



## INTRODUCTION & OBJECTIVE

*Galkayo is one of the oldest towns in Southern and Central Somalia and home to an estimated population of 42,900 Internally Displaced People (IDPs) seeking refuge from regional conflicts as well as livelihood opportunities.*

*Gaalkacyo is split up in a North and South section that are administered by respectively the Puntland and the Galgaduud government. Due to security constraints, there have been more shelter projects in North Gaalkacyo and therefore the two mapping exercises were done separately. Majority of the IDPs in South Gaalkacyo live in buuls located in unplanned, informal settlements.*

This fact-sheet presents an analysis of primary data collected by DRC during the month of August in Gaalkacyo South. The collection of data was closely supervised by the Shelter Cluster in Somalia.

The objective of the infrastructure mapping exercise is to provide a useful and timely ‘snapshot’ of the IDP<sup>1</sup> settlements<sup>2</sup> in Gaalkacyo South, with a main aim to **map out the basic services** that IDPs can access in their respective settlements. This factsheet does not aim to provide detailed programmatic information; rather it is designed to share with a broad audience a concise overview of the current situation in this area.

Settlements in Somalia generally are divided into numerous ‘umbrellas’. Each umbrella is made up of multiple IDP settlements. Umbrella leaders are responsible for the oversight and management of the settlements. Each of the settlements generally have an elected leader or ‘gatekeeper’ responsible for multiple IDP settlements and landowner engagement. Settlements in Somalia are often divided by natural land boundaries belonging to one or more landowner.

The report takes into account several key limitations in the collection of data:

- Due to budget restrictions and the short time-scale, general data on each settlement

was collected through a key informant interview (KII).<sup>3</sup>

- Due to security restrictions and the capacity of field staff, the methodology used for density-estimates was limited to 1 density check per approximately 150 households consisting of 15-20 households per density check.
- In some settlements, the host communities are mixed with the IDP population. Data collected may therefore reflect both IDP and host community needs.
- Other approaches based on probability sampling, including cluster and area sampling<sup>4</sup>, were considered but were not used due to budget restrictions and non-availability of updated Satellite imagery. Emphasis was given to collecting reliable GPS data for the perimeter, density and facility purposes, which resulted in less representative data at the household level.

## METHODOLOGY

The aim of the study was to produce quick turnaround ‘baseline data’<sup>5</sup> that would enable further production of a map of all settlements including a perimeter, a density check and a plot of all facilities accessed by IDPs. The study was conducted on a limited budget and consequently a restricted timeframe. This, combined with security considerations, led the data collection team to adopt a methodology **that was appropriate for the Somalia context and for the scope of this particular exercise**. The following provides an overview of the methodology developed:

- General data is collected through a key-informant interview<sup>6</sup> (see also footnote 3).
- Perimeter of each settlement: The data-collectors walk around the settlement and

<sup>3</sup> Key Informants are categorized as follows IDP community leader, IDP elder, Host community leader, Host community elder, religious leader or a focus group.

<sup>4</sup> This methodology is often used to conduct rapid needs assessment of affected communities after natural disasters through household questionnaires.

<sup>5</sup> As the methodology adopted does not provide a basis for a statistical assessment, the results are suggestive and serve as a starting point for improved programming interventions. Nevertheless, as there is a lack of base-line data, this report can be seen as suggestive for base-line purposes.

<sup>6</sup> Due to budget constraints, it was not possible to use the UNHCR participatory assessment methodology which would recommend the use of different focus group discussions divided according to age and gender.

<sup>1</sup> IDP: Internally Displaced Person

<sup>2</sup> Majority of the settlements are IDPs but the data collected comprises both IDPs and urban poor.

## DATA COLLECTION

capture one in every ten households who resides on the boundary of the settlement. Data in the household survey is collected through direct observation by the data-collector.

