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CONTEXT

December 2017 marked the end of major military operations in Iraq against the so-called Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). While more than 4 million returns have been recorded as of September 2018, almost 2 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain, of whom 71% reside outside of formal camps. Moreover, secondary displacement and new arrivals to formal camps signal the tenuous nature of some returns. Therefore, although recovery efforts in Iraq are underway, understanding the multifaceted and intersecting needs of all affected groups is critical to supporting durable returns, while maintaining services for those in protracted displacement and addressing the unique vulnerabilities of populations who remained non-displaced during active conflict. A Multi-Cluster Needs Assessment (MCNA) was conducted in July 2018 to provide this analysis and inform the 2019 Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO). The MCNA was led by the Assessment Working Group and facilitated by REACH, in close collaboration with OCHA and the Inter-Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG).

METHODOLOGY

A structured household survey was conducted amongst a representative sample of 12,261 conflict-affected households nationwide (of which 2,833 were returnees) using two-stage, stratified cluster sampling. Target sample sizes were calculated based on population figures from the IOM DTM Returnees Master List dataset (15 June 2018, Round 97). Findings are statistically representative of accessible districts in which 200 or more returnee households were present, with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error. Findings at the national level are representative at a higher level of precision, with 99% confidence level and 2% margin of error. Data collection took place from 1 July to 3 September 2018, coordinated by REACH field staff and team leaders from each partner organisation. Analysis was guided by the Multi-Cluster Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) framework (see Annex 1 for the detailed methodology). Findings in this factsheet are representative of returnee households in accessible areas of Iraq only, as depicted in the coverage map below.

POPULATION PROFILE

Demographics

- **Female (48%)**
- **Male (52%)**
- **Age Distribution**:
  - 0-5: 5%
  - 6-17: 27%
  - 18-59: 21%
  - 60+: 16%
- **Average household size**: 6.8
- **Single female-headed households**: 21%

Displacement history

- **Average length of displacement**: 1 year & 10 months
- **Average length of return**: 1 year & 7 months

ASSESSMENT COVERAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All groups</th>
<th>Returnees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>12,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>68,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorates</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection partners

1. Alkhair
2. Bent al-Rafedain
3. DRC
4. Human Appeal
5. IOM
6. IRC
7. Medair
8. Mercy Corps
9. Mercy Hands
10. Oxfam
11. Premiere Urgence
12. REACH
13. Sabe’a Sanabul
14. SEDO
15. Terre des Hommes
16. United Iraqi Medical Society
17. War Child UK
18. Welthungerhilfe (WHH)
19. World Vision

2. CCCM Cluster recorded 10,891 families arriving to camps from January-June 2018 (50% secondarily displaced).
3. The MCNA sought to meet Core Commitment 5 of the Grand Bargain, improving joint and impartial needs assessments, in part through coordinated, partner-driven data collection.
Households in need of protection assistance: 23%

**Severity of need**
On average, households categorised as "in need" scored 17 out of 100 using 8 weighted sectoral indicators.

### GENERAL PROTECTION
- Households with vulnerable members:
  - Disabled members: 5%
  - Pregnant / lactating women: 17%
- Households missing civil documentation of any kind: 8%
- 1% of households experienced movement restrictions during daytime hours in the month prior to data collection.

### HOUSING, LAND, & PROPERTY (HLP)
- Households at risk of eviction: 4%
- Tenancy agreement:
  - No tenancy agreement: 19%
  - Expired tenancy agreement: 0.5%
  - Verbal tenancy agreement: 9%
- 69% of households reported owning their current shelter.

### GENDER
- Households with at least one unemployed woman (18+): 10%
- Households reporting lack of access to reproductive health services: 37%

### MINE ACTION
- 6% of households with members reported to be disabled due to explosive hazards.

### CHILD PROTECTION
- Households with at least one school-aged child outside of a learning environment (formal or non-formal): 20%
- 13% of households with children showing signs of psychosocial distress, such as behaviour change since the conflict began.
- Child labour and marriage:
  - 4% of households with at least one child aged 6-17 working during the 30 days prior to data collection.
  - 2% of households with at least one married child (aged 12-17).

