

# RETURN INDEX

## FINDINGS ROUND FOUR – IRAQ JULY 2019

### HIGHLIGHTS

#### RETURNEE POPULATION LIVING IN SEVERE CONDITIONS

- **Variation since Round 3 (March 2019):** An increase in the number of returnees living in severe or poor conditions has been observed. Of the 1,564 assessed return locations, 286 hosting 514,644 individuals (i.e. 12% of the returnee population), present severe conditions. This represents an additional 42,294 individuals since the previous round, when 11 per cent (472,350 individuals) were living in such conditions across 279 locations. The highest increases were observed in Baghdad and Anbar governorates, where an additional 8,136 and 72,456 individuals, respectively, were found to be living in severe conditions.
- **At the national level:** Ninewa and Salah al-Din remain the governorates hosting the highest number of returnees living in severe conditions, with 177,408 and 185,502 individuals respectively.
- **At the governorate level:** When looking within governorates, Salah al-Din hosts the highest proportion of returnees living in severe conditions (30%), along with Diyala (23%).

#### MOST SEVERE LOCATIONS OF RETURN

- Forty-two locations hosting 33,234 returnees, were identified as having the most severe return conditions. This is a slight decrease compared to Round 3 (35,748 individuals across 44 locations with the most severe return conditions).
- The top five of these locations remain in Tooz District in Salah al-Din Governorate, home to 5,585 returnees.

#### GOVERNORATE HOTSPOTS OF SEVERITY

- Using a combination of score severity on at least one of the scales and the number of families living in the area, 32 hotspots were identified across six governorates.
- Some notable variations include a worsening situation in a hotspot of Anbar (Al-Saqlawiah in Fallujah District) as well as the addition of a new hotspot in Baghdad (Meshahda in Tarmia District). Three of the hotspots, Markaz Telafar and Ayadiya in Telafar District (Ninewa) and Markaz Baiji in Salah al-Din, while still presenting very poor conditions of return, appeared to have slightly improved since the last round.

##### NINEWA

- Markaz Sinjar
- Qaeyrrawan
- Al-Shamal
- Markaz Telafar
- Zummar
- Hamam al-Aleel
- Al-Shura
- Al-Qahtaniya
- Markaz Al-Ba'aj
- Markaz Hatra
- Ayadiya

##### SALAH AL-DIN

- Yathreb
- Markaz Tooz
- Al-Amerli
- Suleiman Beg
- Markaz Baiji
- Markaz Samarra
- Markaz Al-Shirqat
- Markaz Tikrit

##### ANBAR

- Al-Rummaneh
- Markaz Al-Ka'im
- Markaz Al-Rutba
- Al-Saqlawiyah
- Al-Garma

##### DIYALA

- Markaz Al-Muqdadadiya
- Jalula
- As-Saadiya



##### KIRKUK

- Al-Riyad
- Al-Abassy

##### BAGHDAD

- Al-Nasir Walsalam
- Al-Latifya
- Meshahda

Figure 1. Proportion of returnees by category of severity



Data collected March - April 2019

## INTRODUCTION

Data collection for the Return Index Round 4 took place during the months of March and April 2019 across eight governorates, 38 districts and 1,564 locations in Iraq. Since the previous round (collected in January–February 2019), the number of returnees has continued to increase and as of 30 April 2019, an additional 21,954 returnees were identified, reaching a total of 4,210,734 returnees (701,789 families). During Round 4, an additional 17 locations of return were assessed.

This report presents a comparative analysis between rounds 3 and 4 focusing on changes in:

1. the number of returnees living in severe conditions at governorate and district levels – on the overall severity index and both scales;
2. the list of locations with the highest severity;
3. return conditions within hotspots identified at subdistrict level for each governorate.

## METHODOLOGY

The Return Index is built on a list of indicators developed in consultation with relevant partners and stakeholders to reflect the displacement context in Iraq. To measure the severity of conditions in each location of return, the Return Index is based on 16 indicators grouped into two scales: Scale 1, on livelihoods and basic services, and Scale 2, centered around social cohesion and safety perceptions. A regression model is used to assess the impact of each of the indicators in facilitating or preventing returns and to calculate scores for two scales. For example, the model tests how much less likely a location where no agricultural activities are back to normal is to have returns compared to a location where this is not the case. To compute an overall severity index, the scores of two scales are combined.

