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I. Executive summary

Polish Humanitarian Action/Polska Akcja Humanitarna (PAH), founded in 1994, has been operational for 25 years as one of the largest and most active non-governmental, non-profit humanitarian organizations based out of Central Europe. PAH is currently responding to humanitarian crises in Iraq, Syria, Turkey, Ukraine, Kenya, South Sudan and Somalia (Through the 25 years of our activity we reached with our help more than 44 countries, changing lives of millions of people). PAH was active in Iraq already in 2003-2007. We returned to Iraq in December 2016; and currently implementing WASH and Cash Assistance programs in Kurdistan Regional State (KRG) and Ninewa Governorate.

As the humanitarian crisis in Iraq enters its fifth year, Iraq continues to face immense challenges. There are 6.7 million people (18% of the total population) in need of humanitarian assistance. An estimated 4.5 million people face protection concerns. Almost 2 million people remain displaced, over half of whom have been displaced for more than three years, making the prospect of protracted displacement real and warranting a whole-of-system approach to respond to their needs and work toward durable solutions.

Among the 6.7 million people in Iraq in need of humanitarian assistance:

- Approximately 2 million internally displaced people living in-camp and out-of-camp settings will require some form of assistance. Almost 30% of IDPs are in Ninawa Governorate, where some of the highest country-wide poverty rates exist, further increasing their vulnerabilities. Of the total number of IDPs, a significant majority (71%) reside outside of camps.
- Approximately 4 million returnees may require some form of limited humanitarian assistance. An estimated 38% of these returnees are in Ninawa governorate; followed by 32 per cent in Anbar governorate where access severity as perceived by humanitarian actors is the highest.
- Approximately 400,000 vulnerable people in communities hosting large number of displaced families may require humanitarian assistance.
- An estimated 250,000 Syrian refugees are expected to remain in Iraq and require continuing assistance.

The goal of PAH program in Iraq is “to support vulnerable host communities, returnees, IDPs and refugees to be able to improve their living conditions through FSL, WASH and protection interventions which are designed to strengthen local capacities for resilience and produce results that are sustainable; and piloting new areas of programming through detail assessment of target areas”. PAH Iraq mission plans to shift its geographical focus towards central and south Iraq (in addition to focus on the existing target areas of Northern Iraq) with integrated livelihoods, WASH and protection response; and also piloting new areas of programming initiatives when possible. The main focus of PAH humanitarian program will shift from KRI to Central & South Iraq due to emerging needs. Recovery and long term development programs will be both in KRG and Central & South Iraq areas.

This strategic approach of PAH coupled with the current humanitarian context in Iraq highlighted above prompted PAH to comission a multi-disciplinary needs assessment which is aimed at examining and analysing further the humanitarian needs in some poverty-pocet areas within Anbar and Ninewa Governorates. The assessment was aimed at mapping out the gaps in WASH, Cash Assosstance, Livelihoods and protection sectors in the targeted Districts. The methodology of the first phase of the assessment involved primary data collection by means of key informant interviews (KIs) undertaken with 38 individuals, representing 35 organizations or institutions in 5 locations: Ramadi, Falujah, Tikraif, Telafar and Hamdaniyah; to be able to pin point vulnerable areas for further assessment. This was then followed by the second stage of the assessment which involved primary data collection by means of Household Surveys in which 481 households were interviewed in the 5 Districts.
Based on the data collected, an average of 86.4% of the respondents in the five districts (95% in Telafar, 79% in Tilkaif, 81% in Hamdaniya, 91% in Fallujah and 86% in Ramadi) reported that their main source of income in the last 30 days was either one or a combination of retirement fund (average 14.2%), employment (average 20.6%), self-employment (average 21.2%), daily labour (average 19.8%), social protection network (average 4.4%), and loans (average 8.4%). Loans/debt are high in Fallujah and Ramadi (23% and 14% respectively) while it is significantly lower in the remaining Districts (average 3%). And daily labour is taken as an option by an average 29.3% of the respondents in Telafar, Tilkaif and Hamdaniya Districts while it remains at an average of 5.5% for Ramadi and Fallujah Districts. Income analysis indicates that an average of 12% of the responders in Ninewa and 3.5% in Anbar report having no source of income at all. Furthermore, in an average 20.5% of the respondents in Ninewa and 13.5% of the respondents in Anbar have minimal (≥100,000 IQD/month) income. The average frequency of negative coping strategies also appear to be 52% among responders in Ninewa Governorate and 18% among responders in Anbar Governorate.

In regard to the WASH component, respondents in all the five Districts have confirmed that there is no major issue on the area of water availability except Hamdaniya where some 16% of the respondents have indicated concerns of critical shortage of water; the main water sources cited by the respondents (including water networks and borehole) seem to be mostly functioning in most of the Districts. However, there is a very critical concern on water quality (safety) for drinking underlined as alarming by an average of 69.4% of the respondents (i.e. 99% of the respondents in Fallujah, 63% of the respondents in Ramadi, 65% of the respondents in Tilkaif, 41% of the respondents in Telafar and 79% of the respondents in Hamdaniya). The respondents confirm noting that the water mostly contain smell, turbidity, visible impurities, and unfavorable taste. While there is a promising trend of utilization of water treatment options like filtration, boiling and use of chlorine tablets by most of the respondents in Ramadi and Fallujah Districts (the case for an average of 90.5% of the respondents), an average of 53.3% of the respondents (42% in Telafar, 59% in Tilkaif and Hamdaniya each) do not use any of the available water treatment options. This is also corroborated by water related diarrhea occurrence in the last two weeks reported by an average of 51% of the respondents in Hamdaniya and Tilkaif.

While this report provides a consolidated evidence base that helps inform response planning, some of the figures provided throughout the document are estimates based on best available datasets and agreed-upon methodologies. The designation employed and the presentation of material and maps in this report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of PAH concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.
II. Background information

A. Anbar

Situated in western Iraq and with a total population of 1,723,153 (excluding Syrian refugees and IDPs), Anbar is the largest governorate in the country. Over the past decade, it has experienced repeated waves of displacement, including IDPs fleeing the aftermath of the ISIS insurgency which originated in Anbar. The spread of violence in December 2013, followed by the April 2015 crisis, forced over 1,280,000 Anbar residents to move, mostly within the governorate, particularly to Falluja and Ramadi districts, the sites of the fiercest battles between armed groups and Iraqi Security Forces, or to neighbouring Baghdad.

Anbar governorate currently holds the largest share of IDPs across the country. Over one third of all the IDPs across Iraq originate from within the governorate (most particularly from Ramadi and Falluja districts). And an estimated 32% of all returnees in Iraq reside in Anbar governorate where access severity as perceived by humanitarian actors is the highest. Of the the geographical clustering of 641,255 families that have returned in 2018 by severity of the conditions (indicating a lack of livelihoods, services, social cohesion and security), Anbar is among the top five of the geographical clusterings where the very high severity hotspots are concentrated. According to the 2019 HNO, out-of-camp IDPs in Anbar and Ninewa are the only group for which, on average, there are overlapping needs in more than four sectors (including livelihoods, protection, WASH and Shelter).

