



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

Kurdistan Region of Iraq

August 2017

Table of Contents

Methodology.....	3
IDP Beneficiaries	
Profile of Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in August.....	4
Issues faced by Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in August by Payment Modality...	5
Issues faced by All Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in August.....	6
Overview of Non-Food Item Distributions in August.....	7
Issues faced by Non-Food Item Distribution Beneficiaries in August.....	8
Overview of Cash for NFI beneficiaries in August.....	9
Refugee Beneficiaries	
Profile of Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in August.....	10
Issues faced by Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in August by Payment Modality...	11
Issues faced by All Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in August.....	12
Overview of Non-Food Item Distributions in August.....	13
Issues faced by Non-Food Item Beneficiaries in August.....	14
Overview of Cash for NFI beneficiaries in August.....	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 August, data were collected through telephone interviews with randomly sampled beneficiary households between 9 and 30 October 2017. A total of 516 IDP and 564 refugee beneficiaries were called. Of these, 472 IDPs and 379 refugees answered the phone, totalling 851 beneficiaries. Of the total beneficiaries who answered, 5 (<1%) could not remember the distributions and 12 (<1%) reported having not received anything despite appearing in the beneficiary records. Hence, this report is based on a final sample of 374 IDP and 456 refugee beneficiaries who confirmed that they remembered the distributions and had received assistance.

Table 1: Population of interest – beneficiaries assisted in August 2017 as per UNHCR records¹

	Dohuk		Erbil		Sulaymaniyah		Total
	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	
NFI	76	27	23	1364	0	0	1490
Cash for NFI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MPCA Cheque	0	0	27	8	1	0	36
MPCA MMT ²	51	35	481	0	136	0	703
Total	127	62	531	1372	137	0	2229

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.³ 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 August 2017⁴

	Dohuk		Erbil		Sulaymaniyah		Total
	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	
NFI	76	27	23	300	0	0	426
Cash for NFI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MPCA Cheque	0	0	27	8	1	0	36
MPCA MMT	51	30	198	0	136	0	415
Total	127	57	248	308	137	0	877

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.

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

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

³ 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.

⁴ Based on the useable entries of the population of interest as seen in the Table 1.

PROFILE OF IDP MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN AUGUST


	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE PER NUMBER OF MPCA PAYMENTS RECEIVED				
1 Payment	5	5	-	5
2 Payments	-	-	-	-
3 Payments	-	4	-	4
PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS⁵				
Female-headed household	2%	25%	-	6%
Chronic illness	48%	67%	-	52%
Physical disability	28%	33%	-	29%
Mental disability	7%	17%	-	9%
Elderly	7%	67%	-	18%
Pregnant or nursing	38%	17%	-	34%
Child under 5	35%	0%	-	28%
DEPENDENTS⁶ (% of household members dependent on household working age adults)	58%	28%	-	52%
PERCENT OF MPCA BENEFICIARIES WITH NO INCOME				
	17%	0%	-	14%
PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH⁷				
1	Food	Food	-	Food
2	Rent	Rent	-	Rent
3	Healthcare	Healthcare	-	Healthcare

⁵ This section reports on percent of households where at least one member has the following specific needs.

⁶ Working age adults (18-60 years) does not include the elderly, or adults with chronic illness.

⁷ On average, between 28% and 35% of the received cash was spent on the top three reported areas of spending.

ISSUES FACED BY IDP MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN AUGUST BY PAYMENT MODALITY



ISSUES FACED BY IDP MPCA CHEQUE BENEFICIARIES⁸

Were not satisfied with the cheque distribution process ⁹	-	-	-	-
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 ¹⁰	-	-	-	-
Had difficulties cashing their cheques	-	-	-	-

ISSUES FACED BY IDP MPCA MMT BENEFICIARIES

Faced registration difficulties	17%	-	-	17%
Waited more than 2 hours to register	17%	-	-	17%
Had difficulties understanding registration instructions	11%	-	-	11%
Charged for sim card	31%	-	-	31%
Had difficulties cashing out MMT payment	21%	-	-	21%
Charged for cashing out MMT payment ¹¹	21%	-	-	21%

⁸ Only beneficiaries who attended MPCA cheque distributions were asked about the issues highlighted in this section. In August, there were less than ten IDP beneficiaries who attended MPCA cheque distributions, so findings have not been reported here.