The index goes from 0 (all essential conditions for return are met) to 100 (no essential conditions for return are met). Higher scores denote more severe living conditions for returnees. The scores of the severity index are grouped into three categories: 'low', 'medium', and 'high' (which also includes 'very high').<sup>1</sup>

In this fourth round of the Return Index, the questions on recovery of big and small businesses were combined into one question that includes both categories: large private sector employers such as factories or big companies and small businesses such as grocery stores, bakeries, barbershops/hairdressers and restaurants with a small number of employees or without employees. In addition, some occupations can also operate as small businesses, such as carpenters, electricians, farmers, lawyers, accountants and dentists.

Table 1: Indicator list for each scale

SCALE 1: LIVELIHOODS AND BASIC SERVICES	SCALE 2: SAFETY AND SOCIAL COHESION
Residential destruction	Community reconciliation
Employment access	Multiple security actors
Water sufficiency	Blocked returns
Recovery of agriculture	Checkpoints controlled by other security actors
Electricity sufficiency	Daily public life
Recovery of businesses	Illegal occupation of private residences
Access to basic services	Mines
Reincorporation of government employees	Sources of violence
SCALE 1 SCORE = 100	SCALE 2 SCORE = 100
OVERALL SEVERITY INDEX = AVERAGE OF SCALE 1 AND SCALE 2 SCORES	

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to the Round 1 and Round 3 reports for more details on the methodology.

## CATEGORIZING QUALITY OF RETURNS

### OVERALL SEVERITY

An increase in the number of returnees living in severe conditions has been observed in comparison with the previous Report Round 3 published in March 2019. Out of the 1,564 return locations assessed, 286 present severe conditions hosting 12 per cent of the returnee population or 514,644 individuals.<sup>2</sup> This represents an additional 42,294 individuals since the previous round, when 11 per cent (472,350 individuals) were living in these conditions across 279 locations.

As in the previous round, Ninewa and Salah al-Din remain the governorates hosting the highest number of returnees living in severe conditions, with 177,408 and 185,502 individuals respectively. Compared to the previous round, the highest increase was observed in Anbar and Baghdad governorates, where an additional 72,456 and 8,136 individuals respectively were found to be living in severe conditions. This is mainly due to increases in the districts of Falluja in Anbar, caused by a deterioration of the situation on both scales 1 and 2 (see details below) and Mahmoudiya in Baghdad, mostly due to previously unreported house destruction.


Table 2: Number of returnees and locations per governorate by category of severity

Governorate	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL	
	No. of returnees	No. of locations	No. of returnees	No. of locations	No. of returnees	No. of locations	No. of returnees	No. of locations
Anbar	84,174	21	503,718	115	710,244	101	1,298,136	237
Baghdad	11,136	13	32,412	43	43,398	52	86,946	108
Dahuk	0	0	0	0	780	1	780	1
Diyala	52,644	44	131,304	104	39,684	63	223,632	211
Erbil	0	0	6,108	6	34,962	14	41,070	20
Kirkuk	3,780	9	124,416	105	193,662	70	321,858	184
Ninewa	177,408	145	462,306	234	983,370	235	1,623,084	614
Salah al-Din	185,502	54	359,718	106	70,008	29	615,228	189
Total	514,644	286	1,619,982	713	2,076,108	565	4,210,734	1,564

The districts hosting the largest number of returnees living in severe conditions are Falluja (80,772 individuals, 15% of returnees in 15 locations of the district) in Anbar Governorate, Telafar (71,550 individuals, 22% in 39 locations) and Sinjar (56,736 individuals, 95% in 46 locations) in Ninewa Governorate. Telafar District witnessed decreases in the number of returnees living in severe conditions since the previous round; more details can be found in the hotspot section.

