



**Shelter Cluster Iraq**  
ShelterCluster.org  
Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter

JULY 25, 2019

# CONSIDERATIONS ON TRANSITIONING AWAY FROM EMERGENCY SHELTER IN IDP CAMPS IN DOHUK

PREPARED BY THE SHELTER AND NFI CLUSTER IN IRAQ FOR OCHA  
DOHUK, APRIL – JULY 2019

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .....	2
Vision .....	4
Alternatives to Emergency Shelter .....	4
Upgrade of tent plots with concrete structures .....	5
Upgrade of tent plots with traditionally constructed earth blocks (adobe houses) .....	5
Caravan (prefab) installation in currently tented camps .....	6
Considerations on HLP .....	7
Budget implications .....	7
Beneficiaries will be the key factor to achieve the vision.....	8
Services .....	9
The role of the Government .....	9
Preliminary feasibility analysis of shelter options .....	10
Next steps and ways forward .....	12
Annex 1 - Camp overview .....	13
Annex 2 – HLP situation of IDP camps in Dohuk, as of December 2018.....	15
Annex 3 – Showcase: the example of Khanke IDP camp .....	16

## INTRODUCTION

As a result of the conflict with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) several thousands of civilians were displaced to Dohuk Governorate starting from June 2014. While more than four million people have returned to their areas of origin across Iraq, as of February 2019, 696,912 IDPs remain in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI). 334,014 – nearly 48 % of the IDPs in KRI are displaced within Dohuk governorate, of which 136,023 (41%) are hosted in 11 formal camps<sup>1</sup>. Additionally, there are 5 more camps under the Dahuk governorate responsibility with a population of 29,792 individuals<sup>2</sup>. The average size of the total 31,042 in-camp households is 5.3 persons. 10 of the 16 Dohuk camps were opened in 2014 or 2015 and 6 were opened during or after the Mosul Response in 2016 and 2017. In 12 camps IDPs reside in emergency shelter and 4 camps have been provided with caravans (Darkar, Dawaoudia, Mamrashan and Rwanga Community). In all camps there is a need to upgrade infrastructure and conduct regular maintenance. Many needs reported to the Shelter Cluster in Iraq have been addressed throughout the past years, however important gaps remain. Focus should be maintained on continuous maintenance of existing infrastructure, and incremental improvements to drainage, roads, WASH facilities and other camp-level infrastructures.

Dohuk governorate has the largest IDP population of all KRI governorates, predominantly of the Yazidi ethnicity. Since the beginning of 2018 the number of returns has dropped radically with almost no returns to areas of origin. At the end of May 2019, the number of IDPs in Dahuk remains at the same level of the beginning of 2018. In-camp IDP households residing in Dohuk governorate have a very low intention to return, with less than 1% reporting that they plan to return to their areas of origin in the next 12 months, as of February 2019. The respondents cited explosive hazards (48%), the absence of security services (47%) and lack of basic services in areas of origin (32%) as their primary barriers to return<sup>3</sup>. Currently, two camps (Bersive 1 and Shariya) continue to use below-standard tents which are a third smaller than those of other camps (16m<sup>2</sup>, offering approximately 3.2 m<sup>2</sup> of living space per person). Specific focus should be placed on ensuring all camps reach minimum standards and existing infrastructure is maintained and improved to deal with the climatic conditions.

All camps have formal camp management through the Board of Relief and Humanitarian Affairs (BRHA) – an implementing partner of UNHCR. At the time of camp opening shelters have been provided by UNHCR, Ministry of Migration and Displacement (MoMD) or the Turkish Development Agency (AFAD) and this is why some camps are referred in short as “UNHCR, MoMD or AFAD” camps. However, beyond construction and tent replacement services are provided by BRHA/Local authorities or the humanitarian community and coordinated through BRHA and the respective Clusters.

---

1 Based on CCCM Camp Master List and Population Flow, June 2019. Camp names (population in HHs): Bajet Kandala (2,043), Bersive 1 (1,471), Bersive 2 (1,744), Chamishku (5,045), Darkar (727), Dawoudia (628), Kabarto 1 (2,577), Kabarto 2 (2,638), Khanke (2,818), Rwanga Community (2,625), and Shariya (3,091).

2 Based on CCCM Camp Master List and Population Flow, June 2019. Camp names (population in HHs): Essian (2,766), Garmawa (78), Mamilian (204), Mamrashan (1,742) and Sheikhan (845).

