

RETURNS WORKING GROUP- IRAQ

- ❖ **Meeting Date:** 27 January 2021
- ❖ **Meeting Time:** 11:00 am-12:30 pm
- ❖ **Location:** Webex connection

In Attendance: IOM, DTM, PLC, UNDP FFS, Iraq Prospects Partnership, IIC UNOPS, SWEDO, GIZ, JICA, Australian Embassy, US Embassy, UNMAS, WFP, iMMAP, IMC, GRC, Human Rights Watch, Triangle (TGH), DRC, Peace Paradigms, UNAMI/DSO, UNHCR, IVY Japan, CCCM Cluster, UNDP, Shelter and NFI Cluster, SEDO, Protection Cluster, ACTED, ICRC, IRC, HI, REACH Initiative Iraq, INTERSOS, INSO, PRM, German Red Cross, Premiere Urgence Internationale, PAO, COOPI, Social Inquiry, CCI RC, Protection Cluster Ninewa & KRI, Solidarites International, EU Iraq, Netherlands Embassy, ECHO, Canada Embassy, Durable Solutions Advisor to HC, Save the Children, MASC, OCHA, UNICEF, RWG

Agenda Items:

- 1) **Introduction and adoption of minutes:** Review of previous minutes; Follow up on action points from previous meeting
- 2) **DTM Returns Update and CCCM Camp Update:** Update on return figures from RWG/ DTM dashboard and return index; Update on Emergency Tracking for Sinjar returns; CCCM Camp Closures
- 3) **UNHCR presentation:** Iraqi documentation
- 4) **DSTWG:** Update on National Plan, Area Based Planning
- 5) **AOB**

Action Points to follow up by next meeting:

Action	By who
No specific action points	

Key Discussion Points/ Action:

- 1) **Introduction and adoption of minutes:** Review of previous minutes; Follow up on action points from previous meeting

- The chair gave an overview of the previous meeting after the introductions, as well as a review of the agenda items.

- 2) **DTM Return Update and CCCM camp update:** Update on return figures from RWG/ DTM dashboard and return index; Update on Emergency Tracking for Sinjar returns; CCCM Camp Closures

(Presentations attached for more details)

i) DTM updates

- Total no. of IDPs as of December 2020: 1,224,108 individuals (decrease of 54,756 IDPs)
- Total no. of returnees as of December 2020: 4,831,566 individuals (increase of 49,152 returnees)
- Return Index data: out of the 2,076 return locations assessed, 423 present severe conditions hosting 10 per cent of the returnee population, or 484,548 individuals.

- A decrease of 37,542 returnees living in severe or poor conditions has been observed since the round collected in November – December 2019, when 12 per cent of the returnee population (522,090 individuals) were in severe conditions.
- The largest decreases in number of returnees living in severe conditions were recorded in Salah al-Din and Anbar, while the largest increase was observed in Ninewa governorates.
- In Salah al-Din, the largest decreases were recorded in Tikrit and Tuz Khurmatu, where an improvement of the situation in relation to agricultural activities, businesses, employment and reconciliation process was observed.
- In Anbar, the largest decrease was observed in Falluja due to the improvement of situation with daily public life, agricultural activities, and businesses.
- Hotspots: Compared to the round collected in November – December 2019, nine subdistricts were added to the list, Abo Sayda (Al-Muqdadiya District, a newly assessed subdistrict) in Diyala Governorate, Al-Amiryia (Falluja District), Sharqiah (Ramadi District), Al-Baghdady, Al-Forat and Markaz Heet (Heet District) in Anbar Governorate, Al-Eshaqi (Balad District), Al-Moatasseem (Samarra District), Husaibah Al-Markaz Al-Balad (Balad District) in Salah al-Din Governorate.