- Density check (1 per 150 households): The aim of this part of the study is to conduct a quick turnaround household assessment to produce an estimate of population density in the respective settlement.<sup>7</sup> The surveys were conducted among what was determined to be a natural cluster of households in each settlement as selected in the field on a *non-probability basis* and involved a minimum of 15 households in each cluster.
- Facilities mapping: All basic services that IDPs access in their respective settlement are recorded. This includes latrines, water-points, schools, health facilities, kiosks, markets, mosques, garbage collection points, police posts, solar lighting posts and community centres. Most data is collected through direct observation and through meetings with staff available at the facilities or IDPs and host community members living around the facility.

The total study was produced in 1 week of field work and to a budget of \$2,200<sup>8</sup>. The methodology adopted does not provide a basis for a statistical assessment of the resulting density estimate and so p-values and/or confidence intervals could not be prepared. It is therefore strongly recommended that, time and budget permitting, future surveys of this type be conducted on a probability basis to permit the preparation of a full statistical analysis.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, the results are extremely suggestive and serve as a starting point for improved programming interventions.

*REACH provided the necessary support for payments of the enumerators and the Cluster members contributed with human resources and transport. The Shelter Cluster provided training and coordination during the data collection and compiled the final report.*

The methodology applied for this interagency assessment included two phases of data collection and analysis: secondary data review with the Shelter Cluster partners in Gaalkacyo South and primary data collection. Remote sensing and spatial analysis can be added to this exercise if updated Satellite Imagery could be provided.

Drawing on background information from a secondary data review from key agencies in Gaalkacyo South, the assessment engaged cluster member agencies in the primary data collection. One tool was developed for the primary data collection phase: a settlement infrastructure mapping survey, which included a key informant interview, direct observation surveys for HH data and the facility surveys.

The surveys were all conducted with mobile phones by non-technical staff, engaged through cluster partners in Gaalkacyo South and trained by the Shelter Cluster staff. Before beginning data collection, the assessment officer conducted a one-day training on the tool, methodology and data collection plan for team leaders/enumerators in Gaalkacyo South. The Shelter Cluster secretariat provided feed-back in crucial intervals to the Cluster staff in the field and the team leaders.

Data collection was undertaken by 4 assessment teams, with each team consisting of one team leader and four enumerators responsible for data collection. Assessment teams were comprised of male and female enumerators.<sup>10</sup>

Access to the settlements was negotiated in advance through dialogue with the local authority as well as umbrella and settlement leaders, including gatekeepers.

The data was uploaded directly from the mobile phones onto the mFieldwork online platform for analysis by teams based in Nairobi. The assessment databases as well as the methodology and data collection tools are available upon request.

<sup>7</sup> The household survey results were combined with a map/surface-area of each cluster, as prepared in the field by each enumerator using GPS points, to produce an overall estimate of household density.

<sup>8</sup> Including training costs, daily allowances for the teamleaders/enumerators, but excluding salary costs, flights and other related costs for all Shelter Cluster staff.

<sup>10</sup> This is dependent on the availability of female enumerators within the organisations.



## GENERAL DATA

According to data collected during the KII, it was reported that there are 3507 **households** living in 12 settlements, of which 2770 were reported as **IDP households**. An average of 20% of households were reported to be from the host community.

**Overview table:** Settlements and estimated HHs according to KII and secondary data.

Settlements	HH estimate
Alcadala	360
Arafat	100
Bulo bishaaro	267
Bulo jawaan	600
Bulo noto	300
Calanleey	500
Ceelgaab	300
Gaas	90
Hiiraan1	480
Hiiraan2	200
Midnimo	200
Qoraxeey	110
Alcadala	360
Arafat	100

In determining the **place of origin** of the Displaced Population, the KIIs suggest that the majority of IDPs in Gaalkacyo South are from Hiraan, Bakool and Bay.

**Table 1<sup>11</sup>:** % of place of origin reported in KII

DISTRICT	%
Lower Juba	25%
Middle Juba	8%
Gedo	17%
Bay / Bakool	58% / 67%
Banaadir	25%
Hiraan / Galgaduud	83% / 8%
Nugaal	%
Mudug	8%
Middle Shabelle	17%
Lower Shabelle	17%
Bari	%
Awdal / Woqooyi-Galbeed	8% / %
Togdheer / Sanaag / Sool	% / % / %

<sup>11</sup> In all tables and figures, if the data is null, data will be shown as “-” % (blank).

When asked about access to **basic services**, 42% of key informants reported access to **medical care** and stated that the closest health facility that IDPs/host community have access to is on average a 28 minute walk from their place of residence. The closest **school** where IDPs have access to is reported to be (on average) a 16 minute walk.

In 25% of the KII, it was reported that the population had access to **nutrition** programmes. 25% of KII reported the existence of **Child Friendly Spaces**.

When determining the **type of settlement**, it was concluded that 8% of IDPs live in a planned<sup>12</sup> settlement while 67% live in an un-planned settlement.

**Table 2:** % of different settlement options

Group	%
Living in a planned settlement	8%
Living in an un-planned settlement	67%
Living in a public building	%
Living with host families	25%
Other	0%

When asking the key informant on **past emergencies**, 75% reported a fire-outbreak in the past, 50% reported a diseases outbreak and % reported flooding in their respective settlement.

## PROTECTION & SOLUTIONS

100% of KII reported that they were residing on privately owned land. 8% reported there was No Land Tenure Agreement, while 91% reported a land tenure agreement of more than 2 years. 67% of KII responded that they were currently paying rent, of which 88% pay in cash. The data collected on land tenure does not provide a thorough logic. It is necessary to further clarify why 91% reported having a land tenure agreement of more than 2 years.

<sup>12</sup> Definition planned settlements: settlements with a minimum level of site planning with fire-breaks and areas for communal space.

**Table 3:** different land tenure agreements (LTA)<sup>13</sup>

(LTD=land title deed)	%
No LTA	8%
Informal LTA, clan consent	%
Individual permanent LTD	8%
Communal permanent LTD	%
2-5 year LTA	33%
5-10 year LTA	42%
>10 year LTA	8%
Don't know	%

Data regarding persons with specific needs<sup>14</sup> and refugees, returnees and migrants in the settlements is not very clear and has been left out of this report. 33% of all KIIs reported to have new arrivals in the last month.

**Table 4:** % of groups reported in the settlements

Group	%
Refugees	67%
Returnees	%
Migrants	33%
Do not know	%

**Table 5:** % of arrivals reported versus timeframe

Time-period	%
During the last month	33%
1-3 months ago	33%
3-6 months ago	%

92% of settlements reported having committees. 9 out of the 12 settlements reported that the committee addresses security concerns.

**Table 7:** % of different security concerns addressed by the committee

Security concern	%
GBV	33%
Disputes with host community	44%
Conflict with police	22%
Evictions	11%
Conflict with local militia	11%

8% of KII suggest that the overall security situation in the settlement is “very bad” while 8% suggest it is “very good”. Most of the KII suggested that the security situation was “good”.

**Table 7:** Security situation in the settlements

Perception	%
Very Bad	8%
Bad	%
Varies	25%
Good	58%
Very good	8%

When asked about the relationship with the host community, 0% of KII described the relationship as “very bad” and 8% as “bad”. However, the fact that IDPs and host community members were often both present during discussions may have skewed the accuracy of these responses.

% of KII reported they did not know their preferred option for **Durable Solutions**. 75% opted to locally integrate, while 0% preferred to return.

**Table 8a:** preferred option for durable solution

Preferred solution	%
Local Integration	75%
Return	%
Settle elsewhere	25%
Do not know	%
Other	%

**Table 8b:** Main reasons reported during the KII to end their displacement.

Reason	%
No on-going conflict	25%
Access to improved shelter	%
Access to health care	%
Access to education	25%
Access to markets	%
Access to land	50%
Other	%

<sup>13</sup> The categorization of land tenure used will be further defined through a Housing, Land and Property working group under the protection cluster. This survey cannot confirm the authenticity of the LTA or LTDs.

