



INTRODUCTION & OBJECTIVE

Gaalkayo 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 live in tents, hybrids and buuls located in unplanned, informal settlements. Since the beginning of 2011, Shelter Partners have been providing longer term solutions to protracted IDPs in Gaalkayco. Four settlements have been created at the outskirts of the city: Halaboqad, Tawakal, Salama 1 and Salama 2. Salama 2 was not accomplished at the time of this mapping exercise and therefore has not been included in the summary.

There are many findings in the REACH tri-cluster review that provides further inputs on shelter, wash and education facts.

This fact-sheet presents an analysis of primary data collected by REACH NRC UNHCR and UNHABITAT during the month of April in Gaalkacyo. 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 IDP¹ settlements² in Gaalkacyo, 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.

¹ IDP: Internally Displaced Person

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

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).³
- 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.
- Data collected may therefore reflect both IDP and host community needs.
- Other approaches based on probability sampling, including cluster and area sampling⁴, 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’⁵ 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:

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

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

⁵ 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.

- General data is collected through a key-informant interview⁶.
- Perimeter of each settlement: The data-collectors walk around the settlement and 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.⁷ 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 2 weeks of field work. 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.⁸ Nevertheless, the results are extremely suggestive and serve as a starting point for improved programming interventions.

REACH/ACTED provided the necessary support for payments of the enumerators and the Cluster members contributed with human resources and transport. The Shelter Cluster ensured a

⁶ 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.

⁷ 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.

coordination task during the data collection and the compilation of the final report.

DATA COLLECTION

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 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, 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 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. 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 REACH assessments teams which comprises of 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.⁹

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.

⁹ 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 5904 **households** living in 14 settlements, of which 3023 were reported as **IDP households**. An average of 30% households were reported to be from the host community.

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

37 Settlements	HH estimate
Afarta kaare	120
Ala amin 1	140
Ala amin 2	150
Bulo bacley	950
Bulo control	670
Halabooqad	1285
Kulmiye	112
Mustaqbal 1	220
Mustaqbal 2	230
New doonyaale	178
Bulo bidar	170
Salaama 1	239
Tawakal	1200
Warshadgaley	240

In determining the **place of Origin** of the Displaced Population, the KIIs suggest that the majority of IDPs in Gaalkacyo are from Mudug, Middle Shabelle, Banaadir, Hiraan and Bay.

Table 1¹⁰: % of place of origin reported in KII

DISTRICT	%
Lower Juba	29%
Middle Juba	21%
Gedo	14%
Bay / Bakool	50% / 7%
Banaadir	86%
Hiraan / Galgaduud	36% / 14%
Nugaal	7%
Mudug	50%
Middle Shabelle	64%
Lower Shabelle	29%
Bari	7%
Awdal / Woqooyi-Galbeed	7% / 7%
Togdheer / Sanaag / Sool	% / % / 7%

¹⁰ In all tables and figures, if the data is null, data will be shown as “-” % (blank).

When asked about access to **basic services**, 43% 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 39 minute walk from their place of residence. The closest **school** where IDPs have access to is reported to be (on average) a 31 minute walk.

In 79% of the KII, it was reported that the population had access to **nutrition** programmes. 7% of KII reported the existence of **Child Friendly Spaces**.

When determining the **type of settlement**, it was concluded that 36% of IDPs live in a planned¹¹ settlement while 50% lives in an un-planned settlement.

Table 2: % of different settlement options

Group	%
Living in a planned settlement	36%
Living in an un-planned settlement	50%
Living in a public building	%
Living with host families	14%
Other	0%

When asking the key informant on **past emergencies**, it was reported that 79% reported a fire-outbreak in the past, 64% reported a diseases outbreak and 29% reported flooding in their respective settlement.

PROTECTION & SOLUTIONS

86% of KII reported that they were residing on privately owned land. 36% reported there was No Land Tenure Agreement, while 56% reported a land tenure agreement of more than 2 years. 64% of KII responded that they were currently paying rent, of which 100% pay in cash.

