

RETURNS WORKING GROUP- IRAQ

- ❖ **Meeting Date:** 11th June 2018
- ❖ **Meeting Time:** 14:00-16:00 hrs
- ❖ **Location:** Erbil (IOM Conference Room, Gulan Rd.) via bluejeans to Baghdad, SRSG Conference Room

In Attendance: IOM, USAID/OFDA, US Embassy/PRM, WFP, UNICEF, Shelter Cluster, SIF, COOPI, Geneva Call, Relief International, Mercy Hands, REACH, Dary, CRS, War Child Canada, HI, Samaritan's Purse, NRC, TDH-L, Social Inquiry, Peace Winds Japan, CCCM Cluster, , WHH, Arche nova, IRCS, Food Security Cluster, WHO, HLP Sub-cluster, UN-Habitat, Solidarites International, DFID, GIZ, DRC.

Agenda Items:

- 1) **Introduction and adoption of minutes:** Review of previous minutes; Follow up on action points from previous meeting
- 2) **Returns Updates:** Updates from DTM, Field updates from main governorates of return
- 3) **Overview of Areas of Return:** Presentation on the REACH/ RWG Rapid overview on areas of Return (ROAR)
- 4) **Prioritization on intervention in areas of return:** Presentation on return index and ranking methodology on prioritization of intervention in return areas
- 5) **Secondary displacement:** Presentation on current findings on secondary displacement
- 6) **AOB:**

Key Discussion Points/ Action:

- 1) **Introduction and adoption of minutes:** Review of previous minutes; Follow up on action points from previous meeting
-
- The co-chair (deputizing for chair, who is on sick leave) gave an overview of the previous meeting after the introductions, as well as a review of the agenda items. Two of the previous action points, on developing prioritization areas methodology and overview of areas of return, were to be addressed and presented at this meeting (by REACH and Social Inquiry/DTM, respectively). The overview of return areas should help address frequently raised questions asking how areas of return can be prioritized as well as how this information can reach both humanitarian and development partners. There is also ongoing follow up on RWG/PWG advocacy made through OCHA in GRCs regarding the decision to close camps and forced evictions. The government plan to share the camp closure timeline and envision where IDPs would go is still unclear but there are

ongoing discussions on field level and high level. Finally, there are still ongoing discussions regarding the follow-up on queries from MoMD's side and information on the return package, and updates will be provided in due course.

2) Returns Updates: Updates from DTM, Field updates from main governorates of return

i) Update from DTM (Presentation attached for more details):

- As of May 2018, the total no. of returnees was at 3,829,758
- During the reporting period, there was a 3% increase in the no. of returnees.
- Highest governorates of returns (as of May 2018): Ninewa, Anbar, Salah al-Din
- Governorates with highest increase in returns in May: Ninewa (+8%), Kirkuk (+2%), Salah al-Din (+1%)

ii) Field updates from main governorates of return (Presentation attached for more details)

- Co-chair presented the field updates and gave both a general and governorate-specific update on returns, including information from JCMC.
- Main points: 1) 43% of displaced families have returned to areas of origin, according to MoMD figures in April. 2) Eviction of 230 families in Al Dyom complex (Tikrit) to take place end of June. 3) Assessment by Dorcas showed 11 of 18 villages in Sinuni (along Syria border) have received people but residences are largely destroyed and there are no basic services. 4) Special support to be provided to people of Sinjar as per Prime Minister's approval. 5) After the PM visit to Kirkuk, the Governor of Kirkuk, senior leaders of the security forces, Mayor of Hawija district, Mayors of sub-districts of the Governorate of Kirkuk and the Director of the JCMC held a meeting in Kirkuk to establish a streamlined mechanism for the return of displaced people from the camps to Hawija and its sub-districts. There are 6 camps in Kirkuk Governorate with 4,594 families (25,263 individuals). This is simply the government stating their willingness to support returns, and no procedures have taken place yet. 6) 58 HHs from Khaladya camps were not permitted into western Anbar after being rejected by their communities in Heet due to perceived affiliations / tribal reasons and are still in Kilo 18. These HHs have reported that they were forcibly evicted from Khaladya camps and it's uncertain whether they will return to Khaladya camps. 7) About 50 families were re-displaced to al Haidari residential complex in Al Hur district. The families described their return as a premature return as it was not well prepared or managed due to the lack of a return plan (from the government) and insufficient or inaccurate information they had received about the services available in the areas of origin.

