

Iraq: field perspectives on the Grand Bargain

March 2019 • Findings from round 2



GROUND TRUTH
SOLUTIONS



OECD
BETTER POLICIES FOR BETTER LIVES



UKaid
from the British people

Contents

Introduction	3
Key findings	3
Executive summary	4
Survey data - affected people	8
Overview of findings	9
Survey questions	11
Demographics	30
Survey data - humanitarian staff	32
Overview of findings	33
Survey questions	35
Demographics	41
Annex: Notes on methodology	42
Affected people survey	42
Humanitarian staff survey	44
Question formulation	45

Introduction

This research is part of a project to understand how people affected by crisis and humanitarian field staff perceive the impact of the Grand Bargain commitments. It is a joint effort by Ground Truth Solutions (GTS) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Secretariat with financial support from the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID). Iraq is one of the seven countries covered by this research. The others are Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Haiti, Lebanon, Somalia and Uganda.

This report is based on responses to two standardised surveys in Iraq. The first was conducted face-to-face with 704 affected people in the governorates of Anbar, Erbil and Ninewa in November and December 2018. Staff were surveyed using an online survey completed by 266 staff members of national and international aid organisations, as well as UN agencies. Previous surveys of both affected people and staff conducted in 2017 provide a benchmark against which developments in perceptions of the humanitarian response can be tracked.

This summary covers the key findings from the affected people and humanitarian staff surveys. Detailed answers to all questions are included in subsequent sections, as well as comparisons with the results from the 2017 GTS surveys.

Key findings

- Overall, affected people are slightly more positive than they were in the last survey in 2017, although responses show a similar pattern. Their awareness of complaints mechanisms and sense of participation in aid provision show considerable improvements to the previous year. This is mirrored by humanitarian staff, who also report greater consideration of affected people's opinions.
- However, affected people are less convinced the aid they receive covers their basic needs than they were in 2017. A larger proportion (89%) expects to remain dependent on aid and few (19%) see life improving for people in Iraq. Unmet needs most often include cash, healthcare, food and shelter.
- Humanitarian staff see a need for more funding for durable solutions. Better coordination among aid providers and collaboration between humanitarian and development actors are identified as ways forward.
- Fewer staff respondents (40%) feel local aid providers are given enough support, compared to the last survey in 2017. This is despite widespread consensus that a combination of local and international organisations are best placed to provide aid in Iraq. In the absence of adequate support, just over 50% feel local aid providers lack the capacity to deliver high-quality aid.
- Affected people continue to feel safe and respected, while aid providers are trusted to act in their best interest. Where this trust is missing, 30% feel unable to report instances of abuse and mistreatment, and women feel less able to do so than men across locations.
- Close to 60% of those who have filed a suggestion or complaint say they did not receive a response. This stands in stark contrast to the perspective of humanitarian staff, the vast majority of whom (96%) believe that complaints will get a response.
- Over 70% of affected people do not feel informed about available aid, a slight decrease since the last survey in 2017. Without enough information about available aid, over 40% of affected people feel aid is not reaching those most in need. Again, in contrast, humanitarian staff remain positive, with almost 90% saying that aid is distributed to those most in need.

Executive summary


This summary covers the main findings of the affected people and humanitarian staff surveys. Analysis is aligned with the strategic objectives of the Humanitarian Response Plan for Iraq as well as some of the broader themes included in the Grand Bargain. Detailed analysis of all questions is included in the next section of the report and, where possible, compared with the findings from the previous GTS survey that was conducted in 2017.

Overall, affected people surveyed for this latest round of data collection express mixed views about the quality of the humanitarian response in Iraq. Despite a slight improvement in opinion when compared to 2017, the survey findings from the first and second round of data collection are very similar.

Post-conflict transition towards durable solutions


- **Affected people say their needs are not currently met**, considerably less so than in 2017. Returnees in Anbar feel better able to meet their needs than respondents (refugees, returnees and remainees) in Erbil and Ninewa. Most identify cash (70%), healthcare (34%), food (29%) and shelter (24%) as outstanding needs. However, cash is a clear preference as an aid modality: 70% of affected people prefer cash over in-kind assistance and those currently receiving cash are largely satisfied.

Affected people survey: Does the aid you receive currently cover your most important needs?




- **A third of affected people still do not feel aid agencies are taking their opinions into account at all**, although this is an improvement from last year. This contrasts with the view from humanitarian staff, who typically say their organisations 'mostly' consider affected people's views during the design and implementation of programmes.

Affected people survey: Do aid providers take your opinion into account when providing aid?



- **Regarding the future, only a minority feel that life in Iraq is improving.** Government failure and rampant corruption, persistent insecurity and instability, as well as a lack of employment opportunities are cited as causes for this perception. Compared to returnees and refugees, IDPs are less convinced their lives are improving, especially those surveyed in Erbil.

