


SOMALIA TRI-CLUSTER ASSESSMENT

Fact-sheet: Galkayo North

May 2014



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Commission and United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way, to reflect the official opinion of the European Commission or USAID.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
METHODOLOGY	3
DISPLACEMENT OVERVIEW	4
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE.....	4
ORIGIN OF DISPLACED POPULATION	4
CAUSES AND CYCLE OF DISPLACEMENT	5
INTENTIONS OF DISPLACED POPULATION.....	5
LAND AVAILABILITY AND TENURE ISSUES.....	6
LIVELIHOODS & EXPENDITURE TRENDS	6
SECURITY AT THE DISPLACEMENT SITES	7
KEY SHELTER FINDINGS	7
SHELTER TYPES	7
ISSUES RELATED TO SHELTER.....	8
SHELTER MATERIALS	9
KEY WASH FINDINGS	10
WATER	10
SANITATION.....	11
HYGIENE	11
KEY EDUCATION FINDINGS	12
SCHOOL ATTENDANCE	12
TYPE OF SCHOOL	12
SCHOOLING FEES	12
RECOMMENDATIONS	12
GENERAL	12
SHELTER.....	13
WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE.....	13
EDUCATION	14

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1: Number of households, estimated from secondary data and satellite image analysis, and the derived sample sizes

Table 2: Shelter condition score by shelter type

Figure 1: Households' place of origin

Figure 2: Households' period of displacement

Figure 3: Households' Intentions in the next 6 months

Figure 4: Households' main source of income

Figure 5: Households' highest expenditure item

Figure 6: Households' main security coping strategy

Figure 7: Households protection concerns within the settlements

Figure 8: Households' top immediate needs per settlement

Figure 9: Households' shelter support received per settlement

Figure 10: Percentage of households with access to latrines within 50 meters

Figure 11: Households' hand-washing behavior

Figure 12: Percentage of children school going age enrolled in education per settlement

INTRODUCTION

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.

This fact-sheet presents an **analysis of primary data collected by REACH between 19 and 27 April 2014 in the North of Galkayo city, in Somalia**. This assessment was undertaken within the framework of an ongoing partnership between REACH and the Education, Shelter and Water, Hygiene and Sanitation (WASH) clusters in Somalia.

The factsheet focuses on the **humanitarian needs of the IDPs in 11 informal settlements**, covering the specific sectors of **Shelter, Education and Water, Hygiene and Sanitation**. 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.

The settlements in the North of Galkayo are overseen by the Puntland government and are divided into numerous 'umbrellas'. Each umbrella is made up of multiple IDP settlements. Umbrella leaders are responsible for oversight and management of settlements. Each of these settlements has an elected leader or gatekeeper responsible for multiple IDP settlements and landowner engagement. Settlements are often divided by natural land boundaries belonging to one or more than one landowner.

The report takes into account several key limitations in the collection of data. First and foremost, security in the areas of assessment restricted movement, and for this reason, South Galkayo was not sampled. Second, both IDPs and host community members were present in the settlements assessed in Galkayo town. **Data collected may therefore reflect both IDP and host community needs.**

As part of the presentation of key findings for each of the sectors covered by the tri-cluster assessment, suggested **priority interventions are included to inform aid actors in planning timely and appropriate responses.**

METHODOLOGY

The methodology applied for this interagency assessment included four phases of data collection and analysis: **primary data collection; secondary data review; remote sensing analysis; and spatial analysis and mapping.**

Drawing on background information from a secondary data review conducted by the assessment team in Nairobi and Mogadishu, the assessment engaged cluster member agencies in the North of Galkayo to conduct primary data collection. Three tools were developed and used during the primary data collection phase: 1) a household survey questionnaire; 2) direct observation tool and 3) a settlement infrastructure mapping survey, which included interviews with key informants.

