CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 Iraqi districts which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. This data was supplemented with secondary data from the assessment conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP) carried out from October 2019 to February 2020, which also focused on the standard of WASH facilities at schools. It consisted of interviews with headmasters, teachers and students and observations at schools, covering 760 primary schools falling under the system of the federal government of Iraq, in 580 school buildings located in 10 districts⁵ across 10 governorates. As all data derives from either the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed (REACH) or key informant interviews and observations (WFP), findings are indicative only.

AI-Falluja DISTRICT

115 surveys with HHs with school-going children (50%) out of the total number of 231 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

88% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁶ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

78% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

93% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.



*Districts assessed by either REACH or REACH and WFP, as described in the methodology section.

🎭 HYGIENE

100% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, **97%** of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility⁷ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

9.1 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

82% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets⁸ at school at the time of data collection.

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Of the 10 districts where schools have been assessed by WFP, 3 districts were the same as where REACH has conducted HH surveys. ⁶Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ⁷Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines (according to the JMP). ⁶Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.







Al-Ramadi DISTRICT

80 surveys with HHs with school-going children (49%) out of the total number of $164\,$ HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

ecember 2019

83% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

98% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

81% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

98% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

Ana DISTRICT

74 surveys with HHs with school-going children (65%) out of the total number of 113 HHs conducted by REACH

31 schools (100%) in 21 school buildings (100%) out of the total number of 31 schools in 21 school buildings assessed by WFP*

WATER

44% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

87% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

87%

Piped water supply No water source available Don't know



49% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

🍡 HYGIENE

100% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 100% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖣 SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

8.6 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

93% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

At the school's premises72%Within 500m distance14%Don't know8%At more than 500m distance6%



65% of schools were reported to have drinking water from a water source available to students, of which the following types were reported to be available:

Piped water supply	95 %
Water tanker	5%



🍡 HYGIENE

94% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 64% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

94% of schools were reported to have handwashing facilities available to students, of which 66% were reportedly functional and 62% reportedly had soap.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected arinwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, functional or private. *Findings derived from WFP data are presented in turquoise boxes.







Al-Anbar GOVERNORATE

SANITATION

94% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

94%

Flush or pour toilet Hanging toilet No toilet available



5.8 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

Average number of toilets reported to be available at school:

Number of toilets for students	5.4	Number of students per toilet	36
Number of toilets for teachers	2.0	Number of teachers per toilet	14

90% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Heet DISTRICT

87 surveys with HHs with school-going children (38%) out of the total number of 230 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

72% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁴ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

60% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

100% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

90% of schools were reported to have toilets available which are separated by gender for students and 81% of schools reportedly had these for teachers.²

Of the **23%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

There is no water in the toilets	81%
The toilets are not maintained	75%
The toilets have no locks	69%

Proportion of schools that were reported to have the following sanitation issues for student toilets:

There is no water in the toilets	6%	
The toilets need rehabilitation	6%	
The toilets need maintenance	3%	

Proportion of schools by reported sanitation condition:

	Toilets for students		Toilets for teachers	
	Good	Bad	Good	Bad
Structural condition	100%	0%	100%	0%
Hygienic condition	71%	29%	100%	0%

🍡 HYGIENE

93% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 97% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

F SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

9.0 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

88% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP). ² Toilets were also considered to be separated by gender if the school only had one gender of students/teachers. ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ⁴ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the JMP, 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).







CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 Iraqi districts which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. This data was supplemented with secondary data from the assessment conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP) carried out from October 2019 to February 2020, which also focused on the standard of WASH facilities at schools. It consisted of interviews with headmasters, teachers and students and observations at schools, covering 760 primary schools falling under the system of the federal government of Iraq, in 580 school buildings located in 10 districts⁵ across 10 governorates. As all data derives from either the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed (REACH) or key informant interviews and observations (WFP), findings are indicative only.

Shat AI-Arab DISTRICT

98 schools (100%) in 67 school buildings (100%) out of the total number of 98 schools in 67 school buildings assessed by WFP*



12% of schools were reported to have drinking water from a water source available to students, of which the following types were reported to be available:

> Water tanker Piped water supply





92% of schools were reported to have handwashing facilities available to students, of which 83% were reportedly functional and 11% reportedly had soap.



*Districts assessed by WFP, as described in the methodology section.

SANITATION

Average number of toilets reported to be available at school:

Number of toilets for students	7.2	Number of students per toilet	91
Number of toilets for teachers	2.2	Number of teachers per toilet	11

77% of schools were reported to have toilets available which are separated by gender for students and 59% of schools reportedly had these for teachers.6

10% of schools were reported to have unusable student toilets.

Proportion of schools that were reported to have the following sanitation issues for student toilets:

The toilets need rehabilitation	13%	
The toilets have no doors / broken doors	4%	
The toilets are in a bad condition	3%	

Proportion of schools by reported sanitation condition:

	Toilets for students		Toilets for teache	
	Good	Bad	Good	Bad
Structural condition	56%	44%	80%	20%
Hygienic condition	46%	54%	76%	24%

¹ <u>IOM-DTM</u>, October 2019. ² <u>Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020</u>, November 2019. ³ Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (<u>according to IOM-DTM</u>). ⁴ Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵ Of the 10 districts where schools have been assessed by WFP, 3 districts were the same as where REACH has conducted HH surveys. ⁶ Toilets were also considered to be separated by gender if the school only had one gender of students/teachers. *Findings derived from WFP data are presented in turquoise coloured boxes.





REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 Iraqi districts which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. This data was supplemented with secondary data from the assessment conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP) carried out from October 2019 to February 2020, which also focused on the standard of WASH facilities at schools. It consisted of interviews with headmasters, teachers and students and observations at schools, covering 760 primary schools falling under the system of the federal government of Iraq, in 580 school buildings located in 10 districts⁵ across 10 governorates. As all data derives from either the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed (REACH) or key informant interviews and observations (WFP), findings are indicative only.

AI-Khidhir DISTRICT

70 schools (100%) in 62 school buildings (100%) out of the total number of 70 schools in 62 school buildings assessed by WFP*

WATER

50% of schools were reported to have drinking water from a water source available to students, of which the following types were reported to be available:

94%

Water tanker Piped water supply





66% of schools were reported to have handwashing facilities available to students, of which 76% were reportedly functional and 11% reportedly had soap.





