

## ANNUAL REPORT OF THE HUMANITARIAN/RESIDENT COORDINATOR ON THE USE OF CERF GRANTS

<b>Country</b>	<b>Iraq</b>
<b>Humanitarian / Resident Coordinator</b>	<b>Mr. David Shearer</b>
<b>Reporting Period</b>	<b>1 January – 31 December 2007</b>

### I. Executive Summary / Background

The deteriorating humanitarian situation in early 2007, together with related operational assumptions and security scenarios, required that the international community promptly delivered humanitarian emergency response interventions. The nature and patterns of vulnerability and displacement in Iraq required a number of significant responses, ranging from the provision of humanitarian assistance to the question of (re)integration through the development of durable solutions.

The International Organization for Migration's (IOM) priority area of intervention was internally displaced persons:

#### Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)

The February 2007 Cluster F report indicated that almost 729,792 IDP families were displaced due to violence and religious tension. The magnitude and complexity of the crisis made it essential that the emergency response was urgently upgraded to meet pressing humanitarian needs. The most immediate needs identified through IOM's needs assessments were food, access to safe drinking water, and non-food items.

At the time of requesting CERF funding, agencies did not have the funding or capacity to quickly and immediately meet the urgent humanitarian needs of displaced persons in Iraq. Until resources were mobilised to provide emergency relief, a startling assistance gap existed. CERF funds were requested to provide immediate funds to assist IDPs, refugees and vulnerable host communities while the emergency humanitarian response was set in place.

<b>Total amount of humanitarian funding required and received (per reporting year)</b>	<b>Required:</b> \$ 85,000,000 (from July 2007 – July 2009) <b>Received:</b> \$ 25,500,000			
<b>Total amount of CERF funding received by funding window</b>	<b>Rapid Response:</b> \$ 3,533,359 <b>Underfunded:</b> \$ _____ <b>Grand Total:</b> \$ 3,533,359			
<b>Total amount of CERF funding for direct UN agency/IOM implementation and total amount forwarded to implementing partners</b>	<b>Total UN agencies/IOM:</b> \$ 439,556.29 <b>Total implementing partners:</b> \$ 3,093,802.71			
<b>Approximate total number of beneficiaries reached with CERF funding (disaggregated by sex/age if possible)</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>under 5 years of age</b>	<b>Female (If available)</b>	<b>Male (If available)</b>
	17,295 families (103,770 individuals)	No data available	No data available	No data available
<b>Geographic areas of implementation</b>	Babylon, Kerbala, Wassit, Ninewa, Diyala.			

## **II. Coordination and Partnership-building**

### **(a) Decision-making process to decide allocation**

IOM was awarded a CERF grant on 5 April 2007 and the funds were to be disbursed by 5 July 2007. The objective was to assist 15,000 vulnerable post-February 2006 IDP and host community families. IOM identified six implementing partners (IP) to carry out the operation in five governorates. IOM also identified an independent company to monitor and evaluate the whole operation (although the external monitoring and evaluation was not included in the original proposal).

A three-day coordination meeting with all implementing partners took place in Erbil, Iraq with the presence of IOM national and international staff. The original grant agreements were to assist 15,237 IDP and host community families with food and non-food items. However, due to savings made on the budgets by the NGOs and IOM, the CERF could have assisted 17,295 IDP and host community families in total. This was an increase of 2,058 families - more than originally planned in the project proposal. Given an average of six individuals per family, the total beneficiaries were 103,770 individuals assisted with food and non-food items.

### **(b) Coordination amongst the humanitarian country team**

Under the former cluster F<sup>1</sup>, in which IOM was the deputy cluster leader, the CERF proposal was endorsed by all the cluster members, to provide immediate assistance to the most vulnerable IDPs and host communities. Furthermore, the IDP working group, which composed of the NGOs and the UN agencies, consolidated on the assessed needs to enable precise targeting of the beneficiaries. In order to make sure that existing gaps were addressed, IOM consulted with the other UN clusters prior to implementation. IOM coordinated with the Ministry of Displacement and Migration at central level in Baghdad before the distributions took place, and informed the Ministry about the activities to be undertaken.

