



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

Kurdistan Region of Iraq

May 2017

## Table of Contents

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

## METHODOLOGY OF MONTHLY MONITORING

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

To monitor distributions during the month of May, data were collected through telephone interviews with randomly sampled beneficiary households between 20 August and 11 September 2017. A total of 1,148 IDP and 748 refugee beneficiaries were called. Of these, 770 IDPs and 620 refugees answered the phone, totalling 1,390 beneficiaries. Of the total beneficiaries who answered, 7 (<1%) could not understand the enumerator and 39 (3%) reported to have not received anything, despite appearing in the beneficiary records. Hence, this report is based on a final sample of interviews with 730 IDP beneficiaries and 606 refugee beneficiaries who confirmed that they remembered the distribution and had received assistance.

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

	Dohuk		Erbil		Sulaymaniyah		Total
	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	
<b>NFI</b>	90	899	0	5,123	0	1,637	7,749
<b>Cash for NFI</b>	0	0	158	549	0	0	707
<b>MPCA</b>	1,239	355	416	256	130	55	2,451
<b>Total</b>	1,329	1,254	574	5,928	130	1,692	10,907

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

**Table 2: Sample of beneficiaries assisted in May 2017<sup>1</sup>**

	Dohuk		Erbil		Sulaymaniyah		Total
	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	Refugee	IDP	
<b>NFI</b>	54	27	0	93	0	189	363
<b>Cash for NFI</b>	0	0	103	150	0	0	253
<b>MPCA</b>	182	153	157	118	110	0	720
<b>Total</b>	236	180	260	361	110	189	1,336

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

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

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

### Limitations

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

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

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

## PROFILE OF IDP MPCA BENEFICIARIES

	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
<b>AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE PER NUMBER OF MPCA PAYMENTS RECEIVED</b>				
1 Payment	7	6	-	6
2 Payments	6	6	-	6
3 Payments	6	7	-	7
<b>PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS<sup>2</sup></b>				
Female-headed household	20%	17%	-	18%
Chronic illness	70%	74%	-	72%
Physical disability	20%	19%	-	20%
Mental disability	10%	5%	-	8%
Elderly	20%	20%	-	20%
Pregnant or nursing	15%	17%	-	16%
Child under 5	22%	23%	-	22%
<b>DEPENDENTS<sup>3</sup></b> (% of household members dependent on working age adults)	<b>49%</b>	<b>46%</b>	-	<b>48%</b>
<b>PERCENT OF MPCA BENEFICIARIES WITH NO INCOME</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>11%</b>	-	<b>12%</b>
<b>PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH<sup>4</sup></b>				
1	Paying debt	Paying debt	-	Paying debt
2	Healthcare	Healthcare	-	Healthcare
3	Rent	Rent	-	Rent
<b>SATISFACTION WITH THE MPCA MODALITY</b>				
Not satisfied	<1%	<1%	-	<1%
Somewhat satisfied	14%	19%	-	16%
Satisfied	73%	63%	-	69%
Very satisfied	12%	18%	-	14%

<sup>2</sup> This section reports on percent of households where at least one member has the following specific needs.

<sup>3</sup> Working age adults (18-60 years) does not include the elderly, or adults with chronic illness.

<sup>4</sup> On average, between 51% and 68% of the received cash was spent on the top three reported areas of spending across the KR-I.





















## ISSUES FACED BY IDP MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN MAY

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%	0%	-	0%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	5%	8%	-	6%
Were not informed about the selection process	62%	64%	-	63%
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection <sup>5</sup>	0%	<1%	-	<1%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	4%	6%	-	5%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process <sup>6</sup>	<1%	0%	-	<1%
Received no information on what would be distributed	25%	14%	-	20%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	13%	16%	-	14%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed <sup>7</sup>	0%	4%	-	2%
Reported they received nothing <sup>8</sup>	0%	0%	-	0%
Had difficulties cashing their cheques <sup>9</sup>	0%	2%	-	<1%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	89%	79%	-	85%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	100%	100%	-	100%

## BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN MPCA IN MAY<sup>10</sup>

	<b>26%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>20%</b>
TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN MAY				
In-kind	22%	9%	-	17%
Cash	3%	0%	-	2%
Vouchers	3%	2%	-	2%
None	74%	89%	-	80%

## SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN MAY

 I don't know	33%		23%		-	30%	
 Other UN	23%		15%		-	21%	
 Government	25%		23%		-	25%	
 Religious Groups	5%		15%		-	7%	
 Other	20%		24%		-	20%	

<sup>5</sup> “Wasta” is the Arabic term for ‘nepotism’ or ‘corruption’ - relating to favours through personal networks.

<sup>6</sup> All “no” answers include those who believed they were “not satisfied” and “somewhat satisfied”.

<sup>7</sup> All “no” answers include those who reported the distribution to be “not managed” and “somewhat managed”.

<sup>8</sup> Figures from this indicator are drawn from the total sample of beneficiaries called for this report.

<sup>9</sup> All of the May beneficiaries in Erbil and 84% in Dohuk reported receiving their payments through bank cheques.

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



## OVERVIEW OF NFI DISTRIBUTIONS TO IDPS IN MAY

### REPORTED QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO IDPS IN DOHUK<sup>11</sup>

% of NFI beneficiaries who received item		Blanket	Kerosene Can	Tarpaulin	Cooking Stove	Heating Stove	Kerosene	Tent Insulation	Hygiene Kit	Kitchen Set	Mattresses	WJC	Tent	Fans	Lamp
		52%	22%	26%	30%	-	4% <sup>12</sup>	-	41%	44%	96%	15%	-	4% <sup>13</sup>	-
Was it useful?	Yes	71%	100%	71%	100%	-	N/A	-	100%	100%	92%	100%	-	N/A	-
	No	29%	0%	29%	0%	-	N/A	-	0%	0%	8%	0%	-	N/A	-
Was it of good quality?	Yes	64%	100%	100%	100%	-	N/A	-	100%	100%	93%	100%	-	N/A	-
	No	36%	0%	0%	0%	-	N/A	-	0%	0%	7%	0%	-	N/A	-
Did you use it?	Yes	93%	100%	71%	100%	-	N/A	-	100%	100%	96%	100%	-	N/A	-
	No	7%	0%	29%	0%	-	N/A	-	0%	0%	4%	0%	-	N/A	-

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

% of NFI beneficiaries who received item		Blanket	Kerosene Can	Tarpaulin	Cooking Stove	Heating Stove	Kerosene	Tent Insulation	Hygiene Kit	Kitchen Set	Mattresses	WJC	Tent	Fans	Lamp
		91%	71%	80%	86%	6%	30%	1% <sup>14</sup>	88%	84%	97%	72%	46%	10%	69%
Was it useful?	Yes	89%	95%	100%	96%	83%	100%	N/A	100%	99%	98%	96%	100%	100%	98%
	No	11%	5%	0%	4%	17%	0%	N/A	0%	1%	2%	4%	0%	0%	2%
Was it of good quality?	Yes	74%	97%	99%	91%	100%	100%	N/A	100%	99%	97%	100%	95%	100%	98%
	No	26%	3%	1%	9%	0%	0%	N/A	0%	1%	3%	0%	5%	0%	2%
Did you use it?	Yes	96%	100%	100%	96%	33%	100%	N/A	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	98%
	No	4%	0%	0%	4%	67%	0%	N/A	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%

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

% of NFI beneficiaries who received item		Blanket	Kerosene Can	Tarpaulin	Cooking Stove	Heating Stove	Kerosene	Tent Insulation	Hygiene Kit	Kitchen Set	Mattresses	WJC	Tent	Fans	Lamp
		77%	62%	31%	13%	36%	26%	2%	66%	32%	38%	57%	3%	16%	26%
Was it useful?	Yes	97%	100%	100%	99%	86%	91%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	96%
	No	3%	0%	0%	1%	14%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	4%
Was it of good quality?	Yes	92%	98%	100%	97%	94%	95%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	96%
	No	8%	2%	0%	3%	6%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	4%
Did you use it?	Yes	93%	100%	99%	99%	81%	82%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	No	7%	0%	1%	1%	19%	18%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

<sup>12</sup> Only one beneficiary received kerosene in Dohuk in May.

