LOCAL INTEGRATION FOCUS: SOMALILAND 2018
DURABLE SOLUTIONS ANALYSIS

Review of existing data and assessments to identify gaps and opportunities to inform (re)integration planning and programing for displacement affected communities
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ABOUT the Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS)

The Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS) was created in March 2015 with the aim of maintaining a focused momentum and stakeholder engagement in the search of durable solutions for displacement affected communities in East and Horn of Africa. It comprises 19 NGOs: ACTED, CARE International, Concern Worldwide, DRC, IRC, INTERSOS, Mercy Corps, NRC, Oxfam, RCK, Save the Children, World Vision and LWF with DRC, IRC and NRC forming the steering committee.

ReDSS is not an implementing agency but a coordination and information hub acting as a catalyst and agent provocateur to stimulate forward thinking and policy development on durable solutions. It seeks to improve joint learning and research, advocacy and policy dialogue, capacity development and coordination. ReDSS’ goal is to improve programming and policy in support of durable solutions for displacement affected communities in East and Horn of Africa.

ABOUT the ReDSS DURABLE SOLUTIONS FRAMEWORK

ReDSS operationalized the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Framework for Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons to develop ReDSS Solutions Framework, using 28 indicators organized around physical, material and legal safety to measure durable solutions achievements in a particular context. Addressing physical, material and legal safety of displaced people as a whole is critical in the search for durable solutions. The ReDSS Solutions Framework offers a snapshot in time to assess to what extent durable solutions for displaced populations have been achieved in a particular context. A traffic light system has been developed to assess the status of each indicator. This system provides a comparative assessment of conditions between the displaced and the host community. A “green” rating indicates that the situation of the displaced is similar or better than that of the host population, “orange” indicates that the situation of the displaced is worse than that of the host population “red” indicates that the situation of the displaced is significantly worse than that of the host population, with significant displacement-specific vulnerabilities and/or discrimination existing, “white” indicates inadequate data is available to rate the situation.

The Framework can be used as an analytical and adaptive programmatic tool, to support coordination and identify gaps and needs of displacement affected communities. The rationale behind the Framework is that it should improve and standardize the generation and availability of relevant data and analysis to better and more consistently operationalize joint response plans in the search for durable solutions in East Africa.
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GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

Area-Based Approach
An approach that defines an area, rather than a sector or target group, as the main entry point. All stakeholders, services and needs are mapped and relevant actors mobilized and coordinated with. (IRC)

Early Solutions Planning
Early solutions planning encompasses steps to build the self-reliance and resilience of refugees and host communities, as well as prepare refugees for future durable solutions, in the early stages of displacement. For the purposes of this report, the timeframe for “early solutions planning” covers actions that can be taken pre-displacement, as well as during the first 3 years of an influx of refugees. (RedSS)

Durable Solutions
A durable solution is achieved when the displaced no longer have any specific assistance and protection needs that are linked to their displacement and can enjoy their human rights without discrimination on account of their displacement. It can be achieved through return, local integration and resettlement (IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs).

Host communities
The local, regional and national governmental, social and economic structures within which refugees live. (UNHCR)

Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)
Persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border. (Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement)

Livelihoods
A combination of the resources used and the activities undertaken in order to live. Resources include individual skills (human capital), land (natural capital), savings (financial capital), equipment (physical capital), as well as formal support groups and informal networks (social capital). (DfID)

Local Integration
Local integration as a durable solution combines three dimensions. Firstly, it is a legal process, whereby refugees attain a wider range of rights in the host state. Secondly, it is an economic (material) process of establishing sustainable livelihoods and a standard of living comparable to the host community. Thirdly, it is a social and cultural (physical) process of adaptation and acceptance that enables the refugees to contribute to the social life of the host country and live without fear of discrimination. (UNHCR)

RedSS Durable Solutions Framework
An easy to use analysis tool used to assess the extent to which durable solutions have been achieved in a particular context. RedSS operationalized the IASC Framework for Durable Solutions for IDPs to develop the RedSS Durable Solutions Framework for displacement-affected communities. It comprises the 8 IASC criteria around a) Physical Safety – protection, safety and security, and social cohesion b) Material Safety – access to basic services, access to job creation and economic opportunities, restoration of housing land and property, c) Legal Safety – access to documentation, family reunification, participation in public affairs, and access to effective remedies and justice.

Refugee
A person who “owing to well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinions, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country” (Geneva Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, Art. 1A(2), 1951)

Resilience
Resilience is the ability of countries, communities and households to manage change, by maintaining or transforming living standards in the face of shocks or stresses - such as earthquakes, drought or violent conflict - without compromising their long-term prospects (DRD)

Resettlement
The transfer of refugees from an asylum country to another State that has agreed to admit them and ultimately grant them permanent settlement. (UNHCR)

Returnee
The act or process of going back to the point of departure. This could be within the territorial boundaries of a country, as in the case of returning internally displaced persons (IDPs) and demobilized combatants; or between a host country (either transit or destination) and a country of origin, as in the case of migrant workers, refugees, asylum-seekers, and qualified nationals. There are subcategories of return which can describe the way the return is implemented, e.g. voluntary, forced, assisted and spontaneous return; as well as subcategories which describe who is participating in the return, e.g. repatriation (for refugees). (IOM)

Social cohesion
The achievement of a sustainable return to country of origin i.e. the ability of returnees to secure the political, economic and social conditions to maintain their life, livelihood and dignity. (Macrae/UNHCR)

Reintegration
A framework for transitioning displacement situations into durable solutions, requiring a partnership between humanitarian and development actors, refugees and host communities, and the participation of local actors through area-based interventions. Transitional solutions seek to enhance the self-reliance of protracted refugees and host communities alike. (RedSS/Samuel Hall 2015)

Self-Reliance
The social and economic ability of an individual, household or community to meet basic needs (including protection, food, water, shelter, personal safety, health and education) in a sustainable manner and with dignity. (UNHCR)

Social Cohesion
The nature and set of relationships between individuals and groups in a particular environment (horizontal social cohesion) and between those individuals and groups and the institutions that govern them in a particular environment (vertical social cohesion). Strong, positive, integrated relationships and inclusive identities are perceived as indicative of high social cohesion, whereas weak, negative or fragmented relationships and exclusive identities are taken to mean low social cohesion. (World Vision)

Transitional Solutions
A framework for transitioning displacement situations into durable solutions, requiring a partnership between humanitarian and development actors, refugees and host communities, and the participation of local actors through area-based interventions. Transitional solutions seek to enhance the self-reliance of protracted refugees, IDPs and host communities alike. (RedSS/Samuel Hall 2015)
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INTRODUCTION

Internal displacement in Somaliland is complex, driven over the years by multiple, inter-linked factors including insecurity, drought, and other disasters. Multiple displacements are common. The most recent large-scale displacement was triggered by the drought in 2016-17, which according to the UN has led to the displacement of 300,000 people throughout Somaliland since the beginning of 2017. In line with the trend of urbanization in Somaliland, both protracted and recently displaced IDPs are located mainly in cities such as Hargeisa and Burao, where they live either in settlements or among the local population.

The Government of Somaliland has taken positive steps in responding to displacement and planning for durable solutions for IDPs. A National Internal Displacement Policy was finalized in 2015. The Policy aims to establish a systematic, coordinated and principled response to displacement, and provide common guidance on improving IDPs’ living conditions, protecting their rights, and facilitating durable solutions. At the time of writing, the National Displacement and Refugee Agency (NDRA) is also finalizing its 5-year Strategic Plan, which has a specific component on IDPs. Full implementation of both the Policy and Strategic Plan will be essential if durable solutions are to be found and established for Somaliland’s IDPs.

In July and August 2018, the Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS), supported by the Somaliland Durable Solutions Consortium (SDSC), conducted a durable solutions analysis in Somaliland. This process aimed to understand the gaps and opportunities that exist for the reintegration of IDPs, either through local integration, return to area of origin or settlement in a third location. The results of this exercise are intended to inform policy and practice in Somaliland in relation to the reintegration of IDPs, including the utilization of area-based approaches in displacement-affected communities. Significantly, it is hoped that the findings and recommendations will help to inform the implementation of the Internal Displacement Policy and the NDRA Strategic Plan. ReDSS has undertaken similar solutions analysis processes in Uganda, Tanzania, Ethiopia and Somalia.

This report on the durable solutions analysis is presented in the following parts:

- Part I outlines the objectives and rationale of the solutions analysis process
- Part II outlines the methodology, including efforts made to ensure a participatory and consensus building approach
- Part III provides an overview of the IDP population, in terms of numbers, types of settlement, and key characteristics, as well as the root causes of displacement
- Part IV analyses the situation of IDPs in relation to the 8 sub-criteria found in the ReDSS Durable Solutions Framework, and compares their situation to that of the host population
- Part V examines the institutions, actors, policies and strategies that are relevant to internal displacement and durable solutions in Somaliland
- Part VI outlines the options for durable solutions processes in Somaliland

---
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The overall approach taken in the solutions analysis is detailed in the diagram below. Identifying gaps and opportunities for durable solutions planning and programming in Somaliland, specifically the (re)integration of IDPs, was used to understand the current level of integration of IDPs and to identify any displacement-specific vulnerabilities that exist, through comparing their situation to that of the host population in relation to the following criteria/sub-criteria:

**Physical Safety**
- 1. Safety and security/Protection/Social Cohesion;
- 2. Access to basic services;
- 3. Access to job creation/economic opportunities;
- 4. Restoration of housing, land and property;

**Material Safety**
- 5. Access to documentation;
- 6. Family reunification;
- 7. Participation in public affairs;

**Legal Safety**

An analysis under each of the sub-criteria is presented in Part III of this report.