¹¹ 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)¹²

(LTD=land title deed)	%
No LTA	36%
Informal LTA, clan consent	7%
Individual permanent LTD	%
Communal permanent LTD	14%
2-5 year LTA	21%
5-10 year LTA	21%
>10 year LTA	%
Don't know	%

100% of KII reported having refugees in their settlement, while % reported migrants. % of all KIIs reported to have new arrivals in the last month. 75% of arrivals were reported more than 6 months ago.

Table 5: % of arrivals reported versus timeframe

Time-period	%
During the last month	%
1-3 months ago	%
3-6 months ago	25%

100% of settlements reported having committees. 11 out of the 14 settlements reported that the committee addresses security concerns.

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

Security concern	%
GBV	91%
Disputes with host community	45%
Conflict with police	%
Evictions	55%
Conflict with local militia	9%

0 % of KII suggest that the overall security situation in the settlement is “*very bad*” while 0 % suggest it is “*very good*”. Most of the KII considered the security situation as “*good*”.

Table 7: Security situation in the settlements

Perception	%
Very Bad	%
Bad	7%
Varies	21%
Good	71%
Very good	%

When asked about the relationship with the host community, 0% of KII described the relationship as “*very bad*” and 0% 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.

¹² 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.

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.

Furthermore, there was no data collected on the settlements outside town and therefore this data is limited to the 11 settlements in town. There are many findings in the REACH tri-cluster review that provides further inputs on shelter, wash and education facts.

In total, 249 density points were taken during the exercise. On average, there are **7.18 persons per household** and each household occupies **1.4 buuls**. In total, 73% of all the structures are fixed with **doors**, of which 88% are **lockable**. In total, 12 % of all shelters are categorized as buuls.

Table 9: Shelter typologies

What	%
Buul with 1 layer	10%
Buul with 2 layers	2%
Buul with >2 layers	%
Vernacular Buul	1%
Tents	22%
Timber frame / plastic sheeting	46%
Timber shelter	%
Corrugated Iron Sheet	16%
Solid house	1%

In general, the IDP population has 56% access to **mats**, 95% access to **jerry cans**, 24% access to **blankets** and 92% access to **cooking pots**.

Table 10: Access to NFIs

Time-period	%
Mats	56%
Plastic Sheeting	28%
Blankets	24%
Jerry can	95%
Washbasin	63%
Knives	61%
Cooking pots	92%

WASH FACTS

There is a great difference in access to WASH services comparing the IDPs in town (11 settlements) and those that have been locally integrated (8km outside the town). In the latter, nearly all have access to household latrines and in Tawakal all have access to a water-tank at household level. Therefore, further analysis should be done per settlement to get an in-depth understanding.

In total, 1155 **latrines** were captured in all settlements and in total 1294 **dropping holes** were reported¹³. 86% of latrines were categorized as **functional** and a total of 2098 households were reported using them. On average 1.16 households were sharing each dropping hole and 8% of latrines were segregated male/female.

According to the data collected, 13% of all latrines were categorized as **communal** and 86% were reported as **lockable**. In total, 72% of all latrines are reported to be maintained.

Table 11: Reasons of non-functionality latrines

Time-period	%
Pit is full	59%
Super structure cracked	25%
Security	%
Septic tank not connected	6%
Other	15%
Unknown	4%

In total, 615 **water points** were captured in all settlements, with a total of 223 taps. 14% are connected to the **municipal water system**.

Table 12: Typologies of water points

Time-period	%
Burkad	3%
Water tank	72%
Water-trucking	%
Water Kiosk	4%
Other piped systems	15%
Protected well w/o pump	1%
Protected well with pump	1%
Unprotected well	1%
River	%

¹³ All latrines were mapped out, but according to their structures and not according to the dropping holes.

83% of all water points were categorized as **functional**. On average, it was reported that 2670 **Somali Shillings** is paid per jerry can.

