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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As the Syrian crisis enters its seventh year and refugees’ resources wane due to their prolonged displacement, families are struggling to make rent payments, income sources are not sustainable, many people are going into debt and school enrolment rates for Syrian children, especially in urban areas, are low. With prospects for returning to Syria uncertain in the next 12 months, WFP and UNHCR carried out a Joint Vulnerability Assessment (JVA).

The assessment investigated the status of Syrian refugees – in camps and outside of camps – to determine food-targeting criteria that would allow programme adjustments based on needs. It also was designed to address long-standing concerns expressed by refugees and local authorities regarding previous targeting.

Although the vast majority of the Syrian refugee population in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI) is able to acquire sufficient food for an active and healthy life, the same cannot be said for the estimated 17,000 Syrian refugees (7 percent of the total refugee population) who are food insecure. Worse food insecurity was observed among the refugees living in camps compared with those living outside of the camps, with the Erbil camps showing a higher proportion of food insecure households. The difference between camp and non-camp food insecurity can be linked to the economic situation. For example, households living in non-camp areas have better access to employment opportunities.

It is important to note, however, that the proportion of households at risk of food insecurity is substantial, and measures need to be in place to ensure that their food security does not deteriorate. This could be achieved through the implementation of livelihoods projects that are driven by market needs and supported by pre-existing skills, and that, in turn, improve refugees’ self-reliance.

With regard to households headed by women, the conclusion of this study is in line with other studies done in the region. Male-headed households are more food secure than female-headed households. Sulaymaniyah showed the highest proportion of food insecure refugee households headed by women, compared with the other governorates.

The poorest households showed higher food insecurity than the better-off households, indicating the need to factor wealth into targeting criteria. However, it is important to note that the poverty and food insecurity lines are not the same.

An analysis of infant and young child feeding information concluded that about a quarter of children did not receive the recommended minimum meal frequency (MMF), pointing to an inadequacy of calories and other macronutrients and micronutrients necessary for growth and development. Addressing the dietary diversity gaps may increase the proportion of children consuming at the minimum acceptable diet (MAD) level, while addressing food insecurity may support improved infant and young child feeding.

Iraq’s agriculture sector has declined considerably during the last few decades due to the lack of investment, isolation from the global economy, conflict and counterproductive agricultural policies. Iraq has been dependent on importing a significant portion of its food, with almost all Syrian refugees confirming that the main source of food is the market, followed by voucher/ecard assistance. Market monitoring is therefore critical to ensuring that any change in prices does not negatively impact food security, especially of the most vulnerable population.

Households use different coping mechanisms, which vary across the governorates and across levels of vulnerability. The study concluded that more than half of Syrian households in all governorates experienced a lack of food or of money to buy enough food to meet the needs of their household members. In addition, a quarter of Syrian refugee households in Erbil and Sulaymaniyah used consumption coping strategies irrespective of their food security status. Eating less preferred food, limiting portion sizes and reducing the number of meals were the most commonly used coping mechanisms.

In Erbil and Duhok, it was widely observed that vulnerable families experienced asset depletion and indebtedness, and needed to resort to a set of coping mechanisms that negatively impacted their lives and the community at large. Appropriate application of the targeting criteria will ensure that the most vulnerable households benefit from social protection programmes. Their resilience to shocks should be built so that these families no longer engage in negative coping mechanisms, such as selling household properties (refrigerator, television, jewellery, etc.), pulling children out of school or engaging household members in illegal and risky acts.

The study concluded that one third of Syrian refugee households in Erbil and Duhok have no sources of income. However, among those that have at least one source of livelihood, non-agriculture casual labour remains the most commonly reported livelihood activity in all governorates. At this stage, it is important to note that wealth is different from income as a factor relating to food security, with wealth pertaining to assets and liabilities.

In all governorates, more than half of the Syrian refugees participated in employment activities in the three months prior to the assessment, and almost half of those who participated in any employment activity did not have any formal type of education. Surprisingly, nobody who attended technical school in Sulaymaniyah had participated in employment activities in the three months prior to the assessment. This suggests that vocational training and livelihood-oriented capacity-building initiatives should be carefully tailored to the needs of the labour market. Enhancing access to existing livelihood opportunities would inevitably result in enhanced capacity to purchase food and increased food security.

The key factors driving food insecurity for Syrian refugees living in Iraq were used to develop potential targeting criteria for assistance. Factors in the camps included household size, literacy level, job skills, and presence of pregnant or lactating women, while household size and wealth status were more relevant for non-camp refugees.

**Recommendations**

Continuation of food assistance for Syrian refugees calls for developing accurate targeting to ensure that food insecure households receive the assistance they need. At the same time, the targeting should allow for the identification of families that are not receiving food assistance but appear to be food insecure, and those that are likely to become so, due to their socio-economic and protection vulnerabilities.

Further to the study outcomes, UNHCR and WFP concluded that a joint monitoring and targeting exercise should be applied to verify which households are food insecure and to assess the multi-dimensional vulnerability of refugee households. To this aim, the food security calculation model used during the JVA should be combined with protection indicators.

Existing UNHCR registration data should be used to provide an initial prediction of which families are food insecure, based on the JVA’s sample findings. A phased targeting exercise will allow for the careful
monitoring of vulnerable households in the camps, in order to verify their food security and protection status.

WFP and UNHCR will combine efforts and resources to conduct the targeting exercise gradually and in a transparent and informative manner to minimize the impact on the refugee population. Standard operating procedures (SOPs) should be drawn up to clearly delineate responsibilities through this process.

Targeting should be conducted in close coordination with local authorities, refugee communities, camp management and other service providers.

2. INTRODUCTION

The Republic of Iraq is a middle income country with a number of key factors challenging its stability and the implementation of UN assistance for refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). Spill over from the Syrian civil war and ensuing regional instability, as well as domestic tensions and divisions have impacted the political and economic stability of the country. In addition, the war to retake areas from the Islamic State was ongoing from 2015 to 2017 and caused successive displacements of people. A stagnant socio-economic environment and the lack of basic services further hamper daily life in Iraq.

It is within this context that UNHCR, WFP and other UN agencies and partners deliver assistance and protection to vulnerable groups.

As of September 2017, there were 246,434 registered Syrian refugees and 80,795 refugee households in Iraq.2 Of these, 62 percent reside outside of the camps in urban, peri-urban and rural areas (Figure 1 shows the refugee locations). The majority of these refugees are concentrated in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI), where they account for 4 percent of the total population.3 The Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) maintains a welcoming environment towards refugees and returnees, providing UN staff a safe operational environment. However, massive drops in international oil prices have negatively affected the construction industry which had been booming. This has reduced livelihoods for locals as well as for the refugees who gain income through casual labour.

3 According to the Kurdistan Region Statistic Office, the total population in KRI as of 2018 is 5,895,052. Source http://www.krso.net/Default.aspx?page=article&id=899&l=1&
As the Syrian crisis enters its seventh year and refugees’ resources wane due to their prolonged displacement, UN and NGO staff members have noticed increasing levels of vulnerability among Syrians, particularly those outside of the camps. Refugee households have difficulties making rent payments, which they cite as the most frequent reason behind evictions, with many living in shared accommodations. Income sources are not sustainable and many resort to borrowing money, leading to high levels of debt, or the selling of assets.

As per the WFP-UNHCR global Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), periodic joint assessments are recommended as joint operations. The most recent Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) was conducted Feb–May 2014. In a joint February 2017 meeting between WFP and UNHCR in Erbil, it was agreed that the JAM should take the shape of vulnerability assessments and should be conducted jointly by UNHCR and WFP throughout the region.

The JVA investigated the status of Syrian refugees – in camps and outside of camps – to determine targeting criteria that would allow programme adjustments based on needs, and also address a long standing concern expressed by refugees and local governments regarding previous targeting. This study also identified proxy indicators of socio-economic vulnerability and food insecurity that would facilitate targeting the segment of the refugee population that is most in need.

As the economic downturn in the KRI has impacted all refugees, this study is important at this stage. In addition to identifying refugees’ evolving needs, it provides an opportunity for both WFP and UNHCR to gather data on livelihoods.

“This study is a joint exercise organized by WFP and UNHCR in close collaboration with the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) and more specifically the Kurdistan Region Statistics Office (KRSO) of the Ministry of Planning.”
3. OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of the JVA was to assess the vulnerability of refugees across multiple sectors with:

- an immediate focus and prioritization of the food security assessment – this covered both camp and non-camp refugees and has led to programmatic recommendations on processes and criteria for targeting the most vulnerable and food insecure;

- a medium-term focus on multi-sectoral vulnerability in terms of food security, shelter, health, education and specific needs – this also resulted in programmatic recommendations on processes and criteria for targeting the most vulnerable in each sector, including a cross-sectoral comparison.

In particular, the following objectives were implemented.

- Provide an updated and comprehensive picture of multi-sectoral vulnerabilities with a priority on food insecurity among Syrian refugees in the KRI.

- Inform decision-making for inter-agency interventions, informing appropriate assistance responses and targeting criteria for support pertaining to the mandates of WFP and UNHCR.

- Identify resilience programming options for refugee groups based on their skills, the labour market situation and access to markets.

4. METHODOLOGY

The study was led by WFP, in collaboration with UNHCR and with quantitative data collection conducted by the Kurdistan Region Statistics Office (KRSO). The data collection, which took place in August and September 2017, was complemented by qualitative data collection, including focus group discussions (FGDs).

Data and information were collected and compiled by the assessment team through a combination of secondary and primary data analysis. The following methods were used by the JVA team to accomplish the objectives of the exercise.

**Review of secondary data/information.** For the first phase, this comprised reviewing previous assessments undertaken in the KRI, as well as any other available and relevant secondary data sources.

**Quantitative assessment.** The quantitative element of the study provides statistically representative estimates of multi-sectoral needs, including key vulnerability and food security indicators. WFP and UNHCR provided joint training to the enumerators prior to the commencement of the data collection activity. The enumerators then collected data using Open Data Kit (ODK) tablets.

