Summary Overview

- This Allocation Strategy is issued by the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC), in consultation with the Clusters and Advisory Board (AB), to set the IHF funding priorities for the 2nd Standard Allocation 2019.
- A total amount of up to US$ 30 million is available for this allocation. This allocation strategy paper outlines the allocation priorities and rationale for the prioritization.
- This allocation paper also provides strategic direction and a timeline for the allocation process.
- The HC in discussion with the AB has set the Allocation criteria as follows;
  - Prioritization of activities supporting unmet needs and gaps from the 2019 HRP as identified in the PMR and Humanitarian Dashboard January to June 2019.

Allocation strategy and rationale

Situation Overview

Since January 2019, the humanitarian context in Iraq has substantially shifted in some operating spheres and stagnated in others. Returns of internally displaced persons are continuing at a markedly reduced rate from recent years. As of May 2019, the number of IDPs has fallen to 1.67 million, a reduction of 7.5 per cent. However, there is a sense that those who could have returned to their areas of origin have already done so, and the remaining displaced population will require considerable assistance to fulfil rights and seek durable solutions, including return.

Those who remain at risk of protracted displacement do so not out of preference, but due to a lack of feasible alternatives. Moreover, IDPs are fairly consistent in their motives for remaining displaced, citing damaged or destroyed housing as the primary factor, followed by lack of livelihoods and basic services, concerns about security and/or social cohesion, and perceived presence of unexploded ordinance.

Reasons given for return have remained constant and include improvements in the security situation and provision of services, and rehabilitation of houses, in the locations of origin. Of the approximately 4.3 million people who have returned to areas of origin after displacement, 12 per cent (508,000 people) are assessed to be living in conditions of high or very high severity across eight governorates, indicating a lack of livelihoods, services, social cohesion and security.

Progress against the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)

To date in 2019, partners reached 48 per cent of the 1.75 million people targeted by the 2019 HRP. The majority of all programming was targeted at in-camp IDPs, with 91 per cent of these receiving aid. Approximately one third of targeted 500,000 returnees benefitted from humanitarian assistance. In comparison, only 30 per cent of the 550,000 out-of-camp IDPs targeted received aid, while slightly less than 20 per cent of people identified within vulnerable host communities were beneficiaries of humanitarian programming. Humanitarian partners implemented the bulk of their projects in Ninewa and Dahuk governorates, the two provinces hosting the majority of IDP camps; in contrast to Kirkuk, Diyala and Salah al-Din, who have benefitted from significantly less humanitarian programming.

Humanitarian actors have prioritized the protection agenda in 2019, but multiple violations continue to be recorded. According to an incident tracking matrix piloted by the CCCM and Protection Clusters in camps in Nineawa, incidents including interference with distributions or diversion of assistance, restriction of movement, GBV (including exploitation and abuse), mistreatment including verbal and physical assaults, and arbitrary arrests/detentions have all been recorded. These are due primarily to violations of the civilian character of camps. There is a significant shortage of data about out-of-camp IDPs and returnees, as well as information gaps about incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse. Families with perceived affiliations to extremist groups continue to be among the most vulnerable in Iraq.
Prioritized Humanitarian Response Plan Objectives for this Allocation

**SO1:** Post-conflict transition towards durable solutions - The humanitarian community should continue engagement with authorities to facilitate access, and interventions in prioritized geographic areas.

**SO2:** Strengthening the centrality of Protection - Humanitarian actors should continue to prioritize the protection agenda and engage with all possible interlocutors to pre-empt and remedy protection violations, including through platforms such as the Protection Cluster’s Services Advisor.

### Allocation Parameters and Prioritization Criteria

The HC and AB have agreed that the $30 million allocation will be disbursed by October 2019. The allocation will be used to finance gaps in the current response as articulated in the Periodic Monitoring Report (PMR) 2019. To ensure the timely delivery of Humanitarian Assistance to beneficiaries and reduce future funding gaps, large scale projects of no less than 9 months that meet the following criteria will be prioritised:

- ✓ Large-scale, NGO led and multi partner or consortium projects will be prioritized – see below
- ✓ Projects must prioritize 2019 HRP SO1 “post-conflict transition” and SO2 “centrality of protection”
- ✓ Projects must prioritize underserved IDPs in and out of camps and/or returnees and/or host communities in DTM locations within the districts of concern - see below. Partners are able to indicate “contingency districts” where funds may be required in future due to anticipated increase in voluntary returns.\(^1\)
- ✓ Previous partner performance as recorded on the GMS Partner Performance Index will also be used as a selection criteria during the HFU pre-screening process.
- ✓ Current Cluster funding status will be considered when prioritizing Clusters and projects - see below.

### Current Cluster Funding Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Requirements US$</th>
<th>HRP Funding US$</th>
<th>Non HRP Funding US$</th>
<th>Total Funding Received US$</th>
<th>Total Coverage</th>
<th>Unmet US$*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETC</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRM</td>
<td>$890,245</td>
<td>$875,184</td>
<td></td>
<td>$875,184</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>$15,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>$9,373,939</td>
<td>$4,355,848</td>
<td>$4,146,510</td>
<td>$8,502,358</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>$835,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>$39,896,169</td>
<td>$30,591,504</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,591,504</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>$9,304,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>$14,851,682</td>
<td>$2,846,881</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,846,881</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>$12,004,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$35,540,043</td>
<td>$6,625,550</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,337,317</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$14,202,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Based Violence</td>
<td>$33,248,068</td>
<td>$7,539,070</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,539,070</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>$25,708,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCM</td>
<td>$34,470,434</td>
<td>$2,164,773</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,164,773</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$32,305,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$60,930,340</td>
<td>$2,408,021</td>
<td>$4,303,383</td>
<td>$2,811,404</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$32,418,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>$75,522,143</td>
<td>$39,150,178</td>
<td>$364,741</td>
<td>$39,154,919</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$36,007,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter NFI</td>
<td>$74,354,054</td>
<td>$28,427,098</td>
<td>$3,466,257</td>
<td>$31,893,355</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$42,460,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Protection</td>
<td>$92,857,195</td>
<td>$7,493,638</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,410,241</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$62,446,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security</td>
<td>$114,281,363</td>
<td>$1,099,462</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,099,462</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$95,699,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPCA</td>
<td>$114,837,464</td>
<td>$7,607,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,607,200</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$107,230,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Unmet needs figures take into account both HRP and non-HRP funding, noting that non-HRP funding cannot be guaranteed to support cluster objectives and support HRP targets.

### Allocation Priority Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Anbar</td>
<td>Al-Falluja</td>
<td>Diyala</td>
<td>Al-Khulis</td>
<td>Ninewa</td>
<td>Al-Mosul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Anbar</td>
<td>Al-Ramadi</td>
<td>Diyala</td>
<td>Ba’quba</td>
<td>Ninewa</td>
<td>Sheikhani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Anbar</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Diyala</td>
<td>Khanaqin</td>
<td>Ninewa</td>
<td>Sinjar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Najaf</td>
<td>Al-Najaf</td>
<td>Erbil</td>
<td>Erbil</td>
<td>Ninewa</td>
<td>Tal Afar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Sulaymaniyyah</td>
<td>Al-Sulaymaniyyah</td>
<td>Kirkuk</td>
<td>Al-Hawiga</td>
<td>Ninewa</td>
<td>Tikraef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Sulaymaniyyah</td>
<td>Kalar</td>
<td>Kirkuk</td>
<td>Daquq</td>
<td>Salah Al-Din</td>
<td>Baiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Al-Karkh</td>
<td>Kirkuk</td>
<td>Kirkuk</td>
<td>Salah Al-Din</td>
<td>Balad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahuk</td>
<td>Dahuk</td>
<td>Ninewa</td>
<td>Akre</td>
<td>Salah Al-Din</td>
<td>Samarra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahuk</td>
<td>Sumel</td>
<td>Ninewa</td>
<td>Al-Ba’aj</td>
<td>Salah Al-Din</td>
<td>Tikrit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) For example, if returns are anticipated in Al Qaim which is not a priority district for this allocation, partners should mention in the proposal that they may reallocate resources to Al Qaim at a later stage if required.
Consortium Projects

For the 1\textsuperscript{st} Standard Allocation of 2019, the HC and AB endorsed a consortium-based approach for the allocation of funding by the IHF, whereby funds were allocated to multiple humanitarian actors through a single lead organization/agency working in equal partnership with consortium members. The objectives of this approach are threefold (1) to channel funds to and capacity build national NGOs (2) to enhance the efficiency of allocation processes and ensure timely disbursement of funds to prioritized humanitarian projects and (3) to enhance coordination between partners and the response as a whole.