### **(c) Partnerships**

IOM worked closely with the Ministry of Displacement and Migration, UN agencies, international NGOs and national NGOs. After concluding the CERF agreement, IOM identified six implementing partners to carry out the operation. The partners eventually selected were slightly different from the ones originally mentioned in the original proposal. Standard Grant Agreements were signed with all selected partners. Out of six partners, three were international NGOs and three were experienced Iraqi local NGOs. One of the international NGOs is operating through its local counterpart, with whom IOM communicates directly. IOM has had long-term collaboration or previous experience with all of the partners. Out of six partners, three partners implementing in Ninewa and Diyala further use their own local partner to access some locations and some beneficiaries, due to the security situation and movement within the Ninewa and Diyala governorates.

IOM determined the composition of the food and non-food basket. The composition was slightly modified for different governorates per suggestions from partners and local authorities on the ground.

Since IOM procures locally, all implementing partners were asked to submit quotes from at least three different suppliers for the items to be purchased. The quotes were reviewed by the IOM logistics department. Where possible, the selected suppliers were checked by IOM staff on the ground (Karbala, Wassit, and Babylon). The quality of procured items was checked and certified by IOM staff.

IOM hired an external company, the US-based International Solutions Group (ISG), to carry out monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the operation. IOM has previously collaborated with ISG on other monitoring and evaluation activities in Iraq. ISG hired seven monitors and one field coordinator, who were present on the ground from the very beginning. In addition, IOM staff on the ground monitors the performances of implementing partners in Karbala, Wassit and Babylon.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cluster F ceased to exist on 1 December 2007, and was replaced by a new coordination structure.

Where possible, implementing partners fully collaborated with local authorities, most notably with local the Ministry of Displacement and Migration branches, provincial (governorate) councils, district councils (municipalities) and the police.

All partners proceeded with activities in more or less the same order: signing of grant agreement, bid analysis, selection of locations, selection of beneficiaries, packaging and distributions. The implementation modes varied depending on the security situation in each governorate.

All implementing partners reported on a monthly basis and ISG reported on a weekly basis. The monthly reports summarized the activities undertaken and the progress of the distributions. In addition, staff of implementing partners and IOM staff in both Amman and Iraq communicated daily via email, phone and Internet instant messaging.

**(d) PRIORITIZATION PROCESS**

Not applicable.

**III. Implementation and Results**

**Rapid Response projects**

Although displacements due to sectarian violence had escalated long before the delivery of the CERF funds, field reports continued to indicate a critical need for emergency interventions. The timing of the CERF coincided with increased displacements and a worsening IDP humanitarian situation, as witnessed by the UN's declaration of a humanitarian crisis. The CERF grant was effectively utilized to deliver coordinated food and non-food items assistance to especially vulnerable populations.

With CERF support, IOM provided for emergency food and shelter support in the form of non-food items (non-food items) to the most vulnerable IDPs and host communities. Based on its post-February 2006 IDP monitoring and needs assessments, access to shelter and food, in addition to work, are among top needs for the IDPs.

**TARGET BENEFICIARIES**

IOM assistance targeted IDPs as well as host communities in five governorates, namely Diyala, Ninewa, Kerbala, Wassit and Babylon. The ratio of IDP and host community beneficiaries was approximately 70 percent and 30 percent. Assistance to the host community, who are often exhausted from hosting IDPs for extended durations of time and frequently suffer the same vulnerabilities as the IDPs, responded to their needs and also prevented or eased tensions and hostilities among the various populations. To a significant extent, CERF support to IDPs helped stabilize communities where the IDPs have sought refuge. Whenever possible, IOM partners assessed IDP and host community families based on the Cluster F Vulnerability Criteria, which prioritize female-headed families, low-income families, families with elderly or disabled members, families living in destitute conditions and others. In Wassit, Diyala and Ninewa, ongoing clashes between the militias, insurgents and MNF-I triggered movements of the population. Whenever necessary, the partners quickly diverted available food and non-food shares to rapidly assist these displaced families.