Going beyond absolute figures and looking at the intra-governorate percentage of returnees living in severe conditions, Salah al-Din and Diyala occupy the top positions, with 30 per cent (185,502 individuals) and 23 per cent (52,644 individuals) respectively. This finding is significant because although the number of returnees is lower than in other governorates, the proportion of returnees living in poor conditions is significantly higher.


Figure 2: Proportion of returnees by category of severity per governorate



<sup>2</sup> In this fourth round of the Return Index, the rounding of the percentages was applied to sum up to 100 per cent.

The map below shows the conditions of severity based on the population size and severity score of each assessed location. The darker colours point to a larger concentration of families living in severe conditions of return, while the brighter colours indicate lower severity conditions or areas with low level of returns.

Map 1: Density map of all index scores



## SEVERITY SCALE ONE: LIVELIHOODS AND BASIC SERVICES

In terms of indicators relating to livelihoods and basic services, three governorates present the highest number of returnees living in severe conditions: Ninewa (109,842 individuals), Anbar (90,150) and Salah al-Din (71,172). Overall, 314,628 returnees were identified as living in locations with severe Scale 1 conditions. This represents a decrease of 17,190 returnees since

Round 3, recorded across all governorates of return except Baghdad and Anbar, both witnessed an increase in the number of returnees living in locations with severe Scale 1 conditions. Mahmoudiya District in Baghdad and Falluja District in Anbar were the most affected by these increases, mostly in relation to house destruction and employment access respectively.

Table 3: Number of returnees per governorate and category of severity for Scale 1

GOVERNORATE	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	TOTAL NUMBER OF RETURNES
Anbar	90,150	259,530	948,456	1,298,136
Baghdad	21,336	17,244	48,366	86,946
Dahuk	0	0	780	780
Diyala	15,726	159,504	48,402	223,632
Erbil	0	9,828	31,242	41,070
Kirkuk	6,402	116,406	199,050	321,858
Ninewa	109,842	316,566	1,196,676	1,623,084
Salah al-Din	71,172	179,688	364,368	615,228
Total number of returnees	314,628	1,058,766	2,837,340	4,210,734

## SEVERITY SCALE TWO: SAFETY AND SOCIAL COHESION

Based on Scale 2, 760,932 returnees were found to be living in locations with severe safety and social cohesion conditions, mostly across the governorates of Ninewa (319,050 individuals) and Salah al-Din (307,644). Unlike for Scale 1, an increase of 77,790 returnees was recorded during Round 4, mainly in Anbar (75,960 individuals), Salah al-Din (8,448 individuals) and Baghdad (1,044 individuals) governorates. Although some of this increase is attributable to the higher number of returnees

in the current round, mostly in Salah al-Din, some deterioration on Scale 2 indicators was noted. The largest increases in the number of returnees living in severe conditions were observed in Falluja and Heet districts in Anbar, mostly due to an increase in the number of armed actors and concern for harassment at checkpoints, as well as in Tarmia District in Baghdad.

Table 4. Number of returnees per governorate and category of severity for Scale 2

GOVERNORATE	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	TOTAL NUMBER OF RETURNES
Anbar	78,456	418,248	801,432	1,298,136
Baghdad	2,202	23,688	61,056	86,946
Dahuk	0	0	780	780
Diyala	53,532	139,878	30,222	223,632
Erbil	0	3,486	37,584	41,070
Kirkuk	48	90,666	231,144	321,858
Ninewa	319,050	341,490	962,544	1,623,084
Salah al-Din	307,644	240,672	66,912	615,228
Total number of returnees	760,932	1,258,128	2,191,674	4,210,734

## LOCATIONS WITH VERY HIGH SEVERITY

Forty-two locations in Iraq, hosting 33,234 returnees (1% of the total returnee population), have the most severe conditions ('very high') when all indicators are combined (see Annex 1 for full list). This proportion is comparable to Round 3, which reported 35,748 returnees across 44 locations.