The above child protection findings are among all returnee households - not only households with children.
Households in need of WASH assistance: 28%

Access to Drinking Water:
- Households with at least 50 litres* of water per person per day: 85%
  *Cluster-defined minimum standard
- 51% of households reported private access to the network as their primary source of drinking water
- Households treating their drinking water: 56%
  Filtration was the most commonly reported treatment method (41%)

Sanitation & Hygiene:
- Households with access to:
  - Private latrines: 93%
  - Key hygiene items (e.g. soap, diapers): 91%
  - Waste collection / Communal bins: 54%
- 96% of households reported being aware of appropriate hygiene promotion messaging

Households in need of health assistance: 29%

Access to Healthcare Services:
- 9% of households reported not having a functional health clinic within 5km
- 24% of households reported not having a functional hospital within 10km
- Top 3 barriers to accessing care:
  - Cost of services was too high: 66%
  - Cost of medicine was too high: 30%
  - No medicine available at hospital: 23%

Child vaccination rates:
- Polio: 94%
- Measles: 91%
- Penta-3: 85%

*Among children 0-5 for polio and measles; children 0-2 for Penta-3; 99% confidence level and 5% margin of error
### S/NFI & EDUCATION

#### SHELTER TYPE AND OCCUPANCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households residing in critical shelter*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfinished or abandoned building</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged building</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public or religious building</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96% of households reside in non-critical shelter

#### Priority shelter improvements*

| Protection from climatic conditions    | 31% |
| Improved basic infrastructures and utilities | 27% |
| None                                    | 27% |

*Multiple response options could be selected

#### Households being hosted by another family

7%

#### NON-FOOD ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households reporting needing:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 3 of 7 basic NFI items: (bedding, mattress, blankets, cooking utensils, stove, light source, and fuel storage)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 2 of 3 summer items: (coolbox, water storage, fan)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A winter heater</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households in need of shelter assistance 47%

#### Households in need of education assistance 24%

#### ACCESS TO EDUCATION SERVICES

| Households with at least one school-aged child (6-17) not attending formal education | 30% |

Among the 69% of households with school-aged children; 99% confidence level and 3% margin of error

35% of households reported not having a functional primary school within 5 km
10% of households reported not having a functional secondary school within 5 km

#### Top 3 reasons for non-attendance*

| Cannot afford education-related costs | 35% |
| Child is disabled, unhealthy, or traumatized | 15% |
| Do not consider education important | 9% |

*Multiple response options could be selected; among 8% of school-aged children who never attended formal school

19% of households reporting insufficient certified teachers

*Among the 90% of households reporting access to functional schools

#### Findings regarding subsets of school-aged children are representative with a minimum of 99% confidence level and 5% margin of error
Households in need of food assistance (using WFP CARI Methodology) = 10%

### Food Consumption

- **4%** Poor
- **7%** Borderline
- **89%** Acceptable

87% of households accessed the Public Distribution System in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**Food expenditure share**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of total expenditure</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥75%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on 1) dietary diversity, 2) food frequency and 3) relative nutritional importance of 9 weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a 7-day recall period. In the Iraqi context, the thresholds for FSC classifications are as follows: ≥ 42 Acceptable; 28 - 42 Borderline; ≤ 27 Poor.

### Coping Strategies

#### Top food coping strategies

- Shifting toward cheaper / lower quality food: 71%
- Borrowing food; assistance from community: 36%
- Reducing the number of daily meals: 36%
- Consuming less food during meals: 35%

#### Top livelihood coping strategies

- Buying food on credit or borrowed money: 62%
- Spending savings: 59%
- Selling household property: 45%
- Reducing expenditure on non-food items: 28%

22% of households engaged in at least one emergency livelihood coping strategy.