The surveys were all conducted with mobile phones by non-technical staff, engaged through cluster partners in Galkayo and trained by REACH staff. Before beginning data collection, the assessment officer conducted a two-day training of trainers on the tools, methodology and data collection plan for team leaders in Galkayo. A four-day assessment training followed for all enumerators. This included a review about bias and appropriate interview techniques.

Data collection was undertaken by five assessment teams, with each team consisting of one team leader and five to six enumerators responsible for data collection and reporting. Assessment teams were comprised of male and female enumerators.

IDP settlements within Galkayo town were identified for the assessment in consultation with the WASH, Shelter and Education clusters and based on secondary data.

The household survey employed a 95% confidence level and 5% confidence interval calculated for settlements located in North Galkayo.

The sample size was calculated for each IDP settlement located by proportionally dividing the representative sample size among each IDP settlement based on its estimated number of households. Population estimates for each settlement were derived by multiplying average household size (calculated from the household survey) by the number of shelters per settlement (estimated by UNOSAT using satellite image analysis).

For the infrastructure mapping exercise, assets and infrastructure were mapped across all settlements.

Access to the settlements was negotiated through dialogue with the local authority as well as umbrella and settlement leaders. When conducting the household survey and direct observation each enumerator was directed to a specific location within the IDP settlement by the team leader. The enumerator would then walk the entire section, skipping every five houses. This ensured that households in different parts of the settlement were assessed.

Enumerators used a pencil dropped on the ground to identify the direction of the walk, repeating each time until the boundary of the assigned area was reached. Team leaders oversaw each enumerator to ensure that they followed the correct methodology. One enumerator team was responsible for one mobile phone, effective data collection and reporting.

The data was uploaded directly from the mobile phones onto the mFieldwork online platform¹ for analysis by teams based in Mogadishu and Nairobi. The assessment database as well as the methodology and data collection tools are available upon request, with confidential information removed, when necessary.

Table 1: # households, estimated from secondary data and satellite image analysis, and the derived sample sizes

District	Sample Collected	Estimated Households
Afarta Kaare	21	29
Alamin 1	49	50
Alamin 2	41	43
Bulabidaar	66	67
Buulo Control	111	149
Buulo Baclay	215	520
Kulmiye	40	40
Mustaqbal 1	108	120
Mustaqbal 2	113	147
New Doyanley	39	51
Wershada Garey	46	50

¹ <http://mfieldwork.com>

DISPLACEMENT OVERVIEW

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Displaced populations were distributed evenly between males (51%) and females (49%). **The average household consisted of 7 members.**

Nearly one quarter of displaced households (23%) included children under 5. This is consistent with findings from assessments carried out in Lower Juba, Gedo and Bay. A low proportion (5%) of households were composed of members 60 years and above.

Over one third (36%) of respondents were single female heads of households. The traditional practice of levirate marriage² may account for the low number of female headed households.

Throughout the settlements, a relatively low number (16%) of women of child-bearing age were found to be pregnant or lactating.


ORIGIN OF DISPLACED POPULATION

Data collected on areas of origins of displaced persons varied across the settlements. **Almost one third (29%) of households reported originating from Banadir.** The other assessed IDP households reported originating from Bay (8%), Hiran (7%), Mudug (7%), Lower Shabelle (6%), Middle Shabelle (4%) and Lower Juba (3%) while 1% or less originated from Bakool, Bari, Galguduud, Gedo, Middle Juba, Nugaal, Sanaag, Sool, and Woqooyi Galbeed.

Field level observation and focus group discussions suggest **the majority (58%) of IDPs in North Galkayo are from the Rahanweyn clan (Digil and Mirifle).** 20% of the IDPs were reported to be Jarir/Bantu, the African minority clan. A sizeable concentration of the IDPs from the Jarir/Batu clan were reported to be located in Alamin 1, Alamin 2 Buulo Control and Kulmiye. Minority clans are often marginalized and may be considered the most vulnerable. Their presence in the settlements and possible marginalization by the host community should be further explored.