PART II: APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The overall approach taken in the solutions analysis is detailed in the diagram below. Identifying gaps and opportunities for durable solutions planning and programming in Somaliland, specifically the (re)integration of IDPs, was used to understand the current level of integration of IDPs and to identify any displacement-specific vulnerabilities that exist, through comparing their situation to that of the host population in relation to the following criteria/sub-criteria:

**Physical Safety**
- 1. Safety and security/Protection/Social Cohesion;
- 2. Access to basic services;
- 3. Access to job creation/economic opportunities;
- 4. Restoration of housing, land and property;

**Material Safety**
- 5. Access to documentation;
- 6. Family reunification;
- 7. Participation in public affairs;

**Legal Safety**

An analysis under each of the sub-criteria is presented in Part III of this report.

**PARTICIPATORY PROCESS AND CONSENSUS BUILDING APPROACH**

The durable solutions analysis was undertaken using the methods detailed in the table below. A focus was placed upon ensuring a participatory process and consensus-building approach, through the meaningful engagement of key stakeholders and displacement-affected communities, throughout the analysis. The need for a durable solutions analysis was identified during a ReDSS workshop for key government stakeholders, local authorities and operational agencies in Hargeisa in April 2018, during which key gaps in knowledge vis-à-vis displacement and durable solutions were identified.

---

4. [ReDSS Durable Solutions Framework](http://regionaldss.org/index.php/research-and-knowledge-management/solutions-framework/)
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Method | Explanation
--- | ---
Secondary data review | Documents reviewed included relevant laws/polices/plans (including the Somaliland National Development Plan II, and the draft National Displacement and Refugee Agency Strategic Plan 2018-2022); academic research; assessments conducted by humanitarian and development actors; and strategy and programming documents. A full list of documents reviewed can be found in the bibliography.

Key informant interviews (KIs) | Interviews were held with a total of 46 key informants, who included government representatives; representatives of national NGOs, INGOs and UN Agencies; IDP and host population leaders; academics; and donors.

Focus group discussions (FGDs) | 12 FGDs were conducted in displacement-affected communities with the involvement of IDPs, returnees and host population members in 6 IDP settlements in Hargeisa and Burao. 6 FGDs were with women and 6 FGDs were with men, including the youth.

Consultation and validation workshop | In order to discuss, and get consensus on, the preliminary findings and recommendations, a workshop was held in Hargeisa on 4 September 2018. The workshop was attended by local and national government; local and international NGOs; UN Agencies; and research institutions.

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

- Quantitative data comparing the situation of IDPs with that of the host population is limited. The analysis of the ReDSS Durable Solutions Framework criteria relied heavily on qualitative data, found either in the secondary data or during the KIs, FGDs and validation workshop.
- Much of the data available on the IDP population is focused upon those living in settlements in urban areas. There is limited data available on IDPs in rural areas, and IDPs who are living outside of settlements.
IDPs are generally more exposed to protection risks than the host population.

Relations are mostly good between IDPs and the host population.

The situation has improved significantly over the past year, but IDPs, and new IDPs in particular, are more likely to experience food insecurity.

IDPs generally have poorer access to education than the host population.

IDPs tend to have poorer access to health services than the host population.

The situation is generally worse for IDPs than it is for the host population.

The situation is worse than for the host population.

The situation is significantly worse than for the host population, with significant displacement-specific vulnerabilities and/or discrimination existing.

Inadequate data is available to rate this criteria.

All indicators refer to the attainment of benchmarks for IDPs in comparison to the host community.

- The situation of IDPs is similar or better than for the host population.
- The situation of IDPs is worse than for the host population.
- The situation of IDPs is significantly worse than for the host population, with significant displacement-specific vulnerabilities and/or discrimination existing.
- Inadequate data is available to rate this criteria.
PART III: TYPOLOGY OF INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT: WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT IDPs IN SOMALILAND?

HOW MANY IDPS ARE IN SOMALILAND?

Somaliland’s total population was estimated to be 3.8 million in 2016, with 53% living in urban areas, 11% in rural areas, and 34% described as the nomadic population. Somaliland’s population is young and increasingly urbanized, and these trends are mirrored within the IDP population.

Before the recent drought started in 2016, the Government estimated the number of IDPs to be around 76,000 individuals (approximately 2% of the population). With the 2016/2017 drought gravely impacting upon agricultural and pastoral livelihoods, the number of IDPs has increased dramatically. Most stakeholders agree that producing close estimates of the IDP population is challenging. There is a notable deviation between the figure provided by the NDRA of 150,404 IDP households, which would equate to around 900,000 individuals (or almost quarter of the Somaliland population), and the UN figure of approximately 320,000 individuals displaced since the beginning of 2017, based on the figures of the Protection and Return Monitoring Network.

WHAT ARE THE KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF IDPS IN SOMALILAND?

- Somaliland’s IDPs are generally described as either “protracted” or “new”.
  - Protracted IDPs: The vast majority of these protracted IDPs are located in Hargeisa, Burao and Borama. A 2015 IDP Profiling exercise in Hargeisa settlements and IDP hosting areas found that the IDP population consisted of a mix of IDPs from Somaliland, mainly displaced by previous droughts; refugees who have returned from Ethiopia from the 1990s onwards; economic migrants who have moved to the city for a better life, and who tend to be labeled “IDPs”; and a small number of individuals displaced from South-Central Somalia. 49% of IDP respondents in the 2018 Joint Multi-Cluster Needs Assessment (JMCNA) reported being displaced for 3 years or more.
  - New IDPs: The majority of recently displaced IDPs in Somaliland were forced to leave their homes from late 2016 onwards by the drought. Loss of livestock and land was a significant factor in their displacement. Another cause of recent displacement was Cyclone Sagar, which made landfall in May 2018 and affected large parts of Awdal region and the northern coastline.

- IDPs can be found in urban, peri-urban and rural areas, with some living in settlements and others living among the host population
  - Mirroring the Somaliland trend of urbanization, the vast majority of protracted IDPs, and the majority of new IDPs can be found in urban and peri-urban areas. According to the NDRA, “the vast majority of IDPs, estimated to be some 60%, live in host communities, while a smaller number, estimated to be some 40%, live in camps scattered across the country.” The government has generally tried to prevent the establishment of new IDP settlements in urban areas, and not all settlements are officially recognized by the government. Those living among the host population have joined their families/extended families and are staying on their land. Most of the information available on the IDP population is on those living in the settlements, with little available information on those living among the host population.

A significant proportion of the IDPs living in settlements are in ‘temporary’ settlements, even though many have lived in these locations since the 1990s. They are temporary in the sense that the land has been made available for the temporary stay of IDPs, rather than their permanent settlement. Infrastructure development and the building of permanent shelter is generally discouraged in the temporary settlements, relocation to land identified by the government is seen as the main solution for IDPs who want to stay in urban areas. There are a number of notable examples of IDP relocations- including the Jmcale and Ayah IV settlements in Hargeisa- residents of which have received land title deeds. Families living in these locations were relocated from ‘temporary’ settlements, which were quite central, to the relocation sites, which are further from town centers.

- Recurrent drought is likely to continue to be the major cause of displacement in Somaliland
  - The figures of the Protection and Return Monitoring Network indicate that around three quarters of displacement in Somaliland since January 2017 has been due to drought. The drought has severely affected Somaliland. With a scarcity of pasture and water, many animals died, or families were forced to sell off their animals before they died. It is estimated that poor families lost 40–60% of their livestock during the drought. Agricultural land was also devastated, leaving many with little option but to leave their homes. The frequency and severity of drought has increased over the past decade in Somaliland, and this trend is likely to continue in the coming years, placing an increasing number of people in rural areas at risk of displacement. This has implications not only in terms of future durable solutions, but also highlights the need to invest in rural resilience as means of preventing/mitigating future displacement.

- The line between an IDP and an economic migrant is often blurred
  - Key informants highlighted that a number of other factors influence movement from the rural areas to urban IDP hosting areas. These factors include most notably the absence of basic services, particularly water, education and health; and the lack of economic opportunities for young people. Distinguishing between IDPs and economic migrants can be challenging, and the utility of doing so can also be called into question, given that both groups often live in the same locations and share many of the same challenges.

- Many IDPs move between place of origin and place of displacement
  - Many IDPs engage in seasonal movement between IDP settlements in towns and rural areas where they have agricultural land. There is also a prevalence of split households with some members, usually male, remaining in rural areas to tend to agricultural land or livestock, while the women and children move to IDP settlements in towns where basic services and assistance are more readily available. These dynamics and mobility need to be recognized within the planning for durable solutions, and area-based approaches to displacement need to be mindful of the fact that many IDPs move between different areas.
PART IV: ANALYSIS OF IDPS LIVING CONDITIONS IN RELATION TO REDSS FRAMEWORK CRITERIA

In this section, a narrative analysis of the specific needs and vulnerabilities of IDPs is provided under each of the following sub-criteria from the ReDSS Durable Solutions Framework:

1. Safety and security/Protection/Social Cohesion;
2. Access to basic services;
3. Access to job creation/economic opportunities;
4. Restoration of housing, land and property;
5. Access to documentation;
6. Family reunification;
7. Participation in public affairs; and

A traffic light-system is also used to “rate” each of these sub-criteria, based on how the situation of IDPs compares to that of the host population. This rating system is detailed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The situation of IDPs is similar or better than that of the host population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>The situation of IDPs is worse than that of the host population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>The situation of IDPs is significantly worse than that of the host population, with significant displacement-specific vulnerabilities and/or discrimination existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Inadequate data is available to rate this criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations of the rating system

The ratings system is concerned with comparing the situation of IDPs with that of the host population. A “green” rating indicates that the situation of the IDP population is the same or better than the situation of the host population, and that there are no longer protection and assistance needs, or forms of discrimination, specifically related to displacement. However, a green rating does not necessarily indicate a situation that is adequate in terms of human development. Although not captured by the ratings system, the broader development needs in displacement-affected communities are still explored in the narrative under each sub-criteria.