3 Intentions Survey IV, REACH, February 2019

Across KRI there are many types of shelter (for a full list of camps and type of shelter, see Annex I):

1. UNHCR tents (Bajet Kandala, Bersive 2, Garmawa, and Khanke)
2. MoMD tents (Chamishku, Essian, Kabarto 1 & 2, Sheikhan and Mamilian)
3. AFAD tents (Bersive 1 and Shariya)
4. Caravans (Darkar, Dawudiya, Mamrashan and Rwanga Community)
5. Communal tents (Bajet Kandala)

UNHCR tents are regularly based on their wear and tear, and are at standard across UNHCR-constructed camps. On the other hand, in 5 out of the 6 MoMD camps, tents have not been replaced for more than 24 months, leaving a major gap. Tents in Mamilian were only provided with a second cover in November 2018 by a Partner. In Dohuk camps only, it is estimated that 978 MoMD tents<sup>4</sup> are in urgent need of replacement, as their status does not meet anymore the adequacy of shelter that IDPs should be able to enjoy. However, acknowledging that the needs might be higher, the Shelter Cluster in Iraq continues to advocate with MoMD to replace tents on a needs basis. In 2019, BRHA has submitted a formal request to MoMD for the procurement and delivery of 14,500 tents, which will cover blanket replacement for all 5 MoMD camps. This option is costed below.

In consideration of protracted nature of the displacement to Dahuk Governorate and the expressed intention of most IDPs to remain in their displacement area, the Inter Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG) in Dohuk, in collaboration with the Board of Relief and Humanitarian Affairs (BRHA), have started exploring alternative approaches in which humanitarian, emergency-oriented response and longer-term solutions can be combined through three to five-year strategy.

After initial consultation with BRHA, one ICCG brainstorming session conducted on 10 October 2018 and a joint ICCG-BRHA meeting on 17 October 2018, it was agreed to formulate a new mid-term vision of the humanitarian response in Dahuk in consideration of:

- Most IDPs have the intention to stay in Dahuk in the coming months;
- The need to get out from emergency response approach;
- The need to improve the living conditions of the IDPs;
- Identification of synergy between humanitarian response and development interventions through merging services for the IDPs and the hosting communities.

---

<sup>4</sup> Chamishku (43), Kabarto 1 (250), Mamilian (205) and Essian (480). FSMT data – June 2019

## VISION

**Where feasible, transition out of emergency shelter in IDP camps in order to achieve better living conditions, contributing to improved dignity, safety, protection from climatic conditions, and ultimately to the broad protection outcomes.**

In order to achieve this vision, three main factors that may represent a barrier should be analysed:

1. Political concerns around allowing large numbers of people to remain in their current place of displacement
2. Land tenure and HLP issues
3. Financial requirements

The political factor is complex and best explored carefully from a number of angles, including the central government's directives. Forcing fast decision-making processes may hinder the acceptance of local authorities vis-a-vis proposed solutions, including discontent from the host community. Also, the opinion of beneficiaries shall be taken into close consideration. As such, in-depth consultations are key factor to ensure that all stakeholders will move with the same vision. Implementing scalable pilot projects may be the way forward, so as to explore pros and cons of potential solutions.

Land tenure is another main factor that can contribute to or hinder the achievement of the vision. The current situation of land tenure of camps is summarised in Annex 2. The transition from mulk (private property) to miri (governmental property) would normally be attached to the political decision. It should be noted that, at the moment, official building rights are not granted, thus limiting the technical choices for upgrading shelters. Changing this approach may likely happen first on government-owned land (miri). In Dohuk, only two camps (Chamishku and Shekhan) are fully under miri.

Finally, the financial requirements of certain shelter options could be prohibitively expensive for humanitarian actors. Upgrading emergency shelter may be considered a program that falls under the stabilization effort, thus not attracting humanitarian donors. However this factor could be offset by presenting available options to IDPs to undertake the upgrade works by themselves.

Running a feasibility study on different construction options has been recommended, so as to identify the one that would best contribute to achieving the vision on the table. Having all options included will ensure an unbiased approach to the selection of the best solution and looking beyond the above-mentioned factors.