² A levirate marriage is a type of marriage in which the brother of a deceased man is obliged to marry his brother's widow, and the widow is obliged to marry her deceased husband's brother.

Figure 1: Households' place of origin




CAUSES AND CYCLE OF DISPLACEMENT

73% of respondents reported leaving their place of origin due to insecurity, conflict or drought, while 27% reported leaving due to loss of livelihoods.

The **majority (84%) of surveyed households reported having first been displaced 4 to 6 years ago or longer**. A relatively low number reported to have been displaced one to three years or 6-12 months ago (13% and 2%, respectively). The balance reported to have been displaced 1-5 months or less than one month ago. Interviews with settlement leaders suggest 75% of these households relocated directly from their place of origin.

Further, **94% of respondents stated arriving at their present location more than one year ago**. A low number reported arriving 6-12 months or 1-5 months ago (3% and 2% respectively).

Figure 2: Households' period of displacement




87% of respondents reported moving as individual households while 13% reported moving as a group. Relatedly, 97% of households reported a family member was responsible for the decision to move while 1% or less than one percent reported the local authority, gatekeeper or umbrella leader was in charge of the movement.

INTENTIONS OF DISPLACED POPULATION

In the next six months, **58% of IDPs planned to remain in their present location** while a smaller portion (36%) planned to return to their place of origin. A relatively low number planned to relocate in the same district (4%) or outside of the district (1%).

Figure 3: Households' intentions in the next 6 months



Among those wishing to stay in their present location, **97% reported willing to remain longer than one year**. 40% and 20%, respectively, reported continued receipt of aid or family members' occupation as the main reasons for wanting to remain in their present location. **30% reported a willing to remain in their present location permanently**.

Of those households who wish to relocate in the same district, 53% and 16%, respectively, reported 'insecurity in their place of origin' or 'continued receipt of aid' the main reason for not wanting to move further. **22% of this group intends to integrate and remain permanently**. Households reporting a willingness to remain in Galkayo or in their present location permanently must be prioritized for durable solutions and development planning.

Of those that wish to return to their place of origin, 65% and 45%, respectively, reported willingness 'if transport were provided' or 'security improved'. 30% tied return to agricultural opportunities while 25% reported access to healthcare services as the main reason for their return. **19% reported a willingness to return under any condition**. It is recommended that shelter actors further explore the reasons for these households not being able to return.

Of those wishing to relocate in the same district, a low number of households (6%) reported a willingness to sell their shelters or take their shelters with them (16%), while the majority reported they would give them away (63%).

Of those that wished to return to their place of origin, 45% reported a willingness to leave behind their shelters with a designated household. 26% reported they would give them away, while a relatively low number (19%) reported an intention to sell their shelter.

The majority of IDPs expressed a willingness to give away or leave behind their shelters. Aid actors should further examine these findings and their potential linkages to households' receipt of humanitarian items, taxation from local militias and the cost of transporting items.

LAND AVAILABILITY AND TENURE ISSUES

All settlements are located on private land. Enumerator observations and key informant interviews suggest that **81% of the informal settlements in North Galkayo have no land tenure agreement.**

87% of households reported paying rent on the land they occupy. Of households paying rent, **100% reported payments in cash.** On average, these households reported paying 11 USD. The regularity of payments was not reported.

51% of households reported owning their own house and land before displacement while 13% reported owning their house and renting the land. 20% of households reported renting their house and lot prior to displacement.

At the time of the assessment, enumerators observed planned and spontaneous relocation of IDP households to the permanent settlements in Galkayo North. More information should be gathered about the timeframe and nature of these relocations. Specifically, pull-factors for spontaneous relocation and the use or reuse of resources on relocation from the settlement should be explored.


LIVELIHOODS & EXPENDITURE TRENDS

38% and 34% of households, respectively, reported trading or farming as one of their main sources of income prior to displacement. 22% and 16% reported casual labor or pastoral activities, respectively.