Additionally, and as highlighted in Part II, there are a number of different categories of IDPs: protracted versus new; urban/peri-urban versus rural; in settlements versus living among host population. The needs and vulnerabilities of IDPs, and their situation compared to the host population, varies from location to location. The rating itself is therefore very general, but within the narrative an attempt is made to highlight the nuance and the difference within the IDP population.
1. SAFETY & SECURITY/ PROTECTION/ SOCIAL COHESION

Perceptions of safety and security

There is a lack of specific quantitative data comparing exposure to protection risks of IDPs and the host population, and protection risks tend to vary from location to location. However, most key informants felt that IDPs are more exposed to safety and security threats than the host population, including theft, assault and various forms of gender-based violence. Key informants and FGD participants highlighted a number of factors exposing IDPs to risk, including:

- The situation in many IDPs’ settlements (i.e. overcrowding; a lack of lighting; a lack of lockable shelters; a lower police presence; a higher prevalence of gangs, linked to the lack of police presence; a lack of household latrines; and a lack of sex-disaggregated latrines).
- Threats to women when traveling outside of settlements.

A recent NGO assessment16 captured data on IDPs’ perceptions of safety in IDP settlements that had seen influxes of drought-affected IDPs. Significantly, 50% of female respondents said they felt unsafe when traveling outside of their settlement (versus 28% of men). 26% of women felt unsafe in the market, 15% at the water point, 12% at the latrines and 11% in their shelters. In contrast, only 4% of respondents in the SDSC baseline assessment said that they felt unsafe moving around their settlement, although one recently established site (Aqil Yare) was a notable outlier, with 50% saying they felt unsafe. This appears to have been largely due to there being no police station nearby.

Threats to safety and security

According to the data available, the proportion of IDPs who experience security problems and/or protection incidents remains relatively low. 98% of respondents in the 2015 IDP Profiling exercise in Hargeisa said that they had never experienced a direct security problem in their current location.

The available data indicates that women are more exposed to violence than men. The SDSC baseline assessment found that 7% of host population women and 8% of IDP women had experienced physical assault, with domestic violence and other forms of GBV being by far the most common forms, versus 3% of host population men and 2.5% of IDP men. FGD participants pointed to the existence of gangs of young men who have perpetrated thefts or sexual assaults, particularly against women and girls when they are traveling outside of their settlements for work, to go to school or to collect water or firewood16. Loss of livelihood for men, and women’s increasing role as a breadwinner, were highlighted by some key informants as contributing factors to domestic violence (see ‘Access to Job Creation and Economic Opportunities’ section below for further details). The need to strengthen the limited GBV response services in Somaliland was highlighted by a number of key informants, and also came up several times among female FGD participants.

Social Cohesion

FGD participants reported good relations with their host population neighbors. A number of FGD participants pointed out that SDSC project interventions have helped to build stronger relationships (particularly, the establishment of Self Help Groups and cash for work activities) and strengthen dispute resolution (specifically the Collaborative Dispute Resolution trainings conducted by NPC). Key informants also pointed out that relations are good between IDPs and the host population, although there are sometimes tensions over land (see ‘Restoration of Housing, Land and Property’ section below). FGD participants highlighted that there are some tensions in settlements between protracted and new IDPs: some protracted IDPs feel that the new influx is straining resources/services, and some new IDPs feel that the protracted IDPs have received a better level of assistance.

The predominantly good relations between IDPs and the host population were underlined by the findings of a recent NGO assessment16, with only 1% of assessed households indicating that they have a poor relationship with their host population neighbors, whilst the overwhelming majority (93%) reported that relations were ‘good’ or ‘very good’. This is largely due to people settling in areas with the same clan/sub-clan, and therefore enjoying strong social and protective networks.

2. ACCESS TO BASIC SERVICES

Food security and nutrition

Food security and nutrition have improved significantly in the last year, this is a testament to the effectiveness of the humanitarian response. However, food insecurity persists, with drought-displaced IDPs among the most food insecure. The ‘Post Gu’ data of the Food Security and Nutrition Analysis Unit (FSNAU) projects that food security will be at Stressed (IPC Phase 2) and Crisis (IPC Phase 3) in most of Somaliland between August and December 2018, with most of the areas hosting IDP settlements being in IPC Phase 317.

Areas of Somaliland affected by Cyclone Sagar and the northern coastline will be at IPC Phase 4 (Emergency). According to FSNAU data, IDPs are more likely to be in IPC Phases 2, 3 and 418. Furthermore, an estimated 6,000 IDPs in Hargeisa and 3,000 IDPs in Bura are estimated to be in IPC Phase 5 (“Catastrophe”) and in need of urgent attention19.

Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) in IDP settlements is estimated to be at 9.8% in Hargeisa, 6.3% in Bura, and 8.7% in Berbera20. These figures have significantly decreased within the course of one year: in June 2017, GAM in Hargeisa was at 17.3% and 18.7% in Berbera, highlighting the significant impact of humanitarian assistance. The nutrition situation is predicted to deteriorate for IDPs in Hargeisa and Berbera (but not Bura) between August and October 201821.

Water and sanitation

The analysis team were unable to find representative data specifically comparing access to water for the IDP and host populations. Access to water is largely dependent on location, with worse access in rural areas, and displaced populations generally face similar challenges to the host population living in their immediate vicinity. Key informants generally felt that IDPs have poorer access to water than the host population, pointing to the shortage of water services in IDP hosting areas, and that IDPs are less likely to be able to afford the cost of an adequate amount of water.

Water availability is limited in Somaliland, due to the semi-arid climate, low rainfall and the fact that there are no permanent lakes or rivers. According to the NDP-II,22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection, safety and security</td>
<td>IDPs are generally more exposed to protection risks than the host population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Cohesion

FGD participants reported good relations with their host population neighbors. A number of FGD participants pointed out that SDSC project interventions have helped to build stronger relationships (particularly, the establishment of Self Help Groups and cash for work activities) and strengthen dispute resolution (specifically the Collaborative Dispute Resolution trainings conducted by NPC). Key informants also pointed out that relations are good between IDPs and the host population, although there are sometimes tensions over land (see ‘Restoration of Housing, Land and Property’ section below). FGD participants highlighted that there are some tensions in settlements between protracted and new IDPs: some protracted IDPs feel that the new influx is straining resources/services, and some new IDPs feel that the protracted IDPs have received a better level of assistance.

The predominantly good relations between IDPs and the host population were underlined by the findings of a recent NGO assessment16, with only 1% of assessed households indicating that they have a poor relationship with their host population neighbors, whilst the overwhelming majority (93%) reported that relations were ‘good’ or ‘very good’. This is largely due to people settling in areas with the same clan/sub-clan, and therefore enjoying strong social and protective networks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td>Relations are mostly good between IDPs and the host population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food security and nutrition

Food security and nutrition have improved significantly in the last year, this is a testament to the effectiveness of the humanitarian response. However, food insecurity persists, with drought-displaced IDPs among the most food insecure. The ‘Post Gu’ data of the Food Security and Nutrition Analysis Unit (FSNAU) projects that food security will be at Stressed (IPC Phase 2) and Crisis (IPC Phase 3) in most of Somaliland between August and December 2018, with most of the areas hosting IDP settlements being in IPC Phase 317. Areas of Somaliland affected by Cyclone Sagar and the northern coastline will be at IPC Phase 4 (Emergency). According to FSNAU data, IDPs are more likely to be in IPC Phases 2, 3 and 418. Furthermore, an estimated 6,000 IDPs in Hargeisa and 3,000 IDPs in Bura are estimated to be in IPC Phase 5 (“Catastrophe”) and in need of urgent attention19.

Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) in IDP settlements is estimated to be at 9.8% in Hargeisa, 6.3% in Bura, and 8.7% in Berbera20. These figures have significantly decreased within the course of one year: in June 2017, GAM in Hargeisa was at 17.3% and 18.7% in Berbera, highlighting the significant impact of humanitarian assistance. The nutrition situation is predicted to deteriorate for IDPs in Hargeisa and Berbera (but not Bura) between August and October 201821.

Water and sanitation

The analysis team were unable to find representative data specifically comparing access to water for the IDP and host populations. Access to water is largely dependent on location, with worse access in rural areas, and displaced populations generally face similar challenges to the host population living in their immediate vicinity. Key informants generally felt that IDPs have poorer access to water than the host population, pointing to the shortage of water services in IDP hosting areas, and that IDPs are less likely to be able to afford the cost of an adequate amount of water.

Water availability is limited in Somaliland, due to the semi-arid climate, low rainfall and the fact that there are no permanent lakes or rivers. According to the NDP-II,22
less than half the population has access to clean water. The differences between rural and urban areas are stark: as of 2014, 64% of the urban population had access to an improved water source, versus only 28% of the rural population. Increased urbanization is also placing pressure on urban water sources.