## ALTERNATIVES TO EMERGENCY SHELTER

Tents are an emergency solution used by default to respond to immediate shelter needs of people fleeing violence, or when affected by natural disasters. When installed in camps, tents can offer minimum living conditions in terms of safety, dignity, protection from harsh weather and thermal comfort. The material they are made of (canvas coated with waterproof materials) will naturally be subject to wear and tear caused by prolonged exposure to climatic conditions such as rain, snow, humidity, UV light such as sunshine, and significant temperature changes, as between summer and winter and day and night. Thus, a timely replacement of tents is extremely important to maintain living conditions up to standard.

If the displacement is prolonged, as is the case in Iraq, moving toward more durable solutions should be considered. This is not only driven by economic and logistical factors (on average tents need replacement every year, implying a continuous involvement of humanitarian actors), but also to provide better living spaces to displaced people. The latter is particularly related to cultural considerations, where the Iraqi people were not used to live in such temporary structures before the conflict.

Various examples of alternatives to tents have been adopted across the world, with various outcomes. In Iraq, due to the sheer size of the displacement there has been no uniform approach (e.g. Khanke camp: see Annex 3 or caravanned camps). Based on the local context and knowledge, the Shelter Cluster has identified few alternatives to emergency tents: upgrading plots with walls, construction of concrete or adobe shelters or installing caravans.

#### UPGRADE OF TENT PLOTS WITH CONCRETE STRUCTURES

Walls could be fully or partially raised with concrete blocks to a normal ceiling height (around 2.1 meters). The roofing structure could be supported by wooden or metallic poles and covered with the used tents, plastic sheets, corrugated iron sheets, sandwich panels, or traditional compacted earth. Such structure would provide appropriate living conditions, offering better solidity, more appropriate space, and stronger protection from weather conditions, thus achieving an overall improved dignity.

The durability is comparable to the one of a “regular” house.

The implementation time to construct such upgraded shelter is estimated at 10-14 days.

The cost is estimated to be around 1,700 USD for a surface of 27 m<sup>2</sup>.

Masonry skills are required, yet this is widely available among camp population as well as the host community. That would allow some limited, temporary livelihood opportunities as well as capacity building of skills for the displaced and host population.

Such structures may raise HLP concerns due to their perceived durability, as well as a challenge if and when the camp is decommissioned. On the other hand, decommissioned concrete blocks from structures can be dismantled and reused by local authorities and communities for other purposes.

#### UPGRADE OF TENT PLOTS WITH TRADITIONALLY CONSTRUCTED EARTH BLOCKS (ADOBE HOUSES)

These improved shelters seem to provide appropriate living conditions, with only minimal maintenance required. In one field visit to Khanke camp, it was observed that the roofing structure was on steel beams (see Annex 3 for more details). This proves the fact that the bearing load of such walls is quite high. Similar to the concrete structure described above, an adobe (mudbrick) structure would provide appropriate living conditions, offering better solidity, more space, and stronger protection from weather conditions and thus achieving an overall improved dignity. In comparison to the shelters built with concrete blocks, thermal comfort seems to be either comparable or even better for adobe shelters.

The durability is good if regular maintenance is performed, especially for the external plastering that needs retouch once to twice a year using the same mix of clay and hay used for the bricks production.

The implementation time to construct such upgraded shelter is estimated to 3 weeks.

The cost may be around 300 USD for a surface of 27 m<sup>2</sup>.

Masonry skills are required, yet this is available among camp population as well as the host community. That would allow some limited, temporary livelihood opportunities and capacity building.

HLP concerns are far less pressing since their durability is less, and would not pose any challenge in case of decommissioning. The earth structure approach has been explored with BRHA as this is a transitional, less-durable option which escapes the clause of building rights, however it has been confirmed by BRHA that this option would still require political will and sign off to be achieved.

### CARAVAN (PREFAB) INSTALLATION IN CURRENTLY TENTED CAMPS

Caravans and prefabs of different sizes and suppliers are used across Iraq, including in camps. The caravans currently generally in use are 9mX3m and consist of two rooms, a kitchen, a bathroom and a water heating system (e.g. Mamrashan camp) or 6mX3m for camps with existing facilities (constructed kitchens, latrines and showers). The lifespan is between 2 and 5 years, depending on the manufacturer and the maintenance during exploitation. Compared to tents, caravans provide much better insulation and protection from climatic conditions and provide better security since having lockable doors and windows, improving privacy and a sense of safety. Caravans will continue to require maintenance and repairs (especially roof and floors) and eventually will need to be replaced.