Currently, 41% of households reported their current source of income to be trading, 14% selling of aid items and 11% acquired an income from the sale of property. 9% and 8% confirmed income from begging or relatives.


30% reported other methods. **On average, households reported earning 5 USD and spending 4 USD per day.**

Figure 4: Households' main source of income



Households ranked their highest expenditures as: 1) food not including the cost of cooking fuel (98%), 2) water (85%) and 3) firewood (41%).

Figure 5: Households' highest expenditure item



The main source of cooking fuel was reported to be wood (74%). Charcoal (20%) and garbage (6%) were reported second and third, respectively. The majority of households reported purchasing fuel locally (50%) or collecting fuel from around the settlement (46%). A low number (3%) reported they collect fuel from inside the settlement. The type of wood fuel collected by IDP households and the impact of it on the natural environment should be further researched, notably as this may cause tensions and disputes between the IDP population and the host communities.

61% of households reported not having access to adequate markets. 39% reported having access to markets within an average of 19 minutes on foot. Of these, households reported grains (97%), vegetables (96%), pulses/beans (93%), meat/fish (86%) and construction materials (40%) to be available. Those households that reported construction materials to be available at markets, stone (68%), sand (60%), soil (59%) and grass (26%) were reported to be available locally.


When disaggregated by settlement, Buulo Control and Mustabal 1 were the only settlement to report a majority of households with access to markets (57% and 81%, respectively).

SECURITY AT THE DISPLACEMENT SITES

61% of respondents reported they did not fear for their physical safety within the settlements. 39% of respondents reported they did fear for their physical safety. Of these, households ranked areas of protection concern in relation to their security as: 1) inside the shelter at night (78%), 2) outside the settlement (59%), and 3) latrines (57%). It is noteworthy that a high number of households (43%) ranked markets fourth.


Coping strategies were varied. 58% used a torch or flashlight, while 40% practiced avoidance of the areas. 30% and 23%, respectively, reported protection by community-organized police groups or group movements and 22% reported paying for protection. Most respondents (95%) reported their primary source of light to be a torch or flashlight while 15% reported solar lamp.

Figure 6: Households' main security coping strategy



When disaggregated by settlement, a large number of households in Kulmiye (65%), Mustaqbal 1 (84%), Mustaqbal 2 (42%), New Donyalay (46%), Afarta Kaare (38%) and Buulo Baclay (37%) report fearing for their safety. These sites are not in one particular neighbourhood but are distributed throughout the town.

Figure 7: Household protection concerns in the settlement



KEY SHELTER FINDINGS

The assessment scored each shelter type in every settlement as Critical (Red), Urgent (Orange) and Essential (Yellow), using the following eight criteria: (1) shelter condition score, (2) age of shelter, (3) separate sleeping space (4) material of the floor, (4) material of the walls, (5) material of the roof, (6) presence of a door, (7) number of layers and (8) holes in the roof coverage.

These criteria do not replace, but rather they complement the overall criteria for humanitarian intervention: (1) vulnerability of the household, (2) type of shelter of the household and (3) related living conditions.

The scoring grid is intended to provide an additional analysis layer for strategic and operational prioritization.

SHELTER TYPES

Throughout the settlements, three main shelter types were observed: **transitional shelters (30%), buuls (24%) and tents (21%)**. 3% of the population reported to be living in public buildings, while 1% reported to be living in makeshift amorphous shelters.

The majority of buuls (71%) were scored as urgent. 27% and 2%, respectively, were scored as essential or critical. Buuls scored as "critical" and "urgent" require immediate humanitarian response, while short to medium term support should be offered to buuls scored as essential.

Buuls in “essential” condition do not meet minimum Sphere standards, but these households could be prioritized as potential beneficiaries in a second phase of intervention after households scored as “critical” or “urgent”.