The strong tribal structure of the governorate is reflected in its ethno-religious composition: Anbar is the least diverse governorate in the country and its IDP and returnee populations are nearly all Arab Sunni (only 0.09% of its returnee population is of Kurdish Shia Muslim affiliation). This tendency can be traced back to even before the 2014 crisis, with the governorate not showing major ethno-religious changes in any of its locations.

Anbar is also the governorate most affected by land mines and/or UXOs: over 80% of locations are contaminated by explosive devices, mainly in residential homes, police or government structures and religious buildings. Nearly all locations have had rubble cleared, and removal is needed in only 11% of cases, mostly in the Heet district. Unlike in the overall trend where rented housing constitutes the most predominant shelter type for IDPs, the displaced families living in Anbar tend to be hosted by other families (43%) or settled in camps (27%).

- District: 7 Districts
- Area: 138,501 km² (53,476 sq. mi)
- Location: Western Iraq
- Elevation: 32°54′N 41°36′E
- Local time: GMT+3
- Population in need of Humanitarian Assistance by Legal Status:
  - IDPs (in Millions): 0.076
  - Returnees (in Millions): 1.267
  - Refugees (in Millions): 0.004
  - Host Community (in Millions): 0.005
  - Total population in need of Humanitarian Assistance (in Millions): 1.352
B. Ninewah

Ninewa, Iraq’s second largest governorate, is situated in northern Iraq and has a population of 3,261,438 individuals (3.8% of Iraq’s total population).

Since the beginning of the latest crisis, the governorate has been the theatre of dramatic events, resulting in massive displacement movements from and within Ninewa that have shaped the dynamics of IDP movements in the country. In addition, the proximity of Ninewa’s districts to other conflict-affected areas has fostered additional displacement movements from other governorates, such as Anbar, Kirkuk and Salah alDin. And an estimated 38% of all returnees in Iraq reside in Ninewa governorate where access severity as perceived by humanitarian actors is the highest. Ninewa Governorate has both the highest number and the highest percentage of returnees (397,644, 26%) living in locations with very severe conditions. According to the 2019 HNO, out-of-camp IDPs in Anbar and Ninewa are the only group for which, on average, there are overlapping needs in more than four sectors (including livelihoods, protection, WASH and Shelter).

The ethno-religious composition of the IDP population is different from other areas in Iraq, as displaced people residing in Ninewa are mostly Kurdish Yazidis (35%). Apparently they have formed major “hot spots” in Ninewa, same as in bordering Dahuk. On the other hand, Shabak Shia IDPs (14%) have all stayed in Ninewa, their governorate of origin, mostly for fear of being discriminated against by other groups. Ninewa is also home to a relevant share of Kurdish Sunni Muslims (22%) and Arab Sunnis (15%), who are the most prevalent ethno-religious group of the returnee population, around 80% altogether.

Ninewa is also one of the worst affected governorates by the presence of land mines and/or UXOs. Over 30% of its locations are contaminated by explosive devices, which affect primarily agricultural fields, residential homes, roads and bridges. This is evidently hindering returns to liberated areas. Nearly all locations assessed were not affected by or have already been cleared of rubble, and removal is needed in only 20% of locations, mostly in Telafar and Akre districts.

- **District**: 30 districts
- **Area**: 37,323 km² (14,410 sq mi)
- **Location**: Northern Iraq
- **Elevation**: 36°0′N 42°28′E
- **Local time**: GMT+3
- **Population in need of Humanitarian Assistance by Legal Status**
  - IDPs (in Millions): 0.613
  - Returnees (in Millions): 1.481
  - Refugees (in Millions): 0.004
  - Host Community (in Millions): 0.101
  - **Total population in need of Humanitarian Assistance (in Millions)**: 2.168
III. Design & Methodology

A. Modality & Tool:

At this stage of the needs assessment, we opted for house to house visits using a quantitative data collection tool. The Multisectoral needs assessment questionnaire was created in cooperation between CASH, WASH, and MEAL. The thematic parts of the questionnaire were set by the programs teams, where the technical questions were listed by the programs with the initial choices list and sent to MEAL for feedback, modifications, and then transfer onto KOBO for digital data collection and all the features KOBO offers in terms of clean, constrained data, and secure data collection and storage.

B. Sampling Method:

The sampling method adopted for Stage 2 of the Needs assessment was based on several criteria. The Methodology for Stage 1, Type of data and Level at which the data is required to inform programs/proposals, the nature of the Localities/Districts/Governorates and the residents within them were all determining factors with limitations being: limited resources and limited time frame within which the needs assessment needs to be completed.

The Sampling method used is Stratified Random Sampling, where a list of reportedly “most vulnerable” villages/cities was provided by the Stage 1 data collection team leaders with number of Households in each. The stratification was applied on district level and proportionality was used to provide number of Households in each village/city to represent all “most vulnerable” localities.

No sampling frame was available, so we used a random selection approach at field level considering that we will be distributing our focus on multiple parts of the village we are to interview HH within. We realize of course that this method is pre-determinately biased depending on the judgement of the enumerator selecting the house to visit.

The map to the side was used to explain the sample step where the “Tent” icons represent the distribution of neighbourhoods to be visited by the data collection team to fulfil the predetermined proportional sample for each village/city in each district.
### C. Sample size:

The confidence interval used was 95% with an error of 10% was used to calculate the samples per district amounting to between 91 and 97 HH per district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>Total HH / District</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Stratified HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nenawa</td>
<td>1611 Talaafar</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9744 Talkeif</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2292 Hamadaniyya</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14675 Totals</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anbar</td>
<td>2117 Ramadi</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2150 Fallouja</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4267 Totals</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Anbar

**a. Ramadi:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Sample to be Interviewed</th>
<th>Extras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Malaab</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Hamidiyya</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Sijaniyya</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Jomhouri</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Aadii</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. Fallujah**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Sample to be Interviewed</th>
<th>Extras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Wahda</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Saqlawiyiya</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Joulan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Mohandisin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Moalimin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Dibaa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Ninewah

a. Telafar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Sample to be Interviewed</th>
<th>Extras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Wahda</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Muthanna</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Aalamayn</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Kitah</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Nour</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Nida</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal Alhawa Village</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bir Al Hilo Village</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal Hayal Village</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Khadra</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Talkaif

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Sample to be Interviewed</th>
<th>Extras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Salam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharab Bayt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wana</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Qaim</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Shallalat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Hamdaniyya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Sample to be Interviewed</th>
<th>Extras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Sallamiyya</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashour</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Data Collection, Cleaning, & Analysis

A. Anbar

Nine enumerators have been hired for conducing the Needs assessments which was a real challenge to train 9 enumerators since they were living in different districts within Ramadi, that is why, the training was conducted sessions for three different group. In addition to personnel challenge, the access letter required a whole day to be issued while at the time of arrival to Anbar, there was new instructions regarding access letter. The whole process of needs assessment data collection in Anbar took 10 days (roughly estimated as follows: 2 days for travelling, 1 day for hiring and training staff, 1 day for access letter, 4 days for needs assessment, 1 day for Market assessment). In regards to what mentioned above, 4 enumerators have resigned due to the fact they were not interested to travel to Falluja for security reason. Finally, out of the 6 targets locations in Falluja, one neighbourhood was not accessible by the local security forces due to searching operation conducted by the Army.

