

Durable Solutions Technical Working Group (DSTWG) – Ad Hoc Meeting on defining local integration and displacement stock in Iraq

9 December 2024

Participants: Ryosuke Teraoka (UN Habitat), Marta Lopez, Lee Griffin (REACH), Saad Haji (GIZ), Zainab Al-Mufti (OCHA), Ban Yassen (UNMAS), Mohammed Abdel-Razzak, Islam El-Ghazouly, Mohammed Chalabi (RCO), Inge Zondag, Fiona Allen (UNHCR), Wissam Khalil, Kelnor Panglungtshang (ICRC), Hudhaifa Nadhim (IRC), Thordis Webber (ForumZfd), Mariana Andrade, Elisa Molena, Mustafa Al-Sabounchi, Mohammed Natheer, Alaa Ayoob, Amanda Bay, Wahab Sabbar (IOM), Erum Baloch (Secours Islamique), David Videira, Precillar Moyo (DSTWG).

Overview and Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Defining Local Integration
3. Displacement Stock in Iraq

Background

Current Challenges:

1. *Variations between government data and aid community data:* Currently MoMD data is from a case management perspective, ie registration of families on MOMD data base. While MoMD database includes both camp and out of camp IDPs, increasing policy approach is to focus on camp IDPs as camps are perceived as an indicator of instability. Aid community relies on DTM data which tracks movement, relies on key informants and since 2022 started doing HH level data collection to measure progress towards solutions.
2. *How to correctly capture all the 3 solutions pathways:* The need to correctly capture those pathways such as relocation or local integration and distinguish between secondary displacement, failed returns.
3. *Need to continue to prioritize displacement caseload as funding continues to shrink and as government takes the lead more:* While under durable solutions target populations would include IDPs, Returnees and host communities, CCNA and DTM progress data continues to indicate that the various groups fare differently, housing challenges persists more among IDPs and returnees, while livelihoods challenges appear to affect all groups...female headed household and those who have displaced multiple times also appear to make less progress than those with stable or secure tenure.

A. MOMD treatment of displacement:

- Registration data base for different conflicts:
 - 2003
 - 2006
 - 2014
 - Climate displacement (2023---ongoing)
- Household level data.
- For 2014 ISIL conflict **no registration after 2019**. Registration linked to MOMD cash assistance at initial displacement, upon return and in-kind assistance during displacement period and initial year of return.
- Since 2022, registration of local integration/relocation.

B. Aid community treatment of displacement

- DTM tracking of 2014 ISIL conflict IDPs (Master list containing IDP and Returnees).

- Key Informants source.
- Individual and Household data.
- Governorate and location level data
- Displacement and Return Index
- IDP and Returnee (other pathways not reflected yet)
- Progress data since 2022 (specific governorates).
- Climate displacement tracked separately

Definitions:

Policy wise, government and aid community define IDPs in the same way ie ‘persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalised violence, violation of human rights, natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised State border.’¹

However, in practice some distinctions exist.

- a. Internally displaced persons: ---Forced to flee due to 2014 and liberation efforts plus consequences of ISIS. Thus
 - i. Failed Return
 - ii. Secondary displacement
- b. Returnee²----distinction between registering with MoMD and actual physical return to area of origin or normal habitation. Interest by the government to close the displacement file compared with interest to ensure that displaced persons meet the IASC criteria for durable solutions.
- c. Criteria for measuring local integration and relocation.
 - i. **Economic Conditions:** Marta highlighted the role of economic conditions in failed returns, noting that many IDPs are forced to move again due to lack of employment and development opportunities in their areas of origin.
 - ii. **Development Issues:** Participants discussed the broader development issues that contribute to failed returns, emphasizing the need for development solutions to ensure that returnees can sustain their livelihoods and access services in their areas of origin.
 - iii. **Time Frame for Failed Returns:** Inga raised the question of the appropriate time frame for considering a return as failed, suggesting that a clear time frame should be established to distinguish between normal migration and failed returns.

Considerations:

- d. The need to national level data which could help to compare different groups, especially for socio economic data.
2. **Census Data:**
- a. IDPs counted in areas of displacement?
 - b. Action Point: Reach out to UNFPA
 - c. IDSF, Data quality on IDP figures in census, MOP and MoMD
 - d. Assyish data

¹ MoMD National Policy on Displacement 2008 and International Guideline Principles.

² Aid community recognizes that return does not necessarily suggest that solutions are met.



Considerations

- e. Mohammed A (RCO) cautioned on the census data, reliability of the collected data, considering reports that in some locations IDPs were counted as part of the local community while in other locations they were not counted, even though the questionnaire appears to include displaced.
- f. Zainub (OCHA) and Marta (REACH) commented on the need for a clear classification of secondary displacement and failed returns, economic considerations and development issues. Should there be a timeframe for when a return is considered failed or when it is considered secondary displacement.

3. Relocation/local integration:

- a. *Criteria for local integration:* Participants discussed the criteria for local integration, considering factors such as residency cards, access to services and the perceptions of IDPs themselves. Note that clear benchmarks needed to distinguish between local integration and relocation.
- b. *Role of residency cards:* The role of residency cards in determining local integration was debated, participants noted that in some areas, IDPs can change their residency cards reflecting new location while in others this was not possible complicating the classification of local integration.
- c. *Access to services:* participants emphasised the importance of access to services in determining local integration noting that IDPs who can access services such as education, health and utilities in new locations are more likely indications of local integration alongside purchase of houses.
- d. *Perceptions of IDPs:* Perceptions of IDPs themselves considered crucial in determining their status, with some participants noting that some IDPs consider themselves as displaced until they receive certain government entitlements especially compensation for housing.

Action Points:

- **Census Data Availability:** Reach out to UNFPA to find out when the census data will be available and report back to the team. (Precillar DSTWG)
- **Census Data Clarification:** Raise the point about the availability and use of census data during the upcoming meeting with the committee for the project with UN Habitat. (Mohammed DTM)
- **Local Integration Criteria:** Review the actual questionnaire used by UNFPA to see how questions on displacement are phrased and assess its usefulness as a starting point for local integration data. (UNHCR)
- **Engagement with MOMD:** Discuss with MOMD the possibility of capturing local integration and relocation data during the upcoming workshop. (Mohammed DTM)
- **Progress Data Sharing:** Share the link to the progress data with Ryo to help in preparing the proposal targeting both returnees and Idps. (Mohammed)
- **Follow-up Meeting:** Arrange a follow-up session in January to continue discussing and crystallizing benchmarks for local integration and relocation. (Precillar DSTWG)