Trend in mean scores



Trend in mean scores



Affected people survey: Overall, is life improving for people in Iraq?

mean: 2.5, n=662



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

- As a result, more than 80% expect to remain dependent on humanitarian aid in the future. Again, returnees are more positive, especially in Anbar. To live without aid in the future, most say they require a job and salary (60%) or some form of cash assistance (46%).

Affected people survey: Do you feel the humanitarian aid you receive will enable you to live without humanitarian aid in the future?

mean: 1.5, n=663



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

- Humanitarian staff increasingly see room for improvement in the collaboration between humanitarian and development actors.

Humanitarian staff survey: Do humanitarian and development actors work together effectively in Iraq?

mean: 3.2, n=254



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Strengthening the centrality of protection

- Over 75% of respondents do not feel informed of their rights in Iraq at all. For those that do, most (54%) do not see them being respected.

Affected people survey: Are you aware of your rights as an IDP/returnee/refugee in Iraq?

mean: 1.9, n=698



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

- Almost 70% of affected people interviewed feel completely safe in their places of residence, which marks a further improvement from already high scores in 2017. Residents of camps are slightly more positive than people living outside of camps in rural and urban areas.

Affected people survey: Do you feel safe in your place of residence?


mean: 4.5, n=702



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely


Trend in mean scores



- Affected people also feel treated with respect by aid providers and largely trust them to act in their best interest.

Affected people survey: Do aid providers treat you with respect?


mean: 4.2, n=672



- Nevertheless, 30% feel unable to report instances of abuse or mistreatment. Respondents in Anbar feel least able to report abuse or mistreatment, whereas those in Erbil and Ninewa are much more positive. Across locations, women feel less able to report such instances compared to men and the majority (54%) feel most comfortable reporting instances of abuse to the army.

Affected people survey: Do you feel able to report instances of abuse or mistreatment?

mean: 3.8 n=693



- Awareness of general complaints mechanisms has increased considerably among affected people compared to 2017. However, close to 60% of those who have filed a suggestion or complaint say they did not receive a response. This is in contrast to the overwhelming majority (96%) of humanitarian staff who believe that complaints made by aid recipients are responded to.


Affected people survey: Have you received a response to your suggestion or complaint?

n=130



Humanitarian staff survey: If aid recipients make a complaint to your organisation, will they get a response?

n=226




- The actors affected people most trust when making a complaint are international organisations, volunteers or community representatives and independent organisations. Almost all respondents indicated a preference for lodging those complaints in person.

Contingency planning and preparedness


- **Knowing how to access aid is a crucial element of preparedness; however, two-thirds of respondents say they do not feel informed about the aid available to them.** Refugees are the least aware about available aid, followed by IDPs, while returnees are relatively more positive. Affected people have a clear preference for receiving information face-to-face and from international organisations or UN agencies.

Affected people survey: Do you feel informed about the kind of aid available to you?



- Affected people are split on whether aid is reaching those most in need. Syrian refugees living in camps across Erbil are less positive compared to IDPs. The poor, families and orphans are most often identified as those that are left out. In contrast, aid providers believe aid does reach those who need it most.

Affected people survey: Does aid go to those who need it most?




Humanitarian staff survey: Does aid go to those who need it most?



- **Humanitarian staff agree that a combination of local and international actors are best placed to respond to needs** but feel that local organisations do not get enough support and lack the capacity to deliver high-quality assistance. However, a fifth of respondents do not feel there is sufficient coordination between organisations.

Humanitarian staff survey: Are there sufficient coordination efforts between organisations?



The complete data sets from both the affected people and humanitarian staff surveys can be found in the following sections.

Survey data - affected people

Reading this section

The following sections use bar charts for both open and closed questions. Responses to closed questions are reported using a Likert scale from 1 to 5. The mean score is also shown. The bar charts for closed questions show the percentage of respondents who selected each answer option, with colours ranging from dark red for negative answers to dark green for positive ones. The analysis includes any significant difference in the perceptions of different demographic groups. It does not, however, show the full breakdown of responses according to these categories.

For open questions, the percentage and frequency with answers pertaining to a particular question do not always total 100% where respondents are given the option to provide multiple answers.

Sample of the affected people survey

A total of eight enumerators collected data between 5 November and 9 December 2018 across 19 rural, urban and camp locations. They conducted face-to-face interviews with 704 IDPs, refugees and returnees who reported having received aid within the last 12 months in Anbar, Erbil and Ninewa. These locations were selected using the International Organisation for Migration's (IOM) Displacement Tracking Matrix, location data on refugees compiled by UNHCR¹ and through consultations with humanitarian aid providers in country. A more detailed breakdown of the sample can be found in the methodology section.