<sup>13</sup> Only one fan was distributed in Dohuk in May.

<sup>14</sup> Only two beneficiaries received tent insulation kits in May in Erbil.

## ISSUES FACED BY IDP NFI BENEFICIARIES IN MAY

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%	2%	0%	1%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	0%	2%	0%	1%
Were not informed about the selection process	73%	68%	81%	74%
Believed there was "wasta" involved with their selection	0%	1%	2%	1%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	4%	6%	3%	4%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	4%	1%	2%	2%
Received no information on what would be distributed	8%	1%	2%	2%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	0%	0%	0%	0%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	0%	0%	<1%	<1%
Reported they received nothing	13%	4%	7%	6%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	100%	95%	83%	90%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	100%	100%	100%	100%

## MOST COMMON ISSUE WITH THE ITEM RECEIVED AND PERCENT OF RECIPIENTS WHO EXPERIENCED IT<sup>15</sup>

Item	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%
Blankets	Poor Quality	14%	Poor Quality	9%	Poor Quality	5%	Poor Quality	8%
Kerosene Can	N/A	N/A	Poor Quality	3%	N/A	N/A	Poor Quality	3%
Tarpaulin	Not Needed	29%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Needed	29%
Cooking Stove	N/A	N/A	Poor Quality	4%	Poor Timing	1%	Poor Quality	3%
Heating Stove	-	-	Poor Timing	17%	Poor Timing	10%	Poor Timing	11%
Kerosene	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Poor Timing	8%	Poor Timing	4%
Tent Insulation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hygiene Kit	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kitchen Sets	N/A	N/A	Not Enough	1%	N/A	N/A	Not Enough	<1%
Mattresses	Not Enough	4%	Poor Quality	1%	Poor Quality	<1%	Poor Quality	1%
Water Jerry Cans	N/A	N/A	Not Enough	5%	Poor Quality	2%	Not Enough	2%
Tent	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fans	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lamps	-	-	Not Enough	2%	Poor Quality	4%	Not Enough	1%

<sup>15</sup> N/A means no issue was reported.

## PROFILE OF IDP BENEFICIARIES OF CASH FOR NFI<sup>16</sup>

**AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE OF CASH FOR NFI RECIPIENTS**

**5**

## PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS

Female-headed household	14%
Chronic illness	45%
Physical disability	10%
Mental disability	<1%
Elderly	12%
Pregnant or nursing	16%
Child under 5	19%

**DEPENDENTS** (% of household members dependent on working age adults)

**41%**

## PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH<sup>17</sup>

<b>1</b>	Rent
<b>2</b>	Food
<b>3</b>	Healthcare

## SATISFACTION WITH THE CASH FOR NFI

Not satisfied	0%
Somewhat satisfied	36%
Satisfied	59%
Very satisfied	5%



## ISSUES FACED BY IDP CASH FOR NFI BENEFICIARIES IN MAY

Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	5%
Were not informed about the selection process	73%
Believed there was "wasta" involved with their selection	<1%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	17%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	1%
Received no information on what would be distributed	12%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	3%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	9%
Reported they received nothing	1%
Had difficulties cashing their cheques <sup>18</sup>	2%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	78%

## BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN THE CASH FOR NFI IN MAY

**13%**

## TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN MAY

In-kind	12%
Cash	1%
Vouchers	0%
None	87%

## SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN MAY

Religious Groups	5%
Local NGO	5%
Other UN	16%
Government	74%
Other	0%

<sup>16</sup> Cash for NFI distributions only occurs in Erbil governorate.