**Qualitative assessment.** To validate the set of targeting criteria through a qualitative study, WFP and UNHCR conducted ten FGDs across the nine refugee camps that are within the KRI during the first week of December 2017.

**Sample design.** The KRSO provided technical support in preparing a survey sampling plan and drawing enumeration areas. Two strata – camps and outside of camps – were identified and used for the study.

A two-stage cluster design was employed to provide statistically representative results, both inside and outside of camps. The first stage involved selection of clusters/enumeration areas, and the second stage involved selection of households. Clusters were selected using probability proportional to size
Households in the clusters/enumeration areas were selected through systematic random sampling drawn from household listings provided by local government authorities.

The sample size for camps and outside of the camps was determined according to the following statistical parameters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence interval (CI)</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design effect</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin of error for 95% CI</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response distribution</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-response rate</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this, interviews were conducted with a sample of 845 households for each of the two strata – for a total of 1,690 households for the whole survey. The response rate was 99.8 percent.

While the household survey established the extent of food insecurity and overall vulnerability of both camp and non-camp refugees, the FGDs were key to determining the targeting criteria and the viability of different targeting methods.

In this study, the following topics were covered.

**Food security and child nutrition**
- Assess food availability, in particular at refugee household level and in all the areas hosting refugees
- Assess food needs and the appropriateness of on-going food assistance
- Assess household access to food, in particular refugees’ current livelihood practices, including access to income and food-security-related assistance, as well as any factors inhibiting their access
- Assess coping mechanisms
- Highlight any gaps in the food-security-related assistance
- Describe future prospects and probable scenarios for resilience programming
- Indicate child illness issues
- Describe practices of infant and young child feeding, and child vaccination.

**Overall vulnerability**
- Assess the socio-economic status of households, looking at factors such as income and expenditure, debt and employment status
- Analyse the severity of coping strategies used to meet basic needs, such as child labour
- Explore the high non-attendance school rates of Syrian refugee boys, particularly those outside of camps
- Assess the vulnerability of households, using a multi-sectoral approach
- Improve understanding of refugees' working conditions.

**Targeting**
- Assess the potential for targeted assistance and associated risks, and identify potential target groups and eligibility criteria
- Identify and recommend verifiable targeting criteria to select the most vulnerable and food insecure, using geographic and/or household criteria
- Consider possible methods for targeting.
5. DEMOGRAPHICS

According to the survey, the average refugee household consisted of 4.7 members, of whom 19.2 percent were children aged 5 and below, 26.5 percent were children in the 6–17 age group, and 54.5 percent were adults aged 18 and above. Additionally, the ratio of males to females showed similar numbers for the two genders, with males slightly higher at 50.5 percent.

Figure 2: Age pyramid

Almost one in every ten households was female headed (8%). Of those females who were older than 15, 2.2 percent were single, 92.7 percent married and 4.3 percent widowed.

Among the females, 15 percent were reported being pregnant and 19 percent lactating. Almost one third (34.9 percent) of households reported having at least one member with disability problems. The prevalence of disabilities for heads of households was reported to be 18.4 percent, while 9.4 percent of all refugees were reported as having a chronic illness and 10.4 percent as having a temporary illness.

Of the household members above age 60, 20.9 percent were reported as being at risk and without support, warranting this group to be targeted for humanitarian assistance.
Dependency ratio is an age-population ratio of those typically not in the labour force, including dependents whose ages range from 0 to 14, and those 65 and above. It also includes those typically in the labour force, of productive ages between 15 and 64.\(^4\) It is used to measure the pressure on the productive population.

From the results, it can be observed that 45 percent had a dependency ratio of 50 percent and below, while over one quarter (27 percent) had a dependency ratio of 100 percent and above. A high dependency ratio can cause serious problems for a country, as a large proportion of governmental expenditure goes for health, social security and education to support the dependent population. Among those households with a high dependency ratio, the likelihood of being vulnerable to food insecurity is high, especially if they lack a sustainable source of income.

6. MAIN FINDINGS

6.1 Current food security situation

The food security situation was measured and classified using the Consolidated Approach to Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI) methodology.\(^5\) This entailed grouping households according to their levels of food security based on the household’s food consumption indicators and coping capacity, and using indicators measuring economic vulnerability and asset depletion. The food security grouping included severely food insecure (SFI), moderately food insecure (MFI), marginally food secure (MFS) and food secure (FS).

On average, about 7 percent of Syrian refugees in Iraq are food insecure, 6 percent moderately and 1 percent severely. By governorate, the highest proportion of severely food insecure in camp are in Erbil (16 percent) followed by Duhok (12 percent) and Sulaymaniyah (9 percent). Of greatest concern is the 39 percent to 58 percent proportion of households that are vulnerable to food insecurity, with the vulnerability particularly high in camps. Hence, it is important to ensure that this population does not slide into food insecurity by, for example, implementing quality livelihoods projects that have strong links to labour market needs.


\(^5\) http://www.wfp.org/content/consolidated-approach-reporting-indicators-food-security-cari-guidelines
The camps’ levels of food insecurity and vulnerability to food insecurity were higher than outside of camps in all governorates, implying higher food access constraints. This suggests that WFP needs to ensure adequate coverage of the population in need inside of the camps. However, a substantial number of people who live in non-camp areas were also food insecure and should be supported with food assistance if possible. Food insecurity among the camp population was 9 percent in Sulaymaniyah but reached 16 percent in Erbil, where the highest food insecurity was observed across all the surveyed areas.

In Iraq, size of households, and the age and employment status of the household heads are the key drivers of food insecurity. Generally, larger households sustain higher expenditures on food, plus a higher ratio of family members is dependent on fewer income sources – which means greater economic vulnerability.

The analysis indicated that larger households – those with more than six members – were more likely to have a higher food expenditure share compared with smaller households. The food expenditure share among larger families was 23 percent, but 12 percent among smaller families. Larger households were also more food deprived than smaller households as the higher dietary energy requirement is more difficult to sustain.

According to the Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA), high poverty levels also correspond to an increased risk of exposure to external shocks that, in turn, affect the ability to access food. Furthermore, an increased risk of food insecurity for households headed by elderly people is related to the reduced ability of older people to engage in productive work. Thus, a description of household composition is the starting point for developing vulnerability profiles of the food insecure and for understanding their resilience to threats that impede food security.6

---

6 Iraq CFSVA, May 2017
The above statement is in line with the assessment which identified five main drivers of food insecurity both inside and outside of camps. These drivers – lack of income, household size, head of household education level, type of job (skilled or unskilled), wealth status and having pregnant or lactating woman in the household – significantly increase the probability of food insecurity.

The study delved into the four pillars of food security – availability, access, utilization and stability – and the various factors that affect them. Technically, humanitarian assistance and social safety nets fall under both availability and access as it depends on context. Food availability refers to the physical existence of food in the country either through local production, markets and in certain humanitarian contexts, through humanitarian assistance. Individual or household food access refers to the family’s ability to pay for or produce food, and the presence or absence of social safety nets that can provide food access for those who cannot pay, which, in certain humanitarian contexts, is provided by humanitarian assistance.7 Food utilization pertains to the proper use of food, which involves using proper processing and storage techniques, having and applying adequate knowledge of nutrition and childcare techniques, and the existence of adequate health and sanitation services.8 The study articulates the influence of various factors on the key food security pillars. Key factors discussed for each pillar of food security included:

- food availability – local production, markets, social safety nets and humanitarian assistance
- food access – markets, livelihoods, wealth and expenditure and humanitarian assistance
- utilization – food consumption, child care, social and care environment
- stability – role of shocks in impacting stability of food availability, access and utilization.

Cross-cutting factors that emerged from the analysis are also discussed, including gender and population distribution, and education.

6.2 Humanitarian assistance and needs

The assessment surveyed the role of assistance in alleviating food issues for Syrian refugees in the KRI. Assistance meets substantial food and non-food needs, and allows refugee households to use more of their income for other non-food needs.

Since 2016, WFP has provided assistance to 56,000 Syrian refugees under the regional Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO). Beneficiaries received IQD 22,000 (USD 19) per person, per month.9

Of the assessed refugee households, over half (53 percent) reported being WFP beneficiaries, with 63 percent receiving food assistance in the form of an e-card/voucher and 23 percent receiving in-kind assistance (camp residents). In addition, some households reported having received other forms of humanitarian assistance, such as healthcare assistance, reported by 26 percent, and hygiene kits, reported by 9 percent.

---

7 From Food insecurity and conflict dynamics: Causal linkages and complex feedbacks, Cullen S. Hendrix et al., 2013.
8 USAID definition.
However, there were some differences across governorates. In Duhok and Erbil, around 68 percent of Syrian refugees reported receiving an e-card/voucher, while this figure was only 56 percent in Sulaymaniyyah. On the other hand, there were more recipients of in-kind food assistance in Sulaymaniyyah (32 percent), while Erbil had the lowest number of in-kind beneficiaries (17 percent).

In Duhok and Sulaymaniyyah, there were significant differences in the food security status of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of food assistance. However, in Erbil, no out-of-camp households were receiving food assistance, and there was only a slight difference in the food security status of the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in camp. Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that the food assistance provided by WFP prevents food insecurity among the most vulnerable households. Overall, food insecurity among non-beneficiaries is significantly higher than among beneficiaries. Therefore, it might be worthwhile to reassess the population not benefitting from assistance, using criteria established by this assessment to ensure that those eligible but excluded from assistance are identified and assisted.

Figure 6: Beneficiaries of food assistance (ecard/voucher)

Figure 7: Non beneficiaries of food assistance (ecard/voucher)
Despite the ongoing assistance provided by humanitarian actors, Syrian refugees are still in need of additional assistance. Twenty percent of Syrian refugees self-identified cash assistance for housing and access to income and jobs as their first priority needs. The second self-identified priority, food, was reported by 15 percent, and the third, medical assistance, was mentioned by 11 percent. Although the Government of Iraq has committed, with support from humanitarian actors and international donors, to providing all vulnerable refugees with basic needs, there are still many barriers, such as access to stable employment and, for non-camp refugees, access to adequate accommodations.

