



UNHCR

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
Haut Commissariat des Nations Unies pour les réfugiés

Rapid Needs Assessment (RNA) of Recently Displaced Persons in the Kurdistan Region



DAHUK GOVERNORATE
May 2007 – June 2008

Table of Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. SUMMARY OF GOVERNORATE	7
3. IDP MONITORING	7
a) Methodology	7
b) IDP monitoring summary	8
4. IDP PROFILE	9
a) IDP flow	9
b) Movement profile	9
c) Demographic profile	11
5. IDP PROTECTION	13
a) Access to governorate	13
b) Permission to remain in the governorate	14
c) Freedom of movement and security	14
d) Documentation	14
6. IDP LIVING CONDITIONS AND ACCESS TO SERVICES.....	15
a) Housing	15
b) Employment	17
c) Basic services	19
d) Humanitarian assistance	24
7. PRIORITY NEEDS AND SUGGESTED INTERVENTIONS	25
ANNEX I: GARDASIN IDP CAMP	27
ANNEX II: ASSISTANCE PROVIDED IN DAHUK GOVERNORATE	29
ANNEX III: DATA SHEET	34

Overview of Figures

Figure 1: Summary of Governorate	7
Figure 2: Monitoring Summary	8
Figure 3: Percentage of IDP families surveyed	8
Figure 4: IDP figures by month	9
Figure 5: Place of origin	10
Figure 6: Reasons for being targeted	10
Figure 7: Reasons for moving to current location	11
Figure 8: IDP intentions	11
Figure 09: Age breakdown	12
Figure 10: Ethnicity breakdown	12
Figure 11: Breakdown by religion	13
Figure 12: Vulnerabilities	13
Figure 13: Renewal of documentation	15
Figure 14: Shelter type	15
Figure 15: Housing	16
Figure 16: Examples of rented IDP accommodation	17
Figure 17: Employment	18
Figure 18: IDPs unemployed	18
Figure 19: Work sectors	19
Figure 20: Access to PDS	20
Figure 21: Reasons for being unable to access PDS	20
Figure 22: Access to Primary health care	22
Figure 23: Percentage of children not attending school	23
Figure 24: Reasons for not attending school	23
Figure 25: Assistance received	24
Figure 26: Priority needs	25

List of Abbreviations

CAPNI	Coalition of Advanced Practice Nurses of Indiana
DDM	Directorate of Displacement and Migration (previously Directorate of IDPs and Refugees Dahuk [DIDPRD])
HOH	Head of Household
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
ID	Iraqi Dinar
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IRCS	Iraqi Red Crescent Society
IRD	International Relief and Development
KRG	Kurdistan Regional Government
MNF-I	Multi-National Forces in Iraq
MoDM	Ministry of Displacement and Migration
NFI	Non-food item
PAC	Protection and Assistance Centre
PDS	Public Distribution System
PHC	Public Health Centre
PWJ	Peace Winds Japan
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
US	United States
WFP	World Food Programme

Executive Summary

UNHCR's partner International Relief and Development (IRD) surveyed a total of 1,715 IDP families in the Governorate of Dahuk between May 2007 and June 2008. The majority of those surveyed had fled in the wake of escalating violence after the February 2006 Samarra bombing and reported having faced direct threats on ethnic grounds. More than three quarters of them are ethnic Kurds, who had fled the Governorates of Ninewa and Baghdad. In addition, the Governorate hosts a significant number of Christians.

Key findings

Access to the Governorate: Generally possible, but restrictions exist for single men not originating from one of the three Northern Governorates.

Permission to remain in the governorate: All persons not originating from one of the three Northern Governorates need to obtain a permit to stay. Single men in addition need a sponsor.

Freedom of movement: No restrictions to move within the three Northern Governorates, provided entry and stay are permitted.

Documentation: 85% of the IDP families surveyed reported difficulties in obtaining/renewing documentation, particularly food ration cards.

Housing: Almost half the IDPs surveyed (45%) are living in rented housing, 28% are staying with relatives, 21% own their own house and 3% are living in tented camps or public buildings.

Employment: 66% of the surveyed IDPs of working age have been unemployed since their displacement.

Source of income: 26% of the IDP families surveyed reported having no source of income.

Food: 85% of the IDP families surveyed did not have access to their food rations in displacement.¹ Some of these families may be benefiting from the World Food Programme's (WFP) rations programme, which started in March 2008; however, the full target of beneficiaries has not yet been met.

Health: Only 64% of the IDP families surveyed have access to primary healthcare (PHC) in their current location and only 18% reported access to basic pharmaceuticals.

Education: 77% of the school-age children surveyed are attending school, though the figure varied considerably across districts.

¹ Given the decision of the Governor's Office to allow for the temporary transfer of food rations in August 2008, more IDPs should be able to access their food rations in Dahuk Governorate; however, this new development has not been covered in the monitoring period and is therefore not reflected in the figures provided.

Water and sanitation: 95% of the IDP families surveyed reported having access to potable water. 99% reported having sufficient water for cooking, but only 69% reported having enough water for hygienic purposes.

Electricity: The large majority (97%) of the IDP families surveyed reported having access to four or more hours of electricity per day.

Humanitarian assistance: Only 28% of the IDP families surveyed have received some form of assistance since in displacement.

Priority Needs

The survey revealed that access to food through the Public Distribution System (PDS) was a priority need given that more than three quarters currently have no access to it. Another priority is access to shelter as most IDPs are living in sub-standard, crowded and overpriced rental accommodation that exceed their financial means given that two-thirds are unemployed since their displacement. Also access to public services is a major need, in particular access to health, as more than one third of those surveyed do not have access to primary healthcare and three quarters do not have access to basic pharmaceuticals.

1. Introduction²

The purpose of this report is to reflect the situation of the recently displaced in the Governorate of Dahuk and, in particular, the movement and demographic profile of IDPs, their access to shelter, employment and basic services (including water, food, healthcare and education) as well as their future intentions.

It is estimated that over 2.8 million people remain displaced within Iraq as of June 2008, with more than 1.6 million displaced following the Samarra bombing in February 2006.³ These attacks resulted in the escalation of sectarian violence with large-scale revenge killings, alongside an insurgency directed against the Iraqi Government and the Multi-National Forces in Iraq (MNF-I), counter-insurgency, intra-Shi'ite fighting and high levels of criminality. Mixed communities, particularly in Baghdad, have borne the brunt of the conflict between members of Iraq's principal religious groups, Shi'ite and Sunni Muslims. Minority groups in Southern and Central Iraq, including Christians and Kurds, are without strong protection networks and therefore particularly vulnerable to violence and intimidation.

A significant number of IDPs displaced since February 2006 have sought refuge in the three Northern Governorates of Dahuk, Erbil and Sulaymaniyah, which, in comparison to other areas of Iraq, remain relatively stable. According to the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG), 41,476 families⁴ have been displaced from the south and centre to the three Northern Governorates since 2003, the majority of whom were displaced after February 2006. By April 2008, Dahuk Governorate hosted 16,587 IDP families (99,522 persons), roughly 40% of all IDPs displaced to the three Northern Governorates since 2006.⁵

The influx of IDPs since 2006 has had a significant impact on the host communities: increasing housing and rental prices, additional pressure on already strained public services and concerns about security and demographic shifts. At the same time, however, the three Northern Governorates have also benefited from the migration of professionals, bringing with them skills and disposable incomes that boost the local economy. Unskilled IDPs have also provided cheap labour for the construction industry. A recent survey conducted by IRD in Dahuk showed that the authorities have recorded 195 IDP families departing Dahuk in 2008;⁶ however, the figure might well be higher as persons are not obliged to register when they are leaving.

² This report was researched and drafted with UNHCR's partner, International Relief and Development (IRD).

³ IDP Working Group, *Internally Displaced Persons in Iraq Update*, June 2008.