As of June 2019<sup>5</sup>, there are 24,000 occupied tents in the 16 camps under BRHA management, including 6,000 tents replaced at the end of 2018 (Sheikhan) or to be replaced in 2019 (Bersive 1 and Shariya camps). The procurement and transportation costs for caravans are significant, compared to other shelter options and are unmanageable for humanitarian actors and current levels of funding. Currently, existing caravans in camps have been provided by the government or other private donors.

Funding from humanitarian actors for such shelter option will not be feasible, as their investment costs for a shelter type that still needs maintenance and replacement does not offer cost efficiency compared to other self-driven shelter types (e.g. mud or concrete block houses). Depending on the manufacturer, the procurement cost is 180-200 USD per square meter, with additional cost for transportation between USD 100 and USD 250 per caravan, depending on the size and distance. The most conservative estimate per a 9mX3m caravan (with transport) will be USD 4,960. Tented camps with a small population could be converted first and gradually expand to bigger and more populous camps, however a full intervention to cover the area will cost around 120 million dollars. This financial

---

<sup>5</sup> CCCM Camp master List and Population Flow, June 2019.

requirement does not include the continuous need for maintenance and repairs that caravans require, as well as the fact that replacement will still be needed after their lifespan is over. Additional cost for the caravans with kitchen and latrine equipped is the infrastructure required to connect the caravans to existing sewage and water networks or the need to establish new ones.

It should be noted that self-installation of electrical connections by IDPs or faulty wiring is a common issue in camps with prefabs and can present significant fire risks. In January 2019, 14 caravans in Harshm camp in Erbil burned down completely as a result of electrical fault in one of the caravans. Proper fire breaks are crucial, especially for those caravan types with internal kitchens, and should be equal or the height of the caravan installed to at minimum (minimum 2.5m). Therefore, caravans do not offer a better fire risk prevention than currently used tents.

## CONSIDERATIONS ON HLP

As highlighted above, considerations around HLP rights and related issues is one of the crucial factors to choose which upgrade among the ones presented above is the best-fit solution.

First of all, protection risks may emerge when an unofficial housing market is created, putting the most vulnerable at greater risk of various forms of exploitation. This is a wide-spread yet underestimated and not-well-known phenomenon happening across the world - even at first stages of an emergency situation - that should be carefully monitored throughout.

Moreover, the government shall clarify which rights beneficiaries will acquire on the transitional shelter, and on the land these are constructed on. That means the length/duration of use as well as the free versus fee-based use.

Thirdly, the government shall clarify any implication on HLP rights beneficiaries may have in their area of origin/elsewhere. The Iraqi law no. 20 envisages compensation schemes for those who have sustained losses as a consequence of war. IDPs currently living in camps may have properties heavily damaged by the conflict, and could be entitled to file a compensation claim. This should remain a right for them, irrespective of the fact that they are allowed to improve the shelter in their current displacement location. For those who have no property to claim back in areas of origin, should be explained which rights they may or may not acquire in areas of displacement.

The Shelter Cluster in Iraq will seek further guidance from the HLP AoR on the possible HPL implications of any chosen solution.

## BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Budget implications in the selection of the different shelter type may be significant. However the self-build capacity of the population, both in terms of skills required as well as their access to some sort of income to bear the costs, should not be underestimated and instead considered one of the main driving factors. The role of the humanitarian community could be the technical support to IDPs to achieve the vision rather than shouldering the total cost burden. Overall it should be remembered that:



- IDPs have lived under emergency conditions for four years and improving their shelter would contribute to the broad protection outcomes.
- If tents are maintained, continuous support from humanitarian actors will be expected but not guaranteed. Only for 2019, the budget implications to replace 978 MoMD tents which lifespan has long expired<sup>6</sup> stands at 371,640 USD. In the case of blanket replacement, MoMD will need to provide 14,500 tents, as requested by BRHA, for the value of USD 5.5 million. This does not include the regular contribution from UNHCR that has been replacing tents with their own funds, Iraq Humanitarian Fund support for the replacement of AFAD tents, or additional damages that might arise due to floods and UV exposure in the summer months.