B. Ninewah

Ninewah assessment team was composed of six staff members (4 males – 2 females). The team worked for two weeks in areas within Hamdaniya and Telakif districts, the team was devided over 3 groups each group worked as pair visiting households and conducting the assessment, the data was collected on tablet using Kobo toolbox. The team has faced some challenges of access in terms of restrictions regarding obtaining approvals on accessing and working within the mentioned areas. This has led to some delays which prompted the team to work overtime and during weekend to compensate the lost time.

With the challenges in mind, there was a risk of seeing the results in the data collected. Errors such as data entry errors are a direct possible result of interview fatigue, Insufficient training, Enumerator bias, and so on and so forth. And the assumption was correct, where for example there were; “Other” text fields that were not filled even though they were required even though they were mitigated in the design of the questionnaire used by entering verification markers and hints. Another example of enumerator error is false sense of overconfidence that the enumerator acquires after a few questionnaires filled where they assume they now know the questions and no longer give adequate time to accurately read the questions before asking, which causes issues with data entry as well and sometimes even contradictory entries in consecutive answer fields or even repetitive answers for similarly worded questions that differ minutely in meaning.

These issues resulted in a tedious data cleaning, re-formatting, and re-coding process and so the data collected was cleaned & formatted to suit the usability of the graphs and information to be produced from the data.

Since the abovementioned challenges were expected, mitigations measures were adopted to lessen the impact of the abovementioned so that the data produced complied with minumum standards. These mitigation measures included the design of the data collection tool where restrictions on answer formating was adopted, choice lists included when possible and skip patterns were integrated into the tool followed by proper field testing before roll out. A full day of training for staff involved in the data collection with learning objectives including but not limited to; Induction on Needs assessments, the methodology, and areas of Data collection. Technical training sections were also included; i.e, Data collection best practices, Role play, Data collection tool induction, KOBO operation, Accountability standards, Technical WASH and CASH introductions… The result was visible in the data quality and the data curing was quite straight forward despite the challenges.

Below are the findings brought forth by the data provided for the Second stage of the needs assessment and the topics requested as agreed upon with programs and HoM.
C. Household Characteristics

1. Household | Gender of Respondent

The respondents are the persons our enumerators were able to find at home and able to spare the time to be interviewed at the moment of the visit. The Respondents were generally defined as either the Head of household, their spouse, or any other adult over 18 years of age with no predefined bias on gender. It is notable that in all four districts the gender distribution of respondents is very similar for Females going between 43% in Fallouja down to 35% in Hamdaniyya where the male respondents became more frequent at 65% of respondents as opposed to Fallouja at 57%. Notably, Telafar shows the lowest percentage of Female respondents at 22% and a majority of 78% male respondents the highest of all locations.

![Figure 1: Gender Distribution of Respondent per District](image)

2. Household | Age of Respondent

The gender distribution of the respondents is by far greater for the 18 to 59 year old range at 85% to 94% for all districts. A minor 1% below the age of 18 were interviewed in Fallouja and Hamdaniyya. As for the 60 and above age range, they were also relatively close ranging from 6% in Tilkaf balancing out at 13% to 15% in the other 3 districts.

![Figure 2: Age Distribution of Respondent per District](image)
3. Household | Head of HH Gender / Age Distribution

The Head of Household is the member who is responsible for taking the final decisions within a HH. Elderly females over 60 years of age are the least frequent at 2% to 6% for the four districts. In Fallouja, 22% of our Head of HH were adult females (18 to 59 yrs old) and between 8% to 12% in the other three districts. Elderly males however are slightly higher in frequency in Tikiaf (25%) and between 10% and 14% in the other three districts. Then come the male adults between 18 and 59 age range with a stable 62% to 81% distribution in the four districts. The only child heads of Household were found in Hamdaniyyah at 1% of HH interviewed.

4. Household | Household Size

The average number of HH members in Iraq as reported by UNHCR is 6 HH members which is reportedly 13% of HHs visited for Hamdaniyyah and 17% in all other districts. It is indeed the highest percentage of all HH sizes. At a close second, at 11% to 15% for 7 person HHs, with a close third ranging between 8% to 11% of HH with 5 persons. The chart above shows HH size per district, Governorate and both Governorates together for a general average. What is noteworthy is that HH size may rise to 17 to 25 persons in a HH. Especially in Ramadi, Tikiaf and Hamdaniyyah with very miniscule proportions of the interviewed HHs.
5. Household | Legal Status

A majority of the respondents in the 4 Districts are returnees (i.e. 92% of the respondents in Fallujah, 92% of the respondents Ramadi, 92% of the respondents in Tikkaif and 82% of the respondents Hamdaniya). A smaller percentage of the respondents were IDPs (i.e. 8% of the respondents in Fallujah, 8% of the respondents Ramadi, 1% of the respondents in Tikkaif and 10% of the respondents Hamdaniya). Only 6% and 1% of the respondents in Hamdaniya are host communities and refugees respectively.

![Image of HH shelter type by HH legal status]

6. Household | Occupancy arrangements by Shelter Type

Occupancy Arrangements by Shelter Type

![Image of percentage of HH occupancy arrangements]

Information provided by responders shows that in majority of cases no occupancy arrangement for shelter takes place. House is the most popular shelter option in all districts with other options such as unfinished, abandoned or damaged residential building, residing in the home of relatives or members of the host community, apartment, tent, religious building and makeshift shelter (made of scavenged materials) are...
usually a singular case. In every district minority of houses are rented, Anbar Governorate has a noticeably higher percentage of rented houses then (25% in Falluja and 19% in Ramadi) over Ninawa Governorate (20% in Telafar, 15% in Hamdaniya and 12% in Tilkaif). In Ninawa Governorate there is also a noticeable higher number of cases of alternative shelter options. In Tilkaif District a few responders reported tents, damaged, unfinished or abandoned residential buildings as they place of stay while in Hamdaniya District a few cases of staying in damaged, unfinished or abandoned residential building and residing in the home of relatives or member of the host community were reported.

7. Household | Under Threat of Eviction: Occupancy Arrangements

Under Threat of Eviction: Occupancy Arrangements by Shelter Type

![Figure 7: HH that are under threat of eviction: Occupancy Arrangement: Rented or not Rented by Shelter Type]

According to responders feedback threat of eviction is more prevalent in Anbar Governorate than in Ninewa Governorate. In Falluja District several cases of threat eviction was reported, mainly related to either rented or not rented houses. In Ramadi District respondents living in rented houses were the biggest group reporting threat of eviction. The interesting numbers come from Telafar, where there is Zero threat of eviction to residents of any type of shelter, rented or not rented alike where figure 6 shows that the type of shelters in Telafar is unfinished buildings, tents and houses.
D. CASH

Cash component of the needs assessment is focused on analysis of assessed household income (source of income by district and source of income during last 30 days) and negative copying strategies (type of practised negative copying strategies divided for 7 days and 30 days and frequency of use). Provided analysis will compare differences between specific districts and their vulnerability level.