6.3 Markets

Table 1: Price trends (Iraqi dinars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Previous Period</th>
<th>% Change From the Previous Period</th>
<th>Direction of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>1 M 3 M</td>
<td>1 M 3 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duhok</td>
<td>Wheat flour</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>938 1,000</td>
<td>7% 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oil (vegetable)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,438 1,500</td>
<td>4% 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,131 1,125</td>
<td>-24% -11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beans (white)</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>2,875 2,813</td>
<td>-7% -5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>1,025 2,000</td>
<td>13% -8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erbil</td>
<td>Wheat flour</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>600 1,000</td>
<td>15% -25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beans (white)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000 2,000</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750 1,250</td>
<td>0% -60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oil (vegetable)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500 1,500</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,750 2,000</td>
<td>14% 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymaniyah</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,688 850</td>
<td>-11% 70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oil (vegetable)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500 1,350</td>
<td>0% 11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wheat flour</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>938 1,000</td>
<td>-25% -30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,313 900</td>
<td>-5% 88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beans (white)</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,025 10,000</td>
<td>-5% -75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food markets play a critical role in ensuring local food availability in mainly market-based economies such as Iraq. The markets set prices and generate incomes, allowing households to access food.

From October 2016 to October 2017, commodity prices were mostly stable. In October 2017, food prices observed some stability in the KRI, with minor changes observed on the average price of vegetable oil (+1 percent), lentils (-1 percent) and wheat flour (-3 percent) compared with September 2017. Rice prices increased (+6 percent), while sugar was the only main commodity to show a price decrease (-6 percent). These data were collected through WFP’s ongoing monthly monitoring and market bulletin, where the latest information can be found.
However, food prices have followed very different paths across governorates. Rice prices increased 13 percent in Duhok and 14 percent in Erbil, but decreased 11 percent in Sulaymaniyah (Table 1). Price of wheat flour followed a similar path, increasing 7 percent in Duhok and 15 percent Erbil, but decreasing 25 percent in Sulaymaniyah. In the case of Sulaymaniyah, all main commodities were found to be less expensive in October then in September, when the governorate had experienced a set of price spikes. No other governorate showed a similar general decreasing trend. On the other hand, Erbil and Duhok witnessed a general increase in prices.

The food basket price increased by 12 percent in Erbil and by 6 percent in Duhok, while it decreased by 13 percent in Sulaymaniyah between September and October 2017 (Figure 10). These fluctuations and the general increase in price of the main commodities, which are in line with regular fluctuations in market prices, have negatively impacted the purchasing power of Syrian refugees in the KRI.
With regard to the availability of commodities, there has been a good supply and stocking of commodities despite recent national events that threaten the closure of supply routes from neighbouring countries. As such, there was adequate availability of main commodities in all of the KRI governorates (Table 2).

Table 2: Availability analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>Wheat flour</th>
<th>Sugar</th>
<th>Onions</th>
<th>Fuel (gas)</th>
<th>Oil (vegetable)</th>
<th>Fuel (super petrol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duhok</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erbil</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymaniyah</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

AV Available

In October 2017, the wages for unskilled labour decreased by 9 percent across the KRI. In Erbil, they were 13 percent less than in September 2017 but 17 percent higher than in July 2017 when compared to October. In Duhok the wage rate was stable and therefore no difference was observed for the previous six months. Sulaymaniyah observed a slight decrease of 2 percent compared with September 2017, though this represented an increase of 17 percent from July 2017. Considering the challenging economic situation in the KRI and the unpredictable availability of unskilled labour, these fluctuations in wages were not surprising.

Figure 11: Wage-to-wheat ToT (in food baskets/day)

As a consequence of lower prices, on average, the wage-to-wheat terms of trade (ToT) decreased 19 percent in the KRI region, compared with September 2017 (Figure 11 and Table 3). This reduction of unskilled wage rates in the KRI, and consequently the ToT, will have a negative effect on the food security situation of the Syrian refugees who depend on the market to acquire food and on casual labour as their unique source of livelihood.
### 6.4 Source of food

Iraq’s agriculture sector has declined considerably during the last few decades due to a lack of investments, isolation from the global economy and counterproductive agricultural policies. As a result, Iraq has been dependent on importing a significant portion of its food. Of the Syrian refugees, 85 percent confirmed that their main source of food was markets, while 9 percent relied on vouchers/e-cards assistance.

The reliance on markets exposed households to rising food prices and made them more likely to experience a shock related to the unaffordability of food in the event of an economic crisis, compared with households that rely on agriculture.

### 6.5 Food expenditure

Expenditure share on food was categorized into the following categories: low – >50 percent, medium – 50 percent to 64.9 percent, high – 65 percent to 74.9 percent, and very high – > 75 percent. The expenditure results indicated that households living in camps spent a greater proportion of their household expenditure on food compared with households living outside of the camps. However, in all governorates, more than 35 percent of households reported a high expenditure share on food. This level of expenditure was driven by the predominantly market-dependent nature of households in Iraq where there is minimal or no contribution of local production as a source of food. The highest food expenditure share was recorded in camps, where households spend a disproportionately higher proportion of their income on food. Food expenditure share is an indicator of economic vulnerability; it highlights the potential of households to survive a
shock. Results showed that around 40 percent of households in camps spent disproportionately on food, compromising their spending on other non-food needs.

6.6 Wealth

Wealth\textsuperscript{10} is the value of all natural, physical and financial assets owned by a household, minus its liabilities. Household wealth, a measure commonly used in food security assessments, indicates a household’s ability to access food and the severity of food insecurity. It also gives information about the household’s economic situation, and is used to differentiate between the poorer and the wealthier households in relation to food security indicators, such as food consumption, and thereby provides guidance on how to target the food insecure.

The wealth index was computed based on household possession of a range of assets, housing facilities and access to water and sanitation facilities. Accordingly, households were ranked into five quintiles. According to the findings, 45 percent of the Erbil population ranked as poor, followed by Sulaymaniyah, with 32 percent poor, and Duhok, with 25 percent. Figure 14 indicates that the highest proportion of the better off are found in Sulaymaniyah, with 18 percent.

The findings depict increasing levels of poverty among the Syrian refugee population in Iraq, which may relate to fighting against the Islamic State, and ongoing economic instability and their impact on the Syrian refugee population. Poverty influenced household food security, with wealthier households showing better food security than poorer ones (Figure 15).

6.7 Food consumption and dietary diversity

Food Consumption Scores (FCSs) are based on a seven-day recall period that captures the diversity and frequency of food intake, including approximate nutrient density values. Food consumption patterns are an important indicator of food security.

\textsuperscript{10} VAM Guidance Paper – Creation of a wealth Index: https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000022418/download/
Consumption patterns in all governorates were above optimal, with dietary intake mainly consisting of cereals, dairy and meat. As such, this is adequate to meet the recommended requirements for a healthy life.

Sulaymaniyah (non-camp) and Erbil (in camps) had a substantial proportion of households with unbalanced diets (20 percent and 17 percent respectively). This might have been the result of lower purchasing power and could result in kilocalorie shortfalls among the affected population.

For this analysis, standard indicators were used to measure dietary diversity based on weekly consumption. The results indicate that 26 percent of households in Erbil (in camps) and 28 percent in Sulaymaniyah (non-camp) had the lowest household dietary diversity score (HDDS). Sulaymaniyah governorate showed the highest proportion of households (25 percent) with a low HDDS, compared to Erbil (21 percent) and Duhok (11 percent) (see Figure 17).

On average, the number of meals eaten by adults in Erbil is worrisome. On average, Erbil adults ate two meals per day, while in Duhok and Sulaymaniyah adults were consuming three meals per day. This might explain some of the dietary diversity shortfalls in some of the areas assessed. Results indicated that children consumed three meals per day in all governorates, on average.

Coping strategies
Households were also interviewed on whether they experienced difficulties in accessing food or money to purchase food and, if so, how they had coped with the difficulties in the seven days prior to the assessment. A coping strategy index was computed based on the five standard consumption-related strategies: relying on less preferred and less expensive foods, reducing the number of meals eaten in a day, limiting meal portion sizes, borrowing or relying on food from friends and relatives, and restricting consumption by adults in order for children to eat. The Coping Strategy Index (CSI) was further grouped into high, medium and low. Households use different coping mechanisms that vary across the governorates and levels of vulnerability. In the 30 days prior to data collection, more than 50 percent of Syrian households in all governorates experienced a lack of food or did not have enough money to buy sufficient food to meet household needs. Consumption coping strategies were used in 20 percent of Syrian refugee households in Erbil, 18 percent in Sulaymaniyah and 9 percent in Duhok. Irrespective of their food security status, the majority of households employed what would be regarded as low CSI, typically switching to less preferred food commodities, reducing meal portions or reducing the number of meals.

Livelihood coping strategies were studied to better understand households’ longer term coping capacity. A livelihood-based coping strategies module was adopted to categorize the population into stress, crisis and emergency coping strategies, based on perceived severity. Begging, selling the last female animal and the entire household migrating were considered emergency coping strategies. Consuming seed stock, reducing expenditures on health and education, and selling productive assets were ranked as crisis coping strategies. Spending savings, borrowing money, selling more animals than usual and sending household members to eat elsewhere were included in stress coping strategies.

Emergency coping strategies were found to be used mainly in Erbil and Duhok, where they were adopted by 20 percent of households, indicating asset depletion. Use of negative coping mechanisms impedes the recovery of the most vulnerable households in the event of a shock.
As Figure 19 illustrates, the level of livelihoods coping is similar for both camp and non-camp populations across the governorates. This indicates similar levels of stress for the most vulnerable households inside and outside of the camps.