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

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

¹¹ Beneficiaries who were charged for cashing out their MPCA MMT payment reported paying between 7,000 and 60,000 Iraqi Dinar (IQD) in August.

ISSUES FACED BY ALL IDP MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN AUGUST¹²

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Travelled to receive cash assistance more than once	13%	0%	-	11%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to receive cash assistance	3%	0%	-	3%
Were not informed about the selection process	86%	33%	-	76%
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection ¹³	3%	0%	-	3%
Reported they received nothing ¹⁴	0%	0%	-	0%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	83%	100%	-	86%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	62%	100%	-	71%

BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN MPCA IN AUGUST¹⁵

31%

17%

-

28%

TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN AUGUST

In-kind	27%	0%	-	22%
Cash	0%	17%	-	3%
Vouchers	3%	0%	-	3%
None	69%	83%	-	72%

SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN AUGUST

Don't know	44%	0%	-	40%
Other UN	33%	0%	-	30%
Government	12%	0%	-	10%
Qandil	0%	100%	-	10%
Other	11%	0%	-	10%

¹² All beneficiaries were asked about the issues highlighted in this section, regardless of payment modality or whether they attended MPCA distributions.

¹³ “Wasta” is the Arabic term for ‘nepotism’ or ‘corruption’ - relating to favours through personal networks.

¹⁴ Figures from this indicator are drawn from the total sample of beneficiaries called for this report.

¹⁵ For this section, multiple options were available to the respondents and numbers may therefore exceed 100%.

6

OVERVIEW OF NFI DISTRIBUTIONS TO IDPS IN AUGUST

REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO IDPS IN DOHUK¹⁶

% 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
		95%	-	14% ¹⁷	19% ¹⁸	1% ¹⁹	-	19% ²⁰	19% ²¹	95%	19% ²²	-	-	-
Was it useful?	Yes	85%	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	95%	N/A	-	-	-
	No	15%	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	5%	N/A	-	-	-
Was it of good quality?	Yes	95%	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A	-	-	-
	No	5%	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	0%	N/A	-	-	-
Did you use it?	Yes	100%	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A	-	-	-
	No	0%	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	0%	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	Fans	Lamps
		3%	33%	34%	34%	1% ²³	23%	37%	36%	40%	26%	32%	4%	28%
Was it useful?	Yes	91%	98%	100%	76%	N/A	90%	97%	97%	95%	99%	98%	100%	96%
	No	9%	2%	0%	24%	N/A	10%	3%	3%	5%	1%	2%	0%	4%
Was it of good quality?	Yes	91%	98%	100%	56%	N/A	96%	99%	94%	94%	98%	93%	100%	99%
	No	9%	2%	0%	44%	N/A	4%	1%	6%	6%	2%	7%	0%	1%
Did you use it?	Yes	82%	99%	100%	97%	N/A	100%	99%	98%	98%	100%	100%	100%	98%
	No	18%	1%	0%	3%	N/A	0%	1%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	2%

REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO IDPS IN SULAYMANIYAH

No NFI distributions were monitored in Sulaymaniyah in August.

¹⁶ All "no" answers for the indicator "Was it useful?" include those who believed the items they received to be "not useful" or "somewhat useful".

¹⁷ Only three beneficiaries received tarpaulin in Dohuk in August.

¹⁸ Only four beneficiaries received cooking stoves in Dohuk in August.

¹⁹ Only two beneficiaries received heating stoves in Dohuk in August.

²⁰ Only four beneficiaries received hygiene kits in Dohuk in August.

²¹ Only four beneficiaries received kitchen sets in Dohuk in August.

²² Only four beneficiaries received water jerry cans in Dohuk in August.

²³ Only two heating stoves were distributed in Erbil in August.

ISSUES FACED BY IDP NFI BENEFICIARIES IN AUGUST

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%	1%	-	1%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	0%	16%	-	16%
Were not informed about the selection process	40%	61%	-	60%
Believed there was "wasta" involved with their selection	0%	2%	-	2%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	0%	32%	-	31%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	0%	13%	-	12%
Received no information on what would be distributed	25%	27%	-	27%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	0%	1%	-	1%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	0%	21%	-	20%
Reported they received nothing	4%	1%	-	1%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	100%	89%	-	89%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	100%	96%	-	96%

MOST COMMON ISSUE WITH THE ITEM RECEIVED AND PERCENT OF RECIPIENTS WHO EXPERIENCED IT²⁴

Item	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%
Blankets	Not Enough	15%	Not Enough	9%	-	-	Not Enough	11%
Kerosene Can	-	-	Poor Quality	2%	-	-	Poor Quality	2%
Tarpaulin	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	N/A	N/A
Cooking Stove	N/A	N/A	Poor Quality	37%	-	-	Poor Quality	36%
Heating Stove	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	N/A	N/A
Kerosene	-	-	Poor Timing	9%	-	-	Poor Timing	9%
Hygiene Kit	N/A	N/A	Not Enough	2%	-	-	Not Enough	3%
Kitchen Sets	N/A	N/A	Poor Quality	3%	-	-	Poor Quality	3%
Mattresses	N/A	N/A	Poor Quality	5%	-	-	Poor Quality	4%
Water Jerry Cans	N/A	N/A	Not Enough	2%	-	-	Not Enough	2%
Tent	-	-	Poor Quality	2%	-	-	Poor Quality	2%
Fans	-	-	N/A	N/A	-	-	N/A	N/A
Lamps	-	-	Not Enough	5%	-	-	Not Enough	5%

²⁴ N/A means no issue was reported.



OVERVIEW OF IDP CASH FOR NFI BENEFICIARIES IN AUGUST

There were no IDP Cash for NFI distributions in August.


PROFILE OF REFUGEE MPCA BENEFICIARIES

	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE PER NUMBER OF MPCA PAYMENTS RECEIVED				
1 Payment	4	4	5	4
2 Payments	-	5	-	5
3 Payments	-	5	5	5
PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS²⁵				
Female-headed household	4%	2%	21%	6%
Chronic illness	40%	35%	68%	42%
Physical disability	6%	8%	16%	10%
Mental disability	0%	0%	3%	1%
Elderly	2%	3%	20%	6%
Pregnant or nursing	55%	40%	11%	35%
Child under 5	47%	50%	9%	41%
DEPENDENTS (% of household members dependent on household working age adults)	43%	45%	35%	43%
PERCENT OF MPCA BENEFICIARIES WITH NO INCOME				
	9%	12%	19%	13%
PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH²⁶				
1	Rent	Rent	Paying Debt	Rent
2	Paying Debt	Paying Debt	Food	Paying Debt
3	Food	Food	Rent	Food

²⁵ This section reports on percent of households where at least one member has the following specific needs.

²⁶ On average, between 57% and 70% of the received cash was spent on the top three reported areas of spending.

ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN AUGUST BY PAYMENT MODALITY



ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE MPCA CHEQUE BENEFICIARIES²⁷

Were not satisfied with the cheque distribution process	-	0%	-	0%
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	-	0%	-	0%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	-	0%	-	0%
Received no information on what would be distributed	-	21%	-	21%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	-	0%	-	0%
Had difficulties cashing their cheques	-	0%	-	0%

ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE MPCA MMT BENEFICIARIES

Faced registration difficulties	43%	6%	13%	10%
Waited more than 2 hours to register	39%	2%	16%	7%
Had difficulties understanding registration instructions	5%	7%	13%	8%
Charged for sim card	32%	15%	6%	14%
Had difficulties cashing out MMT payment	11%	3%	1%	3%
Charged for cashing out MMT payment ²⁸	19%	4%	29%	10%

²⁷ Only beneficiaries who attended MPCA cheque distributions were asked about the issues highlighted in this section. In August, there were less than ten refugee beneficiaries who attended MPCA cheque distributions in Sulaymaniyah, so findings have not been reported here. However, because findings are disaggregated by governorate, the overall proportions of the reported issues include those faced by refugee MPCA cheque beneficiaries in Sulaymaniyah.

²⁸ Beneficiaries who were charged for cashing out their MPCA MMT payment reported paying between 1,000 and 16,000 Iraqi Dinar (IQD) in August.

ISSUES FACED BY ALL REFUGEE MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN AUGUST²⁹

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Travelled to receive cash assistance more than once	23%	10%	12%	11%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to receive cash assistance	2%	2%	6%	3%
Were not informed about the selection process	79%	70%	66%	70%
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection	17%	0%	1%	2%
Reported they received nothing	0%	0%	0%	0%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	85%	82%	83%	83%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	82%	77%	67%	76%

BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN MPCA IN AUGUST

	0%	19%	1%	14%
TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN AUGUST				
In-kind	0%	0%	1%	1%
Cash	0%	19%	0%	13%
Vouchers	0%	0%	0%	0%
None	100%	81%	99%	86%

SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN AUGUST

Don't know	0%	9%	0%	9%
Other UN	0%	0%	100%	0%
Government	0%	0%	0%	0%
Religious Groups	0%	14%	0%	14%
Other	0%	77%	0%	76%

²⁹ 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 AUGUST

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
		76%	11% ³⁰	9% ³¹	11% ³²	-	-	18%	29%	98%	15%	1% ³³	-	-
Was it useful?	Yes	78%	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	100%	94%	91%	100%	N/A	-	-
	No	22%	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	0%	6%	9%	0%	N/A	-	-
Was it of good quality?	Yes	76%	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	100%	94%	93%	100%	N/A	-	-
	No	24%	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	0%	6%	7%	0%	N/A	-	-
Did you use it?	Yes	95%	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	N/A	-	-
	No	5%	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	N/A	-	-

REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO REFUGEES IN ERBIL³⁴

% 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
		64%	-	9% ³⁵	-	9% ³⁶	-	27%	36%	73%	9% ³⁷	27%	17%	9% ³⁸
Was it useful?	Yes	86%	-	N/A	-	N/A	-	100%	100%	87%	N/A	100%	100%	N/A
	No	14%	-	N/A	-	N/A	-	0%	0%	13%	N/A	0%	0%	N/A
Was it of good quality?	Yes	57%	-	N/A	-	N/A	-	100%	100%	87%	N/A	100%	100%	N/A
	No	43%	-	N/A	-	N/A	-	0%	0%	13%	N/A	0%	0%	N/A
Did you use it?	Yes	100%	-	N/A	-	N/A	-	100%	100%	100%	N/A	100%	100%	N/A
	No	0%	-	N/A	-	N/A	-	0%	0%	0%	N/A	0%	0%	N/A

REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO REFUGEES IN SULAYMANIYAH

No NFI distributions were monitored in Sulaymaniyah in August.

³⁰ Kerosene cans were only distributed to three beneficiaries in Dohuk in August.

³¹ Tarpaulin was only distributed to five beneficiaries in Dohuk in August.

³² Cooking stoves were only distributed to six beneficiaries in Dohuk in August.

³³ Tents were only distributed to one beneficiary in Dohuk in August.

³⁴ There were a total of 11 refugee beneficiaries who received NFI distributions in Erbil in August.

³⁵ Tarpaulin was only distributed to one beneficiary in Erbil in August.

³⁶ Only one heating stove was distributed in Erbil in August.

³⁷ Water Jerry Cans were only distributed to six beneficiaries in Erbil in August.

³⁸ Lamps were only distributed to one beneficiary in Erbil in August.

ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE NFI BENEFICIARIES IN AUGUST

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL ³⁹	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%	-	-	3%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	0%	-	-	0%
Were not informed about the selection process	47%	-	-	49%
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection	0%	-	-	0%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	9%	-	-	7%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	0%	-	-	0%
Received no information on what would be distributed	7%	-	-	8%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	0%	-	-	0%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	0%	-	-	0%
Reported they received nothing	0%	-	-	4%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	89%	-	-	91%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	91%	-	-	89%

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

Item	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%
Blankets	Poor Quality	19%	-	-	-	-	Poor Quality	18%
Kerosene Cans	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Tarpaulin	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Cooking Stove	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Heating Stove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kerosene	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hygiene Kit	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Kitchen Sets	Poor Quality	13%	-	-	-	-	Poor Quality	9%
Mattresses	Poor Quality	4%	-	-	-	-	Poor Quality	5%
Water Jerry Can	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Tent	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Fans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

14 ³⁹ Issues faced by refugee NFI beneficiaries in Erbil have not been reported here due to low sample sizes, with only seven beneficiaries attending the distribution. However, because findings are disaggregated by governorate, the overall proportions of the reported issues include those faced by refugee NFI beneficiaries in Erbil.



OVERVIEW OF CASH FOR NFI DISTRIBUTIONS TO REFUGEES IN AUGUST

There were no Cash for NFI distributions to refugees in August.