**IMPLEMENTATION**

IOM was awarded the CERF grant on 5 April 2007 and the funds were to be committed by 5 July 2007. The objective was to assist 15,000 vulnerable post-February 2006 IDP and host community families. IOM was able to work closely with the Ministry of Displacement and Migration, UN agencies, international NGOs and Iraqi NGOs. After signing the LoU between IOM and OCHA, IOM identified six implementing partners to carry out the operation. Standard Grant Agreements were signed with all selected partners. Out of the six partners, three were international NGOs and three were experienced Iraqi local NGOs. IOM has had long-term collaboration or previous experience with all of them.

IOM determined the composition of the food and non-food basket. The composition was slightly modified for different governorates as per suggestions from partners and local authorities on the ground to adjust to the actual weather conditions and needs of the target beneficiaries.

Since IOM procures locally, all partners were asked to submit quotations from at least three different suppliers for the items to be purchased. The quotations were evaluated and approved by the IOM logistics department. Where possible, the selected suppliers were checked by IOM staff on the ground (Karbala, Wassit, and Babylon). The quality of procured items was checked and certified by IOM staff.

IOM hired an external consulting company to carry out monitoring and evaluation of the operation. IOM has previously collaborated with this company on other monitoring and evaluation activities in Iraq. The company hired seven independent monitors and one field coordinator, who were present on the ground from the very beginning. In addition, IOM staff on the ground monitored the NGOs' performance in Karbala, Wassit and Babylon.

### **How did CERF funding enable prompt, early action to respond to life-saving needs and time critical requirements?**

Where possible, the NGOs fully collaborated with local authorities, most notably with the local Ministry of Displacement and Migration branches, provincial (governorate) councils, district councils (municipalities), and the police, in addition to local community and mosque leaders and IDP representatives.

All partners proceeded with activities in more or less the same order: upon signing the Standard Grant Agreement with IOM, they administered the procurement tender, selected locations (based on IOM list of IDP locations in the respective governorates and in consultation with the Ministry of Displacement and Migration) selected beneficiaries packaged the food and non-food parcels and then proceeded with distributions. The implementation modes varied depending on the security situation in each governorate. In some governorates, such as Babylon, Karbala and Wassit, the security situation allowed to organized "centralized" distributions at the local stadium, in front of the Ministry of Displacement and Migration office and other known locations. Beneficiaries were notified few days in advance to come with their documents and pick up the shares. In other governorates, such as Ninewa and Diyala, the security situation was volatile throughout the implementation, and distributions had to be sometimes delayed weeks at a time until the situation allowed to distribute.

All partners reported on a monthly basis and the Monitoring and Evaluation Company reported on a weekly basis. The monthly reports summarized the activities undertaken and the progress of the distributions. In addition, the NGO staff and IOM staff in both Amman and Iraq communicated daily via email, phone and internet instant messaging.

## **RESULTS**

Through CERF funding, 17,295 beneficiary families (approximately 103,770 individuals) received assistance from IOM through its implementing partners. Some of the salient achievements include:

- Provision of essential emergency complementary food basket and household support to IDPs and host communities;
- Improved capacity of NGO partners in provision of emergency assistance;
- Improved beneficiary selection process thanks to partners' use of Cluster F Vulnerability Criteria and analysis;
- Full support and collaboration with the Government of Iraq, and especially its Ministry of Displacement and Migration; and
- Invigoration of local economies thanks to local procurement of all items and services.

### **(1) Babylon**

The distributions ended on 3 July and in total, 3,000 IDP and host community members were assisted.