Table 2: Shelter condition score by shelter type

Shelter Type	Shelter Score
Buul	2% Critical
	71% Urgent
	27% Essential
Tent	5% Critical
	82% Urgent
	13% Essential
Transitional Shelter	2% Critical
	84% Urgent
	14% Essential

The majority of transitional shelters (84%) were scored as urgent. 14% and 2% scored as essential or critical, respectively. Transitional shelters provided by aid actors are generally an adequate short-term to mid-term solution for displaced households.

Transitional shelters within the settlements were found to be 19 months old, on average. Additional support for households living in transitional shelters rated as urgent and essential should be formulated under a durable solutions and development perspective where land ownership is taken into account.

Enumerator observations suggest the majority (53%) of tents are significantly below the Sphere standards for shelter. Tents are often provided as an emergency means of intervention and do not provide the UNHCR recommended space (3.5 m² per person), adequate privacy or protection from weather conditions and theft. Tents normally have a lifespan of two years. Tents observed were found to be an average of 26 months old. Very few of these were able to provide shelter from harsh weather conditions to the interviewed household.

Throughout the settlements assessed, 79% of households reported an interest in occupying more permanent stone structures. 8% and 17% reported an interest in occupying buuls or iron sheet structures respectively.

ISSUES RELATED TO SHELTER

When asked to identify shelter issues, 83% of households ranked weather conditions (rain, heat and cold) as the main shelter issue. Land (43%) and space (28%) were ranked second and third, respectively.

The majority (75%) of households ranked their immediate need to be financial support. Ranked separately, the provision of emergency shelter (8%) and tents (7%) were reported second and third, respectively. The highest proportion of households prioritizing the need for emergency shelter and tents were in Alamin 1 (24%), Alamin 2 (22%), Kulmiye (35%), Mustaqbal 1 (24%), Mustaqbal 2 (34%), New Donyayle (24%) and Wershada Garey (19%). These settlements should be considered for immediate response, while households prioritizing the need for financial aid should be considered for second phase of interventions.

When disaggregated by settlement, the majority of households in Afarta Kaare (91%), Buulo Baclay (95%), Buulo Bidar (94%), Buulo Control (90%), Kulmiye (63%), Mustaqbal 1 (67%), Mustaqbal 2 (53%), New Donyalay (74%) and Warshad Garey (54%) reported their immediate needs to be financial support. It is recommended that actors consider these settlements for integrated cash programming.

In the assessment areas, 36% of respondents reported building their own shelters, while 31% reported to have received their shelter through humanitarian distribution. Of households reporting to have constructed their own shelters, 49% reported collecting the materials for free. 28% and 6%, respectively, reported either purchasing the materials locally or bringing the materials from elsewhere.

At the time of the assessment, 70% of respondents reported not having received shelter assistance. Of those that have received assistance, the majority (65%) of households reported to have received tents. 14% and 12% reported to receive construction tools and shelter repair kits or construction materials, respectively. A low number (8%) reported the receipt of technical support. All settlements reported receiving tents. When disaggregated by household, 100% of households in Afarta Kaare and the majority of respondents in New Donyalay (91%), Alamin 1 (90%), Alamin 2 (89%), Buulo Control (69%), Mustaqbal 1 (58%), Mustaqbal 2 (75%) and Wershada Garey (77%) reported receiving tents.

Throughout the settlements assessed, the majority of households reported that **financial support (95%) and material support (74%)** could be used by the household to upgrade their shelters themselves while

52% reported technical support would be necessary. Actors should further explore these findings in particular the high number of households reporting the need for technical support.

IDP intentions and ability to access shelter items on the market should be further explored by actors prior to any cash distribution.

SHELTER MATERIALS

The results of the direct observation are varied regarding the materials used to build different shelter types.

The buuls observed most commonly used wood (88%) for the internal structure and plastic sheeting (74%) or cloth and rags (61%) for walls and roofs. **55% were equipped with a physical door.** In terms of locks, the majority were equipped inside (78%) and outside (75%).

Figure 8: Households' top immediate needs per settlement





Figure 9: Shelter support received per settlement



Transitional shelters observed most commonly used wood (87%) for the internal structure while iron sheeting was most commonly used for the walls (81%) and roof (76%). **93% of transitional shelters in the settlements are equipped with a physical door.** In terms of locks, nearly all are equipped with locks from the inside (91%) and outside (92%). This can be considered a large contribution to the protection findings above, as doors and locks provide security from theft and violence.

Overall, the quality as well as the cost of the materials used must be explored further.

KEY WASH FINDINGS

WATER

Community-led settlement perimeter mapping indicates the majority (82%) of water points were located on private land. 85% were reported to be functional, of which 95% were reported to hold potable water. 84% were reported not to be connected to the municipal water system.

39% of households reported having access to water through tanks and taps, while 25% and 19% reported access through other piped water systems or water kiosks, respectively. Other sources of water include: water tanks (6%), protected wells with hand pumps (2%) and shallow wells (2%). The majority of households (78%) reported their water source to be reliable and 7% reported the water source to be very reliable, while 15% reported it unreliable.

Respondents reported spending an average of **6 minutes walking to reach a water source** and an average of 8 minutes waiting at the water point.

Spatial analysis shows **98% of shelters identified in satellite imagery to be within 200 metres of available waterpoints.** Some shelters to the west-side of Buulo Bidar are outside of this distance, however.

94% of households reported paying for water at an average payment of 2 USD for 20 litres. All settlements reported a majority of households making payments for water while 100% of households in Afarta Keen, Alamin 2 and Mustaqbal 1 reported the same.

47% and 29% of respondents, respectively, reported collecting drinking water two or three times a day, while 16% reported collecting drinking water one time per day. 8% reported collection more than three times per day. On average, **58 litres of water are available at the household level per day.**

90% of households use the same container for storage and transport. 92% use the same container for drinking and washing. Household reasons for reuse of containers and linkages to disease and outbreak must be further explored by WASH actors. Jerry-cans were by far the most commonly used container-type throughout the settlements.


41% of households reported treating their own water. Of these, three main practices were noted: 1) **chlorination (65%), 2) boiling (22%) and 3) filtering (18%).**

SANITATION

Across the settlements, **86% of households reported access to latrines within the Sphere standard of 50 metres from their shelters.** This is somewhat consistent when compared with spatial analysis, which demonstrates 96% of shelters are within 50 metres of a latrine. However, spatial analysis shows Afarta Kaare is the only settlement to meet the sphere standard of 20 households per latrine.

98% of latrines were reported to be communal and only 2% private. 94% were reported not to be separated by gender. This can be considered a large contribution to the protection findings above, as communal non-gender-specific latrines have the potential for higher levels of sexual and gender –based violence.

Figure 10: Percentage of households with access to latrines within 50 meters




According to survey responses, 56% of households that are without access to latrines practice open defecation away from the home. 40% and 17% practice open defecation by the home or use community defecation points, respectively.

HYGIENE

Across the settlements, **61% of households reported no receipt of hygiene items in the last three months.** Of households that received hygiene items, the majority reported receiving soap (90%), shampoo (24%) or washing powder (20%). 11% confirmed the receipt of other hygiene items. When disaggregated by settlement, a higher than average number of households in Buulo Baclay (91%), Buulo Bidar (87%), Buulo Control (55%), Kulmiye (65%), and Mustaqal 1 (67%) reported not receiving hygiene items. **It is recommended these households be prioritized in future distributions.**

63% of respondents reported washing of hands with water only, 20% reported the use of water and soap and 17% used water and ash. WASH actors should further explore these behaviors and linkages to cultural practice and hygiene item distribution.

Figure 11: Households' hand-washing behavior



90% of respondents reported maintaining body cleanliness in latrines and 5% outside the home in a private space. The security at these sites should be further explored by WASH and protection actors.

