

Iraq

# Monthly Post-Distribution Monitoring: UNHCR NFI and Cash Distributions to IDPs

Kurdistan Region of Iraq

November 2017

ANDIL

CR  
e Agency



**UNHCR**  
The UN Refugee Agency

**IMPACT**

Shaping practices  
Influencing policies  
Impacting lives

## Table of Contents

<b>Methodology.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>IDP Beneficiaries</b>	
Profile of Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in November.....	4
Issues faced by Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in November by Payment Modality....	5
Issues faced by All Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in November.....	6
Overview of Non-Food Item Distributions in November.....	7
Issues faced by Non-Food Item Distribution Beneficiaries in November.....	8
Overview of Cash for NFI beneficiaries in November.....	9
<b>Refugee Beneficiaries</b>	
Profile of Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in November.....	10
Issues faced by Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in November by Payment Modality....	11
Issues faced by All Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in November.....	12
Overview of Non-Food Item Distributions in November.....	13
Issues faced by Non-Food Item Beneficiaries in November.....	14
Overview of Cash for NFI beneficiaries in November.....	15

## METHODOLOGY OF MONTHLY MONITORING

IMPACT Initiatives (IMPACT) conducts post-distribution monitoring (PDM) of UNHCR's 2017 non-food item (NFI), multi-purpose cash assistance (MPCA), and cash for NFI distributions to refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) in the Kurdistan region of Iraq (KR-I) and neighbouring areas on a monthly basis. The objectives of monthly monitoring are to provide UNHCR with reports from beneficiaries on their progress and to identify any issues beneficiaries faced, either at the distribution or with the assistance received, for follow up.

To monitor distributions during the month of November, data were collected through telephone interviews with randomly sampled beneficiary households between 18 and 28 December 2017. A total of 1,149 IDP and 548 refugee beneficiaries were called. Of these, 1,051 IDPs and 497 refugees answered the phone, totalling 1,548 beneficiaries. Of the total beneficiaries who answered, 3 (<1%) could not remember the distributions, 1 (<1%) could not understand the enumerator and 45 (3%) reported not having received anything despite appearing in the beneficiary records. Hence, this report is based on a final sample of 1,011 IDP and 483 refugee beneficiaries who confirmed that they remembered the distributions and had received assistance.

**Table 1: Population of interest – beneficiaries assisted in November 2017 as per UNHCR records<sup>1</sup>**

	Dohuk		Erbil		Sulaymaniyah		Total
	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	
NFI	379	2,710	0	65	0	4,832	7,986
Cash for NFI	0	0	13	0	0	0	13
MPCA Cheque	1	0	155	1	1	0	158
MPCA MMT <sup>2</sup>	0	0	78	0	0	0	78
Total	380	2,710	246	66	1	4,832	8,235

Findings are disaggregated by type of assistance, IDP versus refugee beneficiaries and governorate. Where the population of interest is a minimum of 200 cases (see Table 1), samples were drawn to ensure findings are statistically representative with a 95% confidence level and 7% margin of error. For population groups of 200 or lower, censuses were attempted.<sup>3</sup> However, not all recipients responded. Monitoring of MPCA was conducted after beneficiaries had received all payments for which they had been approved. Distributions where the number of beneficiaries was less than 10 were not reported on.

**Table 2: Sample of beneficiaries assisted in November 2017<sup>4</sup>**

	Dohuk		Erbil		Sulaymaniyah		Total
	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	
NFI	274	476	0	34	0	500	1,284
Cash for NFI	0	0	9	0	0	0	9
MPCA Cheque	1	0	135	1	1	0	138
MPCA MMT	0	0	63	0	0	0	63
Total	275	476	207	35	1	500	1,494

Data were uploaded on a daily basis by an IMPACT Senior Data Collection Officer for cleaning and preliminary analysis. Feedback from the cleaning and analysis was shared every day with call centre enumerators during the morning debriefing. The final raw data was cleaned to eliminate demonstrably erroneous entries.

The following report consists of two chapters, IDPs and refugees, each of which contains six sections. The first section of the factsheets covers MPCA beneficiaries and provides an overview of the profile of the assisted population. The second and third sections report on partner non-compliance with UNHCR standards of MPCA programming. The overview of NFI distributions is meant to provide beneficiary feedback about the items they received, and the subsequent section reports on non-compliance issues faced by NFI beneficiaries. Lastly, the final section provides an overview of Cash for NFI beneficiaries and non-compliance issues related to this distribution.