Locations with the most severe conditions are spread over only four governorates and the top five of these locations are all found in Salah al-Din Governorate, specifically in Tooz District. In the current round, four new locations with the most severe conditions were identified, two in Ninewa (Hardan Sager and Hazeel Alwasti Village in Sinjar District), one in

Diyala (Arab Dhaher Village in Al-Muqdadiya District) and one in Salah al-Din (Banat Al-hassan village in Samarra District).

Six locations were removed from the list of the highest severity due to a slight improvement, four in Ninewa Governorate (Om ahjaraa Aulea village in Mosul, Al-Jazera village in Telafar, Al-Swejen and Jwar-Algharbiya in Al-Ba'aj), one in Diyala Governorate (Hembes village in Al-Muqdadiya) and Aziz Balad in Balad. A summary of the districts in which these locations are found, as well as the number of returnees living in these locations, is presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Districts hosting returnees with the most severe conditions of return ('very high')

GOVERNORATE	DISTRICT	NO. OF RETURNEES
Diyala	Al-Muqdadiya	6,900 individuals across 5 locations
	Khanaqin	1,050 individuals across 4 locations
Kirkuk	Kirkuk	48 individuals in one location
Ninewa	Al-Ba'aj	516 individuals across 3 locations
	Hatra	354 individuals in one location
	Sinjar	7,818 individuals across 15 locations
	Telafar	6,720 individuals across 6 locations
Salah al-Din	Balad	2,520 individuals in one location
	Samarra	1,722 individuals in one location
	Tooz	5,586 individuals across 5 locations
Total number of returnees in very high severity locations		33,234 individuals across 42 locations

## HOTSPOTS PER GOVERNORATES


The hotspots presented in the next section have been selected for each of governorate based on their high score on at least one of the scales, high number of families living in the area and geographic proximity. While the emphasis in this report is on the change in situation since Round 3, further details on the situation in the hotspots can be found in the Report Round 3. Additional data has been gathered for each hotspot to validate the reasons for variation (or absence of) since Round 3. In this round, a new hotspot in Tarmia District in Baghdad has been identified.

## ANBAR GOVERNORATE

Five hotspots were identified in Anbar Governorate: two in Al-Ka'im District, two in Falluja District, and one in Al-Rutba District. While no significant variation in conditions was observed for the hotspots in Al-Ka'im and Al-Rutba since Round 3, a worsening of the situation has been noted for the Fallujah hotspots. This is especially noticeable in the case of Al-Saqlawiyah, where the overall score went from medium to high. Social cohesion and security remain fragile, and key informants in virtually all locations indicated that returnees expressed concerns about the risk of mines and explosive devices, resurgence of ISIL cells, or a tense daily public life. This is compounded by a general absence of livelihoods, both in terms of agriculture and, to a lesser extent, businesses.

Table 6: Severity hotspots in Anbar Governorate

DISTRICT	SUBDISTRICT	NO. OF RETURNÉES	NO. OF LOCATIONS	OVERALL SEVERITY	SCALE 1 SEVERITY	SCALE 2 SEVERITY
Al-Ka'im	Al-Rummaneh	5,880	7	High	Medium	High
	Markaz Al-Ka'im	24,558	18	Medium	Medium	Medium
Al-Rutba	Markaz Al-Rutba	28,050	10	Medium	Medium	Medium
Falluja	Al-Saqlawiyah	65,982	12	High	Medium	High
	Al-Garma	117,504	18	Medium	Medium	Medium



## BAGHDAD GOVERNORATE


DTM has added the subdistrict of Meshahda in Tarmia District as a hotspot due to a slight worsening of severity conditions in some locations to the identified hotspots of Nasir Walsalam in Abu Ghraib District and Al-Latifya in Mahmoudiya District.