### Household in need of livelihoods assistance

39%

64% of households reported a total monthly income less than their monthly expenditure.

*In the 30 days prior to data collection.*

Households with at least one unemployed adult actively seeking work = 37%

*At the time of data collection.*

**Top sources of money**

- Employment: 74%
- Loans, debts: 23%
- Savings: 17%
- Retirement fund or pension: 12%

*Multiple response options could be selected.

### Primary reasons for taking on debt

- Shelter (e.g. rent and utilities): 38%
- Food: 29%
- Healthcare: 16%
- Purchasing productive assets: 5%

*Threshold of 480,000 IQD defined by the Cash Working Group and threshold of 505,000 IQD defined by the Emergency Livelihoods Cluster. 480,000 IQD represents the cash transfer value of the Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket. Fixed exchange rate of 1200 IQD to 1 USD.*

### Severity of need

86 out of 100 using 3 weighted sectoral indicators
BACKGROUND

REACH supports the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Task force on Accountability to Affected Populations, which is working towards better representation of the views of affected populations in humanitarian response planning, including Humanitarian Needs Overviews. A series of priority indicators and corresponding questionnaire questions were identified for inclusion in the 2018 REACH-facilitated MCNA.

Additionally, the MCNA asked households about their movement intentions, to better understand how access to services, assistance, and information may affect secondary displacement or the durability of returns.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE RESPONSE

- **Assistance received***
  - 87% of aid recipients were satisfied with the aid received
  - 4% were not satisfied

- **Households satisfied with the behaviour of aid workers in their area**
  - 64% were satisfied

- **Households feeling that they have a say in decisions that affect their community**
  - 31% felt they had a say

MOVEMENT INTENTIONS

**Movement intentions in the 3 months after data collection**

- 97% Remain in current location
- 2% Wait to decide
- 1% Move (within or outside Iraq)

**Top reasons for those considering redisplacement (3%)**

- Security situation in return area is unstable 32%
- Lack of basic services 27%
- Lack of livelihood opportunities 23%
- Property destroyed / looted / occupied 16%

NEEDS & INFORMATION PREFERENCES*

**Priority sectoral needs**

- Food 60%
- Healthcare 59%
- Employment 47%

**Preferred means to receive information about aid**

- Direct observation 51%
- Phone / voice call 48%
- Face-to-face communication 45%

**Priority information needs**

- Livelihoods / job opportunities 52%
- Safety and security 38%
- Health 35%

**Preferred means to provide feedback about the quality, quantity, and appropriateness of aid**

- Face to face (at home) w/ aid worker 81%
- Phone call 46%
- Face to face (office/other venue) w/ aid worker 35%

*Multiple response options could be selected for above questions
To better understand the needs of conflict-affected populations in Iraq, it is important to consider that households may face simultaneous needs in multiple sectors. Humanitarian needs and conditions are likely most severe for areas and population groups where high proportions of households were categorised as being in need in more sectors at once.

Roughly one-third of all returnee households were found to be in need of humanitarian assistance in three or more sectors. The below map shows the average number of sectors in which returnee households were found to be in need in each district of assessment, highlighting that humanitarian needs for households returning home are pervasive across all geographic areas of Iraq.

Finally, in support of a coordinated response to address priority needs of conflict-affected populations, Figure 1 below illustrates the most common combinations of sectors for returnee households who were found to be in need of humanitarian assistance. As households look towards rebuilding their homes and livelihoods, effective response planning must consider the cross-sectoral nature of these needs. One-fifth of in-need returnee households were found to face simultaneous needs in shelter/NFI and livelihoods, and an additional 21% faced simultaneous needs in shelter/NFI and WASH.