➤ Discussion:

- A query was made regarding the type of documentation that was missing from 75% of Sinuni sub-district returnees. The co-chair responded that this information was shared at the ICCG meeting in Duhok but the type of documentation was not clarified.
- A question was raised on whether there were any negotiations with Ninewa governorate to open the registry for properties. Co-chair said that this information was not shared and there may be threats to Sinjar IDPs who cannot return. More information would have to be obtained on the property-related issue.
- A question was raised regarding the ethnic makeup of families still stuck on Sinjar mountain. The response mentioned that all were all Yezidis.
- An inquiry made regarding Kirkuk on whether the streamlining of return to Hawija is being done through returns committee (and if there's participation by NGOs/UN) or if it's completely independent. Co-chair said that this was just information shared by JCMC, and not through GRCs. CCCM Cluster added that Kirkuk GRC, saying that only an informal meeting has been held but there will be another meeting shortly. CCCM Cluster explained that any return processes and initiatives will be halted until a formal meeting is held. There are debates on who will be the correct counterpart to take responsibility for Kirkuk GRC. This point is now clarified between JCMC and MoMD, and specific candidates were nominated this week. More clarity is expected in the next couple of weeks. The principled returns framework has been presented by Protection cluster to the government counterparts there.

➤ Action Point:

- Field updates to be shared with partners
- Follow up on Salah al-Din evictions and intention surveys, keeping in mind advocacy for principled return and durable solutions with local authorities

3) Overview of Areas of Return: Presentation on the REACH/ RWG Rapid overview on areas of Return (ROAR)

-
- REACH presented on the Rapid Overview of Areas of Return (ROAR), which was done in cooperation with RWG to find out more on AoOs, what people's motivations for return are, security situation, availability of basic services, livelihood opportunities, and protection concerns. ROARs have so far been conducted for Tel Afar, Baaj and Sinjar. These were done through 76 key informant interviews. (Presentation attached for more details)
 - Note: pre-conflict numbers difficult to find in the concerned areas, so numbers from last year were used:
 - 1) Baaj: 14,000 (mainly Sunni Arabs)

2) Tel Afar: 200,000 (Mainly Shia Turkmen, with some Sunni Arabs, Kurds, Christians)

3) Sinjar: 80,000 (mainly Yezidis and Sunni Arabs)

- Conclusion: basic services disrupted or not functional; considerable amount of protections concerns, including social cohesion – making return very difficult

➤ Discussions:

- An inquiry was made by NRC on how perception of safety could be captured in different locations for different population groups. REACH stressed that it is difficult to capture such details as interviewed returnees don't always mention their ethnicity, and that there is only a small number of key informants, therefore making the information quite general.
- An inquiry was made on whether more development actors and experts in analyzing areas of return are attending these RWG meetings. Co-chair concurred and mentioned that this point has been raised in previous meetings and with OCHA as there are still gaps between humanitarian and development actors. Information by development actors are essential in prioritizing return areas. It is difficult to obtain systematic information to make sustainable analysis, but RWG is attempting to arrange bilateral meetings with development actors and is pursuing this issue.
- Question raised on whether gender issues could be captured as KIs seem to be mainly male. REACH indicated that they are working on including more female-headed HHs and gender balance, but also mentioned the difficulty of obtaining female contact numbers.
- Inquiry from EU delegation on whether the reason behind better perceived security in AoO (as it was highest motivation for return) was due to less fighting or better security in area. REACH mentioned that both reasons have been heard, but due to a limited number of contacts and general nature of the question there are no detailed answers available for that.

➤ Action Points

- Follow up on next ROAR assessments focusing on western Anbar (Qa'im, Ra'ua, Ana, and potentially Rutba)

4) Secondary displacement: Presentation on current findings on secondary displacement

Before the presentation the co-chair briefed the attendants on the current work undertaken in the ICCG to define "secondary displacement". The presentation prepared by IOM was the same presentation given in the last HCT which had triggered the discussion at the ICCG level on the definition of secondary displacement. Therefore, the co-chair mentioned that the data and info provided in the presentation might

change later on as it was based on the definition of secondary displacement adopted primarily by DTM and RWG until the last HCT. In the next RWG meeting, the finalized definition agreed in the ICCG and HCT will be presented.