Table 7. Severity hotspots in Baghdad Governorate

DISTRICT	SUBDISTRICT	NO. OF RETURNEES	NO. OF LOCATIONS	OVERALL SEVERITY	SCALE 1 SEVERITY	SCALE 2 SEVERITY
Abu Ghraib	Al-Nasir Walsalam	6,222	7	Medium	High	Low
Mahmoudiya	Al-Latifya	9,864	11	Medium	Medium	Medium
Tarmia	Meshahda	7,668	18	Medium	Medium	Medium

In Al-Nasir Walsalam, residents report facing more severe issues with livelihoods and basic services than with social cohesion and safety perceptions. Destruction has affected about half of the houses in the locations assessed and reconstruction is limited. In Al-Latifya, on the other hand, some of the locations experienced a slight improvement in access to employment, owing to a reported improvement in the economic situation there and healthcare provision.

The severity of conditions in Meshahda subdistrict is mainly due to inability to find work (for less than half of residents) in the vast majority of locations, and to concerns over social cohesion. In half of the locations, residents tend to leave their homes only when necessary due to tensions in daily public life. Issues with reconciliation between communities have also been reported in three of the subdistrict's locations.






## DIYALA GOVERNORATE

There are three hotspots in Diyala, in the districts of Al-Muqdadia and Khanaqin. Of these, Markaz al-Muqdadia remains the subdistrict with the most severe conditions in the governorate.

Table 8. Severity hotspots in Diyala Governorate

DISTRICT	SUBDISTRICT	NO. OF RETURNÉES	NO. OF LOCATIONS	OVERALL SEVERITY	SCALE 1 SEVERITY	SCALE 2 SEVERITY
Al-Muqdadia	Markaz Al-Muqdadia	53,166	56	High	Medium	High
Khanaqin	Jalula	74,748	49	Medium	Medium	Medium
	As-Saadiya	20,928	16	Medium	Medium	Medium

Conditions in these subdistricts have not varied significantly. There has been a slight positive variation in Jalula subdistrict in terms of businesses present in the area, as well as another slight improvement in water provision in Markaz al-Muqdadia. The severity score, however, remains relatively high mainly due to the multiplicity of security forces, as well as a generalized lack of livelihoods and a significant level of house destruction.




## KIRKUK GOVERNORATE

The two hotspots in the governorate are in Al-Hawiga District. These locations are mostly rural. While most of the indicators remain unchanged and the situation of returns remains quite severe, there has been a slight improvement in Abassy subdistrict in terms of access to agriculture, with most of the agricultural land being cultivated – compared to the previous round.

Table 9. Severity hotspots in Kirkuk Governorate

DISTRICT	SUBDISTRICT	NO. OF RETURNEES	NO. OF LOCATIONS	OVERALL SEVERITY	SCALE 1 SEVERITY	SCALE 2 SEVERITY
Al-Hawiga	Al-Riyad	10,482	7	Medium	Medium	Medium
	Al-Abassy	38,004	27	Medium	Medium	Medium



## NINEWA GOVERNORATE

Eleven hotspots were identified in Ninewa, in the districts of Sinjar, Telafar, Mosul, Al-Ba'a'aj and Hatra. A common characteristic for many of these hotspots, namely Qaeyrrawn, Markaz Hatra, Markaz Telafar, Ayadhiya Al-Qahtaniya and Markaz Al-Ba'a'aj subdistricts, is that they are among the last territories in Ninewa retaken from ISIL in 2017.


Table 10. Severity hotspots in Ninewa Governorate

DISTRICT	SUBDISTRICT	NO. OF RETURNEES	NO. OF LOCATIONS	OVERALL SEVERITY	SCALE 1 SEVERITY	SCALE 2 SEVERITY
Sinjar	Markaz Sinjar	10,584	11	High	High	High
	Qaeyrrawn	3,822	7	High	High	High
	Al-Shamal	45,288	39	High	Medium	High
Telafar	Markaz Telafar	157,548	40	Medium	Medium	High
	Ayadiya	24,294	22	Medium	Medium	High
	Zummar	88,434	47	Medium	Low	High
Mosul	Hamam al-Aleel	41,784	23	Medium	Low	High
	Al-Shura	47,040	25	Medium	Medium	Medium
Al-Ba'a'aj	Al-Qahtaniya	864	5	High	High	Medium
	Markaz Al-Ba'a'aj	9,390	8	High	Medium	High
Hatra	Markaz Hatra	4,764	15	High	High	Medium

There have been significant variations in conditions for returnees in several of these hotspots. For instance, due to persistent severe conditions in all locations in Ba'a'aj District, many families have relocated from their villages towards the district's centre in search of relatively better security and services. This area remains one of the hotspots with the worst severity score across governorates.