Households in need, by number of sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Sectors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sector</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sectors</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 sectors</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 sectors</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 sectors</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 sectors</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 sectors</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Common combinations of sectors in which households were found to be in need
### ANNEX 1: METHODOLOGY

#### OVERVIEW OF THE MIRA ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

MCNA data collection and analysis was guided by the IASC MIRA Analytical Framework, to allow for a common understanding of where humanitarian needs are most severe and to support a coordinated strategic plan by the humanitarian country team. The MIRA framework supports stakeholders in the identification of the severity of the crisis, gaps in response, and priority areas for intervention.

The full Research Terms of Reference for the MCNA can be found at this link.

#### RESEARCH DESIGN

1. Information needs and gaps identified by Clusters
2. Cluster-driven indicator design through Iraq Assessment Working Group’s Common Database of Indicators

#### DATA COLLECTION

3. Trainings led by REACH on assessment methodology and questionnaire, with additional Cluster-led sessions
4. Household data collection conducted by 18 operational partners and REACH, coordinated by REACH

#### ANALYSIS

5. Sectoral index of need defined through Cluster consultations, including indicator thresholds and weights
6. Bilateral presentations and discussions to obtain consensus on preliminary findings

#### APPLICATION

7. Culmination in the incorporation of sectoral and cross-sectoral findings at the HNO Joint Analysis Workshop led by OCHA, in support of evidence-based humanitarian needs and responses.

### CALCULATING PROPORTIONS AND SEVERITY OF NEED

Analysis of household-level needs was conducted using Stata’s statistical packages, applying the Alkire-Foster (AF) Method for multidimensional needs developed by Oxford Poverty and Human Development Institute. This methodology counts overlapping or simultaneous household needs in different sectors, such as a lack of education or employment, or poor health or living standards.

A sectoral index of need was calculated for each sector, comprised of multiple indicators selected and refined through consultations with each active Cluster in Iraq. Indicators within each sectoral index took on different weights based on their estimated proportional contribution to the overall need, as defined by the Cluster. Households were then identified as “in-need” if the weighted sum of their sectoral deprivation was greater than a specified cut off.

**Severity of need:** For households classified as "in need" in each sector, a total severity score was obtained by aggregating the weights for all sectoral indicators where the household was found to be in need.

**Multi-sectoral needs:** The multidimensional index of need for each household was subsequently calculated as a total of the number of sectoral needs that the household faced (maximum of 7). This aggregated number can then be extrapolated to the district and national levels for each population group.

### SECTORAL INDICATORS AND WEIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>% of HH missing civil documentation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of single female-headed households</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH with at least one child out of school environments (formal or non-formal)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH with children showing signs of psychosocial distress</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH at risk of eviction</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of IDP HH citing HLP issues as a top reason for not intending to return</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH with at least one member with a disability due to explosive hazards</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of IDP HH citing explosive hazard contamination as a reason for not intending to return</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH:</td>
<td>% of HH with access to less than 50L of water per person per day</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH who require water treatment prior to drinking</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH without access to private or communal latrines</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH without access to hygiene items or unaware of appropriate hygiene messaging</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH without access to waste collection of communal garbage bins</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health:</td>
<td>% of HH without access to a functional health clinic within 5km</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH without access to a functional hospital within 10km</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH with at least one child (aged 0-5) vaccinated against measles, polio, and penta-3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH with at least one member with a chronic illness</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter:</td>
<td>% of HH reporting at least 2 priority needs to improve current shelter</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH at risk of eviction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH with NFI needs (≥ 3 basic items, ≥ 2 summer items, and a winter item)</td>
<td>25, 15, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td>% of HH with at least one school-aged child not attending formal education</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH without a functional primary and secondary school within 5km</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH who reported sufficient certified teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH with at least one school-aged child who dropped out after January 2014</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security:</td>
<td>CARI Analysis; Food Consumption Score, food expenditure share, coping strategies</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods:</td>
<td>% of HH having debt greater than 500,000 IQD</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH taking on debt due to basic needs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH with at least one unemployed adult seeking work</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>