## BENEFICIARIES WILL BE THE KEY FACTOR TO ACHIEVE THE VISION

In order to achieve the vision, all stakeholders need to be consulted. IDPs benefitting from transitioning out of emergency shelter should be widely involved before any approach be chosen, as their contribution will be the key factor in the feasibility of the program. A self-driven approach seems to be the most adequate approach. That will allow beneficiaries to meet their shelter needs in a flexible yet regulated manner, thus the challenges they may face are important factors to take into consideration. First and foremost, achieving shelter outcomes cannot expose them to protection risks (e.g. Gender-Based Violence and Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, as consequence of socio-economic vulnerability or belonging to specific ethnic or religious group). Therefore the level of their self-reliance should be well understood. Access to construction market, affordability of the identified shelter, understanding of HLP rights as well as of what can and cannot be done (e.g. they cannot use concrete blocks if they are allowed to construct with earth blocks, or expand the plot area), are essential elements that should be discussed with the whole population, taking into consideration the perspective of: women, youth, elderly, persons with specific needs, minorities, etc.

Vulnerable cases that would not be able to implement the self-upgrade would require special assistance, likely from humanitarian actors but also the government. The identification of such cases should be made carefully, so as to ensure that only genuine cases receive the needed support. The host community should also be consulted, so as not to create tensions around a perception of assisting only one population group. Ideally, needs around shared resources and services (e.g. water, wastewater, solid waste and electricity) should be addressed so as to create a more favourable environment. Consultations with beneficiaries are highly dependent on the political decision taken by the authorities in KRI as feasible, before they are presented to the beneficiaries.

---

<sup>6</sup> Based on FSMT data, April 2019

## SERVICES

Shelter aspects cannot be dissociated from the services they require, in order to meet additional people' living needs, e.g. access to water, sanitation, solid waste management, electricity, access roads, just to mention the ones purely related to infrastructure. Other important ones would be: access to markets, livelihood opportunities, and health and education facilities. In the discussion on shelter improvement, these elements should also be taken into consideration and the beneficiaries asked where they see their priorities, so as to meet their needs in the most appropriate manner.

A careful consideration around costs to connect communal services should be made. While the government may be generous in granting some HLP rights to IDPs, costs related to infrastructures may be extremely high, discouraging connectivity unless there are promises to maintain funding level. As such, provision of services' maintenance so far covered by the humanitarian community needs to find a relevant actor.

It has to be reminded that current IDP camps may transform into proper human settlements, but the risk is to turn those into slums if appropriate inter-sectorial upgrade is not provided. For the latter, it is likely that stabilization programs are needed to complement the self-upgrade of shelter. When returns become possible and the beneficiaries are willing to return to their areas of origin, the existing camp infrastructure might be used by government authorities and local populations as they see fit and to the benefit of the wider host communities.

## THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Government of Iraq has officially declared the defeat of ISIL and the consequent end of the active conflict in December, 2017. Yet many widespread issues continue to exist, ranging from security threats to exclusion from many rights for certain groups, such as the ones with perceived affiliation to extremist groups. Many Iraqis are still very much reliant on humanitarian support to cope with the current difficulties, also related to poverty, lack of livelihood, loss of properties and assets, depleted resources, etc. In the case of IDP camps, the government has provided support to a certain extent but without consistent, predictable commitment over the years. It will be crucial to understand which governmental support will be provided, also bearing in mind that Iraq is a developed, very resources-rich country and the humanitarian relevance and legitimacy is decreasing in a post-conflict situation. Humanitarian funding is declining annually, as well as individual agencies' budgets which are being diverted by new emergencies around the globe. It is worth noting that as of June 2019, the 2019 Iraq Humanitarian Response Plan, which requested a little over USD 700 million for IDPs, is funded at 30%<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> FTS data as of June, 2019