1. Source of Income by District

![Figure 8: Source of Income in the Last 30 days per District](image)

Information provided by responders shows that Ramadi and Telafar have the highest percentage of employed persons (31% and 29% respectively) followed by Tikkaif (25%). Falluja has the smallest percentage of population with permanent employment (16%). In Tikkaif (38%), Telafar (26%) and Hamdaniya (24%) similar percentage of responders generate income through daily labour, in case of Falluja only 8% of responders had access to daily labour and Ramadi (3%). Ramadi District has also the highest number of persons relying on retirement fund or pension with 22% of responders selecting this option, followed with Falluja and Hamdaniya (16%). In case of Tikkaif district only 10% of responders have access to retirement fund or pension. In Anbar Governorate significant number of responders selected loans and debt as their primary source of funds (25% in Falluja and 18% in Ramadi), this is significant difference when compared with Ninawa districts (6% for Hamdaniya, 3% for Tikkaif and 1% Telafar). Percentage of responders left with any source of income shows significant changes depending on Governorate level. While in Anbar only 5% in Falluja District and 2% in Ramadi District claims lack of income, in Ninawa 13% of responders in Hamdaniya and 7% in Telafar confirmed similar situation. Social protection network seems to provide significant assistance only in Ramadi District (11%) while this source of income nearly does not appear in other districts. Humanitarian assistance as a source of income appears in Ramadi and Tikkaif district (3% and 4% respectively), in case of Hamdaniya district no responders claimed to use humanitarian assistance as a main source of income, while in Falluja only 1% of responders marked this option. Support from the community, friends and family appears as one of main source of income in all districts: Ramadi (5%), Tikkaif (4%), Falluja (3%) and Hamdaniya (1%). Self-employment is much more prevalent in Ninawa Governorate where in Tikkaif district 10% of responders claims that this is their main source of income, followed by Hamdaniya (4%). In Anbar Governorate only 1% of Falluja responders mentioned self-employment, with no such response in Ramadi District. Remittances and social services were mentioned only by 1% of responders in Falluja and Hamdaniya respectively.
2. Household Income | Last 30 Days by District

Income Last 30 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Under 100 K IQD</th>
<th>100 K - 500 K IQD</th>
<th>500 K - 1 M IQD</th>
<th>1 M - 2 M IQD</th>
<th>2 M IQD</th>
<th>&gt;2 M IQD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falluja</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramadi</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telafar</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilkaif</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamdaniya</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Total Household income in IQD in the last 30 days per District

Results of total income generated by responders show similar trends thought all assessed districts. The most popular option selected by responders is income between 100 000 IQD till 500 000 IQD per month. This option was selected by 62% responders in Ramadi, followed by 55% in Falluja and Telafar, 50% in Tilkaif and 44% in Hamdaniya. Second most popular option was income between 500 000 IQD and 1 000 000 IQD, this range of income was selected by 27% of responders in Ramadi District, 25% in Tilkaif and Telafar, 24% in Falluja and 22% in Hamdaniya. Responders with minimum income of under 100 000 IQD were mainly identified in Hamdaniya District (21%), Tilkaif (20%), Telafar (18%) and followed by Falluja (17%) and significantly smaller percentage in Ramadi (10%). Income higher than 1 000 000 IQD was marginally present in all districts with an exemption of Hamdaniya where apart from 8% of responders who reported income between 1 000 000 IQD to 2 000 000 IQD there was also a 4% group with income higher than 2 000 000 IQD (such income was not reported in any other district).
Responders in T Ilkaif District identified borrowing food or asking assistance from relatives and friends as the most frequently used (33%) negative coping strategy during last 7 days, second most popular option was shifting towards cheaper and less quality food items which was reported by 28% of responders. Reducing the number of daily meals and consume less food during meals were third most popular negative coping strategy with 14% and 13% of responders selecting those options. 4% responders decided to select curbing the adults need to ensure food needs of children. 9% of responders decided not to answer on this question. Similar pattern can be seen in other Anbar Governorate district, Hamdaniya where slightly more persons (30%) selected shifting towards cheaper and less quality food items then borrowing food or asking assistance from relatives and friends (20%). Reducing the number of daily meals and consume less food during meals were third most popular negative coping strategy with 17% of responders selecting those options. A noticeable increase in curbing the adults need to ensure food needs of children negative coping strategy can be observed with 8% responders selecting this option, the same amount of responders decided not to answer on this question. In Ramadi district 46% of responders identified shifting towards cheaper and less quality food items as negative coping strategy that they follow. Large part of responders (31%) confirmed also that they borrow food or ask for assistance from relatives and friends. Reducing the number of daily meals and consume less food during meals were slightly less frequent when compared to Anbar Governorate with 11% and 8% of responders selecting those negative coping strategies. Only 1% of responders confirmed in Ramadi District that they use curbing the adults need to ensure food needs of children as one of negative coping strategies. 3% of responder’s decline to answer on this question. In Fallujah district more than half of provided answers (57%) was shifting towards cheaper and less quality food items. Remaining other options were much less popular with consume less food during meals was second most popular answer (12%) followed by reduction of number of daily meals (11%). Borrowing food or asking assistance from relatives and friends, much more popular option in other districts, was confirmed as only 10% of all answers provided in Hamdaniya district. 5% responders decided to select curbing the adults need to ensure food needs of children. 5% of responders decided not to answer on this question.
a. Coping Strategies | Last 7 days | Frequency of Use

More responders in Ninawa Governorate uses at least one negative coping strategy than in Anbar Governorate. 35% of responders in Hamdaniya, 32% of Tikraif and 31% of Talafar responders selected at least one negative coping strategy. Compared to that in Anbar Governorate only 22% of responders in Ramadi and 25% in Fallujah practises at least one negative coping strategy.

![Frequency of using at least one Coping Strategy per District in the last 7 days](image)

**Figure 11:** Frequency of using at least one Coping Strategy per District in the last 7 days

b. Coping Strategies | Last 7 days | Simultaneous Use

Information provided by responders presents that in Ninawa Governorate there is significant higher percentage of persons that do not follow negative coping strategies (17% in Tikraif and 16% in Hamdaniya) as compared to Anbar Governorate (5% in Ramadi and 8% in Falluja). On the other hand, severity of need is much higher in Ninawa Governorate where responders who followed more than one negative copying strategy are much more frequent (44% in Tikraif, 47% in Talafar and 51% in Hamdaniya). Compared to that in Anbar Governorate group of responders who confirmed using more than one negative coping strategy are less frequent (18% in Ramadi and 26% in Falluja).

![Proportion of HHs per district using a combination of coping strategies simultaneously in the last 7 days](image)

**Figure 12:** Proportion of HHs per district using a combination of coping strategies simultaneously in the last 7 days
4. Coping Strategies | Last 30 days

Coping Strategies | Last 30 Days

Results showed in Talafar the three most often used negative coping strategies are borrowing money from relatives and friends (45%), spending savings (22%) and selling household property (14%). Similar pattern can be noticed in other Ninewah Governorate districts in Tilkaif District the three most often used negative coping strategies are borrowing money from relatives and friends (39%), spending savings (23%) and selling household property (13%). In Hamdaniya where borrowing money from relatives and friends is still the most frequent negative coping strategy (25%) followed by spending savings (20%) and selling household property (18%). Analysis of Anbar Governorate negative coping strategies shows different approach of responders as compared to Ninewah Governorate. In Ramadi district most frequent followed negative coping strategy is borrowing money from relatives and friends (55%) and reducing expenditure on non-food items (health, education) (11%) being most popular. Fallujah District shares the same order of the most frequently used negative coping strategies with borrowing money from relatives and friends being the most popular (46%) followed by borrowing food or asking assistance from relatives and friends (13%) and reducing expenditure on non-food items (health, education) (12%). Children dropout from school was identified in three districts – Hamdaniya (7%), Fallujah (6%) and Tilkaif (3%). Changing place of residence was reported mainly by responders form Anbar Governorate – 6% in Fallujah District, 5% in Ramadi District and 1% in Hamdaniya District.
a. Coping Strategies | Last 30 days | Frequency of Use

Negative copying strategies frequency of use shows that Ninawa Governorate districts use negative copying strategies more frequent as compared to Anbar Governorate. 19% of responders in Hamdaniya and Telafar and 26% of Tikkaef responders selected at least one negative copying strategy. Compared to that in Anbar Governorate only 15% of responders in Ramadi and 17% in Fallujah practises at least one negative copying strategy.