Water trucking to public water tanks remains the primary water source in displacement-affected areas: 71% of respondents in the SDSC baseline assessment (in Hargeisa and Burao), and 67% of respondents in Hargeisa in the 2017 JMCNA reported receiving their water this way. This is in part due to the “temporary” status of IDP settlements, which has inhibited the development of water supply infrastructure. However, it is also notable that the relocation sites of Jimcale, Ayah IV, and Diagade all rely on water trucking. The SDSC baseline assessment in 2017 found that the approximate price of water was 500 Somali Shillings for a 20l jerry can.

In terms of sanitation, the difference between urban and rural areas is also stark. According to the NDP-II, only 26% of household members in rural areas use an improved sanitation facility, versus 87% in urban areas. IDPs are more likely than the host population to share a latrine with people who are not in their household: in the SDSC baseline assessment, 37% of IDPs indicated using a shared latrine, versus 16% of the host population. Unsurprisingly, access to sanitation appears worst for those recently displaced. The prevention of installing infrastructure in temporary IDP settlements undoubtedly inhibits access to latrines. A 2018 NGO assessment, conducted in settlements that have received large numbers of drought-affected IDPs, found that one in two respondents had no access to latrines. The 2018 JMCNA also found that IDPs were more likely than the host population to report having no access to a latrine.

Access to education
Access to education is significantly higher in urban areas that it is in rural areas in Somaliland. In the SDSC baseline assessment, there was also a significant difference in the % of households reporting that there were school going children in their household in Hargeisa (92%), as compared to Burao (58%). The analysis was unable to find information comparing enrollment rates for IDPs and the host population, however, a 2017 JMCNA reported that among respondents a lower proportion of IDP children going of school age were attending school (93% of boys and 40% of girls from IDP households, versus 75% of boys and 57% of girls from the host population). Respondents in the SDSC baseline assessment from IDP settlements in Burao (Aidan Saleban, Aqil Yare and Ali Hussein) reported the lowest percentages of children of school going age that are in school (less than 50%).

FGD participants in all locations highlighted that there are no nearby secondary schools. Children who attend secondary schools often have to walk long distances due to poor transportation, and this can expose girls to protection risks. The lack of nearby secondary schools was also highlighted as one of the major reasons for children dropping out of school. Other FGD participants cited the challenges of affording secondary education, and one group highlighted that this has led to some households pulling their children out of school to work, or in some case resorting to early marriage. The 2018 JMCNA also found that girls are more likely to be held out of school for work, with this trend being more pronounced among the IDP population.

Access to healthcare
There are significant disparities in the abilities of urban and rural residents to access healthcare, with women in urban areas more than three times as likely to give birth in a proper health facility. Levels of access to healthcare for IDPs vary depending upon their location, with urban IDPs experiencing the best access, followed by peri-urban and rural IDPs. While urban and peri-urban IDPs enjoy better access to healthcare than the host population in rural areas, the available information suggests that they have worse access than the host population in their immediate vicinity. However, it should also be noted that influxes of IDPs into urban areas place pressure on existing services, adversely impacting upon access to (and quality of) healthcare for the host population.

Even within urban areas, access to healthcare for IDPs tends to vary from site to site. Many of the so-called temporary settlements, such as State House in Hargeisa and Aqil Yare in Burao, have no health facility. Some relocation sites, such as Jimcale and Diagade in Hargeisa, have Maternal Child Health Centers (MCH); however, respondents in FGDs were quick to point out the shortcomings of these facilities in terms of shortages of staff, medicines and services offered. There are no delivery services in most of the IDP settlements and FGD participants highlighted that women in labor are forced to travel long distances, with poor access to transport, if they wish to deliver in a health facility. The SDSC baseline assessment found that host population women were significantly more likely to deliver in a health center than IDP women (75% versus 40%). 49% of IDP respondents reported delivering at home.

IDPs are undoubtedly drawn to, and chose to stay in, cities because of the improved access to services they experience there. However, a number of key informants highlighted that IDPs in urban areas are also more susceptible when there are disease outbreaks, due to the overcrowded living conditions in many of the settlements. For example, IDP hosting areas were more affected by outbreaks of acute watery diarrhea in 2017.

3. ACCESS TO JOB CREATION/ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

Livelihoods and employment in Somaliland
According to the NDP-II, less than 50% of Somaliland’s population are in the labor force. Youth unemployment is high: a 2012 labor force survey carried out by the International Labor Organization (ILO) in Hargeisa, Borama and Burao found that only 5% of youth (15-24 years old) were employed. Drought-related loss of livelihood and lack of economic opportunities are the major causes of both displacement and migration from rural areas of Somaliland.

Income and economic activity in displacement
The SDSC baseline assessment found IDP household incomes to be considerably less than those of the host population. The proportion of IDPs who earn a monthly income of less than USD 100 was considerably higher (68%) as compared to that of the host population (23%). Incomes are particularly low among those who have been more recently displaced, and who have lost assets due to drought. There was also a significant difference between levels of earning in Hargeisa and Burao for both IDPs and the host population, with a higher percentage of respondents in Burao (72%) earning an income of less than USD 100 per month as compared to 52% in Hargeisa.

Women cannot give birth at the MCH, we have to travel to the District hospital. It’s difficult to get transport and the road is bad”. FGD participant in Jimcale
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Access to education | IDPs generally have poorer access to education than the host population.
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The predominant sources of income for IDPs and the host population members are cash for work/casual day labor, skilled/salary work, and petty trade, with skilled/salary work being more common among the host population. 11% of IDPs reported relying on humanitarian support as a key income source in the 2018 JMCNA, versus only 3% of the host population. Most IDP households earn small incomes from casual labor (men in most of the settlements visited highlighted that construction work was their major source of income). Women are increasingly engaged in selling products (fruit, meat, etc.) at markets, street hawking, or working as domestic workers. FGD participants in peri-urban relocation sites highlighted the costs and the time it takes to travel into the center of town to find work.

A number of key informants and FGD participants highlighted that women in IDP communities are increasingly likely to be engaged in paid work outside of the home. This is echoed in a recent NGo assessment28, which found that 49% of the sampled IDP households in Somaliland reported fathers as the primary breadwinner, compared with 48% reporting mothers as the primary breadwinner. This trend is partly a result of recently displaced IDP men struggling to find work or being underemployed, and the lack of relevance of their farming or herding skills in the urban environment. Some key informants and FGD participants highlighted protection concerns that are emerging from this trend:

- Children are left on their own for longer periods of time with both parents leaving the home to work;
- Women and girls are exposed to the risk of GBV when traveling long distances outside of settlements to work; and
- Tensions have been caused within the households between husbands and wives, with some believing this has led to increased domestic violence; and
- With men often struggling to find work, there has been an increase in the number of children working29.

Skills development/training

Vocational training opportunities are limited in Somaliland, with most of the training unsurprisingly being located in urban centers. An ILO Labor survey in 2012 found that, for persons aged 15 and over, 19% of males and 4% of females had done some form of vocational training, with the corresponding figures for Burao being lower at 2% and 3% respectively. There was no evidence found to suggest that IDPs have less access to the minimal vocational training opportunities that are available. Vocational training for youth was highlighted in FGDs as a major priority.

4. RESTORATION OF HOUSING, LAND AND PROPERTY

The issue of access to land with secure tenure in urban locations was highlighted by key informants as one of the most significant barriers to durable solutions. Almost all land in urban areas in Somaliland is privately owned. Although there are laws in place focused on land governance, including the Urban Land Management Law and the Agricultural Land Ownership Law, their implementation and enforcement is limited.

IDPs who come to the cities settle either outside of settlements on the land of extended family or sub-clan, or in informal settlements on private land or the little public land that is available. IDPs living in temporary settlements are vulnerable to land disputes and also forced evictions. Most tenure arrangements are oral, and, in some cases, non-existent30. According to the data of the Protection and Return Monitoring Network, forced evictions from both public and private land are on the increase. From June to August 2018, there were 8 reported forced evictions in Hargeisa and Burao.

The urban land dispute mechanisms available in Somaliland are the customary system (xeer), or formal mechanisms- the courts, and Land Dispute Tribunals 31. Data on IDPs’ access to these mechanisms is not available, however, the SDSC baseline assessment, KILs, and FGDs all revealed that IDPs prefer to try to resolve land disputes through customary and informal means.

Section 4 of the Internal Displacement Policy outlines procedures for carrying out evictions, however, the implementation of these procedures is limited. Under the SDSC project, NPC are intervening when evictions are threatened, arranging advocacy meetings with the aim of preventing forced evictions. NRC have also being providing collaborative dispute resolution training in some communities- this support has been greatly appreciated, and a number of FGD participants highlighted that their communities now have improved skills to resolve land disputes as a result.

The feasibility and appeal of return for IDPs will be influenced by whether they own land and property in their area of origin. The 2015 IDP Profiling exercise in Hargeisa revealed that only 21% of IDPs owned land or a house in their place of origin, suggesting that most protracted IDPs would be unlikely to want to return home. Similar data on ownership of land, land and property in areas of origin for those displaced since the drought could not be found, but would be very useful in informing future durable solutions planning.