Emergency Tracking Camp Closures:

- Between 11 and 17 January 2021, a total of 857 new households (4,274 individuals) have been recorded as arriving to non-camp settings following the camp closures that are currently taking place. Ninewa governorate received all the arrivals primarily in the districts of Mosul, Sinjar and Al-Ba'aj.
- A total of 6,519 households (33,290 individuals) have been recorded as arriving to non-camp settings since the camp closures began in mid-October. This reflects the general trend since the movements began, with Ninewa having received the most arrivals overall (3,677 families) followed by Kirkuk, and then Diyala.
- Of the total recorded arrivals since 18 October 2020, 1,965 households (30%) have not returned to their location of origin and are now considered to be secondarily displaced, while 4,554 households (70%) have returned to their respective village or neighborhood of origin and are considered to be returnees.
- In 15 out of the 51 districts having witnessed new arrivals from camps, a total of 1,634 newly arrived households (36%) are hosted in high severity locations.
- Ninewa governorate hosts the highest number of households living in highly severe conditions, especially in the districts of Al-Ba'aj (508 households) and Sinjar (388).

Emergency Tracking Sinjar

- As of 3 January 2021, 45,268 individuals have returned to Sinjar and Al-Ba'aj districts since 8 June.
- Between 22 November 2020 and 3 January 2021, the average number of daily individual arrivals was 111 to Sinjar and 10 to Al-Ba'aj.
- The majority of individuals have been recorded as returnees (77%), while 23% have been recorded as out-of-camp IDPs. This means that around ¼ of individuals end up in secondary displacement.
- The majority of individuals left camp settings in Sumel and Zakho, in Duhok, as well as Shikhan in Ninewa

- In this reporting period, the average number of daily individual arrivals was 111 to Sinjar (down significantly from 258 in the last round - 30 October and 21 November) and 10 to Al-Ba'aj (down from 16 in the last round).
- The most common sub-district of arrival was Al-Shamal with 2,514 individuals (56%), followed by Markaz Sinjar with 1,077 individuals (24%).

New Index

- DTM is working on a new Displacement Index (similar to the Return Index)
- The tool is designed to measure the severity of conditions in locations with IDP HHs.
- Data is collected at community-level through DTM's network of Key Informants in all non-camp locations hosting IDPs across Iraq by IOM's Rapid Assessment and Response Teams (RARTs).

2021 Plans

- Please see presentation for details of product schedule.

ii) CCCM camp updates

- To date 42,449 individuals have departed camps since October 2020. Sixteen sites have close or been reclassified (14 camps in federal Iraq, 2 camps reclassified, 2 informal sites closed). There are 25 camps that remain administered by the KRI.
- Jeddah 5 camp closure was announced on 21 January and departures are ongoing.
- Data with regard to the camp closures is being collected through CCCM (Area of origin information), IOM-DTM (Emergency tracking of locations of arrival), CCCM/Protection Cluster/ IIC (Camp departure follow-up calls conducted 2 weeks after departure).
- According to the latest camp departure information:
 - 41% of households report having not returned to their area of origin when they were required to depart from a camp
 - Of those who returned to areas of origin, 38% report not being able to return to their previous residence
 - 18% of households report residing in substandard shelter – tents, unfinished or abandoned buildings, or makeshift shelters, while 40% report renting housing. Almost all families report either relying on daily labour, borrowing money, or having no income.
 - 55% report that they have not had access to sufficient food since leaving the camp
 - 37% report not having access to sufficient drinking water, and 57% not having access to sufficient hygiene items, since leaving the camp
 - 16% of households report having family members missing civil documentation, and 39% report at least one family member being in need of medical assistance that they are unable to access.
- The information that partners can access from the camp departure surveys includes a publicly available dashboard and data that can be asked from the cluster (anonymized dataset and referrals).