Figure 14: Frequency of using at least one Coping Strategy per District in last 30 days

b. Coping Strategies | Last 30 days | Simultaneous Use

In all assessed locations similar group of responders confirmed that they do not follow any negative copying strategies (15% in Tikkaef District, 14% in Fallujah District, 12% in Hamdaniya District, 9% in Anbar District with significantly less in Telafar District – 2%). Severity of need is much higher in Ninawa Governorate where responders who followed more than one negative copying strategy are much more frequent (43% in Tikkaef and 61% in Hamdaniya). Compared to that in Anbar Governorate group of responders who confirmed using more than one negative copying strategy are less frequent (15% in Ramadi and 21% in Fallujah).

Figure 15: Proportion of HHs per district using a combination of coping strategies simultaneously
E. WASH

1. Water Sources, Issues, & Safety

a. Water Availability

A significant ratio of the host community and returnee households in accessible areas in Anbar and Mosul reported there are not experiencing water shortages. 100% of the respondents in Falluja, 99% of the respondents in Ramadi, 100% of the respondents in Telafar and Tilkaf, and 84% of the respondents in Hamdaniya. They noted that the water is available in their areas.

**Water Availability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Falluja</th>
<th>Ramadi</th>
<th>Telafar</th>
<th>Tilkaf</th>
<th>Hamdaniya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anbar</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninewa</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 16: Water Availability per District](image)

b. Water Availability by Water Source

Networks and boreholes constitute the least of main sources of water. 100% Networks in Falluja, Ramadi, Telafar and Tilkaf, in Hamdaniyah 77% of the water sources from Network, 23% boreholes and 1% trucking.

**Water Source by District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Falluja</th>
<th>Ramadi</th>
<th>Telafar</th>
<th>Tilkaf</th>
<th>Hamdaniya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anbar</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninewa</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 17: Main Source of water by District](image)
In general, there are no issues with the main water source which is supplied through the network but there is a huge issue when the main water source is a borehole and Trucking. The network is an available main water source in Falluja, 97% of respondents interviewed noted there are no issues with water sources but 3% have issues. In Ramadi and Telafar, the network is an available main water source 84% of respondents interviewed noted no issues with water sources whereas 16% have issues. In Talkaif the network and Borehole is an available main water source, In areas where the water source is a network 84% of respondents interviewed noted there are no issues with water sources whereas 16% have issues, In areas where the water source is a borehole 100% noted they have issues with water sources, In Hamadaniya the network, Borehole and Trucking are the available main water sources, In areas where the water source is a network 84% of respondents interviewed noted there are no issues with water sources whereas 16% have issues, In areas where the water source is a borehole 15% noted there are no issues with water sources as opposed to 85% having issues, In areas where the water source is Trucking 100% noted they have issues with water sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Network (pipe)</th>
<th>Borehole</th>
<th>Trucking</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
<th>Network (pipe)</th>
<th>Borehole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anbar</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telafar</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falluja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramadi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telafar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talkaif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talkaif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamadaniya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamadaniya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borehole</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: % of HH having an Issue with their Main Water Source
d. Water Safety: Opinion

In Falluja, 99% of respondents thought their water was not safe for drinking. The second highest was Hamdaniya at 79%. At a close third and forth 65% & 63% for Tilkaif and Ramadi whereas 41% of respondents in Telafar thought their water was not safe for drinking.

![Graph showing water safety opinions by district.](image)

**Figure 19:** Percentage of Respondents who think they have same drinking water

e. Water Safety | Criteria count

To compare opinion with actual water safety criteria, we inquired about turbidity, smell, taste, impurities and occurrence of illness within family members as a result of water consumption. Figure 20 shows the percentage of HH reporting the occurrence of “No issues” to the simultaneous occurrence of 1 to as many as all 5 criteria within their HH. 5% of HH in Hamdaniyya report no occurrence of any criterion, 18% of HH in Falluja and Tilkaif report no criterion whereas 28% of HH in Telafar and Ramadi report no occurrence of criterion. Even though the criterion are merely “First sign” indications of possible low quality water, it is troubling to see that at best 28% of HH are experiencing no occurrence of turbidity, taste, smell, impurities and illness. These numbers do corroborate the findings in Figure 19 to a significant extent where HH express their opinion of how unsafe their drinking water is.

![Graph showing water safety criteria count by district.](image)

**Figure 20:** Percentage of HH experiencing issues with their water
2. Water Bourne Diseases

a. Water Treatment Methods used

Because the respondents believe that the water is not safe enough for drinking, they use different methods to treat water such as filtration, boiling, chlorine, and tablets, but the biggest percentage used is filtration. In Telafar, Hamadaniya and Tilkaif, between 42% - 59% of the respondents do not treat the water, and the other uses different methods to treat water such as filtering, boiling, chlorine tablets, in Ramadi and Falluja most of the respondents they treat the water uses different methods such as filtration, boiling and chlorine tablets.

b. Water Transmission of Disease: Opinion

Most HH in Anbar and Ninevah have the knowledge and awareness that water can transmit diseases. in Falluja 100% mentioned that water can transmit diseases, in Ramadi 76% mentioned that water can transmit diseases but 24% they think the water does not transmit diseases, in Tilkaif 80% mentioned that water can transmit diseases but 20% they think the water does not transmit diseases. in Hamadaniya 84% mentioned that water can transmit diseases whereas 16% think water does not transmit diseases.
c. Illness in HH in last 3 Months

Most respondents mentioned that diarrhea was the most occurring in the past three months. Skin infection diseases came second and Typhoid fever in third place as the most common diseases that has hit families in the past three months.

A significant ratio of the host community and returnee households in Telafar and Tilkaif mentioned that in the last 3 months the most common illnesses they have been Respiratory infection, diarrhea, skin infection (e.g. Scabies), Eye infection, Typhoid fever. In Hamdaniya, Ramadi and Falluja Respiratory infection, diarrhea, Skin infection (e.g. Scabies), Eye infection, Leishmaniasis ('habit Baghdad'), Typhoid fever, Malaria.

d. Water related Diarrhoea Occurrence

Most HH affected by diarrhea related to water quality are reportedly in Hamdaniya at 60% of HH. In Tilkaif 41% of HH report occurrence of diarrhea with a close third for Falluja at 36% and then Ramadi at 15% and Telafar at 6% of HH reporting occurrence of Diarrhea within the 2 weeks prior to the interviews.
e. Water Concerns | Quality Vs Quantity

In the need assessment findings, in Ramadi and Falluja the quality of water is the main concern, but in Telafar, Tilkaif and Hamdaniya, the quality and quantity of water is the main concern.