Presentation by IOM, which included current data on secondary displacement (the number of in-camp and out-of-camp IDPs) from multiple sources such as ILA III, JCC, and CCCM; the four different scenarios that constitute secondary displacement; and challenges, limitations and recommendations. (Presentation attached for more details)

(Discussion:

- CCCM asked on the extent of which secondary displacement information is useful and how it will inform any response, especially its relevance to CCCM in an operational sense considering the affected population is largely outside camps. CCCM also inquired whether RWG has a 3W or response matrix for return areas, and what is currently being implemented by the group. Co-chair mentioned that the data on secondary displacement is useful not only to RWG but also to other clusters, particularly Protection, to understand which are the obstacles to a sustainable and conducive return; also to be able to track the areas most affected. The focus will definitely be to out of camp situation as well, such collective center and informal settlements, however it is easy to collect info from the IDPs going back home while it is more challenging to get information from IDPs living in out of camp setting due to their volatile situation.
- Secondary this information collected for secondary displacement will be used by RWG and Protection cluster to advocate to the government on behalf of the affected communities and see if there is any plan for durable solutions. RWG is currently working on developing the 3W, however it is very challenging as it requires the support of Clusters and Development actors to receive up to data information. The main aim now is to understand problems in areas of return with the support of REACH, which is information that would be presented to development actors. and The support of CCCM is helpful within camps and would help inform a response in areas of origin.
- GIZ emphasized the importance of collecting data on secondary displacement in camps and out of camp, as those are IDPs who really want to return. The data on Mosul seems missing, as it's on a district level and not location level, as it is more useful to know in which towns and villages are certain problems being witnessed. It would help GIZ to focus its resources on certain areas. GIZ also asked whether information was collected in Anbar and other governorates. CCCM said it can provide all the data requested however they don't have IMO capacity to implement and analyze the data. The co-chair mentioned that the RWG could provide support on this and perhaps a bilateral meeting could follow.
- Co-chair mentioned that it is sometimes difficult to share every data collected with a wider group due to sensitive information. It was also mentioned that the next presentation on prioritization of

return areas would address this issue, and secondary displacement won't be the only factor in determining priority areas for stabilization purposes. Shelter cluster mentioned that it has been working on the damaged shelter rehabilitation tool, which is now online. The tool indicates where assessments have been conducted and where shelter activities have been done. However, the tool focuses mainly on Ninewa and dependent on partners who are willing to report their activities. Therefore the tool itself has its own limitations. The platform is open, and anyone can request access. Shelter added that they have been working with UNDP and Habitat as well.

➤ Action Points:

- RWG to meet with Un-Habitat

5) **Prioritization on intervention in areas of return:** Presentation on return index and ranking methodology on prioritization of intervention in return areas

Presentation by Social Inquiry on the development of a new methodology (in cooperation with DTM) to identify priority areas of return. The goal of this method is to judge the condition levels of areas to which IDPs are returning. The mechanics of this tool uses the monthly data collection of indicators in each of the 1,390 locations of return in DTM, after which the responses to indicators are combined to generate a score: each location will have a score -- a proxy for "quality of returns" that can be tracked across time.

(Presentation attached)

➤ Discussion:

-

➤ Action Points:

- Prioritization methodology to be further developed.
- To present this methodology to development actors

6) **AOB:**

- DFID inquired on post-election environment and its implications on field activity, as well as the frequency of MoMD's participation at the RWG meetings. Co-chair mentioned that no specific implications have been raised so far from partners. In regards to inviting MoMD to the RWG meeting, the co-chair mentioned that MODM representative is only invited on an ad-hoc basis as not everyone feel comfortable to share sensitive data on returns.

- Inquiry made on whether return packages will be standardized. Shelter explained that as long as there are ongoing movements and camps aren't closing, talks on the return package will be on hold. The situation will be monitored for now.
- The Know Before You Go (KBYG) flyer was also presented. KBYG is a joint product developed by RWG, Protection Cluster and CwC task force to help the IDPs willing to return to the AoO to make an informed decision. The co-chair mentioned that the flyer is still in pilot phase and has been tested in Salah al-Din.

➤ Action Points:

- Follow up on KBYG flyers test feedback

DRAFT