### **(2) Karbala**

Distributions finished on 13 July. In total, 3,108 IDP and host community families were assisted. There was a considerable media presence throughout the distribution activities. The NGO

partner held a press conference at the end of the project, highlighting IOM contribution in facilitating the CERF assistance.

- (3) **Wassit**  
The distributions were completed at the end of July. In total, 3,108 families from IDP and host communities were assisted.
- (4) **Ninewa**  
Due to the volatile environment in Ninewa, two partners were selected to assist in this governorate. One partner assisted 3,350 families (the distributions finished on 31 August) and the other partner assisted 1,237 families (distributions finished on 10 August). The latter group was all displaced from the city of Talafar after counter-insurgency operations there.
- (5) **Diyala**  
Some 3,330 families were assisted. All distributions ended by 30 September.

#### **(e) The monitoring and evaluation of the CERF projects**

The monitoring and evaluation of the intervention was done by three different means:

- (1) IOM contracted an external company to monitor and evaluate the performance of the partners.

The monitoring and evaluation had four distinct objectives:

- **Basket items price and quality check** – Crosscheck basket items' quality and prices with market samples
- **Beneficiary selection** – Monitor and evaluate the process by which implementing partners select IDP and vulnerable host community beneficiary families
- **Food and non-food items distribution** – Monitor and evaluate the process by which implementing partners distribute food and non-food items baskets of goods to selected IDP and host community beneficiary families
- **Basket relevancy** – Advise on the usefulness of IOM's food and non-food items basket of goods as it relates to the vulnerable IDP and host community families.

The external monitoring and evaluation proved very useful, as it provided IOM a means to crosscheck the information provided by the partners in their monthly reports. The results and recommendations were summarized in the company's final report.

- (2) In addition to external monitoring and evaluation, IOM national staff on the ground in Iraq closely followed the entire process in Babylon, Wassit and Karbala.
- (3) Finally, IOM international staff was able to visit the warehouse in Erbil run by one of the partners, observe packaging and loading of items, attend the distribution in the district of Sheikhan in Ninewa and interview some of the beneficiaries. A sample of the locally procured, distributed items was brought to Amman for external auditors of IOM to demonstrate the food items and non-food items procured and distributed with CERF funding by IOM partners.

#### **(f) How did other initiatives complement the CERF-funded projects?**

The IOM fundraising strategy for 2007 was affected adversely by the reduction of the emergency response funds through traditional donors. This was the situation by December 2006 and that the IOM pipeline was drastically constricted. The CERF fund helped bridge this gap and IOM has been able to provide the much needed assistance to affected communities, especially in the five targeted governorates.

## **IV. Lessons learned**

### **Teamwork**

Due to the security situation in Iraq, any information, especially contact information, is shared carefully. Despite the fact that IOM normally retains anonymity when it comes to details about its implementing partners, an open mailing list was created of all CERF partners and the external monitoring and

evaluation company, so that general correspondence was shared with everyone. NGOs have also used this list to share with their colleagues updates about their activities, tips, ideas and alert reports. This created a sense of teamwork, which in the current Iraqi setting, when NGOs are spread across Iraq and beyond its borders and information is closely guarded, was very important for strengthening the working relationship between IOM, the monitoring and evaluation monitors and the implementing partners. The sense of teamwork was strengthened further by a three-day seminar for IOM partners implementing the CERF distributions. The workshop was held in Erbil, Iraq in June 2007. All participants appreciated the opportunity to discuss implementation challenges in person and visit the warehouse of one of their fellow colleagues based in Erbil.