⁴ Figures for Erbil Governorate provided by the General Directorate of Displacement and Migration (DDM), April 2008; figures for Dahuk Governorate provided by the Governor's Office, April 2008; figures for Sulaymaniyah Governorate provided by the Directorate of Security, June 2008.

⁵ 16,587 families out of a total of 41,476 families displaced to the three Northern Governorates.

⁶ Mayors in Dahuk Governorate surveyed by IRD in July 2008 knew of only 195 families that departed from the Governorate.

2. Summary of Governorate⁷

Figure 1: Summary of Governorate

Size	6,553 km ²	Administrative Capital	Dahuk City
Districts	Dahuk, Amedi, Sumel and Zakho (<i>de facto</i> Akre, Bardarash and part of Shekhan) ⁸	Administration	<i>Qadha</i> (district) and <i>Nahiya</i> (sub-district) Councils, Governorate Council
Internal Boundaries	Erbil, Ninewa	Checkpoints	Rizgari sub-District checkpoint, Dahuk City checkpoint
Population excluding IDPs	954,087 ⁹	IDPs from the Centre and South (since 2003) ¹⁰	Individuals: 99,522
Dominant Religion	Islam (Sunni Muslims)	Dominant Ethnicity	Families: 16,587 Kurd

3. IDP Monitoring

a) Methodology

UNHCR's partner IRD monitors IDPs in Dahuk Governorate through its local monitoring team, which collects information from household interviews,¹¹ consultations with UNHCR field staff, the Dahuk Protection and Assistance Centre (PAC) and interviews with local community leaders. A survey plan was set up according to geographic concentrations of IDPs across the governorate as per April 2007 and then revised according to August 2007 figures. An effort was made to get a representative sample of IDPs' religious/ethnic background proportionate to the figures received from DDM.

IDP figures used in this analysis are the most recent available (April 2008) and data is rounded off to zero decimal places. The Dahuk Governor's Office provided these figures and previous figures were issued by the Directorate of Displacement and Migration (DDM). An effort was made to get a representative sample of IDPs' religious/ethnic background proportionate to the figures received from the Governor's Office.

⁷ For further details on the Governorate of Dahuk, please consult UNHCR's Governorate Assessment Report, September 2007, <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/iraq?page=governorate>.

⁸ Akre and Shekhan Districts belong *de jure* to the Governorate of Ninewa; *de facto* they are under the control of the KRG. Until 1976, the Governorate of Dahuk was part of Ninewa Governorate, which was called Mosul Province at the time. Bardarash District was split from Akre District on 16 April 2007.

⁹ As of 31 December 2007. Information received from Dahuk Food Department based on PDS registrations in the Governorate.

¹⁰ Dahuk Governor Relations Office through security departments.


¹¹ IRD monitors use UNHCR's IDP/Returnee Household Monitoring Form, Version C, October 2006.

b) IDP Monitoring Summary

Figure 2: Monitoring Summary

Districts surveyed	Dahuk Centre, Sumel, Amedi, Zakho, Akre and Shekhan
Number of surveys	1,715
Percentage of IDP population surveyed	10% (of April 2008 figures)
Districts with highest IDP concentration (families)	Akre: 4,140, Dahuk Centre: 4,070, Zakho: 3,159, Shekhan: 2,853, Sumel: 1,612 and Amedi: 753
Main cause of flight	Post-Samarra events (94%)
Main governorate of origin	Ninewa (74%)
Main ethnicity	Kurd (68%)
Main religion	Islam (69%)
Priority protection needs	Access to food through the PDS
Priority assistance needs	Shelter and public services
Received some form of assistance	28% of surveyed IDP population

Figure 3: Percentage of IDP families surveyed¹²




¹² Source of map: <http://www.esri.com>.

4. IDP Profile

a) IDP flow

According to the figures issued by DDM Dahuk, the number of IDP families in Dahuk Governorate increased steadily for the first half of 2007 and then sharply from September to October. According to DDM Dahuk, this spike in September and October 2007 is likely not due to a major influx of new IDPs, but rather the result of enhanced IDP registration. From the peak in October 2007, the figures begin to gradually decline, possibly reflecting a departure of IDPs from the governorate from late 2007 onwards.¹³

Figure 4: IDP figures by month




b) Movement profile

Place of origin: The majority of the IDP families surveyed are from neighbouring Ninewa Governorate (74%). Others fled from Baghdad Governorate (25%) and the remaining 1% from other areas (see Figure 5).¹⁴ Of those that fled from Ninewa Governorate, 92% came from Mosul City. Of those that fled from Baghdad, 47% came from Al-Rusafa and 49% from Al-Karkh Districts.

¹³ Please note that figures were not given consistently for each month so some of the monthly totals are calculated on an average over a two to three month period for which figures were issued.

¹⁴ Including the Governorates of Al-Anbar, Basrah, Kirkuk, Muthanna, Najaf, and Salah Al-Din.


Figure 5: Place of origin¹⁵



Flight: Sectarian violence in the aftermath of the February 2006 Samarra bombing was the main cause of flight for 94% of the IDP families surveyed, whilst 6% fled because of other violent events occurring since 2003.

92% of the families surveyed said that they were specifically targeted, mostly (81%) for belonging to a specific ethnic group (Figure 6).

Figure 6: Reasons families were targeted¹⁶




Better security in Dahuk Governorate was the key reason for IDPs relocating to Dahuk and 83% of the IDPs surveyed reported having relatives in Dahuk as their main reason for fleeing to Dahuk (Figure 7).

¹⁵ Sample size of 1,715 families.

¹⁶ Sample size of 1,584 out of 1,715 families.


Figure 7: Reasons for moving to current location¹⁷



Note: Multiple answers were possible.

IDP Intentions: 86% of the surveyed IDP families intend to locally integrate, 14% hope to return to their place of origin (Figure 8).

Figure 8: IDP intentions¹⁸



c) Demographic profile

Gender and age breakdown of families: The ratio between the number of male and female IDPs surveyed was equal (50%/50%). 89% of the head of households surveyed were male and 11% were female. 49% of the IDP family members included in the survey were between the ages of 18 and 59, 47% were under the age of 18 and 4% were 60 or over. The average family size was 5 (Figure 9).

¹⁷ Sample size of 1,715 families.


¹⁸ Sample size of 1,715 families.

Figure 9: Age breakdown¹⁹

	Akre		Amedi		Shekhan		Sumel		Zakho		Dahuk Centre		Dahuk Governorate	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Pop 0-4	331	15	51	12%	285	18	159	12	163	12	293	14	1,282	14
Pop 5-17	874	39	76	19%	591	37	425	31	368	27	635	30	2,969	33
Pop 18-59	948	43	248	60%	701	43	719	53	737	53	1,106	52	4,459	49
Over 60	61	3	35	9%	38	2	61	4	116	8	85	4	396	4
Total	2,214	100	410	100%	1,615	100	1,364	100	1,384	100	2,119	100	9,106	100

Ethnicity: The IDP families surveyed are largely representative of the ethnic breakdown of IDPs across the Governorate with Christian IDPs slightly overrepresented and Kurdish and Arab IDPs slightly underrepresented. According to the April 2008 IDP figures, the IDPs in the Governorate are ethnically mixed, including Kurds (73%), ethnic-based Christians (19%), Arabs (7%) and others 1% (Figure 10).

Figure 10: Ethnicity breakdown²⁰




Religion: According to the April 2008 IDP figures provided by the Governor’s Office, the majority of the IDPs are Muslims (80%), followed by Christians (19%) and others (1%).²¹ 69% of the IDP families surveyed were Muslims (68% Sunnis and 1% Shi’ites). The remaining 31% surveyed were either Christians (29%) or Yazidi (2%); see Figure 11).

¹⁹ 9,106 individuals of 1,715 families surveyed.

²⁰ Sample size of 1,715 IDP families in comparison with Dahuk Governor’s Office IDP figures for April 2008.


²¹ The Iraqi Red Crescent Society (IRCS) is of the opinion that the Christian population in Dahuk Governorate is higher. One possible explanation for the discrepancy is that many Christians from Southern and Central Iraq have roots in the Governorate and may therefore be less inclined to register with the authorities as IDPs.