In Telafar District, positive changes in terms of livelihoods and basic services have been noted and all hotspots now have a medium severity score. In both Ayadhiya and Zummar subdistricts, electricity supply has improved thanks to a new power station entering into service. In addition, most or all agricultural and livestock activities in many locations in these areas are now restored to previous levels because of better climate conditions. However, reconciliation needs are significantly high and unmet in most of the district, and concerns linked to security provision remain.

The other hotspots such as Sinjar District and the southern subdistricts of Markaz Hatra, Al-Shura and Hamam al-Aleel have not experienced a significant variation in their severity score, especially in terms of social cohesion and safety perceptions.



## SALAH AL-DIN GOVERNORATE

Eight hotspots have been identified in Salah al-Din: Yathreb in Balad District; Tooz District, Markaz Baiji in Baiji District, Markaz Samarra in Samarra District, Markaz Al-Shirqat in Al-Shirqat District and Markaz Tikrit in Tikrit District.


Table 11. Severity hotspots in Salah al-Din Governorate

DISTRICT	SUBDISTRICT	NO. OF RETURNEES	NO. OF LOCATIONS	OVERALL SEVERITY	SCALE 1 SEVERITY	SCALE 2 SEVERITY
Balad	Yathreb	29,304	1	High	High	High
Tooz	Markaz Tooz	27,600	10	High	Low	High
	Al-Amerli	5,755	5	Medium	Low	High
	Suleiman Beg	5,850	2	High	High	High
Baiji	Markaz Baiji	83,442	31	Medium	Medium	High
Samarra	Markaz Samarra	28,986	5	High	Medium	High
Al-Shirqat	Markaz Al-Shirqat	138,414	48	Medium	Low	Medium
Tikrit	Markaz Tikrit	129,492	38	Medium	Medium	Medium

Markaz Baiji has experienced one of the most significant improvement across the country, going from a high to a medium score since last round. While in the vast majority of locations there was no access to livelihood for the residents in the previous round, this report found that some of the largest locations have improved in terms of employment opportunities. Sporadic housing reconstruction efforts are also ongoing. In addition, Baiji's communities have been able to resolve some tribal tensions that required reconciliation and dialogue, as reported in the previous rounds.

Positive changes in terms of reconciliation have also been reported in the case of Yathreb, where lack of social cohesion and safety was the main driver of severity in this area. A reconciliation process has recently been initiated among the main tribes in Yathreb, sponsored by the government and the Sunni Endowment. It is expected that this reconciliation process will facilitate new returns.

Regarding the remaining hotspots, including the districts of Tikrit, Shirqat, Samarra and Tooz, no significant changes in severity across rounds has been reported. However, the hotspots of Tooz and Samarra, for example, still present the highest severity scores across governorates.



# ANNEX 1

Locations hosting returnees with the most severe conditions of return ('very high') ranked by overall severity index