### **Guidance from IOM regarding beneficiary selection**

IOM provided the partners with the Cluster F vulnerability criteria. All partners incorporated the criteria into their beneficiary selection according to their capacity, time availability and the security situation in the governorate. Both the IOM partners, through the coordination meeting in Erbil, as well as the monitoring and evaluation company in their final report, recommended that IOM offered more guidance in beneficiary selection. Therefore, as a directly lesson learned during the CERF intervention, IOM designed a simple vulnerability criteria for the selection of beneficiaries of food and non-food items. These criteria have since been translated into Arabic, and are being actively used by all current IOM implementing partners across Iraq.

### **Composition of the food/non-food items basket**

The composition of the food items basket was similar to the composition of the traditional Public Distribution System (PDS) ration. However, it became clear that in the future, it is better to exclude some of the items, such as salt, decrease the amounts of other items, such as flour, and to include other demanded items, such as chick peas. The same applies for non-food items; IOM learned that it would have been better to exclude items, such as the toilet paper, decrease the amounts of other items, such as the shampoo but include more of other items, such as soap. All these suggestions have been taken into consideration, and have influenced the composition of the food and non-food basket ever since. Above all, however, IOM retains flexibility in composing the food and non-food items basket according to the season, circumstances in which the target beneficiaries live, as well as security.

## V. Results

Sector/ Cluster	CERF projects per sector (Add project nr and title)	Amount disbursed (\$)	Number of Beneficiaries (by sex/age)	Implementing Partners	Expected Results/Outcomes	Actual results and improvements for the target beneficiaries
Shelter and Non-food items	<b>07-IOM -006 “Immediate Humanitarian Relief to IDPs and Host Communities”</b>	\$1,770,989.62	15,000 IDP and host community families (90,000 individuals) *no data available by sex/ age	Due to the security concerns, IOM does not reveal the names of its implementing partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Selected 15,000 vulnerable IDPs and host community families receive household support in the form of essential non-food items in five governorates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 17,925 IDPs and host community families in total were assisted with non-food items. This is an increase of 2,295 families (15.3 percent). Given an average of six individuals per family, a total of 103,770 individuals were assisted with non-food items.</li> </ul>
Food	<b>07-IOM -006 “Immediate Humanitarian Relief to IDPs and Host Communities”</b>	\$ 1,762,369.38	15,000 IDP and host community families (90,000 individuals) *no data available by sex/ age	Due to the security concerns, IOM does not reveal the names of its implementing partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Selected 15,000 vulnerable IDPs and host community families have increased access to food in five governorates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 17,925 IDPs and host community families in total were assisted with a one-month food ration for a family of 6. This is an increase of 2,295 families (15.3 percent). Given an average of six individuals per family, a total of 103,770 individuals were assisted with foods.</li> </ul>

## CERF IN ACTION:

Firas (not his real name), his wife and their nine children (seven boys and two girls) lived in Baqouba, Diyala. They had a house and Firas had a job. Despite the turmoil in the country, their life was going reasonably well until April 2007. Following the threats his family received, they quickly left their home in search for a safer place to live. With meagre savings on their hand, they came to a town in one of the governorates south of Diyala. A tent camp was being set up by the Ministry of Displacement and Migration on the location of a former playground. Being a large family, they received two tents to settle down in.

At the time when IOM's partner found them, they have been displaced for one month. With no access to the government-provided food ration, with no furniture and little recourse to buy either of them, the distributed food parcel composed of flour, rice, beans, lentils, tomato paste, sugar, tea and oil and the household items such as a basic hygiene kit, kitchen set, cooking stove, water thermos, blankets, jerry cans and water buckets came at the right time. It covered the family's food needs for over one month and improved the living conditions inside the tents.

At the time of the distribution, Firas' family was still facing uncertain future; with no job, no documents, no resources to rent a decent living place and no prospects to return to Diyala, one of the most dangerous and unstable provinces in all Iraq, the upcoming months looked dim. However, Firas was grateful for the emergency assistance he received as he was starting his new life in his new home.



*Firas' family in front of their tent in Wassit*

*(Photo: IOM partner)*



*Vulnerability assessment/interview with Firas*