Relocation to land identified by the Government is seen as the main solution for those who want to stay in urban areas. There are a number of notable examples of IDP relocations- including Jimcaale, Diagaale, and Ayah IV in Hargeisa- for which residents have received land title deeds. While on the one hand, residents of these sites are grateful to have received their own land and have the feeling of security and permanence that comes with it, many voiced concerns about now being located further away from services (particularly secondary schools and health facilities), and economic opportunities. The Government (at regional and municipal levels) has made efforts to identify further land for relocations, but this has proved difficult given that most land is privately owned. Relocation land to date has largely been identified through the government asking private landowners to donate some of their land. A few examples of local business people purchasing land for IDPs to live on were also highlighted in the KILs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing, land and property</td>
<td>For the most part, IDPs have weak security of tenure. Their lack of secure tenure in place of displacement and place of origin greatly inhibits the establishment of durable solutions, as does the availability of land for relocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 JMCNA, versus only 3% of the host population. Most IDP households earn small incomes from casual labor (men in most of the settlements visited highlighted that construction work was their major source of income). Women are increasingly engaged in selling products (fruit, meat, etc.) at markets, street hawking, or working as domestic workers. FGD participants in peri-urban relocation sites highlighted the costs and the time it takes to travel into the center of town to find work.
31  Data on IDPs’ access to these mechanisms is not available, however, the SDSC baseline assessment, KILs, and FGDs all revealed that IDPs prefer to try to resolve land disputes through customary and informal means.
5. ACCESS TO DOCUMENTATION

The level of birth registration is very low across all communities in Somaliland. The NDP-1 states that only 5% of births are registered. The SDSC baseline assessment found that only 2% of those surveyed were in possession of a birth certificate. The 2015 IDP profiling in Hargeisa found similarly low levels of birth certificate possession, but highlighted that these low levels represented “a systemic challenge and not a displacement-specific one”32.

In terms of other documentation, the SDSC baseline assessment found that the 2 common types of documents possessed by respondents were a national ID card (79%) and a Voters Card (56%). In the 2015 IDP Profiling in Hargeisa, individuals originating from South-Central Somalia were found to be the group least likely to be in possession of identification documents, with only 3% of them claiming to have a Somali identification document.

A number of key informants highlighted that there is a lack of data available on access to documentation for both IDPs and the host population, as well as the challenges faced by those who do not possess certain types of document—people are supposed to produce identity documents for accessing remittances, land registration and school enrollment, as well as other government services in Somaliland. Some key informants felt that the costs of obtaining documents are often more prohibitive for IDPs, however, more data is required to make a rating on this sub-criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to documentation</td>
<td>Access to documentation Not enough information available to rate this sub-criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. FAMILY REUNIFICATION

Unsurprisingly, family separation is more common among IDPs than it is among the host population. The SDSC baseline assessment found that 15% of IDP respondents were separated from a family member, versus 7% of host population respondents. The majority of these separations are as a result of drought, and are deliberate rather than accidental; another recent NGO assessment33 found that 93% of households who had experienced a separation indicated that it was voluntary.

Separated children are much more likely to be staying with extended family members rather than on their own or in institutional care, suggesting social and family networks are strong in Somaliland34. A number of key informants and FGD participants highlighted that levels of unaccompanied children in IDP settlements are extremely low.

Key informants highlighted that family separation is often temporary, and as a result of seasonal migration, with some family members moving between IDP settlements and places of origin to tend to farmland/livestock. Family separation is used as a survival strategy, resulting in “more women-headed and child-headed households in displacement sites, which then become more vulnerable to other threats”35. Several key informants highlighted that this can increase exposure to violence, as women and children are more likely to travel outside of the settlements to find work (see ‘Access to Job Creation and Economic Opportunities’, and ‘Protection, Safety and Security’ sections above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family reunification</td>
<td>Unsurprisingly, IDPs are more likely than the host population to experience family separation. The vast majority of separations are intentional, and used as part of a coping strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

There is a paucity of information available in the literature comparing the extent to which the IDP and host population participate in public affairs.

Only 12% of SDSC baseline assessment respondents said that they or someone from their households participate in local decision-making processes.36 Notably, the proportion of the host population (19%) who participate in local decision-making processes was higher than that of IDPs (11%). Among the IDP respondents, there was a small difference between the reported level of participation of men (13%) and women (11%). However, it is important to note that the SDSC baseline assessment did not explore the nature or quality of participation. Female IDP respondents in another recent NGO assessment reported that women have little influence in community decision-making processes. Other research (not specifically focused on IDPs) has highlighted that women, youth and minorities in Somaliland generally have limited opportunities to participate in local decision-making processes37, and that people in urban areas are more aware of their rights, and therefore more likely than their rural counterparts to engage their local leaders and government representatives38.

The analysis team met with representatives of the leadership committees in 6 IDP settlements. Some of these committees included members of the host population. Women and youth are also members of the committees, although it was not possible to assess the quality of their participation. Committees’ responsibilities include raising awareness within the community e.g. hygiene promotion; resolving disputes; security; reporting concerns/issues to the government and NGOs; organizing deliveries of water; and addressing the needs of vulnerable members of the community. Committee members reported that generally they have good access to, and are treated with respect by, government actors, and have been able to raise their concerns with Mayors, line ministries and the NDRA. However, a number of committee members complained that they often do not receive feedback, and they receive little information from the Government on their plans for their area.

One key outcome of the SDSC project is increasing the voice of displacement-affected communities (both displaced and host populations) in decision-making processes. Having a stake in decision-making processes around durable solutions will be critical for IDPs, and SDSC partners should try to gather further data on participation in decision-making process in displacement-affected communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in public affairs</td>
<td>Not enough information available to rate this sub-criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND REMEDIES

The analysis team was unable to find data that compared the experiences of IDPs and the host population in accessing justice mechanisms.

The formal justice system in Somaliland faces significant challenges, including a shortage of qualified professionals, limited resources and infrastructure, and a paucity of data and record keeping.39 There are some legal aid providers, although provision is limited. Resources in the formal justice system are concentrated in Hargeisa, and access to formal justice mechanisms in rural areas is extremely limited40. Furthermore, the population has little faith in formal justice, leading most to continue to rely on customary law mechanisms41. Xeer, the customary form of justice overseen by clan elders, is used to resolve a wide range of disputes between individuals and families.
A 2018 NGO assessment in Somaliland's IDP sites found community or camp leaders usually resolve disputes, including those related to GBV. This was echoed in the SDSC baseline assessment and the FGDs undertaken as part of this solutions analysis, where participants highlighted that most people address safety and security problems by first going to community leader/clan elders. This reliance on informal mechanisms is not thought to be specific to IDP communities. With its focus on maintaining relations, rather than punishing perpetrators and providing remedies to individuals, Xeer is ill-equipped to deal with gender-based violence and other serious crimes. A landmark law recently passed in the Upper House of Somaliland's Parliament, which criminalizes rape and other forms of gender-based violence such as forced marriage, trafficking for sexual slavery and sexual harassment. This will hopefully lead to increased prosecutions in the formal justice system, and a decreased reliance on Xeer for addressing sexual and gender-based crimes.

Overall, the analysis team found that there was a lack of detailed information available on how IDPs pursue justice through both formal and informal mechanisms, and on how their experiences compare to those of the host population. This is an area where further research would be beneficial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to justice and remedies</td>
<td>Not enough information available to make a comparison between IDPs and the host population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PART V: DISPLACEMENT-RELATED INSTITUTIONS, POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

### INSTITUTIONS, POLICIES AND STRATEGIES OF THE SOMALILAND GOVERNMENT SPECIFICALLY FOCUSED ON DISPLACEMENT

The Somaliland National Displacement and Refugee Agency (NDRA) was established in January 2018. Formerly the Ministry of Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (MRR&R), the NDRA's mission is "to protect and support refugees/asylum seekers, returnees, IDPs and migrants by meeting their basic needs through registration, provision of emergency humanitarian support, protection, relocation and livelihood support, as well as promoting and facilitating durable solutions". The NDRA's key roles in relation to IDPs include coordination, policy/strategy formulation and oversight, facilitating durable solutions, representing the government on issues related to internal displacement, managing settlements, and mobilizing and managing funds.

The NDRA has presence in all the regions of Somaliland, a good knowledge of the context, and good relations with NGOs, UN Agencies and other government entities. However, it is under-resourced and under-capacitated: it has limited capacity for monitoring and evaluation, policy and strategy implementation, and coordination particularly at sub-national level; a small budget in relation to its mandate and responsibilities; and limited facilities and equipment.

Somaliland also has an Internal Displacement Policy finalized in 2015. It establishes the primary responsibility of the MRR&R (now NDRA) for the implementation of the Policy, and commits the government to including displacement-specific elements into all development planning processes. The Policy itself is wide-ranging in that it outlines provisions for prevention and preparedness of displacement, support during displacement, and finding and establishing durable solutions (return, local integration and resettlement in a third location). The Internal Displacement Policy is a strong document, however, its implementation has been limited to date, and much work needs to be done to:

- Raise awareness on the content of the policy among all stakeholders;
- Use the policy to inform the development of government plans and strategies e.g. regional and national development plans, and the sectoral plans of line ministries;
- Improve the overall monitoring of the policy; and
- Strengthen the capacity of the NDRA to lead on the implementation of the policy.

One current strategic planning process offers an excellent opportunity to further the operationalization of the policy. At the time of writing, the NDRA's 5 Year Strategic Plan (2018-2022) is being finalized. The IDP component of the strategy places a strong focus on durable solutions and is centered around the following:

- Strengthening the capacity of the NDRA to undertake its role in relation to IDPs;
- Facilitating permanent voluntary relocation of Somaliland IDPs from temporary to permanent settlements;
- Facilitating the voluntary return of IDPs to their places of origin; and
- Supporting the local integration of IDPs through enhancing services and improving access to economic opportunities.