6.8 Infant and young child feeding for children 6 to 23 months

The analysis of infant and young child feeding information included key complementary feeding indicators recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO): minimum meal frequency (MMF), minimum dietary diversity (MDD), and minimal acceptable diet (MAD).

**MMF** is a measure of the quantity and energy density of food consumed by children of 6 to 23 months. For the average healthy breastfed infant, complementary foods should be provided 2 to 3 times per day at 6 to 8 months of age, 3 to 4 times per day at 9 to 24 months of age, and 4 times a day for non-breastfed infants, with additional nutritious snacks offered 1 to 2 times per day, as desired.

The survey found that about a quarter of the children did not receive the recommended MMF. Their diets lacked adequate calories and other macronutrients and micronutrients necessary for growth and development.

A lower proportion of children met the recommended MMF in the camps than outside of camps, suggesting that camp populations face more constraints to food access. Overall, the proportion of children meeting the MMF across the different population groups is similar, ranging between 65 percent and 83 percent.

**MDD** represents the quality of food consumed, based on the seven food groups recommended for children's diets, which are shown in Figure 21. WHO recommends that children aged 6 to 23 months consume at least four food groups. Poor dietary diversity is associated with micronutrient deficiencies and could also result in protein energy malnutrition. Half of the children surveyed were not receiving the recommended MDD.

Overall, their diets are predominantly cereal and dairy based, with shortfalls in the consumption of iron-rich animal and plant sources, and of foods rich in vitamin A. The risk of micronutrient deficiencies increases in areas where major shortfalls are observed. In Sulaymaniyah, a meagre 26 and 38 percent of children aged 6 to 23 months, in camps and non-camp settlements respectively, received the recommended food groups.

**MAD**, a composite indicator of quality and quantity, found that only a third of children were eating as per the WHO quality and quantity recommendations. Addressing these dietary diversity gaps may increase the proportion of children consuming a MAD. The lowest MAD was reported in Sulaymaniyah, where only 19 percent of the children in camps consumed the recommended diet.
From a bivariate analysis, major factors affecting nutrition for children under 2 included the source of their drinking water and the sufficiency of water for household use, and the number of meals consumed by children and adults in the household. Findings suggest that access to safe water significantly influences child feeding quality and quantity. Hence, poor access to water compromised the diets of children, supposedly because households with poorer water access spend more time looking for water and probably have to divert some of the household spending to secure water, limiting resources left for food.

Similarly, the number of meals consumed in a household reflected the adequacy of the children's diets. This highlights the role of food access and food security on child feeding. Households that consumed more than three meals were significantly more likely to have better feeding of children ages 6 to 23 months.

### 6.9 Literacy/education of the head of household

Education is a measure of human capital – associated with productivity and, in turn, linked to food security and nutrition. In rural contexts, education influences food security through access to information on best agricultural practices, nutrition and sanitation practices. In urban settings, education links to food security through proxies such as employment, household income and decision-making, which have effects on the access, utilization and availability dimensions of food security.

The most educated generally have a greater ability to cope with a variety of difficult situations and have a higher probability of finding employment. In addition, numerous studies have shown a link between maternal education/literacy levels and child health and nutrition. Well-educated mothers are more likely to access health services and vaccinate their children, and they are less likely to have malnourished children.11

---

11 2007 Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis in Iraq
The illiteracy rate among Syrian refugee heads of households was found to be around 24 percent. Of the 76 percent of the heads of households who were literate, 43 percent had finished primary school and only 4 percent had a university degree. In addition, the highest proportion of food insecure families (10 percent) was observed in households with illiterate heads.

**Figure 22: Highest level of education of head of household**

- **Primary school**: 43%
- **Secondary school**: 10%
- **Intermediate/complementary school**: 14%
- **Technical/trade course**: 2%
- **Diploma**: 3%
- **University degree of higher**: 4%
- **Illiterate**: 24%
- **He/she didn’t attend**: 13%
- **He/she attended but didn’t complete any level**: 11%

Education is markedly associated with gender. Females are less likely to be educated. An estimated 63 percent of adult women heads of households were found to be illiterate, compared with 20 percent of men. In addition, huge differences were observed between the percentage of females and males who had graduated from school. For example, 45 percent of females and 21 percent of males had completed primary school, 15 percent of males and 11 percent of females had completed middle school, and 11 percent of males and 1 percent of females had graduated from high school.

### 6.10 Livelihoods/Income

According to the findings from the study, significant proportions of refugee households – 31 percent in Erbil and 30 percent Duhok – did not have any source of income. In Sulaymaniyah, 10 percent of the interviewed households were economically inactive. The most common livelihood activity, non-agricultural casual labour, was undertaken by 34 percent of households in Sulaymaniyah and 23 percent in Duhok and Erbil. The next most common source of income – informal credit/debts from shops and friends – was reported by 15 percent in Sulaymaniyah and 13 percent in Duhok and Erbil. Those without a source of income are vulnerable to food insecurity. Being targeted by livelihoods projects may help ensure their resilience and enable them to maintain a level of food security.

Skilled labour was reported as the main source of livelihood by 11 percent of households in Sulaymaniyah, and 5 percent of households in both Erbil and Duhok. With these findings, as shown in Figure 23, Sulaymaniyah offers better opportunities than Erbil and Duhok for having at least one family member producing income.
Additional analysis of household incomes was conducted by disaggregating the total monthly income earned by the household members into four categories: less than IQD 0.5 million, IQD 0.5 to 0.75 million, IQD 0.75 million to 1.0 million, and above IQD 1.0 million. From the results, it can be observed that the majority of people in Duhok had lower incomes both inside and outside the camps, while Erbil showed a significant number of households with better incomes outside of the camps, with 19 percent of the households earning above IQD 1.0 million per month. When income sources of the three governorates were grouped into the more or less reliable and sustainable income sources, Duhok had the highest proportion of households relying on the less sustainable sources.

Duhok also had the highest proportion of economically inactive and aid-dependent households, further explaining the differentials in income levels in the governorate. Income levels influence wealth and food security of households. Households with better incomes are more likely to have better food security status. This could explain why Duhok had the highest proportion of households that are food insecure and vulnerable to food insecurity. This can also be linked to the large proportion of refugees living in camps in Duhok compared with other locations.
With regard to previous employment experience, it was observed that more than 45 percent of Syrian refugees in all governorates were employed in construction prior to becoming refugees. In addition, 3 to 6 percent of Syrian refugees across the governorates had professional backgrounds as, for example, medical doctors, teachers and lawyers, which highlights their potential to engage in productive skilled work.

Figure 26: Participation in employment activities in the last three months/Level of education

In the three months prior to data collection in August 2017, it was observed that the majority of people in Duhok had participated in employment activities. Surprisingly, no one who attended technical school in Sulaymaniyah had participated in employment activities in the preceding three months.

People who had not participated in any employment activity in the preceding three months were asked if they would be willing to participate or work if an opportunity arose. Surprisingly, the majority of people in Duhok (76 percent in camp and 69 percent out of camp) replied that they would not be willing to participate. This finding can be linked to low-paying jobs.
opportunities in Duhok, where refugees face challenges accessing jobs. As a result, the majority of people both inside and outside of camps in Duhok have low income levels.

The study also evaluated the constraints in accessing employment or job opportunities. It was observed that a significant proportion of refugees living in Erbil (30 percent in camp and 46 percent out of camp) faced no challenges in accessing employment. However, it was a different story in both Duhok and Sulaymaniyah. In Duhok, 82 percent in camp and 81 percent out of camp faced problems accessing employment, and in Sulaymaniyah, 80 percent of those both in camp and out of camp faced problems.

In conclusion, Erbil offered much better job opportunities compared with other governorates. In Sulaymaniyah, a high proportion of people faced challenges in accessing job opportunities, but it still had a lower proportion of people with an income lower than IQD 0.5 million. Conversely, the constraints in accessing jobs in Duhok partly explain the high proportion of households with lower incomes.

Furthermore, when asked about reasons for not accessing employment opportunities, more than 80 percent of refugees across all governorates mentioned the competition for jobs/lack of jobs as the major reason. This was followed by distance to travel to the job, which was mentioned by at least 25 percent of respondents in all governorates.

---


13 For more information on job opportunities, see the Kurdistan Regional Statistics Office’s 2015 Labour Force report: [http://www.krso.net/files/articles/22117014510.pdf](http://www.krso.net/files/articles/22117014510.pdf)
As per general definition, job stability can be understood as the capacity in normal circumstances to maintain employment over time, in the absence of negative shocks such as economic crises or conflict-induced displacement. For the purpose of this study, job stability was divided into five categories: permanent, regular, regular but temporary (short-term), irregular-seasonal and irregular-intermittent. Based on this, the study found that the majority of Syrian refugees in Duhok (69 percent in camp and 61 percent out of camp) and Erbil (72 percent in camp and 58 percent out of camp) have irregular-intermittent jobs, while a high proportion of Syrian refugees in Sulaymaniyah have regular jobs (Figure 29).

In addition, the majority of Syrian refugees across all governorates are engaged in unskilled jobs – 70 percent in camp and 53 percent out of camp in Duhok, 76 percent in camp and 63 percent out of camp in Erbil, and 56 percent in camp and 51 percent out of camp in Sulaymaniyah – which confirms that a high proportion of Syrian refugees engaged in unskilled job are in camps (Figure 30). The lack of job security for those working in unskilled labour could have implications for their resilience to shocks.

Data on livelihoods gathered in this assessment can be combined with further data on the needs of particular value chains and labour markets. This can be used to build an evidence base in consideration of livelihoods programming to support the resilience of Syrian refugee families who are vulnerable to food insecurity.