<sup>17</sup> On average, between 70% and 86% of the received cash was spent on the top three reported areas of spending.

<sup>18</sup> 99% of the May beneficiaries reported receiving their payments through bank cheques.



## PROFILE OF REFUGEE MPCA BENEFICIARIES





















	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
<b>AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE PER NUMBER OF MPCA PAYMENTS RECEIVED</b>				
1 Payment	5	4	5	5
2 Payments	4	5	8	5
3 Payments	4	4	2	4
<b>PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS</b>				
Female-headed household	23%	12%	9%	19%
Chronic illness	43%	50%	46%	45%
Physical disability	8%	7%	15%	8%
Mental disability	4%	2%	2%	4%
Elderly	11%	10%	8%	10%
Pregnant or nursing	27%	16%	30%	25%
Child under 5	30%	27%	39%	30%
<b>DEPENDENTS</b> (% of household dependent on working age adults)	<b>42%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>43%</b>
<b>PERCENT OF MPCA BENEFICIARIES WITH NO INCOME</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH<sup>19</sup></b>				
<b>1</b>	Paying Debt	Rent	Paying Debt	Paying Debt
<b>2</b>	Rent	Paying Debt	Rent	Rent
<b>3</b>	Healthcare	Healthcare	Food	Healthcare
<b>SATISFACTION WITH THE MPCA MODALITY</b>				
Not satisfied	<1%	2%	0%	<1%
Somewhat satisfied	24%	30%	22%	25%
Satisfied	63%	56%	70%	61%
Very satisfied	12%	12%	8%	13%

<sup>19</sup> On average, between 55% and 80% of the received cash was spent on the top three reported areas of spending.

## ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE MPCA BENEFICIARIES IN MAY

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%	<1%	0%	<1%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	7%	5%	2%	6%
Were not informed about the selection process	58%	63%	63%	60%
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection	7%	7%	0%	7%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	21%	7%	4%	15%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	4%	<1%	3%	3%
Received no information on what would be distributed	25%	23%	10%	24%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	6%	3%	7%	6%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	12%	5%	7%	9%
Reported they received nothing	0%	0%	2%	<1%
Had difficulties cashing their cheques <sup>20</sup>	1%	2%	2%	1%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	92%	86%	96%	90%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	99%	100%	98%	99%

## BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN MPCA IN MAY

	<b>7%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>15%</b>
TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN MAY				
In-kind	3%	3%	2%	3%
Cash	2%	25%	5%	8%
Vouchers	2%	1%	37%	4%
None	93%	73%	57%	85%
SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN MAY				
Other UN	67% 	8% 	87% 	42% 
Don't Know	8% 	2% 	2% 	4% 
Qandil	25% 	82% 	9% 	50% 
Government	0% 	7% 	0% 	3% 
Other	0% 	7% 	2% 	4% 

<sup>20</sup> In May, 98% in Dohuk, 100% in Erbil and 84% in Sulaymaniyah received their payments through bank cheques.

## OVERVIEW OF NFI DISTRIBUTIONS TO REFUGEES IN MAY

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

% of NFI beneficiaries who received item		Blanket	Kerosene Can	Tarpaulin	Cooking Stove	Heating Stove	Kerosene	Tent Insulation	Hygiene Kit	Kitchen Set	Mattresses	WJC	Tent	Fans	Lamp
		56%	31%	26%	31%	2% <sup>21</sup>	2% <sup>22</sup>	-	31%	54%	91%	31%	20%	-	-
Was it useful?	Yes	77%	100%	100%	94%	N/A	N/A	-	100%	94%	90%	100%	100%	-	-
	No	23%	0%	0%	6%	N/A	N/A	-	0%	6%	10%	0%	0%	-	-
Was it of good quality?	Yes	60%	100%	100%	88%	N/A	N/A	-	100%	96%	86%	100%	100%	-	-
	No	40%	0%	0%	12%	N/A	N/A	-	0%	4%	14%	0%	0%	-	-
Did you use it?	Yes	90%	100%	93%	88%	N/A	N/A	-	100%	97%	98%	100%	91%	-	-
	No	10%	0%	7%	12%	N/A	N/A	-	0%	3%	2%	0%	9%	-	-

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

No NFI distributions were monitored in Erbil in May.

