



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

Kurdistan Region of Iraq

April 2017

Table of Contents

Methodology.....	3
IDP Beneficiaries	
Profile of Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in April.....	4
Issues faced by Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in April.....	5
Overview of Non-Food Item Distributions in April.....	6
Issues faced by Non-Food Item Distribution Beneficiaries in April.....	7
Overview of Cash for NFI beneficiaries in April.....	8
Refugee Beneficiaries	
Profile of Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in April.....	9
Issues faced by Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Beneficiaries in April.....	10
Overview of Non-Food Item Distributions in April.....	11
Issues faced by Non-Food Item Beneficiaries in April.....	12
Overview of Cash for NFI beneficiaries in April.....	13

METHODOLOGY OF MONTHLY MONITORING

IMPACT Initiatives 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 IDPs in the 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 April, data were collected through telephone interviews with randomly sampled beneficiary households between 30 July and 17 August 2017. A total of 1,176 IDP, 924 refugee and 3 host community¹ beneficiaries were called. Of these, 879 IDPs, 749 refugees and 3 host community members answered the phone, totalling 1,631 beneficiaries. Of the total beneficiaries who answered, 4 (<1%) could not understand the enumerator and 50 (3%) reported to have not received anything, despite appearing in the beneficiary records. Hence, this report is based on a final sample of interviews with 864 IDP beneficiaries, 700 refugee beneficiaries and 3 host community members who confirmed that they remembered the distribution and had received assistance. These figures include 21 interviews conducted as part of winterization data collection conducted between 25 and 30 May 2017.

Table 1: Population of interest – beneficiaries assisted in April 2017 as per UNHCR records

	Dohuk		Erbil		Sulaymaniyah ²		Total
	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	
NFI	0	0	0	3,682	343	0	4,025
Cash for NFI	0	0	86	1,415	0	0	1,501
MPCA 1	326	483	86	71	106	44	1,116
MPCA 2	325	233	29	138	2	0	725
MPCA 3	52	66	7	109	0	0	234
Total	703	782	208	5,415	451	44	7,602

Findings are disaggregated by type of assistance, IDP versus refugee beneficiaries and governorate. Findings are statistically representative with a 95% confidence level and 7% margin of error. Censuses were successfully conducted for refugee MPCA beneficiaries in Sulaymaniyah and Erbil, and were attempted for IDP MPCA beneficiaries in Sulaymaniyah, however not all recipients responded. Monitoring of MPCA was conducted after beneficiaries had received all payments for which they had been approved.

Table 2: Sample of beneficiaries assisted in April 2017³

	Dohuk		Erbil		Sulaymaniyah		Total
	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	
NFI	0	0	0	104	125	0	229
Cash for NFI	0	0	60	173	0	0	233
MPCA 1	123	140	60	53	69	44	489
MPCA 2	123	107	29	81	2	0	342
MPCA 3	24	50	7	71	0	0	152
Total	270	297	156	462	196	44	1,445

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 five sections. The first section of the factsheets for MPCA beneficiaries provides an overview of the profile of the assisted population. The second section reports 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 the household dependent on working age adults (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 Three respondents reported to be host community members despite appearing on a beneficiary list for IDPs.

² According to the beneficiary lists provided by UNHCR, distribution of winterization assistance in April only took place in Sulaymaniyah governorate. Some of the beneficiaries interviewed during winterization data collection reported receiving items that are part of the New Arrival Kit, such as tents, water jerry cans or hygiene kits. Therefore interviews with April NFI recipients in Sulaymaniyah governorate conducted during Winterization data collection were added to the dataset of this report (these are not included in table 1 or 2).

³ Based on the useable entries of the population of interest as seen in the Table 1, except for the distribution of winterization assistance conducted in Sulaymaniyah.