¹ "Total persons of concern", UNHCR Iraq, last modified 28 February 2019, <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/5>


Overview of findings

● 2017 ● 2018



SO1: Post-conflict transition towards durable solutions


Does the aid you receive currently cover your most important needs?



Do aid providers take your opinion into account when providing aid?



Overall, is life improving for people in Iraq?



Do you feel the humanitarian aid you receive will enable you to live without humanitarian aid in the future?



SO2: Strengthening the centrality of protection


Are you aware of your rights as an IDP/returnee/refugee/remainee in Iraq?




Do you feel your rights as an IDP/returnee/refugee/remainee are respected?



Do you feel safe in your place of residence?



Do aid providers treat you with respect?



Do you trust aid providers to act in your best interest?



Do you feel able to report instances of abuse or mistreatment?



How easy did you find making the suggestion or complaint?




SO3: Contingency planning and preparedness

Do you feel informed about the kind of aid available to you?



Does aid go to those who need it most?



Are you satisfied with the education provided to your children?



43%

have access to employment.



58%

know how to make suggestions or complaints about the aid they receive.



87%


send their children to education classes.

Survey questions


Post-conflict transitions towards durable solutions

Q1. Relevance


Does the aid you receive currently cover your most important needs?



Trend in mean scores




Location type*



Follow-up question asked to those who responded **not at all** or **not very much** to the previous question:

What are your most important needs that are not met? (n=597)



Other responses include, in order: energy, education, WASH, psychosocial support, and information.

Note: Percentages do not total 100% because respondents were able to choose multiple answers. Only the top five responses are shown.

*Location types are made up as follows:

IDP camps include: Harsham camp in Erbil and Hassan Sham camp in Ninewa.


Refugee camps include: Darashakran, Kawergosk and Qushtapa in Erbil.

Rural areas include Haditha and Hay Al-Khudir Kubayash in Anbar, Soranshaqlawa in Erbil, as well as Al-Areej village, Bartella, Qabr al-Abid, Shaquli and Sheikhan in Ninewa.

Urban areas include Fallujah and Ramadi in Anbar, Erbil city in Erbil, as well as Bakhdida, East and West Mosul in Ninewa.

Follow-up question asked to everyone:


How would you prefer to receive humanitarian assistance? (n=704)




Affected people already receiving cash assistance (n=186) are fairly satisfied with the assistance they receive, although 25% cite being unsatisfied. Just over half (54%) report receiving this cash assistance from either international NGOs or UN agencies, while 24% see their cash assistance coming from the government. Unfortunately, over 20% do not know which organisation provides their cash assistance.

Q2. Participation

Do aid providers take your opinion into account when providing aid?



Trend in mean scores



Governorate



Location type




Gender




When the means of the sample sizes of IDPs, refugees, and returnees are weighted in accordance with the proportion of population covered, the mean score value for this question increases from 2.8 to 3.3.

Q3. Progress

Overall, is life improving for people in Iraq?



Governorate



1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Location type



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Status



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely


Do you have access to employment?



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Trend in mean scores



Follow-up question asked to those who responded **not at all** or **not very much** to the previous question:

Why not? (n=274)


- 44% Government failure and corruption
- 32% Lack of security
- 16% Lack of employment opportunities
- 12% Instability
- 9% Lack of services

Those who feel life is improving in Iraq most often identified improved security and stability, general improvements, the defeat of ISIS and a new government as reasons.


Note: Percentages do not total 100% because respondents were able to choose multiple answers. Only the top five responses are shown.

Q4. Empowerment


Do you feel the humanitarian aid you receive will enable you to live without humanitarian aid in the future?




Trend in mean scores




Governorate



Status



Awareness of complaints mechanisms



Follow-up question asked to those who responded **not at all** or **not very much** to the previous question:

What would you need to live without humanitarian aid in the future? (n=539)


- 60% Job and salary
- 46% Cash assistance
- 5% Shelter support
- 2% Food and household items

Note: Percentages do not total 100% because respondents were able to choose multiple answers. Only the top four responses are shown.


Strengthening the centrality of protection

Q5. Awareness of rights


Are you aware of your rights as an IDP/returnee/refugee/remainee in Iraq?



Governorate



Status




Follow-up question asked to those who responded **mostly yes** or **yes completely** to the previous question:

Q6. Respecting rights

Do you feel your rights as an IDP/returnee/refugee/remainee are respected?

mean: 2.5, n=90




When the means of the sample sizes of IDPs, refugees, and returnees are weighted in accordance with the proportion of population covered, the mean score value for this question increases from 2.5 to 3.0.