Discussion:

- What two camps were reclassified as an informal settlement?
 - HTC camp in Anbar
 - Zayona camp in Baghdad
- OCHA: What is the status of the two Latifiyah camps in Baghdad?
 - CCCM: MOMD's initial idea was to remove the fence and turn it to an informal site. As of now, there is no clear vision from the local authorities. The camps are still open and services are ongoing (health included)

- Shelter Cluster and PRM: Asked about the plans with regard to the KRI camps and the visit of the MODM minister to KRI to discuss camp closure prospects in the KRI?
 - Protection: there was supposed to be a meeting between KRG and central government, but the meeting has taken place and it is still undecided.
 - CCCM: KRI position same as before, that there will be no forced camp closures in KRI and IDPs should be allowed to voluntarily depart camps
- CCCM added that with the Jeddah 5 closure, there is an intention to form committees on a local level to facilitate returns especially for those families who have social cohesion obstacles to return.
- Dutch embassy: What does the reclassification by the government mean in practice? E.g. in terms of service delivery?
 - CCCM: Noted that while the government is responsible for service delivery for camps when a site becomes reclassified the standard of service delivery is lower but in some instance some partners do continue to provide services and assistance to IDPs.
- Do we have any update about the rumored status of the Amalia camp that is intended to host Iraqi returnees from Al Hol?
 - CCCM: No update on Amalla or returns from Al Hol.
- PLC: Are there Arab returnee villages are being support with livelihood in 2021?
 - IOM has projects in Qayrawan and can share privately the focal point overseeing operations in Sinjar.
- WFP: The follow up survey shows that majority of the returns are not to the area of origin and even those to the area of origin not in their original residences. Does it means secondary displacement in their return areas and how this impact the families if they do go to their original homes?
 - DTM the methodology uses is that if an IDP returns to his/her village/neighborhood of origin we classify them as a returnee, but if the IDP returns to the district of origin but not to their original village we do not classify them as a returnee but as a IDP in secondary displacement.
 - CCCM in some instances the IDPs may have not owned homes prior to displacement and may have been renting and in other cases their home may be destroyed and although they might return to their village of origin they might reside with family or may rent, there are many factors which could play a role
- PRM: How many returnees and how many IDPs participated in the camp departure follow up survey?
 - CCCM for the period between October 2020 and 19 January 2021, 2,742 households participated in the camp departure follow up survey of those HH which left 13 camps in Federal Iraq.
- PLC: Are there any partners working in agriculture project on west of Sinjar, such as, Qahtania, Suknia, Rambusy east Rambusy west, Jidali, Hayal villages?
 - WFP partner WHH is implementing resilience and Agriculture project in Qahtaniya and we can provide more details. Will be implementing more projects in Sinjar in 2021.
 - IOM is implementing agriculture related operations in Rambusy.
- UNAMI: what is the latest records of arrivals in Sinjar and Baaj?
 - DTM; Information available on this [link](#)

3) UNHCR presentation: Iraqi documentation

(Presentation attached for more details)

Key points:

- Importance of documentation to freedom of movement, legal, material, physical safety, longer term social cohesion.
- It was noted 2,3 million individuals are missing core legal documents therefore will require protection services throughout 2021.
- 73% of the PiN are in 12 districts in 6 governorates (Ninewa, Erbil, Dohuk, Anbar, Kirkuk and SAD)
- Operational responses include – Legal assistance, Information & outreach, Coordination Area-based, Legal Task Forces, Mobile missions, CADs, courts, Infrastructure support, Addressing barriers, Advocacy, Security clearances, Implementation of directives to ensure access to Govt services (health, education), Longer-term--removal of barriers, reforms

Discussion:

- Australian Embassy: where can we access the mapping of civil documentation needs from UNHCR and REACH?
 - See [link](#) - Civil Documentation and Housing, Land and Property Needs in Iraq
- UNAMI: How many security entities are involved in security clearance process?
 - Protection Cluster: suggest to reach out to Legal TFs coordinators. You can direct requests to Toloe and Douglas and they will put you in touch with Legal TFs coordinators Toloe Masori <MASORI@unhcr.org>; Douglas Jennings <jenningd@unhcr.org>

4) DSTWG: Update on National Plan, Area Based Planning

(Presentation attached for more details) – delivered jointly by DS advisor to HC and DSTWG co-chair.