Figure 11: Breakdown by religion²²



Vulnerabilities: 33% of the IDP families surveyed reported having one or more family members with special needs, of which chronic disease was the main cause of vulnerability (Figure 12).

Figure 12: Vulnerabilities²³



Note: Multiple answers were possible.

5. IDP Protection

a) Access to governorate

Persons originating from the three Northern Governorates can enter the Governorate of Dahuk without any restrictions. Also, families not originating from one of the three Northern Governorates are allowed to enter without restrictions, while single men not originating from one of the three Northern Governorates need to have a sponsor for security reasons.²⁴ The sponsor has to present him/herself at the entry checkpoint and

²² Sample size of 1,715 families versus Dahuk Governor office IDP figures for April 2008.

²³ Sample size of 573 out of 1,715 families.

²⁴ The sponsor could either be an individual person or a company. The responsibility of the sponsor is to inform authorities that s/he knows the IDP and, in case of security-related incidents, the sponsor will be questioned. The sponsor should have her/his food ration card issued in the Governorate of Dahuk and have a good reputation.

provide his or her Civil ID Card, phone number and address. The IDP has to fill out a card at the entry checkpoint and will then be allowed to enter the Governorate. Single males without a sponsor are generally denied entry into the Governorate.²⁵

b) Permission to remain in the governorate

All IDPs not originating from the three Northern Governorates have to approach the Residency Section in the Security Department to obtain a permit to stay. Single men not originating from one of the three Northern Governorates in addition also need to have a sponsor in order to legalize their stay.²⁶ IDPs applying for a permit to stay have to undergo a security screening in which the reasons for relocation are investigated. Applicants need to either establish political links to the region or provide evidence that they have fled violence or persecution; otherwise they will not be allowed to stay. Provided the person is not considered a security risk, s/he will be granted a permit to stay for 3-6 months, which is subject to extension. Upon arrival IDPs should also contact the Quarter Representative (*mukhtar*) to introduce themselves and should inform the security department whenever they change the place of residence.

Since November 2006, Arabs and Kurds from disputed areas have reportedly faced difficulties in registering in the Governorate.

c) Freedom of movement and security

IDP families with temporary residency in one of the KRG-administered Governorates are free to move within the three Northern Governorates and are also free to leave. All women surveyed reported feeling safe.


d) Documentation

85% of the IDP families surveyed reported difficulty in obtaining/renewing documentation. In particular, transferring PDS cards from the governorate of origin to the Governorate of Dahuk was reported as a difficulty for most households surveyed (Figure 13).

²⁵ It appears that the authorities exceptionally grant entry to IDPs without a sponsor, provided that 1) the person's background can be thoroughly checked by the KDP, if the party has an office in the person's place of origin (e.g. in Kirkuk, Ninewa) and it is determined that he does not pose a security risk and 2) the person can establish that he fled violence or persecution. Otherwise, the person will not be admitted to the Governorate of Dahuk.

²⁶ Without a sponsor, on an exceptional basis, and provided that 1) the person's background can be thoroughly checked and it is determined that she/he does not pose a security risk; and, 2) the person can establish that he fled violence or persecution, a permit to stay might be given.

Figure 13: Difficulty to renew documentation²⁷




Note: multiple answers were possible.

6. IDP Living Conditions and Access to Services

a) Housing

More than half of the IDP families surveyed live in rural (62%) and semi-rural areas (19%). The most common living arrangement is rented housing (45%), followed by staying with relatives (28%), living in their own house (11%), living in a house on land they do not own (9%), living in tented camps or public buildings (3%; see Figure 14).

Figure 14: Shelter type²⁸




Types of shelter varied across districts in Dahuk Governorate as illustrated in (Figure 15).

²⁷ Sample size of 1,457 families.

²⁸ Sample size of 1,715 families.

Figure 15: Housing²⁹



In Shekhan (57%), Dahuk Centre (54%), Sumel (48%) and Zakho (38%) Districts, most families are renting their accommodation. A significant number of IDP families surveyed in Amedi and Zakho Districts own their own houses built on land they own (32% in Amedi District and 17% in Zakho District). These families are mainly Christian IDPs, who have family roots in the area and many of whom have benefited from housing schemes funded by the KRG, the Church and private donations.

8% of the IDP families surveyed in Akre District reported living in a camp. They mostly live in tents provided by UNHCR in a formal camp in Gardasin, which hosts 151 families. A few IDP families live in tents in Fayda sub-District, a “disputed area” in Ninewa Governorate, which is considered by the KRG to be part of the District of Sumel. Living conditions in these tented camps are poor (for more details, see Annex I).

Rental accommodation³⁰ used by IDPs in Dahuk Governorate is generally of a low standard and dilapidated with poor or no ventilation, leaking roofs, missing window panes, no internal doors separating communal areas from bathrooms or kitchens and limited kitchen and bathroom facilities. 69% of the IDP families surveyed reported living in crowded accommodation (46% in somewhat crowded and 23% in extremely crowded houses).³¹ Almost all families reported that they do not face pressure to leave their current location. For examples of shelter rented by IDPs, see Figure 16.

²⁹ Sample size of 1,715 families.

³⁰ Any housing for which an IDP family is paying rent is recorded as rental housing.

³¹ Somewhat crowded (5+ persons per room), extremely crowded (8+ persons per room).

Figure 16: Examples of rented IDP accommodation



Two-room IDP shelter in Sumel District, home to a family of five. Rent: US \$120 per month.



Two-room IDP shelter in Akre District, home to a family of five. Rent: US \$220 per month.




Two-room IDP shelter in Shekhan District, home to a family of nine. Rent: US \$70 per month.

b) Employment


The survey showed that 66% of the surveyed IDPs of working age have been unemployed since their displacement (Figure 17).

Figure 17: Employment³²



The rate of unemployment was generally stable across the four Districts of Dahuk Centre, Shekhan, Sumel and Akre (62-66%). However, the two districts hosting most Christian IDPs, Zakho and Amedi,³³ reported significantly higher levels of unemployment with 73% and 77%, respectively (see Figure 18). A possible explanation is that these IDPs were displaced from mostly urban areas and have not been able to transfer their professions to these districts' rural areas.

Figure 18: IDPs unemployed³⁴



Of 1,530 individuals that reported having some kind of employment, the majority are working as casual labourers (Figure 19).³⁵


³² Sample size of 4,459 family members of working age from 1,715 families.

³³ Zakho (78% Christians) and Amedi (86% Christians) from surveyed families.

³⁴ Sample size of 4,459 persons of working age from 1,715 families.

³⁵ Sample size of 1,530 family members working out of 1,715 families.

Figure 19: Work sectors



Source of Income: 26% of the families surveyed reported having no source of income. Of the 74% that did report having some income, 99% listed some form of employment as their main source of income and 1% listed remittances and savings. Christian families, particularly those with roots in the governorate, are often assisted financially by the KRG, the Church and private donors.

In late 2007, MoDM launched a stipend of 150,000 Iraqi Dinar (ID, approximately US \$120) for each IDP family which registers with MoDM. Despite the absence of MoDM in the Kurdistan Region, it is intended to be a national programme also covering the three Northern Governorates. However, the programme has not yet been launched in Dahuk Governorate.³⁶


c) Basic services

Food: 18% of the IDP families surveyed said that they solely relied on food rations through the PDS. However, only 15% of the IDP families surveyed are currently able to access the food rations in displacement.³⁷ Access to the PDS varies significantly by district, ranging from just 4% in Shekhan to 26% in Sumel (Figure 20).

³⁶ The PAC confirmed in June 2008 that the Central Government in Baghdad has not yet transferred the funds and requests accurate IDP figures from the KRG.


³⁷ Given the recent decision of the Governor's Office to allow for the temporary transfer of food rations (see below), more IDPs should be able to access their food rations in Dahuk Governorate; however, this new development has not been covered in the monitoring period and is therefore not reflected in the figures provided.