Q7. Safety

Do you feel safe in your place of residence?

mean: 4.5, n=702



Trend in mean scores



Governorate

Anbar mean: 3.7, n=123



Erbil mean: 4.9, n=269



Ninewa mean: 4.5, n=310



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Location type

IDP camps mean: 5.0, n=89



Refugee camps mean: 5.0, n=150



Rural areas mean: 4.3, n=207



Urban areas mean: 4.3, n=256



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Country of origin

Iraq mean: 4.4, n=552




Syria mean: 5.0, n=150



Results in %


1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Status




Q8. Respect


Do aid providers treat you with respect?




Trend in mean scores




Governorate



Status




Have you made a suggestion or complaint?



Q9. Trust

Do you trust aid providers to act in your best interest?

mean: 3.7, n=669




Governorate




Results in %

Location type




Results in %

Status



Results in %

Country of origin




Results in %

Q10. Reporting abuse and mistreatment

Do you feel able to report instances of abuse or mistreatment?

mean: 3.8, n=693



Results in %

Governorate



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Gender



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Awareness of complaints mechanisms



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Follow-up question asked to everyone:

Who would you feel comfortable reporting instances of abuse and mistreatment to? (n=686)

54% Army

18% Information centres/hubs

9% Religious leaders

5% Mukhtars


5% Community volunteers

Q11. Awareness of complaints mechanisms

Do you know how to make suggestions or complaints about the aid you receive?




Governorate




Gender



Status



Do you have access to employment?



When asked to specify how they would go about making a suggestion or complaint, the majority (79%) say they would do so in person to an aid worker, while others would make use of a suggestion box (11%) or helpline (8%). This aligns closely with respondents' preferences for different complaints mechanisms. Given the choice, most would prefer to make complaints or suggestions in person to an aid worker (81%), while others expressed preferences for helplines (7%), suggestion boxes (6%), providing feedback at community meetings (4%) or through SMS or WhatsApp message (1%).

Follow-up question asked to those who responded **yes** to the previous question:


Have you made a suggestion or complaint?



Governorate*




Location type




Country of origin



Status



Do you have access to employment?




* Anbar is excluded from this breakdown as only one respondent in Anbar indicated being aware of complaints mechanisms.


Follow-up question asked to those who responded **yes** to Q11:

How easy did you find making the suggestion or complaint?


mean: 3.7, n=131



Governorate*



Country of origin




Follow-up question asked to those who responded **yes** to Q11:

Have you received a response to your suggestion or complaint?


n=130



Governorate*




Status



* No respondents in Anbar reported having made a suggestion or complaint.

Country of origin



Follow-up question asked to everyone:

Who do you trust most to make a suggestion or complaint to? (n=680)


- 57% International NGOs
- 54% Volunteers/community representatives
- 23% Independent organisations
- 13% Government agencies
- 11% Local NGOs
- 5% None of the above

Note: Percentages do not total 100% because respondents were able to choose multiple answers.


Contingency planning and preparedness

Q12. Awareness of available aid


Do you feel informed about the kind of aid available to you?




Trend in mean scores




Governorate




Location type




Status



Country of origin



Awareness of complaints mechanisms



Follow-up question asked to everyone:

How would you prefer to receive information? (n=704)

85% Face-to-face

10% Hotline

2% Facebook

2% Leaflets

Others include: government websites, Viber (messaging app), radio, WhatsApp, NGO websites and camp speaker systems.

Note: Only the top four responses are shown.

Follow-up question asked to everyone:

Who would you prefer to receive information from? (n=702)

- 41% International organisations
- 35% UN agencies
- 10% Government
- 6% Mukhtars
- 4% Local organisations

Others include: community leaders, religious organisations and camp managers.


Note: Percentages do not total 100% because respondents were able to choose multiple answers.

Only the top five responses are shown.

Q13. Fairness

Does aid go to those who need it most?

mean: 3.0, n=695



Governorate


Anbar mean: 2.9, n=121



Erbil mean: 2.5, n=264



Ninewa mean: 3.5, n=310



1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Country of origin

Iraq mean: 3.3, n=547



Syria mean: 1.9, n=148



1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Status

IDPs mean: 3.2, n=223



Refugees mean: 1.9, n=148




Returnees mean: 3.3, n=323



1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Follow-up question asked to everyone:

Who is left out? (n=261)



Other responses include, in order: people with disabilities, people with illnesses, older persons and youths.

Note: Percentages do not total 100% because respondents were able to choose multiple answers. Only the top five responses are shown.


Q14. Access to employment

Do you have access to employment?




Those who feel unable to access employment most often cite a lack of jobs and economic opportunities as reasons (55%). Other respondents cite being stay-at-home caregivers (15%), disabilities or sickness (10%), old age (8%), rampant corruption and nepotism (8%), as well as a lack of education or certificates (7%).


Governorate



Location type




Gender




*Just over half of all respondents in Anbar (52%) chose to not answer this question.