Debt ranges by households

Within the KRI, 33 percent of refugee households reported they had no debt at all, while 29 percent reported having debt of less than IQD 0.5 million (equivalent to USD 400). At the same time, 30 percent had debts between IQD 0.5 and 2.0 million (USD 400 to 1,600), and 8 percent reported having debts of more than IQD 2.0 million (USD 1,600). Households with male and female heads were almost identical in terms of their debt. Overall, it appears that the households living in urban and peri-urban settings are likely to have a lower level of indebtedness then families living in camps. These families are competing with host communities in accessing livelihood opportunities and therefore are more likely to find daily/short-term wage jobs. Despite having more additional costs than those living in camps, families living in urban and peri-urban areas appeared more capable of paying off debt and maintaining a low level of indebtedness thanks to access to employment opportunities. Families who may be in need of more resources are likely to seek placement/accommodation in refugee camps, a trend that increased in 2017, likely due to the shrinking opportunities offered by the labour market. Figure 31 shows debt ranges by households across the KRI.
Figure 31: Debt ranges by households across the KRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Debt Range No Debt</th>
<th>Debt Range &lt; IQD 500K</th>
<th>Debt Range IQD 500K - 2 M</th>
<th>Debt Range &gt; IQD 2 M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duhok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working children

Due to the economic downturn and lack of employment opportunities, some families feel that children should also contribute to the family finances. In some cases, children are possibly considered the only ones who can be employed. Overall, some 7 percent of interviewed families reported they had children working in various jobs to provide financial support to their families (at least 1 hour, or more, in the previous three months). The rate of children working outside of the camps was 8 percent, compared with 5 percent among the families living inside the camps. In Sulaymaniyah, 10 percent of children from urban and peri-urban families were working, compared with 7 percent in Erbil and 5 percent in Duhok. Figure 32 shows more details on children who are working to support their families.

Figure 32: Percentages of working children
Households having or planning to have their own businesses

Fifteen percent of the household heads interviewed reported they had their own businesses. The highest rate for business ownership was 20 percent in Erbil, followed by Duhok with 10 percent and Sulaymaniyah with 6 percent. The rates were identical both inside and outside of camps. Almost three out of any four household heads who didn’t own businesses said they planned to have a business in the future. This included 78 percent of those interviewed in Duhok, 77 percent in Erbil and 54 percent in Sulaymaniyah. The in-camp versus non-camp figures for household heads planning to have businesses were almost equal, at 73 percent and 74 percent respectively. Figure 33 presents the percentages of household heads who have their own businesses and those who are planning to have businesses.

Figure 33: Percentages of household heads who have their own businesses and those who are planning to have businesses.

To a large extent, refugee families in Iraq have access to income, work or economic activities. However, refugees who are economically active do not always have stable income and job security. The high numbers of informal credits, informal casual labour, and irregular and low incomes result in a significant number of refugee households with debts. Additionally, a significant number of refugee households do not have income activities.

Even though a high number of those refugees without income reported that they would not be willing to work if they had the chance (around 70 percent in Duhok), it is important to emphasize other elements besides dependency on humanitarian assistance to clarify why a significant part of the refugee population is not economically active.

In addition to labour market competition, refugees reported that distance and transport to job opportunities were the main reasons they were not accessing work. This could be the result of freedom of movement issues due to lack of documentation. Economically active households also reported negative coping mechanisms such as child labour. This indicates that protection elements, such as lack of documentation and negative coping mechanisms, influence access to livelihoods and should be taken into account and further assessed in the context of resilience, livelihoods and food security programming.
6.11 Health

Refugees in the KRI have access to free primary health care inside and outside the camps. Although there is no free secondary health care inside the camps, in-camp refugees can still receive referrals to the free-of-charge secondary health care centres outside the camp.

Specific (health) needs

In the KRI, 35 percent of the interviewed households reported having at least one household member with specific needs – 29.5 percent in camp and 46.4 percent out of camp.

Among the refugees who reported having specific needs, 11 percent reported they had specific health problems, including problem with sight, hearing, communication, memory, mobility or self-care.

In total, 9.4 percent of the refugees interviewed were chronically ill, 10.4 percent reported that they had temporary functional limitations and 3 percent reported serious medical conditions. Of the individuals who reported health issues, 20 percent reported that the identified health problems affect their ability to perform daily activities, such as eating, bathing, going to the toilet or dressing.

Figure 34: Percentage of refugees with medical conditions

Among women in the 12–50 age group, over one third were pregnant or lactating – 15 percent pregnant and 19 percent lactating. The reported rate of households with early pregnancy is low, at 0.5 percent.

According to their vaccination cards, 81 percent of children under 5 in the interviewed households were vaccinated, while others did not have vaccination cards.

Access to health care

In total, 20 percent of households reported at least one member who required primary health assistance and could not get it. The main reported barriers to accessing primary health care (PHC) were: relevant services were unavailable (42 percent), cost of drugs/treatment (8 percent) and doctor’s fees in semi-private and private facilities (5 percent). Additionally, 19 percent of households reported that at least one member required secondary health assistance and was unable to access it. The main
barriers to accessing secondary health care (SHC) were: relevant services were unavailable (31 percent), doctor’s fees (9 percent) and cost of drugs/treatment (3 percent).

In total, 69 percent of households reported they were able to access free primary health care assistance – 82 percent in camp and 62 percent outside camp. The lower out of camp access rate can be explained by lack of awareness about available services and by the cost of transportation. Inside camp, the reasons for not accessing primary healthcare included misperceptions about fees and quality of public health care, and their preference for private health care. Overall, 67 percent of the households received primary healthcare from a public hospital/clinic, 22 percent from private hospitals/clinics and 11 percent from NGO clinics. The reason they accessed private or NGO hospitals could have been the lack of availability of treatment in public hospitals or lack of trust in the quality of public health care.

Of the interviewed households, 59 percent were able to access free secondary healthcare. This included 67 percent of individuals living in camps (83 percent in Duhok, 49 percent in Erbil, and 17 percent in Sulaymaniyah), and 49 percent of those outside camps (68 percent in Duhok, 47 percent in Sulaymaniyah, and 42 percent in Erbil). While secondary health care services are not available inside camps, refugees living in camps benefit from free referrals by the camps’ Primary Health Care Centres (PHCCs) to secondary health facilities outside camp. Overall, 47 percent of the households received their secondary healthcare from public hospitals and clinics, 50 percent from private hospitals and clinics, and 3 percent from NGO clinics.

Refugees self-funded their secondary healthcare more often than their primary healthcare, due to unavailability of treatment and services, their preference for private services over public services, their perceptions regarding the quality of service, or due to availability of medicines.

Figure 35: Main source of funding for healthcare

In the event of life-threatening issues or need for urgent medical attention, 35 percent of households – 24 percent outside camps and 12 percent inside camps – reported that they did not know how to access medical services/assistance.

Overall, 17 percent of the households – 33 percent in camps and 9 percent outside of camps – reported they accessed healthcare/drug assistance. Of those receiving such assistance, 56 percent received it continuously, 39 percent received it just once and 5 percent had once – but no longer – received it on a regular basis.
In addition, 3 percent of households – 6 percent in camps and 2 percent outside camps – received psychosocial support. Of those receiving such assistance, 56 percent reported that they received it continuously, 40 percent received it just once and 4 percent had once – but no longer – received it on a regular basis.

In summary, almost half of the interviewed households reported to have at least one member in the household with some form of specific need (35 percent), with a chronic illness (9.4 percent) or with a serious medical condition (3 percent). The majority of households with health issues were able to access free primary or secondary health care.

However, a noteworthy part of the interviewed population reported not having access to health care due to services not being available, inability to pay doctor’s fees and negative perceptions about the quality of the health care provided. As primary healthcare is free in and outside of camps, and secondary healthcare is free outside of camps but also available free for those inside camps through referrals, more communication outreach is necessary to inform refugees about the free health services available. Untreated chronic illnesses, disabilities or serious medical conditions are likely to affect the resilience and access to livelihoods.

6.12 Protection

Registration

Refugees registered with UNHCR in the KRI are issued either asylum-seeker or refugee certificates that are valid for one year. Using their UNHCR certificate, asylum seekers and refugees can obtain a KRI residency permit, which is also valid for one year. Refugees who are not registered with UNHCR do not have access to residency in the KRI, which affects their freedom of movement and can increase the chance of facing safety and security issues.

Of the respondents, 97.1 percent of the households stated that they were registered with UNHCR, and 84.7 percent of the households reported that all their household members were registered.

Respondents living in camps are registered with UNHCR more frequently than those living outside camps. Registration centres are mostly situated in camps or nearby urban centres, which makes access to information regarding UNHCR’s registration activities easier and less expensive for households living inside camps.

Respondents indicated they were prevented from registering or renewing their certificates, mainly due to the cost of reaching the registration centre (61.9 percent) and their lack of knowledge about the registration procedures (34.5 percent).

Households residing in Erbil face more difficulties registering all members of the household than households in Duhok and Sulaymaniyah, as Erbil hosts a higher percentage of refugees outside camps (75 percent) than Duhok and Sulaymaniyah.

Figure 36: Registration status with UNHCR

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>97.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-registered</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only 2.9 percent of the households reported having problems registering with UNHCR or renewing their UNHCR certificates. There is a strong correlation between facing difficulties in registering or renewing certificates and their intention to move to a different location in the next three months. In these cases, most intend to move to camp locations, and most indicate the main reason for moving is safety concerns.

There is also a correlation between assistance received and difficulties of registration or renewal. Households that faced difficulties getting registered or renewed had received less frequent assistance during the previous three months than households that did not face difficulties with registration or renewal.

**Residency**

Issuance of residencies and their renewals is subject to clearance by government security entities. This can cause delays, especially for asylum seekers out of camp. The cost of residency permits and renewals may constitute an obstacle for asylum seekers.

Residency permits are issued to all refugees and asylum seekers on the basis of valid registration with UNHCR. The residency permit itself is issued free of charge, however, asylum seekers pay an IQD 8,000 fee for the photograph. Residency permits are issued to individuals in the family, but this process is not harmonized across the KRI. In Duhok, all family members are issued individual permits, but in Erbil, individual permits are only issued to those aged 12 and above and, in Sulaymaniyah, only to those aged 14 and above.\(^{14}\)

Lack of residency could lead to arrest and detention. According to the 2015 residency law, a person could be subject to 3–5 years imprisonment for illegal entry, movement and residence. Some refugees said that they are at risk of losing their jobs due to lack or expiration of their residency permit.