For this 2\textsuperscript{nd} Standard Allocation of 2019, the consortium approach is considered the preferred modality but needs to ensure consortia function effectively as more than an administrative entity and really draw on the benefits of the modality. While consortia are the preferred modality, in cases where it is operationally not feasible, individual partner grants will still be signed upon agreement of the IHF, Cluster and partner and endorsed by the HC. Eligibility criteria and guidance for consortia projects are as follows;

- Consortium or multi-partner projects should budget for dedicated resources and management for the consortium to function. At a minimum this should include dedicated, management, finance and monitoring/reporting functions. Dedicated capacity building functions are also encouraged.

- Consortia of up to 4 partners must include at least 1 NGO, consortia of 5 and 6 partners must include at least 2 NGOs and consortia of 7 or more must include 3 NGOs.

- Projects led by international actors must include activities for capacity building of consortium members with emphasis on NGOs in the proposal budget and results section of the log frame. Capacity building activities should be targeted to supporting the delivery of the project and technically focused with reporting on results highlighted in interim and final narrative reports.

- Consortium lead agencies are encouraged to share a proportion of the 7\% program support costs (PSC) in agreement with consortium members. Consortium members are encouraged to budget for all operational costs in their partner budgets.

- Maximum allowable consortia project budget is the sum of the individual partner allowable budget as per IHF operational modalities (see below). Therefore, if a consortium contains 5 partners each with allowable budgets of $500,000, the maximum budget for the consortia will be 5 x $500,000 or $2.5 million.

- In accordance with article 5 of the IHF Grant Agreement, the consortium lead “\textit{shall be fully responsible for all work and services performed by these operational partners and for all acts and omissions committed by them or their employees.”}

- A single partner may not apply for and lead more than 2 consortium projects per allocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Project duration (months)</th>
<th>Project value (thousand USD)</th>
<th>Maximum amount per project (thousand USD)</th>
<th>Disbursements (in % of total)</th>
<th>Financial reporting</th>
<th>Narrative reporting</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For disbursements</td>
<td>31 Jan</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Progres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>&lt; 7</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>50-50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>&lt; 250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>40-30-30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2-3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>&lt; 7</td>
<td>&lt; 250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>80-20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>&lt; 250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>60-40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>&lt; 7</td>
<td>&lt; 400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 400</td>
<td>80-20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>&lt; 400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 400</td>
<td>80-20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 mid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cluster Priorities

Based on the Periodic Monitoring Report (PMR) review of priorities as outlined in the 2019 HRP, the Clusters have identified the following needs and interventions as critical priorities for this allocation. Details of prioritised activities and locations can be found in Annex 1 – Summary of Cluster priorities.

Camp Coordination and Camp Management Allocation - $1,600,000

Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019

Minimum standards in formal sites impacting in-camp IDPs: Despite funding gaps, CCCM partners have continued to reach all remaining formal camps in Iraq with CCCM services, covering 95% of the cluster's target population in camps. However, funding gaps mean that fewer resources are being stretched across a still large in-camp population and number of sites, leading to challenges in maintaining minimum standards across all sites.

Capacity to meet targets for IDPs (out-of-camp): In much the same way CCCM partners have been stretched to maintain minimum standards in camps, coverage of out-of-camp populations is limited by partner capacity which has, in turn, been limited by lack of funds. While CCCM partners have reached 91% of CCCM Clusters' targeted out-of-camp population, additional resources are needed to ensure dignified and safe living environments in informal sites.

Capacity to meet targets for Returnees and Host Community support: Gaps in funding for CRC activities have contributed to a substantial reduction in the number of CRCs brought into operation in 2019, verses those planned. This has limited CCCM Cluster's ability to actively support sustainable returns and durable solutions in line with its 2019 HRP cluster strategy with partners only reaching only 11% of the target Returnee population in the first five months of 2019.

Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:

CCCM needs both in formal camps and informal sites in Iraq are and will continue to remain high, due to the slow rate and limited intentions for returns. The CCCM Cluster/REACH Intention Survey conducted across areas of displacement in February, determined that only 2% of IDPs intended to return in the short term (3 months) and 5% in the medium term (12 months). According to the DTM Protracted Displacement Study released in May 2019 most IDPs continue to live in private settings (979,236 individuals, 59%), 32 per cent are in camps (531,606). 9 per cent (153,504) of these are living in critical shelters. (DTM, April 2019)

These findings highlight that CCCM services will remain vital to ensure that the over 536,204 IDPs targeted through the Cluster’s 2019 HRP are provided with life-saving humanitarian assistance and that a dual approach including mobile teams working in informal sites and CCCM teams in formal camps continues to be required.

According to the March 2019 report of the DTM Returns Index Ninewa, Salah al Din, Anbar, Diyala, Kirkuk and Baghdad remain priority locations where returnees live in high severity conditions. 11 per cent (472,350 individuals) are living in high severity conditions across 279 locations. Ninewa and Salah al-Din governorates host the highest number of returnees living in these conditions with 213,372 and 187,812 individuals, respectively. Locations including Ba’aj district in Ninewa, Tooz in Salah al-Din were particularly highlighted in the report. Community Resource Centres in 12 locations across Iraq facilitate the sustainability of return and support to affected populations by providing vital information and referrals to returnees, IDPs and host community. CRC partner had as of June reached 22% of the 210,000 returnees targeted under the Cluster’s 2019 HRP. Support to these activities and a possible expansion of its reach to other high severity return areas will continue to be an important priority for the cluster.
CCS Allocation - $2,300,000

Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019

Access and other regulatory issues, including arbitrary demands being imposed by various authorities, continue to pose challenges to humanitarian partners. This often severely impacts operations and response, particularly in Ninewa, Kirkuk, Al-Anbar, and Salah Al-Din governorates. Continuation of services offered by the IDP Information Centre including follow-up procedures and clusters needs to be strengthened in order to improve response rates, and accountability to the affected population. Partners such as DTM indicate that there are approximately 66 locations that remain inaccessible due to insecurity. These locations are mostly in Kirkuk, Ninewa, and Salah Al-Din. This provides an obstacle to obtaining reliable data to support strategic planning.

Sub-national inter-cluster coordination needs to be strengthened. There also needs to be a stronger link between the sub-national and national ICCGs to provide field-based inputs to strategic decision-making. There is also a need to ensure that assessments, mapping, and analysis are evidence-driven to ensure a comprehensive understanding of needs, to support AAP and to provide impartial humanitarian assistance.

Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:

Strengthen coordination and ensure continuation between the IIC, PSEA Network GBV Sub-Cluster and other clusters as relevant to ensure an adequate referral system is in place. Work to strengthen situational awareness, contribute to safety and security of humanitarian aid workers and activities, and advocate for enabling environment to facilitate humanitarian access and enhance operational impact, especially in remote and risk-prone areas.

Education Allocation - $2,850,000

Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019

Not all conflict affected children have access to quality education halfway into 2019. Partners have provided access to education for approximately 160,000 children out of a target of 400,000. Approximately 2,244 teachers received various trainings and about 24,000 children received psychosocial support in the schools with 266 cases referred to child protection partners for individualized care management. Be this as it may, 240,000 children (60 per cent of the target) in both IDP settlements and areas of return still don’t have access to quality and inclusive formal and non-formal education. 3,904 teachers (64 per cent of the target) have not been trained on the education in emergencies, pedagogy, positive discipline and PSS. In some of the camps, only 15% of children who sat for their examinations passed and this is alarming. This situation is far from perfect and partners need to work exceedingly hard to reach the target we set out to achieve at the beginning of the year. The situation is dire in both IDP camp and out of camp locations where we have seen some partners pulling because of lack of funding. More needs to be done in areas of return to ensure that children have access to education and do not fall into harmful coping mechanisms.

Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:

The programmatic approach for this funding round focuses on covering gaps indicated in the PMR in both areas of displacement and in areas of return. The response will focus on continued access to safe and secure learning environments and improved quality of learning for children and youth. The key programmatic priorities to be addressed this allocation will be:

- Promote access to education for out of school-aged children through conducting non-formal and formal learning opportunities.
- Distribute appropriate education teaching and learning materials, i.e. textbooks.
- Train teachers on pedagogy specially on literacy and numeracy skills, child protection referral-pathways and psychosocial support for at-risk children.
- In areas of return conduct minor rehabilitation on school buildings to allow children to access safe learning spaces.

**Food Security Allocation - $985,000**

*Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019*

Lack of food assistance distributions outside the IDP camps and in sub-standard accommodations to the most vulnerable IDPs, as well as in the areas of return.

**Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:**

- Supporting families affected by the recent crop fires. Seeds and fertilizers distributed to those families were damaged to help them restore their livelihoods.
- Provision of agricultural inputs to returnees and most vulnerable host communities to encourage food production and income generation. Increasing resilience-livelihood activities in the areas with high number of returnees, aiming to reduce dependency on food assistance distributions.
- Inclusion of the expected caseload of the 31,000 Iraqi returnees from Al-Hol camp to specified camps in Ninewa.

**Emergency Livelihoods Allocation - $835,000**

*Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019*

2106 Households (12,636 people) are still in gap of access to livelihoods support this year. Main geographical scope includes Ninewa (Telafar and Sinjar); Kirkuk (Hawija); Salah El Din (Tooz Khurmatu); Diyala (Edheim, Al Khalis and Jalawla & Saadia in Khaneqeen).

**Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:**

1. Access to livelihoods, mainly asset replacement for reestablishment of livelihoods for returnees and IDPs, together with training and coaching to ensure access to durable solutions
2. Continue to focus on areas with high severity and density of needs, mainly returnees and IDPs who need support to return

**Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance Allocation - $4,000,000**

*Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019*

According to the assessments conducted by the CWG partners, using the new Socio-economic Vulnerability Assessment Tool (SEVAT) on approximately 2,200 households in several locations (Kirkuk, Mosul, Zahko, Hawiga), the following have been noted as key conclusions:

**Family characteristics:** 40% of the assessed households have no education, while only the 43% of households have primary education and another 8% - secondary education. 12% of households have at least one person with disability, out of those, 75% have a disability that prevents them from working. Almost 14% are women headed households; 22% of all the assessed households have at least one pregnant or lactating woman in the household. The majority of the families (32%) is composed of 5-6 members, while almost 20% have 7-8 members and 8% are households with 9-10 members.

**Employment and income:** While 32,6% of households declared to have regular employment, this seems still not to be sufficient to cover their basic needs. Lack of employment, labor and non-labor income is confirmed to be the main trigger of socio-economic vulnerability. Almost 40% of the population assessed has access only to temporary employment opportunities and only 5,5% possess small businesses. A large share (31%) use a combination of different coping strategies to achieve a certain monthly purchasing power. 27% declared
that they are forced to sell assets, 37% - to spend on credit, 7% sold means of transport and almost 60% are purchasing on credit.

Other negative coping strategies: 51% of the interviewed reduced their food expenditure and 11% changed shelter because they were unable to afford the rent. Almost 10% of households had at least one child drop out from school and child labor result is around 4%. Around 10% of households had to attend to food events and another 1.5% engaged in illegal acts. Similar percentages have been found also in relation to child marriage (1.15%) and forced marriage (1.1%).

Predicted per capita consumption: Different level of assistance are provided to those resulting to be extremely vulnerable, vulnerable or moderately vulnerable as previously mentioned. 70% of the assessed households shows a level of consumption below the country poverty marker. 4.5% of the assessed population lives in acute poverty with less than 50,000 IQD per capita per month (less than 1.4 USD per day).

As per the PMR submission, the following have been identified as key gaps in coverage:

- 82% per cent of households (100,900 households) targeted with MPCA did not receive assistance yet. This may be attributable to funding issues.
- 70% per cent of households (170,000 households) targeted with MPCA vulnerability assessments are not yet assessed.
- Coverage gaps remain in Ramadi, Hamdaniya, Heet, Hawiga districts (extreme priority); Fallujah, Telafar, Tikrit, Khanaqin, Sinjar, Kirkuk (top priority); Tilkai, Zakho, Samarra, Akre (priority); Mosul, Shikhan (moderate priority).

Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:

Given that the needs in Iraq remain extensive, priorities to be addressed should focus on areas (district level) that have not received sufficient MPCA funding. Further funding is needed to cover these geographic gaps with prioritized activities (cash distributions) that remain in line with MPCA strategy: distribution of one-off cash transfer of 400 USD for the moderately vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption between 92,000 and 110,000 IQD), distribution of two months of cash assistance for a total of 800 USD for the vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption between 72,000 and 92,000 IQD), distribution of three months of cash assistance for a total of 1,200 USD for the extremely vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption under 72,000 IQD).

Health Cluster Allocation - $5,000,000

Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019

Key priorities remain sustaining support to the PHCCs in camps with sizeable population till they are consolidated or closed, providing short term support to health facilities in areas where IDPs reside (out of camps) and capacity building of DoH staff to enable them to take over services currently supported by humanitarian actors.

Given the low funding status as we reach mid-year, Cluster partners are not able to reach the projected target population and are prioritizing the camps with sizeable populations in order to avoid a service-gap as much as possible.

Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:

Priority is being given by the Cluster to IDP camps, with some major returnee locations being targeted under this allocation. Sustaining services in camps with sizeable populations is of immediate importance since some partners will phase out by September 2019 while the DoHs in the target governorates have mentioned their inability to support services in the camps. In addition, although there was an expectation of consolidation/closure of camps, to date, there is no significant reduction in the number of displaced populations from the camps.
The financial needs of the cluster partners are higher than what is being requested under this allocation. However, since partners have been advocating on an individual basis with their donors, these requirements are being sought elsewhere. In addition, all resilience-building activities, such as capacity building are not being targeted under this allocation.

**General Protection Allocation - $1,900,000**

**Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019**

There remain significant unmet needs in legal assistance, psycho-social support for adults, and emergency-cash for protection. NPC advocates for the de-linking of security clearance mechanisms from access to public services, and for simplified legal and administrative procedures to facilitate wider access to civil documents. The coping capacities of affected individuals has been stretched to the maximum. Moreover, access to government social welfare benefits remains limited in areas of displacement and origin, hence the ongoing need for emergency cash for protection. In addition, achievements of general protection partners on community-based activities remain relatively low as compared to the needs. This directly impacts persons with perceived affiliation to extremists – particularly women and children – who continue to be subject to significant and persistent movement restrictions, segregation in camps, and widespread social discrimination.

**Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:**

Priority activities to be addressed in this Allocation are: legal assistance, PSS for adults, emergency cash for protection, as well as community-based protection interventions. While recognizing the importance of protection monitoring, especially considering the continued presence of armed military/security actors in camps and forced/premature returns of IDPs in the context of camp closures and consolidations, protection monitoring will not be prioritized in this Allocation. This is due to the high number of people reached through protection monitoring by projects funded under the first IHF Standard Allocation and bilateral donor funding.

**Housing, Land and Property Allocation - $1,000,000**

**Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019**

Due to limited funds and resources allocated to HLP specialized services, partners were unable to extend their projects to several of the prioritized districts. HLP legal assistance, particularly for restoration of ownership documents, secondary occupation and support to file claim for compensation for damaged or destroyed properties, remains a critical gap in the HRP response.

**Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:**

There is a need to continue and expand provision of HLP legal assistance, in particular because the establishment of Compensation sub-committees in conflict affected governorates is likely to result in increased compensation claims for damaged/destroyed properties, and demand for restoration of HLP ownership documents. Legal assistance to restore ownership of unlawfully occupied HLP is also a pressing ongoing need.