Country of origin



Status



Follow-up questions asked to those who responded **yes** to the previous question:

Are you able to make a living by working in the local economy?




Q15. Access to education

Do you send your children to any education classes?




The most common reason (72%) given for not sending children to education classes is that they are not yet old enough to go to school. A minority (12%) cite a lack of funds. Other, less frequent responses, include being displaced, a lack of security and schools being full.


Governorate




Location type



Country of origin




Status



Q16. Satisfaction with education


Follow-up questions asked to those who responded **yes** to the previous question:

Are you satisfied with the education provided to your children?




Respondents unsatisfied with the education of their children typically cite poor quality of education (51%), a lack of teachers (36%), language barriers (5%), a lack of materials (4%) and too few schools (2%) as reasons why.


Location type



Country of origin



Status



Q17. Addendum

Open-ended question asked to all:

Is there anything else you would like to tell us? (n=322)

Most call for **improvement in public services** across Iraq, especially in areas of return. More specifically, respondents demand better access to potable water and the provision of electricity in conflict-affected areas. In a similar vein, improving upon local infrastructure by building schools and paving roads in those areas are often mentioned in conjunction with public services.

There are also widespread concerns about **damaged homes** and **poor-quality shelter**. Respondents in camps are frustrated by the state of their tents, while those eager to return to areas from which they were displaced say they require more assistance to reconstruct their homes.


Employment is considered just as important. Respondents feel that a job and salary would contribute greatly to an overall improvement in their lives by allowing them to satisfy different needs. In some instances, respondents who have lost family members to the ISIL conflict feel they should receive financial compensation from the government.

Finally, many raise concerns regarding a **lack of healthcare**. People have a broad wish list, from concrete calls for more health centres and improved medicine, to traveling abroad for treatment not available in Iraq.

Demographics


The graphs below depict the demographic breakdown of the 704 respondents in the affected people survey. Each graph includes percentages, as well as the frequency in parentheses.

Gender



● Male: 67% (475)
● Female: 33% (229)

Country of origin




● Iraq: 79% (554)
● Syria: 21% (150)


Age




Status




Governorate



Housing




Types of services received




Note: Percentages do not total 100% because respondents were able to choose multiple answers.


Location



Type of location



Year of arrival in Iraq (refugees)




Aid providers




Note: Percentages do not total 100% because respondents were able to choose multiple answers.

Type of cash assistance received



Delivery mechanism



Survey data - Humanitarian staff

Reading this section

The following sections use simple bar charts for both open and closed questions. Responses to closed questions are reported using a Likert scale from 1 to 5. The mean score is also shown. The bar charts for closed questions show the percentage of respondents who selected each answer option, with colours ranging from dark red for negative answers to dark green for positive ones.

For open questions, the percentage and frequency with answers pertaining to a particular question do not always total 100% where respondents are given the option to provide multiple answers.

Sample of the humanitarian staff survey

Data was collected between 9 November 2018 and 9 December 2018 using an online survey to from 266 humanitarian staff members working in Iraq for UN agencies, international agencies and local organisations. Each organisation participated in and distributed the online survey among staff. For more information on the sampling approach, see the sample methodology section.

Overview of findings

● 2017 ● 2018



SO1: Post-conflict transition towards durable solutions

Does your organisation take opinions of affected people into account during design and implementation of programmes?



Does your organisation have enough information about the way affected people see aid programmes?



Do humanitarian organisations share assessment information and data about affected people with your organisation?




Do agencies take corrective action in project implementation based on feedback from affected people?



Do humanitarian and development actors work together effectively in Iraq?




Is there an adequate balance between funding for emergency needs and funding for durable solutions?



Are there sufficient coordination efforts between organisations?




Do local aid providers receive sufficient support in Iraq?




Do local organisations in this country have the capacity to deliver high quality assistance?



SO2: Strengthening the centrality of protection



SO3: Contingency planning and preparedness



85%

of staff have reported instances of mistreatment.



82%

work for organisations that receive multi-year funding.



78%


of staff say their organisation regularly conducts joint needs assessments with other organisations.

Survey questions


Post-conflict transitions towards durable solutions

Q1. Participation

Does your organisation take opinions of affected people into account during design and implementation of programmes?




Trend in mean scores




Q2. Sufficient perceptual data


Does your organisation have enough information about the way affected people see aid programmes?



Trend in mean scores




Age



Q3. Sharing perceptual data


Do humanitarian organisations share assessment information and data about affected people with your organisation?



Q4. Acting on perceptual data

Do agencies take corrective action in project implementation based on feedback from affected people?


mean: 3.4, n=254




Q5. Humanitarian development nexus

Do humanitarian and development actors work together effectively in Iraq?

mean: 3.2, n=254




Trend in mean scores



Q6. Balanced funding

Is there an adequate balance between funding for emergency needs and funding for durable solutions?


mean: 3.0, n=256




Just over 81% of staff respondents who feel this balance is inadequate believe more funding for durable solutions is needed.