Figure 20: Access to PDS



Of the 85% of IDP families surveyed that do not have access to their food rations, the majority listed insecurity in their place of origin as the main barrier to access (Figure 21).³⁸

Figure 21: Reasons for not being able to access PDS³⁹



Unlike in Erbil and Sulaymaniyah Governorates, Dahuk Governorate until recently did not allow the temporary transfer of food rations. In early August 2008, the Dahuk Governor's Office approved the temporary transfer of food rations for IDPs from the Centre and South to Dahuk Governorate (while they remain registered in their place of origin in the Centre/South). IDPs in Dahuk Governorate can apply for the transfer at the local mayor's office. The application will then be sent to the Ministry of Trade (MoT) in Baghdad, from where it will be forwarded to the governorate of origin in order to temporarily suspend the distribution of food rations to the applicant there. Once the suspension confirmation is received in Dahuk through MoT in Baghdad, the applicant can receive his/her food rations in Dahuk Governorate. By 18 August 2008, only a small portion of the IDPs in Dahuk Governorate have applied for the temporary transfer of their food rations, approximately 1,600 families. The new procedure is reportedly rather cumbersome and slow.

³⁸ At the time of the monitoring, IDPs wishing to transfer their food rations were still required to return to their place of origin in order to de-register with the PDS before being able to register in their place of displacement.

³⁹ 1,466 families reported that they do not receive food rations.

In addition, some IDPs were able to permanently transfer their PDS registration. According to the General Directorate of Food Rations, the PDS cards for 663 families have been permanently transferred to Dahuk Governorate by June 2008. These families are likely Kurds or Christians displaced from non-disputed areas that also have family roots in Dahuk Governorate.⁴⁰

WFP rolled out a food subsidy programme for IDPs across Iraq, including Dahuk Governorate, in March 2008. The programme provides a food package to IDPs (equal to 50% of the daily energy requirement of 2,100 kcal), provided they meet the following criteria:


- they are displaced outside their governorate of origin;
- they have not transferred their food ration card;
- they hold a food ration card from their place of origin; and
- they are registered with DDM.

However, the full target of beneficiaries has not yet been met.

Health: Only 64% of the IDP families surveyed have access to a primary healthcare centre (PHC) in their current location and only 18% reported access to basic pharmaceuticals. Access to primary healthcare varied greatly among districts. For example, in Shekhan District, 79% of the families surveyed have access compared with only 32% in mostly rural Akre District (Figure 22).

⁴⁰ Out of 188 requests for assistance in transferring the PDS registration submitted to the PAC, all were successful.

Figure 22: Access to primary healthcare⁴¹



The major reason for not having access to PHCs was non-availability (91-100%). Others (1-9%) reported that they are not able to access primary healthcare in their current location due to financial reasons.⁴²

99% of the children under the age of five have vaccination records and 47% of the families received visits from a health worker, mostly pertaining to vaccinations (94%). 34% of the families reported health problems, including chronic diseases (87%), child health (5%), maternal health (3%) and dysentery (1%).


Education: 92% of the IDP families surveyed with school-age children reported living within a school catchment area. 77% of the school-age children are attending school and 90% of those registered in schools reported being registered in the correct grade. The number of school-age children not attending school varied considerably across districts. For example, in Sumel District only 8% (18 families) reported having children not attending school while in Akre District, 37% (90 families) reported having children not attending school (Figure 23).⁴³

⁴¹ Sample size 1,715 families.

⁴² PHCs charge a nominal fee of 500 ID; however, for persons with no source of income even such charges may be a financial burden. In addition, patients have to pay for x-rays, blood or urine tests and medication.


⁴³ In total, 296 boys and 380 IDP girls surveyed did not attend school in the Governorate.

Figure 23: Percentage of children not attending school



Approximately 8,587 post-2006 IDP children are registered in schools in Dahuk Governorate.⁴⁴ The Governorate has the largest number of Arabic schools in the three Northern Governorates.⁴⁵ Arabic schools are located in the five districts of Dahuk Centre, Zakho, Amedi, Sumel⁴⁶ and Akre.⁴⁷ Most of these schools operate double or triple shifts to accommodate the students. 33% of the 257 families with children not attending school listed the children’s need to “work” as the main reason for non-attendance (see Figure 24).

Figure 24: Reasons for not attending school⁴⁸



Water and sanitation: 95% of the IDP families surveyed reported having access to potable water. 78% received the water from public wells/taps and 17% by municipal pipe networks. 99% of the IDP families surveyed reported having sufficient water for cooking, but only 69% of the families reported having enough water for hygienic

⁴⁴ According to UNICEF, there are 5,858 primary and 2,729 secondary school IDP children. The next update is due at the beginning of the new school year in September 2008.

⁴⁵ In total, 19 primary and secondary schools.

⁴⁶ In addition, there are three Arabic primary schools and two secondary schools in Fayda (not included in the figure for Sumel District as they are technically in Ninewa Governorate).

⁴⁷ Information provided by UNICEF.

⁴⁸ 257 families with children not attending school.

purposes. However, lack of water is a problem IDPs share with the local community, particularly in semi-rural and rural areas where under-development and poor basic services are common place.

Virtually all IDP families surveyed reported having access to toilets (99.88%), but 52% reported sharing toilets with other families.


Electricity and fuel: 2% of the IDP families reported having no access to electricity. Of those families that do have access to electricity, the large majority (97%) reported having access to four or more hours of electricity per day. Neighbouring Turkey supplies Dahuk Governorate with electricity; however, between November 2007 and the end of March 2008, the supplies were stopped thus reducing electricity supplies during this period to 3-4 hours per day. Currently, the average amount of government supplied electricity per day in Dahuk Governorate is about 6-9 hours per day.

77% of the IDP families surveyed reported being able to afford fuel costs; however, many others cannot afford the high costs (during winter approximately US \$160 for a barrel of 200 litres).

d) Humanitarian assistance

Only 28% of the IDP families surveyed in Dahuk Governorate received some form of assistance. The types of assistance included shelter (49%), food (20%) and “other” (46%)⁴⁹. The number of families that received assistance varied greatly across districts (Figure 25). IDP families in Zakho and Amedi received most assistance, mostly related to shelter.⁵⁰

Figure 25: Assistance received⁵¹



Note: multiple answers were possible.

The main provider of assistance was reported to be the Church (24%), followed by the KRG (21%), IRCS (23%), religious group (10%), Qandil (8%) and IRD (7%). Other

⁴⁹ “Other” included in particular cash assistance from the Office of the KRG Minister of Finance.

⁵⁰ Probably referring to shelter schemes for Christians supported by the KRG, the Church and private donors.

⁵¹ Sample size of 486 families.


providers of assistance included relatives and the host community. Only 28% of the female-headed households received assistance, mostly related to shelter.

Annex II illustrates some of the assistance provided by UNHCR and international NGOs to post-February 2006 IDPs and host communities in Dahuk Governorate.

7. Priority Needs and Suggested Interventions

IDP families listed the following three priority needs: shelter (70%), public services (65%), and employment (57%).⁵² For more details, see Figure 26.

Figure 26: Priority needs



Note: Multiple answers possible.

As demonstrated above in *6.d Humanitarian Assistance*, a concerted effort by multiple organizations has been made to address some of the core needs of IDPs in Dahuk Governorate. However, as Dahuk Governorate hosts roughly 40% of the total number of IDPs in the three Northern Governorates and accounts for the third largest post-2006 IDP population in the country after Baghdad and Ninewa Governorates,⁵³ efforts to address the needs of vulnerable IDPs need to be maintained and, ideally, increased.

Shelter: While most IDPs appear to be renting houses, resources are limited and many live in dilapidated structures. Assistance programmes should also target the upgrading of sub-standard shelters, taking into account ownership rights. Since poor quality accommodation is often rented out for rather high prices, one option may be to regulate rent prices by introducing standard rent ceilings for some categories of accommodation.