Every effort was taken to protect the identities of participants involved in this study and ensure the integrity of the data collected. Beneficiaries were informed at the onset of the interview that their participation had no link to receiving assistance, and that information provided would be strictly confidential.

### Limitations

All results are based on UNHCR beneficiary lists and do not include other persons of concern (PoCs) that were not targeted for assistance. Therefore, it is not possible to generalise findings for the IDP and refugee populations at large. Due to inherent biases in self-reporting, there may be under-reporting of certain indicators related to the assistance received.

The 'dependents' indicator shows the percentage of household members dependent on working age adults within that household (18 to 60 years of age). The indicator also accounts for the elderly, or working age adults who are unable to work due to chronic illness, and who are therefore also defined as dependent.

<sup>1</sup> The population of interest is determined by the number of useable beneficiary data points submitted by UNHCR.

<sup>2</sup> MPCA Mobile Money Transfer (MMT). Findings for MPCA payments have been reported separately for MPCA cheque and MPCA MMT payments.

<sup>3</sup> The minimum number of cases used to determine a census is 68. Where population group sizes are generally low this minimum number will be increased in accordance with data collection capacity, and may therefore change from month to month.

<sup>4</sup> Based on the useable entries of the population of interest as seen in the Table 1.



## PROFILE OF IDP MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN NOVEMBER<sup>5</sup>







	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
<b>AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE PER NUMBER OF MPCA PAYMENTS RECEIVED</b>				
1 Payment	-	-	-	-
2 Payments	-	-	-	-
3 Payments	-	-	-	-
<b>PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS<sup>6</sup></b>				
Female-headed household	-	-	-	-
Chronic illness	-	-	-	-
Physical disability	-	-	-	-
Mental disability	-	-	-	-
Elderly	-	-	-	-
Pregnant or nursing	-	-	-	-
Child under 5	-	-	-	-
<b>DEPENDENTS<sup>7</sup></b> (% of household members dependent on household working age adults)	-	-	-	-
<b>PERCENT OF MPCA BENEFICIARIES WITH NO INCOME</b>				
	-	-	-	-
<b>PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH<sup>8</sup></b>				
1	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	-	-
3	-	-	-	-

<sup>5</sup> In November, there were less than 10 IDP beneficiaries who received MPCA payments in KR-I (one respondent in Erbil) and therefore findings are not reported here.

<sup>6</sup> This section reports on percent of households where at least one member has the following specific needs.

<sup>7</sup> Working age adults (18-60 years) does not include the elderly, or adults with chronic illness.

## ISSUES FACED BY IDP MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN NOVEMBER BY PAYMENT MODALITY

	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
<b>PERCENT OF MPCA BENEFICIARIES BY PAYMENT MODALITY</b>				
 Cheque/Cash	-	-	-	-
 Mobile Money Transfer (MMT)	-	-	-	-
<b>SATISFACTION WITH THE MPCA MODALITY</b>				
 Not satisfied	-	-	-	-
 Somewhat satisfied	-	-	-	-
 Satisfied	-	-	-	-
 Very satisfied	-	-	-	-

## ISSUES FACED BY IDP MPCA CHEQUE BENEFICIARIES<sup>8</sup>

Were not satisfied with the cheque distribution process <sup>9</sup>	-	-	-	-
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	-	-	-	-
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	-	-	-	-
Received no information on what would be distributed	-	-	-	-
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed <sup>10</sup>	-	-	-	-

## ISSUES FACED BY IDP MPCA MMT BENEFICIARIES

Faced registration difficulties	-	-	-	-
Waited more than 2 hours to register	-	-	-	-
Had difficulties understanding registration instructions	-	-	-	-
Charged for sim card	-	-	-	-
Had difficulties cashing out MMT payment	-	-	-	-
Charged for cashing out MMT payment	-	-	-	-

<sup>8</sup> Only beneficiaries who attended MPCA cheque distributions were asked about the issues highlighted in this section.

<sup>9</sup> All "no" answers include those who believed they were "not satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied".

<sup>10</sup> All "no" answers include those who reported the distribution to be "not managed" and "somewhat managed".

## ISSUES FACED BY ALL IDP MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN NOVEMBER<sup>11</sup>

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Travelled to receive cash assistance more than once	-	-	-	-
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to receive cash assistance	-	-	-	-
Were not informed about the selection process	-	-	-	-
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection <sup>12</sup>	-	-	-	-
Reported they received nothing <sup>13</sup>	-	-	-	-
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	-	-	-	-
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	-	-	-	-

## BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN MPCA IN NOVEMBER<sup>14</sup>

	-	-	-	-
--	---	---	---	---

## TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN NOVEMBER

In-kind	-	-	-	-
Cash	-	-	-	-
Vouchers	-	-	-	-
None	-	-	-	-

## SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN NOVEMBER

Don't know	-	-	-	-
Other UN	-	-	-	-
Government	-	-	-	-
Qandil	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-

<sup>11</sup> All beneficiaries were asked about the issues highlighted in this section, regardless of payment modality or whether they attended MPCA distributions.

