reunification with family members separated during displacement	Separated household members	4%	2%	2%
7. Participation in public affairs	At least one adult unable to register to vote	16%	14%	15%
8. Access to remedies	Lack of awareness of how to access complaint mechanisms	19%	45%	41%

DURABLE SOLUTIONS

Key Durable Solutions findings, by population group




- Across all population groups, durable solutions related challenges were highest in relation to administrative issues such as missing documentation and ownership over agricultural land.
- The percentage of returnee households in need of property compensation but unable to access it ranged from 33% to 100% across districts.


LONG-TERM SAFETY, SECURITY AND FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT

% of households experiencing daytime movement restrictions

1) By population group



2) By districts with the highest reported percentages among returnee households




- **Daytime movement restrictions can strongly be related to missing key documents.**
- The percentage of returnee households experiencing daytime movement restrictions ranged between 0% in Al-Shikhan and 100% in Al-Baaj and Heet.


ADEQUATE STANDARD OF LIVING

% of households without access to essential health services (emergency, maternity, pediatric and surgical) within 10km

1) By population group



2) By districts with the highest reported percentages among returnee households




- The proportion of returnee households without access to essential health services within 10km varied considerably across districts, ranging between 8% in Khanaqin and 100% in Sinjar and Al-Baaj).


PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

% of returnee households with at least one adult unable to register to vote

1) By population group



2) By districts with the highest reported percentages among returnee households




- In four districts, more than 25% of returnee households reported that at least one member of their household was unable to register to vote.
- **Adults being unable to vote can again be related to missing documentation.**

3 – KEY SECTORAL FINDINGS & TRENDS

LIVELIHOODS

VULNERABILITY – INCOME

% of households with income-related vulnerabilities, by population group:




A higher proportion of IDP households living in camps, compared to out of camp populations, had income-related vulnerabilities.

*households that took on debt to be able to cover healthcare, food, education, or basic household expenditures, in the 30 days prior to data collection.

LIVELIHOODS - EXPENDITURE


Types of expenditures as a share of total household expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection



- **Proportionally to total expenditures, returnee households reported considerably higher expenditures on shelter, debt and food when compared to IDP households out of camp.**
- Types of expenditure only show a minor variance between female- and male-headed households.

LIVELIHOODS – PRIMARY SOURCES OF INCOME


Most commonly reported sources of income by population group in the 30 days prior to data collection



- **Female-headed households are more likely to rely on social services** (10% for female-headed households and 3% for male-headed households) **and pensions** (21% for female-headed households and 9% for male-headed households) whereas **male-headed households are much more likely to rely on employment as a primary source of income** (50% for female-headed households and 78% for male-headed households).

LIVELIHOODS – DEBT

% of households with a debt value of more than 505,000 IQD



- **The average debt value was highest among returnee households (1'800'000 IQD)** when compared to IDP households in camp (1'300'000 IQD) and IDP households out of camp (1'700'000 IQD).

4 – CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS – SECTORAL (DS and Livelihoods)

Durable Solutions:

- **The vast majority of households reported missing key civil documentation and being unable to access compensation.** The high percentage of households reporting on missing documentation raises other durable solutions related concerns in relation to participation in public affairs and daytime movement restrictions.
- **Other durable solutions needs varied considerably across districts and population groups,** indicating the need for a returnee and stabilization response that is tailored to local and population-specific needs.

Livelihoods:

- **IDPs and returnees continue to face severe livelihoods challenges, with 60% of all surveyed households being unable to meet their basic needs** and therefore having to rely on unsustainable income sources. The debt value is highest among returnee households, with almost 50% of returnee households reporting a debt value of more than 505,000 IQD.
- **Female-headed households are found to be particularly vulnerable in relation to livelihood needs, underlining the need to pay particular attention to this group when addressing durable solutions in Iraq.**

OUTPUTS

Available

- Dataset available upon request.
- Preliminary findings and HNO inter-sectoral findings available upon request.
- Terms of reference available on the [REACH Resource Center](#).
- HNO / MCNA presentation available on the [REACH Resource Center](#).

Upcoming

- MCNA Factsheets (November)
- MCNA final report (December)