A residency permit is required for employment. In practice, however, residency is required for particular jobs in the private sector and not for unskilled and daily labour.

In addition, lack of residency permits also affects freedom of movement for refugees. Those without permits are restricted, as they cannot move out of camp or cross checkpoints.

Of the respondents, 7 percent were not holding residency permits in the KRI. Similar to UNHCR registration, camp residents are more likely to be in possession of residency permits than those living outside of camps.

Figure 37: Residency status in KRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency</th>
<th>93%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No residency</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households explained they were prevented from getting a residency permit for a variety of reasons. For example, 13.9 percent had entered through unofficial border crossings, 9.7 percent could not afford

\(^{14}\) KR-I PA 2017
the costs for renewal, and 6.3 percent were being asked to present an Iraqi sponsor to the KRI security, the Assayish. These reasons were mainly given by households living outside of camps.

**Civil documentation**

Birth certificates are issued by hospitals or by offices of the Birth and Mortality Directorate within applicable deadlines of 15, 30 or 45 days. The fee is IQD 1,000. If they miss the deadlines, parents must approach the court and pay a fine. Syrian refugees face obstacles with birth registration, especially in cases of children born outside of hospitals, parents not in possession of civil status documents, and for children born outside of marriage. Reportedly, 32 percent of births are not registered with the KRI authorities.

Refugees must produce a civil marriage certificate, Syrian ID card or family booklet, or a UNHCR asylum-seeker certificate, and they may be requested to provide proof of residency. As per court procedures, marriage documentation is only issued for refugees with residency documents.

Refugees in and out of camps expressed lack of knowledge and information regarding legal procedures and regulations for asylum seekers and refugees in the KRI. Among the households, 14.5 percent stated they lacked knowledge of the procedures for obtaining birth or marriage certificates. Many reported not being aware of any laws or rules, and that issues would be solved according to tribal procedures.

**Figure 38: Knowledge about where to obtain civil documentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>85.50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No knowledge</td>
<td>14.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a correlation between social cohesion within the community and legal awareness. Households that stated they received little support from either the local host or refugee communities upon arrival in the KRI also had less knowledge about birth and marriage registration procedures than households that received support upon arrival.

Lack of a birth registration certificate affects access to education for those who cannot provide the original or a copy. In the long term, this increases the risk of statelessness, as refugees and asylum seekers have, in principal, no access to the acquisition of Iraqi nationality.

**Security issues**

Since 2003, foreigners in Iraq, including refugees and asylum seekers, have been exposed to possible harassment, threats, arbitrary arrest, physical abuse and prolonged detention under the anti-terrorism law. Syrian asylum seekers, registered in the KRI, may be arrested and detained for illegal entry in Iraqi governorates outside of the KRI.

Syrian refugees report that their safety and security concerns are directly linked to discrimination and negative attitudes from the host community and authorities. This includes their perceptions that local authorities give preferential treatment to the host community.

Discrimination, and the verbal and sexual harassment of Syrian refugee women and girls have been reported, with serious implications for safety and security, emotional well-being and access to basic rights.
However, of the interviewed households, only 0.6 percent reported that they had experienced safety-related issues during their previous 3 months in Iraq. Of those, 93.8 percent stated that this lack of safety did not affect their freedom of movement.

**Child protection**

Of the interviewed households, 17 percent were taking care (separated) children who are not immediate family members. For those families taking care of these children, the average number of separated children per family is higher outside camps than inside camps.

As for child labour, 7 percent of children are working to support their families. The rate of children working outside of camps (8 percent) is higher than the rate of those working in camps (5 percent). Child labour, child marriage and child recruitment are the results of the economic downturn and lack of employment opportunities. Children are forced to work in various jobs to provide financial support to their families.

**House, land and property (HLP)**

A limited number of evictions take place at the request of neighbourhood committees. These local committees submit a written request to the mayor for endorsement. These evictions mainly affect single men. Further, private homeowners may request refugees to leave premises due to their inability to pay the rent.

Rent prices are not controlled and, with the influx of IDPs, house prices have risen. Of the interviewed households, 49.2 percent had a formal agreement with their landlord, 43.8 percent had no agreement and 7 percent had an informal agreement.

In Erbil and in Sulaymaniyah, the majority of the households had a formal agreement with their landlord, while in Duhok, more than 90 percent of the households had no agreement whatsoever. In urban areas, more than 50 percent had a formal agreement with the landlord, while in rural areas, only around 15 percent had a formal agreement.
Only 0.5 percent of the questioned households had ever received an eviction notice, and the vast majority of these households did not have a formal agreement with their landlord. The majority of the households that received an eviction notice were under threat of eviction because they were unable to pay their rent.

Movement within the KRI

Of the questioned households, 3.6 percent had moved to a different location within the KRI in the last three months. Of these, 8 percent reported they moved due to security concerns in their locations (all outside camps in Duhok).

Of the households that reported moving during the last 3 months, 85.6 percent moved to a location within the same district. Most of these households that moved to a location within the same district were residing in Erbil. In Duhok and Sulaymaniyah, households more frequently reported moving to another governorate or to one of the camps.

There is a strong correlation between having moved to another place during the last 3 months and: i) experiencing difficulties with registration and renewal; ii) not receiving any food assistance during the last 3 months; and iii) not receiving health care, in some cases due to lack of documentation. This gives a good indication as to why Syrian households decide to move to other locations.

Return to Syria and onward movement to third countries

Despite the precarious living conditions in the KRI, returning to Syria is not a viable option for most Syrian refugees, due to risk of forced recruitment, lack of services, lack of security and stability, lack of educational opportunities and destruction of infrastructure, including their homes.

Less than 8 percent of the households reported that they were planning to move to other locations within the next 3 months. Of these households, half reported that they were planning to go to a third country, and 6.8 percent reported – 4 households out of every 1,000 – they planned to return to Syria.
Of the households planning to move, 68.9 percent said the main reason was the high cost of living in their current locations within KRI.

### Social cohesion and community leadership structures

Across the KRI, various forms of community-level representation have been established, but not all refugees have the same perceptions of these representatives. Of the respondents, 64.9 percent did not have regular contact with their community leaders. Refugees reported that Mukhtars, Anjumans, sector leaders and other forms of leaders both in and out of camp were not legitimate representatives, or that they did not advocate on their behalf – instead they garnered assistance only for those with whom they were acquainted. Refugees living in urban areas had less contact with their community leaders than refugees living in rural areas.

With regard to the relationship between refugees and the host community, refugees who had negative interaction with the host community said that tensions and misunderstandings prevailed mostly in non-
camp settings. Syrian refugees reported that negative attitudes from the local community and local authorities had led to safety concerns.

Perception exists that local authorities give preferential treatment to the host community. Syrian refugees in all three governorates said they believed that members of the host community were aware of the preferential treatment they received from the authorities and did not hesitate to use this power to abuse and threaten refugees.

Communication with communities

Of the reporting households, 95 percent said that they had received information regarding services available to them. Households living inside camps were more up-to-date about information regarding services (98 percent) than households living outside of camps (93 percent). In addition, 64 percent of the households used social media, such as Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, Viber and Twitter, 55 percent used internet on an almost daily basis, and 34 percent never used it.

The current dire socio-economic situation in KRI has pushed refugee families to adopt negative coping mechanisms in order to survive. Refugee respondents to this survey reported many protection concerns, including child labour; working without legal documentation which exposed them to the risk of extortion, mistreatment, detention and refoulement; women and girls exposing themselves to sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV); and renting without a formal agreement.

Protection issues, such as challenges to accessing territory (admission), registration, and legal and civil documentation contribute to the above mentioned negative coping mechanisms and general vulnerability. They need to be addressed, not only through advocacy, outreach and communication with communities, but also through multi-sectoral vulnerability targeting.

6.13 Education

There are more than 60,000 Syrian refugees in the 5–18 age group in KRI. They represent 27 percent of the total Syrian refugee population, yet only around 30,000 refugees are enrolled in formal education.

Currently around 43 percent of school-age refugee children reside in camps across the KRI, and the other 57 percent reside in urban, peri-urban and rural communities. In the KRI educational system, children can enter preschool at age 5 or primary at 6, secondary at 12 or high school at 15, and they can enter university at 17.

Refugee children have access to education on a par with Iraqi citizens. Nevertheless certain facts, conditions and circumstances are hampering their access to education.

Of children who are 5 years old (one year before the official primary entry age), 70 percent attend an early childhood education programme. This rate is 81 percent in camps and 56 percent outside of camps.

For the surveyed children of primary school entry age, 65 percent were reported as having entered grade one at the intake age of 6. The rate was 70 percent outside camps and 60 percent inside camps. In terms of governorates, the rate was 85 percent in Sulaymaniyah, 62 percent in Erbil and 56 percent in Duhok. Of those who did not enter primary school, the rate of girls (55 percent) was higher than boys (45 percent).

In KRI, where refugees have free access to public education, 70 percent of children in the 6–15 age group currently attend public primary or secondary school (1 percent fewer girls than boys). Duhok has the highest rate, with 77 percent of children enrolled, followed by Erbil with 68 percent and Sulaymaniyah with 57 percent. Attendance in camps is approximately 78 percent, while outside camps it is 65 percent. Figure 44 shows the breakdown of attendance in different locations.
In non-camp areas, geographic access to education is particularly challenging due to lack of available schools and language barriers.

Figure 45: Children of 6–15 age group currently attending primary or secondary schools

Regarding access to education, no incidents have been reported of overt denial of education to refugee children. Overall attendance is relatively consistent across the governorates. For the current school year, more boys were attending pre-school and primary school, while the gender parity was almost identical in middle school, and more girls were attending secondary, university or an institution than boys. However, these figures do not include the completion rate. Table 6 shows the grade levels of children ages 5 and above.