**Gender-based Violence Allocation - $1,800,000**

**Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019**

As of May 2019, GBV partners had reached 14 per cent of the targeted returnees and 31 per cent of targeted IDPs, particularly in Dahuk, Erbil, Kirkuk, Ninewa and Sulaymaniyah governorates. This highlights a significant gap in the response that needs to be addressed, particularly in Ninewa, Kirkuk, Salah Al Din and Diyala governorates. GBV response in camps has also been greatly impacted, with no to very low GBV service provision in the following camps: Laylan 1 and Laylan 2 (Kirkuk), Saad camp (Diyala), Hamam Al-Alil 1 & 2 and Qayarra Airstrip (Ninewa) and Khazer M1 and Hasansham U2 (Hamdaniya). In addition, an increasing number of static women’s centers are closing by the end of July, or at risk of closure by the end of the 3rd quarter of 2019. According to reports from partners, critical gaps have been identified in: (i) case management and specialized services; (ii) capacity building of specialized GBV service providers – with just
10 per cent coverage; (iii) provision of dignity kits – with 11 per cent coverage; and (iv) PSS programmes (recreational and vocational training), with 26 per cent coverage. Negative social attitudes and stigma continued to impede survivors’ access to GBV services.

**Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:**

Provision of comprehensive GBV case management services (including integrated services of PSS, health, legal assistance and strengthening of referrals to other sectors) in areas of origin, camps and out of camps (especially in districts that are critically affected by funding gaps) remain a key priority to be addressed in this Allocation. Other priorities include strengthening the capacity of GBV service providers in order for GBV survivors to safely access confidential and timely GBV services. To mitigate GBV risks and prevent further violence, community engagement must be included in all interventions.

**Child Protection Allocation - $1,703,650**

Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019

Child Protection Sub-Cluster (CPSC) needs to reach a total of 10,721 extremely vulnerable children in need of case management support by the end of 2019. In 2019, an estimated 45,000 children are in need of civil documentation. Without access to civil documentation, children are vulnerable to various risks, including lack of access to education and health services. CPSC partners have assisted 5,954 children to secure civil documents, which only represents 42 per cent of the 2019 target, demonstrating a clear need to scale up such services.

**Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:**

Full case management services for the most vulnerable girls and boys and access to civil documentation represent the main gap and top priority to be addressed by this Allocation, with a focus on urban out of camp return areas. The selected locations has not been served or will no longer be served after September 2019, with significant concentration of IDPs and/or returnees. In order to have entry point with the most vulnerable children who required case management, structured PSS and parenting activities will be implemented in the community centers. Integration of structured PSS in learning centers and teachers training in child protection will be incorporated under the Education cluster allocation in this Standard Allocation.

**Shelter and Non-Food Items Allocation - $3,327,060**

Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019

Key priorities have not changed from the initial plan highlighted in the HRP 2019. Vulnerable people out of camps in critical shelter remain the priority as shelter assistance remains key to ensure safety, privacy, dignity and protection from weather conditions. As of June 30, five Shelter NFI Cluster partners are funded at various levels, while 12 agencies’ projects in the HRP have not yet been funded. This is particularly concerning at the mid-point of the year. Although more funds may be received in the second semester, unless funded, these organizations may need to reconsider their presence in Iraq.

Of the 971,300 people targeted under the HRP, 683,863 individuals remain unserved. Most concerned districts for large population in need and not served yet are in Anbar (Falluja and Ramadi: more than 121,000 unserved individuals), Dohuk (Sumel and Zakho: more than 75,000 unserved individuals), Kirkuk (Kirkuk and Daquq: more than 41,000 unserved individuals) and Salah al-Din (Tikrit: more than 24,000 unserved individuals). Moreover, an uneven presence of Cluster actors across the prioritized districts is remarkable, with some relatively well covered while others have only one partner or no partner presence (e.g. Samarra, Tuz in Salah al-Din).

**Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:**

Anbar, Dohuk, Kirkuk and Salah Al-Din governorates are among the HRP prioritized IDP/host areas with a high concentration of IDPs out of camp and returnees, paired with very low intention to return. Additionally, the SNFI Cluster has further identified priority districts, populations and interventions with targets for 2019 to
guide partners, based on the abovementioned criteria, plus the concentration of vulnerable out of camps population living in critical shelter and missing basic NFIs.

Dohuk governorate hosts the 2nd largest IDP population country-wide, with 67 per cent of those IDPs in two sub-districts, which also have a large concentration of informal settlements and families living in critical shelter. There is a need for tailor-made interventions for Shelter and NFI, like voucher or cash for NFI programmes, rental subsidies, support for vulnerable IDPs in critical shelter and long-term hosting situations. The primary target of this proposal is IDPs out of camp in the identified sub-districts, as well as extremely vulnerable host families identified through Socio-Economic Vulnerability Tool (SEVAT).

With a decreased availability of habitable space as many houses are destroyed or structurally compromised, many displaced and return families cannot afford renting or to repair their own shelter. They thus resort in moving into cheap, substandard shelter arrangements such as unfinished or abandoned buildings, informal settlements, non-residential buildings or squatting in public buildings. Support to bring their living conditions to minimum standard (through in-kind or cash-based interventions) is crucial to ensure SNFI but also broader protection outcomes to almost 4,600 families in SAD, almost 1,400 families in Anbar and more than 1,300 families in Kirkuk.

**Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Allocation - $5,000,000**

**Cluster needs’ and gaps outlined in the PMR for 2019**

While majority of in-camp populations have been reached with water and sanitation activities, only 17 percent of out-of-camp population has been reached with water activities and 7 per cent of them with sanitation activities. It is estimated that 25 per cent of the camps are not meeting the minimum standards of water provision quantity. Approximately 85 per cent of targeted population has not been reached with hygiene services and activities. Furthermore, over thirteen camps across Ninewa, Diyala, SAD and Baghdad remain uncovered by regular funding sources and remains a key gap in terms of provision of WASH services.

**Key Issues and Priorities to be addressed in this Allocation:**

WASH Cluster targets continuation of WASH services to approx. 31,000 individuals in the 15 identified priority camps across Ninewa, Diyala, SAD and Baghdad. These camps were covered under IHF 1st funding allocation, however critical WASH needs such as water and sanitation infrastructural upgrades and maintenance, water supply and hygiene promotion, aiming at mitigation outbreak of waterborne diseases (e.g. Cholera), continue to remain critical gaps in these camps and require continued funding support. WASH partners will continue reinforcing their capacities and efforts to improve standards and quality of WASH services across all camps.

Water quality and availability has been observed as a major concern in some camps. Emphasis on phasing out water trucking in some of the camps and sustainable water supply sources is a key focus under this allocation. Other sustainable, innovative and cost-effective approaches towards wastewater treatment, desludging and solid waste management and disposal are key priorities.

Furthermore, condition of existing facilities also requires upgrades in terms of quality and design. On the parallel, identified priority off-camp locations especially in Anbar, Northern Ninewa (e.g. Sinjar) and SAD have remained with critical WASH needs especially in water supply. As such WASH Cluster has prioritized WASH support in these out of camp locations under this allocation keeping in view the increase in return of IDP populations.

To better assure dignified access and equitable coverage of services, WASH cluster shall emphasize a strengthened focus on inclusive services that take in to account gender and cultural needs of users, mitigate against risks to GBV, address the needs of People with disability and respond to seasonal and climatic variances in water demand. Providing integrated WASH interventions (WASH in Schools and health facilities) to increase impact and coverage especially among IDPs in camps.
Prioritization of Projects

The prioritization of project proposals is made in accordance with the programmatic framework and focus described in the Revised CBPF Operational Manual and on the basis of, the following criteria and as outlined in the Strategic Scorecard (see annex 4).

✓ Protection Mainstreaming: incorporating protection principles and promoting meaningful access, safety and dignity in humanitarian aid.

✓ Access: accessibility and/or physical presence to areas of operation; the location of the project is clearly identified.

✓ Accountability to affected populations: establishing appropriate mechanisms through which affected populations can evaluate the adequacy of interventions, and address concerns or complaints. Commitment to coordinate with IDP Call Centre.

✓ Strategic relevance: clear linkage to the 2019 HRP strategic and Cluster objectives, compliance with the terms of this allocation strategy, and alignment with Cluster activities described in Annex 1.