**PRELIMINARY FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS OF SHELTER OPTIONS**

Shelter Type	Unit Cost (USD)*	Implementation Modality	Environmental Considerations	Site Adjustment	Durability/ Lifespan	Sourcing	Considerations/ Comments	Beneficiary Preference
<b>1. Adobe bricks (mud) constructed shelter</b>	300	Self-constructed	<p>Environment friendly;</p> <p>If unused will collapse and disintegrate with time;</p> <p>Earth should be sourced from an approved quarry</p>	Walls extended on top of the existing concrete base, following the footprint of the tent	Can last years with regular maintenance (plastering) after every rainy season.	Beneficiaries with technical support and local expertise.	<p>Takes relatively short (2-3 weeks min) time to construct.</p> <p>Requires preparation (producing the bricks).</p> <p>Regular maintenance (twice a year) needed.</p> <p>Better insulation than other options.</p>	<p>Further consultations with beneficiaries to be conducted.</p> <p>From direct observation of limited cases, majority of beneficiaries living in such type of shelters are satisfied.</p>
<b>2. Concrete blocks constructed shelter</b>	1,700	Self-constructed	<p>No significant impact on the environment;</p> <p>Concrete blocks are durable but can be reused for other purposes.</p> <p>Building material is available and can be purchased locally (concrete blocks, cement, sand, steel frame and sandwich panels)</p>	Walls extended on top of the existing concrete base, following the footprint of the tent	Can last years with minimal maintenance required.	Beneficiaries with technical support and local expertise.	<p>Takes short time to construct (7-10 days).</p> <p>Easier to source the concrete blocks.</p> <p>No major maintenance needed.</p>	Same as above.

<p><b>3. Caravan/ Prefab (9mX3m)</b></p>	<p>4,960</p>	<p>Supplied/ purchased</p>	<p>Parts and materials can be scrapped or reused;  Whole caravan can be moved and reused in other locations, although this will carry extra costs;</p>	<p>Can be placed on existing concrete based or elevated on concrete blocks.  For pre-existing 3-row walls, 2 rows can be removed easily, blocks to be used for other purposes.</p>	<p>2-5 years lifespan, depending on use and maintenance.</p>	<p>No humanitarian funding available. Other funding needed.</p>	<p>Easy to source locally. No major preparation required, considering the base type. Transport and logistical support required and challenging in crowded camps settings. If beneficiary-owned, it can be reused.</p>	<p>Further consultations with beneficiaries to be conducted.</p>
--	--------------	--------------------------------	--	--	--	---	---	--

- Indicative prices based on the best knowledge of the Shelter and NFI Cluster as of June, 2019. Variations are not excluded, based on availability of materials, site conditions, etc.

## NEXT STEPS AND WAYS FORWARD

The following steps are suggested:

1. Discuss this document with ICCG at Dohuk and national level and partners in Dohuk.
2. Present this document to the local authorities in Dohuk, seek their approval on the general content and ask clarification on:
  - HLP rights
  - Political will for multiple shelter improvement options
  - Suggestion for a pilot project in one identified site.
  - Discussions on the role of the government in the next steps.
3. Identify which enabling factors should be met in one site, in order to move toward an improved shelter solution. Some could be: safety of the site (e.g. non flood-prone), residents with low intention to return, acceptance from host community, camp located on public land, willingness of the government to grant temporary building rights on that site, access to other services (e.g. market, livelihood, water, sanitation, electricity, health and education facilities).
4. Identify a camp where shelter plots improvement could happen.
5. Engage in wide consultation with camp population and host community to present the available options, including priority services and inter-sectoral considerations.
6. Analyse any shortcoming in the self-upgrade option chosen, e.g.: access to construction market, people able to access some form of income, identification of vulnerable cases that will require external support.
7. Once solutions to above shortcomings are identified, pilot the project.
8. Engage with stabilization actors to ask for commitment in supporting parallel upgrading of below-standard services.

## ANNEX 1 - CAMP OVERVIEW

As per CCCM Cluster data, below are the population figures in Dohuk Governorate, as of March, 2019 combined with the latest Intention Survey data as of February 2019.

Camp name	# individuals	# families	Unoccupied plots	Shelter type	Average family size <sup>8</sup>	Meeting minimum standards <sup>9</sup>	Intention to remain (next 12 months)
Bajed Kandala	10,579	2,043	-	UNHCR& Communal tents	5.2	Yes	90%
Bersive 1	7,852	1,471	603	AFAD	5.4	No	91%
Bersive 2	8,937	1,744	1	UNHCR	5.5	Yes	87%
Chamishku	27,029	5,045	0	MoMD	5.5	Yes	93%
Darkar	3,960	727	-	Caravan	5.5	Yes	87%
Dawudiya	3,241	628	0	Caravan	5.2	Yes	87%
Essian	14,998	2,766	-	MoMD	5.4		89%
Garmawa	444	78	1,084	UNHCR	5.7		84%
Kabarto 1	13,529	2,577	-	MoMD	5.1	Yes	82%
Kabarto 2	13,753	2,638	0	MoMD	5.3	Yes	82%

<sup>8</sup> Average size is calculated based on the latest families vs. individuals data, June 2019

<sup>9</sup> Shelter standard is calculated as the living space of the shelter type divided by the average family size for each camp. The emergency shelter standard for covered living area, as per Sphere Handbook is 3.5m<sup>2</sup> per person.