Health: Mobile medical support in remote areas and support to PHCs should be continued and extended according to needs.

⁵² Sample size of 1,715 families.

⁵³ IDP Working Group, *Internally Displaced Persons in Iraq*, Update June 2008, p. 3.


Food: Recognizing that some agencies operating in the three Northern Governorates are providing limited food provisions for some families, a two-pronged approach is recommended for the large number of families who do not have access to the PDS. Firstly, encourage the authorities to swiftly process submissions for the temporary transfer of food rations and, secondly, prioritize vulnerable IDPs.

WFP's food subsidy programme for IDPs that started in March 2008 across Iraq should help alleviate the situation of some vulnerable IDPs. However, given that it is a slow process, DDM should be encouraged to process registrations in an unbureaucratic manner.

Income: A number of income-generation activities targeting IDPs have been launched in Dahuk Governorate; however, these are mostly cash for work projects, which provide only temporary alleviation but fail to address long-term unemployment. To support vulnerable IDPs, an assessment of the viability of more vocational training for IDPs should be undertaken. Also, language lessons should be offered to adult IDPs, for whom the lack of Kurdish language skills is the main barrier to employment.

Education: The local authorities should be supported to provide access for children to the existing Arabic primary and secondary schools. Additional support to vulnerable IDP families covering transportation, school uniform and book costs should also be provided.

ANNEX I: Gardasin IDP Camp⁵⁴

Location	An area of approx. 14 villages in Gardasin, Akre District	
IDP families	Approx. 97 (as of 30 June 2008).	
Shelter	193 tents.	
Ethnicity /origin	Kurds from Mosul.	
Status	The camp is located on communal grounds. IDPs are accepted by the authorities, which also facilitates co-existence with the local community. However, the IDPs are not always welcomed by the local community due to their perceived affiliation with the former regime.	
Management	The authorities do not provide formal camp management as they do not officially recognize Gardasin as a camp. There are periodical meetings between the Gardasin sub-District Mayor and the IDP families. IRCS has unofficially taken over the supervision of the camp. Different actors are engaged in the delivery of services to the population together with the KRG, including UNHCR, PWJ, Qandil, ICRC, IOM, UNICEF and IRD.	
Water supply	Three deep wells with pumps have been established inside the camp, which also supplies the local community. The distribution system is limited to supply individual family PVC-tanks.	
Sanitation	PWJ has implemented an open sewerage system project.	
Fuel	Fuel and kerosene heaters were provided in winter by IOM and PWJ.	
Primary healthcare	The primary healthcare centre is 2 km from the camp. The centre has been provided with basic equipment and supplies by IRD and medicine by PWJ. IRD also operated mobile medical units from September 2007 to July 2008.	
PDS	No family has been able to transfer their food rations to Gardasin. Some families travel to Mosul, security permitting, to collect their rations and others go without.	
Education	All school-age children are attending school in Gardasin town near the camp. Some students are enrolled in the Akre Arabic secondary school. As the school is 25 km away from the camp, these students are living with relatives.	
WC	1 toilet per approx. 20 persons.	
Additional assistance provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access roads, water supply (well), improvement of sanitation; • Individual assistance: Food and NFIs, income-generation projects and winterization, including concrete bases and kitchen sections; • Electricity/fuel: PWJ installed a generator to provide electricity for the camp and distributed home electrical devices (refrigerator, fan and rechargeable torch) to each family in the camp. In addition, PWJ also distributed 200 litres of kerosene, a kerosene container and kerosene heaters for each family; • Fuel was distributed by Qandil. 	

⁵⁴ This information was collected by the IRD/UNHCR PAC.

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Roads: Internal roads were paved by Qandil.• NFIs/FIs: UNHCR distributed NFIs to 174 families. ICRC distributed FIs and NFI to 142 families and VOP provided NFIs to 157 families. IRCO and PWJ provided clothes for women and children.• Income: IRD ran an income generation clean up campaign• Education: Qandil covered the transportation costs for 12 IDP students to attend school. |
|--|---|

Annex II: Assistance provided in Dahuk Governorate

Sector	Implementer	Location	Description	Beneficiaries
Protection	UNHCR / IRD	Dahuk Centre	PAC	1,100 IDPs
NFI / FI	UNHCR	Sheladize and Hawriska villages	NFIs	12 IDP families
		Gardasin Camp	NFIs	151 IDP families
		Gardasin Camp	NFIs	97 families (557 persons)
		Gardasin Camp	NFIs	31 families (253 persons)
		Fayda	NFIs	20 families (129 persons)
		Sheladize, Deralok	NFIs	2 families (5 persons)
		Sumel	NFIs	10 families (39 persons)
		Gardasin	NFIs	139 families
		Chamanki village, Amedi District	NFIs	25 families (174 persons)
		Gardasin	NFIs	35 families (261 persons)
		Dashtmir	NFIs	1 family
		Dahuk City Centre	NFIs	6 families (16 persons)
		Dahuk	NFIs	1 family
		Dahuk and Atrosh sub-Districts	NFIs	32 families (162 persons)
	Bagerat collective town	NFIs	57 families (315 persons)	
	UNHCR / Qandil	Atrosh and Bardarash	Children clothes, water pumps and water containers	113 IDP families
		Villages between Dahuk and Ba'adra, Atrosh and Bagera	NFIs	113 IDP families
		Sarsink sub-District, Mangish sub-District and Bakhetma village	NFIs	281 families
		Batofa sub-District, Rizgari sub-District, Hawrisk village, Marina collective, Bamarni Centre, Tene village, Dawodiya village, inside Duhok, Sheladize Camp and Deralok Camp	NFIs	772 IDP families
	VOP	Atrosh/Bildisha Camp	NFIs	30 IDP families
		Shekhan		100 IDP families
		Shekhan/Qasrok/Kalkchi village		30 IDP families
		Qasrok		40 IDP families
		Shekhan/Qasrok/Mahat village		30 IDP families
		Shekhan/Qasrok/Mahat village		15 IDP families
		Shekhan/Qasrok/Mahat village		80 IDP families
Hawreske		107 families		
Gardasin		157 families		
IRD	Fayda/Alqush and Gardasin	NFIs, Food	1,600 IDP families	

Sector	Implementer	Location	Description	Beneficiaries
	ICRC	Dahuk Centre	NFI stockpile	Vulnerable households, incl. IDPs
		Dashtmir Camp	MREs canned food.	40 12 IDP families
		Gardasin Camp	Food, NFIs	142 IDP families
		Doahuk Centre	Food, NFI	21 families
		Sinjar – Mosul	Food, NFIs	200 HH affected by explosions
		Zommar – Mosul	Food, NFIs	150 HH affected by explosions
		Zommar – Mosul	Food, NFIs	15 IDP families
		Darkar, Batufa	Food, NFIs	227 border affected HH.
		5 Forts / Bartilla – Mosul	Food	500 IDP family
		5 Forts / Bartilla – Mosul	Food	1364 IDP family
		5 Forts / Bartilla – Mosul	Food	1619 IDP family
		Dahuk	NFIs	1 family
		Dahuk and Atrosh sub-Districts	NFIs	32 families (162 persons)
		Bagerat collective town	NFIs	57 families (315 persons)
			IRCS	Gardasin Camp
Dahuk	Distribution of relief items			200 families affected by border shelling
	Qandil	Gardasin Camp	Kerosene	160 IDP families
		Shekhan		298 IDP families
	Qandil/IOM	Dashtmir, Sheladize camp, Deralok Camp, Hetit Camp, Sumail industrial area, Gavarki, Shendokha.	Food	185 IDP families
	MSF	Gardasin Camp	NFIs	500 families
		Winterization program	NFIs	424 IDP families in Bardarash, 72 families in Kalak, 52 families in Daratu, 87 families in Rovia and 60 families in Zelkan