<sup>12</sup> “Wasta” is the Arabic term for ‘nepotism’ or ‘corruption’ - relating to favours through personal networks.

<sup>13</sup> Figures from this indicator are drawn from the total sample of beneficiaries called for this report.

<sup>14</sup> For this section, multiple options were available to the respondents and numbers may therefore exceed 100%.

## OVERVIEW OF NFI DISTRIBUTIONS TO IDPS IN NOVEMBER

### REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO IDPS IN DOHUK<sup>15</sup>

% of NFI beneficiaries who received item		Blanket	Kerosene Can	Tarpaulin	Cooking Stove	Heating Stove	Kerosene	Hygiene Kit	Kitchen Set	Mattresses	Water Jerry Cans	Tent	Lamps
		94%	67%	93%	3%	94%	0% <sup>16</sup>	8%	3%	4%	28%	1% <sup>17</sup>	2% <sup>18</sup>
Was it useful?	Yes	85%	97%	97%	100%	100%	N/A	95%	100%	95%	98%	N/A	N/A
	No	15%	3%	3%	0%	0%	N/A	5%	0%	5%	2%	N/A	N/A
Was it of good quality?	Yes	79%	99%	100%	93%	99%	N/A	100%	100%	100%	99%	N/A	N/A
	No	21%	1%	0%	7%	1%	N/A	0%	0%	0%	1%	N/A	N/A
Did you use it?	Yes	97%	96%	87%	86%	97%	N/A	100%	100%	100%	94%	N/A	N/A
	No	3%	4%	13%	14%	3%	N/A	0%	0%	0%	6%	N/A	N/A

### REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO IDPS IN ERBIL

% of NFI beneficiaries who received item		Blanket	Kerosene Can	Tarpaulin	Cooking Stove	Heating Stove	Kerosene	Hygiene Kit	Kitchen Set	Mattresses	Water Jerry Cans	Tent	Lamps
		18% <sup>19</sup>	6% <sup>20</sup>	26% <sup>21</sup>	-	97%	3% <sup>22</sup>	24% <sup>23</sup>	12% <sup>24</sup>	18% <sup>25</sup>	9% <sup>26</sup>	-	0% <sup>27</sup>
Was it useful?	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	94%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A
	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	6%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A
Was it of good quality?	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	94%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A
	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	6%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A
Did you use it?	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	88%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A
	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	12%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A

### REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO IDPS IN SULAYMANIYAH

% of NFI beneficiaries who received item		Blanket	Kerosene Can	Tarpaulin	Cooking Stove	Heating Stove	Kerosene	Hygiene Kit	Kitchen Set	Mattresses	Water Jerry Cans	Tent	Lamps
		36%	24%	24%	21%	9%	6%	40%	26%	39%	48%	2%	1%
Was it useful?	Yes	78%	97%	98%	86%	93%	97%	93%	96%	93%	92%	100%	100%
	No	22%	3%	2%	14%	7%	3%	7%	4%	7%	8%	0%	0%
Was it of good quality?	Yes	68%	100%	100%	83%	93%	100%	98%	98%	96%	94%	100%	100%
	No	32%	0%	0%	17%	7%	0%	2%	2%	4%	6%	0%	0%
Did you use it?	Yes	96%	97%	97%	90%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	93%	75%	100%
	No	4%	3%	3%	10%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	7%	25%	0%

<sup>15</sup> All "no" answers for the indicator "Was it useful?" include those who believed the items they received to be "not useful" or "somewhat useful".

<sup>16</sup> Only one beneficiary received kerosene in Dohuk in November.

<sup>17</sup> Only three beneficiaries received tents in Dohuk in November.

<sup>18</sup> Only three beneficiaries received lamps in Dohuk in November.

<sup>19</sup> Only six beneficiaries received blankets in Erbil in November.

<sup>20</sup> Only two beneficiaries received kerosene cans in Erbil in November.

<sup>21</sup> Only nine beneficiaries received tarpaulin in Erbil in November.

<sup>22</sup> Only one beneficiary received kerosene in Erbil in November.