<sup>14</sup> Includes unaccompanied minors, separated children, single-headed families persons with disabilities, etc.



## SHELTER FACTS

The data reflected under the shelter facts are derived from the data collected of the perimeter and density points. The surveys were conducted among what was determined to be a natural cluster of households in each settlement as selected in the field on a non-probability basis and involved a minimum of 15 households in each cluster. Therefore the data of the shelter facts are more suggestive than representative.

There is a strong difference in-between the level of shelter assistance in North Gaalkacyo versus South Gaalkacyo. This is mainly due to the level of access and security.

In total, 282 density and perimeter points were taken during the exercise. On average, there are **7.4 persons per household** and each household occupies **2.22 buuls**. In total, 48% of all the structures are fixed with **doors**, of which 79% are **lockable**. In total, 78 % of all shelters are categorized as buuls.

**Table 9:** Shelter typologies

What	%
<b>Buul with 1 layer</b>	36%
<b>Buul with 2 layers</b>	20%
<b>Buul with &gt;2 layers</b>	22%
<b>Vernacular Buul</b>	%
<b>Tents</b>	15%
<b>Timber frame / plastic sheeting</b>	3%
<b>Timber shelter</b>	%
<b>Corrugated Iron Sheet</b>	3%
<b>Solid house</b>	1%

In general, 29% of the IDP population have access to **mats**, 49% have access to **jerry cans**, 9% have access to **blankets** and 98% have access to **cooking pots**.

**Table 10:** Access to NFIs

NFI type	%
<b>Mats</b>	29%
<b>Plastic Sheetting</b>	9%
<b>Blankets</b>	9%
<b>Jerry can</b>	49%
<b>Washbasin</b>	25%
<b>Knives</b>	93%
<b>Cooking pots</b>	98%

## WASH FACTS

In total, 56 **latrines** were captured in all settlements and in total 121 **dropping holes** were reported<sup>15</sup>. 91% of latrines were categorized as **functional** and a total of 1394 households were reported using them. On average 19.9 households were sharing each dropping hole and 30% of latrines were segregated male/female.

According to the data collected, 66% of all latrines were categorized as **communal** and 80% were reported as **lockable**. In total, 63% of all latrines are reported to be maintained.

**Table 11:** Reasons of non-functionality latrines

Reason	%
<b>Pit is full</b>	99%
<b>Super structure cracked</b>	%
<b>Security</b>	%
<b>Septic tank not connected</b>	%
<b>Other</b>	%
<b>Unknown</b>	%

In total, 26 **water points** were captured in all settlements, with a total of 61 taps. 65% are connected to the **municipal water system**.

**Table 12:** Typologies of water points

What	%
<b>Burkad</b>	4%
<b>Water tank</b>	4%
<b>Water-trucking</b>	%
<b>Water Kiosk</b>	62%
<b>Other piped systems</b>	12%
<b>Protected well w/o pump</b>	%
<b>Protected well with pump</b>	%
<b>Unprotected well</b>	%
<b>River</b>	%

88% of all water points were categorized as **functional**. On average, it was reported that 2136 **Somali Shillings** is paid per jerry can.

<sup>15</sup> All latrines were mapped out, but according to their structures and not according to the dropping holes.

**Table 13:** Reasons for non-functionality of water points reported

Time-period	%
Storage tanks broken	32%
Taps broken	32%
Water contaminated	%
Water trucking stopped	%
Connection to municipal is broken	%
Insecurity	%
Dominated by host comm.	%
Pump broken	%
Unknown	%
Other	64%

### HEALTH FACILITY FACTS

3 **health facilities** were captured. All of them are **functioning** and all are reported to have a **lockable room**. In total, 5 **rooms** were reported in all the health facilities.

**Table 14:** Typologies of Health Facilities

Typology	%
Health Centres	%
Primary Health Care Unit	67%
Hospital	%
Other	33%

**Table 15a:** Services available

Services	%
Maternal health services	33%
Vaccination services	%
Paediatric services	33%
Outpatient services	67%
Inpatient services	%

**Table 15b:** Running of the health facility

Services	%
INGO	33%
LNGO	33%
Private	%
Public	33%

67% of health facilities reported having access to **water**. 33% % of the health facilities reported having access to **electricity**.