Table 4: Children ages 5 and above attending school, by grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>Camp status</th>
<th>Pre-school</th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Intermediate school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>University/institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duhok</td>
<td>Erbil</td>
<td>Sulaymaniyah</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Camp</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Camp</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Camp</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Camp</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the KRI, the ratio of girls and boys attending primary education, known as the Gender Parity Index (GPI), is close to 1.00, indicating almost no difference in primary attendance between genders.
However, differences can be noted across governorates and districts. Table 7 shows the rates per district for children enrolled for primary education.

Table 5: Children in 6–12 age group, not enrolled for primary education, by district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>% Not attending school</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duhok</td>
<td>Shikhan</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amedi</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sumel</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bardarash</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zakho</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duhok city</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erbil</td>
<td>Erbil city</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banslawah</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaqlawa</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koisnjaq</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khabat</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymaniyah</td>
<td>Dokan</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rania</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sulaymaniyah city</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 46: Percentage of school age children out of school, disaggregated by age and sex

Looking at the reasons why children in the 6–12 age group were not going to school, the most common reason for those who children were 6 years old was that their child was not of school age. For others in this group, the reason was that they had missed two years of education and hence were not allowed to attend school in the KRI. Meanwhile, some children never attended school, the cost of education supplies and uniforms was too high for some, and some thought that children should stay at home. Figure 46 shows more details for the 5–12 age group.
Despite progress in enrolment and retention of refugee children in primary education, secondary education for refugee adolescents remains a critical gap, as the completion rate is very low. For children in the 13–18 age group, the reasons for not going to school were mainly that the child had completed a certain level of education, the cost related to education, the child worked to support the household, the child was not the right age for school, differences in curriculum and language, children need to stay at home, there was no school in the area, the child was married and could not attend school anymore, or they were refused entry due to disabilities and other reasons, as few school have disability friendly premises. Figure 47 shows more details for the 13–18 age group.

Figure 47: Reasons for children in 5–12 age group not attending school

Regarding attendance and dropouts, both children and parents said that the quality of education in schools is low due to unqualified teachers, high staff turnover and overcrowded classrooms. In some cases, young people and their families simply do not see the benefits of pursuing secondary education, especially if they have experienced poor quality primary education or perceive the efforts required to access secondary education – such as distance, cost and language – to be too difficult. Peer pressure, family responsibilities and a lack of understanding of the long-term benefits of secondary education can discourage transition to secondary school.

Figure 48: Reasons for children in 13–18 age group not attending school

The rate of children who are going to school and working\(^\text{15}\) within the KRI was 2.1 percent overall. The highest percentages were outside of the camps in Erbil and Sulaymaniyah, which saw 2.6 percent. The

\(^{15}\) Assuming that the student may be involved in at least 1 hour of work in 3 months up to working on full time basis.
average outside the camps of the three governorates, 2.3 percent, was higher than the 1.8 percent average rate inside camps. Figure 48 shows the percentages of working students within the KRI.

Child marriage and child labour, the prevailing child protection issues, are results of the poor economic situation, subsequent lack of employment opportunities, and cultural beliefs. Economic vulnerability keeps a significant number of children out of school, which further increases their vulnerability and has potential to dramatically impact their future.

Figure 49: Working students

With regard to the adult population, it is worth noting that among all household heads, 16 percent did not know how to read or write, while 11 percent knew how to read or write but had not completed any level of education. Forty percent had completed primary education while 10 percent had a secondary education, 4 percent had finished technical education and 6 percent had a university degree.

In general, the rate of illiterate household heads was 21 percent in camps and 14 percent outside of the camps. The rate of illiterate household heads was 24 percent in Sulaymaniyah, 21 percent in Duhok and 12 percent in Erbil. Within the KRI, 8 percent of households were headed by women, of whom 44 percent were illiterate, 15 percent could read and write, and 17 percent had completed primary education.

Figure 50: Education levels of household heads
6.14 Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)

In refugee camps, water is supplied by autonomous systems fed by boreholes which are drilled near the camps. Availability of water in camps stands at 88, 78.5 and 90 liter/person/day in Erbil, Duhok and Sulaymaniya, respectively. The vast majority (86 percent) of camp and non-camp refugee families across the governorates reported that they had access to sufficient water for all uses, including drinking, cooking and washing. Households made use of water storage tanks to ensure water provision 24/24 hours, a practice also applied in host communities across the KRI.

Overall, in camps and outside camps, 4 percent of refugee families reported only having sufficient access to drinking water, 6 percent reported only having sufficient access to domestic use water, and 4 percent had no sufficient access to water for drinking, cooking, washing or for using the toilet. Beneficiary satisfaction with water supply outside the camps (93 percent) was better than in camps (74 percent), despite the continuous investments in water facilities by humanitarian agencies in camps. The Duhok and Sulaymaniya camps reported the lowest rate for having access to both types of water, with 61 percent and 67 percent, respectively. Figure 50 presents access to sufficient water within the KRI.

Regarding water quality, over three quarters of households (77 percent) living outside camps perceived the water they accessed was safe to drink. Of the 23 percent of households that perceived their water was unsafe to drink, over half, 52 percent, did not use any water treatments.

Figure 51: Access to sufficient water for drinking and domestic uses

![Bar Chart]

Of the households with access to piped-in drinking water, 52 percent had water piped into their homes for more than two hours per day, and 39 percent had water for less than two hours per day. Other sources of water were public standpipe and bottled mineral water, which each supplied 3 percent of households, and protected springs which supplied 2 percent of households. The rate of unimproved drinking water supply in total was less than 1 percent, from various sources. Figure 51 shows the sources of improved and unimproved drinking water.
Of the households with access to washing water, 54 percent enjoyed a water supply mainly piped into their homes for more than two hours per day, and 42 percent had water piped for less than two hours per day. In addition, 3 percent had access via a public standpipe, and 1 percent relied on other sources. Figure 52 presents the sources of washing water within the KRI.

The 4 percent of households that reported insufficient access to water are located in Duhok and Sulaymaniyah camps, and outside camps in Erbil. They reported different coping strategies. Almost one out of three households reduced the consumption of water, 15 percent spent money usually spent on other things to buy water, 8 percent borrowed money to buy water, 6 percent took water on credit from the shop, 5 percent borrowed from family/friends, and the rest used other strategies to cover their needs.

Access to bathroom facilities in the plot/apartment is the preferred option for families in KRI. Only four households out of 1,000 reported that they had no access to bathroom facilities. In Erbil, all households reported access to individual latrines/toilet facilities as reflected in Figure 53. However, wastewater management is challenging in Duhok and Sulaymaniyah.

In Sulaymaniyah’s Arbat refugee camp, the sanitation system is combined but wastewater is not properly disposed in the environment. In Duhok’s Domiz 1 camp, desludging the high volume of wastewater, which reaches 9,000 m³/month, continues to be a challenge. There is also the challenge of separating grey and black water at the household level in this camp. Failing to do so contributes to frequent filling of septic tanks which thus requires frequent desludging of septic tanks.
In total, 67 percent of households had access to improved pit latrines with cement slabs, 30 percent had access to flushing toilets and 3% had access to traditional pit latrines. In Erbil, 100 percent of the interviewed households had access to improved pit latrines while in Duhok and Sulaymaniyah, only 33 percent had access. Figure 53 shows the breakdown of households using sanitation facilities across the KRI.

Figure 54: Percentages of households using sanitation facilities

In terms of personal hygiene, 95% of all households had sufficient access to personal hygiene items such as soap, toothbrushes and toothpaste, 96 percent had access to cleaning/hygiene items such as laundry detergent and cleaning products, 88 percent had access to female hygiene and dignity items, and 66 percent had access to baby care items.

As far as WASH-related assets are concerned, across the KRI, 92 percent of households had water containers. In Erbil, UNHCR has provided water containers in refugee camps. This means 89 percent – almost all families in the camps – had a water container, with 68 percent stating that they had a water heater. In addition, all families had individual roof water tanks, made of high-density polyethylene material with at least 500 litres of storage capacity to secure water availability 24/24 hours.

In the camps, 50 percent of households had a water heater, while outside camps, 77 percent – over three out of every four households – had a water heater. Erbil camps had the lowest rate of households with water heaters, at 27 percent. In most cases, the water system at household level is designed to fit with installation of electrical equipment, such as solar panels and instant gas water heaters. Meanwhile, 83 percent of households had a washing machine, with the proportion almost identical for households inside and outside of camps. Only 2 percent of households had a dishwasher. In general, refugees had acquired these WASH items themselves.

The reported average monthly expenditure by households was USD 11 on hygiene supplies and USD 3 on water. The average expenditure for both water and hygiene supplies in camps ranged from USD 9 in Erbil refugee camps to USD 19 in Duhok refugee camps. It is worth noting that in Erbil refugee camps, there is no charge for water, thanks to the permanent availability of water from the source and presence of storage capacity at household level.

Overall, refugee households in the KRI have relatively good access to WASH facilities and items. The vast majority reported they had access to water, bathroom facilities and hygiene items. Access to WASH facilities was lower inside camps than outside camps, and lower in Sulaymaniyah than in Erbil. Considerations to be made on improving the access to WASH facilities are related to additional upgrades of the water system in the camps, at the source level (solar power) and at household level.
(storage equipment), in order to decrease operation and maintenance costs, ensure cost-effectiveness of the service delivery in the long run, and ensure safe elimination of wastewater in camps.

6.15 Shelter

Across the KRI, 84 percent of the interviewed households outside the camps lived in independent houses or apartments, while 13 percent shared independent houses or apartments with others, 2 percent lived in unfinished buildings or shelters, and 1 percent lived in other types of shelters. As for the out-of-camp population, 97 percent of households rented independent housing. Of these, 92 percent lived in unfurnished rental homes or apartments, meaning that the tenants had to buy their own furniture and equipment, and 5 percent lived in furnished rental homes or apartments. In addition, 1 percent had homes or apartments provided by their employers, and 2 percent had arranged other types of occupancy such as an owned apartment, hosted for free, squatting or assistance/charity.