<sup>23</sup> Only eight beneficiaries received hygiene kit in Erbil in November.

<sup>24</sup> Only four beneficiaries received kitchen sets in Erbil in November.

<sup>25</sup> Only six beneficiaries received mattresses in Erbil in November.

<sup>26</sup> Only three beneficiaries received water jerry cans in Erbil in November.

<sup>27</sup> Only one beneficiary received a lamp in Erbil in November.

## ISSUES FACED BY IDP NFI BENEFICIARIES IN NOVEMBER

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	1%	0%	2%	1%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	1%	0%	4%	3%
Were not informed about the selection process	81%	85%	84%	83%
Believed there was "wasta" involved with their selection	3%	10%	3%	3%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	12%	5%	13%	12%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	3%	0%	9%	6%
Received no information on what would be distributed	23%	0%	7%	14%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	3%	0%	0%	1%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	5%	0%	10%	8%
Reported they received nothing	2%	0%	5%	3%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	92%	80%	95%	94%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	93%	88%	92%	92%

## MOST COMMON ISSUE WITH THE ITEM RECEIVED AND PERCENT OF RECIPIENTS WHO EXPERIENCED IT<sup>28</sup>

Item	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%
Blankets	Poor Quality	10%	-	-	Poor Quality	19%	Poor Quality	14%
Kerosene Can	Not Needed	2%	-	-	Not Needed	2%	Not Needed	2%
Tarpaulin	Not Needed	2%	-	-	Not Needed	1%	Not Needed	1%
Cooking Stove	N/A	N/A	-	-	Poor Quality	14%	Poor Quality	13%
Heating Stove	N/A	N/A	Poor Quality	2%	Poor Quality	7%	Poor Quality	1%
Kerosene	-	-	-	-	Not Enough	3%	Not Enough	3%
Hygiene Kit	Not Enough	5%	-	-	Not Enough	5%	Not Enough	5%
Kitchen Sets	N/A	N/A	-	-	Poor Quality	2%	Poor Quality	1%
Mattresses	Not Enough	5%	-	-	Not Enough	5%	Not Enough	5%
Water Jerry Cans	Not Needed	1%	-	-	Not Needed	3%	Not Needed	1%
Tent	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lamps	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

<sup>28</sup> N/A means no issue was reported.





## OVERVIEW OF IDP CASH FOR NFI BENEFICIARIES IN NOVEMBER

There were no IDP Cash for NFI distributions in November.

## PROFILE OF REFUGEE MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN NOVEMBER

	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH <sup>29</sup>	OVERALL
<b>AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE PER NUMBER OF MPCA PAYMENTS RECEIVED</b>				
1 Payment	-	5	-	5
2 Payments	-	4	-	4
3 Payments	-	4	-	4
<b>PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS<sup>30</sup></b>				
Female-headed household	-	24%	-	24%
Chronic illness	-	60%	-	60%
Physical disability	-	12%	-	11%
Mental disability	-	1%	-	1%
Elderly	-	30%	-	30%
Pregnant or nursing	-	13%	-	13%
Child under 5	-	23%	-	23%
<b>DEPENDENTS</b> (% of household members dependent on household working age adults)	-	<b>34%</b>	-	<b>33%</b>
<b>PERCENT OF MPCA BENEFICIARIES WITH NO INCOME</b>				
	-	<b>14%</b>	-	<b>14%</b>
<b>PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH<sup>31</sup></b>				
1	-	Paying Debt	-	Paying Debt
2	-	Healthcare	-	Healthcare
3	-	Rent	-	Rent


<sup>29</sup> In November, there were less than 10 refugee beneficiaries who received MPCA payments in Dohuk and Sulaymaniyah, which have not been reported at governorate level.

However, because findings are aggregated to KR-I level, the overall proportions of the reported issues include those faced by refugee MPCA beneficiaries in Dohuk and Sulaymaniyah.

<sup>30</sup> This section reports on percent of households where at least one member has the following specific needs.

<sup>31</sup> On average, between 57% and 69% of the received cash was spent on the top three reported areas of spending.

## ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN NOVEMBER BY PAYMENT MODALITY



## ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE MPCA CHEQUE BENEFICIARIES<sup>32</sup>

Were not satisfied with the cheque distribution process	-	2%	-	2%
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	-	0%	-	0%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	-	16%	-	16%
Received no information on what would be distributed	-	12%	-	12%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	-	3%	-	3%
Had difficulties cashing their cheques	-	0%	-	0%

## ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE MPCA MMT BENEFICIARIES

Faced registration difficulties	-	2%	-	2%
Waited more than 2 hours to register	-	2%	-	2%
Had difficulties understanding registration instructions	-	9%	-	9%
Charged for sim card	-	12%	-	12%
Had difficulties cashing out MMT payment	-	0%	-	0%
Charged for cashing out MMT payment	-	0%	-	0%

<sup>32</sup> Only beneficiaries who attended MPCA cheque distributions were asked about the issues highlighted in this section.