In undertaking this current durable solutions analysis, ReDSS recognizes that the Internal Displacement Policy and the NDRA 5-Year Strategic Plan are the critical documents that should guide interventions aimed at supporting IDPs and establishing durable solutions. The recommendations in this report are therefore aligned with these two documents, and aimed at supporting their full implementation.
Other relevant government institutions, policies and plans

It is widely recognized that national development plans offer a key opportunity to anchor durable solutions as a priority within development processes. Somaliland’s National Development Plan II 2017-2021 only gives brief mention to IDPs as a vulnerable group. This is possibly because the number of IDPs was considerably lower at the time of the development of the NDP-II, however, the lack of focus on IDPs is an illustration of the Internal Displacement Policy not being applied; the Policy states that “The Government commits to include displacement-specific elements in development plans, poverty alleviation initiatives, urban planning processes and other relevant development plans and programs”.

Mainstreaming displacement into the national development plans is not a magic bullet that automatically translates into a multi-sectoral, development-focused response to displacement and the establishment of durable solutions. However, the lack of focus on IDPs in the NDP-II does highlight the need for the NDRA to work closely with the Ministry of Planning and Development, other ministries and local government actors to ensure there is a focus on displacement in the Government’s national and regional development plans, as well as the sectoral plans of line ministries. It is clear from key informant interviews with government representatives that they do see displacement as a critical challenge to the development of Somaliland, and there is therefore potential to improve the integration of a displacement focus into government planning moving forward.

Another very relevant institution in relation to durable solutions is the National Disaster Preparedness and Food Reserve Authority (NADFOR). The goal of NADFOR is “to prevent frequent occurrence of disasters, droughts and reduce vulnerability of communities by improving sustainable coping capacities to decrease overall impact to disasters on lives and livelihoods of Somaliland communities”. NADFOR have developed and overseen the implementation of the National Disaster Risk Management Policy (revised in 2017), and the National Drought Recovery Strategy (2017). Although neither of these documents is specifically focused on displacement, there are clear linkages to the Internal Displacement Policy and NDRA’s 5 Year Strategic Plan, particularly in terms of resilience building both to prevent displacement, and also to put in place the conditions to enable the voluntary return of IDPs. Continued close collaboration between NADFOR and NDRA, particularly in the development and implementation of interventions related to these policies and strategies, as well as the Recovery and Resilience Framework, will be particularly important to ensure that recovery and resilience interventions are joined up with those supporting durable solutions for IDPs.

Donors, UN Agencies, NGOs and private sector

The Somaliland Development Fund is the main vehicle for bilateral development support in Somaliland. The funding for the SDF is provided by DFID, DANIDA, Norway and the Netherlands. SDF funding is aligned to the targets and gaps identified in the NDP-II. Projects under the SDF have been implemented in a range of sectors, specifically roads, agriculture, livestock, environment, water, fisheries, education and water. Although the SDF is aligned to the NDP-II, and therefore not specifically focused on displacement and durable solutions, SDF projects have helped to improve conditions in displacement-affected communities and areas of return. For example, a water supply project benefited 10,000 residents (primarily IDPs) of Ayah 1 and 2 settlements in Hargeisa.

UN Agencies and NGOs operating in Somaliland can access humanitarian funding, including funds mobilized under the Humanitarian Response Plan, and the Somalia Humanitarian Fund (SHF). A notable recent contribution from the SHF was the release of 2.7 million USD to support basic needs and help to reestablish livelihoods in areas affected by Cyclone Sagal.

Donors have shown some willingness to fund projects focused on durable solutions and/or building resilience. The SDSC project, funded under the European Union’s RE-INTEG Programme, is a multi-year project focused on the sustainable (re)integration of IDPs and returnees. The SDSC project is already having some positive results in terms of increasing integration of IDPs and building social cohesion in urban areas. ReDSS is working with the other SDSC partners to capture lessons learned, which will be crucial in terms of informing future durable solutions processes in Somaliland. Various actors are also engaged in resilience programming in rural areas, including the FAO’s efforts to strengthen food security and livelihoods, and the work of NGO resilience consortia, such as the Somaliland Resilience Programme (SOMREP). Although not specifically focused on durable solutions, these resilience programs play a key role in terms of preventing and minimizing future displacement, and in putting in place the conditions to support the early return of IDPs.

Local actors must always play a key role in search for durable solutions. Somaliland is home to a wide range of local NGOs, whose work already contributes to the integration and reintegration of IDPs in Somaliland. Moving forward, their local knowledge and strong community relations will be crucial in the search for durable solutions. A number of key informants highlighted that these local NGOs need to be empowered through increased funding and partnerships with INGOs and UN Agencies based on mutual respect.

Key informants also highlighted the role that the private sector and local businessmen have played in responding to displacement in terms of providing immediate assistance, facilitating cash transfers, partnering with WFP as vendors, providing employment, and in some cases purchasing land for IDPs to stay on. Humanitarian and development actors should seek to increase coordination and partnerships with the private sector, and include them in the planning and implementation of solutions-focused interventions.

Coordination

Sector working groups exist for food security, nutrition, education, health, protection, WASH, and shelter/non-food items. Chairing of the Working Groups is shared by government and UN/NGOs, for example the Protection Working Group is co-chaired by UNHCR and NDRA. The focus of these sectoral working groups is largely humanitarian. Sector groups with a more development focus also exist, aligned to the sectors of the NDP-II. Durable solutions is an issue that is relevant to all sectors. Acknowledging this, a number of key informants highlighted that efforts should also be made to mainstream durable solutions into the discussions and planning of sectoral Working Groups. Key informants generally preferred this mainstreaming approach to establishing a regular, national-level durable solutions coordination forum. However, several key informants did highlight the need for strong local coordination around specific durable solutions processes e.g. the establishment of new relocation sites.
PART VI: OPTIONS FOR DURABLE SOLUTIONS

WHAT ARE THE FUTURE SETTLEMENT PLANS OF IDPs?

The most recent data available on the future intentions of IDPs comes from the 2018 JMCNA, in which 89% of IDP respondents stated that they intended to stay and settle permanently in their current location.14

The 2015 IDP Profiling exercise in Hargeisa offers an insight into the intentions of protracted IDPs. It found that the overwhelming majority of IDPs originating from Somaliland (98%) wished to remain in the city. The figure was significantly lower for those originating from South-Central Somalia (57% of those living out of settlements and 69% of those living in settlements wished to remain in Hargeisa). The main reasons people cited for wanting to stay in Hargeisa were safety and security; better economic opportunities; and family and land ties. This data is now 3 years old, and of course was gathered before the drought led to a significant increase in IDP numbers. However, most key informants interviewed as part of this analysis did feel that the intention of most of the protracted IDP population is to stay in their current location. The desire of many IDPs to stay in urban centers is unsurprising given the broader trend in Somaliland of urbanization, particularly among younger people. The fact that most protracted IDPs do not have land or property in their areas of origin is also a major contributing factor.

As for those more recently displaced by the drought, key informants were somewhat split in their assessment of these IDPs’ future settlement plans. Some felt that many of these IDPs would be willing to return home if they were to receive adequate support to do so. They cited the importance of investing in agriculture, restocking, strengthening services in rural areas, and other interventions that would build rural resilience. Some key informants highlighted that the focus of assistance/support is concentrated in urban areas (where the major numbers and concentrations of IDPs are), and that not enough attention is being paid to areas of origin, and interventions that would support the transition/reintegration of IDPs who might wish to return home. Other key informants were more skeptical about the prospects of large-scale return, pointing to the limited return of IDPs after previous influxes (particularly the 2011 drought), the general trend towards urbanization, people’s fear of another drought, and the unlikelihood of significant levels of funding becoming available for interventions in places of origin. Many key informants highlighted that farmers will be more likely to return than pastoralists as they have land in their area of origin. Due to time constraints, it was not possible to explore the future intentions and aspirations of IDPs in any level detail in the FGDs, however, the participants that were asked expressed a preference to remain in their current location.

Key informants generally agreed on two things vis-à-vis the future settlement options of IDPs:

- Multiple options for durable solutions will need to be pursued.
- There is a need for better data to inform future planning on durable solutions. This data would include: IDPs’ future intentions and aspirations; their areas of origin; conditions in areas of origin that would need to be in place for them to voluntarily return; and mapping of existing interventions in areas of origin.

SDSC Project Engagement with Government Stakeholders

The European Union and the SDSC partners have sought to make the Government of Somaliland a key stakeholder in the SDSC project from the outset. Early engagement of government actors at all levels has proved critical in terms of securing buy-in. Before the project was awarded, the Government were involved in evaluating project proposals. Representatives of Government, including key ministries and the NDRA participate in Project Steering Committee meetings, which review project progress, and also inform the design and adaptation of ongoing project activities. These same government actors have also accompanied SDSC agencies on quarterly monitoring missions to project sites that have helped to influence government planning.

WHAT ARE THE FUTURE SETTLEMENT OPTIONS FOR IDPS?

Based on what we currently know about the future plans of IDPs, the perspectives of key informants, and the content of the draft NDRA Strategic Plan, future settlement options are listed below:

1. Relocation within urban areas

This option would allow IDPs to move from temporary settlements to permanent locations where they would integrate with eventual land ownership. The main challenges in pursuing this option are 1) the availability of land for relocation in areas to which IDPs would wish to move; and 2) ensuring that relocated IDPs have adequate access to services and economic opportunities in places of relocation. It is clear that this will be an option for some rather than all IDPs given the shortage of available land.

2. Return and reintegration in areas of origin

Most of Somaliland remains peaceful, and insecurity is not a barrier to return in most areas. However, loss of livelihood, lack of land and property, degradation of land, and insufficient services in rural areas do pose significant barriers to return. Furthermore, it is unclear how many IDPs would consider return as an option, and what support would need to be in place to influence their decision to do so.