SANITATION

Average number of toilets reported to be available at school:Number of toilets for students5.8Number of toilets for teachers2.1Number of toilets for teachers12

79% of schools were reported to have toilets available which are separated by gender for students and 63% of schools reportedly had these for teachers.⁶

37% of schools were reported to have unusable student toilets. Proportion of schools that were reported to have the following sanitation issues for student toilets:

The toilets need maintenance	2
There is no water in the toilets	
The toilets have no doors	
The toilets are in a bad condition	



Proportion of schools by reported sanitation condition:

	Toilets for students		Toilets for teachers	
	Good	Bad	Good	Bad
Structural condition	74%	26%	81%	19%
Hygienic condition	32%	68%	76%	24%

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ² Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³ Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴ Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵ Of the 10 districts where schools have been assessed by WFP, 3 districts were the same as where REACH has conducted HH surveys. ⁶ Toilets were also considered to be separated by gender if the school only had one gender of students/teachers. *Findings derived from WFP data are presented in turquoise coloured boxes.





REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

ecember 2019 WASH NEEDS IN SCHOOLS IRAQ

Al-Najaf GOVERNORATE

Thi Qa

CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of the needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 districts across Iraq which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) level surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. As all data derives from the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed, findings are indicative only.

Kerbala Babi Al-Anba AUDIARAB Al-Najaf <u>Al-Najaf</u> Al-Muthanna Assessed district (REACH)³ Unassessed district

*Districts assessed by REACH, as described in the methodology section.

AI-Kufa DISTRICT

120 surveys with HHs with school-going children (71%) out of the total number of 168 HHs conducted by REACH



21% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

46% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁵ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

No water source available Piped water source Don't know



71% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

99%

1%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance



🛬 HYGIENE

100% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 23% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).





AI-Najaf GOVERNORATE

SANITATION

99% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

6.5 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

71% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 27% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:



AI-Najaf DISTRICT

94 surveys with HHs with school-going children (80%) out of the total number of 117 HHs conducted by REACH



2% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

95% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source³ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply No water source available



98% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

100% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

ъ HYGIENE

100% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, **4%** of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

F SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

6.1 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

96% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 1% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained The toilets have no locks There is no water in the toilets



REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, <u>according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme</u> for <u>Water Supply</u>. <u>Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)</u>. ² Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ³ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, <u>as defined by the JMP</u>, 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).



CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

ecember 2019

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 Iraqi districts which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. This data was supplemented with secondary data from the assessment conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP) carried out from October 2019 to February 2020, which also focused on the standard of WASH facilities at schools. It consisted of interviews with headmasters, teachers and students and observations at schools, covering 760 primary schools falling under the system of the federal government of Iraq, in 580 school buildings located in 10 districts⁵ across 10 governorates. As all data derives from either the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed (REACH) or key informant interviews and observations (WFP), findings are indicative only.

AI-Diwaniya DISTRICT

28 surveys with HHs with school-going children (27%) out of the total number of 102 HHs conducted by REACH



75% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

92% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁶ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.



*Districts assessed by either REACH or WFP, as described in the methodology section.

8% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

100% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.



96% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 52% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Of the 10 districts where schools have been assessed by WFP, 3 districts were the same as where REACH has conducted HH surveys. ⁶Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).







🖣 SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

5.3 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

96% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the **21%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained100%The toilets have no locks100%There is no space / it is too crowded20%



AI-Hamza DISTRICT

129 schools (86%) in 64 school buildings (57%) out of the total number of 150 schools in 113 school buildings assessed by WFP^{*}

SANITATION

Average number of toilets reported to be available at school:

Number of toilets for students	4.6	Number of students per toilet	74
Number of toilets for teachers	1.6	Number of teachers per toilet	11

WATER

65% of schools were reported to have drinking water from a water source available to students, of which the following types were reported to be available:

Piped water supply Water tanker Well

y 91% 7%



🎭 HYGIENE

82% of schools were reported to have handwashing facilities available to students, of which 92% were reportedly functional and 10% reportedly had soap.

48% of schools were reported to have toilets available which are separated by gender for students and 65% of schools reportedly had these for teachers.³

Proportion of schools that were reported to have the following sanitation issues for student toilets:

There is no water in the toilets	12%	
The toilets need maintenance	11%	
The toilets have no locks	9%	
The toilets are in a bad condition	9%	
The toilets need rehabilitation	3%	

Proportion of schools by reported sanitation condition:

	Toilets for students		Toilets for teachers	
	Good	Bad	Good	Bad
Structural condition	50%	50%	63%	37%
Hygienic condition	41%	59%	58%	42%

¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, <u>according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme</u> for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP). ² Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ³ Toilets were also considered to be separated by gender if the school only had one gender of students/teachers. ⁵ Findings derived from WFP data are presented in turquoise coloured boxes.





REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of the needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 districts across Iraq which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) level surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. As all data derives from the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed, **findings are indicative only**.

AI-Sulaymaniyah DISTRICT

 $70\ surveys$ with HHs with school-going children (57%) out of the total number of $123\ \text{HHs}$ conducted by REACH



78% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁵ at school, with as mainly used type:

Piped water supply Protected well/spring



91% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

100% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.



*Districts assessed by REACH, as described in the methodology section

🎭 HYGIENE

100% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 83% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility⁶ at school, with as most commonly used type:

65%

35%

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform



4.4 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

43% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets⁷ at school at the time of data collection.

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected varing and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected varinwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected sping and sufface water (from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ⁶Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved jit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines without slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to JMP). ⁷Toilets were considered unusable if not accessible, functional or private.





Chamchamal DISTRICT

 $42\ surveys$ with HHs with school-going children (41%) out of the total number of $102\ \text{HHs}$ conducted by REACH

WATER

ecember 2019

57% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

98% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

48% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

100% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

Derbendikhan DISTRICT

57 surveys with HHs with school-going children (56%) out of the total number of 102 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

68% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

95% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:



🍡 HYGIENE

95% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 64% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖣 SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, with as most commonly used type:

82%

18%

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform



4.3 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

20% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the **20%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

There is no water in the toilets	89%	
There is no space / it is too crowded	78%	
The toilets have no locks	78%	
The toilets are not maintained	56%	

61% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

90%

8%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance Don't know



ъ HYGIENE

95% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 79% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.





Al-Sulaymaniyah GOVERNORATE

SANITATION

98% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform Pit latrine without slab or plaform



4.1 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

Dokan DISTRICT

34 surveys with HHs with school-going children (47%) out of the total number of 73 HHs conducted by REACH



83% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source³ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

83% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

100% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

31% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 5% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

There is no water in the toilets100%The toilets have no locks100%The toilets are not maintained67%There is no space / it is too crowded67%



🍡 HYGIENE

94% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 61% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖣 SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school, with as most commonly used type:

71%

29%

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform



2.8 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

37% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

3% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, <u>according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme</u> for <u>Water Supply</u>. <u>Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)</u>. ² Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ³ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, <u>as defined by the JMP</u>, 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).