Sector	Implementer	Location	Description	Beneficiaries	
	PWJ/IOM	Gardasin Camp/Deralok and Sheladize	200 litres kerosene, kerosene containers	199 IDP families	
		Gardasin Camp/Deralok, Sheladize, Hetit and Nahawa	200 litres kerosene	280 IDP families	
		Gardasin Camp		Kerosene heaters	151 IDP families
				Children clothes and shoes	545 IDP children
		Alqush and Fayda	Kerosene, kerosene containers and kerosene heaters	28 schools with IDP students	
		Gardasin Camp	Kerosene heaters and plastic sheet	151 IDPs families	
	PWJ/ UNHCR	Gardasin Camp	Plastic sheets	157 IDP families in Gardasin for 193 tents	
	WFP	All Dahuk districts	Distribution of three food items (oil V., flour and beans)	44,753 IDP persons in first cycle	
IDP camp projects	UNHCR/ PWJ	Gardasin Camp	Winterization programme	151 IDP families	
		Gardasin Camp	Sanitary and hygiene kits	400 IDP females	
		Dashtmir Camp	Sanitary and hygiene kits	110 IDP females	
	Qandil		Internal road construction	152 IDP families	
	Qandil/ UNHCR	Fayda IDP Camp	Garbage collection for Fayda IDP camp		
	Qandil/ UNHCR	Dashtmir Camp	Infrastructure support	45 IDP families	
Health	IRD	Gardasin sub-District	Provision of basic equipment and supplies for PHCs	1,614 persons	
			Mobile medical units (MMUs)	4,972 persons	
	Qandil	Fayda	PHC construction	1,720 IDP families	
	ICRC	Dahuk	Extension of maternity hospital in Shekhan	3,000 IDP and host community members	
		Ninewa	Construction of paediatric unit in Hamdaniya hospital	5,000 IDPs and members of the host community	
		Dahuk and Ninewa	Distribution of war wounded kits (WWK) to emergency hospitals	800 wounded persons	
		Al-Smood – Zommar / Telafar	Rehabilitation of PHC	10,000 individuals	
	PWJ	Dahuk Centre	Five PHCs constructed	IDPs and host community	
	UNHCR/ PWJ	Fayda, Domeez, Gardasin Camp	Provision of medicines two times	3,200 IDP families	
	VOP	Moquble		Mobility aids	10 families
				Hearing aids	8 families
		Dahuk		4 wheelchairs	4 handicapped IDPs
		Shekhan		Distribution of toys	30 sick IDP children
	WFP	Dahuk	Food security survey through statistic and	1,500 families	

Sector	Implementer	Location	Description	Beneficiaries
			health departments	
	MAF	Dahuk	Support individual IDPs for medical referral	300 persons
Education	UNHCR/ PWJ	Fayda/Domeez	Renovation and extension of two schools in Fayda/Domeez	1,849 IDP students
		Akre	Renovation and extension of Alayee school	450 IDP and host community families
	Qandil	Gardasin.	Construction of 9-classroom school in Gardasin	
	PWJ/IOM	Akre	Renovation and extension of Shekhanook Haji School	143 IDPs and host community families
	Qandil	Khanik	Construction of 9 classroom school in Khanik	
	Qandil/IOM	Meserik collective	Improvement of Lazzaka school	
	Qandil	Mangish sub-District and Gardasin	Support to IDP students to attend Arabic schools	50 IDP students
	Qandil	Dashtmir Camp, Mangish sub-District, Gardasin Camp, Bakhitma village, Sarsink sub-District	Support to IDP students to attend Arabic schools	218 IDP students
	UNICEF	Throughout Dahuk Governorate	Renovation and extension of 28 schools	IDP and host community students
Income generation	IRD	Gardasin sub-District	Cleaning campaign	60 IDPs labourers
		Fayda/Azadi and Rezgari collective towns		33 IDPs labourers
		Gardasin camp		20 IDPs labourers
		Bartilla		25,722 IDPs and members of the host community
		Alqush	Public garden rehabilitation	8,914 IDPs and members of the host community
	Qandil	Dashtmir camp	Distribution of 150 goats	45 IDP families
	UNHCR/ PWJ	Fayda	Income generation	10 IDP families
	PWJ	Fayda military camp	Hair dressing vocational training	6 IDP women
			Construction skills vocational training	20 IDPs
ICRC	Levo village, Batofa and Darkar sub-Districts, Zakho	Distribution of sheep to	100 IDP families	
Water	IRD	Gardasin sub-District	Water project	4,238 persons
		Seji village, Sumel District		120 persons
	Gardasin sub-District	Hygiene promotion campaign	417 persons	
	Fayda		652 persons	
		Qwekan	Water project	630 IDPs and host

Sector	Implementer	Location	Description	Beneficiaries
				community members
		Gardasin		4,238 IDPs and host community members
		Topzawa		3,120 IDPs and host community members
	Qandil	Fayda	Water improvement project	1,720 IDP families
			Three wells improvement	400 IDP and host community families
			Sewerage system	72 IDP families
		Marina collective	Improvement of Marina water project	125 IDP families
		Saro Kani	Water project	80 IDP and host community families
		Sumel	Water improvement project	150 IDP and host community families
		Ba'adra		350 IDP and host community families
	UNHCR/ Qandil	Mangesh/Kuren Gavana collective town	Water improvement project	537 IDP and host community families
		Fayda ex-military camp	Improvement of water project	450 IDP families
		Shekhan	Water project	840 IDP and host community families
	PWJ/IOM	Alqosh/Bandawa village	Water project	57 IDP and host community families
	PWJ/ UNHCR	Gardasin Camp	Additional 32 water tanks	32 IDP and host community families
		Akre	Water project in Shekhanok Haji	143 families
	ICRC	Gardasin camp	Sanitation and water supply construction	160 IDP families
		Fayda and Telkef	Potable water distribution	500 IDP families
		Zakho/Dashtmir		46 IDP families
		Akre	Water supply project in Alayee	3,000 IDPs and host community members
		Aqra	Rehabilitation of the network water supply of Aqra town and repairing deep wells of Shorash and Khabat collective towns	5,000 family
		Abo Wajna village in Zommar/Telafar	Water supply project for 4 collectives	1,500 individuals
		Al-Smood – Zommar/Telafar	Repairing pumps in the water supply project of Al-Smood	5,000 persons
		Gir Ozer village/Sinjar	Improving water supply project	5,000 persons
		Cobany village/Zommar	Water supply project for two villages in talmurag / Zommar	5,000 persons
		Rabiah/Telafar (Mosul)	Improving water supply of Rabiah and five villages around	32,500 persons

Annex III: Data Sheet

Household Survey Summary

Governorate: Dahuk

Duration of data 20/05/07 - 30/06/08

Sample size 1,715 households

No	Question	Result	%	Comments
1-16	Distinguish between IDP and Returnees and record interviewer details	n/a	n/a	n/a
Basic Profile				
Head of household and age and gender breakdown				
17	Head of Household			
	HOH is Male	1,527	89.04%	Out of ,1715 IDP households surveyed
	HOH is Female	188	10.96%	
18	Household Profile			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
	Average family size	5.0		
a	Males	4,547	49.93%	
b	Females	4,559	50.07%	
c	Age under 1	276	3.03%	
d	Age 1-4	1,006	11.05%	
e	Age 5-17	2,969	32.60%	
f	Age 18-59	4,459	48.97%	
g	Age 60 and above	396	4.35%	
Ethnicity and Religion				
19-	To which ethnic group does the family belong to			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
a	Arab	38	2.22%	
b	Kurd	1,157	67.46%	
c	Feili Kurd / Iranian Kurd	1	0.06%	
d	Turkmen	10	0.58%	
e	Other (specify)	4	0.23%	
f	Assyrian	83	4.84%	
g	Chaldean	413	24.08%	
h	Armenian	9	0.52%	
21-	What is the Family Religion			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
a	Islam – Shi'ite	17	0.99%	
b	Islam – Sunni	1,166	67.99%	
c	Other Islam (not Shi'ite or Sunni)	1	0.06%	
e	Christian	505	29.45%	
f	Yazidi	26	1.52%	
Most Recently Displaced From Governorate/District				
28	Most Recently Displaced From Gov			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
	Ninewa	1,270	74.05%	
	Baghdad	431	25.13%	
	Kirkuk	5	0.29%	
	Salah Al-Din	3	0.17%	
	Basrah	3	0.17%	
	Najaf	1	0.06%	
	Muthanna	1	0.06%	
	Anbar	1	0.06%	