✓ Needs-based: the needs are well explained and documented, and beneficiaries are clearly described

✓ Appropriateness: the activities are adequate to respond to the identified needs

✓ Technical soundness and cost effectiveness: the proposal meets technical requirements to implement the planned activities; and the budget is fair, proportionate in relation to the context

✓ Risk management: assumptions and risks are comprehensively and clearly spelled out, along with risk management strategies

✓ Monitoring: a realistic monitoring and reporting strategy is developed in the proposal

Project Proposal Preparation and Submission

Proposal Preparation

1. All project proposals should be submitted via Grant Management System (GMS) by Saturday 31st August 23:59 Iraq time. Any submission after this date will not be accepted. GMS registration is obligatory for all eligible partners prior to the project proposal submission with due diligence component approved. GMS is a web-based platform that supports the management of the entire grant life cycle for the HF. https://cbpf.unocha.org/

2. Once you complete your registration on the GMS, please login to CBPF GMS Support portal and read instructions on how to submit a project proposal. http://gms.unocha.org/content/partner

3. Project proposals should be prepared in line with the objectives of the 2019 Humanitarian Response Plan and the priorities of this Allocation Paper. This needs to be supported by clear log frames with outcomes, outputs, SMART indicators and detailed activities. (Please refer to Annex 8 of the Global Guidelines for a sample Project Proposal Template).

4. Implementing partners may not apply for more than two projects per allocation with a maximum budget as per the IHF operational modalities – see page 13 of the IHF operational handbook.

5. Organisations should consult with relevant cluster coordinators during the project proposal preparation phase.

Budget Preparation

6. All project proposals must have a detailed budget outlining all the project related expenditures under relevant budget lines. Please refer to Operational Manual Annex 13 Project Budget Template for further details.

7. Budget proposals must reflect the correct and fair budget breakdown of the planned costs and clearly outline units, quantities and percentages. When budget lines contain costs of multiple items greater than US$10,000, a budget breakdown should be included in the GMS BOQ tool, listing item, unit, quantity, cost (per unit and total cost).
8. Provide a budget narrative (as an essential component of the budget) that clearly explains the object and the rationale of any budget line. For example, shared costs, large/expensive assets, and costs/equipment required to support the regular operation of the implementing partner, are clear cases where the provision of details will be necessary in the budget narrative.

9. Project proposals that do not meet the above requirements or with missing financial and budgeting information will not make it to the strategic review stage and those project proposals will be eliminated.

10. For further guidance on budgeting (eligible and ineligible costs, direct or indirect costs) please also refer to the Revised Operational Handbook for CBPFs pages 39-44.

Start date and eligibility of expenditure

11. The HFU will liaise with the implementing partner to determine the start date of the project. The agreed-upon start date will be included in the grant agreement. If the signature of the grant agreement occurs after the agreed-upon start date, the date of the signature of the grant agreement takes precedence. The HC can then sign the grant agreement.

12. Upon signature by the HC, the HFU notifies the partner that the project has been approved and sends the agreement for counter signature. Once the partner has countersigned, the agreement will be sent to OCHA for Executive Officer Approval. Eligibility of expenditures will be determined by the date of implementing partner’s signature of the grant agreement.

Contacts and Complaints Mechanism

All correspondence regarding the Iraq Humanitarian Fund should be sent to ihpf@un.org. Complaints from stakeholders regarding the IHF allocation process should be sent to feedback-ihpf@un.org. The OCHA Head of Office will receive, address and refer any critical issues to the HC for decision-making.
## Timeline and procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal Development</strong></td>
<td>Launch Allocation Strategy paper – Call for Proposals</td>
<td>HC, OCHA HFU</td>
<td>8th August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal Development Phase (note Eid Holiday 11th &amp; 12th August)</td>
<td>IPs</td>
<td>8th August to 31st August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for submission of Project Proposals</td>
<td>IPs</td>
<td>31st August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Process</strong></td>
<td>Strategic and Technical Review</td>
<td>Clusters, OCHA</td>
<td>5th September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partner Proposal Revision and Adjustments</td>
<td>IPs</td>
<td>5th September to 15th September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Technical and Finance Review</td>
<td>TR0s, OCHA HFU</td>
<td>15th September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval Phase</strong></td>
<td>Budget Approval</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>20th September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant Agreement (GA) preparation</td>
<td>OCHA, HFU</td>
<td>22nd September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HC signs GA / Final approval</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>25th September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA countersignature</td>
<td>IPs</td>
<td>29th September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disbursement</strong></td>
<td>GA final clearance</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>From 29th September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First disbursements</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>From 1st October</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 1 – Summary of Cluster Projects for Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Needs/Gaps</th>
<th>Location – District Level</th>
<th>Prioritised Activities</th>
<th>Estimated Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Working Group - $4,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority gaps: populations in need of MPCA residing in the locations outlined in the next column – these locations have been chosen as the <em>extreme priority</em> based on the fact that the targets here have not yet been achieved (level of achievement stands at zero (0) percent).</td>
<td>Ramadi, Hawiga, Dohuk, Touz, Balad, Karkh, Ba'quba, Khalis, Najaf</td>
<td>Conduct Socio-Economic Vulnerability Assessment Tool (SEVAT). Based on the results of the assessment, distribution of one-off cash transfer of 400 USD for the moderately vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption between 92,000 and 110,000 IQD); distribution of two months of cash assistance for a total of 800 USD for the vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption between 72,000 and 92,000 IQD); distribution of three months of cash assistance for a total of 1,200 USD for the extremely vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption under 72,000 IQD).</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populations in need of MPCA residing in the locations outlined in the next column – these locations have been chosen as <em>top priority</em> based on the fact that the targets here have achieved at a minimal level (from 1 to 10 percent of the total).</td>
<td>Fallujah, Telafar Tikrit Khanaqin, Sinjar, Kirkuk</td>
<td>Conduct Socio-Economic Vulnerability Assessment Tool (SEVAT). Based on the results of the assessment, distribution of one-off cash transfer of 400 USD for the moderately vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption between 92,000 and 110,000 IQD); distribution of two months of cash assistance for a total of 800 USD for the vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption between 72,000 and 92,000 IQD); distribution of three months of cash assistance for a total of 1,200 USD for the extremely vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption under 72,000 IQD).</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populations in need of MPCA residing in the locations outlined in the next column – these locations have been chosen as <em>priority</em> based on the fact that the targets here have achieved at a minimal level (from 10 to 20 percent of the total).</td>
<td>Tikraif, Zakho Samarra, Akre</td>
<td>Conduct Socio-Economic Vulnerability Assessment Tool (SEVAT). Distribution of one-off cash transfer of 400 USD for the moderately vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption between 92,000 and 110,000 IQD); distribution of two months of cash assistance for a total of 800 USD for the vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption between 72,000 and 92,000 IQD); distribution of three months of cash assistance for a total of 1,200 USD for the extremely vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption under 72,000 IQD).</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populations in need of MPCA residing in the locations outlined in the next column – these locations have been chosen as <em>moderate priority</em> based on the fact that the targets here have achieved at a medium level (from 20 to 30 percent of the total).</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>Conduct Socio-Economic Vulnerability Assessment Tool (SEVAT). Distribution of one-off cash transfer of 400 USD for the moderately vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption between 92,000 and 110,000 IQD); distribution of two months of cash assistance for a total of 800 USD for the vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption between 72,000 and 92,000 IQD); distribution of three months of cash assistance for a total of 1,200 USD for the extremely vulnerable households (predicted per capita monthly consumption under 72,000 IQD).</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCCM - $1,600,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$850 000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate and coordinate the provision of multi-sectorial interventions and conduct site risk reduction activities to ensure safe and dignified environment for internally displaced people in formal and informal sites including newly and secondary displaced. Empower the affected-population and local actors to prepare, maintain, and coordinate CCCM services. Support well-planned and principled implementation of the camp life cycle through effective information management, coordination, and advocacy, in line with the CCCM Position Paper on Camp Consolidation.</td>
<td>Monitoring of service delivery to identify gaps and avoid duplication of activities, service mapping and maintenance of updated 3W, and implementation of CCCM FSMT. Gap filling to be coordinated through camp level coordination mechanisms and escalated through cluster. Partners lead/participate in formal camp level coordination mechanism on monthly basis to coordinate camp level activities and gap-filling. Communal and/or household level infrastructure/services improved or maintained in consolidated camps, including drainage systems, roads, electricity provision, fencing, lighting, waste management, etc. Activities may include implementation through CfW projects. Coordinate the establishment/efficient use of documented referral pathways for assistance/service delivery. Establish or support existing governance structures and focal points for formal camps to ensure accountable and meaningful participation of IDPs in camp coordination and management. Formal site monitoring and/or camp profiling conducted.</td>
<td>Establish CCCM mobile teams for site management, monitoring and community engagement. Establish/update list of informal IDP sites at appropriate geographic level. Establish/update 3W’s of partners operating in informal IDP sites. Coordinate/ conduct intention surveys with relevant partners and clusters to ensure the intentions of populations are understood and supported. Establish or support existing governance structures and focal points for informal IDP sites. With other clusters and partners, as well as the authorities, coordinate the establishment/efficient use of documented referral pathways for assistance/service delivery (including to persons with special needs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal camps in KRI, Ninewa, Salah al Din, Anbar, Kirkuk</strong></td>
<td>**Monitoring of service delivery to identify gaps and avoid duplication of activities, service mapping and maintenance of updated 3W, and implementation of CCCM FSMT. Gap filling to be coordinated through camp level coordination mechanisms and escalated through cluster. Partners lead/participate in formal camp level coordination mechanism on monthly basis to coordinate camp level activities and gap-filling. Communal and/or household level infrastructure/services improved or maintained in consolidated camps, including drainage systems, roads, electricity provision, fencing, lighting, waste management, etc. Activities may include implementation through CfW projects. Coordinate the establishment/efficient use of documented referral pathways for assistance/service delivery. Establish or support existing governance structures and focal points for formal camps to ensure accountable and meaningful participation of IDPs in camp coordination and management. Formal site monitoring and/or camp profiling conducted.</td>
<td>Establish CCCM mobile teams for site management, monitoring and community engagement. Establish/update list of informal IDP sites at appropriate geographic level. Establish/update 3W’s of partners operating in informal IDP sites. Coordinate/ conduct intention surveys with relevant partners and clusters to ensure the intentions of populations are understood and supported. Establish or support existing governance structures and focal points for informal IDP sites. With other clusters and partners, as well as the authorities, coordinate the establishment/efficient use of documented referral pathways for assistance/service delivery (including to persons with special needs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Response Teams to identify IDP populations and needs priorities in informal settlements, working at all levels to support safe, dignified and voluntary returns.</td>
<td><strong>$550 000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Anbar:** Falluja, Ramadi  
**Dohuk:** Sumel, Zakho  
**Kirkuk:** Daquq, Kirkuk  
**Ninewa:** Telafar, Telkael, Sheikhan  
**Salah al Din:** Tikrit, Tooz, Al Daur  
**Sulaymaniyah:** Sulaymaniyah | Establish CCCM mobile teams for site management, monitoring and community engagement. Establish/update list of informal IDP sites at appropriate geographic level. Establish/update 3W’s of partners operating in informal IDP sites. Coordinate/ conduct intention surveys with relevant partners and clusters to ensure the intentions of populations are understood and supported. Establish or support existing governance structures and focal points for informal IDP sites. With other clusters and partners, as well as the authorities, coordinate the establishment/efficient use of documented referral pathways for assistance/service delivery (including to persons with special needs). |
| Facilitate sustainability of return and support to affected populations through Community Resource Centres. | Anbar: Fallujah, Ramadi, Al Qaim  
Diyala: Jalamia  
Kirkuk: Hawija  
Salah al Din: Baiji, Tooz, Balad, Tikrit  
Nineva: Telafar, Mosul, Baaj | Conduct site risk reduction activities through CFW or contractual implementation methods  
Supporting the establishment or expansion of the CRC mechanism in high priority affected areas  
Ensuring appropriate liaison between CCCM in-camp service providers, CCCM out-of-camp service providers, local authorities and other partners in return areas  
Facilitating two-way communication and regular information to returnees and other vulnerable people in return areas regarding the returns process  
Minimising protection and safety risks by supporting a safe and dignified returns process  
Encouraging durable solutions to displacement, as well as minimising the risk of secondary displacement, by ensuring appropriate linkages with humanitarian, transition / recovery and government actors in return areas | $200,000 |