3. Increase local integration in current place of displacement

The shortage of land for relocation, and the likelihood that many will not want to return home, will mean that a large number of IDPs will likely remain in temporary settlements in urban and peri-urban areas. Although finding a permanent, durable solution for these IDPs will be difficult, efforts can still focus on building their self-reliance and resilience in their current place of displacement, and increasing levels of social and economic integration.

Actions required to move forward these options are addressed in the Recommendations section of this report.

---

14 Presentation on findings of JMCNA 2018, delivered in Hargeisa in September 2018.
Internal displacement in Somaliland is complex, driven over the years by multiple, inter-linked factors including insecurity, conflict, drought, and other disasters. The increasing frequency and severity of drought means that future displacement from rural areas should be expected and planned for. This has implications not only in terms of future durable solutions, but also highlights the need to invest in rural resilience as a means of preventing/mitigating future displacement.

IDPs in Somaliland find themselves in a number of different situations. They are in urban, rural and peri-urban areas, living in settlements or among the host population. Some have been displaced for decades, while others were displaced by the drought from late 2016 onwards. Data on the IDP population is fairly limited, with most of the information available being on those who live in settlements in urban and peri-urban areas.

The IDP experience is characterized by conditions of poverty, low incomes, inadequate access to services, insecure tenure, and exposure to protection risks, particularly for women and girls. Where adequate data is available, the situation of IDPs under most of the ReDSS sub-criteria was found to be worse than that of the host population. Despite this, it is important to note that IDPs and the host population living in their vicinity generally share many of the same challenges, particularly in terms of access to services and economic opportunities. This highlights the need for area-based approaches, which seek to improve the situation of both IDPs and the host population. The situation of protracted IDPs is closer to that of the host population, and displacement-specific vulnerabilities are more pronounced in those more recently displaced. There are also significant differences in the situations of rural and urban populations (both IDPs and host population), with access to services tending to be much better in urban areas, highlighting the need for greater investment in rural areas.

This analysis sought to identify gaps and opportunities for durable solutions for IDPs in Somaliland. As highlighted in the previous section, the 3 solutions options are: 1) voluntary relocation within urban areas; 2) voluntary return and reintegration to place/livelihood of origin; and 3) increased local integration (transitional solutions) in current place of displacement. A summary of the gaps and opportunities in relation to these options is listed below:

**CONCLUSION**

IDPs in Somaliland find themselves in a number of different situations. They are in urban, rural and peri-urban areas, living in settlements or among the host population. Some have been displaced for decades, while others were displaced by the drought from late 2016 onwards. Data on the IDP population is fairly limited, with most of the information available being on those who live in settlements in urban and peri-urban areas.

The IDP experience is characterized by conditions of poverty, low incomes, inadequate access to services, insecure tenure, and exposure to protection risks, particularly for women and girls. Where adequate data is available, the situation of IDPs under most of the ReDSS sub-criteria was found to be worse than that of the host population. Despite this, it is important to note that IDPs and the host population living in their vicinity generally share many of the same challenges, particularly in terms of access to services and economic opportunities. This highlights the need for area-based approaches, which seek to improve the situation of both IDPs and the host population. The situation of protracted IDPs is closer to that of the host population, and displacement-specific vulnerabilities are more pronounced in those more recently displaced. There are also significant differences in the situations of rural and urban populations (both IDPs and host population), with access to services tending to be much better in urban areas, highlighting the need for greater investment in rural areas.

This analysis sought to identify gaps and opportunities for durable solutions for IDPs in Somaliland. As highlighted in the previous section, the 3 solutions options are: 1) voluntary relocation within urban areas; 2) voluntary return and reintegration to place/livelihood of origin; and 3) increased local integration (transitional solutions) in current place of displacement. A summary of the gaps and opportunities in relation to these options is listed below:

### OPPORTUNITIES

- Somaliland is peaceful for the most part, and insecurity does not pose a major barrier to return for most IDPs.
- A National Internal Displacement Policy has been developed, and the NDRA's 5 year Strategic Plan will soon be finalized - both demonstrate a government commitment to finding durable solutions.
- There is a strong presence of NGOs and UN Agencies in Somaliland.
- Donors have shown some willingness to fund multi-year projects focused on resilience building and/or durable solutions.

### GAPS

- There is a shortage of relevant and informative data on the IDP population, including their future aspirations and settlement plans, which can inform durable solutions planning.
- Implementation and monitoring of the Internal Displacement Policy has been very limited. Assistance/support to displacement-affected communities tends to be focused in urban/peri-urban areas.
- There is limited knowledge of durable solutions concepts and processes among key stakeholders, particularly in Government.
- There is a need for greater linkage between resilience building interventions in areas of origin and interventions supporting IDPs in place of displacement.
- There is a shortage of land available for relocation/permanent settlement of IDPs. Available land is mostly in outlying urban areas where access to services and economic opportunities are often limited. There are limited multi-year funding opportunities to scale up resilience building and durable solutions focused programming.
- Local actors are not adequately empowered to play a lead role in promoting and facilitating durable solutions.

The recommendations in this report are largely aimed at addressing the gaps, and capitalizing on the opportunities, outlined in the table above. These recommendations are underpinned by the ReDSS core elements for durable solutions planning and programming:

- National, regional and local authorities have the primary responsibility for finding durable solutions and need to be supported to play their leadership and coordination role.
- Displacement-affected communities (both IDPs and host populations) should be meaningfully involved in the search of durable solutions.
- Collaboration between multiple stakeholders (humanitarian, development, human rights, peace-building) is required in working towards durable solutions for IDPs. It is critical to involve development actors from the start to inform medium to long-term sectorial priorities complementing humanitarian interventions.
- Area-based approaches, which support the host population as well as IDPs, should be adopted.
- Interventions should be aligned and contribute to existing plans and strategies that have a focus on displacement and/or area-based development.
- Interventions should take into account the gender and age dynamics at play and give special attention to the concerns of women and youth.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations are presented in three thematic areas:

A. Strengthening information and knowledge on displacement;
B. Operationalizing policies and plans relevant to durable solutions; and
C. Implementing durable solutions-focused interventions.

A. STRENGTHENING INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE ON DISPLACEMENT AND DURABLE SOLUTIONS

1. Increase the availability of relevant data to inform solutions planning and programming

Better data is required on the following:
- Overall IDP numbers, displacement locations, and areas of origin, disaggregated by age, gender and different vulnerability types (e.g. disability);
- Future aspirations and settlement intentions of IDPs (i.e. return, local integration, relocating to another area), and an understanding of the support that would be required to influence their future decisions on settlement;
- Specific needs, vulnerabilities, threats and opportunities in places of displacement;
- The situation in potential areas of return and relocation: current status and absorptive capacities of services; analysis of markets and income earning opportunities; and mapping of existing resilience and development interventions.

Such information will help to inform area-based interventions that support the achievement of durable solutions. The NDRA should lead on strengthening data gathering and management, and international actors and donors should invest in enhancing their capacity to do so. An initial first step would be to conduct a longitudinal aspirations survey to determine the future settlement preferences and aspirations of the IDP population, and to understand the conditions and support that would need to be in place to enable the return and reintegration of those who are considering this as an option.

2. Increase awareness of durable solutions concepts and approaches

Key informants highlighted the need to increase the awareness and knowledge of government stakeholders, within ministries and at regional and district level, as well as staff from UN Agencies and NGOs. ReDSS conducted an initial durable solutions training in Hargeisa April 2018, and there is a clear need for further such trainings. However, capacity development efforts should extend beyond one-off trainings; other approaches, such as peer-to-peer workshops and the provision of technical support should also be explored.

B. OPERATIONALIZING POLICIES AND PLANS RELEVANT TO DURABLE SOLUTIONS

1. Ensure the implementation of the Internal Displacement Policy, and NDRA's 5 year Strategic Plan

These should be seen as the 2 key documents in guiding approaches to finding durable solutions for IDPs. In order to ensure their full implementation the following will be critical:
- Dissemination and awareness raising on the content of the Policy and the Strategic Plan. This could include dissemination workshops and consultations at national, regional and district-level, as well as with donors.
- Development of an action plan for the IDP component of the 5-Year Strategic Plan, with collective outcomes, and a clear set of actions that need to be undertaken, as well as a monitoring and evaluation framework. This would provide a clear framework for the development of area-based plans in areas of displacement and areas of origin.
- Enhancing the capacity and resources of the NDRA to adequately lead on the implementation and monitoring of the Policy and the 5 Year Strategic Plan.

2. Adopt a “whole of government” approach to durable solutions, through the incorporation of a focus on displacement and solutions within relevant development policies and plans

These would include regional and district development plans, as well as the sectoral plans of line ministries. A focus on displacement and durable solutions should also be incorporated into coordination mechanisms at national and sub-national levels, and the leadership role of national and local authorities within these mechanisms should be promoted and supported by humanitarian and development actors. The meaningful engagement of other critical local actors, most notably local NGOs and the private sector, should also be fostered within durable solutions planning and coordination.

3. Improve the linkages between durable solutions planning and the recovery and resilience agenda

The Drought Recovery Strategy and Disaster Risk Management Policy do not explicitly mention displacement and durable solutions, but they are clearly relevant to durable solutions planning in terms of putting in place the conditions conducive for return, and also in terms of preventing/minimizing future displacement. This calls for continued close collaboration between NADFOR and NDRA, and ensuring that there is joined up action planning for the Drought Recovery Strategy (encompassing activities implemented under the Recovery and Resilience Framework) and NDRA's 5 Year Strategic Plan, to ensure that recovery and resilience interventions support and facilitate durable solutions for IDPs. At the project level, there is also a need for closer collaboration between actors working in urban/peri-urban IDP settlements, and those working on resilience building interventions in rural areas.