	Most Recently Displaced From District			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
	Anbar – Al-Rutba	1	0.06%	
	Baghdad – Abu Ghraib	16	0.93%	
	Baghdad – Al-Resafa	203	11.84%	
	Baghdad – Karkh	211	12.30%	
	Baghdad – Mada'in	1	0.06%	
	Basrah – Basrah	3	0.17%	
	Kirkuk – Kirkuk	5	0.29%	
	Muthanna – Al-Rumaiitha	1	0.06%	
	Najaf – Kufa	1	0.06%	
	Ninewa – Al-Ba'aj	2	0.12%	
	Ninewa – Al-Shikhan	3	0.17%	
	Ninewa – Hatra	4	0.23%	
	Ninewa – Mosul	1,167	68.05%	
	Ninewa – Shekhan	16	0.93%	
	Ninewa – Sinjar	24	1.40%	
	Ninewa – Telafar	51	2.97%	
	Ninewa – Tilkaif	3	0.17%	
	Salah Al-Din – Samarra	1	0.06%	
	Salah Al-Din – Tikrit	1	0.06%	
	Salah Al-Din – Tooz	1	0.06%	
Number of Displacements and Reasons for Leaving Village/Town				
29-	How many times has the household been displaced inside Iraq			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
	1	1,515	88.34%	
	2	194	11.31%	
	3	5	0.29%	
	4	1	0.06%	
30-	Reasons for leaving village/town			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed. The values may not add up to 100% because households may list up to three reasons for leaving.
a	March 2003 events	97	5.66%	
d	Other armed conflict	1	0.06%	
r	Post-Samarra events	1,617	94.29%	
Cause of Flight and Reasons for Moving to Other Locations				
31	Why did the family flee			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed. The values may not add up to 100% because households may list up to three reasons for moving to other locations
a	Direct threats to life	578	33.70%	
b	Specific sectarian threats	3	0.17%	
c	Left out of fear	1,516	88.40%	
d	Generalized violence	140	8.16%	
e	Armed conflict	7	0.41%	
f	Forced displacement from property	9	0.52%	
g	Discrimination	22	1.28%	
h	Other	2	0.12%	
32	Was the family targeted			Out of 1,584 IDP households surveyed targeted
a	Belonging to a certain ethnic group	1,284	81.06%	
b	Belonging to a certain religion or sect	259	16.35%	
c	Holding a certain political opinion	3	0.19%	
d	Belonging to a certain social group	38	2.40%	
e	Do not think the family was targeted	131	7.64%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
33	Reasons for Moving to Current Location			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed. The values may not add up to 100% because households may list up to three reasons for moving to current location
a	Improved security	1,569	91.49%	
b	Change of political situation	139	8.10%	
d	Property claim	1	0.06%	
e	Harassed in displacement	1	0.06%	

f	Relatives living there	1,426	83.15%	
h	Beginning of school year	1	0.06%	
i	Political support	46	2.68%	
j	Reconstruction assistance	24	1.40%	
k	Other	3	0.17%	
m	Tribal links	7	0.41%	
Intentions				
34	What are the main intentions			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
a	Return to their place of origin	241	14.05%	
b	Locally integrate in the current location	1,467	85.54%	
c	Resettle in a third location	1	0.06%	
d	Waiting on one or several factors	6	0.35%	
35	When does the family plan to return			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
a	In less than 6 months	1,090	63.56%	
b	In 6 to 12 months	392	22.86%	
c	In more than 12 months	24	1.40%	
d	Whenever the security situation improves	209	12.19%	
Shelter				
36	Type of Shelter			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
a	Owned house on owned land	189	11.02%	
b	Rented house	771	44.96%	
c	With relatives	482	28.10%	
d	Public building	15	0.87%	
e	Other	32	1.87%	
f	House on land not owned	161	9.39%	
g	Camp	32	1.87%	
h	In the house of host family	32	1.87%	
k	Collective town / settlement	1	0.06%	
37	House Crowding			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
a	Not overcrowded	540	31.49%	
b	Somewhat overcrowded	786	45.83%	
c	Extremely overcrowded	389	22.68%	
38	House Location			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed.
a	Rural	1,057	61.63%	
b	Urban	296	17.26%	
c	Camp	32	1.87%	
d	Semi-rural	330	19.24%	
Pressure to Leave				
39	Pressure to Leave			Out of 4 IDP households surveyed faced pressure to leave
b	Pressure from relatives	3	75.00%	
d	Pressure from militants	1	25.00%	
a	No pressure to leave or threat of eviction	1,711	99.77%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
Property Owned Before Being Displaced				
40	Property owned before being displaced			Out of 409 IDP households surveyed owned property before displacement
a	House	381	93.15%	
b	Apartment or room	6	1.47%	
c	Land for housing	11	2.69%	
d	Land for agriculture	6	1.47%	
e	Shop/small business	32	7.82%	

f	Other	5	1.22%	
Now able to access property				
41	Now able to access property?			Out of 409 IDP households surveyed property owned before displacement.
a	Yes, property accessible	123	30.07%	
f	Do not know	245	59.90%	
	If no why:			
b	Property destroyed or damaged so as to be unusable	11	26.83%	Out of 41 IDP households surveyed having property not able to access
c	Property occupied, controlled or claimed by private citizens	6	14.63%	
g	Property occupied by militia groups	6	14.63%	
h	Property sold or exchanged	18	43.90%	
42-A	Did your family lose property From 17 July 1968 to 9 April 2003, if so, how?			
42-B	Property lost from 9 April 2003 to 22 February 2006			Out of 4 IDP households surveyed who lost property from 9 April 2003 to 22 February 2006
	Threats by others	4	100.00%	
42-C	Property lost after 22 February 2006			Out of 25 IDP households surveyed who lost property after 22 February 2006
	Threats by others	20	80.00%	
	Other	5	20.00%	
Water				
49	Family normally drinks clean water	1,632	95.16%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
50	If no access, why not?			Out of 83 IDP households surveyed not having access to water
	Other	76	91.57%	
	Insufficient Quantity	7	8.43%	
51	Main water sources (multiple choice)			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
a	Municipal water (underground pipes)	292	17.03%	
b	Public well/tap	1,334	77.78%	
c	Unprotected dug well	5	0.29%	
d	Tanker/truck vendor	200	11.66%	
g	Spring	16	0.93%	
h	Other	71	4.14%	
j	Open, broken pipes	1	0.06%	
52	Other Water Questions			
a	Enough water for drinking & cooking	1,690	98.54%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
b	Enough water for hygiene	1,188	69.27%	
53	Access to sewerage system	1,245	72.59%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
54	What type is it?			Out of 1,245 IDP households surveyed having access to sewerage system
a	Modern (underground pipes)	332	26.67%	
b	Traditional (runs through the streets)	913	73.33%	
55	Access to toilets	1,713	99.88%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
56	Toilets shared with other families	890	51.90%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
Food				
57	Receives PDS rations	249	14.52%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed

58	If not receiving PDS rations, why			Out of 1,466 IDP households surveyed not receiving PDS rations
a	Delay transferring PDS registration to new location	53	3.62%	
b	Unable to register for PDS because of lacking documentation or PDS card	43	2.93%	
c	No food to distribute	7	0.48%	
d	Inability to access food distribution point due to insecurity	1,306	89.09%	
e	Inability to access food distribution point due to distance	1	0.07%	
g	Do not know why	23	1.57%	
h	Other	33	2.25%	
59	Do you receive food from other sources on a regular basis?	66	3.85%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
60	Do you rely solely on the PDS?	309	18.02%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
Health Care				
61	Access to PHC in village	1,092	63.67%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
62	Access to drugs mostly needed	312	18.19%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
63	Reason for no access to health			Out of 623 IDP households surveyed who indicated their reason for no access
a	Not available	590	94.70%	
b	Refused service	1	0.16%	
d	Distance	4	0.64%	
e	Financial	28	4.49%	
64	Children have vaccination records	764	98.58%	Out of 775 IDP households surveyed with children under 5
66	Purpose of visit by health worker			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
a	Has not been visited	905	52.77%	
b	Medical examination	2	0.25%	Out of 810 IDP households surveyed visited by health workers
d	Vaccinations	762	94.07%	
e	Consulting or education	10	1.23%	
f	Other services	37	4.57%	
67	Family's main health problems			
a	Dysentery	6	1.04%	Out of 579 IDP households surveyed who indicated having a health problem
b	Child health	28	4.84%	
c	Maternal health	19	3.28%	
d	Malnutrition	1	0.17%	
e	Chronic diseases	501	86.53%	
f	No health problems	1,136	66.24%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
Education				
68	Access to education in village	872	91.60%	Out of 952 IDP households surveyed having children/adolescent of school or university age.
70	Students attending school	2,241	76.83%	Out of 2,969 persons of school age
70a-1	Primary students – Male	802	54.89%	Out of 1461 primary students
70a-2	Primary students – Female	659	45.11%	
70b-1	Intermediate – Male	279	57.41%	Out of 486 intermediate students
70b-2	Intermediate – Female	207	42.59%	
70c-	Secondary – Male	91	45.73%	Out of 199 secondary students

1				
70c-1	Secondary – Female	108	54.27%	
70d-1	Higher – Male	54	56.84%	Out of 95 higher students
70d-2	Higher – Female	41	43.16%	
70e-1	Total Male	1,226	54.71%	Out of 2,241 students
70e-1	Total Female	1,015	45.29%	
	Percent of children in primary and secondary school	2,146	72.28%	
71	Families with children >6 not attending	257	29.14%	Out of 882 IDP households surveyed with children age 5-17
a-1	Primary – Male	296	43.79%	out of 676 6-18 years old students
a-2	Primary – Female	380	56.21%	
72	Reasons for not attending			Out of 257 IDP households surveyed having children not attending school
a	Work	86	33.46%	
b	Curriculum language	46	17.90%	
c	Distance	2	0.78%	
d	Financial	31	12.06%	
e	Refused access	1	0.39%	
f	Cultural/religious	49	19.07%	
g	Other	42	16.34%	
74	Children enrolled at correct grade level	781	89.56%	Out of 872 IDP households surveyed having children attending school
75	Illiterate children under 15	79	2.78%	Out of 882 households surveyed with children 5-17
76	Children not speaking school language	125	4.39%	Out of 882 households surveyed with children 5-17
Access to services				
80	Access to electricity			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
a	No electricity	41	2.39%	
				Out of 1,674 IDP households surveyed having access to electricity
b	1-3 hours per day	46	2.75%	
c	4 or more hours per day	1,628	97.25%	
81	Access to fuel			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed Out of 1,319 IDP households surveyed having access to fuel
a	No access to fuel	396	23.09%	
b	Benzene	143	10.84%	
c	Diesel	3	0.23%	
d	Propane	555	42.08%	
e	Kerosene	1,279	96.97%	
f	Other	22	1.67%	
Documentation				
82	Problems getting documents	1,457	84.96%	Out of 1715 IDP households surveyed
				Out of 1457 IDP households surveyed having problem in getting documents
a	National ID new	38	2.61%	
b	Passport	661	45.37%	
c	Birth certificate	138	9.47%	
d	PDS Card	1,309	89.84%	
e	Other	1	0.07%	
Security Situation				
85	Family members feel safe	1,714	99.94%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed

87	After 2003, how many people in family have been			
a	Detained	3		Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
b	Kidnapped	35		
c	Killed by militants	21		
d	Killed by another citizen	43		
88	Number still not accounted for	35		Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
Gender				
90	Women/girls feel safe outside the house	1,705	99.94%	Out of 1,706 IDP households surveyed having a woman in the family
91	Women approach whom for help			Out of 1,706 IDP households surveyed having a woman in the family
a	Family	1,692	99.18%	
b	Tribal leaders	14	0.82%	
92	Women's ability to move outside of home since 2003			Out of 1,706 IDP households surveyed having a woman in the family
c	No change	2	0.12%	
a	More able	23	1.35%	
b	Less able	1,681	98.53%	
Special Needs				
98	Families with Special Needs			Out of 573 IDP households surveyed having one need or more. The total may not adding 100% as some households may list more than one need.
1	Mentally Disabled	11	1.92%	
2	Physically Disabled	60	10.47%	
3	Malnutrition	1	0.17%	
4	Serious Medical Condition	11	1.92%	
6	Unaccompanied or Separated Child	1	0.17%	
9	Woman at Risk	30	5.24%	
13	Old Age in Need of Support	7	1.22%	
15	Victims of Torture	1	0.17%	
17	Chronic Diseases	464	80.98%	
18	Other	49	8.55%	
19	One or more need	573	33.41%	
Income and commodities				
99	Main source of income			Out of 1,274 IDP households surveyed having a source of income
a	Full time employment	314	24.65%	
b	Casual/irregular employment	862	67.66%	
c	Self-employment	82	6.44%	
f	Savings/benefits	16	1.26%	
d	No employment (no income)	441	25.71%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
100	Family members of working age who are:			
a	Of working age	4,459		Out of 4,459 individuals of working age
b	Working	1,530	34.17%	
c	Working and paid (casual labor)	1,058	69.15%	Out of 1,530 IDP households surveyed having a family member working
d	Working in private sector	123	8.04%	
e	Working in public sector	345	22.55%	
102	Items brought with family			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
a	Livestock	0	0.00%	
b	Agricultural tools	0	0.00%	
c	Shelter material	15	0.87%	
d	Car/transportation	62	3.62%	
e	Winter clothing	1,625	94.75%	

f	Other	490	28.57%	
Assistance				
103	Received assistance	486	28.34%	Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed
104	Type of assistance received			Out of 486 IDP households surveyed
a	Health	12	2.47%	
c	Shelter	240	49.38%	
d	Wat/San	29	5.97%	
f	Other	223	45.88%	
g	Food	97	19.96%	
	Number of FHH received assistance	53	28.19%	Out of 188 IDP households surveyed
Priority needs				
105	Top Priorities			Out of 1,715 IDP households surveyed. The values do not add up to 100% because households listed up to three priorities for assistance.
a	Electricity	85	4.96%	
b	Health	589	34.34%	
c	Job	977	56.97%	
d	More money	112	6.53%	
e	Public services	1,113	64.90%	
f	Security	2	0.12%	
g	Shelter	1,195	69.68%	
h	Social insurance	1	0.06%	
I	Documentation	1	0.06%	
j	Water	92	5.36%	
m	Education	21	1.22%	
o	Roads	50	2.92%	
p	Banking services	2	0.12%	
q	Assistance	501	29.21%	
u	Food	155	9.04%	
z	Other	149	8.69%	

Organization and type of assistance

Organization	Assistance	No. of families received assistance
Church	Other	145
Host community	Other	1
IRCS	Food	58
IRCS	Other	25
IRCS	Shelter	55
IRD	Food	9
IRD	Health	12
IRD	Other	13
IRD	Wat/San	15
Kanbe	Food	6
KRG	Shelter	128
MSF	Food	4
Qandil	Food	14
Qandil	Other	21
Qandil	Wat/San	14
Relatives	Food	2
Relatives	Other	8
Relatives	Shelter	4
Religious group	Other	10
Religious group	Shelter	53
WFP	Food	4
		601