In Falluja 97% they concern about the quality of water and 3% about Both. In Ramadi 67% about the quantity, 10% about the quality and 25% about both. In Telafar 36% about the quality, 9% about the quantity and 55% about both. In Tilkaif 41% about quality, 3% about quality and 55% about Both. In Hamdaniya 60% about Both, 35% about quality and 4% about quantity.

f. Water Storage Cleaning

Most people have the knowledge and awareness that cleaning water storage is very important, for this reason, the assessment showed that the majority of HH interviewed clean their water storage tanks. The highest percentage of HH that do not clean their water storage is in Falluja at 41%. Whereas the percentages in all other locations are 29% and below.
3. Stagnant Water

a. Stagnant Water Causes: Opinion

The water accumulated in front of houses is a major challenge as it poses a threat to the environmental and health hazard to the families, most of the areas do not have a drainage channel and the other out of work because it is broken. In Falluja 60% for the drainage channel is broken and 40% there is no drainage channel, In Ramadi 44% for the drainage channel is broken and 56% there is no drainage channel, In Telafar 27% for the drainage channel is broken and 73% there is no drainage channel, In Tikaf and Hamdaniya 5% for the drainage channel is broken and 95% there is no drainage channel.

4. Sanitation

a. Type of Sewage System

The need assessment showed that some area have a sewage network, others they have cesspool or manhole and some area they don’t have sewage network. In Falluja 54% they have sewage network, 38% they have cesspool or manhole and 9% they don’t have sewage network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Only cesspool or manhole</th>
<th>No Sewage network</th>
<th>Sewage network</th>
<th>Open/External Channels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falluja</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramadi</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telafar</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikaf</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamdaniya</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Ramadi 42% they have sewage network, 57% they have cesspool and or manhole 1% they don’t have sewage network, In Telafar 6% they have sewage network, 93% they have cesspool and or manhole 1% they don’t have sewage network, In Tilkaf 19% they have sewage network, 70% they have cesspool or manhole, 2% they don’t have sewage network and 9% they have open channels. In Hamdaniya 7% they have sewage network, 68% they have cesspool or manhole, 5% they don’t have sewage network and 19% they have open channels.

b. Sewage System Issues

Most respondents explained that there are many problems in the sewer as most of the areas they don’t have a sewer network and if they have, the networks are not working well because there are many broken pipes. 17% of the proportion of host community & returnee households in Falluja they mention there is no problem in the sewage system, 42% they mentioned the sewage system not functional and 41% they mentioned there is no sewage system. In Ramadi 38% they mentioned there is no problem in the sewage system, 17% they mentioned the sewage system not functional and 45% they mentioned there is no sewage system. In Telafar 21% they mentioned there is no problem in the sewage system, 25% they mentioned the sewage system not functional and 63% they mentioned there is no sewage system. In Tilkaf 31% they mentioned there is no problem in the sewage system, 5% they mentioned the sewage system not functional and 64% they mentioned there is no sewage system. In Hamdaniya 17% they mentioned there is no problem in the sewage system, 2% they mentioned the sewage system not functional and 90% they mentioned there is no sewage system.
5. Solid Waste Management

a. Solid Waste Disposal

In order to understand the existing conditions of the solid waste management, the surveyed households were asked about whether there is any functional solid waste management system. The majority of surveyed households reported not having a functional solid waste management system. Where it is reported most of the respondents mentioned that they use different methods to dispose of the solid waste and one of the most common methods is throwing the garbage in open areas and place the garbage in their own garbage bins. In Falluja 75% of the respondents they place the garbage in their own garbage bins and 17% they throw it in the open areas, in Ramadi 57% they place the garbage in their own garbage bins, 24% they throw it in the open areas, 2% they burn it and 14% in the main garbage bins. In Telafar 39% of the respondents they place the garbage in their own garbage bins, 60% they throw it in the open areas and 1% they burn it. In Tilkaif 34% they place the garbage in their own garbage bins and 63% they throw it in the open areas, in Hamadaniya 16% they place the garbage in their own garbage bins, 82% they throw it in the open areas and 1% they burn it.

b. Solid Waste Management Issues by District

Figure 31 shows that in Hamdaniya, Tilkaif and Telafar, there are issues with solid waste management ranging relatively equally between the absence of HH bins, communal bins, garbage collection trucks, and dump sites. These issues seem to become less or dump sites and garbage collection trucks but stay at a similar range of 26% to 33% for HH bins & communal bins. Looking at Falluja and Ramadi, they display 39% and 22% no issues in regards to Solid waste management.
c. Garbage Truck Pickup Frequency

Garbage collection is the most difficult challenge for families, where the assessment found that the duration of garbage collection varies from area to area. In Falluja the assessment shown that 26% daily collected, 51% weekly, 11% every two weeks and 9% once per month. In Ramadi 47% daily, 30% weekly, 5% every two weeks, 5% once per month and 12% Never. In Telafar 3% daily, 6% twice per week, 8% weekly, 22% every two weeks, 28% once per month and 33% Never. In Tilkaif 11% daily, 9% twice per week, 14% weekly, week, 10% every two weeks, 9% once per month and 48% Never. In Hamdaniya 3% daily, 5% twice per week, 9% weekly and 83% Never.

6. Hygiene

a. Communications on HP: Opinion

Regarding the best ways to receive information on keeping healthy and hygienic:
In Telafar 31% prefer to get the information from the schools, 33% from Health Centers, 13% posters, leaflets, 22% hygiene sessions and 1% internet/social media. In Tilkaif 28% from the schools, 24% from Health Centers, 22% posters, leaflets and 26% hygiene sessions. 32% of the schools in Hamdaniya, 27% from the Health Centers, 23% poster, leaflets, 16% hygiene sessions and 2% from the media. In Ramadi, 13% from the schools, 78% from the Health Centers, 5% from posters, leaflets, 2% hygiene sessions and 2% from the media. In Fallouja, 21% from the schools, 53% from the Health Centers, 17% from the posters, leaflets, 1% hygiene sessions and 9% from the media.
V. Conclusions

A. Conclusions | CASH

Income analysis indicates that Ninawa Governorate districts are more vulnerable when compared to Anbar Governorate districts. In Tilkaif 7% of responders confirmed having no source of income, in Hamdaniya this level reached 13% responders as compared to 2% in Ramadi and 5% in Falluja. Furthermore, level of income shows that higher percentage of responders has only minimal income (less than 100 000 IQD per month) in Ninawa Governorate (20% in Tilkaif District, 21% in Hamdaniya District and 18% in Telafar District). In Anbar group with minimum income is less frequent (10% in Ramadi and 17% in Falluja).

Negative copying strategies also clearly indicates higher vulnerability level in Ninawa Governorate. Practise of negative copying strategy in Ninawa Governorate is much more frequent (43% in Tilkaif, 40 in Telafar and 61% in Hamdaniya of responders using more than one negative copying strategy). Compared to that in Anbar Governorate group of responders who confirmed using more than one negative copying strategy is less frequent (15% in Ramadi and 21% in Falluja). Based on that multipurpose cash assistance should primarily respond to identified higher needs in Ninawa Governorate.