Key points:

Update on National Plan

- Engagement on National Plan – MoMD and MoP, feedback from the DSTF has been incorporated to broaden the approach of the government to inclusion of out of camp, other solutions etc. Process for finalization underway
- Next step would be to engage in further discussions with GoI to update on area based planning approaches and support to operationalization of plan at local level, as well as to ensure a forum is established for regular meetings to highlight cross-cutting issues, across areas, and ensure a feedback loop of information on updates between the local and national level.
- **Overview** The DSTWG is the Body through which area-based durable solutions plans of action will be overseen and steered
- Area-level groups are small, core, planning bodies – including focal points and 5-7 members –that steer and guide the development, implementation and monitoring of local DS plans jointly with authorities
- Members should be from the area, from across ‘the spectrum’ of organizations, and not necessarily DSTWG members (although at least one focal point should be for linkages with national DSTWG).

- These members and focal points will link with other groups – idea is not to recreate and duplicate other bodies – this is a core group that will very actively participate in planning and government engagement
- Area level groups have set processes to follow to develop plans – ensuring harmonization and consistency in approaches, with guidance and support from national DSTWG. These processes are centered around developing, implementing and monitoring DS plans which require set process including initial brainstorming among the ABC, meetings with government authorities, context analysis, consultations with other partners and communities, roundtables and workshops, drafting of plans, developing monitoring indicators and so forth
- Selection of areas dependant on a number of factors/criteria such as availability of partners available/willing to support and lead durable solutions area-level planning and implementation, commitment of authorities to support and participate within the area, access etc and broad involvement of diverse actors humanitarian, development, stabilization and peace-building actors for the specific area
- The current list of focal points and areas was noted. It was highlighted that these focal points are under the process of finalization, it is important that we begin soon – we'll be organizing an induction session for all members and focal points to outline expectations of these groups, available support, anticipated work plan etc.

Support of ABCs from National Level

- It is understood that there are many expectations of the area-level groups and therefore support is required. The RWG team, including focal points based in Centre South, KRI, Kirkuk/Ninewa, who have been working on many tasks that have now been brought under the DSTWG, will be formally supporting the DSTWG, backstopping area-based groups. In addition, at the national level, additional capacity is being hired to support these processes, to draft plans of action, to facilitate consultations and government roundtables.

Next Steps

- See presentation for schedule of activities.

Discussion:

- UNAMI: How to join the ABC for DS groups?
 - DSTWG; interested partners should contact the chairs of the DSTWG. DSTWG to share finalized list of areas and confirmed focal points next week. Important to note that the smaller 'steering grou's are expected to be actively engaged in the development of plans (max 5-7 members, 2 focal points), however there will be extensive outreach and engagement of all relevant partners who can contribute to the achievement of DS objectives, who can input on DS plans etc.
- UNHCR: What the linkages with UNSDCF coordination structure (PWGs) and with Clusters? Is a tool to converge the 2 or is a third coordination structure? Or a consultation mechanism? And if is a third coordination structure, how is going to operationalize the strategies, pilots, initiatives, without dedicated funding streams?
 - DSTWG: They are represented on the DSTWG and designed to bring them together (nexus). The idea is to avoid duplication and build on what exists.
- Shelter Cluster: how are clusters going to be represented at the area-based coordination level/meetings?
 - DSTWG: We aim to keep the TWG small enough to be effective but also to representative of all areas (humanitarian, development etc.). The intention is to continue very closely with clusters and other WGs. Hence there will be outreach



to all partners. The objective is not to have a group of coordinators, rather to focus on operational actors. The DSTWG currently includes members from SNFI/HLP, ICCG, NPC, at the area level, at present, OCHA had indicated membership of each group and would be available to create linkages with platforms that exist while members will also be doing the same for area-based coordination.

- Participants requested the email addresses of focal points from DSTWG to whom NGOs can express interest of ABC membership.
 - Focal point emails: zkazim@iom.int, bmellicker@iom.int, hilary.murphy@undp.org, ismael.frioud1@un.org

5) AOB

- REACH is publishing a ReDS factsheet on Markaz Sinjar, which will be made available soon. Contact email: cristina.carrandi@reach-initiative.org