Halabcha DISTRICT

50 surveys with HHs with school-going children (52%) out of the total number of 97 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

83% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

98% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

97%

2%

86%

7%

Piped water supply Protected well/spring No water source available



Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

At the school's premises Within 500m distance At more than 500m distance Don't know



Kalar DISTRICT

67 surveys with HHs with school-going children (61%) out of the total number of 110 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

95% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

ъ HYGIENE

95% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 89% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

97% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet68%Pit latrine with slab and platform29%No toilet available2%Don't know2%



4.3 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

22% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

2% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

82% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

100% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

ъ HYGIENE

98% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 100% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.





91%

SANITATION

94% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine without slab or platform 6% Pit latrine with slab and platform



Rania DISTRICT

42 surveys with HHs with school-going children (43%) out of the total number of 98 HHs conducted by REACH



91% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

97% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source³ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply Protected well/spring No water source available Don't know



81% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

96%

3%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance Don't know



8.1 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

92% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection.

📆 HYGIENE

99% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 79% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖣 SANITATION

99% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet 74% Pit latrine with slab and platform 25% Don't know



4.6 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

34% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 4% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:





¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, <u>according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme</u> for <u>Water Supply</u>. <u>Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)</u>. ² Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ³ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, <u>as defined by the JMP</u>, 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).



REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

Babil GOVERNORATE

CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of the needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 districts across Iraq which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) level surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. As all data derives from the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed, **findings are indicative only**.

AI-Hilla DISTRICT

57 surveys with HHs with school-going children (39%) out of the total number of 148 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

88% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁵ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

78% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

98%

2%

At the school's premises Don't know





*Districts assessed by REACH, as described in the methodology section.

ъ HYGIENE

97% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 100% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

F SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility⁶ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

9.0 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

89% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets⁷ at school at the time of data collection.

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected spring and suffice water (from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ⁶Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines without slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to JMP). ⁷Toilets were considered unusable if not accessible, functional or private.





CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of the needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 districts across Iraq which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) level surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. As all data derives from the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed, **findings are indicative only**.

Al-Adhamiya DISTRICT

 $36\ surveys$ with HHs with school-going children (30%) out of the total number of $121\ \text{HHs}$ conducted by REACH

WATER

97% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

95% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁵ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply	95%	
Rainwater tank	3%	
Don't know	3%	

95% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.



*Districts assessed by REACH, as described in the methodology section.

🍡 HYGIENE

100% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 100% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

F SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility⁶ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

8.9 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

92% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets⁷ at school at the time of data collection.

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected spring and suffice water (from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ⁶Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved jut (VIP) latrines and pit latrines without slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to JMP). ⁷Toilets were considered unusable if not accessible, functional or private.





AI-Kadhmiyah DISTRICT

77 surveys with HHs with school-going children (31%) out of the total number of 251 HHs conducted by REACH



84% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, with as mainly used type:

98%

2%

Piped water supply Protected well/spring



71% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

AI-Karkh DISTRICT

71 surveys with HHs with school-going children (36%) out of the total number of 196 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

93% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

99% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

98%

1%

Piped water supply
Tanker/truck/cart
Protected well/spring



93% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

ъ HYGIENE

97% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 97% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖣 SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

9.7 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

70% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

ъ HYGIENE

97% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 99% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

F SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

9.9 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

85% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

1% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.





AI-Mahmoudiya DISTRICT

 $99\ surveys$ with HHs with school-going children (38%) out of the total number of $258\ \text{HHs}$ conducted by REACH

WATER

ecember 2019

91% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

98% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply Tanker/truck/cart



Ο

98% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

AI-Risafa DISTRICT

 $40\ surveys$ with HHs with school-going children (43%) out of the total number of $94\ \text{HHs}$ conducted by REACH

WATER

95% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

98% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

ъ HYGIENE

100% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 93% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

9.1 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

79% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

🍡 HYGIENE

100% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 98% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

9.7 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

95% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.





CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

ecember 2019

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 Iraqi districts which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. This data was supplemented with secondary data from the assessment conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP) carried out from October 2019 to February 2020, which also focused on the standard of WASH facilities at schools. It consisted of interviews with headmasters, teachers and students and observations at schools, covering 760 primary schools falling under the system of the federal government of Iraq, in 580 school buildings located in 10 districts⁵ across 10 governorates. As all data derives from either the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed (REACH) or key informant interviews and observations (WFP), findings are indicative only.

AI-Muqdadiya DISTRICT

37 surveys with HHs with school-going children (32%) out of the total number of 115 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

100% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁶ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

100% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

100% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.



*Districts assessed by either REACH or WFP, as described in the methodology section.

ъ HYGIENE

100% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, **100%** of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility⁷ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

2.8 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

15% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Of the 10 districts where schools have been assessed by WFP, 3 districts were the same as where REACH has conducted HH surveys. ⁶Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ⁷Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines (according to the JMP).







Baladruz DISTRICT

80 schools (82%) in 70 school buildings (80%) out of the total number of 98 schools in 88 school buildings assessed by WFP*

WATER

ecember 2019

18% of schools were reported to have drinking water from a water source available to students, of which all reported piped water supply to be the used type of water source.

ъ HYGIENE

81% of schools were reported to have handwashing facilities available to students, of which 92% were reportedly functional and 38% reportedly had soap.

Baquba DISTRICT

 $73\ surveys$ with HHs with school-going children (56%) out of the total number of $130\ HHs$ conducted by REACH

WATER

93% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

98% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source³ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply	989
Unprotected well/spring	2%

85% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

At the school's premises	98%
Within 500m distance	2%

SANITATION

Average number of toilets reported to be available at school:			
Number of toilets for students	3.7	Number of students per toilet	89
Number of toilets for teachers	1.5	Number of teachers per toilet	14

51% of schools were reported to have toilets available which are separated by gender for students and 41% of schools reportedly had these for teachers.¹

Proportion of schools that were reported to have the following sanitation issues for student toilets:²

The	toilets	need rehabilitation	14
The	toilets	are in a bad condition	5

Proportion of schools by reported sanitation condition:

	Toilets for students		Toilets for teachers	
	Good	Bad	Good	Bad
Structural condition	68%	32%	77%	23%
Hygienic condition	60%	40%	78%	22%

🍡 HYGIENE

89% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 87% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility⁴ at school, with as most commonly used type:

Flush or pour toilet	98%
Pit latrine with slab and platform	2%

2.5 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

5% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the **11%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets⁵ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets have no locks86%86%14%



*Findings derived from WFP data are presented in turquoise coloured boxes. ¹ Toilets were also considered to be separated by gender if the school only had one gender of students/teachers. ² Findings are based on 40 schools (50% of dataset) only. ³ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ⁴ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (<u>according to the JMP</u>). ⁵ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.







Khanaqin DISTRICT

128 surveys with HHs with school-going children (56%) out of the total number of 230 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

56% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

78% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply No water source available Protected well/spring Unprotected well/spring



40% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

86%

8%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance Within 500m distance



Kifri DISTRICT

49 surveys with HHs with school-going children (48%) out of the total number of 102 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

81% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

96% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

51% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

100% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

🍡 HYGIENE

81% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 55% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

98% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, with as most commonly used type:

Flush or pour toilet	78 %
Pit latrine with slab and platform	20%

7.2 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

72% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the **23%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets have no locks	85%	
There is no water in the toilets	58%	
The toilets are not maintained	55%	
There is no space / it is too crowed	27%	

🍡 HYGIENE

100% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 58% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖣 SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

9.7 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

94% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.







CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of the needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 districts across Iraq which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) level surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. As all data derives from the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed, **findings are indicative only**.

AI-Amadiya DISTRICT

64 surveys with HHs with school-going children (72%) out of the total number of 89 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

88% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

89% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁵ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

53% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

88%

5%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance Within 500m distance Don't know





*Districts assessed by REACH, as described in the methodology section.

ъ HYGIENE

92% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 48% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖡 SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility⁶ at school, with as most commonly used type:

Flush or pour toilet	86 %
Pit latrine with slab and platform	14%

7.8 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

84% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the **22%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets⁷ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained There is no water in the toilets There is no space / it is too crowded The toilets have no locks

100%	
13%	
13%	
13%	

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected well, uprotected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ⁶Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines without slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to JMP). ⁷Toilets were considered unusable if not accessible, functional or private.





Duhok DISTRICT

90 surveys with HHs with school-going children (74%) out of the total number of 121 HHs conducted by REACH



81% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

95% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

58% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

91%

5%

At the school's premises
Don't know
Within 500m distance
At more than 500m distance



Sumail DISTRICT

170 surveys with HHs with school-going children (71%) out of the total number of 239 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

78% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

93% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

48% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

ъ HYGIENE

94% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 49% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖣 SANITATION

94% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform Pit latrine without slab or plaform Don't know



5.6 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

66% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the **10%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained	1
The toilets have no locks	(
There is no space / it is too crowded	4
There is no water in the toilets	,



Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

94%

4%

At the school's premises Within 500m distance At more than 500m distance



89% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 37% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, vertilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.





Duhok GOVERNORATE

SANITATION

99% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet77%Pit latrine with slab and platform21%Pit VIP toilet1%Don't know1%



Zakho DISTRICT

89 surveys with HHs with school-going children (79%) out of the total number of 113 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

93% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source³ at school, with as mainly used type:

Piped water supply	99%
Protected well/spring	1%

39% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

At the school's premises	97 %
Don't know	2%
At more than 500m distance	1%

THYGIENE

88% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 36% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

6.3 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

87% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 12% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

95%	
17%	
14%	
12%	
	95% 17% 14% 12%

🖡 SANITATION

98% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet	75 %
Pit latrine with slab and platform	23%
Hanging toilet	1%
No toilet available	1%



6.7 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

80% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 18% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

toilets are not maintained	78%	
re is no water in the toilets	28%	
toilets have no locks	22%	
re is no space / it is too crowded	17%	

¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, <u>according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme</u> for <u>Water Supply</u>. <u>Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)</u>. ² Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ³ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by <u>as defined by the JMP</u>, 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).

The The

The

The





Erbil GOVERNORATE

CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

ecember 2019

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures.² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of the needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 districts across Iraq which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) level surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. As all data derives from the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed, findings are indicative only.

Erbil DISTRICT

104 surveys with HHs with school-going children (59%) out of the total number of 177 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

82% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

98% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁵ at school, with as mainly used type:

Piped water supply	96%
Protected well/spring	2%

89% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

87%

11%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance Within 500m distance





*Districts assessed by REACH, as described in the methodology section

📆 HYGIENE

98% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 63% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

96% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility⁶ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

> Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform Hanging toilet Pit latrine without slab or platform



6.6 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

96% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 5% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets⁷ at school at the time of data collection, main reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained 100% The toilets have no locks 66%



¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ² Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³ Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴ Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected spring and surface water (from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ⁶ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved jt (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to JMP). ⁷ Toilets were considered unusable if not accessible, functional or private.





Koysinjaq DISTRICT

55 surveys with HHs with school-going children (42%) out of the total number of 132 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

ecember 2019

89% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

87% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

80%

11%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance Within 500m distance



Makhmour DISTRICT

75 surveys with HHs with school-going children (60%) out of the total number of 125 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

91% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

67% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

At the school's premises	92 %
Within 500m distance	8%

🍡 HYGIENE

98% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 75% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

98% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, with as most commonly used type: Flush or pour toilet 85%

Pit latrine with slab and platform 13%

5.6 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

100% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

🍡 HYGIENE

96% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 54% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, with as most commonly used type: Flush or pour toilet 79%

Pit latrine with slab and platform 21%

5.4 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

99% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

1% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, vertilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.





Rawanduz DISTRICT

 $53\ surveys$ with HHs with school-going children (44%) out of the total number of $120\ \text{HHs}$ conducted by REACH

WATER

ecember 2019

82% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

95% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

82% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

84%

11%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance Within 500m distance



Shaqlawa DISTRICT

57 surveys with HHs with school-going children (46%) out of the total number of 124 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

91% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

98% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

93%

5%

At the school's premises		
Within 500m distance		
At more than 500m distance		



🍡 HYGIENE

95% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 38% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

F SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, with as most commonly used type:

eu type.	Flush or pour toilet	96 %
	Pit latrine with slab and platform	4%

5.5 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

55% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 7% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, the reason given by all was: "There is no water in the toilets"

🍡 HYGIENE

98% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 61% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, with as most commonly used type:

Flush or pour toilet	98 %
Pit latrine with slab and platform	2%

6.2 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

93% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.



Kerbala GOVERNORATE

CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of the needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 districts across Iraq which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) level surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. As all data derives from the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed, **findings are indicative only**.

AI-Hindiya DISTRICT

42 surveys with HHs with school-going children (34%) out of the total number of 123 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

60% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

57% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁵ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

57%

43%

95%

2%

Piped water supply No water source available



24% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance Don't know





*Districts assessed by REACH, as described in the methodology section.

ъ HYGIENE

100% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school.

🖣 SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility⁶ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

4.8 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

57% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the **52%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets⁷ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained100%The toilets have no locks36%There is no water in the toilet14%



¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected spring and surface water (from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or cana). ⁶Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved jt (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to JMP). ⁷Toilets were considered unusable if not accessible, functional or private.





Kerbela DISTRICT

114 surveys with HHs with school-going children (68%) out of the total number of 168 HHs conducted by REACH



69% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

69% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

68%

26%

Piped water supply No water source available Don't know Protected well/spring



39% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

93%

7%

At the school's premises Don't know



ъ HYGIENE

98% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 1% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖡 SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

4.4 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

53% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 54% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained99%The toilets have no locks30%There is no water in the toilets15%There is no space / it is too crowded3%



¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, vertilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.





CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 Iraqi districts which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. This data was supplemented with secondary data from the assessment conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP) carried out from October 2019 to February 2020, which also focused on the standard of WASH facilities at schools. It consisted of interviews with headmasters, teachers and students and observations at schools, covering 760 primary schools falling under the system of the federal government of Iraq, in 580 school buildings located in 10 districts⁵ across 10 governorates. As all data derives from either the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed (REACH) or key informant interviews and observations (WFP), findings are indicative only.

AI-Hawiga DISTRICT

70 surveys with HHs with school-going children (58%) out of the total number of 121 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

89% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply (improved water source)80%No water source available9%Don't know9%Surface water3%



66% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

86% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.



🏂 HYGIENE

87% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 70% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet (improved facility)⁷ Don't know Pit latrine with slab & platform (improved facility)⁷

Pit latrine without slab or platform



3.9 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

73% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

¹IOM-DTM. October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Of the 10 districts where schools have been assessed by WFP, 3 districts were the same as where REACH has conducted HH surveys. ⁶Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ⁷Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines (according to the JMP).







97%

WASH NEEDS IN SCHOOLS IRAQ

Of the 6% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets¹ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

There is no space / it is too crowed 25% The toilets have no locks 25%

SANITATION

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet (improved facility)3 Pit latrine without slab or plaform Pit latrine with slab & platform (improved facility) 1%

3.6 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

Average number of toilets reported to be available at school:

Number of toilets for students	4.1	Number of students per toilet	49
Number of toilets for teachers	1.7	Number of teachers per toilet	10

45% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

55% of schools were reported to have toilets available which are separated by gender for students and 52% of schools reportedly had these for teachers.⁴

Of the **11%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets¹ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

There is no water in the toilets The toilets have no locks The toilets are not maintained



12% of schools were reported to have unusable student toilets.

Proportion of schools by reported sanitation condition:

	Toilets for students		Toilets for teachers	
	Good	Bad	Good	Bad
Structural condition	67%	33%	73%	27%
Hygienic condition	63%	37%	68%	32%

*Findings derived from WFP data are presented in turquoise coloured boxes. ¹Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ²Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, <u>Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)</u>, 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ³Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ⁴ Toilets were also considered to be separated by gender if the school only had one gender of students/teachers.



and **67%** reportedly had soap.





Daquq DISTRICT

118 surveys with HHs with school-going children (58%) out of the total number of 202 HHs conducted by REACH

62 schools (95%) in 48 school buildings (96%) out of the total number of 65 schools in 50 school buildings assessed by WFP*

WATER

75% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply (improved water source)2 54% Don't know 24% Protected well/spring (improved water source)2

No water source available

77% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

84% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

34% of schools were reported to have drinking water from a water source available to students, of which the following types were reported to be available:

92% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 63% of HHs reported

89% of schools were reported to have handwashing facilities available to students, of which 73% were reportedly functional

water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

71%

20%

Water tanker Piped water supply

🔭 HYGIENE



Dibis DISTRICT

79 surveys with HHs with school-going children (56%) out of the total number of 141 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

83% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

92% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

67% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

99% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

Kirkuk DISTRICT

158 surveys with HHs with school-going children (58%) out of the total number of 271 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

95% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

 Piped water supply (improved water source)1
 86%

 Protected well/spring (improved water source)1
 10%

 Don't know
 4%



25% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

97% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

🍡 HYGIENE

94% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 61% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

F SANITATION

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet (improved facility)² Pit latrine without slab or platform



87%

13%

3.9 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

56% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

ъ HYGIENE

99% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, **48%** of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

 Flush or pour toilet (improved facility)2
 93%

 Pit latrine without slab or platform
 6%

 Pit latrine with slab & platform (improved facility)2
 1%



4.7 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

83% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

0% of HHs reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.







CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

ecember 2019

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 Iraqi districts which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. This data was supplemented with secondary data from the assessment conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP) carried out from October 2019 to February 2020, which also focused on the standard of WASH facilities at schools. It consisted of interviews with headmasters, teachers and students and observations at schools, covering 760 primary schools falling under the system of the federal government of Iraq, in 580 school buildings located in 10 districts⁵ across 10 governorates. As all data derives from either the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed (REACH) or key informant interviews and observations (WFP), findings are indicative only.

Al-Kahla DISTRICT

72 surveys with HHs with school-going children (47%) out of the total number of 152 HHs conducted by REACH



91% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

47% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁶ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

47%

42%

Piped water supply Tanker/truck/cart No water source available Don't know





*Districts assessed by either REACH or WFP, as described in the methodology section.

86% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

96%

1%

At the school's premises Don't know 0

🎲 HYGIENE

98% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 88% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ² Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³ Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴ Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵ Of the 10 districts where schools have been assessed by WFP, 3 districts were the same as where REACH has conducted HH surveys. ⁶ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).







Maysan GOVERNORATE

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

4.6 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

97% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 8% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained60%There is no water in the toilets53%The toilets have no locks53%There is no space / it is too crowded7%



Qalat Saleh DISTRICT

65 schools (100%) in 56 school buildings (100%) out of the total number of 65 schools in 56 school buildings assessed by WFP*



82% of schools were reported to have drinking water from a water source available to students, of which all reportedly had piped water supply as used type of water source.

ъ HYGIENE

77% of schools were reported to have handwashing facilities available to students, of which 8% reportedly had soap.

SANITATION

Average number of toilets reported to be available at school:

Number of toilets for students	3.5	Number of students pertoilet	125
Number of toilets for teachers	1.5	Number of teachers per toilet	10

57% of schools were reported to have toilets available which are separated by gender for students and 75% of schools reportedly had these for teachers.³

20% of schools were reported to have unusable student toilets.

Proportion of schools by reported sanitation condition:

	Toilets for students		Toilets for teachers	
	Good Bad		Good	Bad
Structural condition	54%	46%	62%	38%
Hygienic condition	29%	71%	72%	28%

¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, <u>according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring</u> <u>Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)</u>. ² Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ³ Toilets were also considered to be separated by gender if the school only had one gender of students/teachers. *Findings derived from WFP data are presented in turquoise coloured boxes.







CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 Iraqi districts which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. This data was supplemented with secondary data from the assessment conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP) carried out from October 2019 to February 2020, which also focused on the standard of WASH facilities at schools. It consisted of interviews with headmasters, teachers and students and observations at schools, covering 760 primary schools falling under the system of the federal government of Iraq, in 580 school buildings located in 10 districts⁵ across 10 governorates. As all data derives from either the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed (REACH) or key informant interviews and observations (WFP), findings are indicative only.

AI-Baaj DISTRICT

139 surveys with HHs with school-going children (49%) out of the total number of 282 HHs conducted by REACH



20% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

9% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁶ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

53%

20%

Tanker/truck/cart No water source available Don't know Unprotected well/spring





*Districts assessed by either REACH or REACH and WFP, as described in the methodology section.

15% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

At the school's premises52%Don't know37%At more than 500m distance11%



🍡 HYGIENE

77% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 25% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ² Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴ Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Of the 10 districts where schools have been assessed by WFP, 3 districts were the same as where REACH has conducted HH surveys. ⁶ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, protected vell, unprotected spring and surface water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).







Ninewa GOVERNORATE

SANITATION

90% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

64%

24%

Pit latrine with slab and platform Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine without slab or plaform Don't know



Al-Hamdaniya DISTRICT

96 surveys with HHs with school-going children (76%) out of the total number of 127 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

81% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

82% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source³ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

70%

12%

76%

10%

Piped water supply Protected well/spring No water source available Don't know



64% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

At the school's premises
Don't know
At more than 500m distance
Within 500m distance



5.9 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

57% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 37% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

There is no water in the toilets The toilets are not maintained The toilets have no locks

98%	
25%	
12%	

ъ HYGIENE

95% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 79% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖡 SANITATION

97% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet	83 %
Pit latrine with slab and platform	12%
Pit VIP toilet	2%
Don't know	2%

C	

5.3 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

66% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 7% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained There is no space / it is too crowed The toilets have no locks There is no water in the toilets



¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, <u>according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring</u> Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP). ² Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ³ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, <u>as defined by the JMP</u>, 2017. Improved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).







AI-Hatra DISTRICT

101 surveys with HHs with school-going children (65%) out of the total number of 156 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

68% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

38% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Tanker/truck/cart Piped water supply Protected well/spring Rainwater tank



41% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

65%

23%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance Within 500m distance Don't know



AI-Mosul DISTRICT

237 surveys with HHs with school-going children (70%) out of the total number of 338 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

88% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

99% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, with as mainly used type:

spe.	Piped water supply	98%
	Protected well/spring	1%

🛬 HYGIENE

82% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 84% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

98% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform Pit latrine without slab or platform Plastic bag



4.5 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

71% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the **28%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained There is no water in the toilets The toilets have no locks There is no space / it is too crowded 25

93%	
36%	
29%	
25%	

87% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:



92 %	
5%	
3%	



90% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 88% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.







Ninewa GOVERNORATE

SANITATION

97% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform 5% Don't know



4.5 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

AI-Shikhan DISTRICT

139 surveys with HHs with school-going children out of the total number of 202 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

85% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

95% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source³ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

94%

5%

93%

5%

Piped water supply No water source available Protected well/spring



68% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

At the school's premises			
Within 500m distance			
At more than 500m distance			
Don't know			



90% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 14% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained	91%
The toilets have no locks	56%
There is no water in the toilets	23%
There is no space / it is too crowded	1%

🛬 HYGIENE

91% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 42% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

99% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

87%

13%

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform



5.6 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

76% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 12% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained There is no space / it is too crowded The toilets have no locks There is no water in the toilets



¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, <u>according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme</u> for <u>Water Supply</u>. <u>Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)</u>. ² Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ³ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, <u>as defined by the JMP</u>, 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).







Aqra DISTRICT

 $86\ surveys$ with HHs with school-going children (54%) out of the total number of $159\ HHs$ conducted by REACH

WATER

86% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

99% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply	99%
Tanker/truck/cart	1%

83% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

76%

16%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance Within 500m distance



Sinjar DISTRICT

156 surveys with HHs with school-going children (71%) out of the total number of 219 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

69% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

65% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply	52%	
Don't know	14%	
Protected well/spring	13%	
Tanker/truck/cart	11%	

ъ HYGIENE

95% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 43% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

F SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet81%Pit latrine with slab and platform19%

6.5 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

89% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 3% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets have no locks The toilets are not maintained



55% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

75%

11%

At the school's premises Don't know At more than 500m distance Within 500m distance



ъ HYGIENE

61% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 70% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.







ecember 2019

Ninewa GOVERNORATE

SANITATION

67% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform Don't know Pit latrine without slab or platform



Telafar DISTRICT

158 surveys with HHs with school-going children (75%) out of the total number of 211 HHs conducted by REACH

102 schools (42%) in 89 school buildings (43%) out of the total number of 245 schools in 205 school buildings assessed by WFP*



73% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

99% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source³ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply Protected well/spring Tanker/truck/cart



7%

66% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

4.0 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

56% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 37% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

There is no water in the toilets83%The toilets have no locks57%The toilets are not maintained48%There is no space / it is too crowded21%



Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

13%

At the school's premises Within 500m distance



79% of schools were reported to have drinking water from a water source available to students, of which the following types were reported to be available:

Piped water supply	75 %	
Water tanker	20%	
Borehole	5%	

ъ HYGIENE

77% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 91% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

95% of schools were reported to have handwashing facilities available to students, of which 84% were reportedly functional and 45% reportedly had soap.

¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, <u>according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme</u> for <u>Water Supply</u>. <u>Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)</u>. ² Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ³Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, <u>as defined by the JMP</u>, 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped metwork, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). *Findings derived from WFP data are presented in turquoise boxes.







SANITATION

98% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

4.8 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

Average number of toilets reported to be available at school: Number of toilets for students 5.9 Number of students per toilet 80 Number of toilets for teachers 2.0 Number of teachers per toilet

79% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

62% of schools were reported to have toilets available which are separated by gender for students and 59% of schools reportedly had these for teachers.²

Tilkaef DISTRICT

131 surveys with HHs with school-going children (60%) out of the total number of 218 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

91% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁴ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

68% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

96%

4%

At the school's premises Within 500m distance



Of the 26% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained			
There is no water in the toilets			
The toilets have no locks			

96%	
25%	
13%	

Proportion of schools that were reported to have the following sanitation issues for student toilets:

The toilets need rehabilitation	
There is no water in the toilets	

28% 3%

Proportion of schools by reported sanitation condition:

	Toilets for students		Toilets for teachers	
	Good	Bad	Good	Bad
Structural condition	89%	11%	96%	4%
Hygienic condition	33%	67%	65%	35%

🔭 HYGIENE

87% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 86% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school, with as most commonly used type:

Flush or pour to	oilet
Pit latrine with s	lab and platform

96%

4%

4.9 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

76% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 16% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:



¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP). ² Toilets were also considered to be separated by gender if the school only had one gender of students/teachers. ³ Toilets were also considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ⁴ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the JMP, 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected rainwater tank, protected rainwater tank, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).







CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 Iraqi districts which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. This data was supplemented with secondary data from the assessment conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP) carried out from October 2019 to February 2020, which also focused on the standard of WASH facilities at schools. It consisted of interviews with headmasters, teachers and students and observations at schools, covering 760 primary schools falling under the system of the federal government of Iraq, in 580 school buildings located in 10 districts⁵ across 10 governorates. As all data derives from either the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed (REACH) or key informant interviews and observations (WFP), findings are indicative only.

AI-Daur DISTRICT

44 surveys with HHs with school-going children (66%) out of the total number of 67 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

57% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

93% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁶ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply No water source available



Frbil I-Shirgat Ninewa Kirkuk Al-Sulaymaniyah Baiji Tooz Khurmatc Tikrit Al-Daur Salah A -Din Diyala Al-Anbar Assessed district (REACH) Assessed district (WFP)* Baghdad Unassessed district

*Districts assessed by either REACH or WFP, as described in the methodology section.

39% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

98%

At the school's premises Within 500m distance



ъ HYGIENE

98% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 33% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Of the 10 districts where schools have been assessed by WFP, 3 districts were the same as where REACH has conducted HH surveys. ⁶Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).







93%

4%

SANITATION

97% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school, with as most commonly used type:

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform



4.1 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

AI-Shirqat DISTRICT

153 surveys with HHs with school-going children (54%) out of the total number of 282 HHs conducted by REACH $\,$



88% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

98% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source³ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

98%

1%

92%

6%

Piped water supply No water source available Don't know



78% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance Within 500m distance



83% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the **39%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained94%The toilets have no locks44%There is no space / it is too crowded22%

ъ HYGIENE

86% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 72% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖣 SANITATION

92% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:





4.7 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

56% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 9% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained87%The toilets have no locks38%There is no water in the toilets12%There is no space / it is too crowded 12%



¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, <u>according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme</u> for <u>Water Supply</u>. <u>Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)</u>. ² Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ³ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, <u>as defined by the JMP</u>, 2017. Improved water sources include illegal connection to piped water rank, unprotected valle, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).







Baiji DISTRICT

74 surveys with HHs with school-going children (43%) out of the total number of 174 HHs conducted by REACH



ecember 2019

88% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

74% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

82%

18%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance



Balad DISTRICT

36 schools (61%) in 36 school buildings (100%) out of the total number of 59 schools in 36 school buildings assessed by WFP*



53% of schools were reported to have drinking water from a water source available to students, of which all reportedly had piped water supply as type of water source.

🏷 HYGIENE

90% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 78% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖣 SANITATION

98% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

88%

10%

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine with slab and platform Pit latrine without slab or platform



5.0 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

39% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the **10%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained The toilets have no locks 100% 60%



97% of schools were reported to have handwashing facilities available to students, of which 51% were reportedly functional and 34% reportedly had soap.

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for <u>Water Supply</u>. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. *Findings derived from WFP data are presented in turguoise coloured boxes.







SANITATION

Average number of toilets reported to be available at school:			
Number of toilets for students	5.2	Number of students per toilet	55
Number of toilets for teachers	1.5	Number of teachers per toilet	12

69% of schools were reported to have toilets available which are separated by gender for students and 36% of schools

Proportion of schools that were reported to have the following sanitation issues for student toilets:

23%

20% 11% 6%

The toilets need rehabilitation	
The toilets have no locks	
The toilets are inadequate	
The toilets need maintenance	

Proportion of schools by reported sanitation condition:

	Toilets for students		Toilets for teachers	
	Good	Bad	Good	Bad
Structural condition	80%	20%	87%	13%
Hygienic condition	54%	46%	74%	26%

Tikrit DISTRICT

reportedly had these for teachers.¹

102 surveys with HHs with school-going children (47%) out of the total number of 216 HHs conducted by REACH



93% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

98% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source² at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply Don't know



66% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children having the following distance to the main water source for their school:

90%

10%

At the school's premises At more than 500m distance



ъ HYGIENE

96% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 85% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

¹ Toilets were also considered to be separated by gender if the school only had one gender of students/teachers. ² Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).







78%

15%

SANITATION

85% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Flush or pour toilet Pit latrine without slab or platform Pit latrine with slab and platform



Tooz Khurmato DISTRICT

147 surveys with HHs with school-going children (57%) out of the total number of 258 HHs conducted by REACH



72% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

91% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source³ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply No water source available Protected well/spring Tanker/truck/cart



38% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

Proportion of HHs who reported the following locations of the main water source at their children's school:

89 %	
6%	
3%	
2%	
	89% 6% 3% 2%

5.1 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

41% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 3% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained The toilets have no locks



🔭 HYGIENE

66% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 57% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

93% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children's most commonly used type of sanitation facility at school:

Pit latrine without slab or platform Open hole Pit latrine with slab and platform



4.5 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

49% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 27% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets² at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:



¹ Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines, <u>according to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme</u> for <u>Water Supply</u>. <u>Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)</u>. ² Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private. ³ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, <u>as defined by the JMP</u>, 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal).





REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

Flush or pour toilet

CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 Iraqi districts which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. This data was supplemented with secondary data from the assessment conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP) carried out from October 2019 to February 2020, which also focused on the standard of WASH facilities at schools. It consisted of interviews with headmasters, teachers and students and observations at schools, covering 760 primary schools falling under the system of the federal government of Iraq, in 580 school buildings located in 10 districts⁵ across 10 governorates. As all data derives from either the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed (REACH) or key informant interviews and observations (WFP), findings are indicative only.

AI-Chibayish DISTRICT

87 schools (100%) in 67 school buildings (100%) out of the total number of 87 schools in 67 school buildings assessed by WFP*



20/

3% of schools were reported to have drinking water from a water source available to students, of which all reportedly had water tanker as used type of water source.



82% of schools were reported to have handwashing facilities available to students, of which 1% reportedly had soap.



*Districts assessed by either REACH or WFP, as described in the methodology section.

SANITATION

Average number of toilets reported to be available at school:

Number of toilets for students	4.9	Number of students per toilet	58
Number of toilets for teachers	1.7	Number of teachers per toilet	14

84% of schools were reported to have toilets available which are separated by gender for students and 80% of schools reportedly had these for teachers.⁶

1% of schools were reported to have unusable student toilets.

Proportion of schools that were reported to have the following sanitation issues for student toilets:

The	toilets	need	maintenance	69%
The	toilets	need	to be repaired	1%

¹ IOM-DTM, October 2019. ² Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³ Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴ Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵ Of the 10 districts where schools have been assessed by WFP, 3 districts were the same as where REACH has conducted HH surveys. ⁶ Toilets were also considered to be separated by gender if the school only had one gender of students/teachers. *Findings derived from WFP data are presented in turquoise coloured boxes.







Proportion of schools by reported sanitation condition:

	Toilets for students		Toilets for teachers	
	Good	Bad	Good	Bad
Structural condition	48%	52%	72%	28%
Hygienic condition	5%	95%	7%	93%

AI-Nasiriya DISTRICT

44 surveys with HHs with school-going children (51%) out of the total number of 87 HHs conducted by REACH



100% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

100% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school, of whom all reported piped water supply to be the mainly used type.

88% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

100% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

ъ HYGIENE

97% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 94% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

7.3 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

100% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 9% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

 The toilets have no locks
 100%

 The toilets are not maintained
 67%

¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by <u>the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme</u> for Water Supply. Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.







Wassit GOVERNORATE

CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

Roughly two years after the end of major military operations in Iraq against the socalled Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Iraq is shifting from a state of emergency to a recovery phase. As of November 2019, 4.5 million returns have been reported, while 1.44 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain displaced of whom 1.09 million reside outside of formal camps.¹ With ongoing camp closures,² IDPs are increasingly moving to non-camp locations or returning to their area of origin. In 2020, 1.2 million returnees³ and 285,000 IDPs are estimated to remain in need of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) assistance.

On behalf of the Iraq WASH Cluster, REACH conducted an assessment to provide an evidence-based overview of the needs, gaps and priorities in WASH for populations residing out-of-camp. The survey covered 57 districts across Iraq which host at least 200 returnee or IDP families according to data from the International Organization for Migration's Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM) as of July 2019. Nationwide, 9,080 household (HH) level surveys have been conducted with out-of-camp populations from 22 September to 31 December 2019, resulting in findings which are statistically representative with a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error for each population group⁴ at district level. Of these, 4,956 HHs with school-going children have been interviewed to report on the standard of WASH facilities in the school which their child, or majority of their children, attend. As all data derives from the school-going subset of the total number of HHs assessed, **findings are indicative only**.

AI-Kut DISTRICT

53 surveys with HHs with school-going children (56%) out of the total number of 95 HHs conducted by REACH

WATER

52% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

46% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source⁵ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

Piped water supply No water source available Don't know



7% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

93% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.



*Districts assessed by REACH, as described in the methodology section.

🍡 HYGIENE

98% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 6% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

🖣 SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility⁶ at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

5.5 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

85% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the 43% of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets⁷ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained	100%	
There is no water in the toilets	9%	
The toilets have no locks	4%	

¹IOM-DTM, October 2019. ²Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) 2020, November 2019. ³Those displaced since January 2014 who have returned to their location of origin (according to IOM-DTM). ⁴Households have been stratified by IDP, returnee and host population group at district level. ⁵Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water frucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, uprotected rainwater tank, uprotected well, uprotected aring face water (from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ⁶Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines without slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to JMP). ⁷Toilets were considered unusable if not accessible, functional or private.





AI-Suwaira DISTRICT

59 surveys with HHs with school-going children (61%) out of the total number of 96 HHs conducted by REACH



27% of HHs reported their children having drinking water from a water source available at school at the time of data collection.

86% of HHs reported their children usually having access to drinking water from an improved water source¹ at school.

Proportion of HHs who reported their children mainly having access to the following types of water source at school:

86%

7%

Piped water supply No water source available Don't know



12% of HHs perceived the water quality of the drinking water usually available at their children's school to be acceptable.

94% of HHs reported the main water source at their children's school to be located at the school's premises.

🎲 HYGIENE

99% of HHs reported their children having access to handwashing facilities at school. Of these, 1% of HHs reported water and soap to be available at the time of data collection.

SANITATION

100% of HHs reported their children having access to an improved sanitation facility² at school, of whom all reported a flush or pour toilet to be the most commonly used type.

6.2 was the reported average number of functional toilets for students at school.

87% of HHs reported their children having access to toilets separated by gender at school.

Of the **20%** of HHs who reported their children having unusable toilets³ at school at the time of data collection, reasons were:

The toilets are not maintained The toilets have no locks There is no water in the toilets There is no space / it is too crowded



¹ Improved water sources are sources that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP), 2017. Improved water sources include piped water into compound, piped water connected to public tap, borehole, protected well, protected rainwater tank, protected spring and water trucking. Unimproved water sources include illegal connection to piped network, unprotected rainwater tank, unprotected well, unprotected spring and surface water (which means water from a river, dam, lake, pond, stream or canal). ² Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include flush/pour flush toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines and pit latrines with a slab and platform. Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines (according to the JMP). ³ Toilets were considered to be unusable if they were not accessible, not functional or not private.





REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

WASH NEEDS IN SCHOOLS IRAQ

% of HHs with school-going children who reported their children have access to toilets separated by gender at school

% of HHs with school-going children who reported their children have access to handwashing facilities with water and soap at school





Average number of students per sanitation facility reported to be

WASH NEEDS IN SCHOOLS IRAQ

% of schools reported to have drinking water from any water source available to their students



available at school





REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action