Gender

Female mean: 2.8, n=97




Male mean: 3.2, n=155



Q7. Coordination

Are there sufficient coordination efforts between organisations?

mean: 3.4, n=262



Q8. Joint needs assessments

Does your organisation regularly conduct joint need assessments with other organisations?



Q9. Localisation

Who is best placed to provide aid in this country? (n=243)


60% A combination of local and international organisations

30% International organisations

10% Local organisations

Q10. Local support

Do local aid providers receive sufficient support in Iraq?




Trend in mean scores



Staff at headquarters are less convinced that local aid providers receive sufficient support, compared to field staff team members.

Q11. Local capacity

Do local organisations in this country have the capacity to deliver high-quality assistance?




Post-conflict transitions towards durable solutions

Q12. Relevance of aid

Does the aid provided cover the most important needs of affected people?

mean: 3.9, n=264



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Q13. Respect

Do humanitarian staff in Iraq treat affected people with respect?

mean: 4.3, n=261



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Q14. Reporting abuse

Do you feel comfortable reporting instances of humanitarian staff mistreating affected people?

mean: 4.1, n=252



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

A quarter of respondents who feel comfortable reporting instances of mistreatment have done so. For those uncomfortable doing so, almost 90% say they would feel more comfortable reporting such instances through an independent complaints mechanism.

Q15. Responding to complaints

If aid recipients make a complaint to your organisation, will they get a response?

n=226




Results in %

No Yes


Contingency planning and preparedness

Q16. Flexibility

Do humanitarian organisations in Iraq have the flexibility to adjust their projects and programmes when conditions change?




Trend in mean scores




Q17. Fairness

Does the aid provided go to those who need it most?



Trend in mean scores



Field team leaders are more convinced aid is reaching those most in need than other field team members and headquarters staff.

Q18. Multi-year funding


Does your organisation obtain multi-year funding?




Ninety percent of humanitarian staff working for organisations that receive multi-year funding feel this contributes to better results.

Q19. Time spent on reporting

Do you feel the amount of time you spend on reporting is appropriate?



Trend in mean scores



Q20. Harmonisation

Do you feel reporting requirements from different donors are sufficiently harmonised?

mean: 3.1, n=234



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Q21. Safety

Do you feel safe in the area where you work?

mean: 3.8, n=261



Results in %

1 Not at all 2 Not very much 3 Somewhat 4 Mostly yes 5 Yes completely

Q22. Addendum

Open-ended question asked to all:

Please explain what, in your opinion, would be the best way to improve the humanitarian response in Iraq? (n=216)

Improved coordination across humanitarian organisations is mentioned often. Staff feel strongly that coordination takes advantage of the synergies between organisations' efforts to respond to needs, while avoiding unnecessary duplication. There is a sense among staff that the current coordination structures fall short of what is required. As one staff member puts it:

"The cluster system is deeply dysfunctional and yet remains the foremost coordination structure. What is needed is a top-down overhaul and a much lighter structure that focuses on the who, what and where, as well as practical solutions, instead of four-hour long meetings."

Better coordinating efforts between humanitarian and development actors is also mentioned repeatedly. For some, this entails bringing the government, local authorities and civil society into the response to guarantee its sustainability. Others highlight the need for multiyear funding to ensure durable solutions and a sustainable response.


Strengthening the capacity of local actors is widely seen as an essential component of improved coordination. There is sense that international organisations and UN agencies are not sufficiently committed to localisation, frustrating efforts to implement durable solutions in the long-run. Staff recommend encouraging more direct funding of local aid providers, developing their ability to fundraise themselves and improving their relationships with donors.

Consulting affected people and regularly assessing their needs is not only seen as important in principle, but also as a means toward greater effectiveness. As such, strengthening accountability to affected people is viewed as "a key factor in fully achieving the goals of humanitarian work in Iraq". Doing so more systematically would allow organisations to adapt to the dynamism of the humanitarian situation in Iraq, staff say. Some suggest donors could promote this by making it a mandatory element of reporting.


Demographics

The graphs below depict the demographic breakdown of the 266 respondents in the field staff survey. Each graph includes percentages, as well as the frequency in parentheses.

Gender




Types of services provided



Note: Percentages do not total 100% because respondents were able to choose multiple answers.

Governorate of aid provision




Note: Percentages do not total 100% because respondents were able to choose multiple answers.