| \( \text{CCS Cluster $2,300,000} \) | Across Iraq, in particular Ninawa, Erbil Kirkuk, Salah al-din and Anbar  
The receiving and handling of calls to the IDP Information Centre.  
Coordination between the IIC, PSEA Network, GBV sub-cluster and other clusters as relevant to ensure an adequate referral system is in place. | $1,500,000 |

| Work to strengthen situational awareness, contribute to safety and security of humanitarian aid workers and activities, and advocate for enabling environment to facilitate humanitarian access and enhance operational impact, especially in remote and risk-prone areas | Al-Faulljah, Ramadi, Ana, Khanaqin, Al-Khalis, Baquba, Hawiga, Daquq, Kirkuk, Mosul, Tiktaif, Sinjar, Shikhan, Mosul, Baiji, Balad, Tikrit. | Collect, analyse, customize and report security-related threats which will facilitate security coordination, safe access and coordination of operations.  
Providing regular detailed IM situational maps, online real-time dashboards, snapshots, infographics, and situation reports. | $800,000 |

| \( \text{Education Cluster - $2,850,000} \) | | | |
### Continued access to both formal and non-formal quality education for children in the IDP camps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Camps/ Locations</th>
<th>Teacher/Volunteer Training</th>
<th>Teaching/Learning Materials</th>
<th>Additional Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Salahadin</em></td>
<td>Shahama/ Karama, Ninewa - Jeddah 1-6, HAA, Qayyarah airstrip, Salamiya, Nimrod, Haji Ali, Kirkuk - Laylan 1 and 2, Yahyawa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ninewa</em></td>
<td>Jeddah 1-6, HAA, Qayyarah airstrip, Salamiya, Nimrod, Haji Ali, Kirkuk - Laylan 1 and 2, Yahyawa</td>
<td>Train teachers/volunteers on TICC, literacy and numeracy, referral pathways and psychosocial support for at-risk children.</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate teaching/learning materials, such as stationaries, textbooks and school bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kirkuk</em></td>
<td>Chamishko, Khanke, Essyan mostly for additional learning spaces and remedial and catch up classes</td>
<td>Train teachers/volunteers on TICC, literacy and numeracy, referral pathways and psychosocial support for at-risk children.</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate teaching/learning materials, such as stationaries, textbooks and school bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sully</em></td>
<td>- all 6 camps prioritized for teacher training</td>
<td>Catch up and remediation for children linked with the formal education system</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate teaching/learning materials, such as stationaries, textbooks and school bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dahuk</em></td>
<td>Chamishko, Khanke, Essyan mostly for additional learning spaces and remedial and catch up classes</td>
<td>Catch up and remediation for children linked with the formal education system</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate teaching/learning materials, such as stationaries, textbooks and school bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,030,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Improved access to quality education for children in return areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Camps/ Locations</th>
<th>Teacher/Volunteer Training</th>
<th>Teaching/Learning Materials</th>
<th>Additional Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Anbar</em></td>
<td>Ana, Ramadi, Falluja, Ninewa - Tel Afar, Baaj, Sinjar (outside of Sinjar city and Sinuni)</td>
<td>Engage and deploy trained teachers/volunteers to the established temporary learning spaces</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate teaching/learning materials, such as stationaries, textbooks and school bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ninewa</em></td>
<td>Tel Afar, Baaj, Sinjar (outside of Sinjar city and Sinuni)</td>
<td>Engage and deploy trained teachers/volunteers to the established temporary learning spaces</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate teaching/learning materials, such as stationaries, textbooks and school bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salah al-Din</em></td>
<td>Shirqat, Baiji and Tikrit, Kirkuk: Daquq district, and Hawija district (only center of Hawija and Riyadh sub-districts) and Al-Multaqa</td>
<td>Train teachers/volunteers on TICC, literacy and numeracy, referral pathways and psychosocial support for at-risk children.</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate teaching/learning materials, such as stationaries, textbooks and school bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kirkuk</em></td>
<td>Daquq district, and Hawija district (only center of Hawija and Riyadh sub-districts) and Al-Multaqa</td>
<td>Catch up and remediation for children linked with the formal education system</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate teaching/learning materials, such as stationaries, textbooks and school bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,620,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IDP children residing outside camps continue to require access to quality education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Camps/ Locations</th>
<th>Teacher/Volunteer Training</th>
<th>Teaching/Learning Materials</th>
<th>Additional Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ninewa</em></td>
<td>Telkeif, Tel afar, Baaj, Sinjar</td>
<td>Engage and deploy trained teachers/volunteers to the established temporary learning spaces</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate teaching/learning materials, such as stationaries, textbooks and school bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salah al-Din</em></td>
<td>Samarra, Kirkuk: Kirkuk, Dahuk: Sumel and Zakho</td>
<td>Train teachers/volunteers on TICC, literacy and numeracy, referral pathways and psychosocial support for at-risk children.</td>
<td>Provision of appropriate teaching/learning materials, such as stationaries, textbooks and school bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,620,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Provision of appropriate teaching/learning materials, such as stationaries, textbooks and school bags