GOVERNORATE	DISTRICT	SUB-DISTRICT	LOCATION	RETURNEES INDIVIDUALS	OVERALL SEVERITY INDEX <sup>3</sup>
Salah al-Din	Tooz	Markaz Tooz	Al-Salam Village	300	91
Salah al-Din	Tooz	Al-Amerli	Maftol Al Kaber Village	240	83
Salah al-Din	Tooz	Al-Amerli	Maftol Al Sagher Village	366	83
Salah al-Din	Tooz	Markaz Tooz	Yangija Village	270	83
Salah al-Din	Tooz	Suleiman Beg	Sulayman Beg sub district center	4410	83
Diyala	Al-Muqdadaya	Markaz Al-Muqdadaya	Sinsil Al Wasat Village	294	66
Diyala	Al-Muqdadaya	Markaz Al-Muqdadaya	Shak Al Rak Village	5328	65
Ninewa	Sinjar	Al-Shamal	Al Sayer	630	65
Diyala	Al-Muqdadaya	Markaz Al-Muqdadaya	Al Igaidat Village	336	64
Ninewa	Sinjar	Markaz Sinjar	Hay Alshuhada	1290	64
Ninewa	Sinjar	Markaz Sinjar	Hay barbaroj	450	64
Ninewa	Sinjar	Al-Shamal	Al Cheri	138	62
Ninewa	Sinjar	Al-Shamal	Khazoga	1020	62
Ninewa	Sinjar	Markaz Sinjar	Hay Al Naser	510	62
Ninewa	Telafar	Ayadiya	Alsalihiyah	840	60
Salah al-Din	Samarra	Al-Moatassem	Banat Al-hassan village	1722	59
Diyala	Khanaqin	Jalula	Shekh Village	90	58
Kirkuk	Kirkuk	Al-Multaqa	Al Sharifiyah village	48	58
Ninewa	Sinjar	Al-Shamal	Hardan Sager	150	58
Ninewa	Sinjar	Markaz Sinjar	Al Nsireya	900	58
Ninewa	Telafar	Ayadiya	Qasabat Ayadiya	3540	58
Ninewa	Telafar	Ayadiya	Qasbat Al Raei Village	450	58
Ninewa	Sinjar	Al-Shamal	Al Sibaya( um Aldanabk)	360	57
Ninewa	Sinjar	Markaz Sinjar	Hay Azadi	732	57
Ninewa	Sinjar	Markaz Sinjar	Hay Yarmok	1050	57
Ninewa	Telafar	Zummar	Karakafir Village	1200	57
Salah al-Din	Balad	Al-Eshaqi	Al_Farhateya village	2520	57
Ninewa	Al-Ba'aj	Markaz Al-Ba'aj	Al-Sahrej	204	56
Ninewa	Telafar	Zummar	Al Aziziya	210	56
Diyala	Al-Muqdadaya	Markaz Al-Muqdadaya	Al Derwish Village	558	55
Diyala	Al-Muqdadaya	Markaz Al-Muqdadaya	Arab Dhaher Village	384	55
Diyala	Khanaqin	Jalula	Albo Geaid Vellage	90	55
Diyala	Khanaqin	Jalula	Baheza Village	660	55
Ninewa	Al-Ba'aj	Markaz Al-Ba'aj	Abu-Rasen	162	54
Ninewa	Al-Ba'aj	Markaz Al-Ba'aj	Rajm Al-botha	150	54
Ninewa	Sinjar	Al-Shamal	Bisan	54	54
Ninewa	Sinjar	Qaeyrrawan	Um amar Village	306	54
Ninewa	Telafar	Ayadiya	Tuluh bash Village	480	54
Diyala	Khanaqin	Jalula	Al Teneraa Village	210	53
Ninewa	Hatra	Altal	khwetla village	354	53
Ninewa	Sinjar	Qaeyrrawan	Hazeel Alwasti Village	102	53
Ninewa	Sinjar	Qaeyrrawan	Tall Alabtah	126	53


<sup>3</sup> The scores of the overall severity index vary from 0 (all essential conditions for return are met) to 100 (no essential conditions for return are met).


# RETURN INDEX

# FINDINGS ROUND 4 – IRAQ

## JULY 2019

IOM IRAQ

 International Organization for Migration  
The UN Migration Agency - Iraq Mission  
Main Office in Baghdad  
UNAMI Compound (Diwan 2)  
International Zone, Baghdad, Iraq

 + 3908 3105 2600

 [iraqdtm.iom.int](http://iraqdtm.iom.int)  
[iraq.iom.int](http://iraq.iom.int)

 [iraqdtm@iom.int](mailto:iraqdtm@iom.int)  
[iomiraq@iom.int](mailto:iomiraq@iom.int)



@IOMIraq

### Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

All maps in the report are for illustration purposes only. Names and boundaries on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IOM.



© 2019 International Organization for Migration (IOM)

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher.