

Durable Solutions Readiness Assessment (DSRA)

April 2025 | Galkacyo, Somalia

KEY MESSAGES

- In Galkacyo, insecurity (54%), lack of accommodation (38%), and climatic shocks (37%) were the primary drivers of displacement among IDP households. **This underscores how compounding safety risks and living challenges force households to flee**, highlighting the urgent need for integrated responses that address both security and resilience to shocks.
- In Galkacyo district, food access remains a pressing concern, with nearly all households (94% of IDPs and 97% of host community households) depending heavily on market purchases as their main food source.** This reliance makes household food security highly vulnerable to price fluctuations¹, supply disruptions, and seasonal variations, underscoring the need for interventions that strengthen both market stability and household resilience.
- In Galkacyo, access to drinking water was largely reliable, with 98% of IDP households and 97% of host community households reporting no major issues. **However, healthcare access remained a significant challenge, highlighting persistent gaps in essential services that require targeted support to reduce overlapping vulnerabilities.**
- Casual labor was the main income source for 88% of IDP households and 53% of host community households, underscoring limited access to formal employment and a lack of diversified, sustainable livelihood opportunities, particularly for displaced families.** This highlights the need for livelihood support that fosters stability and long-term resilience.

CONTEXT & RATIONALE


Climate shocks and insecurity continue to affect Somali populations, frequently resulting in their displacement. Consequently, an estimated 3.9 million people were displaced in Somalia as of December 2025.²

Protracted displacement has created a need for development-focused, durable solutions alongside emergency support. To better assess IDP sites' conditions and identify those suitable for long-term solutions, the Detailed Site Assessment (DSA), led by REACH and the CCCM cluster, provides critical data on sites locations, capacities, and humanitarian needs. Building on this, the Durable Solutions Readiness Assessment (DSRA) will examine IDP sites to support development-focused interventions in collaboration with partners, including International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Danwadaag Consortium. Additionally, as a pilot country for the Action Agenda on Internal Displacement, Somalia will develop solution pathways to address vulnerabilities and promote social cohesion among IDPs and host communities, facilitating a shift from emergency to durable solutions. In light of this, a Durable Solutions Readiness Assessment (DSRA), supported by IOM was conducted by REACH.

ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

The DSRA was initiated in partnership with the [IOM-led Danwadaag consortium](#) to identify and assess sites appropriate for durable solutions and development-oriented interventions, serving as a tool to initiate service referrals along the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus (HDPN). Using data from the [Detailed Site Assessment \(DSA\) VIII](#), the DSRA identifies IDP sites where progress towards durable solutions has been captured through the DSA VII, and sites' corresponding scores on the Durable Solutions Scoring Index (DSSI). Developed by REACH and IOM, the DSRA complements the Durable Solutions Progress (DSP) survey by guiding strategic operational decision-making for IDPs and host communities, while also measuring progress toward durable solutions. The assessment collected data that is representative of IDPs and host community households at the district level, with stratification by population group and location type (IDP sites and adjacent urban areas), achieving a 90% confidence level and a 10% margin of error. Each Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) site and its nearest city were analyzed as a single area, reflecting neighborhood and catchment clusters under the [Derisnimo framework](#).

DISTRICT COVERAGE MAP



METHODOLOGY OVERVIEW

Sites were selected for this assessment based on several central criteria. First, sites needed to fall within the strategic priority locations highlighted by the principal project partner, the Danwadaag Consortium. Second, to allow for the monitoring of progress of sites assessed through the previous round of the DSRA, any sites from DSRA I, that were also sampled/assessed through the DSA VIII, were selected to be assessed through the DSRA II (20 sites in Galkacyo). Finally, the remaining sites in Galkacyo (5 sites) were selected through use of the Durable Solutions Scoring Index (DSSI) – the primary method of site selection used during the previous round of the DSRA. This index serves as a tool to identify which IDP sites assessed through the DSA demonstrate potential progress toward achieving durable solutions in alignment with the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions. In total 25 sites were targeted in Galkacyo under the DSRA II.

The Durable Solutions Readiness Assessment (DSRA) employed a quantitative method using **structured household surveys** informed by the IOM DTM Local (Re)Integration Assessment tool. Household was the unit of measurement, defined as individuals living together under one roof. **A stratified random sampling approach ensured representation at district level for six districts (Afmadow, Baidoa, Galkacyo, Kismayo, Daynile, and Kaxda) as well as per population group (IDP households in sites and host community households in adjacent urban centres).** To ensure the sample reflected the actual population distribution, the number of interviews in each site was proportionally allocated based on population estimates. Sampling units were drawn randomly within each stratum to achieve a 90% confidence level and a 10% margin of error.

A total of 9,637 households were surveyed across six districts, including 9,213 IDP households and 424 host community households. **In Galkacyo district, 1,433 households were surveyed, comprising 1,363 IDP households and 70 host community households.** Data were collected from 6 to 30 April 2025 via face-to-face interviews using GPS-referenced sampling points. Processing followed REACH Standard Operating Procedures SoPs, including anonymisation, cleaning and data validation. Analysis, conducted in R, produced district-representative results disaggregated by population group. For more methodological details, please refer to the [Terms of Reference](#).

Analysis on Solutions Readiness

The analysis reveals a **notable disparity between the internally displaced population (IDPs) and the non-displaced population** in Galkacyo, **particularly in employment and livelihood stability.** While over 90% of IDPs have employment (compared to 80%+ of the non-displaced), the nature of their employment remains predominantly temporary. In contrast, non-displaced individuals tend to perceive small businesses as permanent employment, indicating a stronger foundation for economic stability. The reliance on small businesses as the primary source of income for both groups underscores the potential for sustainability-focused solutions programming. However, the temporary nature of IDPs' economic activities signifies their ongoing vulnerability and a lack of durable income sources. This gap highlights the need for targeted solutions programming to help IDPs shift from temporary to permanent employment. Strengthening IDP-owned small businesses through financial services, training, and capacity-building, along with promoting access to formal jobs, can boost self-reliance and bring IDPs closer to the economic resilience of host communities, fostering long-term integration.

DSRA and DSP Relationship and Complementarity

The DSRA serves as a critical tool to enable service referrals along the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus (HDPN) by creating an evidence base to identify service gaps for internally displaced persons (IDPs). By assessing a shelter and housing, focusing on security of tenure and adequacy of living conditions; livelihoods and employment, assessing access to income-generating opportunities; protection, with emphasis on safety, security, and access to justice; access to basic services such as health, education, water, and sanitation; social cohesion and participation, examining community engagement and decision-making; and food security and nutrition, the [DSRA data](#) provides actionable insights into where gaps exist, enabling the government and other actors to accurately target areas for intervention. This evidence-based approach supports the practical implementation of services to address needs, fostering collaboration across sectors and ensuring that interventions are tailored to promote sustainable solutions.


The comparative analysis of indicators highlights critical differences in access to services, livelihood opportunities and other factors that contribute towards durable solutions. For instance, while both groups face significant barriers to accessing essential services, **IDPs report higher levels of vulnerability in areas such as economic self-reliance and integration.** These disparities underline the need for targeted interventions that address specific gaps for each group, such as improving access to sustainable livelihoods for IDPs and strengthening community infrastructure for hosts. By addressing these challenges, the DSRA findings provide a roadmap for advancing durable solutions, emphasizing equitable progress and fostering resilience across communities.

The DSRA questionnaire was developed using the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Framework on Durable Solutions to properly encapsulate the unique barriers and experiences faced by IDPs. In addition, all elements of the assessment were closely aligned with the key strategic objectives of [National Solutions Pathways Action Plan 2024-2029](#), developed by the [National Center for Rural Development and Durable Solutions \(NCRDS\)](#). By doing so, the DSRA seeks to inform government led solutions and initiatives aimed at reducing and mitigating the adverse impacts of displacement, and supporting IDPs to achieve Durable Solutions. The DSRA complements the Durable Solutions Progress (DSP) survey by utilizing a harmonized methodology, questionnaire, and data, and advancing the process through the identification of entry points for durable solutions. While the DSP focuses on progress monitoring, the DSRA builds upon this foundation to enable practical service referrals by identifying specific needs and gaps within both IDP and host communities. Additionally, DSRA data contributes to the Ministry of Planning, Investment, and Economic Development (MoPIED) dashboard, offering a centralized resource for strategic decision-making and ensuring co-ownership of data by MoPIED and REACH, thereby enhancing accountability and alignment with national priorities.


➔ DISPLACEMENT CHARACTERISTICS AND MOVEMENT INTENTIONS

In Galkacyo district, all households residing in IDP sites confirmed they remained displaced at the time of data collection. **Displacement was primarily driven by interconnected factors including insecurity, lack of accomodation, and climatic shocks. Security risks were influential, with 54% of IDP households citing as a main reason for leaving their homes, followed by lack of accomodation and climate shocks.** This highlights how safety threats can creates a compounded pressure that drives displacement and limits the ability to remain in place. The level of integrations for both host and IDP households were notably low with only 7% of host households and 16% of IDP households describing themselves as integrated. These findings point to the urgent need for targeted interventions that address both the drivers of displacement and the barriers to integration, ensuring that safety, housing, and resilience to climate shocks are prioritized in durable solutions strategies.


Three most reported reasons why IDP households left their settlement of origin, by % of IDP households:*



Three most reported reasons why IDP households chose to come to the current settlement:



Top three most reported movement intentions for the 12 months following data collection by % of IDP households:



Reported levels of integration among IDPs and host community households in their current place of residence, by % of households:


	Host community households	IDP households
Very integrated	3%	0%
Integrated	4%	16%
Neutral (neither integrated nor not integrated)	84%	72%
Not integrated	9%	9%
Not integrated at all	0%	4%

✂ ACCESS TO BASIC NEEDS AND SERVICES


In Galkacyo district, access to basic needs and services remains a challenge. Half of the households living in IDP sites reported being unable to meet their basic needs independently, marking a 50% decrease from the previous DSRA round I³ when 100% of households in IDP sites reported this challenge. Similarly, nearly half of households in host communities (47%) reported being unable to meet their basic needs independently during the three months preceding data collection. Despite these access challenges, most households in IDP sites (84%) reported no incidents of discrimination when accessing essential services. This suggests that service delivery in the district is largely perceived as fair and inclusive, even among vulnerable groups.

While the reduction in IDP households struggling to meet basic needs is a positive development, the high proportion of both IDP and host households still facing these challenges highlights the need for continued support to improve self-reliance and equitable access to essential services.

% of households that reported having no access to basic needs on their own in the last 3 months prior to data collection:



% of households living in IDP sites reporting to have *not* been discriminated against when trying to access basic services:*



* Responses could be more than 100% as it was a select multiple question.

FOOD SECURITY


In Galkacyo district, food access remains a critical concern, with almost all households (94% of IDP households and 97% of host community households) heavily relying on market purchases as their primary source of food. This reliance leaves household food security exposed to shifts in market dynamics, where changes in prices, interruptions in supply, or seasonal variations can significantly affect access to adequate food. These findings align with the Somalia 2025 HNRP report, which estimates that approximately 4.4 million people are facing high levels of acute food insecurity.⁴

For IDP households, the primary barrier to food access was economic hardship, reported by 60% of respondents. This points to the broad challenges households face in earning enough income to secure adequate food, especially in contexts where displacement has undermined livelihoods and reduced opportunities for steady employment. Limited financial resources continue to be the main barrier, hindering their capacity to meet essential nutritional needs. Addressing food insecurity in Galkacyo requires not only improving market stability and affordability but also creating sustainable livelihood opportunities to reduce the economic vulnerability of both IDP and host households.

% of households that reportedly depended on market purchases as their main source of food:




Most reported barriers to food access, by % of IDP households*:



ACCESS TO WATER AND HEALTHCARE

In Galkacyo, access to drinking water was largely reliable, with 98% of households living in IDP sites and 97% of households living in host communities reporting no major issues. However, access to healthcare services remained a challenge, reflecting overlapping vulnerabilities. In the three months preceding the assessment, 38% of households living in IDP sites and 34% of households living in host communities reported lacking access to healthcare. The primary barrier for both population groups was the high cost of services or medicine, highlighting how economic challenges hinder not only the ability to purchase food but also access essential healthcare. While water access appears stable in Galkacyo, the persistent barriers to healthcare, particularly cost-related, underscore the need for integrated interventions that address both economic vulnerability and service accessibility.

% of households that did not have access to healthcare services 3 months prior to the assessment:



% of households that reported no issues when accessing drinking water (on their way to or at the water sources):



EDUCATION

Education was accessible in Galkacyo district, with almost all of the households reporting the availability of education facilities in their current settlements (reported by 99% of HHs living in IDP sites and 94% of HHs living in host communities). This represents an increase 10% for IDPs and a decrease of 5% for the host communities compared to the previous DSRA I where 87% of IDPs and 99% of host communities reported presence of education facilities in their current settlements. Access to education is a critical factor in achieving durable solutions, as it not only supports children's development and future opportunities but also strengthens social cohesion and long-term resilience within both IDP and host communities.

% of households that reportedly had an education facility available in their current settlement:




* Responses could be more than 100% as it was a select multiple question.

ACCESS TO EMPLOYMENT, LIVELIHOODS AND MARKETS

In Galkacyo, casual labor was the primary income source for 88% of IDP households and 53% of host community households, suggesting limited access to formal employment and restricted opportunities to develop diverse and sustainable livelihoods, particularly among displaced populations. This heavy reliance on informal work often reflects economic instability, lack of job security, and vulnerability to market fluctuations. Salaried labor and small businesses were also reported as income sources but were less accessible to IDP households compared to those in host communities. **Limited access to markets further compounded livelihood challenges, especially for IDP households, with only 12% of households in IDP sites and 44% of households in host communities able to reach markets within 15 minutes using their usual mode of transport.** The dependence on casual labor and the limited physical access to markets highlight the need for targeted livelihood interventions that expand access to formal employment, promote skills development, improve market connectivity, and create sustainable income-generating opportunities, especially for displaced populations seeking durable

Top three most reported sources of income, by % of households*:



Reported time taken by the households using their usual means of transport to get to the nearest market, by % of IDP households:

Time taken	Host community households (%)	IDP households (%)
Less than 15 minutes	44%	12%
Between 15 minutes and 30 minutes	29%	23%
Between 31 minutes and 1 hour	27%	50%
More than 1 hour	0%	16%

ACCESS TO HOUSING, LAND AND PROPERTY (HLP)


In Galkacyo district, access to housing, land, and property (HLP) appears relatively strong, with 64% of households in IDP sites and 70% of households in host communities reporting written land tenure agreements. This marks a significant improvement compared to the previous DSRA I, when only 6% of IDP households and 25% of host households had written agreements an increase of 58% and 45% respectively. This progress is a positive sign toward achieving durable solutions. However, a considerable proportion of households (35% of IDPs and 29% of host community members) still rely on oral agreements. Such informal arrangements, especially for IDP households, increase exposure to eviction risks.

Eviction-related concerns reinforce these vulnerabilities, with 36% of IDP households reporting fear of eviction in the six months prior to data collection. While notable progress has been made in securing formal land tenure, the continued reliance on oral agreements and the prevalence of eviction fears highlights the need for strengthened land governance, legal support, and protective measures to ensure long-term security of tenure for both IDP and host households.

Most reported types of land tenure arrangement, by % of households:

Arrangement	Host community households (%)	IDP households (%)
Written	70%	64%
Oral	29%	35%
None	1%	1%

Fear of being evicted from current shelter in the 6 months following data collection, by % of IDP households:



ACCESS TO DOCUMENTATION

Access to documentation in Galkacyo is relatively strong compared to other districts, with 69% of households in IDP sites and 79% in host communities reported having voter registration. Additionally, a significant proportion of households in both groups, 59% of IDPs and 26% of host community members reported possessing humanitarian aid cards. **Only a small share of households (10% of IDPs and 6% of host households) reported lacking any formal documentation, marking a substantial decrease from the previous DSRA I, when 20% of IDP households and 64% of host households reported lacking legal identification, a drop of 14% and 54% respectively.**

Possessing legal identification is critical for accessing basic services, exercising rights, and improving mobility, especially for IDPs whose displacement often limits their ability to prove identity. Strengthening documentation coverage can therefore play a key role in enabling durable solutions and reducing vulnerability.

* Responses could be more than 100% as it was a select multiple question.

Top three reported types of legal identification documentation that the households possessed, by % of households:*

	Host community households	IDP households
Voting registration	79%	69%
ID card	31%	14%
Humanitarian card	26%	59%
None	6%	10%

DECISION-MAKING, SAFETY AND SECURITY

In Galkacyo, engagement in social and political life remained relatively low, with 68% of IDP households and 50% of host households reporting no active involvement in community initiatives. **Despite this, overall social cohesion appeared moderately strong, supported by shared cultural identity (reported by 87% of both IDP and host households). Additional contributing factors included a shared language (cited by 63% of IDPs and 74% of host households) and, to a lesser extent, mutual trust, solidarity, and unity (29% of IDPs and 43% of host households).** Community representation showed encouraging signs, as 95% of IDP households stated they had a representative advocating for their interests an increase of 22% points compared to DSRA I (73%). Among host households, 81% reported having such representation, suggesting an opportunity to strengthen inclusive governance and participatory decision-making processes. Perceptions of safety and mobility were generally favorable, with 99% of IDP households and 96% of host households indicating they could move freely without fear. **Nonetheless, notable security concerns persisted. Within the previous three months, 70% of IDP households reported experiencing illegal taxation by non-government actors, compared to 40% of host households. For host households, armed violence (60%) and insufficient protection from such incidents (20%) were also identified as key threats.**

While Galkacyo demonstrates promising aspects of social cohesion and community representation, low participation in civic life, combined with ongoing security-related challenges, particularly for IDPs highlights the need for initiatives that both strengthen inclusive governance and address protection risks ensuring safe and cohesive communities.

% of households that reported not actively participating in the social and political life of the community:*



% of households that reported to have a representative that can speak on behalf of the population:



Top three most reported positively influenced factors by households that influence social cohesion in the settlements:*

	Host community households	IDP households
Sharing the same cultural identity	87%	87%
Sharing a similar language	74%	63%
A sense of trust/solidarity/unity	44%	58%

Three main safety and security incidents reported by households in the last 3 months prior to data collection:

	Host community households	IDP households
Armed violence	60%	0%
Illegal taxation non-government actors	40%	70%
Lack of protection from incidents	20%	0%

* Responses could be more than 100% as it was a select multiple question.

LIMITATIONS

The type of potential bias related to the choice of quantitative method used in the analysis of data and presentation of results must be acknowledged. Assessing the nearest host community households for all IDP sites was difficult since there was no clear demarcation or boundary that separated the hosts from the IDPs. In this assessment, “progress toward durable solutions” refers to indicators of stability, self-reliance, and integration among IDPs in Baidoa. This includes households’ willingness to remain in their current settlements, access to essential services like water and education, economic self-reliance through stable income sources, and social cohesion with host communities. However, this progress reflects current conditions and does not account for long-term trends or comprehensive time series data. The findings should be viewed as a baseline to inform future interventions and ongoing monitoring efforts.

ABOUT THE DANWADAAG CONSORTIUM

Established in 2018, Danwadaag (meaning ‘common purpose’) is a durable solutions consortium led by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) with local and international NGOs. The consortium integrates the expertise of humanitarian and development partners and facilitates knowledge sharing for a multi-sectoral response across the humanitarian, development and peace nexus (HDPN). Core consortium members include Concern Worldwide, Norwegian Refugee Council, and Gargaar Relief Development Organization, and strong partnerships with other local NGOs, research, learning and programmatic partners in the durable solutions community. The consortium’s overall objective is to reduce vulnerabilities among displacement-affected communities (DACs) and, in the long run, decrease the humanitarian caseload of displaced people in Somalia. The consortium’s second phase of activities began in 2022, supported by multiple funding streams across the HDPN, including the United Kingdom’s Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO), the European Union, the World Bank through the Government of Somalia and IOM Development Fund. Activities target various groups of DACs including internally displaced people, returnees and host communities, and support local authorities in line with the Somali National Durable Solutions Strategy (NDSS). Guided by evidence-based programming, key activities focus on strengthening government capacity, delivering integrated sustainable basic services, ensuring land tenure security, providing housing, land, and property support, strengthening the social protection system and implementing targeted livelihood programs for the most vulnerable.

ENDNOTES

- 1: [WFP Somalia-Food prices](#)
- 2: [Estimated IDP populations Somalia](#)
- 3: [DSRA I](#)
- 4: [Somalia HNRP 2025](#)
- 5: REACH - Somalia Durable Solutions Readiness Assessment (DSRA) [Terms of Reference](#) April 2025

ABOUT REACH

REACH Initiative facilitates the development of information tools and products that enhance the capacity of aid actors to make evidence-based decisions in emergency, recovery and development contexts. The methodologies used by REACH include primary data collection and in-depth analysis, and all activities are conducted through inter-agency aid coordination mechanisms. REACH is a joint initiative of IMPACT Initiatives, ACTED and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research - Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNITAR-UNOSAT).

DONORS AND PARTNERS



Foreign, Commonwealth
& Development Office



Durable Solutions Readiness Matrix


IDP Site	Freedom of Movement	Food Security	Access to Water	Access to Healthcare Service	Education	Employment	HLP Access	Access to documentation	Security	Access to Market	Social Cohesion	Totals
Alcadaala	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	7-3-1
Alla'Aamin 1	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	6-2-3
Alla'Aamin 2	Green	Yellow	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Yellow	Red	6-2-3
Arafat	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Red	Green	Green	7-2-2
Ayah	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	6-2-3
Barwaqo	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red	5-1-5
Buulo Agoon	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	5-3-3
Buulo Kontrool	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	7-1-3
Deegan	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	8-1-1
Gargaar	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	4-2-1
Halabokhad	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Yellow	Yellow	6-3-2
Hilaal Yamen	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Red	Yellow	Red	5-3-3
Jeexdin	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	6-2-3
Kulmiye-Balli Abaar	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	6-3-2
Libaan 1	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red	5-1-5
Libaan 2	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red	5-1-5
Mudug Sare	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	6-1-4
Mustaqbal 2B	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	5-2-4
Najax	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Red	6-1-4
New Donyale	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	6-2-3
Raysqaboobe	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	6-2-3
Sirmaqabo	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	7-2-2
Waaya Arag	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	7-2-2
Warshad Galay 2	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Yellow	7-2-2
Warshad Galay	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Red	Green	Red	7-2-2

Legend

- Green > Strong progress (>70%)
- Yellow > Partial progress (40%-70%)
- Red > Weaker levels of progress (<40%)












The Durable Solutions Readiness Matrix for IDP sites in Baidoa district highlights significant disparities in readiness across locations. Structured based on the IASC guidelines, this matrix displays the scores received by individual sites within Baidoa across a variety of indicators from the DSRA. Within the matrix, "green" squares indicate the strong progress of a site toward durable solutions within a certain area, with "yellow" represents partial progress, and "red" shows weaker levels of progress. While some sites demonstrate progress in areas such as access to freedom of movement, and access to water, others face critical and persistent challenges in documentation, security, healthcare and food security. These findings underscore the need for a tailored, multi-sectoral approach that addresses the most vulnerable sites' urgent needs, while strengthening progress in more advanced locations to ensure equitable and durable solutions.

Map: IDP Sites in Galkacyo



*For a further scoring breakdown, please see the scoring table on page 9.

Scoring Table: Durable Solutions Readiness Matrix

Category	Indicators/Question	Answer options
 Freedom of Movement	Can you/your household freely move around/ go wherever you want in your neighbourhood?	- % answering "yes"
 Food Security	Which of the following problem/barriers is most relevant to your household regarding access to food?	- % answering "no barriers to obtaining access to food"
 Access to Water	What safety issues does your household face accessing drinking water (on their way to or at water source)?	- % answering "no issues for drinking water"
 Access to Healthcare Services	Did all members of your hh have access to healthcare services every time they wanted it in the last 3 months?	- % answering "yes"
 Education	Where is the education facility located?	- % answering "within the current settlement"
 Employment	Which of these descriptions best describes the employment situation of the main income earner in the last 3 months?	- % reporting some form of employment, including "official", "seasonal", and "informal"
 Housing, Land and Property	Does your hh fear that it could be evicted from your current accommodation/shelter in the next 6 months, or did you suffer an eviction incident in the past 6 months?	- % answering "no fear of eviction"
 Access to Documentation	Which of the following types of legal identity documentation does your household possess?	- % possessing any form of legal documentation (e.g. ID card, birth certificate etc.)
 Security	Does your household currently feel safe enough to pursue all of the social, economic and educational opportunities you want?	- % answering "Feel safe enough to pursue all opportunities"
 Access to Market	On average, how long does it take you or member of your household, with your usual means of transport, to get to the nearest market?	- % answering "less than 15 minutes" or "15-30 minutes"
 Social Cohesion	How would you and the members of your household describe the relationship between the displaced and the non-displaced community in this location in the last 3 months?	- % answering "very good" or "relatively good"