

Returns and Durable Solutions (ReDS) Assessment

**Markaz Samarra Sub-district
Samarra District, Salah Al-Din Governorate
Preliminary Findings Presentation, Iraq**

Assessment Methodology

- **Multi-sectoral** assessment tool, which combined **qualitative and quantitative** data
- Data collection was done **remotely by phone** between 6 and 16 November 2021, adapted to the context of the COVID-19 pandemic
- **Purposive sampling** methods were employed to identify KIs. Findings should therefore be considered as **indicative**.
- Methodology based on **key informant interviews** (KIIs)

↓ ↓ 👤 KI profiles in Markaz Samarra Sub-district

IDPs in community	13 KIs	<div></div>
Returnees (more than 3 months)	11 KIs	<div></div>
Returnees (more less 3 months)	6 KIs	<div></div>
Subject matter experts (SMEs)	5 KIs	<div></div>
IDPs (displaced from the area)	5 KIs	<div></div>
Community leaders	5 KIs	<div></div>

45 KIs

👤 15 KIs 👤 30 KIs





Recent Movements

Recent returns 27-35 households

As reported, the majority of households returned from non-camp areas in:

- Balad and Shirqat Districts
- Yathreb and Moutasim Sub-districts

The most reported reasons for returning were:

- Nostalgia from previous life,
- Sense of increased security,
- Following the return of other family members, and
- Perceived access to services.

Failed returns 9-14 households

Two KIs reported that households failed to return from Balad and Beigi districts.

The main reported reasons were:

- Lack of job opportunities and
- Perceived limited services in their AoO



Expected Movements

Expected returns

77-103 households

Households were reportedly expected to return from non-camp areas in:

- Suleimaniya Governorate
- Balad, Al-Daour, Shirqat and Tikri districts.

The main reported reasons:

- Nostalgia from previous life and
- Sense of increased security.

Family separation

A few KIs reported that there were **households with at least one adult male who remained displaced** at the time of data collection.

The main reasons:

- Lack of jobs in AoO,
- Housing damaged in AoO, and
- Limited basic public services in AoO.

Reunification plans

Two KIs believed that *“if job opportunities are provided to them in their areas of origin, they will return..”*



Access to Housing and Type of Tenure

Housing type and tenure

(Questions in this section excluded IDP KIs from the community)¹

As reported, the majority of households in the sub-district resided in **houses, apartments, and religious buildings.**

The majority of the households reportedly **owned** or **rented** their residences.

The majority of **returnee** and **IDP households** from the community reportedly **had** housing, land, and property **(HLP) documents proving ownership.**



Reported Proportion of Damaged Housing

Over 50%

¹ The tool was tailored to ask specific questions to KIs based on their physical presence or not in the area of assessment at the time of data collection and on assumptions around their knowledge of assessment topics, such as their understanding of factors which might impact the households' intentions.

Access to Housing Rehabilitation

Challenges

All KIs reported that households faced **challenges in accessing housing rehabilitation**.

The three most reported challenges were:

- Lack of compensation for housing rehabilitation,
- Returnee households lack financial resources to rehabilitate their houses, and
- Lack of skilled workers in the construction sector.

Support needed

KIs recommended to the government and humanitarian actors to:

- Implement housing rehabilitation projects.
- Provide financial support for housing rehabilitation directly to affected households.
- Provide legal support to claim properties and present compensation claims.





Access to Compensation Mechanisms

Accessibility

KIs reported that the majority of the **households were not able to access HLP compensation mechanisms.**

Challenges

- Delays or lack of transactions for compensation claims (long and complicated process),
- Affected households forced to pay bribes to governmental officials or intermediaries to present and process their claims, and
- Lack of legal support for households to present their compensation claims.



Access to Basic Public Services

Challenges

KIs reported that the majority of the households faced **challenges in accessing basic public services**, mainly healthcare, education, and water.

The three most reported challenges were:

- High level of damaged/destroyed infrastructure,
- Lack of governmental funds allocated to reactivate the public sector, and
- Lack/limited presence of specialized staff to provide basic public services due to their prolonged displacement and the lack of governmental jobs assigned to the sub-district.