B. Conclusions | WASH

Water:

A significant proportion of the host community and returnee households in accessed areas reported not experiencing water shortages except Hamdaniyah where some 16% of the respondents have indicated concerns of critical shortage of water. The biggest concern for the HHs is the quality of water, where they noticed that the water showed smell, turbidity, impurities, and there is a taste in the water. Some of the HHs reported that they use different methods to treat the water like filtration, boiling and chlorine tablets; while a good portion of them reported that they drink the water without any treatments (mostly due to the financial constraints).

Sanitation:

The needs assessment findings showed that some areas rely on sewage network while others use cesspool or manhole. A good portion of the respondents in the five Districts (an average of 42%) complained about non-functioning sewage system while others complained of not having the sewage system at all (this represents an average of 38% of the respondents in all the five locations).

Solid Waste Management:

There are better solid Waste Management systems up and running in the assessed Anbar Districts than the one of Ninewa. The main solid waste management issues identified by the assessment include lack of household garbage bins and communal garbage bins, absence of garbage trucks and also dump site. While the issues in Anbar are mostly Solid Waste Management systems not operating consistently (for example garbage truck frequency of collection), the issues in the assessed Districts in Ninewa is mostly the total absence of such Solid Waste Management mechanisms.
Hygiene:

Most of the assessed communities have knowledge and awareness that water can transmit diseases and the cleaning water storage is very important. The figures are higher for Anbar than Ninewa. The Households interviewed during the assessment mostly prefer to receive information on health and hygiene from the schools, Health Centers, posters, leaflets, hygiene sessions and internet/social media.

VI. Recommendations

General WASH recommendations:

1. Promote safe water handling and good water quality through water treatment, regular quality testing water, monitoring and reporting of water quality results (All Districts).
2. For sustainability work closely with other WASH actors and invest in cost effective and durable solutions to issues of water treatment and solid waste management. (All Districts).
3. Set up and/or improvement of sanitation facilities and contextually appropriate hygiene awareness to mitigate increased public health risks (All Districts).
4. Provide integrated WASH interventions (in schools and health facilities) to increase impact and coverage among returnees. (All Districts).
5. Carry out limited environment clean up through support to municipal solid waste disposal, drainage management and wastewater treatment. (Hamdaniyah and Tilkaif).
6. Build and strengthen capacity of local actors and community for promotion of hygiene and sanitation services. (All Districts).

General Cash Based Intervention (CBI) recommendations:

1. Within the framework or guidance of the multipurpose cash assistance cluster prioritized locations for 2019, the cash assistance should primarily respond to identified higher needs in Tilkaif and Hamdaniya (average 48% in terms of frequency of negative copying strategies) to be followed by Ramadi and Fallujah (average 18% in terms of frequency of negative copying strategies).
2. Conduct market assessments and price monitoring as an integral part of the implementation of the multipurpose cash assistance. (All Districts).
3. Potential links with WASH should also be explored as follows: (All Districts).
   3.1 Coordinate with WASH Cluster to ensure that Cash for Work and community WASH asset replacement (including infrastructure repairs and care and maintenance,) modalities are integrated.
   3.2 Pursue market-based approaches: vouchers; WASH package (for returnees) and other livelihoods opportunities where possible.
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<td>CASH</td>
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<tr>
<td>DoW</td>
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D. PAH – Multi-sectorial needs Assessment HH questionnaire

PAH – Multi-sectoral Needs Assessment HH questionnaire

A. Information
1. Location
   latitude (x,y °)
   ________________________________
   longitude (x,y °)
   ________________________________
   altitude (m)
   ________________________________
   accuracy (m)
   ________________________________

2. Date
   yyyy-mm-dd
   ________________________________

3. Collector name
   ________________________________

4. Which data collection team are you?

   ○ Nenawa 1
   ○ Anbar 1
   ○ Anbar 4
   ○ Nenawa 2
   ○ Anbar 2
   ○ Team 8
   ○ Nenawa 3
   ○ Anbar 3

4. Governorate
   ________________________________

5. District
   ________________________________

6. Village, Town, City / Locality
   ________________________________

Introduction & Consent
Good day Madame, Sir. My name is and this is my colleague _ I am working for PAH in Iraq. We are currently in the process of planning our yearly activities for 2019 for your District. Which is why we are here today to fill this questionnaire with you so that we can make sure that the assistance we plan for is adequate for you and your needs. Will you give us 40 minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire?

It is important that we highlight that this conversation is characterised by the following:

1. This conversation is confidential and will be shared only with relevant staff within PAH

2. This conversation is voluntary, which means that you have the right to withhold any information you are not comfortable sharing and that you are free to stop the conversation at any point you like.

3. This conversation does not guarantee that you will get a resolution, what it does guarantee is that PAH management will be informed and will try their best to provide a resolution.

Do you give us your consent to all of the above and start the interview?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Begin the Survey

» B. Beneficiary Information

1. Gender respondent

☐ Female
☐ Male
☐ Prefers not to Answer

2. Age of respondent

__________________________

3. Respondent Phone number (ex. 0123 4567 9910)

__________________________

a. Who is the owner of this phone?

☐ My number/My spouse’s Number
☐ Camp management
☐ Relative living far away
☐ Our Neighbour
☐ Relative living nearby
☐ Other

4. Who is the Head of Household?

☐ Female (under 18 year)
☐ Female elderly (over 60 years)
☐ Male adult (18-59)
☐ Female adult (18-59)
☐ Male (under 18 year)
☐ Male elderly (over 60)
☐ Prefers not to answer
6. Household legal status?

- IDP
- Host communitite
- Returnee
- Refugee
- Prefers not to Answer

7. What type of shelter are you currently living in? *

- House
- Tent
- Apartment
- Religious building
- Hotel
- Public building (school, etc.)
- Unfinished building or abandoned residential building
- Container
- Damaged residential building
- Non-residential structure (garage, farm, house, shop)
- Makeshift shelter (made of scavenged materials)
- Residing in the home of relatives or members of the host community
- Other
- Prefers not to Answer

8. Are you living in a rental house/shelter? *

- Yes
- No
- Prefers not to Answer

8. Beneficiary information

B. Please input the number of each HH members including the Head of Household and respondent.

9.a. Number of Children under 5 year

_________________________

9.b. Number of Children between 5 and 18 year

_________________________

9.c. Number of Adults between 18 and 60 year

_________________________

9.d. Number of Elderly over 60 year

_________________________
9.e. Number of Mentally Disabled
0

9.f. Number of Physically Disabled
0

9.g. Number of pregnant or lactating
0

9. Sum of HH members **

PAH plans to implement Cash activities in this area?

- Yes
- No

C. Cash

1. Do you share housing with another household?

- Yes
- No
- Prefers not to Answer

2. How many families share your shelter? (including yours)

3. Do you currently face risk of eviction?

- Yes
- No
- Prefers not to Answer

3.a If YES, What are the main reasons for eviction?