In total, there are 2 **nurses**, 1 **community health worker**, 0 **doctors** and 2 **midwives** employed in the health facilities.

### EDUCATION FACTS

1 functioning school was mapped out. In total, 4 classrooms were reported. The school has access to functioning, gender-segregated latrines. However, the school is not connected to the municipal water system.

**Table 14:** Access to services in the school

Services at schools	%
Access to municipal water	%
Rainwater harvesting	%
Access to borehole	%
Access to water tank	%
Access to shallow well	%
Other	%
None	100%

In total, 74 **male** students and 60 **female** students are enrolled in the schools. 135 **IDP children** have access to these schools.

### OTHER FACILITIES

In total, 1 **market** and 12 **kiosks** were mapped out. The markets and kiosks were reported to be 'open after dark' for respectively 100% and 75%.

In total, 1 **solar lighting post** was mapped out, with a functionality rate of 100%.

This solar post was reported to improve **night activities** and **security**. The community committee takes care of its maintenance.

**Table 16:** Maintenance of solar posts

Who	%
NGO/INGO	%
Community Committee	100%
Unknown	%

1 **community centre** was mapped out. It has access to latrines. Community support activities were reported at 100%.

**Table 17:** Activities reported at the com centre

Activity	%
Community support	100%
Nutrition programmes	%
Learning opportunities	100%
Recreation	100%
Entertainment	100%

0 **garbage collection** points in 12 settlements were mapped out.

## RECOMMENDATIONS<sup>16</sup>

*This report only comprises 50% of the collected data. The assessment databases as well as the methodology and data collection tools are available upon request, with confidential information removed.*

It is recommended to the **WASH, Education and Health** cluster to look at the functionality of the different wash, health and school facilities.

It is recommended for UNHCR and the Protection Cluster to take into consideration the data collected that relates to persons with specific needs, protection concerns and durable solutions.

The **Shelter Cluster** should further develop the mapping tools to become more statistically representative of the population. The methodology could also be improved by using representative Focus Group Discussions instead of Key Informant Interviews. This would help to ensure that the specific protection needs of different gender and age groups are all accounted for. In addition, IDPs and host community members should always be interviewed separately, as IDPs often cannot freely express their needs and concerns in the presence of gatekeepers and other powerful host community members.

*There is a strong difference in-between the level of shelter assistance in North Gaalkacyo versus South Gaalkacyo. This is mainly due to the level of access and security. It is recommended to strengthen the shelter (and other) activities in South Gaalkacyo.*

Emphasis should be put on evaluating the impact of transitional and permanent shelter projects in Gaalkacyo South.

It is recommended that the maps produced are **updated on a regular basis** with the support of inter-cluster coordination. For example, each eviction should be mapped out.

It is recommended to further continue the efforts in ensuring **improved land tenure**. *The data collected on land tenure does not provide a thorough logic. It is necessary to further clarify why 91% reported having a land tenure agreement of more than 2 years.*

## CONTACTS

Somalia Shelter Cluster Coordinator

Martijn Goddeeris: [goddeeri@unhcr.org](mailto:goddeeri@unhcr.org)

Shelter Cluster Coordinator Mudug Region

Mohamed Abdulkadir: [M.Abdulkadir@drcsomalia.org](mailto:M.Abdulkadir@drcsomalia.org)

Shelter Cluster Coordinator Galgaduud Region

Abdikarim Hassan: [Abdikarim.H@drcsomalia.org](mailto:Abdikarim.H@drcsomalia.org)

<sup>16</sup> The methodology adopted does not provide a basis for a statistical assessment of the resulting density estimate and so p-values and/or confidence intervals could not be prepared. Nevertheless, the results are extremely suggestive and serve as a starting point for improved programming interventions in this area.