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

No NFI distributions were monitored in Sulaymaniyah in May.

<sup>21</sup> Only one heating stove was distributed in Dohuk in May.

<sup>22</sup> Kerosene was only distributed to one beneficiary in Dohuk in May.

## ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE NFI BENEFICIARIES IN MAY

ISSUE	DOHUK	ERBIL	SULAYMANIYAH	OVERALL
Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%	-	-	0%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	2%	-	-	2%
Were not informed about the selection process	70%	-	-	70%
Believed there was “wasta” involved with their selection	2%	-	-	2%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	0%	-	-	0%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	0%	-	-	0%
Received no information on what would be distributed	2%	-	-	2%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	0%	-	-	0%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	0%	-	-	0%
Reported they received nothing	16%	-	-	16%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	98%	-	-	98%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	98%	-	-	98%

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

Item	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%	Issue	%
Blankets	Poor Quality	13%	-	-	-	-	Poor Quality	13%
Kerosene Cans	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Tarpaulin	Not Needed	7%	-	-	-	-	Not Needed	7%
Cooking Stove	Poor Quality	6%	-	-	-	-	Poor Quality	6%
Heating Stove	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Kerosene	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Tent Insulation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hygiene Kit	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Kitchen Sets	Poor Quality	3%	-	-	-	-	Poor Quality	3%
Mattresses	Poor Quality	8%	-	-	-	-	Poor Quality	8%
Water Jerry Can	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Tent	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Fans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lamps	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



## PROFILE OF REFUGEE BENEFICIARIES OF CASH FOR NFI

**AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE OF CASH FOR NFI  
RECIPIENTS**

**3**

## PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS

Female-headed household	33%
Chronic illness	28%
Physical disability	10%
Mental disability	2%
Elderly	9%
Pregnant or nursing	23%
Child under 5	16%

**DEPENDENTS** (% of household members dependent on working age adults)

**27%<sup>23</sup>**

## PRIMARY REPORTED EXPENDITURES OF RECEIVED CASH<sup>24</sup>

<b>1</b>	Rent
<b>2</b>	Food
<b>3</b>	Healthcare

## SATISFACTION WITH THE CASH FOR NFI

Not satisfied	2%
Somewhat satisfied	46%
Satisfied	48%
Very satisfied	4%



## ISSUES FACED BY REFUGEE CASH FOR NFI BENEFICIARIES IN MAY

Treated disrespectfully by distribution staff	0%
Travelled to the distribution site more than once	5%
Were not informed about the selection process	84%
Believed there was "wasta" involved with their selection	1%
Waited more than 2 hours for assistance	10%
Were not satisfied with the distribution process	2%
Received no information on what would be distributed	19%
Paid more than 25,000 IQD to travel to the distribution	8%
Believed the distribution to be poorly managed	6%
Reported they received nothing	0%
Had difficulties cashing their cheques <sup>25</sup>	1%
Were not aware of a complaints mechanism	84%
Were not aware that UNHCR selected them	100%

## BENEFICIARIES WHO RECEIVED ASSISTANCE OTHER THAN THE CASH FOR NFI IN MAY

**6%**

## TYPES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED IN MAY

In-kind	4%
Cash	2%
Vouchers	0%
None	94%

## SOURCES OF OTHER ASSISTANCE UNHCR BENEFICIARIES RECEIVED IN MAY

Religious Groups	33%
Other UN	17%
Qandil	33%
Government	17%
Other	0%

<sup>23</sup> The low percentage of dependents is due to 50 out of 104 households being composed of only non-dependent working age adults.

<sup>24</sup> On average, between 77% and 87% of the received cash was spent on the top three reported areas of spending.

<sup>25</sup> 96% of the May beneficiaries reported receiving their payments through cheques.