Age



Type of organisation



Role of staff member



Years of experience in Iraq



Target communities of aid/services



Annex: Notes on methodology

Affected people survey

Sampling methodology

The sampling strategy for Iraq was designed using the most recent figures (as of 31 October 2018) of the Displacement Tracking Matrix for IDPs and Returnees compiled by the IOM in Iraq, as well as location data on refugees compiled by UNHCR.² At the time the reported figures for Iraq were as follows: 4,113,624 returnees, 1,866,594 IDPs and 251,793 refugees. These groups proportionately represented 66%, 30%, and 4% of the combined total of affected people in Iraq. However, the sample sizes chosen for this survey were not based on a representative sampling methodology as it would have necessitated far smaller samples of refugees and higher sample sizes for returnees.

To strengthen the reliability of smaller population samples and meaningfully explore differences between refugee populations, refugees were over-sampled, and returnees were under-sampled, while keeping the proportion of IDPs in line with the figures reported by the UNHCR and IOM.

The risk of disproportionately over-weighted groups skewing the results was mitigated by later weighting the means of each sample size in accordance with the proportion of the population it covered. As such, this methodology allowed us both to maximise reliability for group comparisons and enable a more reliable representative overview of the perceptions within the various regions, as well as among the affected population at large.

The sampling strategy from 2017 was adapted to better reflect realities on the ground, in light of significant changes in the locations of affected people and the recent increase in returns in 2018. At the same time, the geographic scope of the previous sampling strategy was reduced from 11 governorates to just three to enable deeper analysis of the differences in perceptions of IDPs, returnees and refugees in Anbar, Erbil and Ninewa, and to stay within the budgetary constraints of the project.

These three governorates were selected on the basis of the following calculus: Erbil hosts just over 50% of all refugees and 10% of IDPs in Iraq. Of the total returnee and IDP population in Iraq, 31% and 39% currently reside in Ninewa, respectively, making it the governorate with the highest number of both sub-groups. Finally, returnees were also targeted in Anbar as it currently hosts a further 31% of all returnees in Iraq.

Specific locations were selected based on a convenience sample devised in consultation with humanitarian organisations and our data collection partner in country. Enumerators were able to advise on access constraints regarding insecure areas and difficult to reach camps, while humanitarian organisations gave insight into under-surveyed areas. Thus, camps in Erbil and Ninewa were selected based on their population make-up and in consideration of relevant access constraints. The largest urban areas, where much of the response is focused in each governorate, were also included, namely Erbil city in Erbil, East and West Mosul in Ninewa, as well as Fallujah and Ramadi in Anbar. Rural areas were selected based on the presence of IDPs and returnees via the IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix list.

² "Total persons of concern", UNHCR Iraq, last modified 28 February 2019, <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/5>

Data collection

GTS partnered with Proximity International to carry out the data collection. The training of enumerators took place on 18 October 2018 with those designated to collect data in Erbil and Ninewa, while those in Anbar were trained remotely by Proximity's field coordinator and project manager. A total of 704 interviews were conducted between 5 November and 9 December 2018 across 19 locations in Anbar, Erbil and Ninewa.

Data disaggregation

Data is disaggregated by governorate, status, gender, age, household size, dependents under the age of 18 years, country of origin, awareness of complaints mechanisms, access to employment and disability. The analysis in the report includes any statistically significant difference in the perceptions of different demographic groups. It does not, however, show the full breakdown of responses according to these categories.

To identify groups of persons with disabilities within the sample, participants were asked a series of questions:

- Do you have difficulty seeing, even if wearing glasses?
- Do you have difficulty hearing, even if using a hearing aid?
- Do you have difficulty walking or climbing steps?
- Do you have difficulty remembering or concentrating?

For the purposes of this survey, if a survey participant indicated having difficulty or inability to do one or more of the above activities, they are considered a person with a disability.

Survey language

This survey was conducted in Arabic.

Challenges and limitations

GTS is committed to ensuring that data collection adheres to rigorous ethical and methodological standards throughout survey design and development, and sampling strategy design. We developed data collection guides and enumerator manuals to ensure that our approach was contextually and culturally appropriate. The GTS team went to Iraq in October 2018 to set up the survey instruments and oversee enumerator training. The following challenges and limitations were noted during data collection:

Expectation of respondents. Enumerators were briefed and trained in managing expectations and clearly communicating the aims of the research. Before interviews were conducted, potential respondents were informed that their answers would have no bearing on the level of aid they would receive, and that participation was purely voluntary. This message was also reiterated to participants who consented to being contacted by GTS later, with the survey findings.

In spite of these measures, enumerators reported instances of affected people making requests for direct services or support that neither the enumerator nor GTS could offer.

Security. Data collectors were unable to conduct surveys in Kirkuk due to security and access concerns that emerged following the 2017 referendum. According to data collectors, a number of NGOs have faced significant challenges working in Kirkuk over the past year, particularly for any research-related activities, due to the presence of many different security actors who compete for control within the governorate. Reportedly, each of these

security actors requests its own access permissions be granted and does not accept those of others.