79% of households reported disposing of domestic waste. Three main modes of disposal were noted: 1) burn (67%), 2) open-air disposal (63%) and 3) bury (16%). **80% of households reported disposing of waste outside the settlements,** while 20% of households reported disposing of waste inside the settlements.

KEY EDUCATION FINDINGS


SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

Throughout the settlements 44% of children were found to be of school going age. Of these, many (60%) do not attend school.

39% of households reported access to education inside the settlement. The mapping exercise identified a total of 9 education facilities inside settlements. The location of these facilities may be viewed in the REACH maps of Galkayo.

As demonstrated in figure 12, a relatively low number of households in Alamin 1 (26%), Alamin 2 (29%), Buulo Bidar (41%), Kulmiye (30%), Mustaqbal 1 (39%), Mustaqbal 2 (25%) and Weshada Garey (24%) reported children's enrollment in school while a higher number reported children enrolled in Buulo Baclay (49%), New Donyalay (54%), Buulo Control (54%) and Afrarta Kaare (57%).

Figure 12: Percentage of children school going age enrolled in education per settlement



TYPE OF SCHOOL

35% of children received education provided by an NGO. 27% and 19%, respectively, were provided private education or educated in a Madrasa. A low number (8%) reported receiving education from the government. **41% of these educational facilities provide psycho-social support.**

SCHOOLING FEES

55% of households with children enrolled in schooling reported paying school fees. The average fee was reported to be 11 USD. The regularity of payments was not reported and must be further explored.

Payment of school fees was reported as the main obstacle to access education for male (78%) and female (79%) children, while the need for children to support the household working or in the home (27% for male, 30% for female) was reported second. Education actors should further explore the cost of education and its relation to the population's access to education.

61% of households reported they felt their children were safe on the way to school. 39% of households reported they felt their children were unsafe. Of these, the **majority (63%) reported human trafficking as the cause of danger**, while 51% reported abuse and 17% the presence of armed men.

91% of households felt their children's education could be improved. Of these, teacher training (77%) and the purchase of school supplies (70%) were reported as necessary to improve their child's education. 36% and 26% reported access to water and food as needs for students, respectively. Education actors must further explore this need and respond accordingly.

A more in-depth study of cultural preferences, proximity and access to education facilities must be undertaken to complement these initial findings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the key findings from the tri-cluster assessment, the following recommendations are put forward to inform the humanitarian response:

GENERAL

- 52% of households reported wanting to stay in Galkayo North or in their present location permanently. These households must be prioritized by aid actors in regards to development programming and achieving durable solutions.

- 89% of IDPs reported they would give away their shelters. Actors should further examine these findings and their potential linkages to households' receipt of humanitarian items, taxation from local militias and the cost of transport.
- Enumerators observed the planned and spontaneous relocation of IDPs to the permanent settlements. More information should be gathered about the timeframe and nature of these relocations. Specifically, pull-factors for spontaneous relocation and the use or reuse of resources on relocation from the settlement.
- Households reported spending 5 USD per day and earning 4 USD. Actors should further explore linkages to household income, vulnerabilities and needs when considering integrated livelihoods programming, in particular cash for work activities.
- The main source of cooking fuel was reported to be wood (74%). The type of fuel wood collected by IDP households and the impact of this activity on the natural environment should be further researched, notably as this may cause tensions and disputes between the IDP population and the host communities.
- Generally, 58% of IDPs planned to remain in their present location. Of these, 97% reported wanting to stay longer than one year. It is recommended that aid actors undertake a more comprehensive profiling exercise to identify specific vulnerabilities among the displaced population and host communities, as well as protection risks, access to services and issues faced by displaced persons.
- Settlements with a majority or high number of households reporting fear for their physical safety should be prioritized by protection actors for immediate intervention: Kulmiye, Mustaqbal 1, Mustaqbal 2, New Donyalay, Afarta Kaare and Buulo Baclay.
- The majority of households reported financial support or material support could be used to upgrade their shelters themselves. Shelter actors should further explore these findings, in particular the high number of households reporting the need for technical support
- Issues related to heat, wind and rain are the main concerns related to shelter. Additional layers for the buuls and the provision of iron-sheet housing may mitigate weather-related issues. The provision of additional layers for the internal structure of transitional shelters may also be considered.
- 70% of respondents reported not having received shelter assistance. The greatest needs for emergency shelter and tents were reported in: Alamin 1, Alamin 2, Kulmiye, Mustaqbal 1, Mustaqbal 2, New Donyayle and Wershada Gerey. Households prioritizing financial support are located in: Afarta Kaare, Buulo Baclay, Buulo Bidar, Buulo Control, Kulmiye, Mustaqbal 1, Mustaqbal 2, New Donyalay and Warshad Garey.

WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE

- 86% of households reported access to latrines, but Afarta Kaare was the only settlement within the Sphere standard of 20 households per latrine. In all the other settlements, WASH actors should plan interventions to ensure latrines are separated by sex and equipped with lighting and lockable doors.
- 61% of households reported no receipt of hygiene items in the last three months, in particular: Buulo Baclay, Buulo Bidar, Buulo Control, Kulmiye, and Mustaqal 1 - should be prioritized in future distributions.
- 63% of respondents reported washing of hands with water only. WASH actors should further explore these behaviors and linkages to cultural practice and hygiene item distribution.
- 94% of households reported payment for water. WASH actors should further explore this cost and its effect on household livelihood and access to water.

SHELTER

- 451 buuls and 530 transitional shelters were scored as "urgent". Shelter actors should consider immediate interventions to support these structures.

- 90% of households use the same container for storage and transport. 92% use the same container for drinking and washing. Household reasons for reuse of containers and linkages to disease and outbreak must be further explored by WASH actors.

EDUCATION

- 60% of households reported school-age children not enrolled in school. Education actors should prioritize intervention in settlements reporting a low number of student enrollment: Alamin 1, Alamin 2, Buulo Bidar, Kulmiye, Mustaqbal 1, Mustaqbal 2, Weshada Garey.
- The majority of households reported the main obstacle to enrollment to be school fees (on average 11 USD). Education actors must explore the impact of school fees on children's access to education.
- Access to water and food were also reported as major issues to enrollment. Education, WASH and food security partners should closely work together to provide integrated programming to mitigate this issue
- 39% of households reported access to education inside the settlement. Actors should further explore household proximity to education facilities within and in the vicinity of the displacement sites.
- 91% of households felt their children's education could be improved through teacher training and the provision of school supplies. Education actors should further explore this need and the availability of local resources to adequately address it.
- Education actors should prioritize profiling of education preferences at the household level in relation to formal and informal schooling.

Agencies and organizations who participated in the tri-cluster assessment in Galkayo include: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), ACTED, Impact Initiatives, Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), Cooperazione Internazionale (COOPI), and Somalia Birth Attendants Cooperative Organisation (SBACO)

Contacts

Somalia Shelter Cluster Coordinator

Martijn Goddeeris

goddeeri@unhcr.org

Somalia WASH Cluster Coordinator

Patrick Laurent

plaurant@unicef.org

Somalia Education Cluster Coordinator

Tyler Arnot

edclustersomalia@gmail.com

REACH Country Focal Point

Kournie Schaeffer

kournie.schaefer@reach-initiative.org

REACH Informing
more effective
humanitarian action

REACH is a joint initiative of two international non-governmental organizations - ACTED and IMPACT Initiatives - and the UN Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNOSAT).

REACH was created in 2010 to facilitate 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. All REACH activities are conducted in support to and within the framework of inter-agency aid coordination mechanisms.

For more information visit: www.reach-initiative.org. You can write to us directly at: geneva@reach-initiative.org and follow us @REACH_info