- Engage and deploy trained teachers/volunteers to the established temporary learning spaces
- Train teachers/volunteers on TICC, literacy and numeracy, referral pathways and psychosocial support for at-risk children.
- Catch up and remediation for children linked with the formal education system
- Light rehabilitation
- Engage MRE accredited actors to provide MRE sessions within the TLS and formal education sites.
- Provide prefabs as an alternative solution for the damaged schools.
### Emergency Livelihoods - $835,000

| 1500 Households who are still in need of access to livelihoods support this year. | Kirkuk: 1) Hawija; Riyadh and Rashad, Al Abbasi, and a cluster of smaller neighbourhoods 2) Kirkuk camps Lailan Camp 1, Lailan Camp 2, Yahyawa camp 3) Slaia El Din; Tooz Khurmatu; Hay Komari-120 and Hay Rizgar-114 and a cluster of smaller locations 4) Diyala: Khaneqeen; Jalawla & Saadia | Asset replacement for re-establishing livelihoods, and revitalization of businesses and economic activities Business development training and business coaching to ensure sustainability of supported livelihoods Promoting saving groups as a way to increase financing options for small and micro income generating activities | $835,000 |

### Food Security - $985,000

| Provision of agricultural inputs to returnees and host communities | Ninewa Governorate, Wana Sub District. | Greenhouse installation, training and borehole rehabilitation. Providing of Livestock (poultry and sheep) Provision of livestock fodder and vaccines to cover the hunger gap for sheep (summer) Farmer support with required inputs to (re) start production (seeds, fertilizers and cash for land preparation through contractors and rehabilitation of irrigation systems. | $535,000 |

### Livelihoods: extending the Al-Salamiya irrigation system.

| Ninewa Governorate: Nimrud (selected villages) | The plans for the extension of the Al-Salamiya irrigation scheme that currently covers 7.000 donum (1.750 ha) exist for some time. The current scheme that has a pumping station on Tigris river is located at the right side of the Mosul-Kirkuk road. The extension would be located at the left side and would need additional pumps in the same station. This could cover another 3.000 donum (750 ha). In camp response to include initial needs assessment to determine most appropriate response – be it focus on small scale vegetable growing, or cash-based transfers. | $ 450,000 |