Access to Livelihoods

Challenges

KIs reported that the majority of the households faced **challenges in accessing livelihoods**.

The most reported challenges were:

- Lack of decent job opportunities,
- Lack of governmental job appointments, the need for intermediaries, and the need to pay bribes to obtain employment, and
- Lack of governmental compensation for damages to the agricultural sector.

Potential for sectoral growth

The most commonly reported sectors of interest for returnee and IDP households were: **agriculture, healthcare, and education**.

Community leader and SME KIs reported that the **agriculture, public healthcare, and trade, hotel, and restaurant sectors** showed growth potential in the 12 months following data collection.



Access to Humanitarian Aid

Activities

(Questions in this section excluded IDP KIs from the community)

The majority of KIs reported that **there were humanitarian activities or projects implemented** in the area, such as:

- Food and NFI distribution,
- COVID-19 awareness, and
- Psycho-social support

The majority of KIs reported that these activities were mainly **implemented by humanitarian actors**.

Aid as a factor to encourage returns

(Questions in this section included IDP KIs from the community and returnee KIs)

The majority of IDP KIs from the community and returnee KIs reported that access to humanitarian aid **was a factor to encourage returns**.

The most reported needed humanitarian activities were:

- **Housing rehabilitation**, and
- Livelihoods.



Access to Judicial Mechanisms

Challenges

KIs reported that the majority of the households **did not face challenges in accessing public judicial mechanisms.**

However, a few KIs reported that the main challenges were related to the **lack of court in the sub-district** which **forced households to travel to the district center or to Tikri** to process their legal files.

-

Perceptions on Safety and Security

Feeling safe

The majority of **returnee** and **IDP households** reportedly **felt safe or very safe** in Markaz Samarra.

Some households reportedly felt **unsafe** or **a bit safe** due to the **presence of armed actors, checkpoints**, and the **presence of outstanding disputes**.

Resolving disputes

Disputes within the sub-district

Reportedly, **tribal leaders** were the most effective body in resolving disputes with the sub-district, followed by formal security forces and local authorities.

Disputes between the sub-district and other areas

Reportedly, **local authorities** were the most effective body in solving disputes with the sub-district and other areas, followed by formal security forces and tribal leaders.



Perceptions on Social Cohesion

Feeling welcome

KIs reported that the majority of **IDP households in the community** and **older returnee households** felt **somewhat welcome**.

The two most reported reasons were:

- Discrimination based on their displacement status, ethnicity, religion, and tribal roots and
- Some households had alleged links to ISIL.

The majority of **IDP households from the community** and **recent returnee households** reportedly felt **welcome**.

Interaction

KIs reported that the majority of households interacted with **returnees**, followed by IDPs in the community and remainees.

The most reported **ways of interaction** were of two main types:

- Social related and
- Work related.



Perceptions on Social Cohesion

Social cohesion bodies

The **local community** was perceived by KIs as the **main body to promote social cohesion**, followed by humanitarian actors.

Improving social cohesion

KIs believed that the **local authorities**, **tribal leaders**, and **humanitarian actors** played an important role to improve social cohesion.

Reported strategies or initiatives to improve social cohesion:

- Initiatives promoting access to work for all,
- Initiatives promoting community inter-relationships,
- Seminars, awareness sessions, and conferences, and
- Initiatives promoting safety and security.



Perceptions on Durable Solutions

Returnee households feeling re-integrated in AoO

(This section included returnee KIs)

The majority of KIs reported that **returnee households felt re-integrated** in Markaz Samarra.

The most reported reason was related to returning to their original areas and claiming to be *“the original population and decision-makers in the sub-district”*.

IDP households in the community feeling integrated in AoO

(This section included IDP KIs in the community)

All KIs reported that **IDP households in the community did not feel integrated** in Markaz Samarra.

The most reported reason was the **lack of an owned house** in the sub-district.

IDP households from the community feeling integrated in AoD

(This section included IDP KIs from the community)

All KIs reported that **IDP households from the community did not feel integrated** in their AoDs.

The most reported reason was the **lack of an owned house** in AoD.



[illegible]

THANKS FOR YOUR ATTENTION



Baghdad, Iraq



cristina.carrandi@impact-
initiatives.org



Upon request