Thus, additional data collection was shifted to Ninewa to compensate for the inaccessible caseload of Kirkuk respondents. The large number of IDPs and returnees currently residing in Ninewa and the extent to which it was affected by the ISIS conflict further informed this reallocation.

Locating IDPs. Locating IDPs who had received humanitarian assistance over the past year was found to be challenging, as many IDPs had returned to their original areas, in line with the shifting focus of the humanitarian response in Iraq from displacement to returns. This was particularly true in Erbil. Enumerators visited urban locations within Erbil city, as well as some of the villages in the northern and western areas of the governorate. They were informed by the IDPs living there that they had not received any assistance, apart from a few who were still sending their children to UN-established schools or who had received nominal shelter assistance. These non-camp IDPs were ultimately included in the survey in order to capture the perceptions of those receiving relatively less support, along with affected people in other areas.

Survey fatigue. Debriefs conducted during data collection and post-data collection with the enumerators indicated a lack of enthusiasm or interest among affected populations in participating in the surveys. Enumerators noted that a number of respondents seemed to want to rush through the survey, likely because they had been targeted for similar surveys in the past and, presumably, never received feedback on the results. This highlights the importance of 'closing the loop' and keeping participants informed of the results of the survey, as well as providing participants with useful information, when possible and appropriate. In this spirit, GTS enumerators collected the telephone numbers of participants who were interested in being informed of how they can access the survey's results.

Perceptual data. GTS gathers perceptual data from affected people, field staff and local partner organisations to assess humanitarian responses through their views, opinions and perceptions. While principles of accountability, localisation and participation are increasingly being integrated into humanitarian programmes, the voices of affected populations receiving aid are often omitted.³

Gathering perceptual data from affected populations should, therefore, be viewed as part of a broader systemic change in the humanitarian apparatus. It is a vital first step in closing the accountability gap, empowering affected populations to be part of the decisions that govern their lives, building relationships with communities and localising knowledge.

Nonetheless, it is evident that perceptual data alone might be insufficient to evaluate the state of the humanitarian system and should therefore not be seen in isolation, but as complementary to other monitoring and data evaluation approaches.

Humanitarian staff survey

Sampling methodology

Seventeen organisations were approached and asked to participate in the survey, which was available in Arabic and English. All but one participated and distributed the online survey among a convenience sample of their staff. Participating organisations were drawn

3 Benini (2018), 'Subjective Measures in Humanitarian Analysis', ACAPS

from UN agencies, international NGOs, Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and local/national organisations. The NGO Coordination Committee of Iraq (NCCI) kindly forwarded the survey link to all its members, which includes 104 international organisations and 71 local aid providers.

Data disaggregation

While the data was disaggregated by type of organisation, role in the field, number of years working in Iraq and primary target beneficiaries, only a handful of breakdowns were found to be statistically significant.

Survey fatigue

Responses from participants were initially low and several reminder emails were sent in order to reach response figures which could be deemed statistically robust. Feedback from international organisations suggests that staff members are experiencing survey fatigue as the result of the increasing number of surveys they are required to complete.

Participation of local organisations

While a number of local organisations signalled interest in participating in the survey, responses from their staff were particularly low. A total of 22 respondents from local aid providers ultimately responded to the survey, thus limiting the extent to which data could be disaggregated on the basis of organisation types.

Scoring in 2018 compared to 2017

Scores in 2018 are higher on participation and feedback. This could be due in part to the fact that some of the survey questions were formulated differently this year. In 2017, we asked staff about the aid system in general but this year for questions on participation (Q20, Q21 and Q22), we asked about the performance of the respondent's organisation. As people may be more optimistic about their own performance than the aid system as a whole, we aim to watch responses to this question closely in subsequent rounds.

Survey language

This survey was conducted in English and Arabic.

Question formulation

Questions for both the affected people and staff survey were formulated using the Grand Bargain commitments as a framework. The Grand Bargain has described the current aid system as a supply-driven model, which is dominated by providers.⁴ We have looked to see whether a shift has occurred from this supply-driven model to one that is more demand-driven, with the aid system becoming more responsive to the people it set out to serve.⁵ We also probe people's views on whether they see progress beyond meeting their basic needs, towards creating self-reliance and restoring opportunity.⁶

For more information about Ground Truth Solutions surveys in Iraq, please contact Elias Sagmeister (Deputy Director – elias@groundtruthsolutions.org) or Max Seilern (Senior Programme Analyst – max@groundtruthsolutions.org).

4 "The Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need". Istanbul, Turkey, 23 May 2016. P.2

5 Ibid

6 Ibid



Ground Truth Solutions

Visit us at groundtruthsolutions.org