### Health - $5,000,000

| Out of camps: Sulaymaniyah: Water Quality Monitoring and disease surveillance the below locations: Sulaymaniya City: Ablakh , Ali Kamal, Awbara, Azady, Bakhan, Bakhtyary, Bakrajo, Baranan, Barbayakani Qaiwan, Barzayakin slemani, Chami Rezan, Cheshan, chwarbakh, Dabashan, Darokha, Darwaza City, Dieran, Farmanbaran, faramanday 70, Geman villages, goja city Grdy Sarchnar, Grda Graw, Guly shar Apartments, Haji Fatah, Hwara Barza, Hawkary, Hawari Taza, Hawari Shyar, Ibrahim Pasha, Ibrahim Ahmed, Iskan, Islah, Kordsat, Kani Ba, Khabat, Kosay Cham, Kaziwa, Kani Spika, Kani Goma, Majeed Bag, Malik Mahmood Road, Malkandy, Mamayara, mamostayan, Nawroz city, Qaiwan City, Orga, Qalawa, Qlyasan, Orga, Qularaysi, Rapreen, Rzgary, Riya, Roj City Districts outside Sulaymaniya: Pishdar, Ranya, Dokan, Sharbazher, Chamchamal, Garmyan, Darbandikhan, Zmnako, Bazyan, Sharazoor, Said Sadeeq Ninewah: Domiz PHCC (Sinjar) Salah al-Din: Public PHCCs in Baiji, Touz Kirkuk: Al Hawija General Hospital | Support for operation theatre Improving case management of critical infectious diseases Outbreak preparedness, and EWARN Supporting Water Quality Monitoring | $ 3,500,000 |
| Reproductive health services, including ante-natal care, post-natal care, deliveries, etc. Camps: Dohuk: Sharya, Khanke, Kabrato, Bajid Kandla, Chem Mishko, Bersive 1&2, Dawdya, Essyan, Darkar, Mamlyan, Shiekhman, Garamawa, Qadisiya IDP camps and Zakho and Dohuk Maternity Hospitals Erbil: Baharka IDP camp, Erbil Maternity Hospital Sulaymaniyah: Ashiti IDP camps Dylia: Al Wand, Tazade, Qoratou IDP camps Ninewah: Khazer (RH clinic) IDP camps Out of Camps: Zakho and Dohuk Maternity Hospitals | Running static RH clinics in camps Operating static deliver rooms Supporting referral hospitals | Camps: $ 845,900 Out of camps: $ 154,100 | $ 1,000,000 |
| Essential vaccination, nutrition, maternal, neonatal and child health care services Ninewah: Haj Ali, Qayara, Salamiya, West Mosul, Hammam Al All, Erbil: Dibaga, Khazer/Hasansham, Jadaa camps Dohuk: 4 IDP camps (Kebirto 1&2, Sharia, Mamrashan Sulaimaniya: Tazade | Immunization of children Nutrition Neonatal care | All in Camp | $ 500,000 |
| General Protection - $1,900,000 | | |
| Community-based activities | Anbar: Falluja and Ramadi districts  
Dahuk: Sumel, district  
Kirkuk: Daqouq and Kirkuk districts  
Nineva: Akre, Sheikhlan, Sinjar, Tel Afar, Tilkaff, and Ba’aj districts  
Salah al-Din: Balad, Daur and Tikrit districts | Community-Based Activities (including community-based protection committees, Communication with Communities, peaceful co-existence interventions)  
Support to Community-centres | $ 400,000 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Emergency and/or full case management, including through identification and referrals to multi-sectoral interventions (livelihood, multipurpose cash, etc.) and cash for protection, as well as PSS for adults | Anbar: Falluja and Ramadi districts  
Dahuk: Sumel, district  
Kirkuk: Daqouq and Kirkuk districts  
Nineva: Akre, Sheikhlan, Sinjar, Tel Afar, Tilkaff, and Ba’aj districts  
Salah al-Din: Balad, Daur and Tikrit districts | Referral to specialized services or assistance  
Cash for protection  
Disability-specific services  
PSS for adults, including psychosocial counselling  
Group-based structured PSS programmes | $ 700,000 |
| Provision of legal assistance: civil documentation, family law, and detention | Anbar: Falluja and Ramadi districts  
Dahuk: Sumel district  
Kirkuk: Daqouq and Kirkuk districts  
Nineva: Akre, Sheikhlan, Sinjar, Tel Afar, Tilkaff, and Ba’aj districts  
Salah al-Din: Balad, Daur and Tikrit districts | Deployment of legal mobile teams and/or support to mobile documentation activities  
Monitor and follow up detention cases  
Provide legal assistance and counselling  
Follow up with government departments for issuance of civil documents | $ 800,000 |
| Housing Land and Property - $1,000,000 | Anbar: Heet, Fallujah, Ramadi districts  
Dahuk: Sumel district  
Kirkuk: Daqouq and Kirkuk districts  
Nineva: Mosul, Sinjar (Sinjar and Sinune), Tel Afar and Ba’aj districts  
Salah al-Din: Balad, Tikrit and Tooz districts | Provide legal assistance on HLP compensation claims for damaged/destroyed properties, illegal confiscation of properties, secondary occupation, forced evictions from HLP  
Provide legal assistance to secure or restore missing/destroyed HLP documentation | $ 1,000,000 |
| Child Protection Sub-Cluster - $1,703,650 | Kirkuk: Markaz Kirkuk (Rahim Awa)  
Nineva:  
Tel Afar (Qasabet Zummar, Hay El Wahda, and Hay Alkefah al jenobi), Tilkaff (Al Quba,)  
Salah al-Din: Tuz (Hay Komari-120) Samarra (Mahalla Makeshfa), Tikrit (Qadisya 2 Mahala 216 andQadisya 1 Mahala 214) | Provide comprehensive case management services  
Capacity building of front-line case workers  
Establish / update referral pathways  
Provide civil documentation assistance  
Supporting/establishing community-based child protection structures.  
Conduct structured PSS program for children and adolescent in community centers  
Conduct parenting skills programmes | $ 1,703,650 |
| GBV Sub-Cluster - $1,800,000 | | | |
| Strengthening provision of GBV case management services | **Diyala:** Khanaqin (Jalwlaa, Saadiya subdistricts), Ba‘qaa (Saad Camp)  
**Al-Khalis District. (Mansoriya, Al-Adheem).**  
**Kirkuk:** Kirkuk (Markaz Kirkuk and surrounding areas, Laylan 1 and Laylan 2 camps)  
**Salah Al-Din:** Balad (Yethreb, Makaz Balad), Tuz (Sulaiman Beg, Yangiga, Amerli) Baiji.  
**Nineawa:** Mosul (Qayyarah Airstrip and Hamam Al-All and 1&2 Camps in Mosul). Al-Hamdaniya (Markaz al-Hamdaniya, Namrud, and Bartla Subdistricts, Namrud camp) | Provision of GBV case management services  
Provision quality PSS and PFA services through trained staff  
Integration of GBV services with Reproductive health, legal aid, livelihoods and child protection  
Conduct safety audits to mitigate GBV risks  
Mentoring and coaching of front-line case workers  
Strengthening of referral pathways to health (including mental health), legal documentation, livelihood actors, as well as safety/security.  
GBV awareness raising, including strengthening male networks.  
Support static/mobile women centres | $1,000,000 |
| PSS for GBV survivors complemented with community engagement | **Diyala:** Khanaqin (Jalwlaa, Saadiya subdistricts), Ba‘qaa (Saad Camp)  
**Al-Khalis District. (Mansoriya, Al-Adheem).**  
**Kirkuk:** Kirkuk (Markaz Kirkuk and surrounding areas, Laylan 1 and Laylan 2 camps)  
**Salah Al-Din:** Balad (Yethreb, Makaz Balad), Tuz (Sulaiman Beg, Yangiga, Amerli) Baiji.  
**Nineawa:** Mosul (Qayyarah Airstrip and Hamam Al-All and 1&2 Camps in Mosul). Al-Hamdaniya (Markaz al-Hamdaniya, Namrud, and Bartla Subdistricts, Namrud camp) | Provide PSS services  
Strengthen referral pathways to health (including mental health), legal documentation, livelihood and child protection actors, as well as safety/security.  
Community engagement on social re-integration for GBV survivors  
Strengthen male networks & camp/community groups  
Community-led GBV awareness raising | $800,000 |
| SHELTER / NFI Cluster - $3,327,060 | **Dohuk governorate**  
Sumel district: Fayda and Markaz Sumel subdistricts  
Zakho district: Markaz Zakho and Rizgari subdistricts | Shelter and NFI support through SOKs for critical shelter and cash-based interventions for rehabilitation of critical shelter, distribution of vouchers or cash, using the SEVAT tool to identify the most vulnerable families. | **$540,000** for critical shelter  
**$78,000** for NFI transport & distribution costs |
| 1,500 IDP families out of camp with unserved shelter and NFI needs | **Anbar Governorate**  
Fallujah district: Al-Amiriya sub-district | Using the SEVAT tool to identify the most vulnerable families, selected beneficiaries will be supported with critical shelter rehabilitation through owner driven approach. (i.e. cash for shelter, voucher for SOK, etc.), rental subsidies programs and NFI assistance (cash or in-kind) | **$495,720** for critical shelter  
**$71,604** for NFI transport & distribution costs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerable IDPs out of camps and returnees’ families remain with no shelter and NFI support</th>
<th>Salah al-Din Governorate</th>
<th>Using the SEVAT tool to identify the most vulnerable families, selected beneficiaries will be supported with critical shelter rehabilitation through owner driven approach, (i.e. cash for shelter, voucher for SOK, etc.), rental subsidies programs and NFI assistance (cash or in-kind)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tikrit district:</td>
<td>- IDPs in Al-Alam and Markaz Tikrit Sub districts (excluding Al-Qadisiya Complex)</td>
<td>$1,251,360 for critical shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Returnees in Markaz Tikrit, Markaz Samarra and Dijla Sub districts</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90,376 for NFI transport &amp; distribution costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarra district:</td>
<td>Samarra - Markaz Samarra Sub-district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDP HHs live in critical shelter in Kirkuk, concentrated primarily in Markaz Kirkuk (847 HHs), Laylan (208 HHs), and Taza Khurmatu (150 HHs), with a lesser concentration in Makaz Daquq (54 HHs) and Qara Hanjeer (7 HHs)</th>
<th>Kirkuk Governorate</th>
<th>Emergency upgrade or repair of critical shelters, collective centres, unfinished and abandoned buildings, distributions of SOKs, rental subsidies and cash-based interventions for rehabilitation of critical shelter, using the SEVAT tool to identify the most vulnerable families.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daquq and Kirkuk Districts:</td>
<td>Laylan, Markaz Kirkuk, Taza Khurmatu</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WASH Cluster - $5 million

Operate & maintain quality standards of WASH services & provide an enabling environment for good hygiene practices in protracted displacement camps. Cholera/water born disease outbreak preparedness and response actions in camps.

**In-camps:**
- Ninewa, Hamdaniyah (Nimrud, Salamiya 1, Haji Ali);
- Diyala, Khanaqin Quratu, Alwand 1&2;
- Salah Al Din, Shirqat Basateen al Sheuokh;
- Baghdad Mahmudiya (Latifyah 1&2), Abu Ghraib (Al Ahal, Al Shams), Madain (Nabi Younis and Rasafa (Zayouna))

Establishing sustainable water networks/water sources to phase out from water trucking and increase access to safe drinking water with substantial focus on complying with cluster standards in quality and quality.

Operation and maintenance of existing water and sanitation services.

Upgrading existing water and sanitation infrastructure in camps. Sanitation improvement - wastewater desludging/treatment, sustainable management and disposal of solid wastes.

Hygiene promotion activities including promoting safe water handling and good water quality through water treatment, regular quality testing water, monitoring and reporting of water quality results.

Emergency water supply in affected camps in affected areas.

Emergency sanitation activities - desludging in health facilities, solid waste management and disposal and

Targeted hygiene promotion activities including distribution of emergency basic and consumable hygiene kits to people affected camp locations. Training of hygiene promoters.

---

Restore basic WASH services and support good hygiene practices for highly vulnerable populations in areas of return and facilitate takeover of water and sanitation facilities by local authorities. Cholera/water born disease outbreak preparedness & response in out of camps locations/areas of return/host communities.

**Off-camps:**
- Ninewa: Al-Mosul, Telafar, Tikiaf, Hatra and Sinjar;
- Salah Al Din: Balad, Baiji, Samara, Tooz, and Tikrit;
- Anbar: Ramadi and Fallujah
- Diyala: Khanaqin

Limited rehabilitation of water infrastructure to facilitate return of displaced and handover facilities to recovery actors for full rehabilitation/completion.

Repair of dysfunctional WASH facilities in schools and health centres.

Promoting good water quality through water treatment, regular quality testing and monitoring, and reporting water quality results.

Strengthening Community based hygiene promotion and water conservation practices through community-based structures.

Expanding market-based approaches to hygiene to phase out in-kind distribution of hygiene items for returnees.

Targeted hygiene promotion activities including distribution of emergency basic and consumable hygiene kits to people affected camp locations. Training of hygiene promoters.

---

| In-camps | $3,000,000 |
| Off-camps | $2,000,000 |