## ISSUES FACED BY ALL REFUGEE MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN NOVEMBER<sup>33</sup>

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Travelled to receive cash assistance more than once	-	5%	-	4%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to receive cash assistance	-	0%	-	0%
Were not informed about the selection process	-	68%	-	68%
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection	-	1%	-	1%
Reported they received nothing	-	0%	-	0%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	-	79%	-	79%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	-	90%	-	90%

## BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN MPCA IN NOVEMBER

	-	67%	-	67%
--	---	-----	---	-----

### TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN NOVEMBER

In-kind	-	3%	-	3%
Cash	-	66%	-	66%
Vouchers	-	0%	-	0%
None	-	33%	-	33%

### SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN NOVEMBER

Government	-	0%	-	0%
Other UN	-	4%	-	4%
Religious Groups	-	1%	-	1%
Qandil	-	62%	-	62%
Other	-	39%	-	39%

<sup>33</sup> All beneficiaries were asked about the issues highlighted in this section, regardless of payment modality or whether they attended MPCA distributions.

## OVERVIEW OF NFI DISTRIBUTIONS TO REFUGEES IN NOVEMBER

### REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO REFUGEES IN DOHUK

% of NFI beneficiaries who received item		Blanket	Kerosene Can	Tarpaulin	Cooking Stove	Heating Stove	Kerosene	Hygiene Kit	Kitchen Set	Mattresses	Water Jerry Cans	Tent	Fans	Lamps
		97%	42%	55%	11%	59%	-	9%	14%	46%	16%	-	-	-
Was it useful?	Yes	88%	97%	99%	90%	98%	-	100%	97%	84%	98%	-	-	-
	No	22%	3%	1%	10%	2%	-	0%	3%	16%	2%	-	-	-
Was it of good quality?	Yes	95%	98%	100%	93%	96%	-	100%	97%	93%	100%	-	-	-
	No	5%	2%	0%	7%	4%	-	0%	3%	7%	0%	-	-	-
Did you use it?	Yes	95%	97%	85%	76%	93%	-	100%	100%	98%	96%	-	-	-
	No	5%	3%	15%	24%	7%	-	0%	0%	2%	4%	-	-	-

### REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO REFUGEES IN ERBIL

No NFI distributions were monitored in Erbil in November.

### REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO REFUGEES IN SULAYMANIYAH

No NFI distributions were monitored in Sulaymaniyah in November.



## ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE NFI BENEFICIARIES IN NOVEMBER

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%	-	-	0%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	1%	-	-	1%
Were not informed about the selection process	74%	-	-	74%
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection	0%	-	-	0%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	9%	-	-	9%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	3%	-	-	3%
Received no information on what would be distributed	22%	-	-	22%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	1%	-	-	1%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	2%	-	-	2%
Reported they received nothing	2%	-	-	2%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	91%	-	-	91%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	88%	-	-	88%

## MOST COMMON ISSUE WITH THE ITEM RECEIVED AND PERCENT OF RECIPIENTS WHO EXPERIENCED IT

Item	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%
Blankets	Poor Quality	28%	-	-	-	-	Poor Quality	28%
Kerosene Cans	Not Needed	2%	-	-	-	-	Not Needed	2%
Tarpaulin	Not Needed	1%	-	-	-	-	Not Needed	1%
Cooking Stove	Not Needed	7%	-	-	-	-	Not Needed	7%
Heating Stove	Poor Quality	2%	-	-	-	-	Poor Quality	2%
Kerosene	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hygiene Kit	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Kitchen Sets	Not Enough	3%	-	-	-	-	Not Enough	3%
Mattresses	Not Enough	9%	-	-	-	-	Not Enough	9%
Water Jerry Can	Not Needed	2%	-	-	-	-	Not Needed	2%
Tent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lamps	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



## OVERVIEW OF CASH FOR NFI DISTRIBUTIONS TO REFUGEES IN NOVEMBER<sup>34</sup>

Findings for Cash for NFI distributions for refugees have not been reported here due to low sample sizes in November.

---

<sup>34</sup> Cash for NFI was only distributed to nine beneficiaries in Erbil in November.