Inside camps, 73 percent of the interviewed households lived in upgraded shelters. Among them, 1 percent of households shared their shelters, 9 percent lived in semi-upgraded shelters, and 7 percent lived in emergency shelters (tents). Shelter upgrading to durable shelters is ongoing in Erbil and Sulaymaniyah refugee camps by humanitarian agencies or through self-building by the refugees.

Figure 55: Shelter types outside camps

Figure 56: Shelter types in camps
For the 97 percent of the interviewed households outside camps that were renting independent housing, the average reported monthly rent was USD 185 throughout the KRI. The average rent in Erbil was USD 196, higher than in Sulaymaniyah and Duhok, where average rents were USD 171 and USD 157, respectively.

Lack of formal evidence of tenancy may have implications for documentation and consequently residency. Therefore, there is greater need for sustained and reliable housing options for refugees living outside of camps. This would call for ensuring legal counselling or representation for refugees in instances where their rights are likely to be violated.

Figure 57: Mean and median of monthly household rent outside camps in USD

In camps, the UNHCR shelter indicators were met or were acceptable. The average population density of 55.25 m² per person in the four camps in Erbil meets the UNHCR standard of 45 m² per person. This indicator is just acceptable in Duhok camps where density averaged 42 m² per person and Sulaymaniyah camps with 39 m² per person. The average space covered per person for all nine camps was 4.6 m² per person, which meets the UNHCR standard of 4.5 m² per person. More than 80 percent of households had more than 7 m² per person, while 16 percent had 3.6–7 m² per person, and only 1 percent had less than 3.5 m² per person.

In total, 4 percent of all households have received some sort of assistance to improve the quality of their shelter. For those that received assistance, 41 percent received materials, 40 percent received cash, and 19 percent received other sorts of support. The assistance to improve the quality of shelter for those households receiving support came from international NGOs (60 percent), UN agencies (24 percent), local NGOs or charities (7 percent), and local communities (1 percent). Another 7 percent did not know the source of the assistance.

Overall, the shelter conditions for refugees in and outside camp in the KRI are relatively good. Outside camp, the vast majority live in independent houses – 13 percent shared and 84 percent not shared. High rent and lack of formal rental agreements remain problematic, and could expose the families to further vulnerabilities such as exploitation, problems with documentation and residency, and evictions. Inside camps, 73 percent of the refugees are living in upgraded shelters and, in general, the shelter population density meets the UNHCR standards.

Going forward, consideration should be given to regular maintenance and upgrading of shelters and shelter units, and of infrastructure, such as roads, electricity and water networks, in camps.

---

16 We have taken into consideration that the average size of each room is 20 square meters for all types of shelter.
Comparatively to camp dwellings, the shelter sector has been less active in supporting shelter needs of the out-of-camp refugees. Considering that 52 percent of household renting was without a written contract, there is a need for legal counselling or representation to ensure that their rights are preserved. Rent and utilities constitute 41 percent of household expenditures, which is second only to household expenditure on food, which is 42 percent.

7. FOOD INSECURITY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDICATORS TO INFORM THE TARGETING CRITERIA

To define the targeting criteria, a logistic regression – also called a logit model\(^\text{17}\) – was used to explain socio-economic factors that affect food insecurity. Household expenditure was used as a proxy mean for food insecurity, given that expenditure is an indicator for household economic hardship and food insecurity. The idea behind the model is that economic hardship is a function of low access to income-generating activities and socio-economic burden on the household. Considering this, several indicators collected during the study, listed below, were used as independent variables.

- Housing (type and occupancy)
- Sanitation
- Assistance (in-kind, voucher, shelter, etc.)
- Assets
- Income (total, source)
- Wealth index (factor food assistance: in-kind, voucher)
- Education level (main earner of income)
- Demographics (sex and age of the head of household, size of household)
- Disability (sight, hearing, mobility, memory, self-care, communication)
- Employment (preceding three months and stability)
- Type of job (unskilled/skilled)

From the analysis, four key factors emerged as influencing the food security of Syrian refugees in camp populations.

- Household size – larger families have a higher probability of food insecurity.
- Illiteracy – having an illiterate head of household significantly increases the probability of food insecurity.
- Unskilled job – employment as a casual labourer significantly increases the probability of food insecurity.
- Pregnant or lactating household member – having a pregnant or lactating woman in the household significantly increases the probability of food insecurity.

For the out-of-camp population, two factors were identified.

- Household size – larger families have a higher probability of being food insecure.
- Wealth index – poorer households have a higher probability of being food insecure.

In summary, Table 6 shows the key factors to consider in targeting the most food insecure Syrian refugee households in Iraq.

[https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/r/dae/logit-regression/](https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/r/dae/logit-regression/)
As part of the targeting criteria, factors such as: i) elderly people without support and ii) households with disabled members (if the total expenditure is less than the Minimum Expenditure Basket) did not meet the targeting criteria because they were not statistically significant. However, as a way of acknowledging social protection issues, these factors could be considered as part of the targeting criteria. Also, it is worth noting that since the targeting requires having physically identifiable factors and wealth may not be easy to use as a criterion, findings have distinguished the poorer households as those that: are headed by females, rely on unsustainable income sources or have larger household sizes.

**8. CONCLUSIONS**

According to this assessment, an estimated 17,000 Syrian refugees in Iraq are food insecure. As such, this means the bulk of the Syrian refugee population in the KRI are able to acquire sufficient food for an active and healthy life. The study observed the most severe food insecurity among the refugees living in camps, with Erbil camps showing a higher proportion of food insecure households. The difference between the food insecurity figures in camps and outside of camps can be linked to the economic condition of camp vs non-camp areas, and to the better access to employment opportunities in urban and peri-urban areas. As such, income and expenditure are key indicators in highlighting food insecurity.

This assessment has found that a large percentage of the refugee population is vulnerable to food insecurity – a shock could push them into food insecurity. This indicates the need for building their resilience through livelihood projects driven by labour market needs that provide income-generating opportunities and skill development.

Iraq must import a significant portion of its food. Almost all Syrian refugees confirmed that their main source of food was the market, followed by voucher/e-card assistance. Market monitoring is therefore critical for ensuring that any price changes do not negatively impact food security, especially of the most vulnerable population.

Appropriate targeting will ensure that the most vulnerable households receive much-needed food assistance that will prevent them from engaging in negative coping strategies, such as selling household properties, taking children out of school, or engaging in illegal or risky acts. In Erbil and Duhok, it was widely observed that vulnerable families resorted to negative coping mechanisms, such as asset depletion and indebtedness and, as a consequence, will face more challenges in recovering from shocks.

The study concluded that one third of Syrian refugee households in Erbil and Duhok have no source of income. Among those that have at least one livelihood source, non-agriculture casual labour remains the most commonly reported livelihood activity in all governorates.

The key factors driving food insecurity of Syrian refugees living in camps were identified as household size, illiteracy, job skills and whether women were pregnant or lactating, while household size and wealth status were more relevant for the non-camp population. However, all of these factors should also be tied to income, as lack of income was found to be the key driver behind food insecurity. The study
Joint Vulnerability Assessment (UNHCR-WFP)

highlights the importance of continuing the provision of food assistance for those households that are assessed as food insecure, while determining the coping and resilience capacity of households that are likely to become food insecure in the event of a negative shock.

The socio-economic indicators highlighted as being key in this study should be mapped against multi-dimensional vulnerability indicators (socio-economic and protection measurements). A regular verification of multi-dimensional vulnerability needs to be combined with the development of policies aimed at increasing refugee access to livelihood opportunities. Such policies require an in-depth assessment of the opportunities available in the labour markets, an accurate value chain analysis where refugees are residing and a constant update on the skills and assets available within the refugee population.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

The continuation of food assistance for Syrian refugees requires the development of accurate targeting to ensure that food insecure households receive the assistance they need. At the same time, the targeting should allow for the identification of families who are not receiving food assistance but appear to be food insecure, and others still who are likely to become so, due to their socio-economic and protection vulnerabilities.

Further to the study outcomes, UNHCR and WFP concluded that a joint monitoring and targeting exercise should be applied to verify which households are food insecure, and to assess the multi-dimensional vulnerability of refugee households. To this aim, the food security calculation model used during the Joint Vulnerability Assessment should be combined with protection indicators.

Existing UNHCR registration data should be used to provide an initial prediction of which families are food insecure, based on the Joint Vulnerability Assessment sample findings. A phased targeting exercise will allow for the careful monitoring of vulnerable households in the camps, in order to verify their food security and protection status.

WFP and UNHCR will combine efforts and resources to conduct the targeting exercise gradually and in a transparent and informative manner to minimize the impact on the refugee population. Standard Operating Procedures should be drawn up to clearly delineate responsibilities through this process.

Targeting should be conducted in close coordination with local authorities, refugee communities, camp management and other service providers.
10. ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARI</td>
<td>Consolidated Approach to Reporting Indicators of Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFSVA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Confidence interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>Coping Strategy Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Dependency ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>Food Consumption Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDDS</td>
<td>Household dietary diversity score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td>House, land and property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally displaced person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAM</td>
<td>Joint Assessment Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JVA</td>
<td>Joint Vulnerability Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRI</td>
<td>Kurdistan Region of Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRG</td>
<td>Kurdistan Regional Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRSO</td>
<td>Kurdistan Region Statistics Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD</td>
<td>Minimum acceptable diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDD</td>
<td>Minimum dietary diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFI</td>
<td>Moderately food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMF</td>
<td>Minimum meal frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODK</td>
<td>Open Data Kit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>Primary health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHCC</td>
<td>Primary Health Care Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Probability proportional to size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO</td>
<td>Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBV</td>
<td>Sexual and gender-based violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHC</td>
<td>Secondary health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFI</td>
<td>Severely food insecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Standard operating procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToT</td>
<td>Terms of trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>UN Refugee Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, sanitation and hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme of the UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>