________________________

________________________

________________________
4. In your current location, what is the household's primary sources of income and support?

- Employment
- Remittances
- Retirement fund or pension
- Selling Household Assets
- Loans, Debt
- MoDM Cash Assistance
- Support from The Community, Friends, Family
- NGO or charity assistance
- Social Services (disability allowance)
- Illegal or socially degrading activities (e.g., unlawful sales, begging, etc.)
- Humanitarian aid
- Borrowing money
- Social Protection Network
- None
- Other safety nets
- Other (specify)
- Prefers not to Answer

4.a. If other, please specify:

5. In your current location, how many household members over 18 have worked in the past month? (including head of HH)

6. When did you last received Government Salary, Pension, or MoDM Cash Assistance?

   yyyy-mm

7. In your current location, what is the total income of your household over the past 30 days (including any governmental salary, pension, or MoDM Cash Assistance)? IQD only.
   Please insert the '0' for thousands ex: #9,000

8. During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to do one of the following things because there was not enough food or money to buy it?

- Spending savings
- Selling household property
- Buying food on credit or through borrowed money from relatives and friends
- Children dropout from school
- Reducing expenditure on non-food items (health, education)
- Changing place of residence and accommodation to reduce expenses
- Borrowing food or asking assistance from relatives and friends
- Other
- Prefers not to Answer
8.a. If other, please specify:

9. During the last 7 days, how many times, in days, did your household have to employ one of the following strategies to cope with a lack of food or money to buy it?

- [ ] Shifting towards cheaper and less quality food items
- [ ] Borrowing food or asking assistance from relatives and friends
- [ ] Reducing the number of daily meals
- [ ] Consume less food during meals
- [ ] Curbing the adults’ need to ensure food needs of children
- [ ] Prefers not to Answer

* You have chosen “Yes” for question “C.3” above without specifying in “C.3.a”... Please have a look...
  - [ ] OK

* You have chosen “Other” for question “C.4” above without specifying in “C.4.a”... Please have a look...
  - [ ] OK

* You have chosen “Other” for question “C.8” above without specifying in “C.8.a”... Please have a look...
  - [ ] OK

PAH plans to implement WASH activities in this area?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

» D. WASH

» » D. Water

1. Do you have water?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Prefers not to Answer

1.a. If it is no what is the issue

2. What is the main source of water?

- [ ] Network (pipe)
- [ ] Borehole
- [ ] Trucking
- [ ] Buy bottled water
- [ ] Other (specify)
- [ ] Prefers not to Answer
2.a. If other, please specify:

3. Do you have an issue with the main source of water?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefers not to Answer

2.a. If yes, what is the issue

4. How many liters does your HH use per day?*

4.a. Is the amount of water you get daily enough?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefers not to Answer

4.b. If no, How much water does your HH need per day?

5. Is there a water network in the area?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefers not to Answer

5.a. Is the water network working well?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefers not to Answer

5.b. If it is no what is the issue

6. Is there any problem with water access to the house?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefers not to Answer
6a. If it is yes what is the issue

7. Do you think the water is safe enough for drinking?
   
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Prefers not to Answer

* You have chosen "No" for question "D.1" above without specifying in "D.1.a" ... Please have a look...
   ☐ OK

* You have chosen "Other" for question "D.2" above without specifying in "D.2.a" ... Please have a look...
   ☐ OK

* You have chosen "Yes" for question "D.3" above without specifying in "D.3.a" ... Please have a look...
   ☐ OK

* You have chosen "No" for question "D.4" above without specifying in "D.4.a" ... Please have a look...
   ☐ OK

* You have chosen "No" for question "D.5.a" above without specifying in "D.5.b" ... Please have a look...
   ☐ OK

* You have chosen "Yes" for question "D.6" above without specifying in "D.6.a" ... Please have a look...
   ☐ OK

D. Water quality

7a. Did you notice any smell in the water?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Prefers not to Answer

7b. Did you notice turbidity/color in the water?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Prefers not to Answer

7c. Did you notice any impurities in the water (Dust, sand, twigs, Other)
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Prefers not to Answer

7d. Did you notice any Taste in the water?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Prefers not to Answer

7e. Did the water make anyone in your family sick?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Prefers not to Answer

>> D. Water quality

8. Has any diarrhea related to drinking water been reported in the last two weeks?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Prefers not to Answer
9. In terms of water, what is the biggest concern for you?

- Quality
- Quantity
- Both
- Other
- Prefers not to Answer

10. Do you clean your water storage containers?

- Yes
- No
- Prefers not to Answer

» » E. Sanitation

1. Is there water outside the house?

- Yes
- No
- Prefers not to Answer

2. What is causing standing water?

- There is no open channel
- The open channel is broken
- Other (specify)
- Prefers not to Answer

2.a. If other, please specify:

3. What kind of sewerage system you have?

- Sewage network
- Only cesspool or manhole
- Other (specify)
- Prefers not to Answer

3.a. If other, please specify:

4. Is there a problem with the sewerage system?

- No problem
- No sewerage system
- Sewage system is broken
- Other (specify)
- Prefers not to Answer
4.a. If other, please specify:

* You have chosen "Other" for question "E.2" above without specifying in "E.2.a" ... Please have a look...
  - OK

* You have chosen "Other" for question "E.3" above without specifying in "E.3.a" ... Please have a look...
  - OK

* You have chosen "Other" for question "E.4" above without specifying in "E.4.a" ... Please have a look...
  - OK

» » F. Solid Waste Management

1. Where do you dispose of your solid garbage?

  - On mean garbage bin
  - On my own garbage bin
  - I throw it in the open area
  - Other (specify)
  - Prefers not to Answer

1.a. If other, please specify:

2. What are the main problems with garbage? (maity chose)

  - No problem
  - There no HH garbage bins
  - There are no communal garbage bins
  - There is no garbage track to collect the garbage
  - There is no dump site in the area
  - Other (specify)
  - Prefers not to Answer

2.a. If other, please specify:

3. Is there communal garbage bin?

  - Yes
  - No
  - Prefers not to Answer
4. How often the garbage truck collects the garbage?

- Daily
- Weekly
- Every tow week
- One per month
- Other (specify)
- Prefers not to Answer

4.a. If other, please specify:

- You have chosen “Other” for question “F.1” above without specifying in “F.1.a”... Please have a look...
  - OK

- You have chosen “Other” for question “F.2” above without specifying in “F.2.a”... Please have a look...
  - OK

- You have chosen “Other” for question “F.4” above without specifying in “F.4.a”... Please have a look...
  - OK

G. Hygiene Promotion

1. How do you treat the water, if you do?

- I'm not doing any thinks
- Filtration
- Boiling
- Chlorine
- Tablet
- Other (state)
- Prefers not to Answer

1.a. If other, please specify:

2. Do you think that water can transmit diseases?

- Yes
- No
- Prefers not to Answer

3. Which of the following illnesses have most affected you and your family recently (in last 3 months)?

- Respiratory Infection
- Diarrhea
- Skin Infection (e.g. Scabies)
- Eye Infection
- Leishmaniasis ('habit Baghdad')
- Typhoid fever
- Malaria
- Prefers not to Answer
4. What are the best ways to receive information on keeping healthy and hygienic?

- At school
- Posters, leaflets
- Other (describe)
- Health center/clinic
- Hygiene promoters
- Prefers not to Answer

4.a. If other, please specify:

* You have chosen "Other" for question "G.1" above without specifying in "G.1.a" ... Please have a look...
  - OK

* You have chosen "Other" for question "G.4" above without specifying in "G.4.a" ... Please have a look...
  - OK