Table 13: Reasons of non-functionality water points reported

Time-period	%
Storage tanks broken	55%
Taps broken	27%
Water contaminated	14%
Water trucking stopped	20%
Connection to municipal is broken	%
Insecurity	1%
Dominated by host comm.	%
Pump broken	%
Unknown	5%
Other	8%

HEALTH FACILITY FACTS

7 **Health facilities** were captured. Of this 100% of them are **functioning** and 86% of health facilities reported to have a **lockable room**.

Table 14: Typologies of Health Facilities

Typology	%
Health Centres	71%
Primary Health Care Unit	%
Hospital	14%
Other	14%

Table 15a: Services available

Services	%
Maternal health services	43%
Vaccination services	29%
Paediatric services	57%
Outpatient services	71%
Inpatient services	14%

Table 15b: Running of the health facility

Services	%
INGO	14%
LNGO	43%
Private	29%
Public	14%

71% of health facilities reported having access to **water**. 43% % of the health facilities reported having access to **electricity**.

In total, there are 4 **nurses**, 2 **community health workers**, 0 **doctors** and 5 **midwives** employed in the health facilities.

EDUCATION FACTS

17 schools were mapped out of which 94% were functioning. In total, 38 classrooms were reported.

The number of schools with access to **latrines** was reported at 47%. Of these 100% are **functioning**, and 38% are **segregated** male/female.

24% of all schools reported being connected to the municipal water system.

In total, 1273 amount of **male** students and 848 amount of **female** students are enrolled in the schools. 1894 **IDP children** have access to these schools.

OTHER FACILITIES

In total, 20 **markets** and 401 **kiosks** were mapped out. The markets and kiosks were reported to be 'open after dark' for respectively 50% and 66%. *Nevertheless, it is good to mention the majority of kiosks can be found in the settlements outside town (local integration).*

In total, 78 **solar lighting posts** were mapped out, with a functionality rate of 79%. *Nevertheless, it is good to mention that all solar lights have been implemented in the settlements outside town (local integration).*

Table 16: Reasons of non-functionality reported¹⁴

Reason	%
Battery broken	24%
Parts stolen	12%
Lamp broken	24%
Other	%
Unknown	43%

72% of solar posts are reported to improve **night activities** and 86% was reported to improve **the security**. In 46% of all cases, the community committee takes care of the maintenance.

¹⁴ Multiple reasons were provided by water point.

Table 16: Maintenance of solar posts

Who	%
NGO/INGO	41%
Community Committee	46%
Unknown	13%

10 **community centres** were mapped out with 60% having access to latrines. Community support activities were reported at 100%.

Table 17: Activities reported at the com centre

Activity	%
Community support	100%
Nutrition programmes	50%
Learning opportunities	30%
Recreation	20%
Entertainment	10%

39 **garbage collection** points in 14 settlements were mapped out. It was reported that 41% of all garbage collection had been done in the past month.

RECOMMENDATIONS¹⁵

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.

There are many findings in the REACH tri-cluster review that provides further inputs on shelter, wash and education facts. As there are big differences in-between the settlements in town and the settlements outside town (local integration), it will be important to further analyse the data at settlement level to come up with concrete recommendations.

It is recommended to the **Wash, Education and Health** cluster to look at the functionality of the different wash, health and school facilities (again looking at settlement level data).

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

¹⁵ 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.

The **Shelter Cluster** should further develop the mapping tools to become more statistically representative of the population. The methodology could also be improved by increasing the representativeness of focus group discussions 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.

Emphasis should be put on evaluating the impact of transitional and permanent shelter projects in Gaalkacyo North. Shelter Cluster has worked with REACH on an evaluation of the permanent shelter projects in Gaalkacyo. The report should be finalized by end of December.

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**. Forced evictions remain a constant threat to the sustainability of short, mid- and long-term solutions. Strong advocacy towards all stakeholders will be a key activity. There is a strong need to examine the potential usefulness of setting up a separate working group on HLP.

CONTACTS

- Somalia Shelter Cluster Coordinator
- Martijn Goddeeris: goddeeri@unhcr.org
- Shelter Cluster Coordinator Mudug Region
- Mohamed Abdulkadir: M.Abdulkadir@drcsomalia.org