PROFILE OF IDP MPCA BENEFICIARIES

	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE PER NUMBER OF MPCA PAYMENTS RECEIVED				
1 Payment	6	5	6	6
2 Payments	6	6	N/A	6
3 Payments	5	6	N/A	6
PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS				
Female-headed household	20%	19%	14%	19%
Chronic illness	67%	68%	50%	67%
Physical disability	26%	19%	12%	23%
Mental disability	7%	7%	2%	7%
Elderly	31%	14%	14%	26%
Pregnant or nursing	12%	15%	19%	13%
Child under 5	14%	19%	12%	15%
DEPENDENTS⁴ (% of household dependent on working age adults)	45%	46%	47%	45%
PERCENT OF MPCA BENEFICIARIES WITH NO INCOME	14%	13%	5%	13%
PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH⁵				
1	Healthcare	Paying debt	Rent	Healthcare
2	Paying debt	Healthcare	Healthcare	Paying debt
3	Food	Rent	Paying debt	Food
SATISFACTION WITH THE MPCA MODALITY				
Not satisfied	<1%	1%	0%	1%
Somewhat satisfied	20%	23%	29%	21%
Satisfied	56%	53%	62%	55%
Very satisfied	23%	23%	9%	23%

⁴ Working age adults (18-60 years) does not include the elderly, or adults with a chronic illness

⁵ On average, between 54% and 72% of the received cash was spent on the top three reported areas of spending across the KR-I.

ISSUES FACED BY IDP MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN APRIL

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%	0%	0%	0%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	4%	3%	10%	4%
Were not informed about the selection process	56%	54%	45%	55%
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection ⁶	<1%	<1%	0%	<1%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	13%	6%	0%	10%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process ⁷	0%	2%	0%	<1%
Received no information on what would be distributed	18%	15%	12%	17%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	9%	11%	12%	9%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed ⁸	4%	2%	0%	3%
Reported they received nothing	<1%	<1%	2%	<1%
Had difficulties cashing their cheques ⁹	0%	1%	0%	<1%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	90%	88%	88%	90%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	98%	97%	100%	98%

BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN MPCA IN APRIL ¹⁰

	36%	20%	45%	32%
TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN APRIL				
In-kind	28%	14%	40%	24%
Cash	4%	3%	2%	4%
Vouchers	6%	5%	7%	6%
None	64%	80%	55%	68%
SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN APRIL				
I don't know	26%	9%	32%	24%
Other UN	37%	38%	32%	37%
Government	19%	24%	32%	21%
BCF	18%	16%	0%	17%
Other	10%	20%	4%	12%

⁶ “Wasta” is the Arabic term for ‘nepotism’ or ‘corruption’ - relating to favours through personal networks.

⁷ All “no” answers include those who believed they were “not satisfied” and “somewhat satisfied”.

⁸ All “no” answers include those who reported the distribution to be “not managed” and “somewhat managed”.

⁹ All of the April beneficiaries reported receiving their payments through bank cheques.

¹⁰ For this section, multiple options were available to the respondents and numbers may therefore exceed 100%.

OVERVIEW OF NFI DISTRIBUTIONS TO IDPS IN APRIL

REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO IDPS IN DOHUK

No NFI distributions were monitored in April in Dohuk.

REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO IDPS IN ERBIL¹¹

% of NFI beneficiaries who received item									
	Blanket	Cooking Stove	Heating Stove	Hygiene Kit	Kitchen Set	Mattresses	WJC	Tent	Lamps
	88%	81%	85%	94%	81%	91%	80%	37%	77%
Was it useful?	Yes	87%	100%	92%	99%	95%	98%	95%	100%
	No	13%	0%	8%	1%	5%	2%	5%	0%
Was it of good quality?	Yes	75%	100%	100%	99%	94%	99%	94%	100%
	No	25%	0%	0%	1%	6%	1%	6%	1%
Did you use it?	Yes	95%	100%	74%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	No	5%	0%	26%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO IDPS IN SULAYMANIYAH

No NFI distributions were monitored in April in Sulaymaniyah.

¹¹ All "no" answers for the indicator "Was it useful?" include those who believed the items they received to be "not useful" or "somewhat useful".

ISSUES FACED BY IDP NFI BENEFICIARIES IN APRIL

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	-	2%	-	2%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	-	0%	-	0%
Were not informed about the selection process	-	64%	-	64%
Believed there was "wasta" involved with their selection	-	2%	-	2%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	-	3%	-	3%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	-	3%	-	3%
Received no information on what would be distributed	-	4%	-	4%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	-	0%	-	0%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	-	3%	-	3%
Reported they received nothing	-	4%	-	4%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	-	87%	-	87%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	-	100%	-	100%

MOST COMMON ISSUE WITH THE ITEM RECEIVED AND PERCENT OF RECIPIENTS WHO EXPERIENCED IT¹²

Item	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%
Blankets	-	-	Poor Quality	13%	-	-	Poor Quality	13%
Cooking Stove	-	-	Poor Quality	7%	-	-	Poor Quality	7%
Heating Stove	-	-	Poor Timing	9%	-	-	Poor Timing	9%
Hygiene Kit	-	-	Not Enough	1%	-	-	Not Enough	1%
Kitchen Set	-	-	Poor Quality	4%	-	-	Poor Quality	4%
Mattresses	-	-	Not Enough	1%	-	-	Not Enough	1%
Water Jerry Cans	-	-	Poor Quality	5%	-	-	Poor Quality	5%
Tent	-	-	N/A ¹²	N/A	-	-	N/A	N/A
Lamps	-	-	Poor Quality	1%	-	-	Poor Quality	1%

¹² N/A means no issue was reported.



PROFILE OF IDP BENEFICIARIES OF CASH FOR NFI¹³

AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE OF CASH FOR NFI RECIPIENTS

5

PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS

Female-headed household	14%
Chronic illness	45%
Physical disability	3%
Mental disability	3%
Elderly	15%
Pregnant or nursing	15%
Child under 5	19%

DEPENDENTS (% of household dependent on working age adults)

42%

PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH¹⁴

1	Rent
2	Food
3	Paying Debt

SATISFACTION WITH THE CASH FOR NFI

Not satisfied	0%
Somewhat satisfied	43%
Satisfied	51%
Very satisfied	6%



ISSUES FACED BY IDP CASH FOR NFI BENEFICIARIES IN APRIL

Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	9%
Were not informed about the selection process	66%
Believed there was "wasta" involved with their selection	1%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	13%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	3%
Received no information on what would be distributed	18%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	3%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	7%
Reported they received nothing	0%
Had difficulties cashing their cheques ¹⁵	1%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	92%

BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN THE CASH FOR NFI IN APRIL

16%

TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN APRIL

In-kind	15%
Cash	1%
Vouchers	0%
None	84%

SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN APRIL

I don't know	17%
Qandil	21%
Other UN	10%
Government	41%
Other	14%

¹³ Cash for NFI distributions only occurs in Erbil governorate.

¹⁴ On average, between 68% and 85% of the received cash was spent on the top three reported areas of spending.

¹⁵ 99% of the April beneficiaries reported receiving their payments through bank cheques.

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	7	5
3 Payments	3	4	N/A	3
PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS				
Female-headed household	14%	0%	13%	11%
Chronic illness	37%	43%	49%	39%
Physical disability	7%	5%	9%	7%
Mental disability	2%	1%	3%	2%
Elderly	9%	5%	8%	8%
Pregnant or nursing	29%	28%	29%	29%
Child under 5	37%	38%	36%	37%
DEPENDENTS (% of household dependent on working age adults)	42%	43%	52%	43%
PERCENT OF MPCA BENEFICIARIES WITH NO INCOME	13%	17%	19%	15%
PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH¹⁶				
1	Paying Debt	Paying Debt	Paying Debt	Paying Debt
2	Rent	Rent	Rent	Rent
3	Healthcare	Healthcare	Healthcare	Healthcare
SATISFACTION WITH THE MPCA MODALITY				
Not satisfied	<1%	1%	1%	<1%
Somewhat satisfied	16%	22%	32%	18%
Satisfied	61%	63%	58%	61%
Very satisfied	22%	14%	9%	20%

¹⁶ On average, between 56% and 75% of the received cash was spent on the top three reported areas of spending.

ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN APRIL

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%	0%	0%	0%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	7%	12%	2%	7%
Were not informed about the selection process	57%	65%	65%	59%
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection	3%	5%	1%	3%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	16%	6%	8%	14%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	2%	0%	1%	2%
Received no information on what would be distributed	20	15%	21%	20%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	5%	3%	8%	5%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	5%	4%	6%	5%
Reported they received nothing	0%	0%	2%	<1%
Had difficulties cashing their cheques ¹⁷	3%	0%	1%	2%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	88%	86%	88%	88%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	98%	100%	99%	98%

BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN MPCA IN APRIL

	11%	12%	27%	13%
TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN APRIL				
In-kind	7%	3%	7%	6%
Cash	5%	9%	2%	5%
Vouchers	<1%	<1%	19%	3%
None	89%	88%	73%	87%

SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN APRIL

Other UN	42%	8%	67%	44%
Don't Know	27%	8%	29%	25%
Qandil	18%	46%	4%	18%
Other INGO	3%	15%	0%	4%
Other	9%	23%	4%	10%

¹⁷ All of the April beneficiaries received their payments through bank cheques.

OVERVIEW OF NFI DISTRIBUTIONS TO REFUGEES IN APRIL

REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO REFUGEES IN DOHUK

No NFI distributions were monitored in Dohuk in April.

REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO REFUGEES IN ERBIL

No NFI distributions were monitored in Erbil in April.

REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO REFUGEES IN SULAYMANIYAH

		Blankets	Cooking Stove	Heating Stove	Hygiene Kit	Kitchen Set	Mattresses	WJC	Tent	Lamps
% of NFI beneficiaries who received item		37%	1% ¹⁸	2%	4%	2%	78%	8%	1% ¹⁹	1% ²⁰
Was it useful?	Yes	78%	-	100%	83%	100%	82%	100%	-	-
	No	22%	-	0%	17%	0%	18%	0%	-	-
Was it of good quality?	Yes	75%	-	100%	83%	100%	93%	100%	-	-
	No	25%	-	0%	17%	0%	7%	0%	-	-
Did you use it?	Yes	95%	-	100%	100%	100%	93%	100%	-	-
	No	5%	-	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	-	-

¹⁸ Only one cooking stove was distributed in Sulaymaniyah in April.

¹⁹ Only two tents were distributed in Sulaymaniyah in April.

²⁰ Only one lamp was distributed in Sulaymaniyah in April.

ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE NFI BENEFICIARIES IN APRIL

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	-	-	6%	6%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	-	-	<1%	<1%
Were not informed about the selection process	-	-	86%	86%
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection	-	-	12%	12%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	-	-	25%	25%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	-	-	13%	13%
Received no information on what would be distributed	-	-	11%	11%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	-	-	0%	0%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	-	-	22%	22%
Reported they received nothing	-	-	20%	20%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	-	-	96%	96%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	-	-	99%	99%

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

Item	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%
Blankets	-	-	-	-	Poor Quality	16%	Poor Quality	16%
Cooking Stove	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Heating Stove	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hygiene Kit	-	-	-	-	Poor Quality	17%	Poor Quality	17%
Kitchen Set	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mattresses	-	-	-	-	Not Enough	13%	Not Enough	13%
Water Jerry Cans	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tent	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lamps	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

PROFILE OF REFUGEE BENEFICIARIES OF CASH FOR NFI

AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE OF CASH FOR NFI RECIPIENTS

3

PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS

Female-headed household	21%
Chronic illness	38%
Physical disability	2%
Mental disability	2%
Elderly	11%
Pregnant or nursing	17%
Child under 5	13%

DEPENDENTS (% of household dependent on working age adults)

37%²¹

PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH²²

1	Rent
2	Food
3	Healthcare

SATISFACTION WITH THE CASH FOR NFI

Not satisfied	1%
Somewhat satisfied	43%
Satisfied	48%
Very satisfied	8%



ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE CASH FOR NFI BENEFICIARIES IN APRIL

Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	3%
Were not informed about the selection process	67%
Believed there was "wasta" involved with their selection	2%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	0%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	0%
Received no information on what would be distributed	17%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	10%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	2%
Reported they received nothing	0%
Had difficulties cashing their cheques	2%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	86%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	92%

BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN THE CASH FOR NFI IN APRIL

8%

TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN APRIL

In-kind	0%
Cash	6%
Vouchers	2%
None	92%

SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN APRIL

I don't know	-
Other UN	-
Qandil	100%
BCF	-
Other	-

²¹ The decrease in percentage of dependents since last month is due to 29 out of 63 households being composed of only non-dependent working age adults.

²² On average, between 72% and 83% of the received cash was spent on the top three reported areas of spending.