Khanke	16,237	2,818	-	UNHCR + brick walls	5.8	Yes	86%
Mamilian	1,034	204	2,581	MoMD	5.4	Yes	99%
Mamrashan	8,881	1,742	-	Caravan	5.1		96%
Rwanga Community	14,260	2,625	-2	Caravan	5.5	Yes	88%
Shariya	16,646	3,091	25	AFAD	5.4	No	86%
Sheikhan	4,435	845	0	MoMD	5.3	Yes	79%
<b>Total</b>	<b>165,815</b>	<b>31,042</b>	<b>4,269</b>				

**ANNEX 2 – HLP SITUATION OF IDP CAMPS IN DOHUK, AS OF DECEMBER 2018**

Camps	Status (*)	Notes	HLP considerations
Bajed Kandala	Mulk	Rent paid by government to owner each year, no building rights	
Bersive 1&2	Mulk	Rent paid by government to owner each year, no building rights	
Chamishku	Miri	No rent paid, no building rights	
Darkar	Mulk	Rent paid by government to owner each year, no building rights	
Dawudiya	Mulk	Rent paid by government to owner each year, no building rights	
Kabarto 1&2	Mulk	Rent paid by government to owner each year, no building rights	
Khanke	Mulk (200 donm) + Miri (110 donm)	Part of camp land is Mulk and other part is Miri, therefore rent paid by government to owner each year only for 200 donm, no building rights for all	
Rwanga Community	Mulk	Rent paid by government to owner each year, no building rights	
Shariya	Mulk (120 donm) + Miri (104 donm)	Part of camp land is Mulk and other part is Miri, therefore rent paid by government to owner each year only for 104 donm, no building rights for all	
Mamilian	Mulk	Rent paid by government to owner each year, no building rights	

(\*) Mulk indicates private property. Miri indicates Government property



## ANNEX 3 – SHOWCASE: THE EXAMPLE OF KHANKE IDP CAMP

In Khanke IDP camp, the resident population was exceptionally not prevented from upgrading their shelter, thus offering some interesting solutions. People raised the existing tent bases up to different heights. Several solutions for the roof and the walls have been implemented.

### **For the roof:**

- Option 1.** Wall approx. 1m high with a UNHCR tent stretched over it;
- Option 2.** Wall head height with a metal frame installed and tarps over the top;
- Option 3.** Wall beyond head height, a full door frame including top mantel, wooden beams and a sloped metal roof or sandwich panels.

**Option 1** does not move far from the existing situation and doesn't represent a more durable solution, since the tent shall be changed once its lifespan has passed and does not offer anymore the needed protection from climatic conditions.



Abultimman @UNHCR 2019

**Option 2** has an excellent roof and is well constructed locally, although it also needs periodic replacement of the plastic sheets used as roof.



Abultimman @UNHCR 2019

**Option 3** seems to offer a better protection compared to the first two, thanks to a more solid roof and door.





Abultimman @UNHCR 2019

When the Shelter Cluster visited the camp in December 2018, the few beneficiaries interviewed expressed their preference for the walls overhead height and a full door with frame plus a traditional roof made from earth.

**For the walls:**

1. Walls constructed with concrete blocks
2. Walls constructed with earth blocks (or traditional adobe bricks)

Option 1 and 2 both offer better living conditions compared to the tent.

As the plot is already existing it could be possible to argue that it is not an issue to extend the walls up and add a local roofing solution. Ultimately this does not increase the shelter size, however it does significantly improve the

living conditions. BRHA expressed some concerns around people selling adjoining plots and families then joining plots together, slowly claiming all the land. On the two visits performed by the SNFI Cluster in December 2018 and March 2019, this situation was not observed. Instead, some extended families, residing in neighbouring shelters have covered the common areas and the space between the shelters and adjoined the two small kitchen units (constructed back-to-back) to form a larger one, where the families can gather, prepare food and store NFIs. The covering of the space between and in front of shelters should be considered carefully and the population should be provided with relevant communication on fire risks and prevention, fire breaks rules and reasons behind them.