C. IMPLEMENTING DURABLE SOLUTIONS-FOCUSED INTERVENTIONS

1. Prevention and investment into early solutions

Somalliland will continue to experience recurrent, climate-related displacement. Ensuring a robust response to displacement will remain crucial, however, a greater focus needs to be placed on systematic preparedness in order to lay the foundations for durable solutions planning. This calls for:
- Investing in building resilience in areas likely to be affected by future droughts, as a means of supporting early return of IDPs, and also preventing/minimizing future displacement;
- Scaling up safety net programs, and ensuring the inclusion of displaced and returnee communities within these;
- Strengthening early warning systems; and
- Mainstreaming displacement and solutions within development plans and policies to factor in the needs of displacement-affected communities, and the strain that displacement is likely to place on services.

2. Voluntary Relocation

Given that many IDPs will wish to remain in urban locations, the efforts of municipal authorities and other government entities to identify land for relocation should be redoubled. The relocation process must be government-led, with the mobilization of UN and NGO stakeholders to ensure that there is adequate protection, access to services, economic opportunities and transport/road linkages in places of relocation. A clear action plan for each relocation should be developed, which should include a timeframe for the eventual handover of service provision to government entities/local authorities.

The lessons learned from previous relocation exercises should be used to guide future relocations. A simple checklist/guidelines for relocations could be developed, which would encompass:

- Enhancing the capacity and resources of the NDRA to adequately lead on the implementation and monitoring of the Policy and the 5 Year Strategic Plan.
- Dissemination and awareness raising on the content of the Policy and the Strategic Plan. This could include dissemination workshops and consultations at national, regional and district-level, as well as with donors.
- Development of an action plan for the IDP component of the 5-Year Strategic Plan, with collective outcomes, and a clear set of actions that need to be undertaken, as well as a monitoring and evaluation framework. This would provide a clear framework for the development of area-based plans in areas of displacement and areas of origin.
- Enhancing the capacity and resources of the NDRA to adequately lead on the implementation and monitoring of the Policy and the 5 Year Strategic Plan.

The lessons learned from previous relocation exercises should be used to guide future relocations. A simple checklist/guidelines for relocations could be developed, which would encompass:
• Ensuring the voluntariness of the relocation;
• Engaging the displaced population and receiving population (population in areas of relocation) in the planning and management of the relocation;
• Assessing the area of relocation: economic opportunities, access to services etc.;
• Identifying linkages with existing/potential development interventions from which the relocated population might benefit, e.g. road construction, construction of health/education facilities etc.;
• Mobilizing stakeholders to support the relocation: shelter, services, protection, food security and livelihoods; and
• Putting in place guarantees that those being relocated will obtain permanent land titles.

3. Voluntary return and reintegration
Planning on return and reintegration must be informed by better data on IDPs’ future settlement intentions/preferences, the kinds of support they might require to help them return home, and better data on their areas of origin. The support required for return and reintegration is likely to include:
• Support to agriculture and fisheries: provision of inputs (seeds, tools), training, supporting market access, increasing access to credit etc.;
• Support to pastoralists: restocking, livestock management, and establishment of pasture reserves;
• Alternative livelihoods: support to diversification of livelihoods, cash for work and cash transfers;
• Strengthening health, education and nutrition services in areas of origin; and
• Water: drilling of boreholes, dam construction.

Support to return and reintegration should be area-based, ensuring that holistic, joined up support is provided in areas of early return and/or potential return. Support could initially be provided on a pilot basis, with pilot areas chosen for the following reasons:
• They are areas that have seen early returns, or are areas of high potential return (based on the expressed preferences of IDPs);
• There are existing development and resilience building interventions (similar to those highlighted above) being undertaken in these areas.

4. Transitional solutions in place of displacement
Permanent, durable solutions are likely to remain out of reach (at least in the short to medium term) for a large proportion of Somaliland’s IDPs for the following reasons:
• The lack of available land for relocation;
• Many IDPs will be unwilling to return;
• The lack of funding to support large-scale voluntary return; and
• New displacement in the future due to climatic events.

For these IDPs, a “transitional solutions” approach, which focuses on building self-reliance and resilience (not just of IDPs but also of the host population and of local institutions), should be adopted. While recognizing that durable solutions may not be achievable, efforts can still be made to increase the social, economic and legal integration of IDPs.

Based on the findings of the durable solutions analysis, priority interventions in such an approach would include:
• Enhancing protection services, including GBV response services.
• Establishing greater protections against, or in the event of, forced evictions, through increased application and monitoring of Section 4 of the Internal Displacement Policy. This would include strengthening the ability of customary justice mechanisms to play a mediating role.
• Increasing access to economic opportunities: establishment of self-groups; support to small businesses; support to vocational training; cash for work.
• Strengthening voice and accountability in displacement-affected communities.
• Upgrading of services and infrastructure: this would help to increase the value of land, and may provide a basis for landowners making a part of their land available for permanent settlement.

5. Ensuring that durable solutions-focused interventions are “adaptive”
In pursuing the 3 solutions processes highlighted above—voluntary relocation, voluntary return and reintegration, and transitional solutions—a flexible and adaptive approach should be adopted. This means that durable solutions planning and programming should have an in-built flexibility, and be capable of adapting based on 1) changes in context and 2) learning on what works and what does not vis-à-vis durable solutions processes in Somaliland. Adaptive durable solutions planning and programming in Somaliland can be aided by the following:
• Flexible, multi-year funding from donors;
• Periodic solutions analyses, which pay particular attention to the legal and policy environment; disaster and displacement dynamics; the actors involved (and not involved) in addressing displacement; and the vulnerabilities, capacities and needs of displacement-affected communities.
• The meaningful engagement of displacement-affected communities in the planning and management of durable solutions processes, including the establishment of effective feedback mechanisms.
• Developing collective outcomes, and monitoring progress towards these.

Accountability to displacement-affected communities in the SDSC project
In order to improve the quality of programming and be more responsive to community needs and complaints, SDSC partners have established a community feedback and accountability mechanism. Three types of feedback channel are used: a hotline, a SMS platform, and community meetings engaging community and religious leaders, CBOs, women groups, and youth groups in the project sites in Burao and Hargeisa.
### ANNEXES

### KEY STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>TYPE OF STAKEHOLDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Africa Help International</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAL Youth Organization</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwaqo Voluntary Organisation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern Worldwide</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Refugee Council</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
<td>Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcier Consulting</td>
<td>Consulting company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap International</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroodi-Jeeh Regional Government Office</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Office, Burao</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Planning and Development</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Disaster Preparedness and Food Reserve Authority</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Displacement and Refugee Agency</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>UN Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali Disaster Resilience Institute</td>
<td>Research/capacity development institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaliland Social Development Organization</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMREP</td>
<td>NGO Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASCO</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telesom Burao</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NGO Consortium</td>
<td>Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togdheer Regional Government Office</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Resident Coordinator’s Office</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor working with WFP</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEORY OF CHANGE: ReDSS SOLUTIONS FRAMEWORK TOOL

GOAL

DISPLACEMENT AFFECTED COMMUNITIES LIVE IN SAFETY AND DIGNITY WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION

IMPACT

COLLABORATIVE STRATEGY
Actors have agreed on key elements, gaps and responsibility sharing in terms of support durable solutions

COLLECTIVE ACCOUNTABILITY
Actors have agreed to collectively amass and share data according to agreed solutions framework thus increasing collective accountability and aiming to catalyze a wider change

INCLUSIVE APPROACH
Actors have agreed to ensure solutions are
• Anchored in an understanding of the situation of the host environment
• Based on input of priorities and perceptions of the displacement affected communities

KEY DOMAINS OF CHANGE

KNOWLEDGE AND EVIDENCE ON DURABLE SOLUTIONS
• Holistic overview of solutions and solutions environment
• Progress of solutions
• Contributions to solutions

PRACTICE IN SUPPORT OF SOLUTIONS
• Data collection / monitoring / involvement
• Joint programming
• Policy and decision making based on evidence

COLLECTIVE ACCOUNTABILITY
Actors have agreed to ensure solutions are
• Anchored in an understanding of the situation of the host environment
• Based on input of priorities and perceptions of the displacement affected communities

OUTPUTS

SOLUTIONS FRAMEWORK TOOL DEVELOPED
• Guidance
• Standard data collection protocol to support disaggregation of data
• Online tutorial

DISSEMINATION OF LEARNING
• Practitioners and policy makers learning events
• Quarterly update including challenges

APPLICATION OF THE FRAMEWORK
• Publications and reports
• External evaluation
• Lessons learnt on participatory and consensus building process involving multi stakeholders and sectors

Appropriateness: Solutions work is people centered – a community lens approach is used
• Availability of beneficiary 'inputted' data
• Stakeholders confirm usage of beneficiary data
• Participatory process and displacement affected communities surveys
• Framework owned by stakeholders

Coverage: Focus is on displacement affected communities so to ensure involvement of host communities and support a do no harm approach
• Different context and target groups to pilot and test it and to build a database of lessons learnt

Effectiveness: Solution work is holistic approach addressing physical, material and legal safety
• Data is collected on the three safety elements (physical, material and legal safety)
• Implementers consider programming in all three areas
• Policy makers (government and donors) address all the areas

Efficiency: a standard data protocol to support disaggregation of data for better analysis, targeting, coordination and accountability
• Level of input / over time
• Depth of analysis that can be made from aggregated data
• Coordination and connectedness with other initiatives and groups (IASC durable solutions working group, Solution Alliance
• Standard data protocol and guidance note available
• Framework adopted/ used in different regions
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